Appendix

Target for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I attended the annual dinner of the United States Chamber of Commerce and was very much impressed with a very thoughtful, informative, and inspiring address delivered by Mr. Philip D. Reed, the chairman of the board of directors of General Electric Co.

The part of his speech looking toward the future, especially the future planning with reference to meeting the demands of our Nation, is impressive and, I think, quite helpful.

Because I think these remarks by Mr. Reed would be of interest to the people of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARGET FOR TOMORROW

(Address by Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of directors, General Electric Co., at the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., May 2, 1956)

History has no parallel for America or for the economic status of the American people. I shall attempt no extensive documentation of that statement because the figures are too well known, particularly to this audience. The fact, for example, that with only 6 percent of the land area and 7 percent of the population we produce 40 percent of the world's goods and services. The even more important fact that with this great productivity the economic benefits have been very widely shared here in America. Between 1946 and 1956 the number of families and individuals with disposable incomes of over $4,000 rose from 19 million to 29 million. Our society is characterized by an extremely thin band of very rich, an equally thin band of very poor, and the great mass of our population occupying the middle area.

I could give specific examples. To take just one from my own company, in 1939 the average annual earnings of General Electric employees were $2,028; in 1955 these had risen to $5,627; and, as we further automate to meet customer demand, thus raising productivity and constantly increasing both the number and the ratio of highly skilled to unskilled jobs, it seems entirely possible to us that the average earnings of General Electric employees 10 years from now may be in the range of $8,000 to $9,000 annually.

Addressing itself to the past 50 years, the Twentieth Century Fund's Survey of America's Needs and Resources had this to say:

"No period of comparable length in human history has brought such great changes in the variety, quality, and quantity of goods and services available for consumption. In many ways those of us now passing middle age have within our lifetime experienced a greater advance in our material standard of living and a more pervasive change in our way of life than occurred in all the previous centuries of human history. * * * The mass of the people, it is important to emphasize, have been the chief beneficiaries of this great material progress. Worth mentioning is the fact that this momentous development has been taking place not in Communist Russia but in capitalist America. Of all the great industrial nations, the one that clings most tenaciously to private capitalism has come closest to the Socialist goal of providing abundance for all in a classless society."

That ends the quote, but the question remains: To what can this tremendous progress be attributed? To our natural resources—our land, minerals, harbors, forests—these have frequently been cited as a reason for our favorable position? To the energy and resourcefulness of our people drawn from every quarter of the globe? To the size of our domestic market unhampered by internal trade barriers? To our own particular brand of capitalism, evolved through the years? To our concept of freedom and our form of constitutional government with its system of checks and balances so carefully worked out by our forefathers?

Surely each of these has played its full part in producing the economic and social complex which is today's America. But it is also true that each of these important elements has long been exerting its constructive influence on our country's economic development; some of them from the very beginning. One is inclined, therefore, to search for something added, something new, that may help to account for the accelerated pace of the rise of our national economic indexes in recent times. And it is one of these added starters that I shall examine tonight in the hope that its usefulness, as applied by thousands of business organizations, may have broader application to the objectives of the Nation both in business and in other fields.

As a result of visits to some 30 foreign countries since World War II, it is my observation that every successful economic system must be founded on one indispensable concept—growth. Those countries which have made the greatest strides, and many have made great progress, have also been characterized by the emergence of a new attitude or outlook in the industrial and business community. This growth psychology can best be described as a firm and positive faith in the capacity of the economy to maintain a long-term upward trend through continuous and intelligent expenditures for research, improved production facilities, better marketing techniques, and through the broad distribution of the fruits of the progress thus made. Growth, the idea of constant progress and the creation of incentives for every element of the economy to achieve it, is a definite must in any economic system that is going to prosper in the world's economy.

This may seem so obvious as scarcely to warrant more than passing mention. The fact is, however, that reasonably comfortable human beings—you and I, for example—particularly as we grow older, develop a tendency to resist change and to cling to the status quo. Growth and the status quo are as incompatible as competition and cartels or as benzedrine and barbital. And it is for this very reason that such immense importance must be attached to the growth concepts that provide powerful incentives for research, for expansion and modernization of facilities, for increased productivity, for investment in new businesses and in exciting prospects for old businesses.

The "something added," therefore, to which I referred a moment ago in searching for the fresh factor in the American economic scene, is first, the concept, the state of mind that accepts growth, change, and progress as a way of life; second, the practice of setting long-term business targets or objectives; and third, the creation, step by step, of long-term plans to reach them.

Today more and more business leaders are trying to get ahead of the job and attempting to work out more or less definite plans for the development of their enterprises over a period of 5 or 10 years. To a growing extent today's business decisions are being made on the basis of long-range considerations, instead of day-by-day or year-to-year opportunistic measures, rushing to expand when the business barometers read fair, and cutting back at the first sign of a cloud on the horizon. Let me very briefly review the planning process in broad outlines.

The first task is to examine any and all data that will help to determine the size and character of our economy—national, regional or local, as the case may be—5, 10, or more years hence. What is wanted for this purpose is the most expert forecasts available on such factors as population growth, family formation, gross national product, national income and its distribution, research expenditures both overall and in the field of the particular business, etc. Obviously, many other projections of a more specific nature would be used here depending on the kind and location of the business for which the projection is being made. And let me emphasize in passing that statisticians don't make progress, they record it. There is no substitute, therefore, for hard individual thinking, forward thinking, business-by-business, industry-by-industry, community-by-community, venturer-by-venturer; for it is their results which add up to but do not derive from forward estimates of the national economy.

The purpose, then, of this study is to estimate the approximate level of the economy at specified future dates and, more importantly, the approximate potential market for the then products of the business concerned.

The next step is the preparation of sales forecasts over the 5, 10, or more year period, based on the projected market potential indicated in the initial study. Costs and income before taxes would similarly be estimated for the indicated sales.

Next, based on the sales projections just mentioned, a careful study is made of what would be required, and when, in each of the following categories, among others, to achieve and support sales of the magnitude shown in the long-term forecasts:

Additional capital in the business, and from what source.

Additional plant and equipment.

Additional trained manpower, both technical and managerial.

Additional research and development programs and facilities.

New or revised organization structure.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

From these requirements are finally drafted a program, phased over the period of the plan, which will meet the estimated needs of the business on all fronts and in time.

Now, before I turn to the implementation of these plans, let me acknowledge at once the obvious fact that there is always the possibility of substantial error in these forecasts. They should be reviewed each year, revised if indicated, and pushed out 1 more year ahead. Our experience at General Electric has been that more reliance can be placed on a 5-year forecast than on a single year projection. In any event, the very process of making long-term plans, and reviewing and extending them each year, orients the executives' thinking and judgment to the needs and possibilities of the business down the years. It tends to avoid the experience so many of us have been through in years gone by of being unable to supply the demand for our products in good times and being unwilling to invest in new facilities or other prospective needs of the business in times of recession.

* * * * *

No doubt the millenium has not yet arrived, nor an ever-upward path achieved, but the implementation of long-term planning based on the concept of growth that is now common in American industry has had, and will continue to have, a powerful influence on the accomplishment of its own goals and on the maintenance of a more stable overall economy.

And it may be noted parenthetically here that if this premise is sound, and I believe it is, such industries as steel, construction and heavy equipment, which were once thought of as boom or bust industries, should no longer have to be so categorized, provided always that they plan effectively and do not price themselves out of the market during periods of unusual demand.

* * * * *

Now if the concept of growth, progress, and the making and implementation of long-range plans to reach predetermined targets is a useful and constructive business tool, even at this early stage in its development, should we not explore the applicability of this same technique to other targets? Indeed, why not explore its applicability to other objectives dear to the heart of all Americans, and why not test its usefulness in the achievement of international as well as national objectives?

For example, just as we in business are learning to project our future requirements of capital, facilities, manpower, research, and organization structure, educators should be able to visualize the kind of education that must be provided now for people who are to run that kind of economy in the future. * * * It is already apparent that just as our American brand of capitalism is going to be based on the widest possible distribution of the fruits of progress, so is it going to demand the best energies—in terms of trained minds—of all the people.

I am sure that educators all over the country are conscious of these things, and are trying to find ways and means of expanding the capacity and increasing the instructional efficiency of the institutions with which they are associated. But I suggest that far too few people appreciate the immensity of the task ahead. I am told that the projected growth in the number of boys and girls of college age during the next 10 years will require us to put on top of existing facilities a plant equivalent to all the colleges and universities built in this country since the founding of Harvard over 300 years ago—and perhaps we should not even be thinking in terms of an equivalent plant.

There is the common claim that we cannot afford this. But can we, in fact, afford not to afford it? I cannot escape the feeling that if every institution of higher education—institution by institution—were to formulate and publicize in its own community a 10-year plan and program designed to accommodate its share of the projected increase in college enrollment, nationwide understanding of the problem and its solution would be greatly advanced.

* * * * *

There are, of course, many other areas of great national importance in which more long-term planning and progressive implementation are sorely needed. Highway construction, for example, is today far behind our current needs—not so much for lack of a plan at the national level but for lack of congressional approval and implementation. Much State and local highway construction has been held in abeyance in the meantime with the unhappy and extremely expensive result so familiar to us all.

Community planning for growth and development, including slum clearance, slum prevention, and such indispensable services as hospitals, schools, play and parking areas, local transportation, etc., are natural subjects for more and better long-term planning of the kind we have been discussing. * * *

Turning to the international field. The opportunity for and importance of long-range planning is, if anything, greater than in domestic affairs.

Private business investments abroad require the most careful investigation and long-term planning of the character I discussed earlier. Additional elements of risk being involved—exchange fluctuations and control, devaluation and expropriation, for example—the projected return on the investment over a period of years must be closely scrutinized for adequacy.

But quite apart from American business operations overseas, our Government's foreign policy would, in my judgment, greatly benefit from an opportunity to engage in more long-term planning and programing. Let me give you three very brief illustrations.

If it is the policy of our Government—and I deeply believe it should be—to assist underdeveloped countries in their efforts to strengthen and balance their economies, and thus gradually improve their standard of living, by giving them technical advice and, in proper cases, loans or even grants of moderate amount—if this be our policy, then nothing could be more limiting and frustrating than to implement it on a year-to-year basis. Here, if anywhere, planning over a period of years is an absolute essential, and the inability to commit our Government to a program of assistance extending beyond a year or two is in many instances fatal.

The arguments in favor of keeping a string on our commitments to countries we are befriending in our own long-time interest are familiar, but I submit they are frequently outweighed by the value to us of doing the economic and technical assistance job on a carefully planned and realistic basis. Anything short of that would be self-defeating.

The present controversy in the Congress over the so-called OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—is in part the result of inadequate weight being given to the need for orderly and planned administration. The OTC has no power of decision and cannot commit our Government in any way, but it can be invaluable as a continuing administrative body possessed of world trade statistics of immense usefulness and a complete knowledge of the status of trade agreements between all countries of the world.

Last week Secretary Dulles gave official support to the suggestion that NATO be strengthened and invigorated by enlarging its field of action to embrace economic and perhaps other matters in addition to strictly military affairs. In my view, this is a sound suggestion. But in the same breath I urge the need at the outset for the most careful delineation of its extended duties and of the organization that will be required to perform them.

I could go on with other examples, but perhaps I have said enough to make the point that planning—long-term planning—has been so thoroughly demonstrated to be an invaluable instrument for the operation and further development of our own industrial economy that it would be out of character for us not to pursue, perfect, and broaden its use wherever it can serve us.

* * * * *

Ours is quite different from the many economic systems that go by the name of capitalism in other countries. It has been recently, and quite appropriately, described, as "a people's capitalism," in which the masses, not simply the privileged few, enjoy its fruits and benefits. Our brand of capitalism is characterized and distinguished from the others by the following six principal features:

(a) We in America believe in large volume and small profit margins—not small volume and large profit margins.

(b) We in America believe in high wages, high productivity, and high purchasing power. These must occur together. One without the other defeats its own ends, but together they spell dynamic growth.

(c) We in America believe in scrapping the obsolete, regardless of its remaining useful life. A new tool, new technique, or new machine that can do the job better and faster and which, by resulting savings, will pay for itself in a reasonable time, is a good investment even though it replaces equipment in first-class condition.

(d) We in America believe in consumer credit, and have developed and used installment sales techniques to a degree unparalleled elsewhere in the world. Without it our economic indices would be at a fraction of their present level, and new industries like television, for example, would still be in their infancy.

(e) We in America believe in more leisure for our people through a short and highly productive workweek. And the very fact of extensive leisure has produced great new industries that provide means for entertainment, for cultural pursuits, for sports of all kinds, and for the do-it-yourself enthusiasts.

(f) And finally and most importantly, we in America believe deeply in competition versus the cartel. Competition is the sparkplug of our economy. It keeps us endlessly, urgently searching and researching for new and better products, more efficient methods of production, and surer marketing techniques. It is both the carrot and the stick, at once pulling and pushing us forward along the road to better things. Human nature being what it is, I submit there is no substitute for competition.

These, then, are the principal elements of our strictly homegrown brand of capitalism. To them can be added, at least with respect to the practice of many, many companies, the element of long-term planning as a tool which both anticipates and promotes vigorous economic growth. May its effectiveness be sharpened by experience and its use become universal.

* * * * *

In short, it is our job, ladies and gentlemen, to lift our sights, to future-orient our thinking and our corporate planning. Thus, and only thus, can we do our full part in maintaining the now splendidly rising trend of production, investment, and trade—and hence living standards—in America and throughout the free world. In a very real sense, the kind of lives our children and our grandchildren will live is in the making now. And because the pattern is so largely ours to determine, let's make this our target for tomorrow.

JN
.R5
2dset

Challenge to Khrushchev by Ferenc Nagy, Former Prime Minister of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today America is a haven of refuge for many formerly suppressed peoples who suffered from the painful pangs of Soviet tyranny. Many of these peoples were willing to risk their lives in a perilous effort to escape from Communist bondage to western freedom, and certain former leaders of the captive nations were forced into exile by the Kremlin.

In exile in the United States today is one of the most outstanding statesmen of Hungary who was chief executive of that nation before the Communists gained control of the country. He is former Prime Minister Ferenc Nagy whose government was overthrown by the Communist tyrants who now rule his great nation.

Ferenc Nagy, Mr. Speaker, was a peasant by birth and breeding, and from early youth he worked unceasingly to better conditions of the peasantry of Hungary. Born of a Hungarian family whose financial means did not permit him formal education, by the flickering light of tallow candles this great past Prime Minister studied the classics after tilling the soils of his country long hours of the day. When, after reaching manhood and having attained a vast knowledge of the problems of Hungary, acquired through self-education and personal experience, the heavy hand of destiny fell upon his shoulders in the wake of the Nazi scourge.

With a heart filled with ardent love for his people, Ferenc Nagy rose to be leader of the Smallholder Party of Hungary and was elected Prime Minister of his country after Hitler's armies had been smashed. But the dreams of a lifetime were soon to vanish when the dark clouds of world communism suddenly hovered over his land and precipitated a form of cruel bondage upon the good people of Hungary that was even worse than that of Hitler.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Ferenc Nagy is in exile in the United States, but he is far from inactive in the fight against the further spread of world communism. In a ceaseless effort to enlighten potential future victims of Soviet tyranny, he makes frequent trips throughout the remaining areas of the Eastern Hemisphere that are still enjoying freedom; and in those areas he lectures about the evils of communism and the virtues of American democracy. In such a capacity, the former Prime Minister of Hungary is making an important contribution in the free world's struggle against the Soviet goal of world domination. In his heart the glowing vision of his people still remains, and in the hearts of suppressed countrymen of Hungary he still is held dear as a source of hope and confidence; for the good peasantry of Hungary to whose cause he dedicated his life's work know that he is doing all within his power to bring about the birth of a new Hungary—one in which men are free.

On March 27, Mr. Speaker, this distinguished Hungarian statesman outlined a significant challenge to the Kremlin. In a letter to Communist Party boss Khrushchev, Mr. Nagy commended the Soviet boss for exposing the crimes committed by the late dictator, Josef Stalin, against the dead. But the challenge was contained in the suggestion that the Kremlin rectify the crimes committed by Stalin against those who still live. To rectify those crimes would, of course, involve the complete liberation of the satellite and Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, the former Prime Minister of Hungary has given me a copy of his forthright letter to Khrushchev, and I wish to here insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: Your speech delivered at the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Union, in which you made public the sins of Stalin, the former dictator of your country, created a deep impresison on the entire civilized world. The facts outlined were not what impressed me most—of these I had previous knowledge—I was most impressed by the frankness with which you revealed an epoch in the life of the Soviet Union before the world. Presupposing that this frankness permeates the leaders of the Soviet Union, the Government and party leadership alike, and through this a new era is beginning in the life of the Soviet Union, I have decided to take the extraordinary step of writing a letter to you, calling to your attention the fact that—in my opinion—what could evolve as logical and just consequences as a result of your speech. My firm conviction is that these consequences, which would result from a practical application and realization of new policies, could create not only in the life of the Soviet Union, but in the field of international politics as well, a new era, one of peace, understanding, and of prosperity. On the other hand, if your speech on the Stalin affair is not followed up to gain necessary results, and it disappears without a trace in the wake of other daily events, then, in world opinion, the impression which will remain will be that the Stalin affair is the personal affair of the Soviet leaders, who are happy that they no longer have to fear physical annihilation or humiliation; otherwise the policies of Stalin continue unabated without any change whatsoever under your leadership.

The press, so far, has not published complete reports of your speech. From excerpts published thus far, I see that you spoke only of the sins committed by Stalin against the Soviet leaders and against the Soviet military. Stalin's sins are not limited to those committed against his coworkers, the murders and humiliation suffered by the Soviet people. Stalin was the greatest criminal in all history, even if you consider that the number of mass murders in China may possibly exceed in number the sum total of Stalin's victims. Stalin committed the greatest crime in all history against all mankind. After the Second World War, it was Stalin who prevented honest carrying out of international agreements, the creation of a true peace, and as a result, the calming down of humanity. Stalin was responsible for creating international tension, which even today is the primary problem of the entire world. It is the crime of Stalin, that after the Second World War, after Hitler was conquered and destroyed, hate in the world did not cease, that the technical progress learned in the war was not used for the benefit of mankind; that instead of being put into the service of the people's welfare, there began the greatest rearmament race in history, the labors of mankind were heaped into armament, rather than serving the happiness and contentment of the peoples of the world. Into Hitler's place on the gory stage of history stepped Stalin, with the same personal ambitions and the same murderous terror. Hitler was motivated by a mania for power, when during the war he temporarily subjugated the peaceful nations of Europe, but the same mania for power drove Stalin when he, in turn, subjugated the defenseless, plundered, bleeding nations of Eastern Europe after the war.

I am writing you this letter from exile. But at the beginning of the international terror of Stalin's reign, I was still at home in my country, having lived through imprisonment by Hitler's Gestapo. During the two years following the war, I was a cabinet minister, President of Parliament, the Prime Minister, and the leader of the majority democratic party. These are positions in which I had to make personal contacts with the imperialist terror of Stalin. Based on my personal experiences and my proofs, I state, that after the Second World War, the nations of eastern Europe were subjugated by a terroristic minority under the orders of Stalin, with the aid of the Red army, and the open aid of Soviet diplomats. And I further declare that present world tension is not caused by the various problems now engaging the public opinion of the world, but by the occupation of the area of eastern Europe by force—all other events are but results of this No. 1 international crime.

The nations of eastern Europe, from the Baltics to Albania, will speak for themselves. I will chiefly speak of Hungary, where I was a political and national peoples' leader in a period following the war. There was absolutely no necessity for the subjugation of Hungary. The Soviet Union was not in any danger whatsoever from Hungary. She was weakened by the war, and the unanimous aim and hope of the people, robbed by both the Germans and the Russians, was to create peace, build up a democratic system and economy, aid the standard of living, and attain happiness and contentment. The political group which declared war on the Soviet Union, and which entered into an alliance with Hitler, had lost all its influence by the end of the war. Those social groups, which before the war hindered democratic progress, were no longer factors. The people of Hungary—despite the brutality of the Red army—did not hate the Soviet Union. The Government wanted peace, and a good-neighbor relationship with the Soviet Union. The democratic development and the good intentions of the country were fully recognized by the chief representatives of the Soviet Union. After the elections, held in 1945, in which my party obtained an absolute majority, Marshal Voroshilov, the President of the Allied Control Commission, the present President of the Soviet Union, declared before me that the good relations existing between the Soviet Union and Hungary, must be built up in the victorious Independent Smallholders Party. The democratic way of life extant in Hungary, and its peaceful desires were not questioned even by Stalin himself. When in 1946, in April, I was a guest of the Soviet Union in Moscow, Stalin greeted me as the democratic leader of the Hungarian Government, and he solemnly promised that the Soviet Union would never endanger the independence of Hungary, nor would it ever interfere in the internal affairs of Hungary.

Why, then, was it necessary to remove the democratic Government of Hungary, and replace it by force with the henchmen of Stalin at the helm? Why did the Tuchachevsky conspiracy trials have to be repeated in Hungary with the aid of the NKVD? Why did honest Hungarian leaders have to be dragged away to the Soviet Union? Why was there interference in the internal affairs of my party? To this there is no other answer, but

because of Stalin's terroristic criminal tendencies. In the light of reality no explanation can be found for the eastern European policies of Stalin. If Stalin had not subjugated eastern Europe there would now exist a peaceful and prospering east Europe, which would carry on normal commercial and political relations with the Soviet Union. But Stalin created an uneasy and hostile eastern Europe where more than 100 million people look upon communism and Moscow with deepest hatred.

Without a doubt, the Soviet Union in the past 10 years, has massed a great deal from plundering the economy of eastern Europe. But these amounts in no sense of the word are proportionate to the cost of arming the Soviet Union for the illegal occupation of eastern Europe, and the international tensions resulting therefrom. With the occupation of eastern Europe, Stalin plunged the people of the area, as well as the Russian people, into poverty and backwardness. If, after the Second World War, Stalin had permitted true peace to be established, if the basis of international politics had been mutual trust, and rearmament in the Soviet Union could have been kept at a peacetime level, there would have been no reason for even beginning a similar program in eastern Europe. Thus in the Soviet Union, the major part of the cost of rearmament, and in eastern Europe the total cost of a similar program, could have served the development of the economy of the area, and the raising of the standard of living for the people. The detrimental effect of Stalin-type policies is clearly indicated, when, as examples the Soviet Union and Germany are compared. Germany, conquered, plundered, and saddled with reparations problems, today, after a 10-year period following the end of the war, can offer higher living standards to the workers, than even in the time of Wilhelm II, or even in the time of Hitler. In comparison, the citizens of the rich and victorious Soviet Union, in their standard of living cannot even approach that of Germany, or that of other free countries in Europe. In Hungary, compared with the economic situation in 1947, there exists a serious and irreparable decline.

The selfish and terroristic foreign policies of Stalin brought incalculable harm not only to the Soviet Union and the people of eastern Europe but to the people of all the world as well, primarily to the people of Asia and Africa. The problems of these peoples may be divided into two groups. The first group would be comprised of economic problems. The peoples of Asia and Africa are so underdeveloped in relation to the Western World, that without the aid of the West, and mainly that of America, it cannot hope to overcome this problem. America is ready for all sacrifices to lift the backward nations to a higher level, and to enable them to attain the blessings of civilization. But Stalin has forced the rearmament of America and other Western Powers, and this armament program limits the amount of aid which can be extended to Asia and Africa. It is easy to picture what the policies of Stalin have cost the peoples of Asia and Africa, when we know that the annual cost of arming the West is more than the national budget of India for 25 years. In the other group belongs the question of the sovereignty for Asian and African peoples, and the question of colonialism. After the Second World War, a tremendous program of decolonization was instituted. The Western Powers liberated more than 600 million people from a colonial status. This process gave indication of the final liquidation of all colonialism. When did the decolonization program stop? Exactly at the time when Stalin subjugated the countries of eastern Europe. It would be political shortsightedness not to recognize the connection between the two. The West could not relinquish its colonial outposts at the very time that the Soviet Union was conquering new areas for itself.

Naturally, there are many other aspects of the criminal and reckless policies of Stalin which must all be weighed carefully when someone wants to clarify the sins of Stalin. It is only natural, that one cannot stop with recognizing the sins of Stalin, and publicizing them. From these sins, neither you Mr. Khrushchev, nor Mr. Molotov, or even Marshal Voroshilov can be considered exempt, without taking into consideration the end results. As you have been rid of Stalin, so you must rid yourselves of continuing his sins. The sins of Stalin can be expressed in one word: "terror." The results of terror cannot be eliminated by the substitution of a minor terror. You cannot diminish terror at home, and keep up the terror in the international scene. The opposite of terror is freedom. Terror, in even a diminished quantity, is negative; freedom, on the other hand, is positive. This positive idea is the one which must be employed against Stalinism both on the national and the international scene.

It cannot be doubted, Mr. Khrushchev, that you have done a great service to mankind when you place Stalin in history where he rightfully belongs, beside Hitler and the other bloodthirsty terrorists. You have helped along a new way of thinking in the people living under communism, and in those who, in a free world are studying communism, or sympathize with it. But you will only serve mankind truly, if you do not stop at unmasking Stalin, but without any hesitation will begin the liquidation of Stalin tactics. You must give back the right of self-determination to nations, and to the people, as you have together with your fellow leaders won your rights for self-determination through the death of Stalin, and by the recognition of his crimes.

It is not enough to speak about those sins of Stalin which can no longer be rectified. It is those crimes which must be brought to light which Stalin committed against the living: people and nations as well. The dead cannot be resurrected, but imprisoned people can still be liberated, and unjustly subjugated and terrorized nations can also be set free.

Respectfully,

FERENC NAGY,
Former Prime Minister of Hungary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 27, 1956.*

Edward V. Gronet, Polish-American Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Polish-American professional and businessmen of the metropolitan area—Greenpoint, Brooklyn—honored Edward V. Gronet with a testimonial dinner-banquet, Sunday, April 15, 1956, in Brooklyn, N. Y. The event marked the 10th anniversary of Eddie Gronet as a polka disc jockey of Polish-American radio programs Polka Time from station WWRL, Woodside, N. Y. He was the first to introduce a Polish-American TV program, WATV Polka Party, on channel 13, Newark, N. J., which covers four States: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

The entire program for the testimonial dinner-banquet was prepared and arranged by the following Polish-American professional and business men: Chairman, Vincent Brunhard, president of the Ampol Baking Co.; vice chairman, Matthew Widlicki, vice president and treasurer of the D. & Z. Bottling Co.; Martin Weglicki, president of the White Eagle Market; treasurer, John Bucko, of the Bucko Jewelers; secretary, Ted Maksymowicz, of radio station WEVD; journal committee, Paul Pucilowski, of the Powers Furniture Co.; financial secretary, Mrs. Kashimira Garrison, of the Garrison Beauty Salon; ticket committee, Edward Zielenieski, of Martin's Shoe Store; and the reception committee, Al Bartosiewicz, of Newell Fuel Co., Hal Korman, and Dick Martin, WWRL-WATV.

As known to many friends and in the professional field, Eddie Gronet is a man of many accomplishments. In addition to his radio and TV programs, Eddie has one of the outstanding dance and recording orchestras in this area. The voice of Eddie Gronet is known to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans of Polish and non-Polish descent through his radio, TV programs, orchestra, and records.

Eddie Gronet received his education at the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Roman Catholic Parochial School, Bishop Loughlin Memorial High School, and Manhattan College—majoring in music and accounting.

During World War II he served in the United States Armed Forces with distinction for 4 years. Upon completion of his basic training, he was assigned to a tank destroyer unit and later transferred to the finance department at Camp Hood, Tex., where he was promoted to private first-class. Two months later he was promoted to staff sergeant and headed the enlisted personnel and officers day section. Third promotion in succession within 1 year raised him to the rank of warrant officer, junior grade, in the 8th Army Corps, Dallas, Tex. Later he was assigned to the 66th Infantry Division as an administration officer and was shipped overseas in 1944, where he served in England, Germany, France, and with the occupied forces in Vienna, Austria. While in Vienna, Gornet served in the Four Power Secretariat Office as chief clerk under Gen. Mark Clark. He was honorably discharged in May 1946 as chief warrant officer.

After returning from his tour of duty, Gronet resumed his radio and musical career. For the past 10 years he conducted, produced, and is the director of Polish programs at radio station WWRL, Woodside, Long Island, N. Y., and as such participated in many community drives for American Red Cross, heart fund, TB health fund, March of Dimes, Greenpoint Central Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn camp fund, and numerous Catholic and social charities.

Eddie Gronet has one of the outstanding dance and dance-recording orchestras in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, often appearing at Roseland Ballroom on Broadway. He is a re-

cording artist, having performed for Columbia Records and currently under contract with Coral Records. He is also an instructor at the Harmony Music School.

In 1950 he was awarded a plaque for being chosen the favorite polka band in a contest sponsored by Melody Girls, affiliated with the Polish Singers Alliance of America, and in 1953 was awarded a plaque by St. Adalbert Alumni Association, of Bronx, N. Y., as the most popular polka disc jockey. He was also a winner of first prize in a band contest sponsored by Loew's Meserole Theater in 1944. Last September 1955 Eddie Gronet's WATV polka party was awarded the first prize blue ribbon by the New Jersey State County Fair held in Trenton, N. J., for the outstanding TV program of its type.

Besides his music and radio work, Gronet is very active in numerous church, social, fraternal, and community organizations. He served a brief term as president of the Polish-American Democratic Club of the 15th Assembly District in Brooklyn, during which term he was a candidate for the assembly; vice commander of George Washingotn Post, No. 3, Polish Legion of American Veterans—PLAV; secretary of the White Eagle Democratic Club; a director of downstate New York division, Polish American Congress, member of Musicians' Union, Local 802, A. F. of M.; member of the American Radio and Television Artists—AFTRA; Greenpoint Lions Club; Victory Club; Kosciusko Foundation; General Pulaski Memorial committee trustee; Polish National Alliance; Sons of Poland; Holy Name Society; and Knights of Columbus.

Eddie Gronet is a true, a sincere, and a devout Polish and an American patriot, always willing to devote his time, energy, and services toward freedom and democracy. He serves and represents the Polish people of his and other communities well in all reespects, and the Polish people are always very proud of him. Eddie, through his untiring efforts, continues to promote Polish culture in all fields among Americans. Eddie Gronet is considered one of the outstanding Polish-American leaders in the New York metropolitan area.

Ike's Choice of Interior Head Will Be Revealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ike's Choice of Interior Head Will Be Revealing," published in the San Francisco Bee of April 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE'S CHOICE OF INTERIOR HEAD WILL BE REVEALING

President Dwight D. Eisenhower yet has to make his personal position on national resources conservation completely and unequivocally clear.

There have been contradictory and inconclusive actions in the White House, notably the President's advocacy of and then cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract and his on-and-off position on the natural-gas bill.

While speaking up for conservation, President Eisenhower bestowed high praise upon his retiring Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, whose administration was marked by almost continuous charges of giveaways of the Nation's resources.

The President's laudation of McKay had some political implications, since there is nothing the Republican leaders would like more than to have McKay defeat WAYNE MORSE as United States Senator from Oregon.

But no such personal politics will be involved in the selection of a successor. And in the choice he makes the President will be demonstrating not only his convictions but from whom he takes advice on such matters.

One of those prominently mentioned for the post is Clarence Davis, who is Under Secretary of the Department.

In appraising McKay the Washington Post takes the position he was a genial Secretary who did not always know what was going on in the back room.

No such naivete is attached to Davis.

The Post points out it was Davis who negotiated the questionable Al Sarena mining claims in Oregon and who wrote into a Department directive almost verbatim the recommendation of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to relieve private utilities of power wheeling obligation.

Were the President to appoint Davis it would be a clear indication he approves of what has been going on in the Department.

Under McKay the Department slipped far away from the conservation ideals of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. The President has the opportunity to reverse that trend.

Address by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, Before Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Reserve Officers Association at St. Paul, Minn., on May 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE TO RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, STATE OF MINNESOTA, AT ST. PAUL, MINN., May 5, 1956

Never before in our history has the United States been required to invest so heavily in preparing for conflict at a time when its citizens are receiving and enjoying the dividends of peace. As a world leader, we are in the position of leading the forces for freedom and peace in the tense struggle against Russia and her satellites.

This type of position in world affairs presents many problems which we have not faced before. On the one hand, we must make every effort to establish friendly relations and a desire for peace by all nations and, at the same time, think in terms of a war which promises mass annihilation. We must investigate all possibilities for disarmament, but, at the same time, continue our development of the most destructive weapons man has ever known. Within our own Nation, we must gradually build our Armed Forces into an effective and efficient fighting unit, but, at the same time, we must place a priority upon the factors which make up a peacetime economy and society.

We are, as a nation, in the position of a man working in the sunshine with the clouds of a summer storm in the background, threatening to interrupt his activity.

To maintain a proper balance between our search for peace and our preparation for a possible conflict demands the greatest skills of leadership available. In President Eisenhower, we have such leadership. He is particularly suited for leadership at this time because he, above all others, combines the type of statesmanship and diplomacy needed to build a foundation for peace, with the vast experience which he has in guiding the military destinies of the United States and the free world.

The many difficult problems which we have at the present day, however, demand the maximum efforts of all citizens in positions of responsibility. That is why I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet with the Minnesota State Reserve Officers Association. As a veteran of World War I, when I served as both an enlisted man and as an officer, and as your Senator, I understand your problems and recognize the importance of your program in supplying the type of leadership we need today.

Our main concern right now is to establish a proper balance between our manpower reserve and research into existing and new weapons within the budgets established by the administration and the Congress.

The greatest possible effort must be made in the development and research in the field of guided and interceptor missiles. We have already spent millions of dollars in missile research and development and will continue to make this program a priority in our defense preparation. We also realize that the Russians are concentrating right now on missile development. It is no secret that the intercontinental missile, when fully developed, will have a deep impact on relations between the major world powers. At the same time, an interceptor missile which is capable of destroying a missile already in flight will further change the pattern of any future conflict.

At this point, I would like to make clear that I do not view a conflict of major powers as imminent. I believe that all nations are coming to the point where they realize the futility of war. However, we cannot operate on the assumption that peace is assured. We must protect ourselves against any possible outbreak of war. We learned very costly lessons at Pearl Harbor and in June 1950, when the Korean war started. Never again can we afford to be caught off balance.

I should also like to take issue with those who state that manpower is no longer important to our defense planning because the next war will be a pushbutton war and will be over in a short time. No matter what scientific advances we make in the development of new weapons, we will still need well-trained manpower in all branches of the service.

The Congress had this in mind when it passed the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. The

passage of that act was a major step in the development of a strong and effective Reserve, which can be trained and schooled in methods of modern warfare.

In drafting this legislation, the Congress recognized certain facts which make the task of building a Reserve force difficult. We might as well admit from the outset that we are a peace-loving Nation and that during times of peace it is hard to generate enthusiasm for an active fighting force and for a large Reserve. This is a psychological hurdle which must be met.

The young high-school graduate will always have doubts as to why he should be called into service during times of peace. That is only natural. Once he sees that he has a responsibility to his country to maintain its defenses, he will be willing to cooperate and serve in the active forces. However, he would like to have that new responsibility set forth in the most definite terms. That is what the Reserve Forces Act does. It gives the high-school graduate or the person under 20 a variety of alternatives in serving his country.

You are all aware of the provisions of the law and the choices the men have in fulfilling their military services. The opportunity to serve in Active Reserve units not only stimulated Reserve activity but also made the Reserve a most important element in our defense planning.

The present goal is to establish by 1959 an active Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 men. We also hope to have a Standby Reserve of approximately 2 million men by 1959. Much of the responsibility of reaching that goal rests on you as Reserve officers. If we are to meet the goal, we must carry out a consistently effective education program to inform the prospective reservists of the various opportunities which are available. This program must be carried into every community and high school of the United States. The law is a good one. It seeks to alleviate hardships and inequities. It attempts to show the young men in definite terms what is expected of them and enable them to plan for the future. It allows them to proceed with their education at higher levels with the least amount of dislocation.

These facts must be made known to the parents of these men. It is only natural that a parent should be concerned over the future welfare of his child. Parents who want to send their children on to college and university should know that they can do so with no serious delay because of military service.

Prospective employers of these prospective servicemen should be aware of the provisions of the act. They should be encouraged to hire men of military age. They need not fear that a man will be taken away for a long period of time after he has been trained in a business or vocation. These were all factors which made your work difficult in the past. We have tried to make your task easier through this legislation.

The provision allowing for 6 months' active duty and 7½ years in the Reserve should stimulate greater scholarship achievements in our high schools. This, in itself, will have many favorable ramifications. The high-school graduates should also be told that the Armed Forces today make every attempt to place them in positions for which they have an aptitude or for which they have prior training and experience.

This entire program is designed to allow the graduates to fulfill their military duty when it interferes least with his education and plans for a career. This will remove him from the uncertainties of the draft calls.

Another provision of the law which is of great importance is the screening of ready reservists in peacetime. This is a constant process whereby persons of unusual civilian skills may be transferred to the Standby Reserve. This serves to stabilize our civilian labor force so that we may avoid serious dislocations and inequities if it becomes necessary to carry on an actual war.

This Reserve program should have the solid support of all citizens. This support will develop as the people become aware of the many benefits of this plan. It is too early to evaluate the success of the Reserve program either in terms of enlistments or of public acceptance and support.

Another problem which we face is that of retaining already trained men who are on active duty. This has become an increasingly serious problem, due to our domestic economic and social advances made in the past 10 years.

The high degree of prosperity which we enjoy in our civilian society has made a military career less attractive. Just the other day, I came in contact with a striking example of this. A major in the Air Force who had 13 years of active service found it necessary to take a job in civilian life. He told me that his date for retirement would come up at the same time that his children would be of college age. His desire is like most other parents—to send his children to college. The only way he can plan for that is to accept a position at a higher pay level. Here is one case, and there are thousands of them, where the Armed Forces will lose a trained and qualified man who has spent 13 years of his life in the military service.

As your Senator and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can see the same thing happening not only with officers and enlisted men but with highly skilled civilian employees. Private industry today can give to these men a greater amount of economic and financial security.

The last session of Congress took some steps to correct this situation, and the current session will take further action. Such items as reenlistment bonuses, improved medical care for military dependents, and increasing career incentives for doctors and dentists. It is necessary that action be taken to provide service personnel benefits which are more comparable with those enjoyed in civilian life.

There are indications that this inducement program has already eased the manpower situation. The general Department of Defense reenlistment rate for Regulars has increased from 27 percent in fiscal year 1955 to about 43 percent up to March 1 in fiscal 1956. As a result of the increased reenlistment bonuses and career incentive measures, there has been a sharp rise in the proportion of 6-year reenlistments. The total reenlistments in fiscal year 1954 was 47 percent, as compared with 77 percent in the current fiscal year.

There is another facet in this entire manpower situation which does not directly affect the Reserve program, but which is tied in directly with our entire manpower and research and development program.

At the present time, the United States has taken the lead in scientific and technological development, but at the same time we are faced with a shortage of future manpower in these same fields. We must continue our leadership in these areas and make certain that the Russians do not surpass us.

The Soviet Union today is graduating each year over twice as many engineers and scientists as are being graduated in the United States. We are faced with a marked and continuing decrease in the number of qualified teachers at the high-school and college levels in the basic-science fields. As a result, we have fewer and fewer students each year who are pursuing studies in the sciences and in engineering. We are now faced with a situation that at the same time as science and technology are moving to a position of unprecedented importance, the manpower to maintain our progress is declining.

To meet this situation, the President has appointed a nationwide commission to advise the administration as to what can be done to solve this dilemma. Along the same line, I have introduced in the Senate a resolution to establish a Joint House-Senate Committee on Scientific Research. The legislative branch cannot escape the fact that it is going to become more deeply involved in this area of activity. We will be called upon to work with plans and programs established by the executive branch of Government, including the Department of Defense. Such a committee would work in cooperation with the executive agencies, industry, and our institutions of learning. It would, as a result of its work, be in a position to advise and counsel the proper legislative committees which will be called upon to legislate in this area.

We must be ever mindful of our responsibility as a world leader to establish a firm foundation for peace and freedom for all peoples of the world. The Reserve Officers' Association must play a key part in the progress which we make. Without a large and well-trained Reserve, we cannot prevail. No one can predict at this time whether our destiny is to be written in terms of war or peace. We must maintain a steadfast faith and confidence in the hopes for peace, but at the same time, we must be ready to defend the cause of freedom and justice whenever the time should come.

The Significance of OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an article from the May 11, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, by Roscoe Drummond, as follows:

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Eisenhower administration is going to have quite a fight on its hands to win one of its main objectives at this session: Congressional approval for United States membership in OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation.

This is no big headline-making issue. Win or lose, it won't carry a doubtful State or lose a doubtful district. But OTC is the symbol of everything the United States has been trying to do for years, including the Eisenhower years, to expand the channels of profitable trade throughout the free world.

It is the strong conviction of the President:

That American labor, agriculture and business will be benefited by what OTC can do in expanding world trade.

That OTC cannot function effectively without the United States.

That America would be abdicating its world leadership and would be virtually conceding the field to the Soviets if we decide that OTC isn't worth the effort.

The congressional outlook is not as good as the 18-to-7 vote of approval which the House Ways and Means Committee gave to OTC. While the Democrats voted overwhelming, 14 to 1, for United States membership, the Republicans voted substantially, 6 to 4, against OTC. Obviously the President will have to do a lot better than that with his own party if he is to win.

Secondly, the House Ways and Means Committee voted strongly for OTC because its members have come solidly to grips with the facts and know that most of the arguments used against it are fabricated eyewash.

Things bring us to the oddly revealing circumstance that almost the whole opposition to OTC rests upon charges which have not the slightest relationship to reality.

One can honestly argue—though I happen to think mistakenly—that we ought to dump the Reciprocal Trade Act, turn our back on the effort to build freer multilateral trade and put further subsidies on the American consumer to protect the prices of American industry.

But for particular industries—which don't want the hot breath of world trade to force them to be more efficient and more competitive—to argue that OTC puts the Nation's economy into international bondage, scraps the authority of Congress over tariff policy, sinks American sovereignty and undermines United States industry is adulterated buncombe.

It does none of these things. The bill which would put the United States into OTC guards against all these things. There is no factual basis for such contentions.

The fact that the charges are being made and blandly circulated to Members of Congress suggests that the arguments against OTC are so weak that its opponents dare not use them. They are erecting instead a massive, miasmic wall of fiction which they hope will confuse those who haven't laid hold of the facts.

OTC does not involve any new tariff reduction authority, does not change any United States law, does not affect Congress' authority to legislate, does not give the President any additional powers, does not touch the safeguards of the Reciprocal Trade Act like the peril point, and the United States retains a veto over any action which affects American policy.

You wouldn't get Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks or Cola G. Parker, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, to support OTC as they do, if it did any of these things.

OTC is made up of 35 countries which do 80 percent of the trade of the free world. It would be the administrative instrument to carry out existing trade agreements and iron out trade disputes within the framework of existing policy. It would play a big role in preventing other nations from discriminating against United States exports.

Secretary Weeks is no pie-in-the-sky visionary. His report to the Cabinet on OTC was: "With Soviet economic activities on the increase, the United States must strengthen its cooperation with free nations in the trade field. OTC is essential to this end."

Ike Ranks Only Third in Days Spent Away From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch captioned "Ike Ranks Only Third in Days Spent Away From White House:"

WASHINGTON.—The magazine U. S. News & World Report said today President Eisenhower "ranks third among modern Presidents in time spent away from Washington for reasons other than convalescence from illness."

The magazine said it went to official records which gave a log of each Presidential trip, regardless of how short in time and distance, and it continued in a copyrighted article in its current issue:

"Franklin D. Roosevelt was away from his desk at the White House more days each year, on an average, than any other President in this century. William Howard Taft averaged fewer days away from the White House than Mr. Roosevelt, but was away more days than Mr. Eisenhower."

Including both official trips and vacations, U. S. News & World Report said this was the average time spent away from Washington yearly by the last eight Presidents:

Roosevelt, 136 days, not counting 29 days of convalescence from a persistent respiratory infection spent near Georgetown, S. C., in 1944; Taft, 131 days; Eisenhower, 124 days, not counting 81 days of convalescence from a heart attack spent at Denver and Gettysburg, Pa., Calvin Coolidge, 96 days; Harry S. Truman, 86 days: Warren G. Harding, 63 days; Woodrow Wilson, 61 days; Herbert Hoover, 44½ days.

The magazine gave figures on "work-and-play" vacations of the last three Presidents.

It said Roosevelt spent 483 days (not counting 29 days of convalescence) at Warm Springs, Ga., on cruises and at other vacation spots while in office.

Truman spent 309 days at Key West, Fla., on cruises and at other vacation spots, the magazine said.

It said Eisenhower has spent 283 days not counting 81 days of convalescence at Denver, Augusta, Ga., and other vacation spots while in office.

The magazine said Roosevelt averaged 59 days a year while in office at his home in Hyde Park, N. Y.; that Truman averaged 12 days a year at his home in Independence, Mo., and that Eisenhower has averaged 24 days a year at his farm home near Gettysburg, Pa.

U. N. Building Used With Lease Unassigned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article by David Sentner, chief, Los Angeles examiner, Washington bureau. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this material in the RECORD, so that all who read it may see how we are being hoodwinked by this organization, and how it protects and promotes communism in this country:

WASHINGTON WINDOW

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The United Nations never did ratify the amended headquarters agreement—you might call it the lease and fine print trimmings—through which Uncle Sam, the landlord, is supposed to let the internationalist organization operate in the United States.

Maybe Bridey Murphy's eye specialist can explain why nobody noticed this before, including the State Department, the courts and public vigilante groups.

The inference is that the U. N. has been functioning 10 years against the mandate of Congress—which tacked on a reservation to the agreement when it passed a joint resolution in 1947.

The revised agreement—under the tagline of Public Law 357—was sent along to the State Department which presented it to the U. N.

The U. N. officially ignored it, pretending that the unrevised original document, signed by U. N. Secretary-General Trygve Lie and Secretary of State Marshall in 1946 (on the assumption Congress would okay it) was a sufficient arrangement.

The major reason, apparently for the U. N. not approving the hearquarters agreement with the United States, as revised by Congress, was that it proclaimed the right of this country to keep out Communists.

The reservation in Public Law 357, intended to effect an agreement between the United States and the U. N. for establishing a permanent U. N. headquarters here, declared:

Nothing in the agreement must diminish, abridge, or weaken the right of the United States to safeguard its own security and completely control entrance of aliens into American territory, other than the headquarters district. The boundaries of the latter were to be fixed in a supplemental agreement.

The State Department admits the U. N. has never ratified the document.

Therefore, does it mean even the territorial confines of the U. N. is a shadowy matter?

That the controversies over Communists in the U. N. and whether they should receive back pay, should be thrashed out anew?

That the very legal status of the U. N. is open to question along with many of its decisions?

A State Department official presented the following picture:

Circumstances have never arisen to force the issue with the U. N.

The U. N., in general, has acted as if the reservations had been formally approved.

One reason why the Republican 80th Congress put through the headquarters agreement's protective clause was to slow the funneling of top Communist agents into the United States under the guise of U. N. personnel.

Contributing to the general confusion on the subject was the turnabout last week in granting an American visa to Alain Leleap to attend a U. N. group meeting here.

Leleap recently was released from a Paris jail on the charge of imperiling French security along with other Communists.

The above-face was explained at the State Department as due to the determination it was not a security matter but a political matter.

Employment at New Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an Associated Press dispatch captioned "Employment at New Peak":

EMPLOYMENT AT NEW PEAK—BUSINESS BOOMS

WASHINGTON.—Government chart-watchers Wednesday came up with a sheaf of favorable business reports, including a 912,000 rise of employment in April.

That brought the number of jobholders to an April record of 63,990,000. Simultaneously unemployment dropped by 270,000

to 2,564,000 despite continuing layoffs in the automobile industry, the Commerce and Labor Departments reported.

Similar economic strength was reflected in new reports on construction last month and on factory sales, corporation earnings, and dividend payments last year. Meantime the United States Chamber of Commerce, which polled its businessmen members at their annual meeting here last week, reported the results; they augured well for business activity in the second half of this year.

Forecasts by 404 employers, the chamber said, showed that a majority expect both sales and employment in second half 1956 to equal or exceed the levels of this half.

The Commerce Department reported that new construction activity totaled $3,300,000,000 last month. This matched the all-time April record set a year ago and was 9 percent above March.

Residential activity ran 8 percent behind last April's unprecedented level, but commercial building and highway construction rose to records for the month—up 18 percent and 4 percent, respectively, from April a year ago.

A joint report of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission showed that manufacturers' earnings in 1955, both before and after taxes, were approximately 35 percent higher than in the previous year.

The higher rate of business activity which prevailed in the first three quarters of 1955 was well maintained to the year end, the report showed. Sales set a record for the fourth quarter at $73,600,000,000 and profits after taxes were $4,200,000,000.

Petition to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from the National Patrick Henry Organization, of Columbus, Ga., which I have been requested to insert in the RECORD by its national secretary, Mrs. Jessie W. Jenkins:

Whereas during the year 1945, certain forces among us were busily engaged in whipping up a new League of Nations under the label of "United Nations Organization," which was purported to end wars through diplomacy;

Whereas these more or less self-appointed Solomons of the now familiar ideological cult, employed deceit, fraud, and flagrant misrepresentations to sell it to our Senators as a great peace instrument;

Whereas its utter fallacy has been proven in a thousand disastrous ways, including the Korean sellout, wherein we now know Russians also fought, while a Red Russian general directed that war through U. N., contriving the brutal slaughter of thousands of our sons, and our first military defeat;

Whereas the UNO Charter, section 7, article 2, states: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the U. N. to intervene in matters that are essentially within the jurisdiction of any state," but has proceeded to set up a host of treasonable agencies, such as ILO, Human Rights, Genocide, UNESCO, and so on and on, all of which are designed to destroy our States rights, our established laws and customs, our sovereignty, and with it, our freedom, as in Russia;

Whereas we now know and must recognize these forces as the sponsors of the world Communist conspiracy, whose aim is world conquest as attested by the swallowing up of many other nations and the enslavement of their millions before our eyes, as grim reminders of the feudalism and barbarism of the Dark Ages;

Whereas evidence abounds that top brackets of our armed services are loaded with men willing to collaborate, while the covertly obtained "Status of Forces Treaty" places our fighting men in jeopardly of being framed and wiped out at the command of a Red general whom the U. N. Charter provides shall always head its Military Department, proving U. N. authorship the implacable foes of all Christendom;

Therefore, we of the National Patrick Henry Organization, Inc., solemnly declare that U. N. is a den of spies, an agency of destruction, and our mortal enemy;

That its sponsors and supporters are enemies of America, and that Congress should so declare, on the basis of U. N.'s treasonable record, if not their own;

Further, we implore and petition Congress to rescind and abjure U. N.'s Charter forthwith with all its treasonable agencies; to drive it from our soil and to prosecute all its one world Benedict Arnolds.

Mrs. JESSIE W. JENKINS,
National Secretary-Treasurer.

Bend, Oreg., Sets an Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a memorable occasion when a city makes a decision not to apply for Federal funds, which would almost certainly be granted to it. Bend, Oreg., is a very progressive and civic-minded city in my district. It is working on a planning survey for a comprehensive city plan. Instead of asking for Federal funds, it decided to pay its own way.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial telling the story of this event, which appeared in the Boise (Idaho) Statesman and which was reprinted in the Bend Bulletin:

BEND SETS AN EXAMPLE

Well deserving of a preferred position in some national hall of fame is Oregon's town of Bend whose city commissioners have lately rejected a proposal that an application be made for Federal funds to finance a planning study.

Some years ago before ever such an enormous proportion of the national income was siphoned into the Federal Treasury, an Idaho town came in for a good deal of favorable comment when it turned down a proffered new Federal building because, the townspeople said, it wasn't needed.

Bend does have a recognized need for its planning survey. Annually the past 2 years it has appropriated $5,000 to complete a comprehensive city plan. When it was suggested this year that this expense be unloaded on the Federal Treasury, Hans Slagsvold, ex-mayor and a member of the city commission, led the opposition. He argued to this effect:

"Getting Federal money to match our funds is only evading responsibility. If we need money to continue our city planning, let's get it into the budget. Any Federal money you get is money you have sent to Washington, minus freight charges both ways."

Slagsvold's argument was nothing more than plain common sense. But in this instance it was effective. The seven-man commission headed by Mayor Hap Taylor unanimously tabled the proposal.

It may be that Bend, in this instance, has provided the exception that proves the rule these days. Even at that, there must still be quarters in which it will be hailed as a wholesome manifestation of fidelity to the essential virtues of self-reliance and local self-government.

Is it too much to hope that Bend's example may be taken up by so many other communities that their action may be reflected sometime in a reduction of demands that may be translated into a measure of Federal tax relief?

Henry Cabot Lodge and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we seem to be engaged this year in enshrining a myth, at the expense of history. The myth is achieving heroic proportions by virtue of the celebration of the centennial of Woodrow Wilson's birth. It is to the effect that, except for the benighted and vindictive opposition of a little group of willful men, headed by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, America would have joined Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations and peace everlasting would thereupon have descended on the earth.

There are several things wrong with this myth, but time and space do not permit correction here. Suffice it to say that the United States rejected the League of Nations for good and sufficient constitutional reasons—reasons, I may say, which Europe was willing to accept but which Woodrow Wilson was not; and that the main reason was a refusal by the United States to permit a supranational organization to commit this Nation to war, at any time or place on the globe, in violation of our constitutional processes.

The matter is important because generations of young Americans are reaching maturity, believing, on the basis of what they hear and read in some quarters, that the world's hope of peace and utopia was destroyed by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and some of his colleagues, including my distinguished predecessor in this body, the late Senator James W. Wadsworth, Jr., out of personal animus toward Woodrow Wilson. Only recently I heard this canard going out on the airwaves from a great New York City radio station. Then the young people turn their eyes to New York, and see that this country is the home of the United Nations, and certainly its most devoted supporter, financially and otherwise; and they see that our two Ambassadors to the United Nations are former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Mr. James J. Wadsworth, the grandson and son, respectively, of the men who they are told, "wrecked" the League of Nations. Is it any wonder they are con-

fused? Is it any wonder that our friends from abroad, who are even less familiar with our history and our constitutional processes, are even more confused?

In fairness to ourselves, to our contemporaries here and abroad, and to posterity, and above all, in fairness to our distinguished and devoted United States representatives at the United Nations, we ought to be doubly sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do not falsify history in order to honor Woodrow Wilson. There are honors enough to go around.

The elder Henry Cabot Lodge did not set out to scuttle the League of Nations. He tried to bring it into conformity with our hard-won constitutional processes, and time has amply justified his efforts, for the improvements for which he fought, and which Woodrow Wilson would not accept, were, in fact, incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations. The U. N. today is a tribute to the idealism of Woodrow Wilson, but it is also a tribute to the devotion to constitutional processes of Henry Cabot Lodge.

A book entitled "Through These Men" has recently been written by the distinguished author, John Mason Brown. It deals in part with the Lodges, senior and junior, and sets forth, in brief but accurate perspective, the history of the principles for which they fought—principles which were ignored in the League but recognized in the U. N.

Under leave to etxend my remarks, I include in the RECORD some pertinent excerpts from the chapter on Henry Cabot Lodge:

WILSON AND THE ELDER LODGE

Politics absorbed Lodge as they had never attracted his father, and his politics, while he was in college and for the first years thereafter, were his grandfather's. The old Senator died in 1924, 9 months after Woodrow Wilson. During his last 3 years, when he was reviled or revered for his successful fight against Wilson's League of Nations, the first Henry Cabot Lodge's relations with his namesake became closer and closer. An austere man, small in size but commanding in manner, he thawed completely when with his grandson. His eyes lighted up at the sight of him and his face, so often haughty in expression, creased into a hundred smiling wrinkles above his pointed beard and flowing mustache. His was the final flattery of treating his grandson not as a grandson but as an equal in knowledge and experience, and talking with him man to man about national and international affairs.

The young Lodge had good reasons for being proud of his grandfather, reasons which have been obscured or forgotten by those unable to forgive the Senator for having won his battle against the League. Many disagreed violently with his policies, but none could deny his courage, his skill as a strategist, and the multiplicity of his talents. More than being a practical politician, he was a scholar-author-historian. As such he belonged, even as Wilson and the earlier Roosevelt did, to a race of public servants, now almost extinct in this country, of which Churchill in contemporary England has been the most glittering example.

Considering the crowded life he led, the elder Senator's literary productivity was incredible. His biographies of Hamilton, Webster, and Washington were much admired. He turned out work after work on American history, produced countless monographs, and found time to edit, among other things, the Federalist, Andre's Journal, and a nine-volume collection of the works of Alexander Hamilton. The bitterest of his books, though an able presentation of his own position, was the Senate and the League of Nations, a subject which the old gentleman and his grandson discussed by the hour.

The struggle between the elder Lodge and Wilson left its permanent scars on history. Although it turned everyone into a partisan, few could have followed it with a keener interest than young Lodge. It was a battle royal from which, in a ringside seat, he learned much about the infighting of politics, the sorry fate of the highest of ideals when those who fight for them disregard the political means essential to their realization, and the Senate's adamant determination to preserve its constitutional rights.

In spite of their irreconcilable differences, the elements of greatness in Wilson, and Wilson's far larger role in history, Lodge and Wilson had many things in common. Both were brilliant and both scholars. Both were zealots in the beliefs they held and acted in good faith. They were equals in their arrogance and in their unwillingness to compromise. Lodge fought his case with the technical precision of a prophet. This meant the President enjoyed an advantage in the eyes of his contemporaries no less than of the future. He held the trump card, an appeal to the most radiant of man's hopes—lasting peace.

The Senator paid dearly for his victory. His reputation continues to suffer because he felt obliged to oppose the President's global program by mentioning anything which seemed so mean and petty to the idealists of that moment as our national interest. Wilson was talking in terms of moral grandeur, Lodge in cold hard facts. The Senator was, therefore, cast as a villian in the minds of many who did not care about the details by which peace was achieved so long as it seemed guaranteed. Although Lodge rightly resented having the covenant and the treaty presented as a package deal, he was not against the League, as some were. He was for it, but with reservations. Wilson, however, wanted all or nothing and, rather than accept the treaty with reservations, urged Democratic Senators to vote against it when it came up a second time on March 19, 1920.

Many have pointed out the irony of having the United States represented at the "new League" by the grandson and namesake of the man who in the popular mind is supposed to have done most to keep us out of the old League. The real irony lies elsewhere. It is to be found in the U. N. Charter. It was presented to the Senate unattached to any treaty, and its provisions include equivalents of some of the reservations which created such bitterness when Lodge proposed them. Among these are the U. N. guaranty not to intervene in a domestic question; the denial to small countries of equal voting power with the large countries in the making of action decisions; and—shades of article X—the stipulation that each member nation can ratify its particpation in military actions according to its constitutional processes. In other words, in theory at least, the United States cannot be involved in a war or requested to send men overseas without the consent of our Government.

The Rapid Growth of Tax-Exempts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, tax-exempt organizations in the United States are increasing in number and size at a very rapid rate. They are making continued inroads upon taxpaying establishments everywhere. The high corporate rate of taxation, 52 percent, gives the tax-exempt competitors of taxpaying businesses such an advantage that they are growing about as fast as a snowball rolling down a mountain side—growing in momentum with ever-increasing speed. Tax-exempts during the past 15 years have grown from a $5 billion income to a $20 billion income.

Mr. Speaker, with such a tremendously accelerated growth during recent years, it is past time that all tax-exempt business organizations that are in competition with taxpaying business organizations be put upon the same taxpaying basis as their competitors.

The National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., at their 65th annual convention in Los Angeles, held recently, adopted the following resolution which I include as a part of my remarks:

Whereas 40 years of cooperative enterprise tax privileges has been abused and perverted from its original meaning; and

Whereas the "patronage dividend" scheme has been used by many business groups competing with taxpaying American enterprise in order to escape their fair share of taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our industry, contributing millions of tax dollars each year to the economy, does favor enactment of H. R. 43 now pending in Congress, which would end this abuse and equalize taxation for all competitive enterprise.

Opposition to Use of H-Bombs in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent advertisement headed "We Dissent, Mr. President," published by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DISSENT, MR. PRESIDENT—WE DO NOT AGREE THAT THE EXPLOSION OF H-BOMBS IN THE PACIFIC IS NECESSARY FOR OUR DEFENSE

We oppose not only these tests, but any future tests, because they imply our continued reliance on weapons of mass destruction for peace and security.

We agree with the renowned nuclear scientists, including seven Nobel Prize winners, who served notice to the world (July 1955) that the hydrogen bomb threatened the continued existence of mankind. They said in part:

"We appeal, as human beings to human beings: Remember your humanity and forget the rest. We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there not longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: what step can be taken to prevent a military con-

test of which the issue must be disastrous to all."

This is why, Mr. President, we, the undersigned, speaking from our deep concern, have this message for you:

We ask that you now cease these series of hydrogen-bomb tests in the Pacific, and that you seek agreement through negotiations with other nations for cessation of all such tests.

The cessation of thermonuclear weapons tests would be welcomed for the following reasons:

It has been acknowledged by the great powers, both at the summit conference and subsequently during the disarmament debates in the United Nations, that a practical limit to nuclear weapon power has already been reached. To cancel these tests, Mr. President, would be in keeping with this opinion and, moreover, would advance greatly the initiative of the United States at all future sessions of the disarmament commission.

These tests may well be considered an affront by millions of people throughout the world who do not share the confidence of the great powers in the war-deterrent effect of these weapons, and who have not participated in this decision which so vitally affects them.

Cancellation of the tests would have a tremendous moral effect on the people of this country and on the peoples of the world who look to the United States for leadership away from the fear of war and destruction, and toward a fuller life for the present and the future. In particular, we would be showing good faith to the people of our trust Territory, the Marshall Islands, who have again petitioned the United Nations "that all experiments with lethal weapons within that area be immediately ceased."

Finally, since the biological and genetic effects of the explosion of thermonuclear weapons are not fully known, there can be no guaranteed safeguards for food, animals, and human life against the hazards which these experiments might create.

When you launched your atoms-for-peace program, Mr. President, you gave inspiration and hope to the entire world. Today, the reversal of your decision to hold tests would confirm what we truly believe is your dominating desire: this great new power be used for life only, and never for death.

Yours very truly,

Katharine Arnett, Philadelphia, Pa.; Emily Greene Balch, Wellesley, Mass.; Roger Baldwin, New York, N. Y.; Stringfellow Barr, Falls Church, Va.; Helen Marston Beardsley, Los Angeles, Calif.; Helen Boughton, Los Angeles, Calif.; Henry J. Cadbury, Wallingford, Pa.; Dr. Mary Owen Cameron, New York, N. Y.; Lucy P. Carner, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit, Mich.; Dorothy Day, New York, N. Y.; Ruth Freeman, Ithaca, N. Y.; Alice Hamilton, M. D., Hadlyme, Conn.; Rev. Donald Harrington, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Michael Heidelberger, New York, N. Y.; Lewis Hoskins, Philadelphia, Pa.; Hannah Clothier Hull, Swarthmore, Pa.; Rev. Allan A. Hunter, Hollywood, Calif.; Dorothy Hutchinson, Jenkintown, Pa.; Samuel Guy Inman, Bronxville, N. Y.; William Kemsley, New York, N. Y.; Freda Kirchwey, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Flemmie Kittrell, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Charles D. Lawrence, New York, N. Y.; Caroline Biddle Malin, New York, N. Y.; Lenore Marshall, New York, N. Y.; Dr. M. F. Ashley Montagu, Princeton, N. J.; Stella W. Moos, Melrose Park, Pa.; Rev. A. J. Muste, New York, N. Y.; Bertha McNeill, Washington, D. C.; Kathleen Norris, Palo Alto, Calif.; Violet Oakley, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mildred Scott Olmstead, Moylan-Rose Valley, Pa.; H. A. Overstreet, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Victor Pashkis, New Jersey; Clarence Pickett, Haverford Pa.; Josephine Pomerance, Cos Cob, Conn.; Meta Riseman, Dryden, Mich.; Dorothy Medders Robinson, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Orris G. Robinson, Washington, D. C.; Rev. John Nevin Sayre, South Nyack, N Y.; Kathleen W. Sayre, South Nyack, N. Y.; May B. Schamberg, New York, N. Y.; Emily Parker Simon, Baltimore, Md.; Annalee Stewart, Washington, D. C.; Norman Thomas, New York, N. Y.; Howard Thurman, Boston, Mass.; Elizabeth Tolles, Swarthmore, Pa.; Gladys D. Walser, New York, N. Y.; E. Raymond Wilson, Washington, D. C.

IF YOU SHARE OUR CONCERN LET THE PRESIDENT KNOW

This advertisement has been initiated by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, founded in 1915 by Jane Addams, and has been made possible by the generosity of interested members. We welcome your interest and support in our continuing endeavors for peace and freedom.

Mrs. META RISEMAN,
National President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut, Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

I would like to know more about the program of your organization.

Name ----------

Address ----------

Letter From Harry S. Truman to Annual Convention of Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which former President Harry S. Truman sent to the ninth annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action.

In the letter, Mr. Truman expresses concern over the decay of the grand alliance of free nations of the world, over the concentration of economic and political power in the United States, and over the administration's "cruel policy of lower farm prices and fewer farmers."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION FROM HARRY S. TRUMAN ADDRESSED TO JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR., NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF ADA

Mr. JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAUH: Please extend my good wishes to the delegates of the ADA, meeting in their ninth annual convention.

The welfare of the country calls for hard work and courageous action by all ADA members and all independent liberals in this election year. After 3 years of concealment and complacency, the Eisenhower administration is preparing for us another election campaign of high-level Presidential smiles and low-level Vice Presidential smears. The job of the liberals is to bring the real issues out from behind the smoke screen and help all the people to reach an informed opinion.

Liberals today must realize that many of the old battles have been won by the liberal cause. There are new dangers to face and new problems to solve. These new problems demand the same kind of creative thinking that was successful in the past.

The country has unfilled needs for education, health, roads, and expanded community services of all kinds. Civil rights and civil liberties must be high on any liberal agenda. But I would invite your special consideration of three major problems.

First, on foreign policy. We must hold the free world together in the face of a new and more insidious Communist offensive. President Eisenhower has allowed the grand alliance of the free nations to fall into decay. Liberals have a contribution to make in devising new and constructive international measures based on the principle that unilateral action by any of the great free nations will fail to counteract the Soviet threat.

Second, our farmers. An agricultural depression is growing up in the midst of the boom. President Eisenhower persists in the cruel policy of lower farm prices and fewer farmers. Liberals must advance fresh ideas, such as the Brannan plan, to restore to our farmers a fair share of the national income.

Third, the growth of a new feudalism. Centers of private power, beyond democratic control, are exerting greater and greater influence over our national life, driving small business to the wall and strangling individual enterprise. This curse of bigness dominates our press, our air waves, our amusement industries, and is beginning to shape our thoughts and beliefs. We must oppose the socialism of corporate power quite as much as socialism by government. Liberals can serve their country by devising means to reverse this trend.

Let your thoughts be bold, and keep your sights high. For the United States of America, make no little plans.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Paul Wooton, "The Man in Charge"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "The Man in Charge." The editorial refers to the Washington newsman, Mr. Paul Wooton, who for a long time has represented the New Orleans Times-Picayune and is a leader in the great newspaper profession. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN IN CHARGE

To Washintgon newsmen, Paul Wooton has been, for more years than seem probable, not merely an indispensable man but an indispensable institution. This friendly, easy-going, ubiquitous dynamo who for years has represented the New Orleans Times-Picayune and the Chilton Publications in Washington has been at one time or another

president of the White House Correspondents Association, president of the National Press Club, president of the Overseas Writers, chairman of the Business Papers Correspondents' Committee, and chairman or president of an appalling list of other groups and organizations. But he has been at all times permanent secretary-treasurer and chief arranger, factotum, and driving power of every one of them. Whenever the press corps has had work to do, Paul Wooton has done it.

So there was warm gratitude as well as deep affection behind the luncheon given yesterday in honor of Paul Wooton's 75th birthday. There is hardly a member of the press corps who has not personally felt his kindliness and generosity; and there is none at all who has not been a beneficiary of his talents as organizer of banquets, receptions, and celebratory events. When visiting kings or queens or prime ministers have come to Washington, it has always been Paul Wooton who presented them to the press—and always with a simplicity and grace that illuminated the occasions. He has made a career out of helping his colleagues. We congratulate him on his birthday; and we congratulate ourselves on having him among us.

Closing of CIA Offices Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Peter Edson which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Wednesday, May 9, 1956, in which Mr. Edson calls attention to the fact that nine United States foreign aid economic missions abroad have been closed during the past year:

FOREIGN-AID LIQUIDATIONS

(By Peter Edson)

The United States International Cooperation Administration offices, administering foreign aid in Bonn, Germany, and Vienna, Austria, will be closed July 1. Later in the year, says ICA Administrator John B. Hollister, offices in Rome, Italy, and Paris, France, will be closed.

This will make nine United States foreign economic aid missions liquidated in Europe in this fiscal year. Five were closed last September. They were in the Netherlands, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, and Belgium-Luxembourg.

It will leave only five of the original Marshall plan missions going. The principal one will be in London, for which no closing date has been set. It is still administering a sizable program of United States surplus disposal for British currency counterpart funds to help finance British defense.

The Greek and Turkish missions will be continued. Aid to these two countries and their military defense are now linked more closely with the eastern Mediterranean area.

United States economic aid missions in Spain and Yugoslavia are also being continued, but these two countries are now not in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Thus far, Spain has been allocated $232 million in defense support and Yugoslavia $336 million. For next year, $45 million in defense support funds are being requested for Spain and $30 million for Yugoslavia.

Actually, United States aid to Europe has been tapering off gradually for the past 2 years. No new programs have been started since July 1954. The only continuing program is $12 million for next year, requested to aid West Berlin's industries and help care for refugees coming from behind the Iron Curtain through East Berlin.

So by and large, the Marshall plan, which was started with such a great surge of enthusiasm in 1948 and continued in the mutual security program in 1953, will be liquidated by mid 1957. Its main function, which was to aid in the economic recovery of war-torn Europe, has succeeded.

What is proves is that these foreign aid programs do not have to go on forever, but can be terminated in time.

This fact has been generally lost sight of in all the hulabaloo over President Eisenhower's request for $4,900,000,000 to run the mutual assistance programs next year. This year's appropriation was only $2,700,000,000. There are $6,600,000,000 worth of foreign aid supplies on order but not delivered.

These are the figures which make most critics of foreign aid think that it is a constantly expanding and never ending program.

The important point most frequently overlooked in this criticism is that the big item is military aid—which must apparently continue indefinitely for United States' security.

Out of next year's $4,900,000,000 requested for foreign aid, $3 billion will be for military aid. And practically all of the $6,600,000,000 in unspent aid funds will go for military supplies.

Coal Char Industry To Open New Vistas for Red Lodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Coal Char Industry To Open New Vistas for Red Lodge," which appeared in the May 4, 1956, issue of the People's Voice, published in Helena, Mont. It is a stirring story of how Mayor D. W. Columbus, of Red Lodge, Mont., and other Montanans are transforming a dream into a reality as they build a new and important industry for Montana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL CHAR INDUSTRY TO OPEN NEW VISTAS FOR RED LODGE

Behind each dream of a better tomorrow there is usually one person, who, more than all the rest, provides the continuing guiding spirit that eventually leads to that dream becoming a reality.

There was Susan B. Anthony, who spent her lifespan in the fight to secure women's suffrage.

There was Sen. George Norris, of Nebraska, who, for a generation fought for and finally saw his dream of a Tennessee Valley Authority become a reality.

There was, here in Montana, one newspaper editor, Harry (Hungry Horse) Kelley, who for 30 years plugged constantly through his Flathead Monitor at Kalispell for the building of Hungry Horse Dam. Before he died he had the satisfactory of seeing his dream coming true—Hungry Horse was under construction.

Right now, at Red Lodge, there's another Montanan who appears on the verge of seeing a dream become reality. Several years ago when it became apparent the coal industry was definitely on the decline as a source of fuel in the long-accepted sense a group of Red Lodge people, sparkplugged by their mayor, D. W. Columbus, decided to see if there wasn't something that could be done about the economic problem brought on by the decline in use of coal. They had no desire to see their city become like so many coal towns in the east—perpetually depressed areas, nor did they want to see their town die. There must be another way. Columbus took the lead in seeking out that "other way."

Increasing use of coal derivatives for plastics, tars, creosote, char, throughout the Nation as America began entering the Chemical Age in earnest looked like a lead that had possibilities.

Then followed numerous meetings of the Red Lodge Chamber of Commerce industries committee, the arousing of widespread public interest, numerous contacts with political figures in Montana and Washington, D. C., continuing efforts to interest various petroleum and chemical firms in the possibilities of Red Lodge coal.

Columbus made voyages to Helena, to Washington, D. C., to numerous other places. Senator Murray became interested, so did then Gov. John Bonner, another Helenean and longtime champion of greater resource development; Lester Loble, and Willard Fraser, Billings, also a longtime advocate in eastern Montana and Rex B. Zachery who recently joined the Meyer & Chapman State Bank—to name only a few.

Mr. Columbus would be the last person to take full credit for the realization of his dream, and hastens to mention many people who have contributed in an united community effort to open industrial vistas in the picturesque valley in the Bear Tooth Mountains.

A COMMUNITY-WIDE EFFORT

There were the contributions from Red Lodge citizens, large and small, in true spirit of community development, people too numerous to list.

Still the road toward obtaining industry proved discouragingly slow. But then, in the that Montana's abundant coal resources, 1955 legislature, a realization began to dawn that Montana's abundant coal resources, although outmoded as a source of fuel, held real potentialities as the raw material which might well become an important industrial base in the Treasure State. Development-minded Representative Earl Clark, who represented another county hard hit by reduced coal usage—Musselshell—headed up introduction of H. B. 294 to provide Montana State College with a $30,000 appropriation for extensive chemical experimentation with Montana coals.

MSC chemists, with the facilities at hand, have done yeoman-like service. They've found Montana coal contains in good quantity much of the basic ingredients so necessary to the manufacture of plastics, phenol oils, in addition to being rich in tar and creosote. And of course, the residue—char—is of such a quality as to be eminently satisfactory for heavy industrial use, such as the sponge-iron process employed by the Anaconda Co. in smelting operations at Anaconda.

James R. Brophy, owner of the Brophy Coal Co., worked with Dr. Berg, of the Montana State College to perfect the new method of obtaining char and other products from Red Lodge coal.

NEW INDUSTRY SOON

Things are now beginning to pop around Red Lodge. Koal-Krudes, a Spokane corporation, and subsidiary of P. D. & P. Processing Corp., is planning construction of a

char plant in Red Lodge in the very near future. The city of Red Lodge has donated a tract of land adjacent to the railroad for a site.

Initial size of the Koal-Krudes char plant envisages the processing of 200 tons of coal per day. To man a unit of such a plant would require about 20 men in addition to the employment of miners. But 200 tons per day would be only a beginning. The proposed plant is to be constructed in such a way that it can be added onto as markets increase. They hope to add 3 or 4 units as soon as possible. Says Mayor Columbus, "As it looks now from the inquiries Dr. Lloyd Berg, of the Bozeman College, is receiving for char samples, this plant will grow very fast."

As of now, the future begins to take on a more rosy tinge for the Carbon County seat nestled in the mountains just to the north of Yellowstone Park. The coal miner as a producer of fuel is no more, but, soon that coal miner will again be busily plying his craft mining the high-grade coal which has made the Red Lodge-Bearcreek region famous. But this time he'll be mining it with the full realization that the end product may be nylon stockings on milady's shapely gam, and not a clinker in the furnace to cause many a poor husband anguish.

And, when that day arrives, the people of Red Lodge can chalk up their recovered prosperity in large degree to one of their fellow citizens who had a dream and the tenacity to fight on until that dream came true.

Hon. James P. Richards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has announced his intention to retire from Congress at the end of the present term. "DICK" RICHARDS and his charming wife, Katharine, are long-term friends of mine, as they were of my late husand, the Honorable John Kee, who preceded Mr. RICHARDS as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It will be a great personal loss to me when they leave Washington, and I am sure that it will be the same to a host of their other friends. But it will be a loss to the entire Nation not to have the wise and sane leadership of "DICK" RICHARDS in one of the most important posts in Congress during these troubled times in international relations.

It is too late to persuade "DICK" RICHARDS to change his mind about leaving Congress, if that would ever have been possible; and so all that we can do now is to wish him well in his future life with Katharine on their beautiful plantation in South Carolina, where I am sure he will take an active interest in many things besides looking after his cows.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following article about Mr. RICHARDS from the Georgetowner for May 10, 1956:

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES P. RICHARDS PLANS RETIREMENT IN 1957

(By Elizabeth Maguire)

One of the most important men on Capitol Hill is the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, the chairman of the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and a Democrat. Several months ago, Mr. RICHARDS announced he would retire next January. "And I'm going to be long gone," he says. After 24 years in the House—4 of the last years as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—he is looking forward to retirement, so called.

The life which the Congressman and his wife, Katharine Wylie Richards, plan on a beautiful 500-acre farm in their native South Carolina promises to be active and pleasant; and while raising cattle and farming, Mr. RICHARDS will doubtless take a lively interest in foreign affairs. He loves fox hunting and bird dogs, and says that he also has a very fine coon dog with tan tail and tan feet.

On foreign aid, the Congressman has a good deal to say. In an aside, he confessed that his real problem is how his cows are getting along. But in the committee room, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is faced with these two problems: (1) whether or not all the mechanics of our foreign aid program are outmoded; and (2) whether or not we are laying too much emphasis on military aid instead of economic and scientific aid.

"Our military aid to other countries had the Russians just about stopped in their tracks," said Mr. Richards "and they answered with technical assistance and loans to a number of countries. The Russians are saying 'We just want to help,' but at the same time they are increasing their military strength."

"But if our military aid had the Russians stopped, why switch to another form of assistance," we asked.

The Congressman explained, "They have answered us, and now we must answer them. You see, the game of foreign affairs is like a duel between two swordsmen—you thrust here and lunge there."

Mr. RICHARDS said further that the United States formerly had led the world in turning out scientists and technicians, and now the Russians are ahead of us in this respect. He pointed out that the Russians win friends by giving technical assistance to other countries, and this enables them to form a 5th column within those countries.

"And we have got to meet the Russian approach in this field," he continued. "We must not get hysterical about it and we should not out-bid Russia, but we should evaluate what they are doing and meet it when we determine the best method of doing so."

Congressman RICHARDS believes strongly in the necessity of a foreign aid program, and he affirms that if it were not for our foreign aid, the whole continent of Europe would now be dominated by communism, and our backs would be to the wall.

"When people object to foreign aid, they should stop to consider this," he said. The Congressman added, "However, I do think that the executive branch is asking for too much money for the program—we can't afford it—and I was hoping we could taper it off a little more; $4,900,000,000 is too much."

Asked if he thought Monaco would ever be a trouble spot, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee replied, "There's enough trouble in Monaco now, but I don't know whether it's the Prince who is in a hell of a fix or Grace."

On the political scene in the United States, the Congressman sees a new battle shaping up out of which he predicts there will come a realinement of political parties.

"Some of these days," he said, "the fight between constitutional government and left-wing philosophies will force a realinement of parties, and the old terms Democrats and Republicans will give way to something else. I believe in two parties—you have to have criticism in one way or another. The real issue will be between the people in this country who want to save its basic institutions—constitutional government, free enterprise, freedom of speech and other solid principles upon which this Republic has been founded—and those who would regard the Constitution as an obstruction to their purposes and who would whittle away the powcomes, we will have to forget the so-called ers of the Constitution. When that day comes, we will have to forget the so-called Democrats and Republicans, and we will have to get away from prejudices associated with the two parties. The realinement will come about in the face of the bigger issue—sooner or later."

Be all that as it may, Representative RICHARDS will observe future developments in the battle from a vantage point on his lovely estate in Heath Springs, S. C., just outside Lancaster.

Asked if he had lived in or around Lancaster all his life, he proudly stated, "I was born in Liberty Hill. * * * Liberty Hill has a population of 250 people. * * * I've forgotten whether I walked or rode the 20 miles to Lancaster * * * but I went there to practice law after graduating from the University of South Carolina.

In Lancaster JAMES RICHARDS met Katharine Wylie, a southern belle, very small and very charming. "I figured it would be a good idea to do some fast talking," recalls the Congressman, "and I think she has been regretting it ever since."

Mrs. Richards looks forward to having more time to indulge a favorite hobby—collecting antiques. And she'll put to good use her flair for cooking. "She's the best cook I ever saw," brags her husband, "in fact, she's the best cook." In further praise he comments, "She saves many a dollar," but he reflects with a chuckle, "and spends it on something else the next day."

We asked Mrs. Richards for her husband's favorite recipe, and she drew back in silence. Then, after considerable hesitation, she said, "I hate to tell you, but it's 'fatback' and grits."

"Fatback is the kind of salt pork bacon that nobody will buy and grocers don't like to sell," she explained. "And every morning I have to have fatback and grits on the table—with coffee and eggs or something."

The Richards have two sons and a daughter. The eldest son, Richard Richards, is married, has two little girls, and he practices law in Lancaster. The other son, Norman Richards, is just out of paratrooper training and has gone back to Davidson College in North Carolina. The daughter, Jane, attends Salem Academy in Winston-Salem, N. C.

At present the Congressman and his wife live at 3016 O Street. "I kind of like Georgetown," says Mr. RICHARDS, "and when I come back to visit here, I'm going to head for Georgetown first thing. We take the Georgetowner and we read it all the time."

"But I want to get out of Washington before I get pickled," says the Congressman, "What do I mean? Well, being pickled means you can't adapt yourself to anything else; and I want to get out before that happens. There are people in public service who have been here so long that they would not be happy anywhere else, nor would they be happy working at anything else. And they think their services are indispensable * * * yes, they always think that * * * I think the first requirement for anyone with a job is that he not take himself too seriously because nobody else is going to take him seriously."

And so, with new horizons well in view, a leading legislator is bringing a successful career to a close. His friends and colleagues in Washington will miss the tall Congressman with his easy-going manner and keen alert eyes. And the United States will miss his wise guidance in foreign affairs.

Mary Gardiner Knowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Harvard University Young Republican Club publishes a weekly newspaper, the Harvard Times-Republican, which has attracted much favorable comment in college circles. It expresses views of the membership of the club without fear or favor. Under date of May 3, 1956, it had an editorial with reference to the grant of $5,000 by the Fund for the Republic to the Plymouth Meeting Library in recognition of the board retaining as librarian Mary Gardiner Knowles, who had been identified as a Communist. It is an excellent editorial which I feel should go into the RECORD. The young men who comprise the membership of the Harvard Young Republican Club deserve much credit for the patriotic and effective work they are doing in rendering intellectual leadership and integrity in the cause of good government.

The editorial follows:

THIS LAST MONDAY

This last Monday, the United States Senate voted to cite Mrs. Mary Knowles for contempt of Congress. The vote was unanimous. Last year the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee had subpenaed her, because it believed that she possessed information which would be vital in combating the Communist menace. Mrs. Knowles refused to answer any and all questions put to her.

Mary Gardiner Knowles has long had a record of intimate association with those groups which would destroy our Government. For example, she was the secretary of the Samuel Adams School in Boston. This outfit has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as an organization which was a front for those who would overthrow our Constitution by force and violence—the Communists.

Two years ago, Herbert Philbrick, a former undercover agent for the FBI, identified Mrs. Knowles, under oath, as having been a cell members with him in Maiden, Mass.

With this background, one can see why Mrs. Knowles was called before the committee. She could have rendered valuable service to the Nation, but she chose not to do so.

After her refusal to testify, Mary Knowles was released from her position as a member of the staff of a library in Norwood, Mass. She was quickly employed, however, by the William Jeans Memorial Library, which was owned and operated by the Quaker Monthly Meeting, of Plymouth Meeting, Pa. To date, the library committee has refused to dismiss Mrs. Knowles.

The action of the Plymouth Meeting Library caused a violent uproar. Protests were made by the Plymouth Township School Board and local units of the American Legion. Three members of the library committee, the group which did the actual hiring, resigned, and the financial support of the township was canceled.

Into this sorry mess, though, stepped the Fund for the Republic, under the leadership of the free-wheeling nonconformist, Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins. This group is the child of the Ford Foundation, which gave the fund the sum of $15 million.

The fact that the fund's moneys are tax-exempt means that the American taxpayer—you and we are included—must pay for those Government projects which would have been covered by the annual taxes that normally would have been paid on the $15 million fund treasury. Hence, the fund is engaging in projects which are actually being financed by all of us. It is because the fund's activities are actually being financed by the public, that political projects are forbidden by the law.

Speaking of the fund, the Special House Committee which investigated tax-exempt foundations said in its report: "An example of the danger that a great foundation may use its public trust funds for political purposes or with political effect is to be found in the creation of the Fund for the Republic * * *."

The Fund for the Republic granted a $5,000 award to the Plymouth Meeting group (not the library) for "courageous and effective defense of democratic principles in refusing to fire Mrs. Knowles." So far, the group has refused to accept the money.

This will give you an idea of the various projects into which the fund enters. In this case, it sought to reward an organization which hired a person who has done a distinct disservice to her country. By unanimous vote, the Senate has judged her to be in contempt of our Representatives, and for this she will stand trial. But, all this makes no difference to the fund. It merrily goes on its way, dispensing tax-free funds to the benefactors of those who would defy our Congress.

Such action as this is merely another example of why the Fund for the Republic should lose its tax exemption. There is no reason why your money, which normally would be used to defray the expenses of the Government, should be used to promote ideologies which run contrary to the basic sense of the Nation.

Devoted Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, by any yardstick, the city of Rochester, N. Y., is one of the outstanding cities of the United States, and one reason for it is its municipal research bureau, which, everlastingly, through the years, has supplied public officials with the facts they needed, in order to make wise and intelligent decisions.

Next week, a testimonial dinner will be given to Earl Weller, the director of the municipal research bureau, in recognition of the debt which the citizens of Rochester owe him, and the esteem in which he is held. Mr. Weller will retire next month. His influence on good government will not retire with him, however. He has seen many of the things he worked for become realities. Other projects which he launched and assisted are moving to fruition. But far beyond these concrete symbols of his wise guidance and vision is the influence of the example he set for every city in the State, and indeed, in the country. Good government, as the Rochester Times-Union pointed out editorially in its issue of May 8, was Earl Weller's life. Our country can never have too many Earl Wellers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the editorial from the Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y.:

GOOD GOVERNMENT IS WELLER'S LIFE

It's too bad that Rochester and Monroe County can't give W. Earl Weller a completed civic center and an integrated county-city government as a going-away present when he retires as director of the bureau of municipal research on June 30.

There are two projects that took much of his time and energy and held his enthusiasm for at least his last 10 years with the bureau.

But before deciding upon the date of retirement, he had won firm commitments for the civic center. The integration of the two levels of local government had made progress, but not nearly the progress he had hoped for.

There is still time to unify the health services in one countywide health department before June 30. Weller's bureau originated the master plan for that project, as it has the other unifications in force or proposed.

Weller has been a long-time student of means of eliminating overlaps and duplications in local government. He was the originator of the approach being used here—unification by function rather than by annexation.

The bureau is a privately supported watchdog of local government. It has wanted to know not only what local government is doing but also how it might do it better.

It has kept an unofficial eye on the city's physical plant—its sewers, firehouses, water-supply system, and all the technical services required where large numbers of people live in a small area.

Hence, under Weller's direction, it has made itself extremely useful not only to Rochester and Monroe County but to other local governments in New York as well. Good local government owes much to the bureau.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, at Convention of Young Democratic Clubs of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] at the 25th annual convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Oregon, in Portland, Oreg., on April 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I am always grateful for a chance to come to Oregon. I have been doing it for a long time

now. I am grateful for the warmth and the loyalty of thousands of friends here. As a Democrat I have been gratified by the great growth of the Democratic Party in this State.

As both a Democrat and a Members of the United States Senate—and above all as an American—I am grateful that the people of Oregon are represented in the Senate by as fine a pair of Senators as represent any State of the Union.

WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER are great Americans. They work assiduously for the welfare of this State and its people. But beyond that they work unceasingly for the welfare of all our people. Their voices are heard whenever the forces of progress and growth are under attack. They fight for a decent, liberal, prosperous America, and a peaceful world.

WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER do not content themselves with just voting in the Senate and letting others carry the brunt of the battle. Wherever the fighting has been hardest, they have been in the thick of it. No one will ever call them lily livered.

The fact that WAYNE MORSE has been so effective in behalf of the people of Oregon and the Nation is the reason why this year he will be the No. 1 target of the Republican Party.

The other day, Douglas McKay told a reported in Washington that WAYNE MORSE "has put more roadblocks in the path of the Eisenhower administration than any other single politician I can think of."

The Democrats of Oregon ought to glory in that statement.

WAYNE MORSE has often stood like the boy with his finger in the hole in the dike, keeping the land from being inundated by the galloping giveaways.

No wonder the Republicans hate him. No wonder the fat cats and big mules of the predatory interests will be pouring money into this State this fall in an unending stream. No wonder the Republican Party's propaganda experts will be as numerous in Oregon this fall as fleas on a lazy dog.

Mr. McKay calls WAYNE MORSE a "turn coat" for leaving the Republican Party. I doubt that WAYNE MORSE could be said to have left the Republican Party. I think it left him.

WAYNE MORSE represented the final beachhead of the liberal tradition in the Republican Party. From Abraham Lincoln, through Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, George Norris, Charles McNary—and perhaps even Wendell Willkie—it had been a long line. But as big business and selfish interests have gained more and more control of the Republican Party, there has been less and less room for liberalism.

I know how hard WAYNE MORSE worked to keep that faint flame alive in the Republican Party. The remarkable thing to me is that he strove so hard and so long when all the odds were against him.

I am glad that WAYNE MORSE made his great decision. I am glad for the Democratic Party—which he has strengthened not only here in Oregon, but nationally. I am glad for the liberal position in the Democratic Party which his presence and his counsel strengthen and encourage. I am glad for WAYNE MORSE, who has found a party in which, when he puts his shoulder to the wheel, the wheel turns.

Possibly there remains some doubt as to who will be chosen by the Republicans to oppose Senator MORSE. I understand that Douglas McKay is the candidate of President Eisenhower and the Republican national committee. Perhaps he won't make the grade with the Republicans of Oregon, but whether he does or not, Mr. McKay is going to be the campaign issue.

He personifies the Eisenhower approach to the development of natural resources. The Eisenhower approach is "don't do it."

In the whole of McKay's tenure as Secretary of the Interior, he managed to hold just one press conference. I assume that there was too much he didn't want to explain.

At that one press conference, he announced the administration's partnership policy for power development. When he gets out here to campaign I hope you people of Oregon will ask him how it is that his partnership policy has failed to develop a single kilowatt of electric power.

I hope that the people of Oregon will find out from McKay how and why he sought to avoid the preference clause put in the law by Congress to see to it that the public got the first crack at power produced at Federal installations. I hope he will be asked about the abandonment of so-called wheeling arrangements for the transmission of power, which was one way of getting around the preference clause.

While he is out here and within easy reach, I hope you will find out something that Congress has never been able to find out—nor has the press been able to find out: That is why on earth he ever let that Al Serena deal go through.

The conservationists in this State—and there are a lot of them—also ought to find out on what basis Secretary McKay justifies opening up nearly every wildlife refuge to the oil companies.

I am told that Mr. McKay's chief asset is his amiability. In general this is a nice quality and one which we all admire. But when the country has an amiable Secretary of the Interior there always arises the question as to who he is amiable with. Is it the people who would like to destroy public power in America? Is it the people who want to do a little timber mining? Is it the people who tell the ducks and geese to move on somewhere else so that they can look for oil?

The simple truth is that the Eisenhower administration, by its failures in the field of resource development, has put a ceiling on the progress of the West and of this great State of Oregon. And Douglas McKay has been the instrument of that failure.

Oregon and the Northwest have been pushing forward on the impetus they got in the years of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The business and industry that won't get started, the jobs that won't be there when the need comes, the acres which will remain without water and life—the failures due to the inaction of President Eisenhower and Douglas McKay, lie in the future. But that future is too near at hand for comfort.

It took only a few moments and a scratch of the pen for Douglas McKay to write off the great dam at Hells Canyon. But the people of the Northwest may take generations to pay for one of the most callous acts in the history of western development.

I have nothing against the development and sale of power by private means and private capital. I have never been persuaded that power ought to be a governmental monopoly.

What I know the growth of the United States requires, however, is plenty of electric power at the lowest possible cost. And when the most power at the lowest cost can be produced only by public means, then we must adopt methods which will produce the most for the least. When Douglas McKay signed away Hells Canyon he was performing the act of a man who does not believe much in the future of America.

If America is going to grow—and if Oregon and the Northwest are going to grow—we must have tremendous new supplies of energy to make that growth possible.

The growth of industry in this area has in large part been due to prior development of power resources by the Federal Government. One of the greatest factors in this growth has been the increasing development of the electro-processing industries. In 1950 these industries were consuming 17 percent of all power used by industry. By 1975 these industries will be using an estimated 30 percent of all our industrial power. This means that power consumption by these industries alone will increase 425 percent in a quarter of a century.

The growth of these industries can continue only if power costs are kept low—and a difference of 1 mill a kilowatt may make an enormous economic difference—and the future supply growing to meet the demands to be made upon it.

There is no native source of great energy in this region except hydroelectric power. The only hope for the region lies in the development of the full potential of the Columbia, the Snake, and other rivers of the area. It is to this development that Douglas McKay has said "No."

As it is, it is going to take a long time to make up for the mistakes and the failures of President Eisenhower and Douglas McKay in the field of resource development. I hope and expect that next January a Democratic President and a Democratic Secretary of the Interior will be able to reverse this sorry trend. And I hope that WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER will both be there in the Senate of the United States to help them.

The Democrats and Independents of Oregon started the tide turning in 1954, when DICK NEUBERGER was sent to the Senate. This year let's go all the way. Unite and organize and fight—and put Oregon in the Democratic presidential column, elect Democrats up and down the line, and, most of all, reelect WAYNE MORSE.

Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you have heard it said that they are moving mountains in Puerto Rico. Indeed, this is true. They have been moving mountains there since Operation Bootstrap got under way in 1948.

The Puerto Rican people last week enthusiastically celebrated the establishment of the 400th new industry in the island in that brief span of years. This Operation Bootstrap program has been the accomplishment of an inspired people, responding to an inspiring leadership. It is the work of a free people, working happily in the framework of sovereign self-government and within their association to the Federal political system of the United States, made possible by the Congress of the United States and by the voluntary decision of the people of Puerto Rico.

The Thursday, May 10, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald carries an editorial commenting on the gains which have been made in Puerto Rico. I am sure, since this body in large measure has shared the responsibility which resulted in the political evolvement of Puerto Rico, and the accompanying industrial revolution there, each Member will be interested in reading this editorial. The editorial follows:

PUERTO RICO'S EXAMPLE

At a time when free men everywhere are concerned with the plight of underdeveloped countries, America can rightly point with pride to a quiet revolution which has

changed the face of Puerto Rico. For the first time this week, the Commonwealth estimates that manufacturing has displaced agriculture as the chief source of the island's income. This milestone in Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap deserves the week-long celebration it is receiving. It has demonstrated in our own backyard what cynics have argued is improbable elsewhere: That an economically disadvantaged people can industrialize swiftly without resort to iron-fisted 5-year plans or police state goads.

The statistics tell an impressive story. In less than a decade, the life expectancy of Puerto Ricans has increased from 46 to 61 years—and literacy has risen to nearly 80 percent. The annual net income of the Commonwealth has climbed from $230 million in 1940 to almost $1 billion today. According to government estimates, productivity per worker has doubled in this same period—and the average family income has risen from $600 in 1940 to $2,360 in 1955. Much of this rapid progress can be ascribed to the Puerto Rican government's energetic and effective campaign to attract new industries, to diversify the island's agriculture and to lure tourists.

Most important, these changes have taken place in the framework of a free society. Intelligent planning, self-help and free criticism have been the tools of change. It has been a wise policy for the State Department to send thousands of point 4 trainees and foreign visitors to study the island's achievement. As Puerto Rico's brilliant Governor, Luis Munoz Marin, pointed out recently:

"The answer to the Communist challenge lies in the ability of the Western powers to show the less fortunate countries of the world that a greater transformation can be achieved, at an even faster rate and on sounder economic foundations, without shattering or ignoring the fabric of political and individual liberties."

It would be a mistake, however, to interpret Puerto Rico's example only in the narrow gage of cold war strategy. Equally significant, the Commonwealth's advance is a turning point in the far older cold war against poverty and ignorance. While much still remains to be done to bring the island up to continental American standards of prosperity, Puerto Rico's present progress will mean a better life for more people soon. That is an enduring victory which surely transcends swiftly changing cold war strategies. It is worth cheering about.

Altoona (Pa.) Mirror Editorial "Above the Atom" Cited as One of Three Outstanding Editorials in Pennsylvania Newspapers in Behalf of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the September 24, 1955, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror was written by J. E. Holtzinger, president of the Mirror Printing Co., Altoona, Pa.

The editorial titled "Above the Atom" was selected by the governor's committee on employment of the handicapped as one of the three outstanding editorials in Pennsylvania newspapers on the advantages of hiring disabled persons. The editorial follows:

ABOVE THE ATOM

The might of the mind is greater than the power of the atom and the minds of men also conceived the way to use the atom and the minds of men also have conceived ways to use the power of the atom for peace as well as for destruction.

In this swiftly moving world of today scientists already are looking beyond the atom to new sources of energy and along the frontiers of today's knowledge men already are predicting that within the time limits of men now living the world will see vast new sources of energy put to use for the benefit of mankind.

In a world where mere physical strength is being replaced with energy directed by the minds of men and by the skillful use of machines and power tools of all descriptions, it may seem a little foolish to have a special week devoted to the appeal for employment of the physically handicapped. But such an appeal is necessary and October 2 through October 8 has been set aside as a week to draw national attention to the employment of the physically handicapped.

Observant people long have noted nature's gift of compensation to those who suffer an affliction or an impairment of a part of the body. Dim eyesight is often compensated for by acute hearing, a weakness in the lower limbs is quite often compensated for by extra strength in the arms and torso and in numerous other ways old Mother Nature seems intent on giving to each of her children some special gift to make up for a lack in some other department of physical fitness.

Added to these gifts of nature in the past few decades have been the facilities of man-made institutions which have sought to rehabilitate those among us who suffer from some impairment or other. In this modern world of ours all people are needed and all who are of sound mind can contribute their share to the world's progress.

Employment of the physically handicapped is not a one-way street, by any means. Quite often these especially trained people are just the asset business and industry have been looking for to balance out a work force that is now out-producing any other body of workers in the world.

As Henry J. Riter, III, of the National Association of Manufacturers puts it: "Disabled employees in industry throughout the land have written a record of accomplishment which more than justifies the confidence management has placed in them. The social myth that the physically handicapped cannot fit effectively into modern industry has been thoroughly exploded. The fact is that today and every day, the physically impaired compete with the able-bodied and ask no special favors."

Our Nation has now had 9 full years of experience with the National Employ the Physical Handicapped week and as we enter into the 10th anniversary of the special week there are thousands of examples of people who have been employed through this special effort and who have given their employers and their fellow employees many occasions to rejoice over their selection as part of the working force.

Altoona and Blair County long have enjoyed a fine record in their very human approach to this very human problem. Hundreds of handicapped workers have been employed in this area, many of them for several decades before the national effort in their behalf was made.

Perhaps this is only a natural development in a part of the country where railroads and railroad workers have been so predominant, where accidents in the field of transportation and in the adjacent coal fields brought the problems of the handicapped to the fore years ahead of the present national maker of handicaps—the automobile accidents.

America has led the world in so many fields because we have, from the very beginning, refused to acknowledge handicaps. Very early in our history we learned to overcome the handicaps of strange languages, differences of religious opinion, conflicting national origins and of a strange new world where distances were great and travel extremely difficult because the wilderness was unexplored and there were few roadways.

This year do yourselves and your industry or business a real favor. Employ at least one physically handicapped person and discover anew the thrill of helping oneself through helping another. The Pennsylvania State employment service will give you skillful aid in selecting just the right people for the job you have in mind.

Address on Brotherhood Delivered by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent months concerning the so-called problems of brotherhood. Actually, as many of us have tried to show, the difficulties are not an intrinsic part of brotherhood itself, but rather they have evolved from a refusal by some men to recognize an already existing situation.

Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, recently gave an exceptionally fine analysis of that point in an address built around the fact that brotherhood is a condition and not a theory. His remarks were presented at the Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, at the Albright Memorial Evangelical United Brethren Church, Fourth and Rittenhouse Streets NW., Washington, D. C., and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA CONFERENCE OF THE EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH, ALBRIGHT MEMORIAL EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH, FOURTH AND RITTENHOUSE STREETS NW., WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 4, 1956

Brotherhood is a theme on which men can write and have written variations in endless numbers, ranging from the highest realms of thought to the lowest levels of expediency. Consider them in descending order: brotherhood is part of the law of God; brotherhood is the highest of human ideals; brotherhood is the mortar with which we build civilization; brotherhood is the best security of man in a hostile world; brotherhood is a paying proposition.

I propose today to offer you still another variation, without saying whether it is high in the scale of values, or the lowest of all. That depends upon the point of view. But, high or low, it is as profoundly true as any; and I put it in a phrase borrowed from a former President of the United States. It is this: brotherhood is a condition and not a theory.

To illustrate my point I do not need to quote the Bible, nor any other ancient book that men have regarded as Holy Writ. I

call your attention instead to the newspaper accounts of what follows the detonation of such a hydrogen bomb as we set off on a remote Pacific Island. It was, the scientists tell us, by no means the most powerful bomb that can be made; we know the formulas for the construction of others much more destructive than this one, and there is no apparent reason why we cannot produce them whenever we choose to do so.

Yet after this bomb of relatively moderate size exploded for 10 miles up the wind and for 190 miles down the wind, that is, for a total distance of 200 miles, invisible death rained from the skies for the next 2 days. It was a visitation more merciless than the fire and brimstone that the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah, for that at least was swift; the cities of the plain were wiped out almost instantaneously. But this man-created horror does not strike like a thunderbolt; it sets up within the victim's body an invisible and unquenchable fire that consumes him by slow degrees through weeks and months of increasing agony.

Under that soft and gentle sifting down of pain and death, do you think it matters in the least what is the color of a man's skin, or how blue is his blood or which of our countless creeds he holds to be true religion? Whether they cry to Jehovah or to Allah, or to Christ the King, it is all one. Whatever they may have been before, they are brothers in their agony, brothers when merciful death has brought their only possible release.

This, I repeat for emphasis, is a condition and not a theory. We cannot alter it in any way. We can deny it, but our denial will be "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." We all stand in the same peril, all under the same condemnation, and the way of escape is escape for all or for none. War is the last, most insolent denial of human brotherhood; and continued war plainly threatens the existence of the race.

If then, we are brothers in the last extremity, who will have the hardihood to assert that the relation begins only in the shadow of death? And if the relations exist from the beginning, how can we escape the conclusion that the organized slaughter of human beings, whatever name we give it, is in the final analysis fratricide?

It is our custom to brush this somber fact aside with the argument that war has existed since before the dawn of history, that war is a condition of human life in this world, and that it is a distortion of logic to equate it with the individual crime of murder.

It is true that war has always existed, has always been a condition of human life. But war guilt is entirely different. Even the stumbling approach to perfect justice that is manmade law recognizes that the degree of guilt increases with the mental and moral responsibility of the guilty. An imbecile is not held legally responsible for any of his acts, and even the crime of murder cannot send a man to the gallows unless the jury is convinced that he knew the difference between right and wrong.

Only in the higher civilizations have the masses of men begun to suspect the essential criminality of war, and only in the highest have they realized that aggressive war is not distinguishable from mass murder. We have yet to develop a civilization high enough for men to realize that truth, emotionally as well as intellectually, which is to say that we have not yet developed any civilization high enough to abolish war. Not until we feel, as well as think, that war is a crime will we be capable of getting rid of it.

Development of that kind of civilization is the world's one hope, and the chief responsibility for it rests upon the nations that are the leaders of our present civilization. Americans cannot evade that responsibility unless we are willing to concede that ours is a backward nation morally, however far in advance it may be in technology. It is a concession that I, for one, am unwilling to make; I prefer to accept the heavy responsibility for leading the world in the ways of peace.

But in accepting the responsibility we must face the fact that the hour is late, I fear much later than we think. It is an ironical fact that the time left us has been shortened by our own act. Like the fisherman in the Arabian tale who removed the seal of ignorance that barred release of the infernal powers that now loom over us as the monster towered over the fisherman, we excuse ourselves by saying that if our hands had not done it, another's would have within a short time.

It may be true; but that does not alter the fact that we did it, and by doing it incurred chief responsibility for seeing to it that the unleashed evil does not overwhelm our brother men.

How may we hope to discharge that responsibility? Only by facing the facts, all the facts. One that must be faced is the somber fact that the nations are not yet morally developed to the point at which they will all voluntarily renounce war as an instrument of national policy. Some must be restrained by knowledge that aggression cannot bring profit but only ruin to the aggressor; and it is our business so to organize the world that the knowledge will be too plain for any man to escape it; this involves labor, expense, and eternal vigilance. We must be strong ourselves and we must be surrounded by strong friends, a condition that will last probably for many years.

But we must face all the facts, and there is another that is equally grim, equally distressing. It is the fact that our own moral level is far too low to justify us in assuming a holier-than-thou attitude toward any other country. The fact of human brotherhood is frantically denied every day and every hour in the streets of our own city and in every other city across the continent. It is not done in words as often as in deeds more eloquent than words. If we are honest with ourselves we will admit that it is denied in our own hearts. "Am I my brother's keeper?" snarled Cain, and the mark of the murderer was laid upon him; but where is the man who can stand before the bar of judgment and swear that never has that scream of the beast been echoed, even in his inmost thought?

None of us is guiltless, none of us has never yielded to the impulse to reject the condition of brotherhood; and it is that guilt that blinds our eyes so effectively that we cannot see our way through the labyrinth of the modern world. I believe that with the growth of a realization of our brotherhood, not with Chinese and Hindus, but with the man next door and the man down the street, with the man who worships with a rite different from our own, the man whose skin is of a color different from our own, there will come a sharpening of the vision of statesmanship, a lifting of the mists that obscure our way. With the growth of brotherhood here at home, problems abroad that now seem beyond solution will become increasingly simple and plain.

Cynics sneer at this as impractical idealism, but it is the cynics themselves who are superstitious fools, still believing in witchcraft, still proposing to cast out devils in the name of Beelzebub, Prince of Devils. The realist knows that human brotherhood is not a pious aspiration, but a biological fact, and that fratricidal strife among brothers is a defiance of the laws of nature as disastrous as swallowing poison or deliberately walking off the edge of a precipice.

I think it is realism, too, to acknowledge the fact that all existing programs for the abolition of war are probably inadequate. Pacificism will not do it, although loyalty to the ideal of peace is certainly an essential. I am skeptical of world government as a solution because it seems to me that world government should follow as a result rather than come first as the cause of the abolition of war. Most emphatically reliance on military power can produce nothing but the opposite result, as all history proves.

The fact is that the blind alley in which the modern world finds itself has no way out through any sort of formulas and systems. Formulas and systems may have their uses after the way out has been discovered, but the first necessity is a change in the human heart.

If you feel inclined to throw up your hands at that and cry that human nature never changes, my answer is to ask you: In that case, what has civilization accomplished? Is the human nature of an American of the 20th century exactly the same as the human nature of a caveman of prehistoric times? Basically it may be unchanged, but you know very well that it manifests itself in ways so different that the two creatures seem hardly to belong to the same species. Of course human nature changes; if it were not so, education would be a waste of time and religion nothing more than an empty dream.

The attainment of a sense of human brotherhood is not an impossible ideal, but I sometimes think that we may have laid too much stress on it as an ethical duty. It is a duty, certainly, but it is also a rational process, very much like attaining a realization that the world is round. For many ages that idea, too, was rejected by the mass of mankind as a denial of commonsense. Any man, merely by looking around him, could see that the world is flat.

For an even longer time men have been taught by that same commonsense that they are not brothers, but mortal enemies. Any man can see it, merely by looking around him. Nevertheless, as evidence kept piling up that the world is round until the fact had to be accepted, so the evidence that men are and must remain brothers keeps piling up. Th evidence of the hydrogen bomb is merely the latest item. The lives of countless millions of human beings are in our hands, and our lives are in their hands. We are our brothers' keepers, and we can no more alter the fact than we can alter the course of the planet around the sun.

Our choice is limited to accepting or rejecting the duty that the fact implies. It is within our power to be murderous brothers of the breed of Cain, but brothers we shall remain, and if the voice of blood cries out from the ground, it will be our brothers' blood—which is my reason for saying that brotherhood is a condition and not a theory and its acceptance is only secondarily a moral triumph. It is first of all a triumph of reason over ignorance and superstition; and as every triumph of reason results in intellectual enlightenment, so I have faith to believe that the progressive acceptance of the fact of human brotherhood will be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path that will guide us through the darkness that threatens to overwhelm us, and lead us into the perfect day.

The Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most able journalists in the State of Oregon is Mr. Dewey Rand, publisher and editor of the great weekly newspaper in our State, the Capital Press. I have before me three editorials, written by Mr. Dewey Rand, dealing with the political scene, both State and National. The editorials are so excellent, Mr. President, that I believe an historical record should be made of them. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press of April 6, 1956]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

Like many other out-of-State newspapers the Los Angeles Times has entered the Oregon United States senatorial contest. It does not approve of Oregonians electing Senator WAYNE MORSE for another term. If it has its way, and one can be sure it feels it should, Oregon will send Douglas McKay to Washington instead of the man who has had the effrontery to criticize President Eisenhower and—worse still—change his registration from Republican to Democrat.

Oregon editors who do not read the Times are indebted to the Oregon Voter for this news. In the March 24 issue, this courageous defender of Republican monopoly and private power interests in Oregon, published an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of March 13. It is too bad both the Voter and the Times do not have a larger circulation in the State so that Oregon voters could be better informed on the baseness of MORSE and the nobility of McKay. For the Times editorial points out that Oregon voters will have a clear choice between these two extremes if MORSE and McKay are nominated in May, and oppose each other in November.

There could hardly be a more extravagant use of adjectives than the Times editorial writer displayed. Most of the space is devoted to MORSE and running through it are these descriptive words applied to the character or conduct of the Oregon Senator: Obstructionist, deluded, petty, windy, bitter, verbose, self-righteous, unctious, demagog, and, quoting McKay, "slippery." The Times did not need as much space to give its evaluation of McKay. In one paragraph it packed these words, descriptive of the recent Secretary of Interior: Courage, integrity, ability, competent, useful, enterprising, successful, and popular.

Many may wonder why the Times goes to all the trouble of telling Oregonians how to vote, and why. The answer to that is as flattering to MORSE as the Times piece was derogatory. There is a national campaign underway, supported by the big-business interests, including oil, gas, and private power, the Republican National Committee, and the President of the United States, to end MORSE'S political career. Add to this most of the newspapers, not only of Oregon but of the Nation, and the national magazines and you have a rather high recommendation for MORSE in the eyes of the less privileged people.

Although most publications make no pretense of covering their hatred for MORSE, few are as vicious as was the Times in its editorial. The usual anti-MORSE method is more devious and, therefore, more effective. An example of this is the March 19 issue of Time weekly, wherein it reports the coming McKay-MORSE race. Time conceals its prejudice quite well, but it shows in the pictures it uses with the story. Under the one of McKay, the caption reads "Ripened Practically." Under the MORSE picture Time says "Unripened Brilliance." The point in this is, we suspect, brilliance has no place in Government. To keep the country safe, only the successful in business or the military should be recruited or elected to guide the destiny of the Nation.

When MORSE was a Republican Senator his conduct was either applauded by these same editors, who now are united against him, or his actions, when disapproved, were never mentioned. When have the Republican editors of the State, or the Nation, criticized a member of the party? On the other hand, when have they missed an opportunity to vilify a Democrat? This is to be expected, but it should also be remembered when reading partisan editorial comment on Senator MORSE. The Times is entitled to its opinion or its propaganda, but its readers are also entitled to regard what it says with suspicion.

The venom many of the Nation's and Oregon's editors spew on MORSE is little short of amazing. They make no specific charges against him, they do not cite his record, for to do so would assure his reelection. Instead, they search the dictionary for belittling adjectives and manufacture phrases of innuendo. The Los Angeles Times with its complete lack of fairness and restraint, is an example of the extremes to which the press will go to defend those of special interests and privileges who control the Republican Party.

Senator MORSE, independent, brilliant, and capable, is a constant threat to the profitable privileges for the few the Times is defending. In the minds of the majority, the less privileged Oregonians, there should be no better reason for the reelection of MORSE than the opposition of the Times and others of its kind.

[For the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press of April 20, 1956]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

President Eisenhower's appearance on television this week in defense of his veto of the farm bill was a credit to his stage manager, Robert Montgomery. But the script did not quite match the performance. Perhaps the President should get himself some new writers. And then again, perhaps they did as well as anyone could do with that very tough theme, the farm problem, and the President's attitude toward it.

Of course, for those who "like Ike," there sat a man with courage and integrity who faced the issue fearlessly and nopolitically, letting the chips fall where they would. Didn't he, himself, say: "I have one yardstick by which I test every major problem—and that yardstick is: Is it good for America?" You had his own word he had done the wise and fair thing.

But to those who regard the President of the United States only as a man who has great power and whose decisions have profound effect on the lives of those he governs, it was neither that simple nor conclusive. Nor were his words entirely nonpolitical, or the rightness of his veto so conclusively proven as was intended.

Whether or not the bill he killed was good or bad has been debated long enough and there is nothing to do about it now. No one now has hope there will be any substantial remedial farm legislation this year. Surely the President knew his veto would mean just that—everyone else did. On Monday the President once again expressed great concern for the farmer's plight. These were only words. Once again his action belied these words of sympathy.

This difference between words and deeds, which has been the farm policy of the administration for more than 3 years, should leave practically no one with any illusions. If farmers, or those who believe their economic welfare is important, support the President for reelection, it will have to be for other reasons than expectations he will propose or support a plan that will raise the many small farm families to a position of prosperity comparable to those in the Nation's booming industry. Either he does not regard the plight of the farmer with the concern he expresses or, for some reason, he fears a helpful program. The result is the same in either circumstance.

All this is difficult to understand. It may be, as some experts argue, that the small farmer is an outdated economic unit and should be liquidated. Surely this administration has allowed enough progress in this direction to warrant the suspicion, at least, that this is the plan. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, with his cold banking and business regard of the problem, has done his best to further the liquidation with stubbornness, if nothing else. Surely, Benson's actions, attitude, and inactions are approved by the President.

Who can rightly claim to have the answers to this problem? We do not pretend to be the one. But we do believe the President should have signed the bill, and we do not believe it was proven a bad bill simply by the President saying so. We believe the estimated $3 billion it would have provided for the farmers this year would have been good for America—not bad. We do not believe that a country supporting a $38 billion defense load would collapse under this additional strain.

Benson and the President have decried surpluses for 3 years in an effort, it seems to us, to draw attention to their own failures by blaming the Democrats for all the troubles. Admitting the Democrats were to blame for the surplus, too much food is not the greatest evil that can befall a nation. A greater one, we believe, is the impoverishment of millions of American farm families.

President Eisenhower has become a capable and convincing television performer. He gave every appearance, in his talk on the farm bill, of sincerity and deep conviction. But while he was deploring this work of Congress and saying it "would hurt the farmers," and intimating it would be bad for the country, the viewer could not help remembering the alacrity with which he signed away the tidelands oil. What yardstick did he use to measure that problem? Does he have one for American businessmen, and another for American farmers?

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press of April 27, 1956]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

It has been a long time since an Oregon newspaper has produced a sensation equal to the one the Portland Oregonian made last week. All newspapers report news. Last week when the State's leading daily published its first story by two of its top reporters who had spent months investigating political and vice connections in Portland, it had made the news.

In their investigation the reporters could hardly have snared bigger game. That is not saying anyone should be considered guilty of anything at this point. What the stories do show is that Portland officials, Multnomah County officials, labor officials, and underworld characters have been carelessly, to say

the least, associating. Included in the cast are the mayor of Portland, his chief of police, a city commissioner, the Multnomah district attorney and sheriff, a Portland underworld figure, a Seattle bookmaker, and two kingpins of the teamsters union.

The story thus far centers primarily on two men. These two are Clyde Crosby, Portland boss of the teamsters, and Jim Elkins, reputed boss and banker of Portland's underworld. It is intimated Elkins has influence with Portland's police chief, James Purcell. It is charged that Crosby, who was an intimate of District Attorney William Langley, conspired with Elkins, the Seattle bookie, J. P. McLaughlin, and coast teamster boss Tom Maloney, to pool and control all the rackets and fringe business in the county. The break for the Oregonian seems to have occurred when Elkins and the others could not agree, and he started talking to the two reporters.

The Multnomah County grand jury will now take up where the Oregonian has left off. On May 7, Attorney General Robert Thornton will begin an investigation at the direction of Gov. Elmo Smith that will dig to the bottom of the charges and countercharges and will prosecute, if evidence warrants. In the meantime, it would be unfair to those featured in the Oregonian stories to jump to any conclusions of guilt.

Meanwhile, it is more practical to speculate on the political motivation and consequences of the Oregonian's exposé. So far, there has been more political heat generated than crime uncovered in this journalistic enterprise. It is interesting to note that the Teamsters are a power in Multnomah politics, as they are, to a lesser degree, in the State. It is also of interest that the Teamsters support Democratic candidates with few exceptions, and the power of this union swings others in the same direction. Finally, the Oregonian broke the story just 4 weeks before the primary election.

This newspaper itself, has raised the question of politics. In an editorial this week, it protests its innocence. "Neither the investigation nor subsequent news has been motivated or influenced by political considerations," it says. "This newspaper has printed what substantiated information it could obtain, without regard to candidates, officials or political parties." There you have the editor's word that the paper's motives are pure.

But circumstances cause a raised eyebrow, at least, if not actual suspicion. The district attorney, who has appeared in the poorest light in the stories, is a Democrat. So is Sheriff Schrunk, who was, and maybe still is, a strong contender for Mayor Peterson's job. The city election is nonpartisan, but Peterson is a Republican and so is Commissioner Stanley Earl, whom the Teamsters are attempting to defeat. The Teamsters have also endorsed these Democrats: Wayne Morse for Senator; Edith Green for Congress; Robert Holmes for Governor, and Monroe Sweetland for secretary of state. If the Teamsters' leaders are made to look disreputable, or worse still, convicted of criminal conspiracy, some of the scandal will rub off on these candidates.

The Oregonian editors are no political amateurs, and are steadfast propagandists for the GOP and its candidates. They know as well as anyone the political consequences of what they have published. They may not be "motivated or influenced by political considerations," but why such fortunate timing? Portland is a big city, and crime and vice are no new importations. Political and underworld connivance has been going on for many years and the Oregonian has never shown such crusading fervor when the city hall and court house were safely in Republican hands.

The Oregonian has performed a public service by calling attention to the suspicious conduct of public officials, labor czars and racketeers. But in this commendable program, its statement of political purity is out of place and hardly believable when all the circumstances are reviewed. Crusading is one thing, hypocrisy is another.

The Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the daily radio roundup of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1956.

Sagging farm income ought to be a flashing red danger signal to the rest of the country. It's a warning that means a lot of people besides farmers are going to get hurt. The story of how sick agriculture take-home pay is infecting other parts of the economy is told in a couple of newspaper articles. One comes from the St. Paul Pioneer Press. It carries a report under the headline saying, "Ag Troubles Spread to Business," and tells the findings of a checkup by that newspaper. In short, it says "Farm prices and weather trouble are spreading seriously to business in the agricultural implement, auto, and fertilizer industries."

The farm price troubles, said the St. Paul newspaper, are represented by a new sag of 3 percent in the past year in the purchasing power of Minnesota farm products. This finding was from a study made by farm economists at the University of Minnesota. They further report that the purchasing power of Minnesota farmers was the lowest for the month of March in 21 years. That low level of purchasing power reflects low prices of farm products and high prices of things farmers have to buy, says the newspaper.

In fertilizer sales it's a case of sales running better than last year, but the rate of expansion in sales is less than it has been the last few years. Farmers are reluctant to cut down on this way to higher yields—that's being efficient. Farm-machinery dealers are finding the cuts in sales, however, to be sharp. And the same goes for auto sales in farm country here in the upper Midwest.

Another newspaper, the New York Times, also published a survey devoted to the farm machinery and auto sales for the whole country. The newspaper commented that farm income has dropped by 26 percent in the last 5 years, and nobody knows it better than the farm-equipment makers and dealers. Here's what it says about the business: "Even though spring planting is well underway, sales are skidding. The retail dip is as great as 80 percent in some cases, though the average is probably closer to 20 percent. There are variations in the pattern. Farm equipment volume has slumped most in the Midwest farm States." The Midwest Farm Equipment Association, composed of about 750 members in western Iowa and Nebraska, reported to the New York newspaper that their business was running 38 to 40 percent behind the 1955 pace.

And a correspondent from Des Moines, Iowa, told the Times that "the picture for implement dealers here does not look happy. There has been an increase in the number selling out recently." Farmers are poor customers for farm implements and for automobiles, when their income takes the sharp cut that it's been handed for the last few years. And the findings of these surveys show that when agriculture gets under the weather economically it is going to spread to other industries. And one as dependent on farm customers as the farm-implement industry is headed right for the economic sick list. It means workers will be laid off in the cities, as they are these days, and profits of farm machinery manufacturers go down, and some dealers go out of business as they are.

So, it ought to be clear that helping get agriculture back on its feet is a matter that concerns many people besides farmers. GTA, the co-op way, is dedicated to helping farm people win a fair return for their contribution of food abundance to the Nation.

SUNFED Should Not Be a Part of the United States Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on May 7, 1956, I reviewed the question of United States participation in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, popularly known as SUNFED.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Knight newspapers which supports my position.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of May 8, 1956]

NO HELP TO UNCLE SAM—FOREIGN AID VIA THE U. N.

With power diplomacy currently taking on a cash-and-carry aspect as the United States and Russia compete in the open market for allies, it is natural that someone would propose a supermarket system for handing out foreign aid.

That is what the suggestion amounts to that United States aid funds for underdeveloped countries be disbursed by the United Nations.

The plan has strong backing. Our U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge supports it as does Adlai Stevenson, candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

President Eisenhower, on the other hand, is dubious about it, as the majority of Americans are likely to be.

The best case for turning over to the U. N. a large part of the $4.9 billion which Congress is being asked to appropriate for foreign aid is advanced by Ambassador Lodge.

It would, he says, be a big step over an aid program sponsored by the United States alone.

It is his hope that Russia would follow our example. In fact, he thinks the Soviet would be forced to do so. The result would be an end to the spending competition between the two nations in their efforts to win the alliance of underdeveloped countries, and a spreading out the available funds so that more poor nations would benefit.

Other people have offered the argument that aid through the U. N. would be more acceptable to the beneficiaries because it would not put them on one side or the other.

That prompts the question of what the real purpose of handing out billions of dollars for dams and other enterprises really is. As a matter of cold reality, why are we spending billions of dollars unless it is to win the alliance of other peoples to our side in the cold-war struggle with the Communists?

There are several other things that come to mind in a discussion of this plan.

First, we wonder just how fierce is the competition between this country and Russia to aid other nations. There has been a good deal of talk about what the Reds are offering in this or that quarter of the globe. But there isn't much evidence that they make good on their offers. They make promises which they may or may not intend to keep; we match those promises with hard cash.

The results, so far, have been precious little in the way of value received.

If the money was paid by the U. N.—our money—it would have a U. N. label on it. That would mean to the beneficiary that Russia was as much a donor as the United States.

How would that give us the slightest advantage in winning good will?

The U. N., as we understand it, was created to serve as a common meeting ground in which points of tension between two nations could be argued out and eased.

We can't recall that it was intended to buy peace with American dollars.

To make the U. N. a disbursing agent for the money of American taxpayers smacks of the one-world concept. We can almost foresee the time when, under such an arrangement, the U. N. will tell us how much we are to appropriate. Our only job then will be to raise the money.

Finally, we doubt if any such arrangement will ease the tension between the United States and the Communist world. The latter is dedicated to the destruction of freedom as we conceive it.

If a U. N. fund to which we contribute heavily will stop the bidding for friendship that goes on now between this country and the Reds, we can be almost certain that the latter will shift their line and find some other method of undermining our prestige and strength abroad.

North Dakota Clean Grain Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Wayne J. Colberg, secretary of the North Dakota Clean Grain Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE COLLEGE STATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., May 8, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We plan to hold a Clean Grain Banquet in Bismarck, N. Dak., on June 21, 6:30 p. m., in the American Legion Hall. This banquet will be the official "kickoff" of our "North Dakota Clean Grain Week" July 9 through 13, to be proclaimed by Governor Brunsdale.

Our menu will feature only North Dakota grown products and we sincerely hope that we can create a little more interest not only in clean grain but also all of our good North Dakota agricultural products.

On behalf of the North Dakota Clean Grain Committee, I wish to extend an invitation for you to be our guest at this banquet.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE J. COLBERG,
Extension Entomologist and Secretary to North Dakota Clean Grain Committee.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. NOBLE J. GREGORY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, you know that the hearts of all Kentuckians are heavy and our heads are bowed in grief over the passing of our most illustrious native son. I particularly am grieved over the loss of this great and good friend. He was a resident of the great First District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent and which he made a great district as an illustrious Member of the House, as a distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and later as the Vice President. His last words were typical of him and typified his life both as a citizen, as a neighbor, and as a public official. I am sure that I have known him longer than any Member of either body as I knew him when I was a small boy and witnessed his climb in public affairs from county office to the pinnacle in national affairs in his party and in his Nation.

ALBEN BARKLEY was born in the small community of Lowes, in Graves County, Ky. He never forgot his beginning in humble surroundings and his loyalty to that community and his devotion never wavered.

I felt that it would be appropriate that the high school at Lowes, Ky., should have the flag which was flown at half mast over the House from which he started his rise to fame. I have sent this flag to the Lowes, Ky., High School with the accompanying letter:

To the Students of Lowes High School, Lowes, Ky.:

The hearts of all of us in Kentucky and, in fact, throughout the Nation are heavy and our heads are bowed in sorrow over the sudden passing of the late Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY whose life has for so many years been dedicated to unselfish public service to his fellowman.

I know that in his birthplace of Lowes his loss is probably felt more keenly, if possible, than elsewhere. His loyalty and devotion to the Lowes community never wavered. Your forebears knew him as a schoolboy and knew of his ambition, character, and determination to be of service to his fellowman. He realize this ambition and achieved the second highest honor in the world in becoming the most popular Vice President in the history of the United States.

Coming from a modest beginning and having achieved these many great honors by the application of industry and honesty—fortified by character and unselfishness, his life was and will always be a beacon light of inspiration to young men and women possessing these traits.

The Congress of the United States paid just tribute to him. All flags were flown at half mast when his passing was announced. Since he started his rise to fame as a Member of the House of Representatives, I feel that the flag flown over the House of Representatives at half mast should be presented to you to hang in your school as a constant reminder to you and the students of the generations yet to come that great good can be achieved by you if you emulate his great life. I am sure that this will be an inspiration to you.

I have secured this flag and am sending it to you today together with a certificate of the Clerk of the House that this is the authentic flag flown over the House at half mast as a token of grief and deep respect which not only the Congress felt but which was shared by peoples of the entire world.

So long, Mr. Speaker, as character and devotion are honored among men, so long as courage of conviction may be cherished among men, so long as unselfish service to humanity is appreciated—just so long will the memory of ALBEN W. BARKLEY occupy a hallowed place in the minds and hearts of all Americans.

United States Says "No" to Coffee Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on many occasions I have discussed on the floor of the Senate the difficulties interent in attempting to stabilize the prices of commodities through intergovernmental commodity agreements.

For sometime, many Latin American governments have been urging this Government to participate in an international commodity agreement for coffee. The New York Herald Tribune on May 5 reported that the United States Government has decided not to participate in the plan for an international coffee agreement. I commend the State Department for their position in rejecting this scheme.

The difficulties in administering commodity controls are well illustrated in a report by Laurance F. Stuntz, of Rio de Janeiro, which appeared in the Washington Post May 4, 1956. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stuntz' article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 4, 1956]

AUTO AND COFFEE RACKETS IMPERIL BRAZIL'S STABILITY

(By Laurance F. Stuntz)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—A little racket in automobile imports has tipped off Brazilian authorities to a big racket in coffee exports. The two together pose a new threat for the country's precarious money stability.

The illegal import of automobiles apparently is partially financed by the coffee racket. The latter appears to be costing the government somewhere between $25 million and $250 million a year.

The coffee racket, born of Brazil's elaborate control of foreign exchange, works this way:

An exporter ships out, say 1,000 bags of Santos coffee grade 2, but he issues the invoice for the lower grade 4. The difference is usually around 1¼ U. M. cents per pound—$1.50 difference per bag or $1,500 on the shipment.

The United States importer pays the exporter for the higher grade. But the exporter sells the Banco Do Brazil, as the law requires, only the dollars based on the lower grade. Since he receives more dollars this way he can use them to buy cars in the United States or he can sell them on the free market.

DIFFERENCE IS CONSIDERABLE

The difference is considerable. The government pays 37 cruzeiros for every dollar received from the sale of coffee. The free market rate is twice this—around 74 cruzeiros for the dollar. Thus the crooked minority of exporters get twice as many cruzeiros as they would if they sold the dollars to the government.

These dollars feed the free market and the racket probably accounts for the fact the rate is around 74 cruzeiros. One foreign firm has figured the true value of the cruzeiro is now about 90 cents to the dollar. But the heavy sale of dollars from the coffee racket has kept the price lower.

Free market dollars can also be used to buy automobiles to be brought in through loopholes in the customs laws. The going price of $10,000 for a new Chevrolet makes this a profitable business.

It is because of the shortage of dollars that Brazil forbids the import of cars. Anybody who can get a car into the country can make a 400-percent profit. With this much at stake, smart operators looked for a loophole. They found it in the legal provision that lets a returning Brazilian bring in his car from abroad. Dealers could give a housewife a free trip to the United States, arranging for her to bring back a car. The housewife got the trip and the dealer got the car. He could pay the $700 airplane passage and still make plenty.

ONE THOUSAND CARS THIS YEAR

With cars flooding in—more than 1,000 already this year—Brazilian consuls asked United States shipping lines not to carry any more. But other lines were less cooperative and dealers took to chartering ships.

The Government cracked down by increasing port charges in order to dry up the profits. Unloading a Chevrolet, the most popular here, now costs $4,280 even if you can get it out of customs in less than a month. Most cars take around 3 months. Storage is $1,510 the first month and twice that the second month. Port use is $920 and stevedoring bossing $1,850. On top of that, freight and duty are about $750.

Legislation Accomplished in This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a memorandum prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress comparing the legislation accomplished in this session of Congress with that accomplished in about the same period in the 2d session of the 83d Congress:

COMPARISON OF LEGISLATION ACCOMPLISHED IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS WITH THAT ACCOMPLISHED IN ABOUT THE SAME PERIOD IN THE 2D SESSION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

As of May 1, 1954, there were 60 public bills enacted into law.

As of May 1, 1956, there were 112 public bills enacted into law.

As of May 1, 1954, there were eight bills in conference.

As of May 1, 1956, there were 10 bills in conference.

As of May 1, 1954, there were 11 bills through conference.

As of May 1, 1956, there were nine bills through conference.

As of May 1, 1954, the Senate had passed 397 measures.

As of May 1, 1956, the Senate had passed 575 measures.

As of May 1, 1954, the House had passed 442 measures.

As of May 1, 1956, the House had passed 404 measures.

As of May 1, 1954, the Senate committees had reported 426 bills.

As of May 1, 1956, the Senate committees had reported 674 bills.

As of May 1, 1954, the House committees had reported 418 bills.

As of May 1, 1956, the House committees had reported 404 bills.

Yea-and-nay votes:

As of May 1, 1954, there were 48 in the Senate and 19 in the House.

As of May 1, 1956, there were 57 in the Senate and 19 in the House.

Executive nominations:

As of May 1, 1954, the Senate had received and considered 11,680 nominations requiring senatorial confirmation.

As of May 1, 1956, the Senate had received and considered 33,777 nominations requiring senatorial confirmation.

Some of the major proposals which have received action during the 2d session of the 84th Congress are:

Natural gas bill (H. R. 6645) vetoed February 17, 1956.

Disaster loans (H. R. 7871) approved February 2, 1956, Public Law 402.

Home disaster relief (H. J. Res. 471) approved February 10, 1956, Public Law 405.

Farm-gas tax exemption (H. R. 8780) approved April 2, 1956, Public Law 466.

Tax Rate Extension Act (H. R. 9166) approved March 29, 1956, Public Law 458.

Federal Highway Act of 1956 (H. R. 10660) passed House April 27, 1956.

Navy shipbuilding and conversion (H. R. 7993) passed Senate April 26, 1956.

Farm bill (H. R. 12) vetoed April 16, 1956; veto sustained April 18, 1956.

School-milk program (H. R. 8320) approved April 2, 1956, Public Law 465.

Merchant Marine Academy (H. R. 6043) approved February 20, 1956, Public Law 415.

Willful aircraft destruction, penalty (S. 2972) reported in House March 29, 1956.

Aeronautical research (H. R. 8675) passed House February 27, 1956.

Colorado River project (S. 500) approved April 11, 1956, Public Law 485.

Taxation of insurance companies (H. R. 7201) approved March 13, 1956, Public Law 429.

Medical-dental officers, incentives (H. R. 9428) passed Senate April 18, 1956.

Military dependents' medical care (H. R. 9429) passed House March 2, 1956.

Military-procurement contracts, advertising (H. R. 8710) passed House February 20, 1956.

Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act, extension (S. 2990) approved February 15, 1956, Public Law 411.

Military construction (H. R. 9893) passed House April 12, 1956.

Foreign Service pay increase (S. 3481) passed Senate April 12, 1956.

Food and Agricultural Organizations and International Labor Organization (S. J. Res. 97) passed Senate April 19, 1956.

Atomic Energy acquisitions (H. R. 10387) passed Senate April 19, 1956.

National bank examinations (S. 1188) approved April 30, 1956, Public Law 502.

Red Willow and Wilson Dams (S. 1194) approved May 2, 1956, Public Law 505.

Federal Reserve bank authority to purchase obligations (H. R. 9285) passed House April 19, 1956.

War orphans' education (H. R. 9824) passed House April 23, 1956.

Veterans' housing loans (H. R. 9260) passed House April 23, 1956.

Bank holding companies (H. R. 6227) passed Senate April 25, 1956.

Disarmament as a Part of a Just and Durable World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday it was my privilege to address a civic conference in Chicago on the theme of disarmament as a part of a just and durable world peace.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES INTENSIFIED EFFORT TO EXPLORE DISARMAMENT PLANS; QUESTIONS REAL SOVIET ATTITUDE

It is, indeed, a special honor for me to be with you today. It is more than gratifying to see an assembly of local civic groups bound together by a mutual concern for meeting the greatest international challenge of our times—maintenance of world peace through the achievement of workable, safeguarded disarmament.

Secretary Dulles' remarks before the General Assembly in September of 1953, ring truer today than ever before. He said at that time:

"Destructive power inherent in matter * * * must be controlled by the idealism of man's spirit and the wisdom of his mind. They alone stand between us and a lifeless planet. There are plenty of problems in this world, many of them interconnected. But there is no problem which compares with this central universal problem of saving the human race from extinction."

Such is the measure of the problem of regulation and control of armaments in the grim atomic-hydrogen age.

THE SENATE IS FULFILLING ITS RESPONSIBILITY

It is fitting and proper that the Senate of the United States, acting on behalf of the people of our country, has wisely established our 12-man subcommittee, for the exclusive purpose of exploring this central problem.

It is my view, as I know it is yours, that the Congress has an inescapable obligation continually to review this problem with the

highest officials of the Government of the United States, with leading citizens' organizations, and with individual spokesmen for the American public.

It is our task to help spotlight this challenge in all its implications and then, to leave no stone unturned, no channel unexplored, no constructive suggestion unconsidered in trying to help meet this immense and complex problem.

We are all aware that disarmanent plans could not possibly be worked out by the executive branch in a vacuum, or all by itself. Plans must and will be worked out in full accordance with the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate in its advice and consent function and in full accordance with the clear interests and responsibilities of the House of Representatives as well, speaking for our people.

WORLD OPINION'S CRUCIAL ROLE

In turn, disarmament discussions can only advance within the framework of what world public opinion wants and understands and is ready for; and that is where you in particular come in, with your constructive thinking and suggestions.

To better equip yourselves, you are, during this all-day session, getting the benefit of the judgment of a great many experts who have devoted a very considerable amount of time and energy to exploring all phases of this problem. I will not duplicate what they will say or have already said in their respective fields, but I may briefly touch upon some of their areas.

My own principal theme is, that you may feel confident that your Congress and, in particular, your Senate, is moving ahead, seeking earnestly to fulfill its responsibility in this awesome field.

We are not of course, seeking to arrogate unto ourselves any of the powers and rights of the executive branch in spearheading United States diplomacy, nor are we, however, idly sitting back and abandong our own clear obligation to work as a member of the executive-legislative team, on behalf of world peace.

WE WATCH ENTIRE WORLD STAGE

We are keeping our eye on the main ball, and we are not losing sight of the other East-West balls either.

The talks in London were of course, but one part of the fast-changing world stage.

Inevitably, all that transpires in the dynamic field of foreign policy may affect the climate and, indeed, the fate of disarmament negotiations.

The latest Bulganin and Khruschev statements from the Kremlin; the latest signs of dissension over the downgrading of Stalin; new developments in the explosive Middle East; new Soviet trade and technical assistance offers to underdeveloped lands; new Soviet cultural exchanges; the exploration by the three wise men of NATO of greater economic and political cooperation within that vital organization; new nuclear discoveries from laboratory and testing ground— these are but a few of the factors on the world scene which interrelate, if only indirectly, with the problem before us.

They give us clues, signs and omens of the state of Soviet thinking.

THE MOST BASIC OF ALL PROBLEMS: SOVIET INTENTIONS

And always, we get back to the most basic problem of all: Is there, in the heart of the Soviet leaders (as we know there is in our heart) a genuine desire to do everything humanly possible to have all of us succeed in the disarmament talks. Is there a real desire for—just and durable peace, because after all disarmament is not a goal in and of itself but rather is a vital part of a just and durable peace.

Or, are the Soviet leaders simply sparring for time? Are they simply maneuvering for propaganda value—for example, with phony offers on meaningless reduction of their huge ground forces?

Only the future will really tell. But the past does tell us something. And it is this: we have good reason to be on our guard, to be vigilant. We have good reason to be hopeful, and yet, not to be naive.

We have welcomed ford from Harold Stassen, of progress made during the 5 Nation Conference of 6 weeks in London. Indeed, we have welcomed every sign at any time, that, despite the enormous gap which still separates East and West, we have moved toward a closing of at least part of the gap between the United States and her allies on the one hand, and the Soviet position, on the other hand.

There is no reason for discouragement or despair.

But we still don't know the real answer to the real question: What is actually in the mind of the Kremlin?

Does it actually desire to do everything possible to avert an H-bomb holocaust in the world, to avert it by genuinely constructive deeds—irrevocable, ironclad deeds?

Do the "powers" in Moscow truly realize the ominous implications of the ever-mounting East-West stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the ever-increasing destructiveness of these weapons?

Do the "powers" in Moscow actually seek some constructive way out of the arms race, the nuclear deadlock? Or are they only paying lip service to the problem, while actually repeating their "Nyet," "Nyet," "Nyet"?

In his recent visit to Great Britain, Mr. Khruschev said to a group of his hosts: "It would not be of much use to our peoples if we were to stand facing each other like fighting cocks. * * * Such an attitude would lead to an arms race involving tremendous costs; an arms race that can lead only to war; and with modern weapons, war can lead only to disaster for all."

As for ourselves, we clearly perceive the nature of such a possible disaster. So, we will work patiently and persistently, and we will seek "to move mountains" to see that disaster does not befall the human race.

SOVIETS CAN BE MOVED

For the present, we can only say that the Soviets are not immovable. They have moved. They are definitely subject to the pressure and of world opinion. Russian opinion itself.

When we look back at the Soviet position in 1946, we very definitely see modifications. Russia has come a long way from her old arbitrary insistence that prohibition of nuclear weapons should precede an "effective system" of international control.

She now acknowledges the indispensable concept of stages in the process of bringing a disarmament program into being.

Yet, it is true that the Soviets have continued their pattern of "running from specifics." And the areas of disagreement still overweigh those of any agreement. Any optimism in London got a particular setback by statements of Messrs. Khruschev and Bulganin in outright criticisms of the Disarmament Subcommittee's efforts.,

Russia is still unwilling to agree to an adequate inspection system, including combined air-ground inspection and controls.

For the present, she accepts only ground installation inspection. She unsoundly maintains that aerial survey has nothing to do with real disarmament control—that it has "other aims." What these aims are were not specified.

It would seem that Russia suffers "conveniently" from "loss of memory," forgetting that in 1945 she herself introduced a proposal, providing an international air force under the United Nations, to help maintain peace.

Also, the Soviet Union still does not want to comprehend that a settlement of world political problems is part and parcel of general disarmament. How can we possibly agree to her disarmament plans which insist on the neutralization of Germany and Korea, which would mean the complete withdrawal of Western defense forces from world tension centers?

Nor has Russia met the West on definite proposals for even partial—first phase—nuclear disarmament.

She has failed too, to respond to our suggestions for certain confidence-binding gestures such as: Test control areas, exchange of technical missions, and exchange of information on troop movements.

Moreover, we must remember that President Eisenhower is still awaiting a belated reply from Marshal Bulganin in answer to our historic proposal in his letter of March 5. As you well recall, the President had suggested for the first time an East-West freeze on stockpiles of nuclear weapons (with appropriate inspection safeguards of course).

IRON CURTAIN HAS ONLY A FEW PEEPHOLES

Basically, the Iron Curtain remains exactly that. There are a few peepholes for looking through it, but there is no sign of anything like the comprehensive inspection system which must be at the very core of disarmament plans.

Meanwhile, Harold Stassen informs us that in another year, scientific know-how on the hydrogen bomb will have spread around the world. If this information becomes common stuff to other countries before an international disarmament treaty is drawn up, tensions and dangers will be seriously increased.

PROMISING NEWS ON U. N. ATOMIC AGENCY

While we are waiting for some disarmament blueprint, we must and will continue to take the lead in seeing that our "Atoms for Peace" program is carried out. We have already made great strides in seeing a United Nations Atoms-for-Peace Agency drafted and approved. But, the specifics have yet to be put down in print. As set up, this new atomic code would at least help assure to all peaceful nations throughout the world a share in the marvelous benefits of nuclear energy—benefits which will lift mankind to higher levels of well-being.

Most significant for our discussion here today, is that this proposed agency would bar the warlike use of any atomic materials pooled with it, and would set up an inspection system to see that this was carried out. Is it possible that this could be a first step in limiting atom bomb production? The prospects are promising, and the United States should drive for approval of this agency, when it comes up for authorization in September.

OPPORTUNITY IN JUNE AND SEPTEMBER

On an overall basis, our Government is wisely determined to continue its dedicated effort to try to come to sound terms with the Russians. The U. N. Disarmament Subcommittee will meet again in about 6 months—time enough for reappraisal of proposals and positions by both sides. It is obvious that Russia wants some thinking time on United States proposals. Perhaps we will get an inkling of something new when delegates of the five nations report to the full U. N. Disarmament Commission in mid-June, for a review of their latest effort.

As Mr. Stassen remarked, "It is America's policy to turn the armaments spiral downward." In carrying this policy out, we will never slacken our drive to reach a workable accommodation with the Soviets, if it is humanly possible.

We know that our own national interest—our very lives—are directly involved. Life on this planet is directly involved. We cannot afford to be lax. Nor can we afford to make mistakes. We cannot afford to be impractical. We cannot afford to allow scien-

tific and military developments to render our proposals obsolete.

We are fortunate that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State clearly recognize all of the facts which I have mentioned, and that we have the services of so competent a leader as former Governor Stassen.

AVOID BOTH FALSE IDEALISM AND CYNICISM

We must constantly move ahead with judgment and discretion. We, as a people, must and will avoid the bluster of threatening statements, or the impatience of immaturity.

We must avoid any fuzzy-eyed idealism, which would cause us to take ill-conceived, unilateral disarmament steps, without the tightest and most effective safeguards.

But, at the same time, we must avoid the so-called realism which may only be a blind cynicism, which refuses to admit of the possibility of progress in this field.

Instead, the world needs hope; it needs faith. The world hungers for constructive efforts. We will not allow this hunger to go unmet.

Meanwhile, one-third of the Members of the Senate face reelection this year, and all of the House of Representatives. This issue, however, like other key foreign policy issues, must and will be kept out of partisan politics. It is too big, too important. And I am satisfied that this fact is clearly understood.

As we move ahead, it is up to us in the Congress to continue to furnish light for the American people, and for the peoples of the world, in cooperation with our associates of the executive branch.

It is up to us to warn America, however, that we may expect more and more Soviet propaganda tricks between now and the time the disarmament talks resume. We may expect that the Reds will make more showy efforts, for example, to reduce their swollen, conventional land forces. But we will not be deceived.

STAFF STUDIES BY SUBCOMMITTEE

Our subcommittee will help keep the spotlight on this problem. Our competent staff has, as you know, already completed several important studies which are being widely distributed throughout the country to interested citizens and civic organizations such as yours.

For example, our study of the Executive Branch and Disarmament Policy outlines all machinery within the executive branch responsible for carrying out a sound plan for control and reduction of araments. After all, final policy can only be as effective as the agencies involved in formulating it. Are they as efficient and clear-cut as they could be? Is there possibly any duplication or overlapping of efforts? Are lines of coordination, for instance, between Mr. Stassen's office, and Departments of State and Defense clear in analyzing arms control proposals? These are some of the questions we hope to answer.

Another study, A Selected Chronology on Disarmament, has afforded us one of the first really concise outlines of disarmament developments over the decades. These past experiences are highly significant today, and should serve as vital lessons for present and future courses of action over the conference table.

These and other subcommittee publications are gladly available to the public, and should prove of further educational benefit.

Our group will not only keep itself informed of all current developments in disarmament policy; in cooperation with the President, we will continue actively to seek new approaches in controlling the destructive forces unleashed by nuclear energy. Probably the most important phase of our work is collecting the viewpoints of the experts and public. This has alread proved a three-way learning process; enlightening to us; to those in attendance; and, I would venture to say, informative to the experts themselves.

Thus far, we have heard from such officials as Secretary Dulles, Mr. Stassen, Admiral Strauss, and Secretary Wilson. In our hearings with these and other representatives of the executive branch, I think we can stimulate fresh thinking on disarmament. In fact, it is not too presumptuous to believe that our conferences with them may have been helpful in presenting the recent arms control plan.

PAST MEETING IN BOSTON; COMING SESSION IN MINNEAPOLIS

But we have wisely gone to the people, as well, at the grassroots.

Our first out-of-town meeting in Boston was highly successful and informative. We heard from distinguished educators, scientists, clergymen, and private individuals. Their testimony not only took in specific parts of a total disarmament program, but they integrated disarmament with other foreign policy problems.

Needless to say, Boston certainly lived up to its reputation as a center of learning and pursuit of knowledge. Such opportunities to get an exchange of ideas, to talk out the problems at hand, and to receive original disarmament proposals, can but lead to new techniques.

We now look forward to our second "grassroots" meeting in Minneapolis on June 16. Again, printed copies of these hearings will be made available for public distribution.

Earlier, on June 8, we will have held another major hearing in Washington.

We are hoping for the broadest possible press coverage of it, for it is hard to conceive of hearings more genuinely meaningful to our own and all other peoples.

YOUR OWN ROLE

By our mutual efforts, we will help overcome any apathy which exists among our own people.

We know that time is running out and passive indifference must give way to an active searching for peace. Thus, it is up to responsible community organizations such as that of the groups represented here, to continue leadership in this job of public education. We need your continued cooperation in stimulating broader interest.

Through your local discussions and studies, you are arousing expert opinions and working toward an ever-better informed citizenry. At the same time, you are enabling people to help shape and share in policymaking on this crucial subject. The American people must have a still wider chance to participate in constructive discussions on disarmament; for how else are they to understand it and finally accept the policies pursued?

Our universities and colleges should be moving more rapidly into basic research on this problem—in particular, tying in disarmament with their studies in foreign affairs and international relations. Our Boston meeting underlined the important role of our higher educational institutions, in concentrating more specifically on the problem.

CONCLUSION

In summing up, may I congratulate all those who have contributed to the conception and the holding of this conference.

I hope that the work carried on today will move ahead in the days and weeks and months up ahead.

The road to a practical blueprint for weapon control remains a long and hard one. But setbacks and disappointments should only serve to speed constructive efforts on all our parts.

As our President has said, "There is no alternative to peace."

To win this most prized of all goals, we must and will do our part—each and every one of us.

Keynote Speech by Congressman John M. Vorys, Republican Mock Convention, Ohio State University, May 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. VORYS, REPUBLICAN MOCK CONVENTION, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, MAY 12, 1956

I am honored to be asked to address this convention. You have met to frame a platform to support a successful campaign, and 4 years of wise and good administration after victory in November.

The Democrat convention will be engrossed and involved in the ambitions and intrigues of half a dozen presidential candidates, all of whom I have met personally, none of whom is big enough to be President; but they want to run for it, anyway!

Our convention is different. We are concerned with principles. We are inspired and influenced by the radiating personality, the moving spirit of our humble, friendly, beloved, great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Here is a curious thing. We have a President who does not believe in one-man government, indispensable men, a rubber stamp Congress. Last September 10, before his illness, he said, "We don't believe for a minute that the Republican Party is so lacking in inspiration, high quality, personnel and leadership, that we are dependent on one man. We don't believe it for a minute." • • • He said, "Never pin your flag so tightly to one mast that if a ship sinks you cannot rip it off and nail it to another."

Yet this humble man has shown such a genius for team work, such a lifting spiritual quality, such ability in action, such a hold on the hearts of the people, that his already deathless spirit will permeate the conventions of both parties and will influence their decisions. We have had many would-be dictators in the world; some in this country. Our President, who would not be a dictator, has a voluntary following, based on affection and respect, here and over the world without parallel in history. Others would rule by fear; he leads by friendship.

You are young people. Others may feel that what you do or say is unimportant. President Eisenhower does not. He believes in youth. He is an old soldier. He learned in war that winning battles depends upon—not just generals, but youth. He has said: "The old tactical textbooks say that the commander always visits his troops to inspire them to fight. I for one soon discovered that one of the reasons for my visiting the front lines was to get inspiration from the young American soldier. I went back to my job ashamed of my own occasional resentments or discouragements. • • • The young American in action is something to inspire anybody." On the political front, he has said, "Each lower eschelon of leadership should in its composition, respond to the need for youth, for the idealism, the enthusiasm of youth."

So as you meet here, inspired by our President, remember that he is inspired by what you are doing.

II

I have been asked to make a keynote speech. I warn you, I am no orator. In fact, I am dubious about the value of campaign oratory, a phrase that has become synonymous in the public mind with hokum and buncombe. Campaign oratory makes everything black and white; what the opposition does is black, what we do is white. Our country is not that way; our parties are not that way; our government is not that way. I believe in 2-party government as the bulwark of our liberties; one-party government is despotism, as in Russia. Many parties means paralysis of government, as in France. Therefore, I believe in two good parties; I just want ours to be the best. As the President has said, "No party has a monopoly on brains or idealism or statesmanship." You have heard about a bipartisan foreign policy. Many people do not know that in the committees in Congress, and on the floor, most of the work is bipartisan. We have many bipartisan policies, and bipartisan opposition to them: For instance, in agriculture, civil service, roads, veterans. I would estimate that easily 95 percent of the text of bills and reports and debates in Congress is bipartisan or nonpartisan. It is that critical 5 percent that counts, and makes the difference between the parties.

Many people wish there were greater differences between our two great parties. They wish the other party would accommodate by being against everything good, and for everything that is bad. It would make campaigning easier. But neither party will accommodate the other inthis respect. This is hard on compaign oratory. It reveals, however, the essential unity of the vast majority of our people.

We have a big country, with a complex economy, many divergent regions and interests. Communism despises majority rule, so the Communist Party, the only party permitted, can be small and exclusive. In a free country a national party seeking a voluntary majority following must be large and inclusive. Measures that are vital necessities in one section may seem unimportant extravagances to those absorbed in the interests of another section.

An Italian statesman once said, "We have 14 parties, but only 2 factions; you have 2 parties and 14 factions." This was a witty remark, but it did not reveal the great weakness of government by coalitions of parties. We have many factions in this country who want their party to represent only their ideas. Their trouble is that the cannot get all the others to agree, or to drop out. So usually they exercise their right to stay in, and complain.

There is diversity within our parties. There is unity in many things among our people, but there are fundamental differences between our great parties in principle, in practice, in promises, in people.

III

There are cleavages between the northern and southern Democrats that may tear their party apart this year.

What is the Republican Party like in 1956? Some of our right-wingers say it has become Socialistic and is trying to out-deal the New Deal. On the other hand, the Democrat hopefuls in their their campaign oratory are saying the Republicans are the party of big business. Both of these statements cannot be true. As a matter of fact, neither of them is.

We are the middle-of-the-road party, conservative in economics, progressive in meeting human needs. Three words sound the keynote of our country's great desires, our party's principles, practices, and promises. The Republican Party stands for peace, prosperity, and progress. For the first time in a quarter century we have both peace and prosperity. Everything but the guns are booming, and we are marching right up the middle of the road to progress in a Republican administration. We stand, as the President has said, for "a Nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hopes, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secure."

IV

Let us look first to our record of performance. On the Archives building in Washington are inscribed these words, "The past is prologue." When it comes to campaign promises, the Democrats always outdo us. They are the most "promising" party in America; but we older people remember that Franklin Roosevelt won in 1932 on a platform to balance the budget and reduce spending 25 percent. People this year, hearing the Democrats, will remember Emerson's words, "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." What have we Republians done?

Peace

The President promised to end the fighting in Korea. It ended July 27, 1953.

War for Formosa has been prevented.

We went to the brink of war in our offers to help stop Chinese Communist aggression in Indochina, but our allies aifeld us, and we refused to join in the abject cease-fire in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, we have furnished arms and defense support to keep South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam free in the face of constant danger of Red aggression.

We led in forming and implementing SEATO for mutual defense in Southeast Asia.

To the south of Russia, Secretary Dulles led in the northern tier concept, which resulted in the Baghdad Pact, binding together Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey.

In Europe, Western Germany, with her sovoreignty restored, has joined the Western powers in NATO.

Little Austria has at last secured a peace treaty.

The problem of Trieste has been settled.

Bases for our bombers are being built in Spain.

In Latin America the Communist regime in Guatemala was overthrown. Peron is gone from Argentina, and the 21 American Republics have joined unanimously in agreement to resist Communist aggression, subversion, or infiltration in any Latin American country.

The Soviets find themselves now completely hemmed in by a system of regional defenses, with weapons and defense support we furnish, backed by our mobile airpower and military might. And this complex, potent, deterrent to Communist aggression is maintained at less cost to us than the spotty forces supplied under the Truman administration.

So the Soviets have changed their strategy. They know that aggression will not pay right now, and so we have a strategic new look of sweetness and light in their unswerving campaign for world domination. As Secretary Dulles says, the fact that they changed, shows that they think they are unsuccessful.

We have helped the 18 underdeveloped countries that have emerged from colonial status to independence since World War II. We have furnished moral support, economic aid, and technical assistance. Now the Soviets are launching a program of economic aid and technical assistance. As Secretary Dulles says, if imitation is the sincerest flattery, perhaps we should be flattered that they are imitating our programs. He warns, however, that this flattering imitation increases, rather than decreases, the challenge of the Soviet new look.

The dramatic proposal of our President for the use of atoms for peace has captured the imagination of the world. The Soviet charges of American warmongering have been quietly dropped, because nobody believes them any more.

I was opposed to the President's going to the summit meeting at Geneva. I was thinking about Yalta. I should have known better. He made no promises or commitments, but his open-sky inspection proposals electrified the world in the cause of peace and effective safe disarmament.

We have certainly not yet achieved perfect peace.

We must not be lulled into a false sense of security by any means. The Soviet "new look" creates new problems and dangers. But we are not fighting and, with wars under Democrat administrations in recent memory, those who love peace would do well to go forward with Republican President Eisenhower, the master of war, now dedicated to peace, and a Republican team in Washington, down the middle of the road to more just and lasting peace.

Prosperity

Prosperity is like health and fresh air—hard to appreciate while you have it. We are the most prosperous nation in the world in all human history. We have had the highest wages, the highest national income, the highest employment, the higest standard of living, in our own history, in the last 3 years under this Republican administration dedicated to sound government fiscal policies, giving the American free-enterprise system a chance. This record of prosperity is not an accident, or a coincidence. It is the direct result of Republican policies.

Under the Republicans, controls were eliminated on wages, prices, rents.

A Republican Congress in 1954 made the biggest tax cut in all history—$7.4 billion, with 62 percent going to individuals and 38 percent to corporations.

Inflation is stopped and the cost of living has been stabilized. In 3 years the Republicans held the dollar to within 1 cent of its 1953 value, compared with a 12-cent loss in the last 3 Democrat years.

The budget submitted this year is in balance.

The Government got itself out of over 100 business activities and turned them back to private enterprise; everything from synthetic rubber plants and barge lines down to dry cleaning and coffee roasting.

Under a great Ohioan, Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, the fiscal affairs of the country have been managed with imagination, caution, and skill, to encourage private enterprise, to avoid an inflationary boom.

The pattern of prosperity is not perfect. Our farmers are not getting a sufficient share. Many factors account for this, especially the continuance of rigid price supports, initiated to produce wartime needs, into a period of peace by the Truman administration, resulting in ruinous surpluses. The Republican administration proposed the soil-bank plan, boldly designed to strike at the root of the problem, to compensate the farmer, save the land, and reduce our agricultural surpluses. A Democrat Congress loaded down this proposal with a pork barrel of panaceas to buy votes. Our President courageously vetoed it and went to the people. As a result, Congress sustained his veto, a soil-bank bill has passed the House, and I believe will pass the Senate.

The farmers have this choice: either to go back to the party which had depression or war for 20 years and pull everybody down to the farmer's present level, or to stay with the party that brought peace, and prosperity enough for all, including the farmers, if we are given enough time to adjust for past Democrat mistakes.

Progress

Sometimes fiction is stranger than truth. For years, the Democrats, their columnists and commentators, have pictured the Republican Party as mossback, reactionary, old fogies. This strange fiction is belied by the facts.

In their first period in power in 20 years, the Republican Party has proven progressive. In the last 3 years, forward steps have been taken in government, in human welfare:

1. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established under a Cabinet officer. It was appropriate that this new Department, needed for 20 years, should have as its first head a woman, Mrs. Hobby.

2. An Air Force Academy has been established. As an old World War I flier, I can testify to the longtime need for this institution.

3. After three decades of talk, this Republican administration, with a Republican Congress, launched the St. Lawrence seaway, which, among other things, puts Ohio on the seaway map of the world.

4. The Eisenhower administration launched the plan for the interstate highway bill which has now passed the House. This pay-as-you-go measure to create a 40,000-mile defense highway system has been needed for many years.

The Republicans have been progressive in meeting the basic human needs of people; for instance:

1. Social security has been expanded to include 10 million more people.

2. Unemployment insurance has been extended to 4 million more people, in government and small business.

3. Vocational rehabilitation used to help 60,000 annually; now it helps 200,000 each year.

4. Civil rights have been made a reality in the District of Columbia. Integration has been completed in the Armed Forces. Following the Supreme Court decision handed down by Chief Justice Warren on school disintegration, a proposal for Civil Rights Enforcement Division in the Department of Justice has been submitted to Congress.

This is a partial record of progress under Republicans in the last 3 years. After long experience in Congress, I want to remind you that all of our problems have not yet been solved; many that look solved will need additional action later. But on meeting human needs, government needs, which party will be most progressive? The party that promises, or the party that performs, the Republican Party? Charting the future by the past, the Republican Party is going forward, up the middle of the road in peaceful, prosperous progress.

V

You will be drafting a platform for the future. It must contain principles, a program, for the campaign and for the 4 years of responsibility to follow. Our President has said, "Fellow Republicans, the campaign before us is concerned with those things that count most—people and principles."

We are interested in people as individual citizens with God-given rights and duties, their needs, and hopes, and ambitions, not as statistics, or blocs, or classes.

We must make solemn pleges we intend to use in the campaign and carry out afterward. These pledges must be based on principles, not on expediency.

We must avoid the Democrat tactic of setting class against class, selfish appeals to pressure groups, resulting in a meaningless mosaic of conflicting, insincere promises of everything to anybody.

On the other hand, our principles, our program, our pledges, our platform must be broad enough to include the legitimate needs and aspirations of many kinds of good people living all over a vast Republic, in a complex economy, so as to draw them together in a united citizenry.

It is not my function to name a ticket or outline a platform for you. I think it would be helpful, however, to remind you of some fundamental principles of our party, as expressed by our first Republican President and by our latest Republican President.

Abraham Lincoln, who stood for union and freedom, said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

President Eisenhower said, on April 17:

"I am a Republican, because I share our party's deep-lying trust in what freemen can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

"I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy:

"Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans;

"Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom;

"Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared;

"Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs;

"Best assures our children, and their children's children, the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

"I so believe because the Republican Party remains true to its heritage.

"Our party was born to vindicate the equal dignity of all men, their equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The dedication of its earliest days still animates our party, in this age when worldwide corrosion eats away at freedom, and justice and opportunity for men."

VI

Our campaign, as the President said, is concerned with people and principles. After we have the principles for people incorporated into our platform, what about the people?

In our campaign we must remember that people do not vote in blocs or classes or groups. People vote one at a time, in secret.

We must get the Republicans to vote Republican. We must get many Democrats to vote with us. But the election for President and Vice President, for the House and Senate, will turn on the vote of the independents.

We have independent Republicans and Democrats, but how about the unattached, who say, "I belong to no party. I vote for the man."

There are three things we must do.

1. We must have a ticket and a platform that should appeal to any and every right-thinking citizens.

2. We must tactfully remind our independent friends that hardly anyone has the time, or the intelligence, to investigate every candidate thoroughly. I hear people say, "I'm going to vote against so-and-so" because of "this, or that." Then I find that they know nothing about the so-and-so they are going to vote for. People who do not claim omniscience, and do not want to be guilty of negligence, should associate themselves with the party that generally suits them, and then rely upon the collective choice of like-minded people on candidates, unless they know personally about each candidate and his opponent. Independents do not realize that they are political hitchhikers. They expect someone else to pick candidates, to write a platform—and then they may go along for the ride. Let's try, tactfully, to get them to understand the importance of the two-party system and then to join our party, and help it to get along.

3. When it comes to choosing a party, many of us were born into the Republican Party. We cannot say much, from personal experience, when an independent says, "why should I join the Republican Party?" We might call their attention to three very intelligent, very high minded, very experienced, very independent, very different men who asked themselves such a question: Abraham Lincoln, in 1856, had served in Congress as a Whig; the Whigs were dying out; there were a number of new parties around; he searched for principles and like-minded people, and became a Republican. There was Herbert Hoover, in 1920; he was a successful man; both parties courted him; he became a Republican. There was General Eisenhower, a successful general, a successful college president; both parties wanted him; he became a Republican. Henry Clay said, "I would rather be right than President." We cannot guarantee that every good man who joins us will become President. We can prove that wise, successful independents of presidential caliber became Republicans. An independent who joins us may not become President, but he will be right.

Finally, let us remember our keynote is peace, prosperity and progress, as proven by our pledges and our practice, based on our principles, promised in our platform. Politics is an exciting game, but it is more than that. It is more than a deal—new, fair, or otherwise. It is one of the noblest activities of a citizen in a country that would be free. Representative government is on trial all over the world, challenged by Communists seeking a popular front with Socialists. Our Constitution does not mention Democracy, but it guarantees to every State a republican form of government. Our party can guarantee to the Nation a republican form of government, with peace, prosperity and progress, after victory in November.

Fluoridation of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Mr. Ted J. Parkinson, of 435 Fourth Avenue, Salt Lake City, regarding the controversial question of fluoridation, and he requested that the contents of his letter be made available to Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these excerpted remarks from his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congress has been asked to appropriate $2,971,000 to the United States Public Health Service to combat "dental disorders." Most of this money would be used for the "engineering of consent" to persuade city governments to add fluorine to their municipal water supplies. Now, whether an inorganic fluorine compound taken in drinking water would be beneficial, or would have undesirable cumulative effects, is a highly controversial issue with eminent authorities on both sides. To use public funds to promote one side of a highly controversial issue is not good, or in the public interest.

Government in the ideal state is supposed to gradually wither away but our Government is not withering; it is getting bigger and more expensive every year. It is whittling away our free agency a freedom at a time. To use the police power to force fluoridation of municipal water supplies, over the strenuous protests of those who feel it is harmful, is a violation of our fundamental freedom which is totally unjustified. Tooth decay is not an emergency, or a disease which can only be cured by fluoridation.

The problem arises partly because food processing and handling methods remove vitamins and minerals, including fluorine, from various foods so they will keep better. If fluorine is necessary for healthy teeth, then so are the other vitamins and minerals. A better use of that money would be to help educate people to choose better quality, natural, unprocessed foods which are rich in vitamins and minerals, including fluorine.

There are several methods of obtaining the benefits of fluorine about which there is no controversy. There is the topical application of fluorine by the dentists; there are fluorine toothpastes such as Crest; drugstores can provide fluorine tablets which are very cheap; certain foods are rich in natural fluorine. There are many choices, you see, and many people are exercising their rights to choose the best way. To deprive these people of their right to choose, to force them to take fluorine in their drinking water against their expressed will, is an unjustifiable invasion of our fundamental rights as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Gordon Keith Chalmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, last week Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers died at the age of 52. Dr. Chalmers was president of Kenyon College at Gambier, Ohio, a small private church school of higher learning.

In Congress Kenyon has many friends. Kenyon Bolton, son of Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON, is a trustee. Congressman PAT HILLINGS studied there while in the armed service. Former Congressman Robert Crosser and myself are graduates. Congressman WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and Dr. Chalmers were schoolmates at Brown University.

As head of Kenyon, Dr. Chalmers gained a wide reputation, both as an educator and administrator. But more than that, he appreciated the need of small private colleges in our system of education and understood their difficulties in a day when much attention is focused on large State universities operating at public expense. He realized the need of both private and public-supported colleges and universities to advance the educational and cultural life of America. To that end he served both as a member and head of organizations endeavoring to keep the small school a going concern on the American educational scene. His death is a loss not only to Kenyon, but to the intellectual progress of the country.

The Dilemma of the Youth of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, May 11, 1956, written by Sydney Gruson, in which Mr. Gruson calls attention to the dilemma now facing the young people of Red Poland:

YOUTH'S DILEMMA IN POLAND IS TOLD—18-YEAR-OLD DESCRIBES HOW POLICY SHIFTS SHATTERED HIS FAITH IN PARTY

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, May 10.—The people of Poland are talking again and none with more effectiveness than the nation's youth.

They have had silence or conformity imposed on them for nearly 8 years. A steam valve has been opened recently.

What has come out from the youth is eloquent, touching and accusing, a measure of bitterness and cynicism of a new generation in Poland that considers itself lost.

The Government and the United Workers (Communist) Party have recognized this. Officially sponsored meetings are being held to seek ways of reorganizing the Polish youth organization and to try to regain for communism such young men as Michael Bruck.

SPEAKS FOR GENERATION

Michael Bruck is an 18-year-old student at Warsaw Polytechnic. He undertook to speak for his generation in a letter that has been published in the current issue of Nowa Kultura, a weekly magazine. These are excerpts from the letter:

"When I was 10 I was told that my beloved brother Lech was killed in the Warsaw uprising for falsehood. In my childish imagination he was always the embodiment of heroism, courage, and uprightness. When I was 10 they told me in a history lesson that he was killed fighting for the vile cause of the London (Polish) Emigree Government and not for the real Poland. I have thought there was only one Poland and now it appeared that there were many.

"When I was 10 I ceased to believe in the hitherto sacred word 'Fatherland' because I did not know which of these many Polands was my Fatherland. I no longer had a Fatherland.

"I had God. When I was 15 I ceased to believe in God. God had proved to be an ally of the murderers of Lech. For long hours I knelt in a dark empty church. My soul cried, threatened, implored. I hated Him and at the same time I loved Him so much. My poor betrayed Lech also loved him.

"You must know how terrible it is to feel one's faith slip away, vanish, and yet crave for it to remain. You must know those sleepless nights, that desperate struggling in the soul of a child. The day finally came when the cross became to me only a piece of wood.

"A friend 5 years older than I gave me help. He was a Communist. It was he who then brought me closer to the ideology [that] restored my faith in the world, in the goal of life, in mankind. These were my happiest years. I rushed from one meeting to another. I believed in the idea and its executors.

"Three years have passed. Now I am 18. It has turned out that what my family said was true—about the cruelty of secret police investigations and about the dictatorship of Stalin. It has turned out that history was really forged. Those who looked at my personal questionnaire with suspicion when I begged them for an explanation now speak of the Stalin era and the time of Beria [Lavrenti P. Beria, Soviet secret police chief executed in 1953].

They are recommending jazz, which they opposed 2 years ago as a symptom of the decayed culture of the West. They are discussing youth oragnizations in Yugoslavia, about which they sang satirical songs a few years ago.

"And I? I do not know how to change my soul for the fourth time without fear that it will become a rag. Now I cannot stand in the ranks with my face up high although I would like to. I am ashamed of my older colleagues, ashamed for the whole party, for all those who waited, sniffed, and looked around and for those who deceived and let themselves be deceived for my stupidity and credulity.

"I no longer know how to raise my head. If I ever raise it again—but this is impossible for I have no basis for believing anything.

"Our era was not easy and although we had no rifles in our hands we did not have a rosy path. It is not through effeminacy and prosperity that our cynicism was born and it is not egoism and desire for comfort that have ordered us to reject the political leaders. We, 18-year-olds and 20-year-olds, although growing up in new conditions, are not happy because we have perceived that this newness is very old and it deceived our dreams. It is distressing to lose everything in which one believed."

Creeping Killers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Creeping Killers," written by Robert Paine, which appears in the May 1956 issue of the magazine American Motorist, official publication of the American Automobile Association Motor Club.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREEPING KILLERS

(By Robert Paine)

One of the greatest menaces on the highway today is the obstinate, self-centered slowpoke. Most of the emphasis placed on accident prevention and highway safety these days is on curbing the fast driver—the irresponsible psychopath who exceeds the speed limit. The public is beginning to believe that if everybody stayed below the posted speed limit, there would be no more fatal accidents. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Accidents are caused by lots of different things—and high speed is only one of them. Unreasonably low speed is another, but the average driver hears little about it.

The Sunday snail—one of the printable names the slowpoke is contemptuously called by other drivers—thinks of himself as a safe driver. He seldom has an accident himself and if he does it usually isn't too serious.

But how many does he cause other people to have?

There are no statistics to show that Mr. Slowpoke is the direct or indirect cause of X accidents each year, but the way in which he is responsible is painfully apparent.

A traffic engineer would explain it something like this: traffic flow is smoothest and safest when all vehicles move at approximately the same speed. It is great divergencies in speed that cause trouble. Coming up fast behind a slow-moving vehicle, passing at intersections, on hills or on curves are all far more dangerous than speed alone. When a few vehicles travel at speeds well below the general pace of traffic they actually force more of these trouble situations on other drivers than a fast car would create.

Any driver knows from his own experience that this is true. Everyone who has spent much time on the highway knows that when a "snail" picks up a long "tail" of following cars, no matter how bad the highway is or how short the sight distance is ahead, sooner or later somebody is going to lose patience and pass. If the tail is very long and the impatient driver is at the rear, a very dangerous situation will develop. Who's to blame if a crash occurs?

In all probability, the motorist who tried to pass will bear the legal blame—if he lives through the wreck. The "creeper" will merely roll along and remark to the next person he talks to about the "madman" he saw on the highway come to a bloody end. But, human nature being what it is, the legal blame and the moral blame do not necessarily fall on the same person. After following an abnormally slow driver for miles, it is sometimes hard to really hold a man responsible for losing his patience and taking a chance that he would not normally take.

Traffic engineers, safety specialists and accident investigators have known and expounded these facts for many years. The American Automobile Association has actively urged that laws be enacted and strictly enforced to control slowpokes in the same way that speeders are controlled. The type of law which the AAA favors is the one contained in the Uniform Vehicle Code—a model motor vehicle code prepared by a national committee for the guidance of State legislators—which states: "No person shall drive * * * at such a slow speed as to impede the normal and reasonable flow of traffic except when the reduced speed is necessary for safe operation." The model law also gives State and local authorities the right to determine on the basis of "engineering and traffic investigation" whether fixed minimum speeds are needed on certain highways. If they are, the authorities may declare that it is illegal to drive below them.

Few people know it, but more than half the States have such legislation on their books now. The reason that it's not widely known is that the law is seldom, if ever, enforced. Occasionally, a policeman will "speed up" a car loafing along traffic-clogged city streets, but on the open highway it is practically unheard of, and certainly not publicized. The situation as it stands now is likely to go on just as it is until actual minimum speed limits are established.

Many police officers say that it is almost impossible to make arrests and get convictions so long as the law is so broad. Often, motorists just don't know what "such a slow speed as to impede the normal and reasonable flow of traffic" is. Neither do a lot of policemen.

Posted minimum speed limits have been used very successfully in a few places. On long bridges and tunnels where there is no room for passing of any sort, they have been found to be the only way of keeping traffic moving and getting maximum use from the facility. In these places it is fairly obvious to the motoring public as to why minimum speed limits are established, and enforcement officers report that there is comparatively little difficulty in maintaining good traffic flow.

On highways, however, many people do not take kindly to being told how slowly they can drive. The old chant "speed kills" is getting so firmly fixed in the minds of many motorists that any suggestion that they must not drive below a certain speed sounds like a violation of the safety rules. Public education on the theory that uniform traffic flow is usually safe traffic flow is badly needed. The legislators of the various States are tackling the problem.

It is reasonably certain that minimum speed signs will soon be dotting the sides of many roads and major highways. But without public understanding and acceptance—accompanied by sound enforcement—the old slowpoke is, unfortunately, going to remain the number one highway nuisance who often leaves death in his meandering wake.

Plea for a New Kind of Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an article in the New York Times magazine section of April 22, 1956, entitled "Plea for a New Kind of Point 4," by Mr. Willard R. Espy.

Mr. Espy is an eminent writer and publicist, who has long been interested in programs of technical and scientific assistance, coupled with economic aid, as an integral part of our foreign policy. His article is especially timely in light of the new Soviet economic and technical assistance offensive on the international scene. Mr. Espy urges greater use of the United Nations agencies and facilities. In this I strongly concur. It is regrettable that the present foreign-aid program and the one designed for fiscal year 1957 places so little emphasis upon the use of the U. N. technical-assistance project.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLEA FOR A NEW KIND OF POINT 4

(By Willard R. Espy)

Americans, from the President down, are looking anxiously for some means of revitalizing our faltering program of aid to underdeveloped areas. Suggested here is one way, and I think it is perhaps the only practical way at this moment in history to increase the effectiveness of the point 4 program while reassertaing our moral leadership of free men.

There is reason for concern when India, which for years to come will have urgent need of outside help, proposes to reject further American aid; or when Burma refuses $35 million of our money; or when tiny Lebanon considers it politic to turn down a $5 million road-construction loan from the International Cooperation Administration. And the concern becomes acute when Russia unveils an exportable surplus of capital goods which she is happy to send to underdeveloped areas in return for the food she has not yet been able to raise on her Siberian steppes.

Undoubtedly, America has the capacity to deliver to Asia, the Middle East, Africa, or Latin America, on a cash basis, goods and services dwarfing anything in Russia's present power. But that is not the problem. If the aid of either side is simply a way of buying allies, there is no reason to believe they will stay bought if the other side makes a higher bid. The uncommitted nations thus find themselves in a position to play off one side against the other; and this some of them are already doing with a will.

If it could be demonstrated that the recipient nations would benefit from this pulling and hauling of the two great blocs, a detached observer might find a wry gratification in the situation. Unfortunately, however, even this cold comfort is usually denied us. The problem of the underdeveloped areas of the world are deep-rooted. New, inexperienced, and sometimes shaky governments are not always the best judges of their own requirements. Too much of anything—money, dams, fertilizers, or tractors—may be as damaging as too little; and too fast may be as dangerous as too slow.

As the clamor rises to reframe our programs on technical and economic aid, suggestions like these are widely reported:

Gather under one responsible authority the aid functions that have been scattered wildly among a score of Washington agencies; obtain longer-term commitments from Congress so that the recipients will know that they can count on a continuing program; make private investment more attractive by a United States guarantee against risks due to unsettled political conditions; join in aid programs with other like-minded powers, thus eliminating any anti-American suspicion or hostility; emulate the Russian strategy of stressing trade rather than aid and asking not fealty but simply neutrality as the price of help; multiply our assistance, and give it full rank as a perhaps decisive weapon in the cold war; strengthen the economic staffs of our legations abroad.

It is difficult to quarrel with the premise that there should be more unity of direction, more flexibility and continuity in existing aid operations. But can anyone still be so naive as to think that private investment can be aimed and fired like a cannon in the cold war? Money goes where it can bring the highest and surest return. Nor is private investment in any general sense a cause of stability. It is a result. The core of the error in these proposals is the assumption that we can win the cold war in uncommitted, underdeveloped areas simply by outbidding Russia.

It is important to remember that the original theory of the economic and technical aid program was not to outbid Russia. Russia was not even present as an economic factor in most of the areas involved. Rather, the theory was that by establishing the preconditions for orderly progress we would both reduce the likelihood of successful Communist infiltration and eliminate the power vacuums which in the past have proven so irresistible a temptation to stronger nations.

The amount of money and goods that these areas can absorb quickly and profitably is limited. In many cases that amount is well within the apparent economic capacity of the Soviet Union to provide. Once our side and theirs have bid up to that absorption limit, there is bound to be stalemate, or worse—chaos.

The first step toward restoring the good sense and good name of point 4 is to cut down to size its value as a weapon in the cold war, and to build up to size its value in building a durable peace. There will always be aid projects that we will undertake primarily for military reasons. But

there are also projects that are imperative purely and simply because they help to create more viable societies, and so reduce the instabilities which light the fuse for military explosions.

Yet, even if we do set sound economies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as goals in themselves, we shall find it extremely difficult to convince some countries of our sincerity. Quite apart from suspicions that we abet colonialism and imperialism, we are handicapped by the very fact of our technical advancement. It is difficult for an American to understand the needs of a people who are technically 200 years behind him, and because of this gap we are frequently charged with standing apart from the people we are helping.

The form of government on which underdeveloped nations settle will stem from their traditions, not from ours. They will not turn overnight, by magic, into democracies of the United States type. But we do not need, and should not wish, to force an American pattern on their internal politics any more than on their foreign policies. If we truly believe in freedom, we want them to be free from any outside stamp, including our own.

This much we know: Social and economic soundness, which is meat for democracy, is poison for tyranny. Intelligent help will add ultimately not to some Western equivalent of the Russian satellite system, but to the area of a truly free world.

The policies we have been following are sick and no simple remedy will cure them. Regardless of the fact that we face the partisan distortions of an election year, it is imperative to deal with the Communist economic and political offensive on the basis of a major foreign policy decision.

In my opinion, the indispensable decision is to channel a major portion of the world's technical and economic assistance through the appropriate agencies of the United Nations.

First, to be sure, we must once and for all make up our minds as to whether we really want the United Nations to work. For here, at last, is an opportunity to make plain our faith, without in any way changing the U. N. Charter or the nature of our adherence to it. There is no need to risk votes in the General Assembly, or votes in the Security Council, or abrasive delegations of national sovereignty. Many of the appropriate agencies exist; they are doing now—and doing well, to the extent that their means and facilities permit—the kind of job that this proposal would assign them in greater measure.

It would be only necessary for us to increase our annual appropriation to these agencies and to ask other nations within the limits of their economies, to raise their own contributions proportionately. Last year, for instance, we gave $15 million to the U. N. technical assistance program. Ten times $15 million would not buy a single good-sized battle cruiser—but it might well point the road to a durable and dynamic peace. Our overall expenditure for technical aid through the United Nations might well be actually less than our present point 4 budget, at least until results justified raising the amount.

Men of good will have insisted from the inception of point 4 that it should have its major expression through the United Nations. Many observers (including myself) have felt in the past that such a step was politically impractical. Today I believe it is the natural way to sublimate an economic conflict which neither side can possibly win.

The technical assistance program of the U. N. has already produced notable results. In 1955, U. N. agencies gave aid to 92 countries and territories ranging from the plateaus of the Andes to the tropical farms of Africa.

They helped the Middle East battle the desert locust; fought rinderpest in Ethiopia, and foot-and-mouth disease in Syria; trained the fishermen of India in the use of mechanized boats; taught logging techniques in the Amazon Basin; arranged for simplified rules on international air flights. The International Bank lent underdeveloped areas more than $400 million, and the World Health Organization raised to 400 million the number of persons it has helped protect from such diseases as malaria, tuberculosis, and yaws.

What would be the results of channeling economic aid through the United Nations? Here are a few probabilities:

First, the United Nations would be strengthened—not in any area of supranational sovereignty or political conflict, but in the technical, nonpolitical arm that for 10 years has worked quietly and effectively for the good of humankind while oratorical battles rolled and roared around it.

Second, business could anticipate at last conditions sufficiently stable to justify a growing capital investment in many newly independent nations. Such investment has been held back heretofore by the investors' distaste for excessive restrictions and risks. It has been held back also by the host countries' fear of outside economic domination. On both counts the prospects should be more pleasing if the United Nations were in charge of the program.

Conditions applying to investments could then be standardized; nor would changes of national regime lessen obligations assumed under the U. N. It is not difficult for a nation still in swaddling clothes to justify failure to pay what it owes to allegedly imperialist powers or their entrepreneurs. It would be far more difficult to justify reneging on an agreement entered into under U. N. auspices.

Ample U. N. machinery for capital investments and loans is either in operation or in readiness. The World Bank has already helped finance self-liquidating projects totaling $2.5 billion. In the past few months alone it has helped complete a major highway in Guatemala, modernize a rolling mill in Japan, rebuild a port in Pakistan, bring more electric power to Algeria. The International Finance Corporation with $75 million capital, stands ready to put up marginal funds for both private and government investors.

The widest gap in the U. N. credit structure occurs in the financing of multipurpose developments (such as dams) which are not self-liquidating. A Special U. N. Fund for Economic Development, with starting assets of $250 million, has been proposed repeatedly, and repeatedly has been turned down by the United States. Early approval of SUNFED should be a priority item in increased support of the autonomous U. N. agencies.

Third: The Soviet Union and her satellites would meet the Western world on the basis that both sides profess to desire—as peaceful competitors. If Soviet engineers were more fitted to build a dam in Iraq than our engineers were, they would get the job—as members of the U. N. team. And if any American becomes panicky about the spying that would doubtless go along with the dam building, let him ask himself whether he would prefer to have the Soviet Union carry out the whole Iraqui operation on its own responsibility, without outside control or even outside observation.

Any project that can draw the Communists into the constructive work of the United Nations is desirable. The principle, indeed, has long been put into nominal practice; for years we have been giving financial support both to the United Nations itself and to autonomous U. N. agencies in which Communist nationals are represented. Only last February, at the Bangalore conference of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the American representative went out of his way to urge greater Soviet participation in the U. N. technical-assistance program.

After years of "cold war" many of us have forgotten that the U. S. S. R. and her satellites were originally urged to take part in the Marshall Plan. Had Stalin agreed, we might be living in a happier and more secure world today. It may be doubted whether Russia's new leaders would be stupid enough to reject an offer to cooperate with us in an enlarged U. N. aid program.

Russia, like ourselves, would continue to handle alone those projects which she felt directly involved her own national security. But in the vast uncommitted areas of the world unilateral aid would be automatically self-defeating.

The same considerations which nullify for us the cold war value of economic aid nullify it also for Russia. The fear of Western emperialism in Africa and Asia may be great, but the fear of Communist imperialism is no smaller. Aid without cold-war overtones, based on needs rather than blackmail, would certainly be more welcome to the recipient than aid accompanied by Kremlin directives. Russia will cooperate eventually with U. N. aid projects because she will have to.

Fourth. Aid under U. N. auspices would end recipients suspicions that they were being bought for purposes either of economic imperialism or of advantage in the cold war. U. N. aid would be scheduled on its merits, where it was needed and could be put to effective use.

And finally, a move to route economic and technical aid through the United Nations would revive the hopes and faith of a worried, cynical world. It would restore to full luster the moral leadership that this country has sometimes seemed willing to tarnish under the compulsions of the cold war.

Would Congress agree to increase its contribution to the autonomous agencies of the United Nations? I do not know the answer; but I do know that for many weeks it was considered impossible that Congress would agree to vastly more revolutionary Marshall Plan, while the idea that it would make aid available to underdeveloped areas was considered so farfetched as to be laughable.

Yet when policy in Europe became bankrupt, Congress acted decisively; when the need for point 4 was obvious, the legislators acted decisively again. Today, there is overwhelming evidence that we must reassert our moral and economic leadership or lose it forever to the enemies of everything we believe in.

Defense Is More Than Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, May 11, 1956, in which this newspaper discusses military appropriations for the coming fiscal year:

DEFENSE IS MORE THAN GUNS

After only 2 days of comparatively listless debate the House of Representatives has approved unanimously and without major changes the Eisenhower Administration's de-

fense appropriation bill, calling for military expenditures of more than $33 billion during the coming fiscal year. This bill, by far the biggest money measure of the year, must still pass the Senate. But the attitude of the House clearly guarantees similar action in the upper Chamber.

Though by no means a record appropriation, the total is still so large as to give new emphasis to the cost of freedom in the face of the challenge by totalitarian communism. It is indeed significant that despite a perfunctory minor cut by a committee there was no real opposition to the measure, and that the principal objections raised were not that it was too much but that it might be too little. This in itself is reassuring evidence of a bipartisan realization—in contrast to some wishful thinking in Europe and elsewhere—that despite the Soviet "new look" tactics international communism continues to pose a deadly threat to the existence of the free world.

At the same time the debates on our defense structure, in and out of Congress, have revealed some misgivings and confusion as to what defense consists of, and how it should be organized. Some of these misgivings are due to rivalries between the services, in which each service naturally emphasizes its own needs. As a result the technical issues of, say, ground forces versus the air arm, and the long-range bomber versus the aircraft carrier and foreign bases, all become subjects of public debate, in which even experts disagree.

In these circumstances both Congress and the public appear to be guided by two basic considerations. One is that a large American military establishment is here to stay, and that we must therefore plan for the long pull on the basis of defense expenditures which we can sustain for years without wrecking our economy. The other is that, by and large, and despite their natural desire to have more, all our defense chiefs accept the present appropriation as adequate to meet the initial stages of any war. The authority of President Eisenhower as a military expert paves the way for congressional and public acceptance of this judgment.

But in the modern world, in which power rests on, and wars are fought by, not merely the armed forces but nations as whole, our defense cannot be based on our own guns alone, or even on our own atom bombs. And it is here that confusion shows itself. It is now accepted as an axiom that no free nation, not even the United States, can adequately defend itself standing alone, that it needs allies to supplement its own defense efforts and friends to keep the free world as large as possible in order to provide economic breathing space for all free nations.

Yet some of the same people who tend to press for a larger defense effort on our own part also demand drastic cuts in our mutual security program, providing military and economic aid to our allies and friends. This program constitutes only 10 percent of our own defense expenditures, but it helps to produce nearly 10 times as much in mutual defense as would be produced by a like expenditure at home—not to speak of the fact that it is essential to safeguard our bases abroad.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that a Congress which approves our own defense appropriations will also approve the $4.9 billion mutual security program that is as much part of our own defenses as any gun, tank or bomber we may build. This program helps to build up among our allies and friends what are in the end the final criteria of their capacity for defense—namely, good national morale and hope for progress based on a healthy economy and the moral cause of freedom.

Warning Signals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, whether we know it or not, this country is on the threshold of a new era. From here on out, we are going to be required to do more and more with less and less. As a wise and thoughtful columnist has pointed out, in the Rochester Times-Union of May 5, our country is filling up with people, and our supply of timber, coal, oil, metals, and even water, is shrinking a little every year. He does not press the point, but he might have added that our supply of real estate is also shrinking. The demands of the future for rights of way for highways and airports is going to cause as much or more disruption than an atomic attack.

I hope it will be planned and controlled disruption, so that the development of our great country can go forward in an orderly manner, with the conservation of what is good, and the improvement of what is mediocre or poor. And I hope that, as our country fills up with people, they will grow in understanding and wisdom both in their personal relationships and in their relation to their Government. Freedom is always on trial, but in the years ahead, it will be put to unusually severe tests.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a column by A. B. Genung, who writes from the village with the historical and, I hope, prophetic name, Freeville, N. Y.:

HOW IT LOOKS IN FREEVILLE: UNITED STATES AND SQUEEZE THAT'S AHEAD

(By A. B. Genung)

I attended a conference the other day and heard a lot of economists say that this country has passed the peak of its natural resources in relation to population.

What they meant is that the country is filling up with people and our supply of timber, coal, oil, metals, and even water, is shrinking a little every year.

The economists tell all this in a kind of stuffy way—but what they are saying is correct. I could get a good squint at it all just by driving home over the old Bridle Road. That was the original ox track cut through the woods into this part of the country from the Hudson Valley.

Up to about 30 years ago it was just a country road with its sprinkling of farmhouses. Today it is built up for miles just as a suburban street.

By 1975—only 19 years hence—the United States population will be about 225 million. What will the country roads look like then?

Take a look at the size of the homes being built by our present generation. Compare them with the old country houses built a generation or two ago. You could put 3 of these little new houses into 1 of the old ones.

The point is that we don't have the wealth of cheap lumber now that they did when they built the big houses.

Take a look around our community cemetery. There is an old part filled with large stone monuments. Then there's another, newer part, over the whole of which the monuments average about a quarter the size of the old ones. Same principle as with the houses. Our grandfathers had a lot more and cheaper marble and granite than we do.

All this trend hangs up some problems ahead of us.

Take the highways, for instance. Here we've got 58 million cars barging around on roads built for 30 million. By 1975 the figure will be 85 million. We've really got some roads to build.

Take housing. The cities are spilling over into the suburbs. Within 20 years the suburbs, at present rate, will almost double. Just ponder the new houses, stores, sewers, hospitals, schools, and other construction that will be needed to service these vast new areas.

Take the case of water. Whoever expected the water supply to get short in this country? But it already is an acute problem in many places. Within a very few years billions will have to be spent if our growing industries are to get water enough to keep them going.

Not only is our population growing by the minute, but we are bulging in the older and younger categories. Our working force will gain only 20 million in the next 20 years, whereas the less productive groups (over 65 and under 15) will increase by around 30 million. More consumers ahead, in proportion to producers.

The point of all this, it seems to me, is that this country is slowly heading into a kind of squeeze play, where we'll have little room for waste and extravagance. It ought to make us think about work and thrift—more output per man—and especially about turning off the spigot on a lot of foreign handouts.

Give Congress Power To Overrule Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago one of my constituents, Mr. Charles Denegre, attorney at law, Watts Building, Birmingham, addressed a letter to the editor of the Birmingham News presenting a very novel proposal. Mr. Denegre's letter was published in the Voice of the People column of the newspaper.

The proposition merits the careful consideration of every Member of Congress and so I am happy to include same in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

The time has arrived in our country for an important amendment to be made to the Constitution of the United States.

As a result of the decision of the Supreme Court in the integration matter, the general welfare of our people is being very much disturbed and will continue to become worse. It is my opinion that the great majority of colored people are satisfied with equal but not identical privileges with reference to tax-supported public institutions.

The preamble of our Constitution provides, among other things to "promote the general welfare." This provision supersedes all other rights set out in the Constitution when the general welfare of our country is

in danger. This doctrine of law was relied upon when natural-born Japanese-American citizens were brought inland from the west coast in World War II because the general welfare of our country was in danger.

Lincoln in his Gettysburg address said "and that the government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." Therefore, to maintain and continue the right of general welfare, our Constitution should be amended to provide that if and when the Supreme Court renders a decision that interferes with the general welfare of the people, then in such event the Congress by a three-fourths majority vote of the House of Representatives and a three-fourths majority vote of the Senate, would have the right to declare such a decision null and void, with the amendment further providing that the President could not veto such a law. This would place the final authority in three-fourths of representatives of the people rather than in 9 men on the Supreme Court bench. Such a conclusion by a three-fourths majority of intelligent representatives of the people would be more satisfactory for the general welfare of the people than a legal decision of the Supreme Court as now provided in the Constitution.

CHARLES DENEGRE.

WATTS BUILDING.

Red Boss of Poland Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star on Wednesday, May 9, 1956, in which the writer analyzes the internal political situation in Poland now that the Kremlin boss, Jakub Berman, has resigned:

KREMLIN BOSS OF POLAND RESIGNS—SHIFTING OF AXMAN RAISES QUESTION OF POSSIBLE CRACKDOWN IN WARSAW

(By Dorothy Thompson)

"The Poles," Winston Churchill exclaimed in one of his famous aphorisms. "There is no virtue they do not possess and no folly they will not commit."

Are they committing new follies that will lead to a new crackdown?

In the previous column I enumerated four acts recently taken by the Polish Government that put Poland in the forefront of the satellite States in striving for greater internal independence and freedom.

Since then, the resignation of Jakub Berman has been announced from Warsaw.

Berman, Deputy Prime Minister and a member of the Politburo, was a great deal more than that. In the original Communist government he was merely minister without portfolio. Actually he was the key personality, his power resting on his intimate relations with the Kremlin. He was the man who laid down the law as it emanated from Moscow. Although he operated in the background, behind the facade of ministers with more obviously important posts, the Polish people called him the gray eminence and recognized him as the Kremlin's man. He was, therefore, the very symbol of Poland's subservience to Russia.

Berman chiefly engineered the 1947 free elections (required by the Yalta agreement) that resulted in crushing the only anti-Communist opposition party in Poland, the Peasant Party led by Stanislas Mikolyczk.

Mikolyczk was the only member of the London government in exile acceptable to the Soviets, as a token of fulfilling Yalta's promise to widen the base of the government they themselves had set up in Lublin.

Following the strange death, in an airplane accident, of General Sikorski—"strange" because he had barely escaped a similar fate on too many previous occasions to make it seem merely accidental—Mikolyczk became the last Premier of Poland before the Lublin government entered with the Russian troops. He was received, as such, by President Roosevelt, in June 1944.

With the war's end, he returned to Poland and set about reorganizing his party, not without conspicuous success. It was the only formidable contender against the Communists and their leftwing Socialist allies in the 1947 elections.

The maneuvering of these elections to assure the overwhelming defeat of the Peasant Party was fully reported by the columnist, who went to Poland to cover them, as did many international journalists.

During the preelection campaign, Berman's role was obvious. He received the Western press, the object of the conference being to present President Roosevelt as, in fact, hostile to Mikolyczk.

This—and the conduct of the elections—resulted in a run-in between himself and me. My husband and I had been, by mere chance, guests in the White House when President Roosevelt received Mikolyczk at the dinner in his honor attended by the full cabinet, at which we were the only outsiders. It is seldom that a journalist has an opportunity flatly to contradict statements made by a man who is spokesman of a foreign state, but in this case I was able to do so. Berman's discomfiture was veiled by heavy irony. (Subsequently the Warsaw press attacked me bitterly.)

Berman, arrogant but suave and even affable, was not unpopular with naive Westerners. He is a good linguist, cultivated, likes to discuss art and Western literature, and was adept at giving the appearance of reasonableness. But though he never bloodied his own hands, he was the Kremlin's axman, and Poland's ideological mentor, recognized as such by quite ordinary Polish people, who thoroughly detested him.

Certainly he was Stalin's man; I expect he would gladly have been Khrushchev's man. But he was the symbol of Poland's utter subservience to Russia, in a country which, though perennially suppressed, has no subservience in its soul, and throughout history has seized every opportunity to strike for whatever independence is possible— too often by its "folly," for what has subsequently proved impossible.

Feather River Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared January 7 in the Oroville Mercury Register in California.

FEATHER RIVER FACTS

Drew Pearson trifled with the truth again, if he took the trouble to ascertain the truth, when he discussed the causes of the flood situation along the Feather in his release for last Saturday.

Wrote Pearson: "The Feather River—this is one of the major tributaries to the Sacramento River, and disastrously spilled over its banks just before Christmas. To harness the Feather River, Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior under Truman, proposed the Oroville Dam. Pacific Gas & Electric, however, objected. And after much maneuvering and prodding, the State of California took over the building of the dam.

"That was in 1950. Five years have now passed and the Oroville Dam is not yet built. It isn't even started. California appropriated $10 million to get started, part of which was spent, but ground wasn't even broken."

Let us tell the story of the Oroville Dam and the Government the way it really occurred.

Some 8 or more years ago the Oroville Chamber of Commerce was approached by Bureau of Reclamation men (Federal) with the suggestion that a dam might be built on the South Fork, with Federal money. The Oroville men, of course, fell in with the idea. They wanted that dam. Under Bureau plans the dam was to be built above Bidwell Bar on the South Fork, and would not have controlled the heavy floodwater of the main Feather River. This was not the Oroville Dam.

The State of California had a different site (the one now decided upon) and objected. There was long discussion, and finally the Bureau, the State, and the Army engineers all got together and decided on the State's site (5 miles above Oroville, on the main river, below its confluence with the South Fork) as the proper one.

Thus the situation remained until suddenly the Federal bureau, having in the meantime become interested in the power posisbilities of the Trinity project, let it be known that the Trinity project would have priority with it over the Feather River Project.

So it was seen that it was the Federal bureau, not the P. G. & E. or any local or State influence, that caused delay in construction of Oroville Dam and that the bureau plan would not have controlled the main cause of the Feather River floods.

When the bureau shifted its emphasis to the Trinity project, there was a terrific letdown here in C. of C. circles. They felt they had been led up to green pastures by the bureau and then literally sold down the river.

Grasping at straws, there came along something very substantial in the form of the State project to develop the Feather River water for the benefit of the entire State. The chamber group shifted to this project. If Pearson wants a story on the Feather and a dam to prevent floods, he can develop the fact that the dam is now being delayed by public power advocates who don't want it built on any but a public power basis.

During all the time here outlined there never was any suggestion that the P. G. & E. had opposed construction of the Oroville Dam and power house by the Federal Government Government. Such a thing never was mentioned or hinted. It is inconceivable that had the P. G. & E. objected, the proponents of public (socialized) power would not have taken it up and made a lot out of it.

California did not appropriate $10 million to get the project started, as Pearson states. In 1952, 1953, and 1954, the legislature appropriated a total of $2,227,056 to carry on necessary investigations. The 90-page report issued some months ago by State En-

gineer Edmonston represented the expenditure of that money. It also represented the work of 90 engineers, geologists, attorneys and technicians. Twelve eminent engineers, geologists, and investment specialists served on boards of consultants. Contractual assistance was provided by 15 private agencies, 3 Federal agencies and 5 State agencies.

Pearson's assumption that the money thus far spent should have resulted in groundbreaking shows his inexperience with great projects destined to run over a billion dollars in total cost. The ground for the reservoir site has not even been purchased by the State.

In the same article Pearson misrepresents entirely the present situation on the Trinity. The flood on the Klamath, according to the impression given by Pearson, is due to the negligence of Secretary McKay who, after Congress sent the project to him, took no action during 7 months in which not 1 shovel has been lifted.

No human power could have built a dam and a tunnel through the Siskiyous in time to prevent the recent flood. After having left the impression that McKay was to blame for the flood, Pearson himself sees how silly that is and as an afterthought admits that McKay could not, of course, have prevented the flood.

So it is that we can nail down Pearson's misstatements when they concern events that happen right under our noses. But it is different when they deal with matters far afield. Who can follow Pearson around and correct all his stuff for all the papers he serves? Manifestly, it is impossible. So he gets away with it in the public mind.

The time was when a much-quoted adage read, "Let the buyer beware." Change "buyer" to "reader" and you have something that fits the modern situation.

Gen. John Salling: Symbol of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an observance that will take place tomorrow, May 15, in Scott County of the Virginia Ninth Congressional District.

Tomorrow is the 110th birthday of Gen. John Salling, Virginia's only surviving veteran of the Confederate States Army and one of the last three surviving Confederate veterans. It is appropriate that we pause here today to take note of General Salling's birthday, and I know that every Member of Congress joins me in sending best wishes for many more years of health and happiness.

Last year, when General Salling celebrated his 109th birthday, the Bristol Herald-Courier published the following editorial, which I feel will be of interest to the Members. The press, of course, is again taking considerable interest in the general's birthday, and I am sure other editorials will be written in his honor tomorrow.

The editorial follows:

GEN. JOHN SALLING: SYMBOL OF AMERICA

The Nation was young when John Salling was born in 1846.

There were only 27 States in the Union and the population of the United States was somewhere in the neighborhood of 23 million.

We were at war with Mexico. "Californy" was just "out there," waiting for the great Gold Rush of 1849 and admission to the Union in 1950.

Just 14 years ahead lay another war, pitting South against North, States against States, Americans against Americans, the energies of men like John Salling against the stamina of men like "that Yankee" from Minnesota.

Ahead, too, lay the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean war. John Salling has seen them all.

Today, at 109 General Salling is a symbol of the Old South, the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Jefferson Davis. But today, General Salling also is a symbol of all America. He is a cherished link with the past, a man who has bridged the gap between "then" and "now," a man who has come to like "that Yankee," a man who has weathered the stress of time and the strains of physical labor.

He has seen 21 States swell the ranks of the Union. He has seen the population of the United States rise to more than 160 million. He has seen the advent of the automobile, the airplane, the military tank, electric lights, radio, television, atomic energy, movies, ironclad ships, submarines, mechanized farming, telephones.

He has been privileged to watch this Nation rise from the despair and destruction of internal conflict to a position as the greatest power on earth.

And, today, we are privileged to have him with us as a reminder of all the things which have come to pass in his lifetime. We hope this day will be a happy one for him and that we can repeat that hope again in the future.

General Salling, who is still quite active despite his 110 years, mined saltpeter for gunpowder during the Civil War. He has lived most of his life on his farm in Scott County, about 2 miles from his birthplace.

Many distinguished visitors are expected to call on the general during tomorrow's birthday celebration. Among them will be a delegation from the Governor of Virginia to present the general with a 10-gallon Texas-style hat and a Confederate shirt to complete his uniform. Also an area bakery will deliver a huge cake to the general's farm home.

Mr. Speaker, in observing the birthday of one of my most distinguished constituents, I would like to call the attention of the House to a bill, H. R. 6392, which I introduced last year for the relief of the last three surviving Confederate veterans. This bill is pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be "authorized and directed to pay to the proper person or persons an amount equal to the expenses incurred for medical treatment and care furnished on and after the date of the enactment of this act, and during the 1-year period immediately prior thereto."

In the natural course of events, these last representatives of the gallant gray host will not be with us much longer. Can anyone of us find it in his heart to deny these three Confederate veterans the comforts due to their venerable years with tender respect for the honored uniforms they once wore?

Last year, the Congress approved a bill for the relief of the last surviving Union veteran. I urge you to suppport this proposed bill to aid our last three Confederate veterans.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by saying that General Salling, who at 110 maintains an active life, is interested in his farm and his Government, deserves our respect and our best wishes. He is, indeed, a symbol of America. I hope that his 110th birthday will be a happy occasion and that we will be privileged to observe many others with him in the future.

We Are Paying for Flood Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the Members of the House a thoughtful article on the subject of flood control and water conservation which appeared in the spring issue of Land and Water, a quarterly magazine published by Friends of the Land, a nonprofit, nonpartisan society for conservation of soil, rain, and man. It has been written by Mr. Ollie E. Fink, a resident of Muskingum County in the 15th District of Ohio. Mr. Fink has been prominent in conservation circles for many years. He serves as editor of Land and Water. His article is as follows:

WE ARE PAYING FOR FLOOD PREVENTION
(By Ollie E. Fink)

Why must we continue to have the flood disasters? This is the question which our citizens in all parts of the Nation are asking. This question has been asked for a short time after each major flood during the past 30 years or more. Congress has been struggling with the flood-prevention and flood-control problems for many years, but there has been little progress. Less than 8 percent of our watersheds are now managed to afford protection against waste of soil and water and flood disasters.

Damage estimated at $700 million was caused by the two floods in the New England area in 1955. Floods in northern California and southern Oregon caused a damage of $100 million. The damage was held to this figure but would have been double these estimates had there been no flood-control program in operation.

These floods received the newspaper headlines. Each year there are floods on the small watersheds which seldom attract national attention, and yet the damage to property is greater than that of these floods on the main stems of our larger rivers. Some estimate that the annual flood damage on the smaller watersheds will often be as great as 75 percent of the national total.

Floods can be controlled and often prevented. To do so requires engineering structures and scientific knowledge applied to the land use proctices to best conserve our water and soil resources. Every drop of water which can be retained in the area where it falls, either in the earth or by small retarding structures, is 1 drop subtracted from the potential flood and 1 drop added to the potential useful water supply.

The construction of the various structures to prevent and control floodwaters requires an investment of funds. These structures on the main rivers are levees, dikes, floodwalls, storage dams, retardation dams, the latter to delay the runoff just long enough to permit the channel to clear without overflowing the banks below the dam. These devices are all used to control the water after it has collected in the larger channels. An equally important flood-control program should first be applied on the smaller upstream watersheds. These flood-control methods include all of the recognized soil and water conservation practices. It should be kept in mind that mother earth is our greatest reservoir for storing water. Recent research shows methods whereby we can increase the water holding capacity of our soils, increase the infiltration rate of water into the soil, and thus reduce the flood hazard. For example, it is presumed that a terraced field will always reduce the flood crest downstream. Terraces can be constructed to solve the farmers' problems of largely preventing soil and water losses, and yet these terraces will have little effect upon the downstream floods. We are now entering a period of landscape management in which terraces and other upstream techniques will be utilized on the landscape to reduce flood crests. Mulching and plowing with chisel tooth devices to break up subsoil compaction increases the rate and amount of water storage in the earth.

UPSTREAM ENGINEERING

We need the upstream flood-prevention and water-conservation practices installed first, followed by the various control methods in and along the main stem; storage dams, retarding dams, floodwalls, levees, and dikes. Practically all of the funds for flood control appropriated by Congress to this date have been spent for downstream measures, which is much like trying to put out the fire after it has reached its peak. The downstream measures should be designed to take care of emergencies which cannot be held upstream. When the downstream devices are constructed without first having the upstream management program in operation, we pay for the downstream twice. First we pay in loss of life and property, including the flooded acres of land taken out of production for water-storage reservoirs, economic development, and human welfare.

Secondly, we pay in that we have wasted our most vital resource, the water which is our most basic wealth. It is the great giver of life to plants and animals and the index to agriculture and industry. The city depends upon the flow of the river for its power and industrial economy. To have a stabilized flow of water in our rivers we need a land use program upstream engineered to release the water in a stabilized flow. The gashed and eroded landscape will result in frequent floods and ultimately will cause "factory closed" signs in our cities. The resources of power, stream flow, grass, forests, soil and terraces and other upstream land use practices are all tied together in our modern industrial culture. The chain of events in our society is trapped raindrops, crop money, business, happiness and optimum progress. Thus, the utilization of water by modern man is not primarily a thing apart, but interwoven into his social and economic web of living. The abundance and degree of development of the water resources determines the permanent prosperity and use of land and gadgets as our living standards rise higher and higher and each of the things we demand to meet our wants, represents the utilization of water at practically every phase of its creation and production. Therefore the higher the standard of living the more water we use. This leads to a better understanding of the fact that those things we want we regard as wealth, so water is wealth.

MUST KEEP THE WATER

If water is so valuable why do we let it run to waste into the sea? Why not build the dams to keep it from escaping to the sea? Did you ever hear of the Edfina barrage? It is a type of a dam in the Nile River, the Rosetta branch near the delta. The purpose of this Edfina barrage is to prevent the sea from invading and spoiling the fresh water of the river. It testifies as to the completeness of the utilization of the waters of the Nile, during much of the year, not a drop of water is permitted to escape to the sea. These people of Egypt know that water is wealth and in a very true sense it is the only wealth they have, without it they would perish.

The water supply in Egypt determines the number of people and their living standard. The population graph shows less than 5 million people in Egypt less than a century ago, but with the addition of more and more dams and barrages, storing more and more water, the population increased. The large dams were built to increase the national income. The taxable value of the land is an assessment based upon the available irrigation facilities. With this keen understanding of their dependence upon the waters of the Nile, its influence upon the people is majestic; they treat it with respect and understanding. To the Egyptian water is wealth and life.

HOLLAND

Another positive approach to an understanding of water is the history of Holland. An immense dyke has been built which walls off the Zuyder Zee from the North Sea. Dykes are now being constructed inside the Zee and the sea water will be pumped out section by section. The land will be washed with fresh water until the salt deposits are leached out so that the land becomes available for agricultural and industrial use. This reclamation plan will add 10 percent to the arable area of Holland. Someone has said that, "God made the world, but the Dutch made Holland." The cost per acre to the Government for the 50,000 acres claimed from the sea before World War II was approximately $800 per acre, and the present cost of the 240,000 acres being reclaimed is much greater.

We in this country are awakening to the fact that water is wealth. Bankers in some of the far western States now send snow surveyors into the high mountain areas to measure the winter snow fall. When the snow melts, it provides the water for irrigating the crops in the valleys. If the snow fall is light then there will not be much water available for irrigation. Farmers will have smaller acreages and less income and a reduced ability to pay off loans. The banker, knowing the amount of water potentially available, makes his loans accordingly. Here is another direct example of how we turn water to wealth.

CAN WE GET ENOUGH WATER?

It is very probable that within another 20 years we shall be providing 1 million gallons of water annually for each citizen—if we can get it. Whether we can get it or not will to a considerable degree be influenced by our flood-control practices. If our rivers are to carry raging torrents to sea instead of conserving this water for beneficial uses of man we shall not have enough to meet our increasing demands. A few buckets of water from the spring or well no longer meets the need of our homes.

This morning Mrs. Smith switched on the dishwasher, and in a few minutes had sprayed 7 gallons of water in cleaning the dishes. Across the street Mrs. Brown was doing the family wash, using 30 gallons of water in the laundromat. Next door, Mr. Green was using 25 gallons of water in his shower. Mrs. Black was using 2 gallons to operate the garbage disposal. Today the average urban dweller uses nearly 150 gallons of water per day, while only 20 years ago the average use was only 20 gallons per day. Laundromats, dishwashers, hot-water systems, air conditioners, two or more bathrooms, are to a large degree responsible for the increased demands of the modern home for more and more water.

In addition to the water used in the home, there is another demand upon water to operate these conveniences and appliances. Water is used in producing electricity whether it is from a hydro plant or steam generators. When Mrs. Jones turns the switch on the Laundromat or any electrical device, she is obligating herself to pay for the electricity, or actually pay for the benefits of water converted to another convenience at the powerplant. A modern home today is likely to have from 10 to 20 electric motors, or even more. The housewife finds new appliances and electrically operated products on the market each year and she looks forward to adding these as she can to her home.

MILLION GALLONS PER PERSON

The water that goes into growing the food we eat and in manufacturing the things we use raises the per capita requirements to nearly 1,500 gallons per day. The water used in supplying these increasing needs continues to climb to an astronomical figure. It is predicted that by 1975 the demand for water will be double what it is today. Today we are using half a million gallons per year, by 1975 one million gallons per year. Keep in mind that not only is the use per person increasing, but the number of people will reach about 220 million by 1975.

More people, each demanding more water, each producing waste, adding more waste and pollution with thousands of tons of contaminants creates a vicious cycle requiring more water which must come from the watersheds. There are many technical hydrologic and engineering problems which must be solved as well as adjustments in the land use pattern to provide for more water. For example, when water is pumped from a stream above a city to irrigate farm crops, it does not return to the stream to supply the domestic needs and industrial uses in our cities. We are in the beginning stages of an explosive expansion of irrigation in our humid areas. It is probable that the legal, political, and economic solutions, to meeting our increasing water needs, will be even greater than the hydrologic and engineering program to be applied to the watershed. Each watershed is different from another. The perspective of the citizens will be determined by geographical background and even our form of government may be altered to meet the increasing demands of our people for more water. An example of this trend may be seen in the acceptance by many of our citizens of the TVA program, the most socialistic of our Federal programs.

WHERE WATER COMES FROM

Where do we get the water we are presently using? In 1950 the United States Geological Survey estimated that about 180 billion gallons of water were withdrawn from the ground, lakes, and streams each day for use on farms and factories, municipalities, and other business establishments of the Nation. Of these withdrawals 17 billion were used in cities and rural communities, some 83 billions were used in industry, and 80 billions of gallons were used irrigation. Between 30 billion and 40 billion gallons were pumped from ground water sources. Community systems provided water for about 105 million people and 250,000 industrial plants. In the larger cities this water is being provided at an average of about 5 cents a ton. Many communities have already reached the maximum demand and are hard pressed to fill the present demands for the municipal, industrial, recreational, irrigation, power and other uses. In some

parts of the Nation the struggle has already developed between watersheds as for example the question of the water rights to the Colorado River as noted in the Arizona-California litigation. We can expect this type of competition between watersheds to increase in the years ahead.

The rights of individuals in regard to water control and ownership is a hodgepodge of laws, practices, court decisions, and rules of governmental agencies operating in the various geographical regions of the Nation. The Federal policies governing navigation, irrigation, flood control and, to a degree, our power policies have been separately conceived and separately administered. There are 25 separate agencies scattered among the 6 departments in the Federal Government and 5 independent organizations charged with the various Federal water purposes. Federal participation has been on a "hit and miss" basis of independent policies. Frequently, one Federal agency has been effectively able to block and retard the progress of the program of another agency through competitive influence with Congress.

CONGRESS AND HISTORY

At this point it would be well to review briefly the efforts of Congress to secure flood control for the people. While there was some discussion regarding upstream flood control measures the first legislation was the Weeks Forest Purchase Act of 1911. The Clark-McNary Act of 1924 provided for the acquisition of forest lands in headwaters of streams with a view of controlling runoff. The McSweeney-McNary Act of 1928 authorized investigations to find ways to prevent erosion and control water runoff. In 1929 field stations were authorized. In 1933 legislation was passed for relief unemployment authorizing work to prevent forest fires and soil erosion. In 1935 Congress authorized the Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act became law in 1936 and included flood control in its major objectives.

1936

Upstream flood control was first recognized by Congress in significant legislation by the 1936 Flood Control Act. This act designated a list of watersheds that would be surveyed. The Secretary of War was to make the flood control surveys and the Secretary of Agriculture the surveys for the runoff and water retardation. In 1937, the Water Facilities Act authorized the Department of Agriculture to assist individual farmers and groups of farmers to make better use of the water. In 1938 the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized and directed to make surveys and preliminary examinations for flood control on designated watersheds. Under these congressional acts the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers were to cooperate in developing Federal programs for watersheds for the purpose of flood control.

1944

During the years from 1937 until 1944 the Department of Agriculture completed preliminary plans for 154 watersheds; more detailed plans for 18 watersheds and appraisals of flood damage on 40 areas, all in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers. In 1944 the Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to install flood control works on 11 watersheds. The intent of Congress was not clear, at least there was difference in viewpoint within the Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. Since policies were uncertain little progress was made from 1945 to 1954. While more than 1,000 surveys had been authorized; only 58 had been completed, and Congress had authorized only 11 flood-control projects by the Soil Conservation Service, but not one project had been completed.

1953

Public support for upstream watershed flood-control project was apparent from the hearings of the House Agriculture Committee held in 1951. Bills were introduced in Congress in 1951 and 1952, and the pilot project program was initiated by Congress in 1953 and amendment to the appropriations bill. These 62 pilot watersheds were designated to demonstrate the upstream watershed program and provision was made to evaluate the results.

1954

In 1954 Congress passed the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. The main difference between this and former legislation was the greater emphasis on State and local responsibility. The 1936 act placed the Federal responsibility for selection, planning, and constructing projects, the 1954 act placed the major responsibility locally.

The 1954 act provides that the application must be made by some local organization before the State can study and evaluate the worthiness of the project. The State selects projects from applications and assigns a priority as well as an evaluation of the study of the costs and benefits of the several projects. If forwarded to the Department of Agriculture by the State official where an evaluation is made as to the advisability of spending planning money on the project, consideration is given to the probability of the local group in meeting their responsibilities. The decisions of the Department of Agriculture are largely based upon the economic justification of the project. If the project meets the economic requirements, then the Secretary must decide whether to participate, and the degree of cost sharing. It was the intent of Congress that the local or non-Federal interests would be responsible for an estimated 50 percent of the cost of the program. If the project is approved and a proposal is returned to the local group the contracts are to be accepted or refused. The final step when both the Secretary of Agriculture and the local group have reached agreement, is the decision of Congress. Congress may veto the program, especially if the Bureau of the Budget does not approve the appropriations.

The hopes of Congress and of the leaders in watershed flood control efforts are not being realized. The program is not moved ahead. Some of the stumbling blocks are as follows:

1. Local groups are not prepared by experience and the enabling legislation to accept the financial responsibilities of construction cost and other features as well as administration and continued operation.

2. The Federal Government accepted practically all of the financial obligations of the pilot projects.

3. The Federal Government is accepting about 94 percent of the costs of the projects of the Corps of Engineers. (There is considerable logic to the argument that both programs should operate under the same cost ratio.)

THE DIFFICULTIES

Congress and the executive department have accepted the policy of local interests sharing the costs with the Federal Government. The small watershed program will move slowly, due to many difficulties.

I. Local organizations lack responsibilities. Only a few States have legislation which will permit local groups to organize with the power to tax and make contracts which will be required in cooperating with the Federal Government. Soil Conservation Districts are not adequate to meet the needs. They are normally organized on county lines rather than watersheds. They are managed by farm interests. Flood control programs must be financed by all of the watershed people. City people and many of the rural people will look with suspicion on any proposed additional governmental unit with the power to tax. A conservancy district is an example. Soil Conservation Districts normally have not been granted the right of eminent domain.

II. Federal Government cannot finance the total national program without cost sharing from local people. Local interests should help to pay for their protection. Thousands of watershed groups would place requests before Congress and the "pork barrel" legislative pressures would be terrific if no local financing was required.

RECOMMENDATIONS

What should Congress do?

1. Congress should begin an educational program designed to give insight and understanding to our citizens that water is wealth. Once they have this concept the flood control problem will be greatly reduced or eliminated by the people managing local watersheds to conserve the wealth.

2. Congress should help local watershed groups to secure adequate responsibilities and make financing easier. In many instances the improved beneficial uses of the water which would have been wasted in floods, will be an investment more than paying the cost of the flood prevention program. The irrigation program in this country is an example in which the projects are designed to repay the Government for the funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

3. Congress should establish additional research projects to provide facts for better appraisal of proposed projects from the financial and economic basis as well as the best hydrologic and land use information. Incidentally, the focus of emphasis has been on the Federal benefits and before the program will succeed greater understanding of local benefits must be developed.

4. Congress should set up more pilot watersheds with special emphasis on the basic improved water supply and educational demonstrations of all the water conservation techniques in operation. For example terraces designed to reduce flood flow peaks, rather than just terraces to protect the soil on the farm were installed.

Reprehensible Post Office Gag Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our distinguished colleagues to the following letter that I received today from Mr. Wallace J. Legge, Jr., president, first division National Postal Transport Association, concerning certain new sections of the Postal Manual that will serve as a gag on the postal unions and all postal employees, if not immediately eliminated by the Post Office Department.

I am certainly in accord with the views expressed by Mr. Legge and his association. The language in the new sections of the Postal Manual is so ambiguous that a misinterpretation could deny the postal employees the right to petition Congress for improvements in their working conditions and prohibit constructive criticism of the postal service.

However, I am confident that Postmaster General Summerfield has no intention of denying any American citizen the constitutional right to petition Congress. Therefore, I concur with the postal employees that the aforementioned new section of the Postal Manual is detrimental to the best interests of both the public and the postal employees, and should be immediately eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: For years postal transportation clerks have been subjected to a postal gag rule. Now the Post Office Department intends to apply the gag throughout the postal establishment.

On March 28, 1956 the following addition was made to the postal manual:

"744.442. Engaging in campaigns for chances in the service.

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 grants to postal workers the right to petition Congress for improvements in their working conditions, grievances, etc. The National Postal Transport Association contends that the gag rule acts to prevent employees from giving detailed information to their national officers on which to base appeals to the department or to the Congress for improvements in service, working conditions, or adjusting grievances.

The association contends that this rule is detrimental to the best interests of the public because it prevent criticism of management's errors and inefficiencies. Its practical operation tends to intimidate employees and curb the activities of the National Postal Transport Association.

The National Postal Transport Association contends that this rule is a violation of the intent of the Lloyd-LaFolette Act. The association points out that one of the reasons they are seeking enactment of S. 3593 (labor-management relations bill) is the gag rule, which prevents the union from fulfilling its function.

With many thanks for past assistance, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. J. LEGGE,

Louisiana Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks, I wish to say I have just received a letter of May 11, 1956, from Mr. C. J. Bonnecarrere, secretary, State mineral board, State of Louisiana, together with a resolution from this board protesting the action of the Federal Government in lease sales covering tracts of acres in the offshore area of the State of Louisiana on May 15. So that this Congress may be familiar with this protest and the action of the Louisiana State Mineral Board, I set forth the letter from the Secretary of the State Mineral Board together with the resolution of protest:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, May 11, 1956.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: We are in receipt of your letter of date May 7, 1956, relative to the resolution by the State mineral board protesting the Federal Government's lease sale in the offshore area of the State of Louisiana on May 15, 1956.

We enclose herewith certified copies of this resolution in order that you might put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards and best wishes we remain

Very truly yours,
STATE MINERAL BOARD,
By C. J. BONNECARRERE,
Secretary.

The following resolution, introduced by Mr. Clanton and seconded by Mr. Bryant, when put to a vote, was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Department of the Interior of the United States, Bureau of Land Management, acting for and on behalf of the United States and pursuant to section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Act (67 Stat. 462) and the regulations issued thereunder (43 CFR, pt. 201) has published notice that sealed bids are to be received by the Manager, Outer Continental Shelf Office, Bureau of Land Management, 608 Masonic Temple Building, New Orleans, La., on or before May 15, 1956, for the lease of oil and gas in certain areas of what is termed the outer Continental Shelf, off Louisiana and Texas, including the following specially designated tracts, descriptions, blocks, and acreage, as follows:

"1. Off Louisiana

"EAST CAMERON OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 2

Tract No.	Description	Block	Acreage
La.-371	E½	33	2,500
La.-372	W½	33	2,500
La.-373	E½	34	2,500
La.-374	W½	34	2,500
La.-375	W½	39	2,500
La.-376	E½	40	2,500
La.-377	W½	40	2,500
La.-378	E½	41	2,500
La.-379	W½	41	2,500
La.-380	E½	42	2,500
La.-381	W½	42	2,500
[1] La.-382	All	65	2,500
[1] La.-383	S½	66	2,500

"VERMILLION OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 3

La.-390	That portion in the outer Continental Shelf seaward from a line 3 geographic miles from the coastline	27	3,700
La.-391	SE¼	75	1,250
La.-392	N½	87	2,500
La.-393	N½	88	2,500
La.-394	E½	97	2,500
[1] La.-395	E½	107	2,500
[1] La.-396	W½	107	2,500

Footnote at end of table.

"1. Off Louisiana—Continued

"EUGENE ISLAND OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 4

Tract No.	Description	Block	Acreage
La.-407	NW¼	34	1,250
La.-408	W½	38	2,500
La.-409	All	39	5,000
La.-410	S½	40	2,500
La.-411	E½	43	2,500
La.-412	All	52	5,000
La.-413	do	54	5,000
La.-414	do	55	5,000
La.-415	do	56	5,000
La.-416	do	57	5,000
La.-417	do	61	5,000
La.-418	do	65	5,000
La.-419	do	74	5,000
La.-420	do	75	5,000
La.-421	do	78	5,000
La.-422	do	81	5,000
La.-423	do	82	5,000
La.-424	do	83	5,000
La.-425	do	86	5,000
La.-426	do	87	5,000
La.-427	do	96	5,000
La.-428	do	97	5,000
La.-429	do	98	5,000
La.-430	do	99	5,000
La.-431	do	100	5,000
La.-432	do	101	5,000
La.-433	do	102	5,000
La.-434	do	103	5,000
La.-435	do	104	5,000
La.-436	do	105	5,000
La.-437	do	106	5,000
La.-438	do	107	5,000
La.-439	do	108	5,000
La.-440	do	109	5,000
La.-441	E½	117	2,500
La.-442	W½	118	2,500
La.-443	E½	127	2,500
La.-444	W½	127	2,500

"SOUTH PELTO OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 6

La.-470	E½	6	2,500
La.-471	All	15	5,000
La.-472	do	16	5,000

"SOUTH TIMBALIER OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 6

La.-473	N½	32	2,500
La.-474	S½	32	2,500
La.-475	All	33	3,772.18
La.-476	do	51	3,772.18
La.-477	E½	53	2,500
La.-478	E½	64	2,500
La.-479	E½	68	2,500
La.-480	W½	68	2,500
La.-481	S½	85	2,500

"GRAND ISLE OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 7

La.-485	That portion on the outer Continental Shelf seaward from a line 3 geographic miles from the coastline.	11	1,645
La.-486	E½	21	2,500
La.-487	W½	21	2,500
La.-488	That portion on the outer Continental Shelf seaward from a line 3 geographic miles from the coastline	24	2,770

"WEST DELTA OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 8

La.-489	That portion on the outer Continental Shelf seaward from a line 3 geographic miles from the coastline	23	1,800
La.-490	do	24	845
La.-491	do	26	3,300
La.-492	S½S½	28	1,250
La.-493	All	47	5,000
La.-494	N½	77	2,500
La.-495	N½	78	2,500
La.-496	N½	79	2,500
La.-497	All	80	5,000

"BRETON SOUND OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 10

La.-498	All	55	4,994.55
La.-499	do	56	4,994.55

"1. Off Louisiana—Continued

"MAIN PASS OFFICIAL LEASING MAP NO. 10

Tract No.	Description	Block	Acreage
La.-500	S½	37	2,497.28
La.-501	S½	38	2,497.28
La.-502	All	39	4,994.55
La.-503	E½	40	2,497.28
La.-504	W½	42	2,497.28
La.-505	NW¼	57	1,248.64
La.-506	S½	57	2,497.28
La.-507	S½	58	2,497.28
La.-508	S½	59	2,497.28
La.-509	NE¼	59	1,248.64
La.-510	All	60	4,994.55
La.-511	do	62	4,994.55
La.-512	N½	63	2,497.28
La.-513	SE¼	63	1,248.64
La.-514	N½	64	2,497.28
[1] La.-517	All	126	4,994.55
La.-518	do	127	4,994.55
La.-519	do	128	4,994.55
[1] La.-520	do	129	4,994.55
La.-521	N½	139	2,497.28
La.-522	S½	139	2,497.27

[1] Denotes only a portion of tract within Louisiana boundary.

and:

"Whereas the submerged lands, under the tract numbers, descriptions, blocks, and acreage particularly referred to and enumerated in the last and foregoing paragraph, are located in whole or in part within the gulfward or seaward boundary of the State of Louisiana, as set forth and redefined in Act No. 33 of the Louisiana Legislature for the year 1954, and which tracts in whole or in part are owned by the State of Louisiana in its sovereign capacity and within the historic gulfward boundary of said State; and

"Whereas the call for sealed bids for oil and gas leases by the United States, through the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, is a slander of the title of the State of Louisiana and injures its people and their property and property rights and to a substantial extent deprives the full and free use of said property and property rights in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the State mineral board, authorized by law to act as the agency for the State of Louisiana in leasing State-owned lands and water bottoms for oil, gas, and minerals and in supervising such leases, when granted, is the appropriate body corporate to represent and act for said State in the premises: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the State mineral board, acting for the State of Louisiana and on its behalf, in regular session convened at Baton Rouge, La., on April 18, 1956, That it does hereby protest the action taken by the United States, through the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, in calling for sealed bids for oil and gas leases covering the specific tracts of land hereinabove specifically designated and enumerated, which are located within the gulfward boundaries of the State of Louisiana and belonging to said State in full ownership and that the United States, represented as aforesaid, be called upon to rescind and abandon such call for bids, so far as the tracts which are specifically enumerated, listed, and numbered in this resolution are concerned; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be published and circulated fully to warn any and all prospective bidders of this protest and to notify them, if leases be awarded covering the tracts herein specifically referred to and above numbered that the State of Louisiana shall take all appropirate and available legal action to maintain and protect the property and property rights of the State and its people in the areas of submerged lands involved in this protest; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be served upon the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management."

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the State Mineral Board, held at State Capitol in the city of Baton Rouge, La., on the 18th day of April 1956, pursuant to due notice, at which meeting a quorum was present, and that said resolution is duly entered in the minute book of said board and is now in full force and effect.

C. J. BONNECARRERE,
Secretary, State Mineral Board.

Puerto Rico: Island Workshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many members here present today have had the pleasure of visiting my district, which is the island of Puerto Rico. While some of them have so honored us recently, with others, some years have elapsed since their last visit. I invite all of the Members who have never been to Puerto Rico to come at the first opportunity. We would like to show you what we are doing to industrialize, to remove slums, to better our methods of doing things, to build roads and airports, to start new industries, to create employment, and to raise living standards.

To those who have been to Puerto Rico, I should like to say, "Come again now," for you will see that miracles have happened while you were away. You will see whole new communities suddenly come to life. You will see busy factories where there were no factories before. You will see modern roads, superhighways, to take you to the interior of the island, and everywhere you go, you will find people working harder and harder, creating, building, and improving.

The May 14 issue of the Time magazine tells something of the story of Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap. It refers to Puerto Rico, quite properly, I think, as the Island Workshop. I believe that every Member will be interested in this article, which under unanimous consent, I include herewith:

PUERTO RICO: ISLAND WORKSHOP

Two lines will meet and cross on a graph in Puerto Rico this week, and thereby touch off a gerat celebration. The crossed lines mean that, for the first time in history, manufacturing has edged ahead of farming as Puerto Rico's major source of income.

To hammer home the point, no fewer than 20 new factories are to be officially opened. Heading the list is a $2 million General Electric plant to make circuit breakers; other factories will produce such goods as coils, rubber buckets, screen wire, photolithography, saber saws, frozen foods, billfolds, brassieres. The openings will bring to 400 the total of plants drawn to Puerto Rico by its famed Operation Bootstrap.

Puerto Rico's self-help plan is a smashing success, there for any eye to see. San Juan's big, handsome new airport at Isla Verde, built for $15 million, makes most mainland terminals look shabby. An impressive low-cost housing program in San Juan has built 20,000 units. Private building has kept pace. Television antennas forest the roofs of the dwindling slums, and Gov-Luis Muñoz-Marín this week inaugurates an islandwide TV hookup. Wide boulevards and superhighways stretch out from the capital.

Two 300-room hotels are going up near San Juan to help the 300-room, 99 percent occupied Caribe Hilton handle the expected $75-million-a-year tourist traffic. Laurance Rockefeller is putting $1 million into a 72-room luxury hotel with an 18-hole golf course designed by famed Golf Architect Robert Trent Jones. And all over the island are the new factories. They are well lighted, pastel tinted, and smog free (there is no heavy industry), and their signs cry out familiar brand names: Remington Rand, Sylvania, Paper-Mate, U. S. Rubber, Textron, Maidenform, A. S. Beck, Carborundum, Van Raalte, Bostitch, Sunbeam.

UP FROM DESPERATION

But not just any eye can measure the whole force of Puerto Rico's tug at its bootstrap. The full change dates from the thirties, when the economy revolved around the apathetic peasant sugarcane cutter, and when industry—even rum making—hardly existed. In 1940, Puerto Rico resolved that it was going to transform itself. Industrialization became a major goal. As a starter, the government bought out mossback electric companies, built dams, strung transmission lines, and thus provided the electricity that powers today's boom. But the most astute stroke was the 1942 creation of a government corporation, now called the Economic Development Authority, with a charter to industrialize the island.

At first the corporation built and ran plants, for example, a wartime rum-bottle factory, a cement plant. But some strikes that followed showed the vulnerability of government in the double role of industrial labor's friend and employer. The lesson grew clear that the way to industrialize was to attract United States capital. In 1948 Operation Bootstrap, based on that principle, got underway.

DOUBLE PROFITS

Any serious United States businessman who wants to start a factory or a branch plant in Puerto Rico gets kingly treatment from Bootstrap. Under Administrator Teodoro ("Ted") Moscoso, a brief-case-toting man in horn-rimmed spectacles who flouts Latin tradition by working 70 hours a week, EDA can offer mouth-watering inducements. It will provide the businessman with labor from its big files of workers, trained in everything from pastry baking to power sewing by one of the world's largest vocational schools. It will build a plant and rent it to him. Moving to Puerto Rico will free him from United States income taxes. And, as the biggest come-on of all, Puerto Rico will exempt him from all corporate taxes for 10 years if the industry he starts is a new one for the island and not a runaway from the mainland. His personal income from dividends, moreover, can be exempt from taxes for 7 years in the first 15.

Failure is not impossible; 107 firms established under Bootstrap have gone broke for assorted reasons. But the successes are notable. A plastics manufacturer who started in 1953 with a $15,000 investment cleared $200,000 last year alone; a 1952 investment of $675,000 netted $2,800,000 in 1955. The average return on capital before taxes is double that of United States companies.

FREE STATE

Under Governor Muñoz-Marín, Puerto Rico's political innovations have kept pace with the economy. Muñoz is uniquely fitted for island leadership. The son of a famed Puerto Rican statesman, he grew up in Washington, lived for a while as a Greenwich Village poet and intellectual, then returned to Puerto Rico. By hinterlands cam-

paigning for "bread, land, and liberty," he developed a powerful backing among the peasant farmhands, and in 1940 became a senator and an influential leader. In 1948 he became Puerto Rico's first elected Governor (and was reelected in 1952 for a term that expires in 1956).

When in 1950 Congress offered to let Puerto Rico write its own constitution, Muñoz helped draft it and happily saw it approved, 375,000 to 83,000. The constitution makes Puerto Rico self-governing in local affairs, gives it a relationship to the United States defined in the official Spanish term as Estado Libre Asociado (Free Associated State); the official translation is Commonwealth. Congress' laws, notably the draft, apply to Puerto Rico, but, because the island has no vote in Congress, it is spared the income tax.

OVERPOPULATION

Puerto Rico's industrial revolution has wrought the expectable statistical wonders. Per capita national income went from $122 in 1940 to $434 in 1954, against 1954's $201 in the neighboring Dominican Republic, $538 in West Germany, $1,845 on the United States mainland. As a market for the continental United States, the island, buying $584 million worth of goods last year, outranks all foreign countries except Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and Japan.

In thus making more goods available, Bootstrap has tackled one approach to Puerto Rico's basic problem: overpopulation. More than 2,300,000 cram the island, 670 to the square mile. From the approach of providing work, Bootstrap has been barely a holding operation. It has created 33,000 industrial jobs, and perhaps even more resulting service jobs. But a runaway birthrate combined with a death rate lower than the mainland's—plus a parade of labor from the increasingly efficient farms—pours 20,000 workers a year into the market. In the short run, only by heavy emigration to the mainland and the Army's draft has Puerto Rico been able to keep unemployment from rising despite Bootstrap. In the long run, Bootstrap's higher living standards may help importantly; statistics show that the birthrate drops with every increase in family income and education.

TRANSFORMATION

The pull of Bootstrap has transformed Puerto Rican life; the dejection of the past is lost in new pride. A case in point is Salinas, on the south coast, once a drowsy and impoverished sugar town. In 1952 Paper-Mate opened a ballpoint-pen plant there, hired 400 workers, three-fourths of them women who had never worked before, and began to sprinkle a payroll of $1,250,000 a year over the town. As almost the first result, a jewelry store opened to sell the gold watches Puerto Ricans admire. A market soon developed for used cars, furniture, refrigerators.

Now in Salinas, to work for Paper-Mate is to be somebody. After work, in a tableau like a scene from Carmen, the girl penmakers, dressed in factory-provided blue smocks, parade their status through the streets. Drawing a sharp contrast with the old way, sheepish cane cutters often perform the unmanly chore of bringing lunchboxes to their working wives at the plant.

A transformation as speedy and effective as Puerto Rico's has worthwhile lessons for all Latin America, and for all underdeveloped countries with industrial ambitions. The lesson is not being lost; the story of Puerto Rico is better known among development-minded people abroad than it is among Americans. For this week's festivities, 323 foreign students and technicians are on hand, the latest of more than 3,000 who have come in the last 5 years from such distant places as the Fiji Islands, Pakistan, Iceland, Israel, Ethiopia, and Nepal.

They come specifically to learn Puerto Rico's pragmatic techniques of letting private enterprise develop an area while a democratically elected government supplies aid and incentives. Luis Muñoz-Marín thinks that they also see "the United States at its undogmatic best: the helping hand guided by the undoctrinaire spirit, so forgetful of its bigness that it fully reveals its greatness."

Auto Is Greatest Killer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include three news articles dealing with the number of lives America wastes in automobile accidents. When you realize that one American is injured every 24 seconds and 1 is killed every 14 minutes in a traffic accident, and that the automobile is a greater killer than war, it is time action was taken to stop such human slaughter. I am pleased that the House of Representatives has recognized this tremendous waste of human lives and has voted to have the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee study the causes of these accidents with the hope that we may be able to lessen such destruction and waste. The magnitude of this continual disaster is indeed worth our serious study and I hope the committee will be able to begin its investigation in the very near future.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 30, 1956]

HOW TO STOP KILLING YOURSELF

(By Dr. Peter J. Steincrohn)

AUTO IS GREATEST KILLER

"During the Korean war only half of the hospitalized casualties were the result of enemy action. During this same conflict, more Americans were killed in the United States in automobile accidents than were killed in the war."

The foregoing was written by Col. Don. S. Wenger, USAF, in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Colonel Wenger continues: "The automobile is the military establishment's and the Nation's greatest killer. An American is injured every 24 seconds and 1 is killed every 14 minutes in a traffic accident."

As I see it, and the subject is too important to be facetious about, we did our sons a disservice by getting them out of the trenches and into automobiles. We took them from the relative safety of bombs and bayonets and set them down in the front-line danger of tires and brakes and accelerators.

WAYS TO CURB INJURIES

The car is a killer; long statistical columns of the dead verify that. Knowing that you are as anxious to stay alive as I am, I am sure that you, too, will be interested in this excellent summary by Colonel Wenger:

"Injuries usually result from specific causes. Remedies may be just as specific and simple. Reduce the high peaks of decelerative forces, enlarge the area that absorbs these forces, and restrain the occupants of automobiles so that they do not fly around within or outside the car and a majority of the fatalities and injuries would never occur.

"Possible mechanisms to obtain these results are safety belts, a progressively disintegrating frame, and energy-absorbing construction of various lethal parts of the vehicle such as steering wheels, instrument panels, windshields, and set backs.

"A shock-absorbing bumper, either hydraulic or collapsible, padded panels, and pop-out windshields are possible examples of such construction. A high-backed seat would reduce materially the whiplash neck injuries. If properly packaged for survival you can crash your car and live."

But what do you and your neighbors do about it except think: "When will these silly, crusading bores stop throwing 'scare statistics' at the American people. All they do is keep harping on auto accidents. You'd think the streets are littered with smashed cars and the dead."

THIRTY-EIGHT THOUSAND KILLED IN YEAR

As a doctor I cannot help calling this senseless slaughter to your attention. A matter of 38,000 automobile deaths a year isn't 38,000 peanuts littering our streets and highways. Each "cold statistic" in the long column represents a man, woman, or child.

It represents bashed heads and mashed brains; twisted necks and amputated arms and legs; your blood spilled on flowers at the roadside; and curious bystanders shaking their heads in disbelief and amazement that human beings could do such things to themselves.

But they do: not forgetting the 1.5 million injured yearly; and the 100,000 totally disabled. Do you know what it means to be totally disabled for 24 hours a day for your entire life? Do you realize the implications of caring for such a member in your family?

If you are hurt in an auto accident you have 1 chance in 15 of having such an injury. Furthermore, you run 1 chance in 37 of being killed. Once I asked a pilot of a plane what was the most dangerous part of flying. Without hesitation—and with a knowing grin—he said: "There are two dangers, equally great. And don't jump to the conclusion that they are landing and taking off. The two greatest dangers of flying are taking a cab or your car to and from the airport."

POLIO DEATHS FAR FEWER

That sounded like a joke until I saw these statistics by Dr. C. Hunter Shelden, of Pasadena, Calif.: "Last year the United States Air Force lost 700 men killed in aircraft accidents and during the same period lost 678 killed in automobile crashes."

And I suppose you have already heard that auto accidents have caused more deaths during the past 50 years than all the fatalities of all the wars this Nation has ever fought.

Poliomyelitis? Horrible. Almost 2,000 innocent youngsters lost their lives due to it in 1953. Automobile deaths were almost 20 times as numerous. Is there a fitting adjective to describe it? I think we talk too much about it. If there's any more talking to do let's talk to our Senators and Representatives. Let's tell them we won't reelect them unless they offer a national program of auto safety. Let's tell them we want to be able to walk out of our cars, not be picked up on a stretcher. The final answer lies with you, the car manufacturer, and Washington.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 3, 1956]

PSYCHIATRIC TEST REVEALS WHO'S SAFEST DRIVER

CHICAGO, May 3.—A dream of highway safety experts—a test to determine in advance whether a person is mentally accident-prone or accident-proof—appeared a step nearer realization today.

Details of tests which proved about 80 percent accurate in 3 separate trials were prepared for the annual convention of the American Psychiatric Association.

Preliminary findings from the 3-year-old accident research project at the University of Colorado School of Medicine, conducted in conjunction with Fitzsimmons Army Hospital, indicated:

1. Religiously inclined persons make the safest drivers.

2. Motorists with a predominant interest in aesthetic or theoretical values have the worst safety records.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR AIRMEN TESTED

The project leaders—psychologists and psychiatrists—tested and interviewed 264 airmen from Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, on their psychological, psycho-physical and psychopohysiological characteristics.

The airmen had high, moderate or accident-free driving records.

"The stable results achieved with this test suggests that different sorts of individuals are represented in the accident and nonaccident groups," they said.

Stressing that this is a preliminary report, applied to a relatively small group and limited exclusively to airmen living at a base, they added:

"Frankly, the authors are puzzled by the relatively higher theoretical and aesthetic interests and the relatively lower religious interests in the accident individuals.

"It appears that the accident subjects may well be psychologically more complex than their nonaccident counterparts, less in harmony with their environment and less conventional * * *.

"There is some sign that they (the nonaccident group) tend to accept conventional values to a greter extent; have simpler and on the whole less demanding needs; have less conflict, both internal and external; possess less elaborate physiological defense systems and show less tendency, both as children and adults, to engage in contentious or acting-out behavior.

"The non-accident group had fewer conflicts with authority in the forms of truancy, delinquency and minor offenses, and they more regularly go to church, engage in prayer and in general behave in rather socially conforming ways."

The report was by Dr. John J. Conger, Dr. Herbert S. Gaskill, and Dr. Donald D. Glad, all of the University of Colorado.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 28, 1956]

SCIENCE VERSUS SPEEDERS

Virginia's use of radar as a weapon in the war on highway speeders is apt to be more effective than ever, now that the State Supreme Court of Appeals has upheld the constitutionality of the State's radar law. That is good news to drivers who are content to abide by Virginia's safe-driving speed limits. For radar is helping to make the roads safer for all drivers by catching or slowing down the reckless motorists who are to blame for most fatal accidents.

The Virginia law had been challenged by a man convicted, on radar evidence, of driving 62 miles an hour in a 55-mile-an-hour zone. He contended that his rights under the "due process" provision of the Constitution had been violated, since he had no way of proving that the radar evidence was wrong. He also argued that radar signs should be posted on every road in the State. The court ruled unanimously, however, that no rights were infringed by the use of a scientific speed-measuring device such as radar, the "general accuracy and effectiveness" of which "are not seriously questioned." And, the judges said, it was sufficient that radar notices were posted on the particular road on which the speeder was arrested.

The court's opinion will contribute to the safety of those who use the public highways in Virginia. The widespread employment of radar in eliminating potential killers from the roads is thoroughly justified—as experience in many jurisdictions already has shown.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May has passed by silently in Rumania. But when that country was free, May 10 was the day on which they celebrated their independence and that freedom they have now lost.

We are partly to blame for the plight of Rumania, and of many other nations behind the Iron Curtain, and I want at this time to review some of the events that have led up to the present situation, specifically, in Rumania.

Once the Austrian peace treaty had been concluded and the Russian troops withdrawn from Austria, the Soviet Union had the obligation as provided in the peace treaties with Rumania and Hungary of withdrawing her armed forces from these two countries. It should be stressed that the formal motive, as mentioned in the peace treaties, of the presence of the Soviet armies in Rumania and Hungary was the insuring of the Russian lines of communication with the Soviet zone of occupation in Austria. The peace treaties with Rumania and Hungary provide that the Russian troops should withdraw from Rumania and Hungary within 90 days from the conclusion of the Austrian peace treaty. It should also be pointed out that these provisions are guaranteed by the three great powers, United States, United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, the peace treaties being a contract between the three of them and the above countries. Therefore, the implementation of these treaties' provisions is the equal responsibility of all three.

It was, of course, an error to conclude peace treaties with nonrepresentative, tyrannical governments, forcibly installed by Moscow, but once that incredible concession was made to the Soviets and signed, we should at the very least have seen to it that these treaties were respected.

The peace treaty with Austria has been concluded, the 90 days from its conclusion have elapsed and then another 90 days have elapsed, and there is no sign of the Russian troops withdrawing from Rumania and Hungary. The Soviet Union is thus violating its obligations under these treaties. Until now the United States and the United Kingdom have not raised the issue of the withdrawal of the Red troops, although it is their obligation to do so. A profound silence reigns over this whole question. Moreover, the Communist Governments of Rumania and Hungary which have been permanently infringing on the treaties and are subservient accomplices to this last Soviet violation, have been rewarded for their crimes by being accepted as respectable members of the United Nations.

Why does not our country take the necessary steps, asking for the fulfillment of these treaty provisions as it is our obligation to do? Articles 38 and 40 of the Rumanian and Hungarian peace treaties provide for the procedure to be followed in this case. We in the Congress could raise this vital question and ask for action on this matter.

The independence of the Rumanian people was fully reestablished by the Congress of Berlin, 1878, after almost three centuries of being under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire. Up to the moment of the Turkish advance into the Danube area the Rumanian lands had been ruled by national Domni—independent princes—who took an active part in the defense of Europe and of Christian civilization, through an unceasing fight against the invasions from the east.

The victories you have gained with equal wisdom and bravery over the unbelievers, our common foe, have raised your fame to the point that your name is on everyone's lips, and all agree in exalting you—

Wrote Pope Sixtus IV to Stephen the Great, one of these Rumanian Domni ruling in the second half of the 15th century.

The Rumanian people, descendents of the Roman colonists of Dacia—the ancient name of the land inhabited by the Rumanians—form a strong Latin and Christian outpost at the eastern confines of Europe. The country, numbering now twenty-odd millions, has preserved its national integrity throughout centuries of vicissitudes. A deeply rooted nationalism and Christian faith are once more today the inspiration which wealds the Rumanian people together in an unyielding resistance to communism.

The circumstances under which the independence of Rumania was recognized in 1878 are worth remembering.

On the eve of the war between Russia and Turkey on April 16, 1877, Mihail Kogalniceanu, Rumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, signed a convention with Russia. The convention assured to the Russian armies free passage across Rumania, provisioning and the use of roads and railways, and pledged her to respect Rumanian laws and institutions. Article II of this convention had the following text:

In order that no inconvenience should result for Rumania from the fact of the passage of the Russian troops through her territory, the Government of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias pledges himself to maintain and to make respected the political rights of the Rumanian State, such as derive from its internal laws and the existing treaties, as well as to maintain and defend the present integrity of Rumania.

What happened immediately after this Convention was signed is typical.

Meanwhile the Russian attitude was disquieting—

Writes the English historian Seton Watson.

There was a tendency to override or ignore Rumanian susceptibilities and treat the country as a mere Russian dependency. Rumania's cooperation on equal terms was airily rejected by the vain and pompous Gorchakov (the Russian Chancellor), the most that he would concede was that she might join the war uninvited, but in that event there must be complete fusion and unity of command. "Russia," it was stated quite explicitly, "does not need the assistance of the Rumanian Army." (A History of the Rumanians, Cambridge 1934, p. 336.)

But—

In the second half of July the Russians suffered more than one reverse, and finding themselves in urgent need of reinforcements pressed the Rumanians to come to their aid * * * Prince Charles, with a fresh army of 50,000 men and 180 guns at his disposal, was this time able to lay down specific conditions for cooperation, and the Russians dismounting from their high horse, gracefully offered him the command of the united armies before Plevna. * * * On September 8, the Rumanian Army had its real baptism of fire in the redoubts of Grivita, before Plevna; and the foreign attachés and correspondents were unanimous in their praise of its extreme gallantry and steadiness, which contributed very materially to the final victory.

The reward for this cooperation came very soon. On January 29, 1878, Gen. Ion Ghica, the Rumanian representative in Moscow, was officially informed that Russia demanded the districts of Southern Bessarabia, which had been returned to Rumania by the Treaty of Paris.

The plea that the territory in question had been for centuries an integral part of Moldavia and had fallen to Russia the first time only 44 years before the Treaty of Paris seems to have made not the slightest impression upon either the Tsar or Chancellor.

The possession of Bessarabia with control of the Mouths of the Danube, was cynically made by the great powers an object for bargaining, and the Berlin Congress sanctioned this amputation of Rumanian territory to Russia.

In politics—

Remarked Lord Beaconsfield to the Rumanian Prime Minister Bratianu—ingratitude is oftentimes the reward for the most distinguished services.

It was in vain that Gladstone accused the British Government of "selling Bessarabian liberty to Russia."

A similar incident happened, when, in the autumn of 1944, Sir Winston Churchill sold Rumanian liberty to Communist Russia. But this time there was no Gladstone to protest against this political felony. Thus was the great American principle of self-determination which President Woodrow Wilson upheld and made a reality in Eastern Europe, sacrified to placate a Communist tyrant. The fact that from September 1944 until the end of the war, the Rumanian army substantially contributed to the Allied offensive and considerably shortened the war—being considered at that time, as the London Times put it, "the fourth combative force"—has not affected the cinical bargain between the Great Powers in 1944. The situation is remarkably similar to that of 1878; when Russia raped a province from Rumania, her ally, who had saved her from defeat.

Rumania has been blatantly subjugated by Soviet Russia on March 6, 1945; through the politically and militarily enforced ultimatum, delivered to King Michael, by Andrei Vishinsky 2 weeks after the Yalta Declaration. The United States and the United Kingdom officially recognized this enslavement by signing a so-called Peace Treaty with the nonrepresentative Moscow installed puppet-government in Paris 1947.

Thus does history repeat itself, but this time with infinitely more tragic consequences both for Rumania and for the world.

Remarks of Alvin M. Weinberg Before the Atomic Industrial Forum, Oak Terrace, April 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS BY ALVIN M. WEINBERG BEFORE THE ATOMIC INDUSTRIAL FORUM ON APRIL 19, 1956

Dr. Grigorieff, Mr. Goodwin, and guests of the Atomic Industrial Forum, it is a pleasure to welcome you to Oak Ridge and to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. This afternoon I would like to talk about a nontechnical subject—a subject on which most of you are, in a sense, better qualified to speak than I. It is the question of the challenge which nuclear energy development in this country presents to our whole American industrial system. It will be my purpose to describe the nature of this challenge and to explain why I believe we have a good chance of successfully meeting it.

Our Government and our President have decided to make of the peaceful development of nuclear energy an instrument of national policy. They consider this instrument to be as important as, and in some respects more important than, the development of nuclear weapons. This means simply that we in this country have elected to use the development of nuclear energy as a means of furthering the aims of the United States throughout the world; in particular, we have decided to use this development as a means of maintaining our influence in the uncommitted countries—as a means of "gaining friends and influencing people." All of us involved in the effort are enormously inspired by the fact that not only our military efforts, but also our peaceful efforts, are potentially directed toward such lofty ends. But it is clear that we face certain difficulties in achieving this end because of the way we do business. It is a discussion of these difficulties that will be my concern this afternoon.

Make no mistake about it, the United States Government and our President are in complete earnestness in their plan to use nuclear energy as an instrument of national policy to further the American cause throughout the world. But also make no mistake, gentlemen, about the fact that both the British and the Russians are using the same approach to the same end. The British have in the last year or so announced that they are proceeding with a full-scale program of nuclear energy development and that they will build during the next 8 years 8 full-scale gas-cooled power producing reactors. This program is actually in progress; it is not a plan for the future. We can well live with what our good British friends propose to do; if by such a program the British succeed in cornering a piece of the foreign market this is not of too much concern to us. But at the recent Communist Party Conference in Moscow it was announced that the Russians propose to build during the next 5 years 10 full-scale nuclear power reactors with a total capacity of 2,000,000–2,500,000 kilowatts, each of a different type, each to be built before small-scale development has been completed, the total enterprise to cost approximately $1 billion. Following this distressing announcement in Moscow, some of our American representatives had occasion to speak with Professor Emeleanov, one of the most highly placed scientists in the Russian atomic energy effort, who gave considerable detail on the building of these 10 full-scale nuclear power producers. And what shall we do if the Soviet Union, not the United Kingdom or the United States, corners the foreign reactor market?

It is inevitable that we compare the American effort in this field of full-scale power producing reactors with the efforts proposed by the British and by the Russians. Here we see the profound dilemma which we face and the challenge we must meet. In the United States our Government has elected, for the first time perhaps, to leave primarily to private industry the forging of an important instrument of national policy. There are now proposals for 4 or 5 full-scale power reactors sponsored and financed largely by private industry. Yet our full-scale reactor program falls short of the challenge that is thrown to us by our foreign competitors—both friendly and not so friendly—the British with the billion dollar program and the Russians with their billion dollar program.

Why is it that in this country our large-scale power demonstration program cannot be launched on the same scale as the demonstration program of our competitors? The reasons are really not hard to find: they center primarily around the fact that at the moment the economic incentives to go into large-scale power reactor development are not sufficiently apparent to make such development a really good short-term bet. And the bald fact of the matter is that in countries such as Britain which require nuclear energy at any price for survival, there is no choice but to go ahead with full-scale nuclear power development; and in the case of Russia the question of whether or not full-scale power development has any economic incentive is irrelevant. If the Russians can by such development gain more friends than we, they will ignore cost and go ahead as they are now doing.

It does no good for us to ignore this challenge by saying that in some mysterious way we shall beat the other fellow; we must face the hard fact that unless we recognize the challenge we shall fail to win the race. The problem then is how can we, even though short-term nuclear energy is not an attractive economic proposition, nevertheless attract sufficient private capital to make of nuclear energy development an adequate instrument of national policy? I wish I had a simple and clear-cut answer to this all-important question; I do not have a complete answer but I have a few suggestions.

In the first place, while nuclear energy at the moment is not a clear-cut economic proposition, there is little doubt in the minds of any of us who have devoted large shares of our lives to this development that in no more than a couple of decades nuclear energy will certainly be competitive in large

areas of the United States. And there is little doubt that the returns—when they start coming in rather than going out—will accrue in large measure to those who see this possibility and are willing to do some gambling on the basis of it. The second point is that in spite of the fact that this country has not embarked on as large a program of full-scale power reactor development as either the British or the Russians, the United States has nevertheless pioneered, and continues to lead the world in the development of types of nuclear power reactors which are so highly improved and advanced that when they are successful they will make nuclear energy a bona fide economical, technology—a technology which makes economic sense even in the low-fuel cost United States.

For example, at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory we are now making a concerted effort to reduce to practice certain reactor types which have this real possibility of making nuclear energy a cheap and convenient way, rather than an expensive and difficult way, of producing electricity. I refer in particular to the development of the so-called homogeneous reactors, in which the nuclear fuel is in the liquid state. One of the major difficulties in making nuclear energy economical in this country stems from the fact that coal is cheap and the price of nuclear energy must therefore be low to be economically competitive. In most of the reactor concepts worked out to date the fuel is in the form of precision-machined fuel elements which, after a few percent of the fuel is burned, must be dissolved, the uranium recovered from the dissolution operation, and then refabricated. This is an expensive procedure. The homogeneous method we are developing at ORNL is one way of circumventing this expensive refabrication step, although it would be an exaggeration to say that we have reduced this method to a completely reliable process. Yet, short of having such advanced methods available, it will be very difficult to promote the large-scale building of nuclear power plants in this country if the immediate incentive is to be strictly economic.

There are however other possibilities that have not been sufficiently explored by the private industrial segment of the nuclear energy business. Our difficulty as I say, is that we are overly concerned with the economic return. Of course the United States is almost unique in this respect; almost every other country in the world pays much more for energy than we, and so it is relatively easy to make nuclear energy economical almost anywhere except in the United States. For example, I had a visit recently by Prof. J. Costa Ribeiro, scientific head of the Brazilian atomic-energy project, who pointed out that around Sao Paulo there is a large demand for power in 100 mw blocks; it is economical there to pay as much as 15 mils per kilowatt hour. Brazil is only one example. We have had numerous visitors from Japan who stated that at many places in their country power in 100 mw blocks is needed at a cost of 15 to 20 mils per kilowatt hours. It seems to me that our American groups are missing a good bet in not playing the foreign possibilities more heavily than at present.

As I said, we have in this country 4 or 5 firm proposals for large-scale power demonstration reactors. In order really to meet the foreign competition—and I refer to foreign competition with respect to using nuclear energy as an instrument of national policy—I believe that a country as large and strong and vigorous as ours should have several more large-scale propositions actually underway. It is unlikely that we shall find in this country economic incentive to justify, say 10 more full-scale power reactors until the more advanced technologies like the homogeneous or fast breeder are developed. Yet I believe that we can find foreign markets for perhaps 10 full-scale power reactors where we cannot find domestic markets for them. Such foreign ventures might be supported by American capital in much the same way as American capital has been used in exploiting the oilfields in the Middle East. Such a pattern could certainly be worked out if there is a sufficient desire to do so and if we pursue the job in a sufficiently vigorous manner.

There is one other problem which strikes me as being important—namely, that in this country where we necessarily have pursued nuclear power development largely on a private basis, we often find that groups spring up which are not quite large enough, or which lack adequate financial backing, to pursue the larger scale development at the level which is necessary to insure success in such an expensive undertaking as reactor development. The power demonstration program, of course, has at least two large-scale coalitions—the NPG, which consists of Middle West and Eastern utilities, and the Atomic Power Development Associates, headed by Walker L. Cisler, AIF president, which consists of some 20 utilities and equipment manufacturers. However, one also sees in the industrial atomic scene a large number of other groups that have sprung up, many of which are below the critical size required to pursue nuclear energy development successfully. I would therefore suggest to you that the pattern of establishing coalitions to pursue nuclear energy development is one that ought to expand, and that might prove to be the most practical device whereby American industry can push the development.

I believe the challenge which is presented to us by foreign competitors is one which we shall in the end succeed in meeting. I should stress that the only two places where electricity has been produced from nuclear energy are the United States and Russia, and there is a strong indication that the United States is far in the lead in the actual production of nuclear energy. It is no longer a military secret that the nuclear submarine, *Nautilus*, is a successful device. Yet because it is a military powerplant, we tend to overlook the fact that it represents a great technical achievement on the road toward civilian nuclear power.

It is tremendously important for us to maintain our lead, and it is up to us to examine the problems which might stand in our way in continuing to maintain the lead. In final analysis I am extremely optimistic about our being able to do this—optimistic not only because we have gained the lead, despite what some impatient editorials have occasionally stated, but optimistic because it has always been characteristic of our American system—unburdened by doctrinaire habits—to regroup when we see problems which must be solved. In this matter of pursuing nuclear energy as an instrument of national policy—if in spite of everything we do not get enough reactors built—we might revert, for example, to the contractor system which was developed during the war for an essentially similar purpose—to forge instruments of national policy (in that case military weapons) taking full advantage of our American industrial potential. This is only one possibility—others I know will arise and, given the advantage of the inherent elasticity in the American way of doing things; we will work out the means for maintaining our lead in the civilian nuclear energy venture.

The Rule of H. R. 4090 Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I use this means of calling Members' attention to the impending consideration by the House of H. R. 4090, to require an automatic radio alarm device on United States cargo vessels of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than 2 radio operators.

I opposed granting a rule to H. R. 4090 in the Rules Committee, and hope the rule will be defeated when it comes up for consideration in the House. I am informed this will be early next week.

In summary, the objections of the shipping industry are as follows:

First. As stated by the Coast Guard, Federal Communications Commission Department of Commerce and Defense Department in testimony on a similar bill (H. R. 6004) in the 83d Congress in 1954, the present mandatory internationally accepted auto-alarm device is more than adequate from the safety standpoint to receive distress calls and cyclone warnings on off-watch hours.

Second. The expense of hiring two more radio operators on cargo vessels, which as a practical matter is what would result if this bill is enacted into law, on the average per ship will amount to $12,000 per year straight-time pay and $2,500 for welfare per year, plus $3,500 overtime pay. A radio room on a ship now costs about $8,500 per year. By the terms of this bill, the cost will be $26,500 approximately. It is this sort of featherbedding that drives operators to transfer their cargo ships to foreign registry, where they employ low-wage foreign crews. My interest in this subject is in preserving an American merchant marine.

Third. This automatic radio call selector device duplicates existing equipment; it bypasses international safety and communications conventions; it bypasses section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934 which specifically provides a method of approval of equipment in the field of marine radio.

In the presentation to the Rules Committee last week the impression was gained that these devices had come into use since hearings on the bill in March, May, and June 1955. This misapprehension was due to two apparently conflicting statements: the statement that only 1 prototype device had been built, and the statement to the effect that 8 units were in use by the Moore-McCormack Steamship Co. The explanation is that a similar two-signal model was installed by Moore-McCormack in 1947 for convenience and commercial functions, not safety, but was found mechanically defective and the report of the hearings

shows this company's unfavorable testimony.

A more complicated five-signal device is called for by this legislation. But the prototype model of it has never been tried out under operational conditions—as far as I know.

The argument in the Rules Committee by the sponsor of this bill in support of a rule was that the shipping industry has always opposed safety measures and means of increasing safety at sea.

On the other hand in testifying before the Commerce Committee on H. R. 4090 the industry stated without challenge that the shipping industry is safety conscious. It pointed out with pride that it incorporates millions of dollars in safety features into American vessels. It stated with pride that is spends millions of dollars in operational measures and devices to increase safety of life at sea. As a matter of fact, as the hearings state, new technical specifications for the auto-alarm presently used internationally were supported by the shipping industry at the Safety of Life at Sea Conference in London in 1948.

Improved auto-alarm devices to overcome atmospheric and interfering signals are now undergoing tests by the Federal Communications Commission as the hearings show. But such features are not incorporated in the proposed call selector device which would become mandatory under H. R. 4090.

As to the criticism that the industry has always opposed safety I think the voluntary installations of direction-finding equipment 20 to 25 years in advance of compulsion contradict such a statement. Radar, depth sounders, loran, gyrocompasses and gyropilots and similar devices installed but not required by law, indicate the irresponsible nature of such undocumented arguments. Steamship interests supported a program for merchant ships today to have internationally improved lifeboat radio equipment. And besides, if there were a basis of truth for the charge, the argument is hardly germane to the merits or lack of them with respect to H. R. 4090.

A Commerce Committee member before the Rules Committee referred as a similar case to airline opposition to imposition of a new air safety system. I submit that testimony regarding safety devices in the field of aeronautical control is completely irrelevant. The charge is often made that scientific testing such as is conducted by the Federal Communications Commission is slow. If I had patents and was hopefully awaiting approval I would feel that way. But if the safety of my family and friends, and myself, was at stake I would want thorough testing under all conditions. The patented device under H. R. 4090 has never had such a test. What is the hurry? This is being a bit overanxious to hand a signed order in blank to the patent owner, saying if you can make this device work here is an order forcing more than 1,000 American ships to install a $2,500 or $3,000 piece of equipment, and this without finding out if the present internationally accepted system can be adapted to the same purpose.

This measure has the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau; and the House may be misled into giving its blessing to the wrong object. This is special legislation. It is dangerous to allow the high and highly emotional motive of safety-at-sea to be considered hastily with only one hour of debate.

I urge when the rule on H. R. 4090 is debated on the floor of the House that it be defeated so the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can restudy the measure in the light of the evidence.

No Right To Criticize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial from the St. Louis Labor Tribune entitled "No Right to Criticize" which I thought was excellent and a matter for all citizens to ponder:

NO RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat runs a daily column captioned "The Inquiring Photographer." The reporter accosts a number of people, usually six, in some specific area and quizzes them on a current topic.

Recently, the question asked was: "Would you want your child to enter politics?" Not 1 of the 6 men and women queried said they would want their youngsters to enter politics. The concensus of their opinions was that politics is degrading and that its remunerations are not worth the efforts and sacrifices.

We sincerely hope that this unanimity does not reflect a truly majority opinion and that people generally do not have so deprecating and unjustified opinion of politics and politicians as they function in this country.

If politics is supposed to be a dirty business and if only those seeking personal gain have the kidney to make it a career, then the so-called nice, respectable, morally prophilactic people who are completely immersed in getting ahead, the people who pay the bills and take the consequence of bad, incompetent government, have no justification whatever to complain about the way the Government is run, simply because they have defaulted their moral right to a voice in that determination.

In the early days of our Republic, outstanding men in the community and State eagerly sought public offices and considered it an honor and a privilege to be a servant of the people. And in many cases they performed their public duties at a great personal sacrifice.

Politics is and should be an honorable profession—with proper compensation paid to those who enter it. The cream of our young people should be encouraged to enter politics, and should be paid wages comparable to that paid in private industry for similar responsibilities. There never was a time in the annals of our country when there was a greater need of men and women of courage, ability and honor to serve in public office.

Bad government is a sound indictment of the so-called good people of the community who lack the guts, intelligence, discernment and self-respect to get out and fight for the kind of government they are entitled to and pay for.

Cinco de Mayo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 the Mexican people celebrate a day memorable in the annals of Mexican history. That day is the anniversary of the Battle of Puebla, in which the heroic defenders of Mexican freedom repulsed the proud, battle-hardened troops of Napoleon III who had invaded their soil. I think it is fitting that we in the United States also pay homage to the defenders of Puebla, for in a very real sense those brave Mexican troops struck a blow for freedom for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mexico, after independence from Spain had been achieved, suffered a long period of intermittent warfare in the struggle to create a government. In 1857 the liberal forces at last established a democratic constitution. Benito Juarez, an Indian of humble origin but of great intelligence and honor, was elected president of the Mexican people in 1861. The aristocratic and conservative elements, however, fearing for the loss of their privileges, continued to give battle. They even intrigued with Europeans to put an end to the democratic, republican government of the young nation.

England, Spain, and France, vexed by the unpaid claims upon Mexico of their citizens, agreed to send a joint squadron to Mexico to force payment. The allied nations landed troops in the coastal cities. President Juarez promised to meet Mexico's obligations as soon as the weakened country was on the road to recovery. The President's promise satisfied Spain and England, who promptly withdrew their troops. But the French remained, and the ambitions of Napoleon III to set up a French colony in the Americas soon became apparent. Napoleon had visions of a vast French Empire, stretching from the border of the United States, down through the Isthmus of Panama, where the French had plans to build a canal, and even to the southernmost tip of Tierra del Fuego. The moment was opportune to get a foothold. Mexico was weak and tired; French troops were already on Mexican soil; some powerful members of Mexican society supported the French designs; and the United States was too occupied with its own bloody civil war to keep check on French maneuvers. Napoleon ordered his troops to seize Mexico City, the capital.

On May 4, 1862, the French division of some 6,000 encamped on the out-

skirts of Puebla. The following day, an inferior force of raw recruits, badly equipped except for their grim determination and patriotism, clashed with the well-organized, well-disciplined troops of the French emperor. The Mexican victory in Puebla on that memorable May 5 was the event that gave the nation courage to continue resisting the invaders.

Napoleon sent reinforcements from France and finally forced Emperor Maximillian of Austria upon the Mexican people. But the battle of Puebla had given the Mexicans courage and confidence in themselves. The victory at Puebla had taught them that the mighty French were not invincible.

It was not until 1867 that Juarez returned to his rightful position of leadership in the Mexican capital. Many battles were fought before the French troops and puppet emperor were routed. But none holds the place in Mexican hearts of the first encounter, when Mexican men stood up to the might of Europe and in doing so served notice that the young American republics were no longer prey for the imperialist nations of the Old World.

Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement of the Credit Union National Association prepared by H. B. Yates, managing director of the association, which gives an interesting and helpful review of credit union purposes and philosophy, and the reasons the credit union movement opposes a type of share-deposit insurance for credit unions:

CREDIT UNION
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Madison, Wis., May 2, 1956.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: The President, in his economic report to Congress, dated January 24, 1956, suggested that Congress should consider the desirability of establishing a self-supporting Federal program of share-account insurance for credit unions. A copy of the paragraph relating to this subject, which appears on page 95 of the printed copy of the President's economic report, is enclosed.

We believe a Federal program of share-account insurance for credit unions would be most undesirable. We believe it would be most undesirable not only from the point of view of the credit union movement, but from the point of view of other business enterprises and the American people as a whole. We believe such a program is contrary to the basic concept of good government because by such an act the Government would be insuring shareholdings in a private corporation. Credit unions are membership organizations. The members use their own funds and do not do business with the public. There is no more reason why the Federal Government should insure the shareholdings of a credit union than they should insure the shareholdings of a bank or any other stock corporation.

Since banks enjoy the privilege of creating money it is essential that the Federal Government have supervisory control over the banking business. The United States is the only country in the world that has insured bank deposits. The reason for this being that after failing to gain control of the banking business by passing the National Banking Act in 1863 and the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, it was only when the people refused to use the banks in the spring of 1933 that the Federal Government was able to gain supervisory control over the State banks by passing the Federal Deposit Insurance Law.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions made a study of the losses of Federal credit unions from June 1933 to December 31, 1952. This study proved that 81.4 percent of all losses were due to embezzlement and 18.6 percent was due to poor operations. To take care of embezzlements, the Credit Union National Association introduced a special type of surety bond for credit unions which provides for 100-percent coverage against losses up to a million dollars. More than half of the credit unions have already accepted this bond program and the remainder are accepting it at the rate of more than 200 a month. This bond is available to all credit unions and we believe that within 2 years more than 95 percent of all credit unions will be using this program. Credit unions are already closely supervised by Government, are examined regularly and by law are required to set aside adequate reserves to insure against losses.

The credit unions of the United States do not desire or need insurance for credit union share accounts as we have the following safeguards:

1. A credit union is organized among a group that has a common bond; they are sometimes all acquainted with each other. It is a membership organization dealing with people that the credit union manager is acquainted with and not with the general public.

2. Many credit union loans are character loans that a bank or other organizations dealing with the general public could not make.

3. The board of directors, elected by the members, meets monthly for reports on business.

4. The credit committee passes on the loans.

5. The supervisory committee audits the treasurer's books quarterly, many large credit unions have CPA examinations annually.

6. The annual membership meeting gives the members reports on the year's business and also gives the members opportunity to replace members on the board of directors and committees.

7. The reserve or guaranty fund sets aside one-fifth or 20 percent of the net earnings to take care of losses—surely this is enough to spend for poor management.

8. Under the new 100-percent bond program, all losses from embezzlement should be covered.

9. Additional protection for loans is provided by loan insurance, which 80 percent of the credit unions carry as protection against death and total disability.

10. Credit unions under law are limited in their investments.

11. An annual supervisory examination once a year is a further safeguard against losses.

An insurance fund administered by the Federal Government would necessarily require concern for the safety of the fund and rigid rules and regulations, which would automatically stymie the operations of the credit union. Credit unions are organized to serve the people not to amass such great sums of money that it becomes necessary for the Federal Government to watch it. We believe this share insurance program would actually deprive credit unions of the incentive for responsible and resourceful action to solve their own problems. Credit unions are doing too much good and have too clean a record to be saddled with any guaranteed insurance program.

We do hope, therefore, that you will strongly oppose any effort to enact in the United States Congress any legislation setting up share insurance for credit unions. We shall be glad to discuss this with you at any time and to give you any additional information you may require.

Very truly yours,

H. B. YATES,
Managing Director.

EXCERPT FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ECONOMIC REPORT TO CONGRESS, JANUARY 1956

The introduction in 1934 of insurance for bank deposits and for share accounts in savings and loan associations has greatly strengthened the capacity of our economy to resist possible cumulative effects of any recessionary development. The extension of insurance to the share accounts of credit unions would be a useful step in the same direction. These cooperative institutions have been growing rapidly. By mid-1955 over 7.5 million people had about 2.5 billion dollars invested in credit union shares. The loss of any appreciable part of these savings would work severe hardships on individuals of limited means. As suggested in last year's Economic Report, the Congress should consider the desirability of establishing a self-supporting Federal program of share-account insurance for credit unions. If such a system were established, it would be essential to maintain the proper safeguards, limitations, and supervision that go with an insurance system.

Dynamic Incentive Competition Is Responsible for Our High Standard of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt about the fact that the living standards of the people in the United States are the result of a dynamic free economy sparked by the incentive of competition. The Congress of the United States must make sure that incentive competition is not throttled by big business cartels or, as we know them, monopolies.

Mr. Graham Patterson, publisher of the Town Journal, has an interesting editorial on the incentive of competition which I am inserting as part of my remarks. The editorial appeared in the May 1956 issue of Town Journal:

THE INCENTIVE OF COMPETITION

Among the reasons for America's growth and prosperity and its high standard of living is the freedom of our business organizations to compete for the favor of the public. This competition is the lifeblood of our economic strength, for it serves as a constant spur to better products, better service and

lower prices, with resulting benefits to the people.

There are certain fields of industry, however, where competition is controlled by legal restrictions. One of these is the shipment of goods by various means of transport. Many years ago, when competition in this field was largely limited to that among railroads, it became so intense that Government regulation was necessary to prevent unfair competitive practices, and the act to regulate commerce was passed in 1887.

Since then, however, conditions have changed radically. Billions of dollars have been spent on building and improving waterways, and more billions have been spent on improved highways. Today the shipper of goods can choose between railroads, motortrucks, and waterways. Each has natural capabilities and advantages in service, or cost, or both, but Government regulation often prevents the public from gaining the benefit of these advantages. If the railroads, for instance, propose to reduce freight rates on certain products in regions where their natural advantages permit them to operate at lower costs than other modes of transport, permission to do so has often been refused because the reduced rates would be lower than other modes of transport offered. Such action has more of the aspects of allocation of business than regulation.

It is not the prerogative of any Government agency to decide how much or how little business any industry or firm may do. That is something that should be decided by the public, whose decision would be based, of course, upon the quality and price of the product or service offered.

The function of Government is to see that there is a competition, full and free, not to see that there isn't. The Government's responsibility is to prevent unfair practices and keep services vital to the public interest in existence, but its responsibility should end there. If fair competition for the public's favor is permitted to work, prices invariably take care of themselves. And the quality of services and products does likewise.

Unfortunately for the public as well as for business, Government with its regulations—too often unrealistic—seems to be usurping power it does not and should not have, to the point where it can control prices, instead of permitting normal and natural competition to exert its beneficial force.

The horse and buggy and the horse-drawn wagon gave way inevitably to the automobile and motortruck, because they provided the people something better. All through the history of our Nation are countless examples of products and services being supplanted by others that offered better service or lower price. Our country was built on competition, not on Government regulation. With greater freedom in competition among the different types of transportation, the same as in any other field of business, with each user free to choose that which best meets his needs, the real gainer in the end would be the consuming public.

A Letter From the President to Hon. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we Congressmen are apt to be the recipients of a good deal of criticism, slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, some of it unjust. So it is pleasant for us all, regardless of party, when one of our number receives an approving word from his or her leader.

Our friend and colleague, FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., has received the following letter from the President, which we all know is well merited, but nonetheless welcome. The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 28, 1956.

The Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRITZ: I should feel remiss if I failed to express to you my appreciation of your cooperation in the Congress in connection with a number of matters of vital importance to our country which have come before the Committee on Appropriations. I am aware that on several occasions your efforts have contributed a great deal to the success of key programs, and for this I am personally grateful. I look forward to the continuance of your effective public service in the years to come.

With kind regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Value Your Skin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of Congress to an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Friday, May 11, 1956, entitled "Value Your Skin." The editorial writers of the Cleveland Plain Dealer express their concern over the status of America's airpower as follows:

VALUE YOUR SKIN

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson lumps those who express concern over the status of America's airpower as fear mongers.

Include us in, then, and gladly so.

We see nothing whatsoever wrong with expressing honest doubt over our aerial readiness.

It is a known and admitted fact, and this Wilson has not denied, that, Russia not only has more intercontinental bombers like our B–52 than we but also in turning them out faster.

Now Wilson tells the public B–52 production will go up to 20 per month. Present output is six. He does not say when that rate will be obtained. Next month? Next year? No. There's very little chance it can be accomplished before early 1958 at best.

At that point, says Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Strategic Air Command's chief, the Soviets could have far outstripped us. There's no reason to think they won't try it, either, based on the consistent way they have surmounted the problem of aircraft production lead time.

Wilson's rosy reassurances do not bear total disparagment. He properly calls attention to our very large fleet of B–17 medium jets, a force ranging between 1,500 and 1,800 planes. Bolstered by aerial refueling, the 47s could conceivably retaliate against Russia without need for landing at bases overseas. This, though, is as speculative as the status of Red missiles calculated to knock out airfields abroad. The tankers have to operate from those strips.

All Americans, if they value their skins, must continue to insist that we have an air force second to none. It's not enough to be content with one that's merely the equal of a potential enemy. We are grateful to Senator STUART SYMINGTON for forcing this issue, for it goes beyond the trappings of an election-year debate.

Genius at Work in White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "no politics at all is the best politics." There is another one that says "There is no recommendation like a job well done." Wrap these two up together and the result would probably hit the occupant of the White House square on the nose. Stewart Alsop has developed this theme in the attached article, Genius at Work in White House. Due to the fact that Mr. Alsop is usually on the side opposite the present administration, this is indeed a compliment to the President.

This article is from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 13, 1956:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)

GENIUS AT WORK IN WHITE HOUSE

"Who's the new genius in the White House?"

The question was asked rather sourly by a leading Democrat when he heard of the President's appointment of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, as his personal ambassador to NATO. The question was a tribute to the move as a political masterstroke.

The appointment will be popular everywhere, but especially in the South, as a generous gesture to an admired elder statesman.

But that is not the only plus for the administration. The GEORGE appointment blunts Democratic charges that the administration has abandoned bipartisanship. As the President's personal envoy, the revered GEORGE will also serve as a lightning rod to divert Democratic criticism of the administration foreign policy.

Moreover, as the question quoted above suggests, the GEORGE appointment is only the latest in a series of surefooted and brilliantly timed White House moves which have kept the Democrats off balance and at a loss for winning issues. Leaving the merits of the issues to one side, consider the political aspects of the President's two major vetoes in this session of Congress.

It is no secret that a Presidential veto of the farm bill was precisely what very large numbers of Democrats thirsted for, to provide them with a winning issue. Indeed, some provisions of the farm bill were carefully framed to force a veto. But, especially since the President scored so high in the Indiana primaries, the Democrats are beginning to wonder whether the veto will prove quite the bonanza they had counted on.

The President's fireside chat on the veto was effective. Much of the political curse was removed from the veto, moreover, when the Administration, quietly abandoning the

policy of flexible supports, raised the supports on the most politically sensitive crops to within a few points of 90 percent. Then the administration proposed prepayments to farmers under the soil-bank plan (which would have been denounced as fiscal madness if the Democrats had proposed it).

This was the unkindest cut of all—it put the Democrats in the horrid position of refusing money to the beleaguered farmers in an election year.

From a straight political viewpoint, the gas-bill veto was unquestionably a brilliant move. It put the administration morally on the side of the angels and blunted the "give-away" issue. At the same time, the powerful gas and oil interests were put on notice that they would get what they wanted eventually—but only if the Republicans remained in control of the White House.

Or take the administration's fiscal policy. The budget submitted to Congress by the President early this year forecast a very close balance based on exceedingly conservative estimates of revenue. A fat little surplus now appears in prospect.

Budget experts have reported to the Democratic leadership that the administrative surplus should be around $2 billion, the cash surplus around $4 billion. The more the Democratic leaders debate what to do about the surplus, the more aware they become that they are in a box.

If they propose a tax cut, they will split their own party on the issue, and be accused of fiscal irresponsibility and trying to buy the election. If they do nothing, they will permit the administration to take credit for a tax cut, or for reducing taxes, or a little of both. The Democrats darkly suspect that their box was carefully prepared in advance by administration strategists.

Whether or not this suspicion is justified, there is no doubt that the White House has shown a real genius during this session in keeping the Democrats on the defensive and aborting Democratic issues. The achievement is all the more impressive, moreover, if one recalls the stumbling amateurishness which so often showed itself in the first Eisenhower years. Who, then, is the new genius in the White House?

Some identify the genius as White House Chief of Staff Sherman Adams, or Press Secretary James Hagerty, or Attorney General Herbert Brownell, or somebody else. Others espouse the theory that Thomas E. Dewey is the real mastermind of the administration. But another theory is rapidly gaining ground among both Democrats and Republicans on Capitol Hill. This is that the new political genius in the White House is none other than Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Two or three years ago, the President was obviously unsure of himself in the unfamiliar field of politics. But as the years have passed, his sureness of touch has visibly grown. And perhaps his greatest achievement as a politician has been to continue to seem wholly above politics, which remains his greatest political asset.

Location of Credit Unions in the Governmental Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement prepared by Mr. H. B. Yates, managing director of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., which gives some interesting information about this fine association.

STATEMENT OF THE CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION CONCERNING THE LOCATION OF THE BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS IN THE GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

It is our understanding that some thought is being given to the transfer of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to an agency more directly concerned with fiscal administration and supervision.

We are sorry to hear this because we have felt that the present location of the Bureau was a specially happy arrangement and because any suggestion that the Bureau might be more appropriately placed in a more fiscally oriented agency indicates a disturbing lack of realization of the basic nature and purpose of credit unions.

When the Bureau was established in the Social Security Administration in 1948 the late Thomas W. Doig, who was then our managing director, said, "This act places supervision of Federal credit unions in the Federal Security Agency, which deals with the humanities. This we believe to be entirely fitting." We still so believe.

Throughout our credit union history and increasingly as the movement grows in size we have been and are faced with the danger that credit unions will be supervised and regulated as fiscal businesses doing business with the public. If they are to perform their unique and urgently needed social function, credit unions must rather be recognized and supervised as special cooperative agencies through which people may pool their own small resources. They do this to help each other obtain a source of low-cost credit and provide each other in good times and bad a greater measure of financial strength and a sure and understanding source of financial assistance.

People must have this dependable assistance and this increased strength if they are to meet self-reliantly their financial emergencies and if they are to get from their incomes the full benefits offered them by the industrial wealth they help create and which depends upon their buying power.

This need was clearly seen in 1934 by the makers of the Federal Credit Union Act which provided for the federally chartered credit unions "to promote thrift among their members and create (for their members) a source of credit for provident and productive purposes."

If anything the need is greater now, for with the expanding economy it becomes increasingly difficult for people generally to enlist and engage their resources, which includes their credit, to take full and wise advantage of and give full support to the productivity of our economy. On the one hand they are pressed with a wealth of goods and the encouragement to buy them on time with regular payments and carrying charges which are often but not always excessive but which always should be but often are not related to their whole financial circumstances. On the other hand the cost of professional services and of other emergency needs increases with the modern development of professional and physical resources.

The fact is that normal commercial financial agencies and installment dealers do not serve to provide the great mass of people consumer credit designed to be as it should be a part of a thrift program; that is designed to help people spend their financial resources, which includes their credit, in a manner that is truly wise and economical. Certainly the installment dealers do not. Personal loan departments of banks and loan companies do so only to a degree and only for a select part of those who come to them.

Probably no commercial agency could serve such a broad cross section of people credit unions can. Such agencies are understandably directed so as to obtain the maximum amount of loan business from relatively select risks. They naturally therefore tend to unbalance the economy by helping many people to overspend their credit while they fail to help many more use the credit that is innately theirs to spend and which our economy cannot afford to disregard.

On the other hand credit unions through a cooperative approach and using cooperative techniques do make it possible for almost all people no matter how small their incomes or their training to increase their buying power—often by a sort of Operation Bootstraps. Credit union history is full of dramatic examples involving settlement people in New York; factory workers over the continent; fishermen in Nova Scotia, Jamaica, the Fiji Islands; share croppers; residents of an all-Negro community; people everywhere of all sorts and of all abilities.

Under the present economic system, the principle sources of credit for people of small means are credit unions, sales finance companies, and loan companies. In the regulated States loan companies are usually allowed to charge 36 percent interest. In the unregulated States, mostly in the South and West, the unregulated loan companies charge interest rates sometimes running more than 100 percent. People of small means who are suddenly plunged into debt by misfortune, who do not have credit at reasonable rates of interest, sometimes remain in debt for the rest of their lives.

Most everyone in the middle and low-income groups are forced to borrow money at some time in their lives. A bank simply will not make a loan to a person in the low-income group without security but such a loan will be made by a credit union and a loan company. The difference in the credit union and loan company loan is that the credit union is interested in getting the member out of debt, while the loan company, being interested in profit primarily wants to keep him in debt. This is easily accomplished as the loan company will find out how much the person earns, how much it takes to live and then set the payments up to take up the balance of the earnings. One of the causes of poverty today is the loan shark evil that is allowed to exist in so many of our States. "Help people to help themselves," is a slogan used by credit unions. The credit union helps to permanently solve the problem of the unequal distribution of wealth by enabling man to help himself and permanently improve his condition. When man is able to help himself, character is strengthened and improvement is permanent. When man is aided by gifts and subsidies, character is weakened, self-respect is lost and no problem is solved, since relief is only temporary and aid must be continued.

The fact that some credit unions have thousands of members and $1 million and more in assets testifies to the great potential need for credit unions. But it is more notable that the median credit union has around 500 members with less than $100,000 in assets, which means that half of all credit unions are smaller than that.

The point here is that credit unions render a service urgently needed and that they can do so because their orientation is toward people and their problems, not toward the business of making money from money. Their history has been an increasing demonstration that the people can manage their own financial affairs and provide themselves low-cost credit they cannot otherwise get, which is helpful not only to the individual but to the community.

Credit unions have been able to do this, because they have challenged many of the normal business concepts of consumer credit and consumer-credit management. It is notable, too, that they have done this without creating any inflationary new credit money. While some credit unions do borrow money

from banks to meet the loan needs of their members, the movement as a whole has accumulated more funds than its members have outstanding in loans. This, of course, provides a great potential of credit available for time of special need or special opportunity. Actually credit unions provide their members the service of a great revolving fund. On the average credit-union loans are repaid or refinanced about every 260 days.

To be also stressed is the fact that this liberal, across-the-board service has been given with the best of records for safety of funds and returns to the members on their savings (share deposits). We can explain this by the observation that the typical person is honest, is responsible for his obligations to his fellow beings, has good sense, and appreciates and profits by the mutual concern for common problems credit unions provide their members.

An official recognition of these qualities is found in the series of amendments Congress has made in the Federal Credit Union Act which raised the permitted limit on unsecured loans granted members from $50 to $400. The continuing good record of Federal credit unions has confirmed the wisdom of Congress in these actions.

The real problems we credit union people face have much more to do with the human factors with which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare deal than they have to do with tangible assets and the business of finance. Actually, our movement's big concern within itself is to inspire the directors and credit committees of its member credit unions to be as liberal as they should be.

As we grow in united and collective experience we more and more make our individual credit unions agencies of maximum service. We develop the facilities and the ability to help our members face up to their whole financial picture realistically, constructively, and at a minimum cost. We develop understanding of human strengths and weaknesses. By very personal concern and friendly consideration of personal problems, we develop the human resources which are the basis of all credit.

We find it relatively easy to train people to operate a credit union from a strictly operational point of view. Our real concern is to inspire those to assume leadership in credit unions who want to serve people and who inspire people to bring them their problems and talk them over frankly and constructively.

Just so are we most concerned that the supervision of credit unions be from the human being point of view than from the fiscal management point of view. It's the human resoruces that we really have to do with and quite frankly these resources tend to be placed in jeopardy by the restrictions that are apparently innate in normal financial management and financial supervision.

That is why the Credit Union National Association has been happy to have the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and why we would be most unhappy to have the Bureau transferred to an agency primarily concerned with money business. Such a transfer would without question serve to restrict and limit the provision of credit union service in any true sense of the term. For credit unions are not primarily designed to make money from money. They are designed to help people help themselves.

Since the Social Security Administration has to do with the general economic security it seems that the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions should logically be under the Social Security Administration, as Federal credit unions serve as an agency to prevent individuals from becoming dependents. As you know, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is self-supporting and requires no congressional appropriation.

The "Disunification" Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, New York's secretary of state, which was delivered at the annual dinner of the Kings County Democratic Committee, held at the St. George Hotel in Brooklyn, N. Y., on May 10, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, Governor Harriman, Mrs. Shackey, Joe Shackey, Democratic leaders, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a very great pleasure for me to make the brief trip across the East River to visit with my friends and fellow Democrats here in Brooklyn and to reaffirm my personal faith in the strength and vitality of the largest Democratic county organization in America.

The bond of friendship and common purpose which exists today between the Democrats of Kings County, and the Democrats of New York County, reflects not only our traditional relationship as good neighbors but, in a much larger sense, it is typical of the spirit of unity which has developed over the years as one of the strongest and most unique features of our national Democratic organization.

In recent months, the Republican Party leaders have sought to convince themselves and their adherents that all is not well among Democrats in various parts of our country, that so-called regional factions within our party operate at cross-purposes and quarrel with each other to the advantage of Republicanism.

In short, the Republican spokesmen, for once, have remained true to their own tradition, to the historical and hysterical creed which requires all loyal members of the GOP to base their political conclusions upon fancy rather than facts, upon conjecture rather than upon coherent analysis, upon temper rather than upon truth, upon wishful thinking rather than upon well-founded thought.

Earlier this week, our fellow Democrats in the State of Texas—those maliciously slandered Americans whom the Republican dream-merchants envisioned clambering aboard a great GOP Trojan elephant—proved once again that our party's supporters cannot—and will not—be hoodwinked by the desperate devices which the Republicans fondly and foolishly hope may promote Democratic disunity.

And in piling up an unprecedented landslide victory for Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and indirectly for Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the people of Texas conclusively demonstrated the inherent loyalty and political awareness which is characteristic of Democrats everywhere. In so doing, they have won the applause and admiration of their fellow democrats throughout the country.

For the American people understand with perfect clarity that ours is a two-party country * * * that our national greatness, in large measure, has been founded upon the development of a political system broad enough and flexible enough to accommodate both Democrats and Republicans alike.

We know, too, that the organization of our political parties, at the grassroots level, is—and always will remain—the bedrock foundation of American politics, impervious to the trickery of the occasional mugwump.

Mugwump—the very sound of that derisive word provides the key to the attitude of all Americans—whether they happen to reside in Brooklyn, Texas or in any other part of out Nation—toward the kind of political disloyalty which it describes.

Yet, today, the President of the United States flouts the traditional American concept of the two-party system in a reckless attempt to bolster the sagging prestige of his party, pretending that Republicans, too, believe in a sound liberal political philosophy, and hoping thereby to attract the support of loyal Democrats.

It seems perfectly clear that the Republican strategy for fomenting Democratic disunity is under the direction of the same incredible bunglers who, systematically, have made a shambles of our national economy and who seek to conceal their wretched inability to think clearly or to act decisively in the interest of the American people, under cover of a monotonus, droning chant of national prosperity.

Here in New York, we have recently witnessed another—and even more callous—brand of mugwumpery, as a self-styled liberal Republican abandoned his own alleged political philosophy and publicly declared his support for RICHARD MILHAUS NIXON, a man whose possible accession to the presidency of the United States shocks and frightens the entire free world.

Unquestionably, my friends, the members of the ragged regency which rules America today possess a remarkable talent for promoting certain types of disunity. We have only to examine their record in international affairs to discover the awesome variety and extent of their skill.

Here, as always, their tactics have been designed to dazzle the people with words rather than with deeds. In this case, however, the magic word is not prosperity, but peace.

As President Eisenhower sat wreathed in smiles for the world's foremost photographers at Geneva, as he happily told the world's reporters that the Soviet leaders shared his desire for amicable international relations, his press agents chanted that he was delivering peace at the world's doorstep.

Since Geneva, this Republican gift of peace has flowered throughout the world—in the fighting in Israel, in the heightened tension in North Africa, in the unrest on Cyprus, in the gradual return of Yugoslavia to the unholy Soviet orbit, in the Khrushchev-Bulganin courtship of India.

It is a small world, indeed, when you exclude Europe, Africa and Asia, to which the Eisenhower administration has brought peace.

Peace indeed, peace and prosperity. But fortunately for the state of our national well-being, the American people do not share the President's daydream.

Today, the American farmer is not echoing the administration's chant of prosperity. The bankrupt small-business men throughout our Nation do not raise their voices in praise of Republican prosperity.

And millions of American parents need only to search their own hearts to realize—tragically—that their children are not growing up in an era of peace.

Who today is the great Republican architect of peace? I wish I knew. I wish the American people knew. My friends, I wish the administration in Washington knew.

Once we were a nation of people. Today, we seem to have become a nation of presidents. We have a president for foreign affairs, a president for national defense, a president for agriculture, a president for slogan making, a president for publicity, indeed, we have a president for everything except the Presidency.

Fortunately, the era of multiple chief executives is drawing to a close. Next November the American people will elect one man

to the highest public office in our land, one Democrat who will bring sense and form to our National Government.

And, as the John Foster Dulleses, the Charles Wilsons, the Ezra Bensons, the Richard Nixons, and the Sherman Adamses lead the great Republican exodus from Washington * * * we will become not a nation of ex-presidents but a nation of people united under the strong leadership of one president pledged to secure true national prosperity and genuine international peace.

During the coming months we Democrats—in New York, in Texas, in California, and throughout the country—will disprove the false and cynical Republican doctrine that national power depends upon the ability to promote discord among the American people.

We will prove, beyond all question of doubt, that the American people are inherently united in their desire for peace and prosperity in fact as well as in theory * * * and that the American people are determined to implement the achievement of these goals through sound and unified government.

Here in Brooklyn, under the forceful and progressive leadership of Joe Sharkey, I know, you will again demonstrate that the size of your Democratic county organization is matched by the vigor and dedication of its entire membership.

And I can tell you, in all sincerity, that across the river in Manhattan—and throughout our sister boroughs—we look forward to the inspiring task of bringing the message of our party philosophy to our neighbors and fellow citizens * * * and to placing our city in the forefront of the great national Democratic victory for which America has longed since 1952.

Thank you very much.

The Essentials of Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an essay that won first prize in the Gainesville, Tex., Kiwanis Club's citizenship essay contest. The prize-winning essay was written by Miss Beatrice Zimmerer, of the Sacred Heart School in Muenster, Tex., entitled "The Essentials of Good Citizenship," and I feel that it is a privilege to have this excellent essay included in the RECORD:

THE ESSENTIALS OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself has said:
'This is my own, my native land.' "

Probably you cheer loudly when the Stars and Stripes are raised and if called upon you would give your life for your country. But are you living your life as a good citizen?

Citizenship is not an underling's job, but a challenge to the best that is in every man. A good citizen votes, attends meetings, and serves on committees. He makes speeches and writes letters to the newspapers if he wishes. If he is qualified, he should serve in public office. In short, a citizen is public spirited and active, whereas the "parasite" is interested and active only for his own welfare.

To be responsible, a man must have knowledge. He must understand how democracy works and how it can be improved. Democracy needs every bit of his knowledge. He can prepare for citizenship by securing an education. He must keep up with current events through reading and listening all his life. A good citizen pays his share of taxes, whether on property, on income, or on goods he buys. He realizes that taxes are low costs, indeed, for the services democracy furnishes him.

Finally, a good citizen must respect the rights of other citizens. We can have freedom of action only so long as our actions do not endanger the life and property of other people. Reckless driving and reckless talking are both undemocratic, for both may be harmful to other people.

The good citizen is interested in life about him. He knows something about the political, social, economic, and religious life of the Nation of which he is a part. He participates in worthy activities and becomes identified with those forces which make the Nation. Thus, he becomes a worthy part of it.

But there is another great qualification which he should possess if he is to be a citizen of the finest type; that is, a good character which is the very foundation of good citizenship. A good character must grow from within one's self. The home, the school, and the church must all help to start its growth in the young citizen. And as the young citizen grows up, he must himself cultivate good character, so that it will continue to grow and develop. A good character is the sum total of such qualities as honesty, truthfulness, kindness, courtesy, charity, sympathy, self-control, trustworthiness, loyalty, and cleanliness. These qualities cannot be acquired in a day; nor can they be absorbed from books. They come from the development of one's spiritual nature.

Americans now make their pledge of allegiance under God. A citizen is born first into a family. He is responsible to his parents who teach him to honor and obey God as the highest authority. He obeys God's commandments. He does God's will. He honors God as his Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. Thus honoring God, he loves his neighbor as himself; thus loving his neighbor, he works for his neighbor's good as well as for his own. And so, he is a good citizen. As Polonius advises Laertes in Hamlet: "To thine own self be true, and it follows as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

So a good citizen is first, a God-fearing man; then he is a neighbor-loving man; and finally, he is a patriotic man.

H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House that officials of 635 predominantly small industrial concerns, agricultural producers, and labor unions from all over the United States, have filed with the Speaker of the House petitions protesting against passage of H. R. 5550, now pending before the House, and instead urging that the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade be brought before Congress in accordance with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution.

The industries for which these petitions were signed are located in 42 States. They have their main offices or plants in such industrial centers as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Boston, San Francisco, and Pittsburgh, and, in addition, in 183 other congressional districts—approximately 350 districts affected.

The various industrial and agricultural products represented by the petitions include:

Cotton and wool textiles, thread cordage, lace, carpets, felt, blankets, narrow fabrics, elastic fabrics, hats, gloves, hosiery, embroidered articles, wearing apparel, glue and gelatin, colors and pigments, coal, chemicals, steel, nonferrous ores and metals, aluminum wares, silverware, wood products, leather, paper, plywood, building materials, scientific instruments and glassware, surgical and medical supplies, optical goods, tools, electrical equipment, machinery, antifriction bearings, refractory materials, bicycles and motorcycles, clocks, guns and ammunition, metal closures and fasteners, miscellaneous metal products, counting devices, fishing tackle, toys, games, plastic products, buttons, glassware, chinaware and pottery, ceramics and tiles, rubber products, pencils, brushes, sugar, figs, olives, raw wool, and miscellaneous food products.

Petitions were also signed by officials of labor unions and employees of many industries including: leather, glass, pottery, knit glove, scientific apparatus, rubber, lace, woolen textile, and wall products.

The petition which these officials signed reads as follows:

PETITION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE SUBJECT OF H. R. 5550

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition and memorialize you in accordance with amendment I to the Constitution of the United States of America, to refrain from enacting H. R. 5550 and instead to bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade before the Congress of the United States in accordance with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, for the following reasons:

1. Passage of H. R. 5550 would impair the right of petition and redress guaranteed in our Constitution, since tariff policy and foreign commerce would be made subject to determination by an international agency.

2. H. R. 5550 would hinder labor and business from obtaining effective action by the Congress of the United States, as guaranteed by article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which declares: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States * * *"

3. H. R. 5550 would remove from Congress its full and effective freedom to exercise its constitutional responsibilities in these fields.

4. H. R. 5550 would remove tariff and trade policy determinations from the Federal Government and subject them to an international organization in which the people of the United States are not adequately represented and where the United States delegate

would have but 1 of the 35 votes, the same as the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Haiti, and other countries with populations less than many cities and States in this Nation.

Now, therefore, we request that this petition and memorial be formally placed before the Congress of the United States.

Nasser Aspires To Be the Napoleon of the Entire Arab and Moslem World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the article that follows plainly documents the activities of Egyptian Colonel Nasser in his attempt to imitate Napoleon and become the emperor of the entire Arab and Moslem world, and all of Africa. The article appeared in the May 4, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks:

MEMO TO AMERICANS: WHAT DOES NASSER WANT?

The military dictatorship of Gamal Abdel Nasser has its eyes focused upon a goal of fantastic magnitude—leadership of the entire Arab and Moslem worlds and of the continent of Africa.

Nasser's book, Egypt's Liberation—The Philosophy of the Revolution (Cairo, 1955), bluntly reveals this ambitious objective: "to lead the Islamic nations to head the Arab peoples and to become the spokesman of the Arab (Africa) continent."

He writes further: "If anybody tells me that the place for us means this capital where we live, I differ with him. And if anyone tells me that the place for us means the political boundaries of our country, I also differ."

Nasser's blueprint of empire embraces the Middle East to the north and the North African seaboard to the west of Egypt, and the African continent to the south. These, together with the Moslem world as a whole, he defines in his Philosophy of the Revolution as the "three circles" of Egypt's destiny.

To achieve its ends, the Egyptian dictatorship is pursuing a policy of intrigue and incitement in countries all the way from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean and from the Mediterranean to Lower Africa. Its agents include a swarm of renegades, exiles, and terrorists gathered together in Cairo from all parts of the Middle East and North Africa. Never before in modern times has there been built up in the Middle East a ramified network of such intense and widespread subversion.

FIRST GOAL: DESTROY WESTERN INFLUENCE

Having succeeded (with powerful United States help) in securing the fulfillment of Egypt's own major national aspiration—evacuation of the Suez Canal by the British and transfer of its control to Egypt—Nasser's first objective on the road to Egypt's aggrandizement is the destruction of every vestige of Western influence in the Middle East.

His initial onslaught has been against the defensive Baghdad Pact, which he pursues with bitter hatred in all the Arab countries, including Iraq itself. He has termed it "the imperialist big prison . . . meant to enslave all Arabs."

In seeking to destroy the Baghdad Pact, Nasser is intent also on isolating Iraq, Egypt's only rival for ultimate undisputed leadership of the Arab world. Iraq has officially accused the Egyptian Embassy in Baghdad as being the center of a subversive movement "aimed at the assassination of Iraqi statesmen." Nasser replied: "Egypt will never forsake the Iraqi people, no matter what the government does." (Cairo Radio, January 27, 1956.)

The immediate nucleus of Nasser's empire was tentatively formed in October 1955 by the creation of the axis between Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia. On April 10, 1956, Yemen's adherence to it was announced. Overtly designed to counter the Baghdad Pact, it is the basic instrument of Nasser's ambitions. The recent meeting in Cairo of the heads of these states left no doubt of its complete domination by the Egyptian dictator.

The military forces of the axis nations have been placed under a joint command headed by Egypt's Minister of War and Commander-in-Chief, Major Abdel Hakim Amer. Egypt has begun bringing in cadres of Syrian and Saudi Arabian troops for training in the use of Soviet heavy arms. The logical development of this process is for supplies of further heavy Soviet arms to find their way to Syria and Saudi Arabia, directly or funneled through Egypt. (Syria, meanwhile, has contracted to obtain certain types of Soviet arms directly.)

With the help of Saudi Arabian money, the bribing of Jordanians in key places and of Jordanian newspapers, and incitement and threats, Egypt played a major part in organizing the rioting in Jordan against the Baghdad Pact that almost brought about a revolution. The momentum of these intrigues was directed next to securing the expulsion of the British commander of Jordan's Arab Legion, General Glubb.

Nasser is now working to bring King Hussein under his domination and finally eliminate all British influence in Jordan. Failing that, he will plot to overthrow Hussein's shaky throne. In the collapse of Jordan's independence that would inevitably follow, Jordan would come immediately under total Egyptian domination and be a puppet state headed by the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini.

Reports from diplomatic observers leave no doubt as to Nasser's determination to secure control of Saudi Arabia. That country's oil wealth and its significance as the religious center of world Islam make it a valuable prize. The weak and corrupt regime of Kind Saud could offer little resistance to a well-planned Egyptian coup. In the context of these plans, Nasser's attempts to secure possession of the southern Negev from Israel is self-explanatory: it would give him a land bridge directly connecting Egypt with Saudi Arabia.

NASSER OVER AFRICA

A projected all-African conference in Cairo to establish a leadership for the national movements which have arisen in the continent to find a solution to current problems by getting rid of the white race, was one of the first schemes of Egypt's military junta. (Al Ahram, Cairo, December 2, 1953.) A Supreme Council for African Affairs was established in Cairo in 1955 to direct Egypt's political, economic, and social policies in Africa.

Cairo Radio, on four wavelengths and in different African dialects, is beaming a steady stream of incitement to the peoples of Africa. The largest African audience is reached by Cairo Radio's programs in Swahili, spoken by 20 to 25 million Africans in 10 territories extending from Somaliland in the northeast to northern Rhodesia and Mozambique in the south.

Direct contact with Mau Mau leaders was established in the early days of Egypt's military dictatorship. The Mau Mau leader, Abulu Komaro, urged the Egyptian dictator "to place Egypt at the head of the liberation of my country (El Misri, November 5, 1953). Egypt promised and gave Mau Mau fullest support.

Uganda Tanganyika, Nigeria, Northern Rhodesia, British island protectorates off East Africa and other British, French, Belgian, and Portuguese territories are being urged to liberate themselves. Nationalist delegations from them are invited to Cairo. The Egyptian Government subsidizes selected African political associations and newspapers. It is sending teachers to some of these territories and has promised to send more. Arab and other Moslem leaders in all these areas are gradually being organized to serve Egypt's campaign.

At the International Fair at Mogadiscio (Italian-administered Somaliland) in October 1955 vast quantities of Egyptian materials were distributed stressing Egypt's "big brother" mission in Africa; it included 250,000 photographs of Nasser. (Al Ahram, Cairo, November 5, 1955).

Egypt's role in the North African rebellion against France is notorious. Since 1953, it has taken direct part in the North African uprising with a constant stream of money, arms (including British arms), propaganda and guidance. North Africa rebels are trained in Egypt and in Libya under an Egyptian-sponsored program.

Libya (site of the great United States Wheelus Field base and British bases) is the scene of one of Egypt's latest anti-West offensives. An extremely backward territory, Libya is well on the way to becoming an Egyptian satellite. It is dependent upon Egypt for leadership in almost every field. Officials at all levels and all its teachers, lawyers, engineers, etc., are Egyptians. Most of its supreme court judges and the legal advisers to the king are Egyptians, with their salaries paid by Egypt.

AGGRESSION AGAINST ISRAEL

Since the Anglo-Egyptian Agreement on the Suez, the Nasser regime has progressively intensified its policy of military, political and propaganda aggression against Israel. A mounting toll of death, destruction, and tension has resulted.

As Egypt grows swiftly stronger as a result of the Czech arms deal, and the United States continues to withhold defensive arms from Israel, the Nasser regime approaches it day of decision with Israel with growing self-confidence.

The war against Israel serves several purposes:

For Nasser, deliberately maintaining Egypt's and the Arab world's enmity of Israel in a state of ferment serves him as a major rallying point for the whole Arab world.

Within Egypt, this ferment has helped enormously to divert the nation's attention from the spurious character of the revolution and the hollowness of Nasser's alleged reforms. His failure to make any real dent in Egypt's social and economic plight and his justification for large-scale mililtary expenditure can now be blamed on the "menace" of Israel and the needs of "defense against aggression."

The elimination of Israel is also important in the context of his ambitions for Egypt's future role in the Middle East and the world. For Israel's presence is a physical barrier in the way of Egypt's uninterrupted junction with the rest of the Arab world that he is determined to dominate.

THE WEST'S REACTION

Through its arms deal with the Soviet, Egypt has opened up the Middle East to a major confrontation of the Great Powers in this area. This is not only a central fact in the contemporary history of the Middle East, but from the viewpoint of world history, it is a development of revolutionary importance.

The reaction of most of the Western Powers to Nasser's machinations has been

slow to manifest itself. Recently, however, the Western World appears to have begun to move quickly to a realistic appraisal of the character, nature, and intentions of the Nasser regime. In Britain, there is a rising indignation. In the United States, public reaction is gradually becoming outspoken. In France, there has been outraged reaction for some time.

Yet the truth about the Nasser junta's goals and methods is still far from generally recognized. In part this is due to the double-talk that emanates from Cairo—one voice speaking to the West in a great stream of reasonableness and assurances of moderation and conciliation, while the other speaks to the Middle East and Africa in its authentic tones.

The actions of the Nasser dictatorship have begun, however, to talk loudest of all.

"Take Six" With the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the day-long festivities, Saturday, May 5, in Kansas City, Kans., in connection with the dedication of the new million-dollar National Guard Armory, a luncheon was held, attended by many city, county, and State officials, and in addition, many Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Guard officers.

The speaker at this occasion was Maj. Gen. Edgar C. Erickson, Chief, National Guard Bureau. His talk, which stressed the value of the 6-month Reserve training course available to young guardsmen, follows:

The dedication this afternoon of the fine armory which will house eight units of the National Guard is, I am certain, an occasion in which the people of this city take great pride.

I am very happy to be here.

I share your joy in the completion of the armory, particularly because it is a home-grown product, so to speak.

The people of Kansas City, Kans., and the State of Kansas are to be heartily congratulated on their financial initiative in raising the funds for erecting this splendid building.

The completion and dedication of a new armory is an event of great significance to the National Guard, for the armory has come to be a symbol of accomplishment and service.

It is a memorial to the thousands of guardsmen, and the militiamen preceding them, who have served in every war of this Nation.

An armory such as yours provides a sense of security for the citizens of a community because it is a constant reminder that there is a reserve force always on hand and training to defend America's free way of life, or to assist in any local or State emergency.

Most important, I feel, the armory here and the hundreds of others standing in communities across America, are symbols of the spirit of cooperation in our defense effort—between community, State and Federal Government.

It is this cooperation which makes possible today's modern National Guard.

That the National Guard has continued to be, through the years, a strong military reserve force is a credit to the determination of the States to preserve the traditions and concepts of the early militia.

This concept has been workable and effective from the days of the first colonists. It is equally workable and effective in this day of highly complex military forces.

There is an unbroken lineage from the minutemen who fought America's first wars with musket and powder horn, to the minutemen of today who patrol the skies in jet planes, man our antiaircraft guns, and train with all the other modern weapons of war to be ready should the time come when America must, again fight to preserve its rightful heritage of freedom.

This heritage, of which the National Guard is so proud, is typified by the National Guard of Kansas and its 35th Infantry Division, which it shares with Missouri.

Even the 35th's name, Santa Fe Division, calls to mind vividly the historic associations of the people of this area with the name Santa Fe, the old Santa Fe Trail and its iron successor, the Santa Fe Railroad, both integral parts of your tradition.

This association is carried still further in the 35th's distinctive shoulder patch, the Santa Fe Cross, a wagon wheel superimposed on a cross.

I'm told this is a copy of the old wagon wheel markers which were erected at intervals at the side of the Santa Fe trail to keep the covered wagon trains from losing their way during the blinding dust storms.

Back in 1846 during the Mexican War a force of Missourians, part of what is now the 138th Regiment of the 35th, was sent southwestward from here to guard the region of the Santa Fe Trail.

The 138th Regiment, elements of which date to the St. Louis Grays of 1932, is the division unit with the longest continuous history, a history flavored throughout with the words Santa Fe in all their meanings.

I am dwelling deliberately on the history of the 35th and its Santa Fe associations because such traditions are and should be one of the most important sources of esprit de corps in National Guard units all across the Nation.

They serve to link the National Guard solidly with the background of the States and localities where it serves.

The cause of esprit de corps is likewise served in a unit's wartime accomplishments.

The Santa Fe Cross was worn into battle for the first time in September of 1918 when the 35th Division attacked squarely in the center of the great Meuse-Argonne offensive which eventually smashed the Germans' celebrated Hindenburg Line.

The 35th made a major contribution to the final defeat of the German armies in World War I.

The 35th was again ordered to active duty in December 1940, when it became apparent that this country could not long postone its involvement in World War II.

With its strength constantly being drained by thousands of men going to officer training schools and others being transferred out to activate new divisions, the 35th underwent several reorganizations during this time, with selectees filling in the vacancies.

The division went overseas in May of 1944, stopped briefly in England, and by July was heavily engaged in the Normandy campaign in France.

It had a major part in the historic siege of St. Lo and then continued in the pursuit of the German armies retreating eastward across France.

Shifted from the First Army to Gen. George Patton's famous Third Army, the 35th Division had fought its way into Germany and had been pulled back for rest near Metz, France, when Von Rundstedt launched the heavy attack which has come to be known at the Battle of the Bulge.

The 35th was ordered to move out immediately to help stop the Nazi armored columns in the Ardennes Forest to the north.

For nearly 3 weeks the Division battled the German armor, and finally the enemy attack was beaten back.

After fighting 30 miles along the Siegfried line defenses, the division crossed the Rhine, March 26, 1945, and drove into the Ruhr Valley where it captured 3,770 prisoners in 18 days.

Driving on eastward across Germany, the division, then with the Ninth Army, ended up on the Elbe River as the American troops nearest Berlin.

Meantime, the Division's 137th Regiment, four units of which will use the new armory here, had set an impressive mark of being in contact with the enemy for 111 of its 139 days on French soil.

Company F, of the 137th, one of the units to be housed here, was cited for outstanding performance of duty against the enemy.

The company attacked a key defense position on the approaches to the Siegfried line, engaged two enemy companies in hand-to-hand combat, and sustained numerous counterattacks and severe pounding by enemy artillery and mortars.

But it won the battle.

The events I have described illustrate concretely Kansas' part in the great national defense team that is the National Guard.

This team consists of more than 5,600 units of the Army and the Air National Guard, organized in 2,400 communities in every State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

The strength of the Army and the Air National Guard today is the highest in history—more than 466,000 men.

The people of Kansas should remember always that into the National Guard of your State goes a tremendous amount of effort and sacrifice required in the day-to-day building, training, and maintenance of units.

In addition to the weekly training sessions and the 2 weeks of summer field training, some National Guard units are actively engaged today in defense missions, and are standing a 24-hour-a-day watch, 7 days a week in some areas of the country.

There are National Guard antiaircraft batteries manning guns in operational readiness at key industrial and population areas.

There are National Guard pilots on runaway alert duty at a number of important airfields in the country.

Members of these units are prepared, on short notice, to man antiaircraft batteries, or fly the jet fighter planes of the Air National Guard, against any surprise attack by enemy planes.

The Guard is ready and anxious to accept any added responsibilities it may be given as the country seeks to build a stronger Reserve Force.

The Military Establishment is now putting into operation an act of Congress it is hoped will increase the size of the Ready Reserve and improve its training standards.

This act is known as the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

The proper implementation of this law will, I am sure, assist the National Guard, as well as the other Reserve forces, to fill up the ranks and increase the level of training of all units.

The main feature of this act which is of interest to National Guard men is the special training program which applies to the young man who enlists in the Guard between 17 and 18½ years of age.

He may enlist in the National Guard and volunteer to perform 6 months of active duty with the Regular Army.

Upon completion of this 6 months of service he returns to his home and continues to serve in the National Guard until he has completed a total of 8 years of service.

This service in the National Guard offers the young man a means of fulfilling the military obligation placed upon him by the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This programs offers him an opportunity to become a skilled basic soldier at the beginning of his National Guard career and places him in position for early promotion to a noncommissioned officer grade in which he can qualify for a commission as a second lieutenant in the National Guard.

At the present time we are engaged in an effort to sell this new 6 months' training program to young men between the ages of 17 and 18½ through enlistment in the National Guard.

Young men who are between those ages and attending high school may enlist in the National Guard and postpone their entry into active duty until they graduate or until they become 20 years of age, whichever comes first.

While we are making an all-out effort to enlist new recruits for this program, we are also making an effort to obtain volunteers for this special training from men who are already in the National Guard and meet the age requirements.

I recommend this program for serious consideration and support of all of you who are interested in making this Nation strong militarily at a minimum cost to the taxpayer.

That the National Guard continues to grow in size, and that armories such as the one you will dedicate this afternoon are being constructed in every State, is certainly proof of the determination of the States to do their part in our national defense effort.

The people of this city can well be proud of their National Guard men and proud of themselves for the part they have played in making this new armory possible—not only for the training of the local military units but also for community affairs of all kinds.

I congratulate you on a truly worthwhile accomplishment.

Logic of Arguments Against H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4090 would amend part 2, title 3, of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio alarm device on United States cargo ships of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than two qualified operators. Under this legislation, the device would be capable of being set manually to simultaneously receive and respond to international Morse Code signals as follows: First, the ship station call signal; second, the international distress signal; third, the international safety signal; fourth, the international urgency signal; and, fifth, any other emergency code desired.

As a former member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I became familiar with this legislation at a hearing on a somewhat similar bill, H. R. 6004, which was held before this committee during the 83d Congress.

First, let me say that while my careful study of the report on this bill convinced me that there is no justification for making this device mandatory, at the same time, I recognize that the interest of the sponsor of this measure, the distinguished majority leader, is safety at sea, a very meritorious motive.

Since it may be that Members will not have an opportunity to read the entire 130 pages of testimony, I think that they should at least know that outside of the splendid statement in behalf of the objectives of his bill by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the only other proponents were Abraham W. Sereysky, the son-in-law of the owner of the patents to this device, and Benjamin B. Green, the owner. These witnesses should be somewhat prejudiced. Also support was given it by Mr. Morris Harvey Strichartz, a representative of the Radio Officers Union. Since the ultimate effect of this bill might well require the employment of extra radio officers on cargo vessels that now only carry one operator, it might be surmised likewise that Mr. Strichartz would be an interested party. So outside of the author of the bill the proponents—all three of them—have a stake in the passage of this measure.

By the same token, representatives of certain groups opposing the legislation might have biased viewpoints. So let us discount the fact that the American Tramp Shipowner Association testified the equipment was "unnecessary from the standpoint of safety, efficiency, or sound operation." On a similar count, discount the testimony of the American Merchant Marine Institute and their statement that it was "inappropriate and premature to consider the mandatory installation of an unknown and untried piece of equipment" and, finally, discount the statement of the Pacific American Steamship Association. These opponents might be prejudiced.

Now the remaining part of the report on this legislation comes from agencies of Government which certainly should be completely objective. Two Departments, Treasury and Navy, have stated that they have no opposition. The Bureau of the Budget "suggests further study and experimentation before enacting." The Commerce Department recommends against enactment. The report of the Federal Communications Commission based on tests and technical examination states it is not convinced that the uses are clear enough to justify making the device mandatory. Of particular importance is the individual testimony of the Honorable Edward M. Webster, a member of the Commission, which boils down to the conclusion that H. R. 4090 is unnecessary and premature. So there are no Government agency reports favoring the bill—and three against its enactment.

Being against safety is like being against sin or motherhood. It just is not always the easiest position to take, but if this device had been in use in the past as far back as the sinking of the *Titanic* in 1912, I cannot find that any disaster would have been averted or any lives saved. The degree of safety that this equipment would add if installed onboard a ship, to my mind, is exceedingly limited. Otherwise, cost, which is probably somewhere around $3,000 per unit, would have little bearing on the matter. The real cost, however, is not installation. Take, for example, the fact that tests indicate under favorable conditions during a 16-hour period when no radio operator might be on duty, the overtime for answering the alarms would amount to $32.90 per day, or estimating the ship to be at sea 50 percent of the time, approximately $6,000 per year per ship. Obviously, however, no radio operator could stand the strain of 10 alarms during his rest time, so the indirect cost would be actually the cost of a second operator, estimated to be in excess of $12,000 per year.

On the 266 Government-subsidized vessels, the Federal Government would pay the entire added cost estimated to be $3.3 million. On the 771 nonsubsidized vessels, the industry would have increased operating costs of $9.5 million.

These figures do not include any indirect expense such as that of providing space for a second operator. If such additional expense was arrived at by agreement through collective bargaining, we could find no fault with it, but passing legislation on the basis of the testimony presented in the hearings on this and former bills would be the triumph of emotion over good judgment and reason.

That H. R. 4090 duplicates existing equipment with an untested and untried device and bypasses international safety and communication conventions certainly suggests referring the bill back to the committee for further study. Any regulation having to do with navigational messages outside domestic waters and safety should be by international agreement and not be established by a law of this nature, particularly when it would set up a monopoly on an extremely limited and highly questionable system of safety communications.

H. R. 4090 is cloaked in respectability. The Commerce Committee sought to eliminate its private-interest element by an amendment providing that the patents on the device owned by the one organization must be available at reasonable cost to other organizations. How naive can we get?

There are presently approximately 1,000 cargo vessels that would come under the provisions of this legislation. In manufacturing so limited a number of pieces of equipment there would be no place for competition. There would only be one manufacturer whether it would be the present owner of the patents, or another organization which would acquire the rights. The bill could not help but create a monopoly. And the measure is private-interest legislation. It should be pointed out that through increased subsidy the Federal Government would have to make up a good part of the cost.

The Commerce Committee tried to keep the measure from being an out-and-out unconditional signed order for the owner of the patents. It provided an amendment saying the device must be found workable by the Federal Communications Commission.

Of course, this would open the door to political pressure on the Federal Communications Commission to approve the device even though it is subject to false

alarms and other weaknesses. Why the hurry? The Federal Communications Commission is testing other equipment to perform the same function. Why hand one favorite patent owner an advance order and give his patents priority?

I do not charge there is anything wrong here, but I certainly think suspicious people would draw their own conclusions and I feel it would be a favor to the bill's sponsor to defeat the measure.

I know how busy Members are, and all I say to my colleagues is just read Federal Communications Commissioner Edward M. Webster's testimony in opposition to this legislation. That will convince any fairminded person of the logic of arguments against H. R. 4090.

The Chotiner Case: Impropriety Does Not Have To Be Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "The Defense of Chotiner," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 8, 1956:

THE DEFENSE OF CHOTINER

Some of the Nation's press which was loudest in condemning "influence peddling" in the Truman administration is defensive about influence peddling in the Eisenhower administration.

As a glance at today's Mirror of Public Opinion will show, some newspapers do indeed take a critical view of the private activities in Washington of Murray Chotiner, Vice President NIXON's campaign manager. A good many, however, are suggesting that Mr. Chotiner did little wrong in going to the White House in behalf of his clients, and the defense raises 3 points which have little to do with the principles involved.

Point 1 is that Mr. Chotiner did no wrong because his clients lost their cases with the Government. (By implication, at least some of the 5-percenters of the previous administration at least earned their 5 percent). Of course, the answer to this is that impropriety does not have to be successful.

Point 2 is that whether Mr. Chotiner did wrong, whatever he did cannot be blamed on Vice President NIXON. (Let us not be guilty of guilt by association.) The answer to this is that Mr. Chotiner misused his position as friend and adviser to the Vice President to try to help private clients engaged with official business. Mr. NIXON did not disassociate himself from these activities, has yet to criticize Chotiner for them, and declines even to discuss the case.

Point 3 is that whether or not Mr. Chotiner did wrong—and whatever this has to do with Vice President NIXON—it is a fact that the Eisenhower administration stands foursquare against influence peddling because the President has said so repeatedly. The answer to this is that after the President reread his rules against influence he refused to apply them to Mr. Chotiner. President Eisenhower indicated he saw nothing wrong in what Chotiner had done.

We await the day when moral homilies alone may wipe out impropriety in Washington, with some hope that somebody will also apply the ethics so grandly preached. But pending that time, Congress ought to heed Senator HUMPHREY's advice that the Chotiner case needs much more thorough investigation.

Fortunately RICHARD M. NIXON himself is on record in favor of digging out all the facts on influence peddling. He said: "This inquiry has too many loose ends to call it closed, and I think we'll have to resume hearings."

The only trouble is that these words were spoken by Mr. NIXON October 5, 1951, when he was a freshman Republican Senator hot after Democratic influence peddling in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the Truman administration.

In May 1956 the Republicans are in office in Washington. The shoe is on the other foot. Now the Vice President has nothing to say.

Not One Federal Department Favors Enactment of H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4090 would require an automatic radio alarm device on United States cargo ships of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than 2 qualified radio operators.

That I oppose H. R. 4090 in no way diminishes my regard for the objective of safety-at-sea, or recognition of this being the desire of the sponsor of the bill. I shall outline clearly the reasons why I believe the rule when it comes before the House next week should not be adopted, but first in fairness to the majority leader, who introduced H. R. 4090, I refer briefly to an article in the Baltimore Sun. It quoted me as saying the gentleman from Massachusetts was a friend of the owner of the patents for the device which would become mandatory under this bill.

I assure the House publicly as I have the gentleman from Massachusetts privately, I never made such a statement and consider it regrettable. Perhaps I should not dignify the newspaper article by this reference. It embarrassed me and makes my opposition to H. R. 4090 more difficult.

As to the reasons why I believe the rule should be defeated, let me say that one of my reasons is the high regard all of us have for the author of H. R. 4090. As I fear it was in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it might well be if the measure reaches the floor, it might be adopted out of sheer deference to the majority leader. That, in my opinion, would be unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a highly technical subject; it deals with complicated and delicately balanced labor agreements; it deals with maritime law and intricate shipping regulations; it deals with involved electronic questions. The influence and personality of a zealous advocate of safety-of-life-at-sea should be matched by technical knowledge and testimony which the Intstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in reporting the bill ignored.

I am not in the well of this House representing the selfish interests of shipping companies. I am here, opposing this rule, because not one agency of the Federal Government from which the Commerce Committee requested a report, not one Department favored enactment of H. R. 4090.

The Department of Commerce flatly recommended against enactment, and the Federal Communications Commission's report found no justification for making the installation of this device mandatory even though it could be developed to a point where it is considered satisfactory. With such reports it is inconceivable that this bill if passed by Congress would not encounter an Executive veto. Why, under such circumstances should the valuable time of Members be taken for consideration of a bill which will never, in my judgment, become law?

If, as I hope will not prove to be the case, a rule on H. R. 4090 is voted, I intend to offer amendments to defer effect of this bill: First, until reliability of operation of the device is assured by international standardization of criteria governing characteristics of signals to which the device is required to respond; second, until it is determined that agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the purposes which would be served by the call selector device; and third, unless and until an automatic radio call selector is required by the next International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such Convention.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe granting of a rule and the adoption of these amendments is a waste of this body's time. But if we adopt a bill, for heaven's sake let us limit coverage until we can include foreign as well as domestic cargo vessels. Communications on the high seas should be on an internationally uniform basis. Otherwise we would have chaos.

Commissioner E. M. Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission, out of his wide experience and background testifying on this bill, emphasized, in opposing it, the desirability of a common standardized system in the world.

I hope the rule will be defeated. The legislation will add about $12 million to the cost of our merchant marine. If it would save lives it would be well worth the expense, but it will not; it simply would require installing a duplicative and unnecessary alarm system—if the patented device owned by one person can be perfected. I cannot gnd that any life in any sea tragedy from the disaster of the *Titanic* on down to the present, would have been saved—not one life—if this device had been in operation in United States cargo vessels.

And referring again to the cost, bear in mind Americans owning cargo vessels

affected by H. R. 4090 can register their vessels under Panamanian or other foreign flag. They can, and have been in increasing numbers transferring ships foreign and replacing the personnel with low-wage foreign crews. The cost of $12 million to the American shipping industry under this bill would encourage that sort of thing.

There were five basic reasons advanced by Commissioner Webster in his testimony against H. R. 4090: First, there can be no operational reliability of this device because radio operators do not have a uniformity of speed in sending dots and dashes—the device is technically impractical and has, of course, never been tested under actual operational conditions at sea; second, no device should be made compulsory until after there has been sufficient experience and acceptance upon which to base an intelligent analysis; third, any merit to the device is convenience—not safety; fourth, cost is discriminatory against United States Merchant Marine and cannot be justified; and fifth, present international system is performing its job satisfactorily.

Finally, let me add one point more. Listen to this. Can any member of the Commerce Committee or the author of the bill state that the presently used outa-alarm which this new device, the automatic call selector, would duplicate—can anyone say the present alarm cannot be altered to serve exactly the same safety purposes as the device—the monopolistic device—under H. R. 4090 is proposed to serve.

There should be an investigation into alternative and more reliable methods.

I urge strongly defeat of this rule. Send H. R. 4090 back to committee for further study when it comes to the floor of the House.

Plutonium: Stranger Than We Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Plutonium: Stranger Than We Know," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 8, 1956:

One of the great misfortunes of the pall of secrecy which has hung for 15 years over everything concerned with atomic energy is that we have been prevented from savoring the full magic of some of the things which have been done in the atomic energy research establishments.

To most people plutonium is merely a name, or a synonym for atomic bombs. It does not suggest a real material—like copper or gold—which can be turned on a lathe or dissolved in acids.

Certainly it does not suggest that the metal—if such it may be called—is of high interest in its own right as well as the most fabulous material the world—or part of it—has ever seen in bulk.

To make plutonium from uranium is much more remarkable than to make gold from lead in an alchemist's laboratory.

For, unlike gold, plutonium was not known to exist at all in nature when men set out to make it.

Since then radio-chemists of the United States Atomic Energy Commission have sought and found plutonium in nature—mainly in ores of uranium.

In the ores which are richest in plutonium there is roughly one atom of plutonium for every million million atoms of uranium. Finding natural plutonium is more difficult than it would be to find a needle in a haystack. The main sources of plutonium are the atomic reactors in Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union. Altogether 12 different isotopes of plutonium are now known, each of them radio-active. These endure for times which range from a thousand millionth of a second to 900,000 years.

Because of its radio-activity plutonium is one of the most dangerous poisons known. Roughly a third of a millionth of a gram of it, inhaled during a person's lifetime, is a hazard to be reckoned with.

A millionth of this amount is dangerous if it finds its way into a wound, or is otherwise injected into the bloodstream.

The radio-active material finds its way to some part of the human body where it can destroy the blood-forming organs in bone marrow, and hence bring about the radiation sickness which made its first public appearance at Hiroshima.

A cubic foot of it weighs just over half a ton at ordinary temperatures. It is dull grey in appearance.

The behavior of the metal at temperatures of 1 to 200 degrees centigrade is one of the reasons why people ask whether plutonium should be called a metal at all.

Delta-plutonium actually decreases in volume as it is heated—a property which is not possessed by any other known metal, though water just above its freezing-point does the same sort of thing.

It is evident that the conversion of plutonium from a "bad" metal to a "good" metal as temperature is increased is a reflection of the number of radically different structures which the atom can assume.

There are even suggestions that small granules of the material are spontaneously combustible—though, naturally, the experiment is not a safe one to carry out.

Keep the Case Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an analysis from the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel of the activities of Mr. Murray M. Chotiner and his associations with high administration officials.

The editorial follows:

KEEP CASE OPEN

Murray M. Chotiner, the breezy California lawyer, who is not only a friend of Vice President RICHARD NIXON but was Mr. NIXON's campaign manager in 1952, was called by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee to testify on April 26 on alleged graft in Army clothing contracts. The subcommittee, in its investigations, sought to find out about influence telephone calls to the White House in behalf of Mr. Chotiner. To get the proper perspective on the political aspects of those telephone calls, it is apparently necessary to reflect back to 13 days ago—if you will—and then place the maneuvers of Messrs. Chotiner and NIXON in sequence, to get any sense out of the matter.

Going back 13 days, the sequence is this:

Mr. Chotiner is scheduled to appear before the subcommittee where he will give testimony that will be embarrassing to both the President and Mr. NIXON.

Mr. Chotiner does not appear on the day summoned. Instead, waits a full week.

In the meantime Vice President NIXON obtains clearance from the White House and announces that he will run for reelection in 1956.

After everything gets into the record and Mr. NIXON's candidacy is "accepted with enthusiasm" (on the part of some of the GOP), Mr. Chotiner brings forth before the subcommittee a revelation that during the Truman administration would have been called a terrible scandal, such as when William M. Boyle, Jr., J. Howard McGrath, and Matthew J. Connelly were denounced by the press for their influence calls to Government agencies. What did Mr. Chotiner disclose? He disclosed that Maxwell M. Raab and Charles F. Willis, Jr., two White House staff advisers to President Eisenhower, made telephone calls concerning Chotiner clients. When questioned by the subcommittee on whether he attempted to use the name or influence of the Vice President, Mr. Chotiner's answer was: "Unequivocally no."

Now, going back 5 years to October 5, 1951, a Senator is speaking—a Senator who is a member of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee—California's Senator RICHARD M. NIXON. He is on the trail of Democratic influence in the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The future Vice President says: "This inquiry has too many loose ends to call it closed, and I think we'll have to resume hearings."

That, we foresee, is exactly what a lot of the people of this Nation are going to think about the whole business of the White House-Chotiner-Nixon influence case. At any rate that's what we reckon most people will think.

To Assist Farmers in Planting Woodlots, Windbreaks, and Shelterbelts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, I introduced a bill H. R. 11030, which will assist and encourage farmers to plant greatly needed woodlots and shelterbelts.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 11030

A bill to provide assistance in soil and water conservation and the establishment of proper land use to farm owners and operators who convert small tracts of crop or other land to woodland and to cooperate and assist the States in carrying out such development

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby recognized that the planting and development of woodlands on small tracts of cropland

and on other farm lands not suitable for cropping contributes to the public welfare in that it assists in the control of soil erosion and destructive floods, results in more favorable conditions of water conservation and flow and provides for windbreaks, shelterbelts, and woodlots yielding a more adequate supply of timber and other tree products; and that the growing of trees involves a deferment by the landowner of income from the land. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in order to promote woodland conservation on privately owned lands and provide other assistance to owners and operators of small tracts of land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall assist in the establishment and maintenance of woodlands thereon.

SEC. 2. In order to effectuate the policy of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") is authorized—

(a) to approve plans for a conservation program of woodland tree planting submitted by State oil conservation committees, boards, or commissions in cooperation with State officials and State foresters for the purpose of assisting owners of small tracts of land in affecting the policy herein stated: *Provided, however,* That any such plan, insofar as it affects private land within the boundaries of legally established soil conservation districts, shall provide for the carrying out of the plan in cooperation with such soil-conservation districts, and to avoid duplication shall provide that the technical and other assistance provided such districts under other Federal authorizations for assistance in developing and carrying out their soil and water-resource programs shall be utilized in the planting of trees on farm woodlands and for windbreaks;

(b) to assist the State in carrying out such plan as he has approved under this act, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions including the cost of planting, replanting, and other operations necessary to the establishment of woodland tracts as he shall deem proper, provided that the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government for tree planting and woodland development on non-Federal land within the State during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official(s) in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State; and

(c) to give technical advice and assistance to owners of such tracts, including the marketing of the forest products produced therefrom.

SEC. 3. In any plan that coordinates woodlands under the jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary shall obtain the cooperation, assistance, and approval of the Federal agency having jurisdiction thereof.

SEC. 4. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Mr. Speaker, the bill to assist farmers in planting and developing windbreaks and small woodlots is to complement title IV, the forestry provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956, H. R. 10875. That section authorizes additional cooperative activity between the Department of Agriculture and the States in tree planting and reforestation—to build up and maintain a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood. This bill seeks to provide farmers needed assistance to plant and manage woodlots and windbreaks largely for protection purposes and to supply wood for fuel and rough lumber for local farm use only. It is not intended to help commercial tree growers and large forestry enterprises.

I am particularly interested that this Congress give as much help and assistance as possible to those farmers who are in need of it, particularly those who have misfortune come to them because of drought or other circumstances over which they had no control. I want to see the farmer along with labor and business get an even break.

Somehow we have managed to do away with the rows of trees and the woodlots that served to protect farm crops from the hot winds of summer, and to save the livestock and buildings from the cold winds of winter. Of course, there were areas in my State of Iowa, and in the States to the west where trees were not native. However, it has been demonstrated that trees will grow in most all of these areas, but farmers do need help to get them established.

Of importance right now is getting cropland out of production. Actually many farmers are trading crops for land. By that I mean crops are being harvested from land unsuited to cropping. This land is becoming poorer and poorer because of being cropped. Erosion is so serious on such land when it is cropped so as to reduce the yields and make such use unprofitable. Part of this kind of land should be converted to woods not only putting it to its best use but further reducing production of crops now in surplus.

Farmers need windbreaks to protect crops from hot winds that sear corn tassels and burn up grain. This is particularly true in the western Corn Belt. The cycle of dry hot weather that has persisted in the South and Middlewest since 1950 has cut yields on many farms to the point where farm income has been meager irrespective of the price of the product. Also, windbreaks are needed around every farm for shelter and protection for livestock and buildings throughout the central and northern parts of our country.

Wind erosion in the southern Great Plains has damaged over 5 million acres again this blow season. This is the seventh year that drouth has seriously damaged the wheat crop and reduced the productive capacity of much of the land in five southern Great Plains States. Shelterbelts have been successfully established in most of the Great Plains area and most of them could do a great deal toward holding the soil in place.

Nearly 40 million acres of cropland in this country are still being damaged at a critically rapid rate by erosion. Much of this acreage is in small tracts on thousands of farms. These small acreages make some contribution to crop surpluses too and they should be taken out of cropping and planted to trees. Not only will erosion on this land be reduced, but putting the land to trees will contribute immeasurably to reducing water runoff.

Farmers have been establishing good land use through the soil conservation district program for nearly 20 years. During that time some 20 million acres of cropland unsuited to continued cropping have been converted to grassland and woodland. The immediate need for further reducing crop acreage stimulates me to offer additional assistance to farmers in order to speed up the program of cropland conversion. The emphasis that has been placed up to this time on Federal assistance to private landowners and operators in forestry problems other than in the soil conservation district programs has been limited. Of course, under the Clarke-McNary Act, cooperation with the States has materially increased the production and distribution of trees and other planting stock. Also, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed under the Cooperative Forest Management Act to cooperate with the States in respect to management of woodlands and to provide technical services in the harvesting, marketing, and processing of trees. All of the work under these acts is done largely in cooperation with the States, and material contributions to the problem are being made. It is my intention in introducing this bill for stepping up the woodlands program that additional funds and assistance from Federal sources be made available to farmers cooperating with their soil conservation districts. It will augment the small amount out of the total Federal funds now being appropriated for forestry purposes which are utilized to assist farmers to plant and develop small woodland tracts.

Mr. Speaker, there is a clear difference between the provisions for tree planting in the soil-bank bill recently passed by the House, and the provisions and purposes of my bill, in that the soil-bank bill puts emphasis on commercial forests for the production of lumber, whereas my bill provides for small wood lots and shelter belts for farmsteads. For the past half century we Americans have carried on a tree-slaughtering program with a vengence, and in addition we have been straightening our small streams and creeks. Had we planned a desert here, we could not have made a better start. Our soil-conservation program on our farms has been most effective so far as water and soil erosion and flood prevention are concerned, and in which I have long taken a leading role in Congress.

But we are annually losing millions of acres of our priceless topsoil and crops from wind erosion. About 3 years ago I drove through the best agriculture section of France. There I saw what small wood lots and trees along the fence lines can do to stop wind erosion, and certainly it is now a national must here in the United States of America. Some may say trees along fence lines shade too much of otherwise productive cropland, but the greater area they protect from hot withering winds far exceeds the shaded area, also a fertilizer has now been developed which, when applied to

shaded land, will produce about equal crops to unshaded land.

Taking the Seventh Iowa District as an example, I am very sure that, if every farm had a small woodlot, say 2 acres, as a windbreak for the buildings and a row or two of trees along the southernmost boundary of each farm the loss of crops from hot winds and drought would be greatly reduced. True it will take a few years before the trees will be big enough to be greatly effective, but there is no time a start can be made earlier than now. Maybe all of us will not be here long enough to enjoy and reap all the benefits but our children will.

Trees not only serve as windbreaks but the amount of moisture which a good sized tree will hold is almost unbelievable, which serves to moisten the dry destructive winds so only with a few hundred trees on each farm the combined benefit of thousands of trees in a neighborhood would be of untold benefit to exerybody.

I sincerely hope and pray that this tree-planting program will be put into effect at an early date.

Labor and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks the following article which appeared in Human Events for May 12 on the subject of labor in politics:

LABOR IN POLITICS

In reply to Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler's offer to "publicly apologize" to Senator GOLDWATER if the Senator could prove his contention that "compulsory union dues are used for political parties and candidates," the Arizona GOP Senator has sent the following evidence to Butler:

Gus Scholle, president of the Michigan CIO Council and chairman of the Michigan Political Action Committee (PAC), told a reporter for the Detroit Free Press on April 24, 1955, that the PAC was being financed by "dues money allocated by local unions."

Fay Calkins, analyst for the AFL-CIO, gives several examples in her book The CIO and the Democratic Party. On page 45, she notes that over half of the money spent by the PAC in Ohio's 18th Congressional District came "from a monthly per capita tax on locals."

Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO Auto Workers, told the Detroit Free Press, July 7, 1955, that "the union makes no bones about the fact that payment for radio and television programs containing campaign politics came from the UAW general funds." Mazey filed an audit report for the UAW-CIO, for the period of June 1, 1950 to May 31, 1951, showing that the PAC received $120,434.56 out of union general funds. For the 6-month period ending November 30, 1952, the PAC received $66,086.41, also from union general funds. For the year ending December 31, 1954, PAC expenses disbursed from the union general fund amounted to $384,443.33. Mr. Mazey's reports are only for this single International union and do not include the funds diverted from other Internationals or from local, county and State union treasuries into political activities.

The financial statement of Ford Local 600 of the UAW-CIO, dated October 9, 1955, signed by W. G. Grant, financial secretary, shows that the Wayne County CIO Council endorsed John Dingell, Jr., in the Democratic primary election of Michigan's 15th Congressional District. The report reads: "Approval is requested of the council for concurrence in the above endorsement and also to authorize the local officers, in line with past procedure, to incur and pay expenses in connection with said election."

The then director of Labor's League for Political Education, Joseph D. Kennan, was quoted in the January, 1950, issue of the American Federationist, official publication of the American Federation of Labor at that time, as saying, "I have been asked by many local union officers whether any local funds can be voted out of the treasury for political work. The answer is 'Yes'—so long as none of that money is used for a national candidate such as Congressman or President. You can use union funds or assessments to help local and State candidates (in most States)."

"This construction," said GOLDWATER, "places the sole emphasis on legal interpretation. Nowhere in it is there any concern for the problem of using compulsory union dues in politics as a moral or civil rights problem. LLPE Director Kennan would seem to be indifferent to the civil rights question involved in taking the compulsory dues of a union member and using them to pay the campaign expenses of a candidate whom he personally votes against, thereby nullifying his vote and creating a second class citizen."

The Senator concludes his letter to BUTLER: "Upon examination of this sampling of the available proof, I hope you will avail yourself of the earliest opportunity to clear up the record by making your public apology as you agreed to do on May 1."

On April 30, in Fort Worth, Gov. Allen Shivers charged that organized labor was sending "large sums of money into Texas in an effort to capture control of the State's Democratic Party." Shivers said he had photographic copies of deposit slips showing that money had been received by the Rio Grande Valley Democratic Club from the AFL and from "Walter Reuther's CIO."

Eisenhower Administration Shrugs Off Responsibility in Battle Against Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Mr. Aandahl's Passive Role," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 8, 1956:

MR. AANDAHL'S PASSIVE ROLE

Assistant Secretary Aandahl's address to the American Waterworks Association convention here was more notable for what it did not say than for what it did. In more than 4,000 words of prepared text the Interior Department official found not one word to acknowledge the Federal Government's responsibility for nationwide action against stream pollution.

He found not one word in recognition of the by-now obvious fact that the poisoning of interstate streams can be stopped only with the initiative of strong leadership at Washington, including sizable sums of money and strict laws strictly enforced. Instead, Mr. Aandahl disclaimed that there is any national water problem. He said "There can be no overall plan." He foreswore bureaucratic control and vowed to provide the local people a greater voice, which is the new gobbledygook for "we won't do it."

The Assistant Secretary of Interior recognized the great and growing demands on water supply. He recognized that agriculture and industry, even habitation itself, will be affected for the long future by what is done now to insure adequate supplies of clean water. But: "Will the corrective actions now being taken provide adequate water supplies for the future?" Assistant Secretary Aandahl's only answer was to say to the waterworks operators: "You men are better able to answer that than I."

That is shrugging off the problem, not dealing with it.

Armed Forces Day Celebration at Coney Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of all my colleagues and the public at large a most interesting event which is scheduled to take place this coming week-end at Coney Island, in Brooklyn, N. Y. I refer to the Armed Forces Day Celebration which will be held on Saturday, May 19, and Sunday, May 20, under the auspices of the Area IV Armed Forces Day Committee.

The event will be featured by many aerial and amphibious activities which will be observed by as many as 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 people. Perhaps no other place in the United States or elsewhere in the world could attract a larger audience than Brooklyn's famous Coney Island, known for over a half century as the playground of the world. Coney Island is host each season to some 50 million visitors.

The demonstration area for this event is that part of the Atlantic Ocean which is immediately adjacent to the beach, the boardwalk, and the amusement area of Coney Island. I understand that all aerial activities will take place over the ocean, so that there is no civilian hazard involved.

The reason I call attention to the event at this time is that I hope it will prove to be the forerunner of many successful celebrations in the future devoted to our Armed Forces and their achievements. I believe that if properly developed on a huge scale as befits our country, plus the huge audience potential provided at Coney Island, these events could serve as our answer to Moscow's famed Red Square flyover on May 1 each year which attracts such worldwide attention. I propose that we have a 2-day Armed

Forces celebration on the third week-end in May each year for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a release issued today by the Armed Forces Day Committee in connection with the celebration at Coney Island:

AREA IV ARMED FORCES DAY COMMITTEE

Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore, Area IV Armed Forces Day Commander Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Herren, and John G. Ward, president of the Coney Island Chamber of Commerce, have authorized the Public Information Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Day Committee to issue the following announcement in their name:

"GOVERNORS ISLAND, N. Y.—The establishment of the area on and over the Atlantic Ocean off the Coney Island Beach, boardwalk, and amusement area as a newly designated demonstration area for Armed Forces Day weekend aerial and amphibious activities is jointly announced by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Herren, Area IV Armed Forces Day Commander, Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore, and John G. Ward, president of the Coney Island Chamber of Commerce.

"This is the first of a series of special events scheduled to implement the conception of utilizing the Atlantic Ocean, off the Coney Island Beach, and boardwalk, as the world's largest theater, capable of accommodating the world's largest primary audience. The concept was developed by Milton H. Berger, director of special events for the Coney Island Chamber of Commerce, who interested the Armed Forces Day Committee in its utilization for their activities program.

"Of particular interest to the Armed Forces and to the municipal government of the city of New York is the lack of civilian hazard inherent in staging aerial and amphibious events on and over the Atlantic Ocean.

"Of additional interest to all concerned is the easy accessibility of the Coney Island demonstration area to New York and adjacent communities both by subway train and automobile highway. Coney Island is serviced by the "D" train of the Independent Line Subway as well as the Sea Beach, West End, and Brighton Lines of the BMT system. For vehicular visitors, Coney Island is convenient to auto traffic via the East Side and West Side Highways and the Bronx as well as by the Belt Parkway system from Queens and Long Island. It is also serviced by surface buses of the New York City Transit Authority.

"With Coney Island already having recorded upwards of half a million visitors a day during the past several weekends, the audience potential for Armed Forces Day weekend demonstrations is potentially the largest possible primary audience in all the world.

"For Saturday, May 19, and Sunday, May 20, a hundred plus flyover of Air Force and Navy planes is scheduled. Also scheduled for Sunday, May 20, are a series of special activities including Coast Guard helicopter rescue demonstration, air-sea rescue by amphibious plane, landings on, taxiing along, and takeoffs from the Atlantic Ocean by pontoon planes.

"The Army Signal Corps is investigating the possibility of setting up a public address system along the Coney Island boardwalk for one-half mile in either direction from Steeplechase Pier as an announcing center from which the various activities could be described to the assembled viewing public. Other aerial activities are being planned. These will be announced next week along with specific times and other details of the events to be scheduled for May 19 and May 20. Announcement will be made through the Armed Forces Day Area IV Public Information Officer, Capt. Bertrand R. Brinley."

Technical Assistance Under the Foreign Aid Program Should Operate Under a Separate Agency Divorced From Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 4, Dr. John H. Reisner, who is a consultant to the Agricultural Missions, Inc., in New York City, and who has had considerable experience in programs that deal with self-help to people abroad, made an important statement before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his statement:

TESTIMONY OF DR. JOHN H. REISNER BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1956

My name is John H. Reisner, at present consultant to Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York City, and from 1931 to 1953, served as its executive secretary. Since 1949, I have served as an official observer to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. From 1914 to 1931, I was an agricultural missionary in China and for most of this period was dean of the College of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Nanking. From 1951 to 1953, I was an active consultant to the Director of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resources Personnel of the Technical Cooperation Administration. For 42 years my major activities have been concerned with what is now referred to as technical assistance. I have traveled widely in the Near East, Asia, the Far East, and Africa.

I

My testimony will deal principally with title III of the Mutual Security Act of 1956—technical cooperation—and particularly the section dealing with United States bilateral program.

II

Lest my observations seem unduly critical, let me say at the beginning that I believe firmly that technical cooperation must be considered an extremely important phase of our foreign policy. I have always felt that the organized exchange of technical knowledge on a worldwide scale, so that the benefits of human advancement in any one country can be applied wherever they are desired and needed, represents one of the greatest advances of all time in international relations. I am proud of the pioneer part which the United States has played in the development of the idea and we must go on to greater accomplishments.

III

But it is possible to take a good idea and implement it in a way that significantly decreases its effectiveness and I think this has been especially true of our technical cooperation program. In 1949, I testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to this effect:

"The point 4 program which can really be effective will not be completed in 2 or 3 years. Bringing help to the mass of the people in the underdeveloped countries is a huge and complicated problem. It is not simply better seeds and more quinine. Unless our Government and the American people are willing to undertake such long-term programs and supply continuing funds, it would be better to drop the whole matter before it is begun. To raise high hopes for a year or two, then to stop appropriations will cause more ill will than if the point 4 program had not been started. From the very first such a program should be recognized as a definite part of a bipartisan foreign policy."

IV

The mutual security bill before Congress represents the seventh annual request for funds for technical assistance. For 6 years the program has been operating on a year-to-year basis. Total appropriations have passed the half billion dollar mark. While it is true that the International Cooperation Administration can contract obligations for 2 years, the program is essentially a July 1 to June 30 operation. I most heartily endorse the request of the President that the technical cooperation be placed on a long-term basis, so that wise and adequate planning can be done and with assurance that the program can be carried out. I understand certain Members of the House, including some members of this committee, have already expressed themselves in favor of such a long-range policy. To be specific, I suggest a minimum of 10 and preferably 15 to 20 years.

V

The program has suffered severely because of administrative changes. It was first under the Technical Cooperation Administration, within the State Department and with the State Department doing much of the planning and programing. TCA had in 2½ years 2 administrators and 1 acting administrator. The program in August 1953 was made a part of the Foreign Operations Administration under Mr. Stassen. The new setup provided for a Deputy Director for Technical Assistance but was without such director for about 8 months. On July 1, 1955, the technical cooperation program was made part of the International Cooperation Administration, which latter organization has semiautonomous status in the Department of State. So in about 5½ years, we have had 4 administrators, 1 acting administrator, 1 deputy director and 1 acting deputy director. As one would reasonably expect, the administrative changes in Washington resulted in uncertainty and frustration in the field. The point I want to make is that these administrative uncertainties create a difficult climate in which to plan effectively and to accomplish our objectives in the countries in which our technical cooperation programs are operating.

VI

The technical cooperation program must rest on bipartisan support which I understand is the case in Congress. May I respectfully suggest that it needs a bipartisan approach in administration. I am not suggesting that the Democratic administration was blameless in this respect but it is true that most of the high ranking experienced officials in the TCA were relased by Mr. Stassen and the administrative posts given to people without similar experience. In a study by the National Planning Association's special policy committee on technical cooperation, dealing with the administration of bilateral technical cooperation, the statement is made "Political clearances were made a standard requirement for all technical cooperation employees under FOA. This practice started on a large scale with the change of administration in 1953." And to quote again: "Some country directors have been appointed on a political basis despite their lack of special qualifications for leadership in technical cooperation." I take no particular pleasure in reading this paragraph but I think it is part of the record and part of the problem. I plead that we take bipartisanship just as seriously as we know how. We cannot have a successful technical program without it in both the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

VII

Our technical cooperation is less effective than it should be because the country programs are overextended. In the early phase of our technical-assistance operations, part of our foreign policy was to make an impact on the countries that had signed agreements with us. That meant quickly using as many people and as much money as possible. By 1952 we were using not only technical-assistance funds, but special economic-assistance funds. Too many of the early programs were our programs and represented what we thought was good for the country. We were transferring our technological fruit—not technological seeds and roots. We were in too great a hurry to get the job done before we really knew what the job was. A few days ago I was talking with a Congressman who had visited Asia. He had asked a chief of mission how many projects were being operated in the country. The reply was 89. The Congressman suggested that was too many. The chief replied that instead of criticizing him, the Congressman should compliment him for the number had been reduced from 239. I can best sum up the point I want to make by quoting from the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee's mission to east Asia and the Pacific, of which mission Dr. JUDD was chairman:

"The projects ought to be only those that build upon the basic strength of the country rather than spreading the funds over an array of projects, however useful, that must be started from scratch."

VIII

We need to use more imagination in adapting our field administrative organization to the situations found in the host countries. In Latin America the Servicio has been used to advantage. But throughout Asia and the Far East, we operate uniformly, using the USOM, with the exception of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction originally operating on the mainland of China, but now operating in Formosa. This joint enterprise has been signally successful because the two Governments have been operating as partners. Most of the countries where we operate vary greatly and need consideration in terms of their own situation. I am sure that the attitudes in many countries toward our cooperation would be more cordial if the joint commission idea were to be used. When I was in Formost in 1954, I was told that the decisions of the 5 commissioners—3 Chinese and 2 Americans—were invariably unanimous.

IX

The problem of personnel is still with us—really the key factor in the successful operation of technical cooperation programs. We are still appointing most personnel to a 2-year contract. It will be difficult to solve this important problem until Congress decides whether technical cooperation is to be given a reasonably continuing status. I believe many of our best citizens would elect service in technical assistance as a career if our administrative policies would make that possible. This complex problem is so widely recognized that I need only refer to it as part of the overall picture.

X

We need to resolve the growing confusion in the public mind as to what is technical cooperation and what is development assistance. Both categories are seemingly covered by the commonly used term "economic aid." It is highly desirable that the two types of assistance be kept separate in our thinking. In the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the Foreign Affairs Committee spelled out in detail what technical cooperation programs were. Development assistance is not comparably defined. Simply stated, it seems to me that technical assistance consists of those activities which (1) aim at developing the economy or raising the standard of living, primarily through (a) increasing technical competence or (b) helping to organize or improve public programs devoted to these ends; and which (2) are joint activities in which an agency external to the country is a participating partner. Development assistance consists of helping to develop the economy, or raise the standard of living of a country primarily through grants of commodities or funds which can contribute to these purposes. There is no clear line of division between technical cooperation and developmental assistance. On the whole, sending technical personnel to a country is a central feature of technical cooperation but is absent or a minor element in development assistance. In general, appropriations for technical cooperation are in modest amounts whereas grants for development assistance to a particular country in a particular year may run into many millions of dollars. Grants of funds for technical cooperation are legitimate to the extent they are needed to provide teaching and demonstration materials and to share sufficiently in financing certain joint programs that the host government is encouraged to undertake them and so that the external agency of technical cooperation (such as the United States Government) has a right to a voice in the administration.

Technical cooperation is popularly and rightly referred to as a self-help program. It is also thought of as a relatively inexpensive program. The amount requested of Congress for 1957 represents about 3 percent of the total 1957 mutual-security askings.

I am of the firm conviction that a properly administered technical cooperation program will be in the long run one of the best investments in international relations that the United States can make. It is now overshadowed by development assistance and other grant-in-aid and commodity programs. Technical cooperation is essentially a personalized program that should provide us with the personal contacts out of which international understanding and mutual respect can grow, and without which there can be no basis for lasting peace. It is a program for laymen, not for professional diplomats, though personal tact and diplomacy are essential for the laymen, too. Once the broad foreign policy with respect to technical cooperation has been laid down, the administration should be put in the hands of people who are culturally, technically, and administratively competent and allowed the necessary latitude to do the kind of a job that needs to be done in partnership with the other countries concerned. Under the circumstances under which technical cooperation must work at the present time, I see little hope for more than very mediocre success.

XI

For those who had high hopes for the influence which our original point 4—now the Technical Cooperation Program—might have, it is a depressing experience to follow the growing criticisms of the program which appear in the foreign dispatches of our newspapers, in syndicated articles and in congressional reports. It would seem that more criticisms grow out of our larger scale development schemes than from technical cooperation but both are involved. Surely by now we have learned that money can't buy friends and are we so bankrupt otherwise that money and more money is the one major resource on which we must fall back. Are we going to be drawn into a competitive dollar diplomacy race and what will the limits be? Do we not have to learn that in some circumstances, the citizens of our Government rather than the Government itself are the best avenues for attaining national objectives?

XII

Finally, as in 1953 and 1954 before this committee, I would again appeal to Congress to provide a status for our technical cooperation program that will allow it to function effectively. I have referred to the necessity for a long-term policy, to the administrative changes to which the program has fallen heir, to the lack of bipartisanism under which it is administered, to the diffusion of projects in the field, to the acute personnel problems involved, to the necessity of elasticity in our country to country relationships, to unwise and over-extended country programing, the seeming necessity of spending annual appropriations before June 30, and to the rising tide of criticism.

No one would question the responsibility of the president and the State Department to make overall foreign policy with respect to international economic aid. Indeed that has been quite clearly stated. But as suggested above, one policy has been laid down, the technical-cooperation program should be given the best possible chance to succeed. Helping people and governments is a difficult task and with the right kind of personnel dedicated to a long-term job, I see no reason for program and broad policy conflicts.

There are four reasons why technical cooperation should be given an independent status, possibly as a corporation as originally provided by Congress to the still existing Institute of Inter-American Affairs:

1. To separate it, in administration, from developmental assistance (since it is the much larger appropriations for the latter which keep technical cooperation in jeopardy).

2. To allow technical cooperation to be assured a long-term continuity without requiring, or seeming to require, a similarly assistance.

3. To allow it to develop personnel policies, and administrative and fiscal procedures which are well-adapted to the operating field needs of technical cooperation, rather than to standard departmental procedures within Washington.

4. To give it greater insulation from short-run fluctuations of political opinion.

Only in some such radical reorganization do I see any hope for the future of technical cooperation. More money at this stage will only aggravate the situation.

Presidential Inability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following pertinent editorial from the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel:

WHO SHALL DECIDE?

There is danger that an important, though secondary, subject for possible legislation will be lost in the congressional scramble this year. That is the matter of who should decide whether a President has become incapacitated.

To say that this question should be promptly settled is in no sense a reflection on the incumbent in the Nation's highest office. The matter should be considered, insofar as that is possible, without regard to who is now President. There is no escaping the fact, however, that President Eisenhower's attack last fall sharpened the national awareness of this problem.

This awareness prompted various responsible citizens, including former President Herbert Hoover, to study the matter and make recommendations. Some have pro-

posed that the Cabinet be charged with the decision; some would leave it up to the Supreme Court; other suggest a committee of top Government officials advised by a panel of physicians.

Perhaps quite another proposal, or a combination of some of those already made, would win out if the question were debated in Congress. It is important, however, that the matter not be dropped. The next time a Chief Executive is stricken, the Nation may not be as fortunate as it was when President Eisenhower recovered from his grave illness, or when Franklin D. Roosevelt died and Harry Truman became President and master of the situation.

Our Foreign Aid Program Will Not Work As Presently Designed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by Mr. Elgin Groseclose before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in which he points out that our foreign aid program, as presently operating, is based upon certain facilities. I am inserting his statement at this point:

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(Statement by Elgin Groseclose, economic consultant of Washington, D. C., before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Monday, May 7, 1956)

The bill under consideration authorizes an expenditure of approximately $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. During the first quarter of the current calendar year, the Treasury collected by deductions from wages and salaries of Americans some $6½ billion. This sum will therefore meet the bill for foreign aid here presented and allow a small excess toward the running expenses of our own Government.

It is a paradox of the conduct of our foreign policy that we have shown greater concern for the fiscal stability of foreign governments than for that of our own. For some years, the expenditures under the foreign aid program have been a major factor in the United States budget deficit. Upon this deficit the American taxpayer must pay interest charges. Yet these foreign aid billions are spent essentially to cover the deficits of foreign economies, if not the actual deficits of foreign governments.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM INFLATIONARY

It is axiomatic that a sound money depends upon a sound fiscal policy and that budgetary deficits are inflationary. A sound United States dollar is essential to domestic well-being. Today, more than ever, it is essential to the well-being of those countries to which we are ministering through the foreign aid program. This is because the dollar has become the standard of value throughout the world, even in Soviet Russia. Happenings that affect the value of the dollar, or confidence in its value, have worldwide effects.

At a time when the inflationary tendencies in the United States economy are causing concern, the inflationary effects of the foreign aid program should be looked at. In addition to its effect upon the fiscal balance, it has disturbing potentials in the money market. The Federal Reserve is currently engaged in tightening the supply of dollars to the United States economy. At the same time the State Department is making dollars available to foreign governments through the foreign aid program, with no strings attached, little or no interest to pay, and with the general result that they may take down these sums, or their equivalents, in gold or in credit balances with United States banks.

What has happened is visible in the monetary and banking statistics. Foreign governments, with the aid of credits made available to them for economic assistance, have been salting away American gold, or piling up balances in our secure American banks, while individual foreigners have become heavy investors in American securities. In the past 5 years, gold under earmark for foreign government account has increased by over a billion dollars and is now around $7 billion. Meantime, the United States gold ratio to money and deposits has been declining and is today at a lower figure than during the depth of the depression in 1933. In addition, net foreign bank balances—mostly for government account—have climbed to around $10 billion. As these foreign deposits can be drawn down in gold—a privilege denied to American depositors but extended to foreign governments—they constitute a further potential drain upon the reserves behind the dollar.

Ten billion dollars, if spent to feed the hungry populations of the countrise to which we are ministering through the foreign aid program, would of course do much to solve our own farm problem.

Under the monetary laws in effect in many foreign countries, dollar deposits are counted the same as gold in the monetary reserve. Thus these foreign dollar balances that we have made possible through our foreign aid largess provide the means and incentive to inflation abroad. Foreign aid dollars are thereby doubly inflationary. First, as deficit dollars moving into the United States banking system through Government bonds, they provide the basis for credit expansion and inflation. Second, as foreign bank balances here they become the base for currency inflation in the recipient country. It was just such a situation, coupled with thinning gold reserves, that brought on the 1929 collapse.

Even when these dollars are spent in the recipient country under United States supervision, their inflationary and other harmful effects cannot be predicted. Dollars appropriated for domestic purposes stay within the orbit of the United States economy, and to the extent that they are wisely appropriated and spent, they generate business activity, demand for capital and consumer goods, payrolls and taxes. Dollars donated to foreign governments pass out of United States control. We hope, but we cannot say, that they will be spent productively and without extravagance. The best judgment of the departmental experts who pass out these doles in inherently unreliable because of the distance and the difference in conditions upon which this judgment must be exercised.

Let us say that dollars are supplied to finance a cement plant. To a limited extent these dollars may come back to us in the form of engineering fees, or orders for plant machinery and other supplies, but there the beenfit ceases. We do not know, and our experts are only able to guess, whether this cement plant will operate profitably, or whether it will require continuing Government subvention to keep it running. We do not know what harmful effects to the local economy will result from this effort to modernize and industrialize livelihood systems that are often primitive, agricultural, and feudal in nature.

AID PROGRAM DEMORALIZES FOREIGN ECONOMIES

Furthermore, by "forced draft," "crash," and other hurry-up programs to hasten modernization, the aid program has frequently demoralized traditional livelihood systems and created the very unrest and unsettlement which it was designed to allay.

We are dealing here with a condition and not a theory. This may be illustrated by two cases which have recently been exposed to public view. The first is Turkey. When I was there in 1951 that country was baking in a glow of prosperity induced by United States largess. Everywhere I journeyed I saw in the countryside bright red American tractors purchased with counterpart funds. It all looked very progressive; but having lived in these lands and also having some personal experience with the problems of farming in this country, I questioned how successful this effort would be to impose a tractor economy upon a people that had since Roman times been getting along with an ox and wooden plow economy. It was very well to have tractors supplied practically as a gift, but who was to pay for the repairs and for the gasoline, and from where was the money to come? From Turkish wheat, when wheat was already a glut on the world market and United States grown wheat was accumulating in storage? And if so, how were the Turks to get their wheat to market without highways and farm-to-market roads? Would Uncle Sam be asked to provide these too? I raised these questions and have been raising them ever since where opportunity presented.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM PROMOTES UNREST AND REVOLUTION

The payoff to this incautious policy began to appear something more than a year ago, in reports from our representatives in Turkey, telling of mounting economic difficulties, restiveness and public dissatisfaction that were beginning to affect United States-Turkish relations, if not the stability of the Turkish regime. Eventually as you know, we have had to come through with additional largeess to subsidize this unnataural and unbalanced economy which we have fostered through our aid program.

In Afghanistan, our attempts to impose a twentieth century economy on a feudal culture have created tensions and unrest that have played into the hands of Soviet Russia. American engineers, aided by American dollars from the Public Treasury, have created the husk of a Tennessee Valley economy in the wilderness through which the Helmand River flows. The engineering has been relatively simple, however, compared to the difficulties of persuading nomads accustomed since the days of Abraham to settle down to tilling the soil under the watchful eye of a government overseer.

Meantime, the Afghan Government has been saddled with fiscal and administrative problems beyond its competence, while the people of Afghanistan have been burdened with heavy new taxes to finance this fiasco. Prices have risen, and the middle classes are in an inflationary squeeze. No one is happy about the situation. The New York Times, an advocate of foreign aid, reported on the Afghanistan situation in its issue of March 18 of this year in which it refers to the aid program as a "boon" that "has become a bitter burden that seriously threatens Afghan economy and presents the United States with a critical problem in a politically strategic area."

Even when the foreign-aid effort is limited to simple agricultural techniques, it is a hazardous thing for a government such as ours, representing a highly industrialized and developed people, to go into the more primitive areas of the world and attempt to counsel the peoples there on how to improve their lot. The noted anthropologist, Margaret Mead, with a group of fellow scholars,

studied this problem for the United Nations, and reported on the pitfalls in a document entitled "Cultural Patterns and Technical Change."

Even so simple an innovation as an iron plow may have catastrophic consequences, Dr. Mead points out. It throws the carpenter out of work and upsets age-old community patterns. It requires heavier draft animals, which in turn need more fodder than may be available. The wooden plow is light and can be carried from plot to plot, and as a farmer may have several widely scattered plots or strips to farm, the iron plow makes necessary a general rearrangement and consolidation of holdings.

I am not suggesting that modernization would not be good for those cultures and peoples, but this is a task for missionary and philanthropic agencies whose personnel dedicate their lives to the people they serve and who acquire from long experience an understanding of their needs and what can be accomplished. It is not a job for United States Government officials who go out for 2-year stints and who inescapably stand in the eyes of those people as representatives of a distant and alien power.

I pass over the incentives to graft, corruption and extravagance among the recipient countries which this gushing fountain of United States dollars provides, since these are presently under scrutiny by another committee of the Congress. I may only add that Washington has been on notice of these pitfalls. I was in Iran when the aid program was getting started—supposedly as a simple technical assistance program—and I saw the amazement of our officials there when they were notified by Washington that they were to have $50 million to spend during the following year. I am confident that their misgivings were reported to their superior officers.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM PROMOTES SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

A further criticism of the foreign aid program is that while the domestic policy of this Government is to preserve the system of private enterprise among us by getting the Government out of business, in the conduct of our foreign policy it is putting foreign governments increasingly into business, financing programs that promote statism and socialism and in other ways weakening attachment to the system of private enterprise. The United States is in fact doing concretely what Soviet Russia has been doing through propaganda: it is pouring out vast sums to promote totalitarian and communistic economic and political systems. It fosters 5-year plans, 7-year plans, state planning boards, imitation TVA's; it has put governments into the electric power business, into cement manufacture, into slaughter and meat processing, textile manufacture, tanning, sugar refining, milk processing, and other commercial undertakings. The list, if exposed, could be expanded enormously.

POLICY OF SUBVENTION

The trouble with the foreign aid program is that it is too much concerned with dollars. It is a policy of statecraft by subvention that is familiar to history but rejected by the founding fathers as repugnant to the American spirit and character, as well as ineffective and illusory. When the French Directorate in 1797 asked for money in return for French political favor the cry of protest arose, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Instead, Congress voted money to establish an American Navy.

The story of how the American Navy came into being can hardly be found in the high school history texts of today, and a generation has grown up unaware of the traditional American repugnance to statecraft by subvention. Today, the policy that the United States does not buy allies or favor has been dumped. To placate the Arabs and Jews we offer to develop the Jordan valley. To the Indians, we offer locomotive and steel mills; to the Egyptians we dangle the prospect of aid on a fantastic billion dollar power and irrigation scheme which will permit Egypt to double its population and its capacity for mischief. If subvention is a hard word, how else explain the official anxiety over Soviet bidding in the game? If the State Department is so piously concerned about a rising standard of living as an antidote to communism, then why its dismay at Soviet offers of economic assistance?

Actually, the question is not who is being bought but who is being sold. On several counts the State Department has not dealt frankly with the American people on the subject of foreign aid for Asia and the Middle East. The American public was given the idea at first that the program was in the nature of a simple agricultural experiment but from the start it has been a program of subvention. In Iran, where the program started, the largest single item the first year was for the purchase of sugar—some $10 million, I believe. Today, while the foreign aid strategists make much in the public press about the value of foreign aid in raising living standards, in close policy conferences the concern is about projects that make a show. The current officialese for such projects is monuments. One official seemed to argue that a steel mill in India should be located near the pilgrim centers so that as many millions as possible could see it, presumably with a large multilingual sign in neon—"Made in United States of America." Five years ago these officials were content with a less expensive model village set in the middle of a desert.

The Department speaks reassuringly about "our friends abroad." But who in the Department or outside—can say which are our friends and which are not? The unkind words of our French friends uttered a few days ago come like an echo of the nineteen twenties. Who can predict what allies we may have in case of war? The armies of Asia and the Middle East that we are equipping, do we know that they will fight, or if so with what zeal, or that they will remain neutral, or possibly turn their American-made weapons against the very people who supplied them? We have the recent case of the reversion of our good friends the Ceylonese, whose sentiments we had considered to be of the firmest.

AID PROGRAM FAILS TO MEET BASIC PROBLEMS ABROAD

The foreign aid program is based on a misconception of the nature of the problem with which it deals. The foreign aid program is dedicated to the notion that the ills of Asia and the Middle East are economic at root, curable by the application of scientific techniques of production and by sufficiently large doles of money (U. S. variety). It goes on the theory that communism breeds on poverty and that the antitdote to revolutionary unrest is a "rising standard of living."

Yet official reports in the files of the agencies show that there is no observable correlation between standards of living which the United States Government has spent billions of dollars to raise throughout the world and the political unrest and drift to communism in those areas where this money has been and is being spent. In Italy, for instance, communism is more widespread in prosperous northern Italy than in proverty-ridden southern Italy; in Italian factories Communist strength is often greatest in those where working conditions are best, wage scales the highest, employees benefits the most liberal. Despatches to the New York Times from its German correspondent last December reported that "the consensus of year-end messages by representatives of the government, industry and organized labor, is that prosperity in itself has not been an effective weapon against the Communist Party" (issue of December 29, 1955).

In Asia, it has been observed, the centers of unrest are frequently the universities, and the leaders of antigovernment and anti-American movements have been the well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, and presumably well-educated students. This was my personal observation during a year of travel in the Middle East in 1951.

One can but wonder at the lack of official courage in coming to grips with the true causes of unrest in Asia and the spread of communism. The facts are well known or should be well known to the departments from their many competent observers abroad. These are that Communist strength in Asia arises primarily from dissatisfaction with misrule, economic and political injustice, official corruption, and like evils which the governments of the regions either condone or fail to attack. And anti-Americanism arises in large part from our indifference to these conditions in a preoccupation with what has come to be called abroad point 4 colonialism.

During some 8,000 miles of travel through the Middle East in 1951, studying the village and pastoral economy, I made many inquiries of peasants and nomads as to their dissatisfaction. The answers brought forth no complaint of living standards, despite the evident poverty, but much of such things as unjust landlord exactions, corrupt judges, indifferent policy, military conscription, denial of the right to bear arms, and the like.

When the citizens of Boston dumped 342 chests of tea into Boston Harbor on the night of December 16, 1773, they did not do so because of its quality, or its price, or because they preferred coffee, but because they were subjected to taxes, as Samuel Adams said "without their having a legal representative where they are laid." The foreign-aid program assumes that the peoples to whom it ministers are somehow different from Americans, that they are obtuse to the political and social conditions of their existence and are responsive only to the material.

The dollar approach to the problems of the world's ills, the theory that greater production is the key to prosperity and peace ignores, or dismisses as inconsequential, the political and social causes of unrest, such as the faulty organization of government, official laxity and corruption, government intervention in the market, statism, inequitable taxation, imperfect judiciary systems, and venal courts, police brutality, chaotic civil service, nepotism, uncertain paydays, bureaucracy and overstaffing, loss of morale, official impotence and feeble leadership—these and others that could be named.

The hunger for improvement which is prevalent abroad, or the "revolution of expectations" which we observe abroad is a hunger that will not be satisfied by the stones of superior mechanical and scientific techniques. As Minoo R. Masani, the Indian industrialist, speaking at Mount Holyoke College, said, "You have a feast to spread but you give us only the crumbs. Among the qualities which the United States might well share with the East," he went on to say, "were love of freedom, belief in the dignity of labor, the spirit of adventure, and a world-sized mind."

And I might add, it needs the informing ideas which govern activity in this country; it needs the dedication to a task which only attachment to a great religious faith can provide. I mention this because the only observable fruit of the foreign aid program in Asia and the Middle East has been the fires lighted by the personal witness of some of the more dedicated officials of the program. This is worthy of mention in a hearing such as this, because it goes to the

very core of the question of American responsibility to the world, and the means by which this responsibility may be discharged.

President Eisenhower, speaking impromptu and from his heart at the fourth annual prayer breakfast held in his honor on February 2 of this year in Washington, explained the background of the prayer which he said at his inauguration, by saying that he wished to lift up a witness to the fact that a new chief executive was being inaugurated over a Nation that was founded on a religious faith. "We are telling people that this Nation is still a Nation under God" he said, and added, "This is terrifically important today."

What the President told the Nation at his inaugural, however, the foreign-aid program is failing to tell the peoples of the world; but rather it is saying in effect, through its emphasis upon money and techniques and scientific paraphernalia as the cure for the world's ills, that we are a Nation that worships Mammon. "Too much of the world believes the United States to be completely materialistic," the President declared and it may well continue to do so if the concepts and hypotheses of the foreign-aid program are to become a permanent element in American foreign policy.

SUMMARY

In summary, the foreign-aid program is bad policy for the following reasons:

1. The program is inflationary both at home and abroad.

2. The program is frequently demoralizing to recipient countries by:

A. unsettling traditional livelihood patterns,

B. fostering booms and fiscal extravagances,

C. inducing grafts and corruption;

3. The program stimulates statism, socialism, and communism abroad.

4. The program is a statecraft of subvertion that is contrary to American tradition and historic policy, that it is self-corrupting and ineffective.

5. The aid program nurtures frustration, political unrest, revolutionary tendencies, and anti-Americanism among recipient peoples.

6. The aid program gives a wrong idea abroad of the true sources of American vitality, well being, and prograss;

7. The aid program fails to meet the basic problem to which it is dedicated.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Elgin Groseclose, an economic consultant of Washington, D. C., was Treasurer General of Iran in 1943 and is the author of Introduction to Iran and other works dealing with the Middle East. He recently served as consultant to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and as acting deputy director of the Office of Economic Affairs (Department of Commerce).)

An Open Letter to Secretary of State Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dulles has recently stated to congressional committees that he does not know what Communist arms Egypt has received. I accordingly address him as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Is it not a fact that as of April 16, 1956, your files record that Egypt had a minimum of the following: 50 Ilyushin jet bombers, 200 Communist jet Migs, 50 Stalin tanks (60 tons each), 400 Katushka rocket launchers, 6 Soviet submarines, 18 battle cruisers, Communist-made motor torpedo boats?

Please do not say the information is classified.

Nothing can be classified that the whole world knows about.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Cleveland: How To Beat Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the efforts that are being made in the city of Cleveland to arrest the spread of slums and blight by local efforts. The Cleveland effort was recently reported in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, May 9, 1956, in an article prepared by Robert C. Bergenheim, staff correspondent, and entitled "Cleveland: How To Beat Slums."

The citizens of my community are extremely anxious for a liberalization of housing laws to permit a widescale Federal participation in slum clearance and urban renewal. They have manifested exuberant citizen interest in this important work. Mr. Bergenheim's report of May 9 is as follows:

CLEVELAND: HOW TO BEAT SLUMS

(By Robert C. Bergenheim)

CLEVELAND.—Imagination, good business sense, and local pride can turn the tide against slums and preserve healthy neighborhoods. Cleveland is proving just that.

A group of private citizens here pitched in to prove to homeowners through demonstration that well-kept properties are worth more than dilapidated, gloomy structures.

The national interest which has developed in Cleveland's experiment is proof of the true proportions of this program of arresting blight. National statistics show that more than 24 million dwelling units in the United States are in need of repair.

In Cleveland alone one-third of the 300,000 dwelling units were found in need of repair or renovation. An additional 36,000 are beyond saving and must be demolished. There are many cities—particularly the older ones—which are far worse off than Cleveland.

Cleveland citizens and public officials fully recognize the urgency of the problem. Many cities are well underway with Federal urban renewal projects. So is Cleveland. But, in addition, private enterprises have joined together in Cleveland as a major and effective movement against potential slums.

Six months ago a nonprofit organization—Cleveland Modernization, Inc.—was established, with an 18-member advisory committee representing every segment of community interest. This group supports Operation Demonstrate. It is being studied by communities with similar problems from coast to coast.

Operation Demonstration—or OD, as it is being called—is an all-out effort by private enterprise to keep sound residential housing from sliding downhill into slums. It wants to save neighborhoods while they still have their local charm and value. Working with OD has been the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, a national nonprofit organization which hopes to use Cleveland as an example of what can be done to save neighborhoods.

DRAMATIC STEPS NEEDED

Local and family pride are factors just as important as comfort and protection of the real-estate owner's pocketbook. Blight is such a slow, creeping process that it takes dramatic action as supplied by OD in Cleveland to open the public's eyes to the danger.

Instead of telling homeowners what a remodeling job can mean to them, OD has shown them. The slogan "Paint up, fix up, and clean up" doesn't inspire many homeowners to action. But concrete examples of the wonders of the paintbrush, hammer, and saw can stir the imagination, especially if it is a neighbor doing the sprucing up.

Most dramatic part of the Cleveland project has been the remodeling of two houses that were slated for demolition in a Federal urban redevelopment area.

With the permission of Mayor Anthony Celebrezze and other city officials, these houses were moved to the mall. Architects, decorators, and home suppliers were turned loose on them. One was turned into a home of traditional design, the other to contemporary.

These were the first two demonstration houses. Others have been tackled in various sections of the city. Public interest has gone beyond initial expectations. More than 40,000 persons visited the 2 model homes on the mall in the first 4 months they were open.

National magazines, local newspapers, radio and television stations have joined with bankers, real-estate firms, contractors, painters, department stores, and many other groups to sell the idea of Operation Demonstate.

The unprecedented enthusiasm of some of the outside interests has caused some local criticism, however. For example, one local observer claims that the houses moved to the mall were more than redecorated. "They were rebuilt. Only a few pieces of the original lumber survived," he said.

Such a job, he continued, proves only one thing—that with unlimited financial resources any house can be made modern and beautiful.

In defense, some supporters of OD say that visitors to these model homes are not expected to make all the changes shown, but might come away with one small idea which they wish to adopt for their own home.

Expensive decorations supplied by downtown department stores and local merchants also made the model houses good ammunition for the before-and-after photographs for national magazines.

While serving this purpose, some viewers were discouraged, realizing that their modest incomes in no way equipped them to duplicate these show places.

Sponsors of Operation Demonstrate, however say they are more than satisfied with the success of their project. They say that during the first 2 months of the program remodeling permits issued in the city increased 22 percent in number and 49 percent in value compared with corresponding months of the previous year.

Last year $34 million was spent in Cleveland for additions and alterations. In the same period new construction totaled $44 million, according to permits issued.

Some observers, however, do not concede that these percentages are significant nor are necessarily due to Operation Demonstrate.

Realizing that money spent on remodeling must be considered as a wise investment,

Operation Demonstrate set out to prove that remodeling protects a homeowner's financial position.

One 75-year-old house bought by the Cleveland Real Estate Board for $5,300, for example, brought an offer of $10,800 after $2,500 was spent on it, OD officials report.

Such figures have not gone entirely unchallenged by some local observers.

For example, they point to an elaborate remodeling job of a big Victorian-style house in a Negro area where most large houses have been converted into multifamily houses. Local merchants reportedly put between $35,000 and $40,000 into this house that may now sell for approximately $20,000, critics say.

STUMBLING BLOCKS

This sort of situation highlights one of the major dangers to any program aimed at dramatizing the preservation of properties. If a group or community goes overboard on remodeling, the total effect for that particular project is lost. As previously stated, if only proves that with enough money any house can be made as good as new.

A modest remodeling job is more likely to win public approval and get owners to follow suit. It would be practical.

Supporters of Operation Demonstrate constantly warn other civic-minded groups around the country of such dangers. "Biting off more than you can chew is the worst mistake of all," warns Harold Eckes, cochairman of OD.

Other stumbling blocks can be too ambitious programs by outside interests who leave the scene as soon as their needs for the project are satisfied.

Before doing anything, Cleveland OD officials warn other groups to get all their plans on paper, as well as commitments from those who are going to support, work on, and take an interest in the project. Deciding what the operating budget must be and raising it are fundamental steps.

Financial aid for individual property owners expected to go along with the neighborhood conservation program also must be considered. To the owner of a $5,300 house the initial investment of $2,500 for remodeling is often out of the question. On the other hand, a family looking for a $8,000 home might be persuaded to buy a $5,300 house and remodel it, as OD claims often can be done. A rundown house often hides its true value under a shabby exterior or a peeling coat of paint.

When OD started in Cleveland 6 months ago open-end mortgages were difficult to get. FHA home modernization loans require full payment within 3 years, which makes monthly payments too high for many persons.

Operation Demonstrate recognized this bottleneck immediately.

LIBERAL TERMS OFFERED

Five local banks—the Cleveland Trust Co., National City Bank, Society for Savings, Central National Bank, and the Union Bank of Commerce—developed a liberalized remodeling loan, repayable over a period of 8 or more years. Increased monthly payments, therefore, were kept within the reach of the homeowner.

Another stumbling block currently is being removed. The local building code specifies that remodeling must conform with a new construction code. A special home rehabilitation code is currently being tested in the Garden Valley area of Cleveland. After it has been tested and if it proves adequate, supporters of OD will push for its adoption for the entire city.

While recognizing the importance of remodeling, Cleveland Modernization, Inc., has done must to advance urban renewal plans for the city. Formed by 100 of the city's largest corporations, this foundation set up a $2 million revolving fund. At present the city is concentrating on two redevelopment projects, Longwood and Garden Valley.

Longwood, no more than 1 mile from downtown Cleveland, has turned from a dreary slum area into a revitalized, progressive community.

Garden Valley is 2 miles southeast of Longwood. Instead of waiting for approval of Federal funds, the foundation and the five commercial banks formed a $2 million mortgage pool to pick up all the mortgages on Garden Valley's private housing if necessary and to underwrite the entire central residential area rebuilding if necessary. Months were saved by this move by private enterprise.

Albert M. Cole, administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, used Cleveland as an example of what can be done by integration of Federal, State, city, and private-business interests in an address before the United States Conference of Mayors this year.

"One advantage Cleveland has enjoyed in late years," he said, "was the habit early established of viewing itself with critical eyes. * * * Cleveland has looked again and again with the vision of what can be built. As a result, in its central area, this city has cleared or is now clearing more than 26 square miles of land—or about 17,000 acres—for transformation into decent, commodious, and financially sound living space. And Cleveland continues to look forward. Its motto might be, 'What past is prologue,'" Mr. Cole suggested.

Classics of American Democracy

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, peace will come to this old troubled world of ours and victory will light on the banners of democracy only when we have won the war for the hearts and minds of men.

Until now we have been losing that war. Today is the turning point. What we are doing this day will have profound repercussions all over the world. I think it is safe to say that, measured in the future by the result of the action we now are taking, today will go down as a day of great historical significance. It marks the beginning of the frontal decisive attack in the war for the minds and hearts of men that up to this day of decision has been going steadily against us.

It was the force of reason that gave strength in vision and in deed to those who built for the dignity of man a fortress of democracy on American shores. There is no difference among men of various races and nationalities in common physical needs and in their basic desires and aspirations. The force of reason will be generated in any country and in any clime, in relatively equal measure, when the sources for reasoning are available and in a form of presentment to make them understandable. This I believe.

What we are doing today is to make available to mankind in every clime and translated into every tongue the classics of American democracy that are the sources of the eternal truths of government by, of, and for the people, government that upholds the dignity of all men and respects the purposes of the Creator of both men and nations.

CLASSICS FOR ALL THE WORLD

My colleagues will recall that a year ago when the appropriations of 1956 were under consideration I offered an amendment to provide for funds for a Classics of American Democracy program. While the amendment was ruled out on a point of order, the suggestion embodied in the amendment, I am happy to say, was sympathetically received by the House. That was a year ago. Much has happened in the intervening time. Later in my remarks I shall sketch briefly the events that marked the progress of an idea and its growth in the brief period of about a year into reality.

The important point is that with the increased appropriation for USIA in the bill now under consideration, and with the endorsement and cooperation of the commission on books of which the distinguished Dr. Mark May is chairman, and under the able guidance and experienced direction of USIA, the Classics of Democracy that inspired our forefathers are to be made available to peoples everywhere in inexpensive editions and translated into many tongues.

Heretofore these works were available only in the larger libraries and in editions priced beyond ordinary reach. There were few translations, none at all of some of our most precious national documents. Now they are to go on sale in the book stalls of the world, selling at prices comparable to those for which the literature of the Soviet is sold, and translated by outstanding scholars.

ON SALE IN ORIENT MAY 1

I am happy to be able to report that on May 1, now only a few days away, the following books in paper back editions will go on sale in the Far East at the prices given:

John Adams, Political Writings, 223 pages, 15 cents.

John C. Calhoun, Disquisition on Government, 104 pages, 10 cents.

Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography, Other Writings, 218 pages, 15 cents.

Thomas Jefferson, Representative Selections, 15 cents.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, Selections from the Federalist, 231 pages, 15 cents.

Henry D. Thoreau, Selected Writings on Nature and Liberty, 10 cents.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense, 184 pages, 15 cents.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution: Roots of American Constitutionalism, 71 pages, 10 cents.

Lord Charnwood's Abraham Lincoln, 501 pages, 10 cents.

WILL MEET SOVIET PRICES

This is the first time that American classics have been sold at prices comparable to those at which communistic books have been sold. With no publicity, the advance orders ran over 5,000 copies in a week. This is an index of the interest at grassroots level. It is in a field that heretofore we have not touched, leaving it to be monopolized by the Soviet. Now we are moving in, and I can assure my colleagues that what we are doing today in supplying the funds for the expansion of the present USIA pilot program will have tremendous results in our war to win the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

Within a matter of months our American classics will be translated into 25 languages, printed and distributed by local dealers in the respective countries, and sold in all the bookstalls of the foreign world at 10 and 15 cents a copy. Too much credit cannot be given American book publishers for their fine cooperation in developing a program from which their only return will be the satisfaction of rendering a patriotic service.

GRATITUDE DUE SUBCOMMITTEE

The distinguished and most able chairman [Mr. ROONEY] and members of the subcommittee are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have handled the appropriation request of the USIA. While the sum granted is $25 million less than the amount requested by the agency it nevertheless is a considerable increase and provides funds for the agency to carry on the classics of democracy program and to increase its overall work in several critical areas of the world. Some of us believed the full amount requested should have been granted because of the many new and difficult duties which have fallen upon USIA as a consequence of the latest Russian propaganda offensive. Nevertheless, the chairman and members of the subcommittee have done a great and patriotic job and deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

It is next to impossible to speculate with accuracy as to what the Russians might do next in their drive to conquer the world. In the past they have not hesitated to engage in armed aggression to accomplish their objectives. They have long depended upon internal subversion to aid them in destroying the independent action of nations and men. They have demonstrated a capacity to stop at nothing in their fanatical drive to eliminate competition of every sort in the countries occupied by communism.

HOW SOVIET SPREADS DOCTRINE

We also know that the Communists have made tremendous gains in deceiving large numbers of people in many lands as to the true facts about communism in practice. One of their principal weapons to misguide public opinion has always been books carrying the theories and doctrines of communism.

In every country of the world the Russians have put out inexpensive books in the native language in order to get their propaganda story across. By inexpensive books I mean books within the easy reach of students, laboring people and youth. In instances where important groups are made a special target of the Communists thousands of doctrinal books are spread among them at no monetary cost to the victim whatever. In the case of colleges, universities, and outstanding intellectuals the Communists have deluxe, leatherbound editions of the basic works of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and so forth, which are presented as gifts. All in all they make certain that anyone who can read will not find it difficult to come by one of their doctrinal books.

Moreover the Communists have developed the know-how for distributing great volumes of their books. For example, in India the Communists have a virtual monopoly of the inexpensive book market. This accounts in large measure for the confusion among the people of India on the true nature of communism and their so-called neutralism on the question of communism. A captive audience in any country cannot make fair judgments on world issues when they only get one side of the issue. That is one of the major problems of the Indian people.

TWENTY MILLION TRANSLATIONS

The increase in budget granted the USIA will permit the Agency to carry through with its book program planned to counteract the damage done by Communist books and to present the truth about the United States, including our political and social institutions. The Agency has planned to make available over 20 million books in 25 languages to the people of key countries in the free world. These will be inexpensive editions costing between 5 cents and 15 cents per copy. Thus students, laboring people and all interested will be able to get reliable books about the United States at a cost they can afford. This program will be concentrated on those areas where the Communists have flooded the bookshops, colleges, and libraries with their cheap books carrying Communist ideology.

BIRTH OF A PROJECT

In this connection it was my privilege and my pleasure to play a part in launching the project called Classics of Democracy. This project is now known to practically every Member of the Congress and has gained the support of important national organizations and prominent individuals in every part of the country. The Committee on Books Abroad of the USIA has given long and careful study to the project. Recently on the suggestion of the group backing the Classics of Democracy program a pilot project was launched to bring about the production of inexpensive books in some 10 different languages. A number had been recommended by our group as the type best expressing our American political and social philosophy. This project already has blazed the trail for a winning-books program and maximum utilization of the many fine suggestions which have developed from the original project and campaign for the Classics of Democracy.

I hope the USIA will not find it necessary to cut any funds from the book program. I have been assured that it will not. That program is the best weapon we have to help us win a just peace by making the political and social ideals which have made America the leading peace-loving nation of the world, known to millions of people who are hungry for knowledge and the true facts about the American people and the philosophies of democratic government by which we abide.

Again, I congratulate the subcommittee on a job well done.

HOW PROGRAM DEVELOPED

Mr. Chairman, I have stated that I was privileged to have a part in the Classics of Democracy program. It was a part which I shared with the distinguished statesman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. The concept was born in, and the dynamic drive in its development came from, the discussions and activities of a small group in Chicago composed of:

Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, probably the most widely read Protestant periodical in the country.

Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation, University of Chicago. He is nationally known as an educator in the field of political science and a prominent Catholic layman.

Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, a State Department visitor to universities in Indiana, and a former member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Dr. Emery T. Filbey, vice-president emeritus of the University of Chicago.

Thomas B. Stauffer, Humanities instructor, Wilson Junior College. He has a rich background in foreign service and was at one time aid to the Honorable Jefferson Caffery.

John McGinnis, President, Pennsylvania Railroad Lodge, No. 225, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. T. Burch, executive editor, Chicago Daily News.

Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News.

It began with informal discussions in Chicago motivated by observations made by members of the group during world travel both in an official and unofficial capacity. Their spadework brought them a letter of approval from the Committee on Books Abroad for the United States Advisory Commission on Information. Dr. Mark A. May, chairman of the committee, called upon the Chicagoans to supply a list of books to be considered.

OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

In February of 1955 the Chicago Daily News called upon its foreign correspondents in different parts of the world to investigate the extent of the Communist book campaign and what the United States was doing to meet it. The reports from Paris, London, Bonn, Rome, as well

as uncommitted parts of Asia and Africa all pointed to the fact that in the words of Van Allen Bradley, the literary editor of the News, "The United States is losing the Battle of the Books." In an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and in all the Knight newspapers on June 6, 1955, Mr. Bradley pointed out:

Russia is turning out in many languages millions of volumes of inexpensive editions of the classic Communist statements of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other writers whereas we have nothing to compare with the Communist cheap book distribution plan.

The illuminating and revealing survey of the foreign book situation by the Chicago Daily News was one of the year's outstanding American journalistic achievements. The report will be found on pages 6746–7 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1955.

QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS APPROVAL

The public response was instant and widespread. Further evidence of the depth of the popular interest in the Classics of Democracy program was furnished by the response to the questionnaire mailed in December of 1955 to 3,500 outstanding industrialists, editors, educators and recognized leaders in labor, veteran and women's organizations to sound public reaction to the proposed program. Another purpose of the questionnaire was to ascertain what books in the judgment of a jury of American enlightened public opinion were entitled to inclusion in the list of books Americans as a whole would agree constitute the imperishable classics of our democracy.

Many of the letters received in response to the questionnaire were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows: January 18, 1956, pages A488–495; January 19, pages A581–88; January 20, pages A602–607; January 23, pages A666–76; January 26, pages A816–20. The reading of these letters, I can safely say, furnishes a liberal education in the subject. Most of my colleagues, I am sure, are familiar with them. As one colleague remarked, "Once one starts reading, he cannot stop until the last word of the last letter, they are that interesting, inspiring and patrioticly thrilling." Moreover, the letters reflected the thinking of the highest scholarship of the country. If you have not read these letters, you really have missed the substance of a cost enriching hour or two of reading time.

CONFERENCES WITH USIA CHIEFS

Meanwhile conferences had been going on with Theodore C. Streibert, the able director of USIA, Dr. Franklin L. Burdette, Edward O'Connor, Dr. Claude E. Hawley, and others of USIA in which Congressman FEIGHAN and I participated. On January 27, 1956 Director Streibert gave the glad announcement of the launching of the pilot project in the following letter:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: May I extend to you my appreciation for your leadership in highlighting the necessity for creating and distributing overseas inexpensive editions of American classics of democracy as one of the principal means for furthering United States information objectives.

In accordance with our conversation and with discussions you have held with members of the Agency staff, I should like to recapitulate certain related activities the Agency is now pursuing. Inexpensive editions of 25 United States titles in English are being prepared and will be distributed commercially in Asia beginning February 1. Of these, 10 express our basic American social and political philosophy. In February a pilot project will be undertaken to publish 10 titles in foreign languages to be made available in the most inexpensive form possible. Through this project we expect to develop the necessary channels to permit the launching of a large-scale program which will accelerate the overseas distribution of books about the United States. Several of the titles used in this project are planned to be of the type advocated in your proposals.

Looking to the future, we are requesting funds from Congress to permit expansion of the program for the distribution of inexpensive books in English to a level of 80 titles, plus some 440 editions of inexpensive translations, encompassing publication in more than 20 languages. For the most part, these will be available in foreign markets for the equivalent of 10 cents retail, although in some instances individual titles may be priced at the equivalent of 15 or 20 cents, depending upon the requirements of the program in different parts of the world. In all cases, commercial facilities will be used in order that the books may be accessible through normal means.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell you how much all of us in the Agency appreciate the interest you have shown and the work you have done. It is certainly gratifying to learn of the response you have received from hundreds of outstanding citizens and organizations throughout the country. Please extend our thanks to the group of Chicagoans who assisted in promoting the idea of worldwide distribution of the Classics of Democracy and particularly to the Chicago Daily News for its pioneering efforts. We hope they will all continue their interest in this work and that we will have the benefit of their continuing advice.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT.

CONGRESSMAN HAUNTS BOOK STALLS

It would be impossible to overstress the importance of Congressman FEIGHAN'S trip to the Orient after the adjournment of the first session for first-hand information. For days and weeks he haunted the book stalls. Perhaps no American with the single exception of Dr. Richard P. McKeon ever before made such a thorough inspection of what people in the Orient at grassroots were buying and reading. The American people are greatly indebted to Congressman FEIGHAN for the weeks of grinding, fatiguing work he gave to this work. What he found verified in every detail the reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News that we were losing the battle for the minds and hearts of men because the classics of our political philosophy, the classics that inspired our own forefathers, just were not available in translated and inexpensive editions.

On December 9, 1955, Congressman FEIGHAN reported to the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad on his trip to the Far East where he observed the distribution of Communist and other books through commercial channels. His report made a profound impression.

On February 21, 1956, I reported to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations chaired by Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY on the findings of the Chicago group and the results of the nationwide questionnaire among leaders in American public opinion. The testimony will be found on pages 377 to 383 of the public hearings on USIA. I am deeply grateful to Chairman ROONEY and the members of the subcommittee for the lengthy and sympathetic hearing they accorded the presentment of the views of the Chicago group and the larger group nationwide that had responded to the questionnaire. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of all those interested in the Classics of Democracy program to Chairman ROONEY and Congressmen PRINCE H. PRESTON, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, DON MAGNUSON, FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., FRANK T. BOW, and CLIFF CLEVENGER.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BOOKS

In February of 1956 the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad of the United States Advisory Commission on Information gave a much appreciated and significant recognition by devoting one of its sessions to a discussion of the project. Congressman FEIGHAN and I were honored by an invitation to appear before this most distinguished body. We were accompanied by Mr. Stauffer, representing and presenting the views of the Chicago group.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information was created by Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress. The members of this Commission serve without pay and represent a cross section of professional and business experience in the communications field. The chairman of the commission is Dr. Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations of Yale University. Other members of the commission are Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Sigurd S. Larmon, president of the advertising firm of Young & Rubican, Inc., and Philip D. Reed, chairman of General Electric Co. Assisting the commission in formulating policies there are advisory committees, each chairmanned by a member of the commission.

Dr. May is the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad. Its members are George P. Brett, Jr., president of the Macmillan Co., Robert L. Crowell, president of Thomas Y. Crowell Co., Robert B. Downs, director of libraries at the University of Illinois, Charles W. Ferguson, Sr., editor of the Readers Digest, Freeman Lewis, executive vice president of Pocket Books, Inc., Keyes D. Metcalf, former director of libraries at Harvard University, and Charles E. Odegaard, dean of the Colleges of Literature, Science, and the Arts of the University of Michigan.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDS PROJECT

In its 11th semiannual report to Congress, made on March 30, 1956, the Commission approved the recommendation of its advisory committee that "in view of the present world situation resulting from the Geneva 'summit' meeting it is imperative that large quantities of books be translated and widely distributed in certain areas." The Commission stated:

In view of these facts we agree with the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad that it is in the public interest for the Congress of the United States to increase its appropriations for the translation and distribution abroad of selected American books at prices which will compete with those of subsidized Communist books.

In recent months, a group of citizens in Chicago has expressed interest in the translation and distribution abroad in low-priced editions of the Classics of Democracy. We agree thoroughly that a substantial number of the books to be included in the Agency's program of low-cost translations should be of this nature. Some should be complete volumes in original form, others could be collections of basic documents, assembled and described by eminent scholars.

We are glad to note that Congressmen BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, and MICHAEL FEIGHAN from Cleveland have been working with this group of citizens on this matter and are taking an active interest in the need for a greater distribution abroad of American books and particularly translations of the Classics of Democracy.

VICTORY NOW IN SIGHT

Mr. Chairman, we now are on our way to victory in the war for the hearts and minds of men. That is why, as I have said, this is a day of historical significance. Again I commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman and all the members of a great and far-visioned subcommittee.

In closing, permit me to cite one recent illustration of how all the world is hungering for the classics of our democracy that heretofore for the most part have been unavailable in translated editions. At long last an edition of the Federalist Papers in Italian has been placed before the people of Italy. The University of Rome recently undertook the translation and publication. The volume is more pretentious than the 10- and 15-cent editions to which I have referred. It is selling for $2.60 per copy. Already it is second on the list of best sellers in Italy.

What, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, may we expect to come to our country and to the cause of democracy as dividends on what we are doing today when all over the world are classics of democracy, translated into all tongues and selling for 10 and 15 cents a volume, within the reach of everybody?

American Firms Boycotted by Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the May 4, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks. The article describes the manner in which the Arab Middle East is carrying out a directive by the Arab League to discriminate against American firms:

ARAB BOYCOTT HITS UNITED STATES JEWS

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The traditional American firmness in protecting the rights of its citizens in international relations, regardless of race or religion, has received a number of setbacks in recent years. In the face of a defiant and concerted campaign of discrimination against the mistreatment of American Jews by the Arab states, the Government has retreated on all fronts: Where it has not been weakly apologetic for Arab hostility, it has voiced perfunctory disapproval or, worse, remained indifferent to the blatant violations of the rights of American citizens.

(The worldwide Arab campaign against "international Jewry" has concentrated its animus against the Jewish community of the United States. This has taken many forms: A hate-pronaganda drive in this country, launched by official Arab agents and cooperating closely with the native anti-Semitic lunatic fringe; denial of visas to American Jewish tourists and American military personnel; discrimination in employment of American workers for private and Governmental projects in the Arab Middle East; and an open blacklisting of American firms owned by Jews or employing Jews.

(The latter is the subject of the present article. Future pieces in this section will take up other aspects of the Arab campaign against American citizens.)

NEW YORK.—On February 3, 1956, General A. K. Gailani, of the Iraqui consulate in New York, made the following declaration:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christian, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League, not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries."

This was only one of several official statements confirming the Arab League directive boycotting business enterprises throughout the world which maintain commercial relations with Israel's firms. The Arab blockade against Israel herself, an attempt to strangle her economically, had been expanded, several years ago, to include all of Jewry all over the world. The intention was not only to hurt Jews economically: The campaign had all the earmarks of a fullblown anti-Semitic movement directed at Jews as such.

The tactics here has been to bring pressure against non-Jewish firms employing Jews or doing business with Jews by using the threat of boycott. This has been applied not only to the matter of doing business with such firms but even to the import of their products. Gradually the program has been expanded to a blacklisting of all businesses, whether or not they have affiliations in Israel, so long as they are either owned by Jews, employ Jews or even subscribe to Jewish charity appeals. The Economic Bulletin of the Arab League, published in Cairo, reports a total of 162 such firms on the blacklist: 45 British, 44 American, 23 French, 14 Swiss, 11 Argentinian, 10 Canadian, 8 Belgian, 6 Dutch, and 1 Australian. The character of this economic reprisal is clearly anti-Semitic.

SAUDI ARABIA MOST ACTIVE

Most of the members of the Arab League are participating in the boycott, but most active has been the Saudia Arabian government.

Correspondence from Saudia Arabian firms cancelling contracts with American businesses, in the files of the American Jewish Congress, indicate the effectiveness of the campaign. A directive issued by the Saudi Arabian chamber of commerce, at the behest of the Saudi Arabian Government, instructs all firms in the country to discontinue all relations with firms controlled by or employing Jews.

The directive makes clear that any contract drawn up in violation of such orders will be automatically cancelled and that any merchandise imported into Saudia Arabia from such firms will be confiscated. This has forced importing firms in the country to get definite assurances from their business associates abroad that they are free of all Jewish connections.

The nature of such demands is clearly revealed by letters received by American firms from Saudi Arabian companies. For example (letters or quoted verbatim, and follow punctuation and capitalization of originals):

"We very much regret to inform you that our Government has duly published a notice announcing that any Importers of Suadi Arabia must not be permitted to import the goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish Firms of the world.

"We are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm is belong, to Jewish or Christian? And until we have full particulars from you we are obliged to stop our business with you."

On October 1, 1953, an American firm was informed that:

"In connection with our request for not effecting the shipment of our order by any steamer which belongs to any Jewish steamship company. This is in compliance with our Government's regulation announced recently, further this ordinance warns that any shipment by such steamers will not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia."

The boycott includes goods manufactured by Jewish firms, though handled by non-Jewish exporters, as evidenced by the following excerpt.

"We have also to inform you that you are well aware we are prohibited to import any goods manufactured in any Jewish factories."

CERTIFICATION DEMANDED

American firms are asked to certify their freedom from Jewish association before any business deal is consummated with Saudi Arabians.

"It is forbidden to deal with a Jewish company or with a company whose any of its workmen is Jewish or has branch in Israel, and if a merchant intended to deal with a company and knows that the same company is not Jewish, should also be asked to submit a letter of certificate issued by the chamber of commerce certifying that neither of its workmen is Jewish."

In a letter of November 27, 1955, it is the Saudi Arabian legation that American firms are referred to for certification.

"According to Saudi Arabian Government's regulation all invoices for the goods supplied, must be legalized by Saudi legation of your side. We are strictly prohibited to deal with Jew firms and therefore it will be appreciated if you can furnish us with a certificate duly legalized by the Saudi legation stating that your firm is not Jews firm."

One of the letters cited above was received by an American firm which, prior to the boycott, did a $2 million business with Saudi Arabia by export of wheat, flour, rice, and textiles. Under the International Wheat Agreement, the United States pays 70 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped as a subsidy to American exporters. American submission to the Arab boycott means, therefore, that such benefits are denied Jewish firms simply on the basis of their religion.

BOYCOTT IS WORLDWIDE

The Arab boycott is world-wide in scope and has as its goal the exclusion of Jews from international trade. Press reports have recently indicated Arab boycott efforts in various European countries, resulting in a number of protests in England, Italy, Switzerland, and Holland. A letter received by Verkoopantoor Van der Heen N. V., The Hague, Holland, begins by explaining that the Arabs are at war with Israel and are "making an economical siege around that Israel" and then proceeds to ask for information about the firm, including the following items:

"Do you have any Jewish employees in your company, if yes, how many and what are the positions held by them?

"Are there any Jews in your board of directors as members?

"Is any of your managers or branch managers a Jew? if yes, please give the name of the department headed by such a man.

"Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew?

"What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices?

From the evidence already cited, it is clear that the boycott is inspired and directed by the Arab League and the individual Arab countries, and that it is not simply a policy instituted by private Arab firms, as some United States Government officials have declared. It is, besides, impossible to assume any private initiative impinging on international relations in a rigid despotism such as Saudi Arabia, for example.

Moreover, official representatives of Saudi Arabia in the United States have been directing the boycott and channeling all certification. Affidavits filed with the American Jewish Congress show that the Saudi Arabian consulate in New York has labeled some American firms as "undesirable" and has refused to legalize commercial invoices.

Representatives of American firms have been questioned closely by the consulate as to their Jewish affiliations and Jewish personnel. Even messengers delivering papers from American firms to the Sauri Arabian Consulate have been questioned about their religious affiliation. It is indisputable that the anti-Jewish discrimination is the official policy of the Arab governments, zealously executed and promoted by their authorized agents in the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT INACTION

What has been the attitude of our State Department on this official discrimination against a segment of the American population and the high-handed behavior of Arab diplomats in this country?

When the matter was first brought to the attention of the State Department in 1952, it was taken up with Saudi Arabian representatives informally. In a letter to Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, Assistant Secretary of State Jack K. McFall declared that these efforts had been successful and that the broad restrictive Saudi Arabian decree has been superseded as of April 4, 1952.

But the boycott has continued and has, in fact, become more open and more brazen.

Further efforts to bring the anti-Semitic campaign to the attention of the State Department and suggest some action in defense of American citizens' rights have been met with indifference or with attempts to evade the issue by labeling it a private boycott.

"The Department hopes [wrote the then Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton on December 15, 1953] that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Government."

That the Arab boycott is not a sporadic, out-of-bounds affair of some individuals is abundantly evident from the letters cited which refer to the Government ban, and from the statement of Arab officials themselves. On December 29, 1955, for example, the New York Mirror reported the Saudi Arabian blacklist of Jewish firms and added:

"At the Saudi Arabian consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab country."

DUTCH ACT, STATE DEPARTMENT DOUBLETALKS

The attitude of the State Department has been hesitant and uncertain: It has indicated apprehension about possible repercussions more than concern about the violation of the citizens' rights. The Dutch recently set an example of courage and integrity by calling on its chamber of commerce not to supply information on the number of Jewish executives and employees in Dutch export houses as demanded by Arab firms. But the United States State Department speaks of the delicacy of the problem and an informal approach and even attempts to fly in the face of the facts by suggesting the boycott is due to the excessive zeal or misunderstanding of some individual Arabs.

A more recent illustration of the quality of State Department thinking on the issue is found in the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956. In a colloquy with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Mr. Dulles launched into a discussion of Moslem religious practice in Saudi Arabia, and then continued:

"Now, we do not like or approve of or acquiesce, except perforce in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, became an ally in the first instance through the conversations and subsequent communications with President Roosevelt, and we have a very special relationship there with that Government.

"That does not mean we approve of all its practices at all. It does mean we get along together in a way which is of mutual advantage.

"We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like."

There are a whole host of precedents in American history where the American Government insisted that its nationals be protected, without regard to race or religion, and upheld the rights of American citizens without discrimination. Today, the American Secretary of State declares that we must accommodate ourselves to an antisemitic campaign launched by the Arab States, directly affecting American citizens, and being conducted by foreign diplomats in America.

As Senator LEHMAN wrote to Secretary Dulles on January 25, 1956:

"Would you not agree that our Government has an obligation to its citizens, and its own ideals, to let the Government of Saudi Arabia know not only on one occasion but on repeated occasions that we view with utmost distaste this policy of antisemitic discrimination?"

MOHAMED ALI MOHAMED SULEMAN,
Manufacturers' Representatives,
Importers, and Commission Agents,
P. O. Box 37 Jeddah,
(Saudi Arabia).

It may also be noted that according to Saudi Arabian Governments' regulation all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by Saudi Legation of your side. We are strictly prohibited to deal with Jew firms and therefore it will be appreciated if you can furnish us with a certificate duly legalized by the Saudi Legation, stating that your firm is not Jews firm, otherwise we regret we shall not be able to enter into business with you.

However, we are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm is belonging, to Jewish or Christian, or until we have full particulars from you we are obliged to stop our business with you.

DEAR SIRS: Our Government has announced today that your firm is Jewish one. Therefore, you must ship all our goods or orders through your sister English or American firm, otherwise we shall be unable to honor your drafts and we shall both be on a very, very unexpected loss.

We regret to have to inform you that our chamber of commerce has published a notice of our Government's order which warn all importers of our country that no one should cooperate with any Jews firms of your country. Along with the notice a list of some names of Jews firms is attached, and among these names your name is also mentioned as Jew's firm. This order is strict, and it warns that if anyone will import the goods from these firms their goods will be held out by Government and no application will be considered for its exemption.

We very much regret to inform you that our Government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers of Saudi Arabia must not be permitted to import the goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish firms of the world.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, ———, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, ———, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Fennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, ———.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	
Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss.*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Beamer, John V., *Ind.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, John J., *Tex.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio.*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio.*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va.*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C.*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr.*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio.*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y.*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg.*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn.*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*

Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis.*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William A., *Utah.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex.*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*—2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa.*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich.*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa.*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex.*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont.*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn.*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex.*
George, Myron V., *Kans.*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill.*
Granahan, William T., *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith, *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky.*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y.*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Hale, Robert, *Maine.*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J.*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind.*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark.*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich.*
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Heselton, John W., *Mass.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hill, William S., *Colo.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif.*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans.*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md.*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa.*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif.*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala.*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J.*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va.*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa.*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, Karl C., *Pa.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn.*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak.*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4320 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

"We Who Are About To Die—"

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the most important bill of the session. It deals with the most vital and most important issue before the American people today. It carries inevitable, imperative, and inescapable allocations and it appropriates vastly more money than all the rest of the appropriation bills that have been passed or that will be passed by this Congress. It provides the money for national defense. It carries funds for the preservation of free government around the globe. It is the last hope of civilization. If it fails, if America falls, there is no other people, no other government left to take up the torch stricken from our hands.

So we have little option, little latitude in the drafting of this bill. It is merely a matter of how much money can be used effectively by our technicians, our masters of strategy, and our agencies of production. So the committee is going along, largely, with the budget. We are accepting in general the decisions of the President and the Pentagon as to amounts and allocations, although there are some of us on both sides of the aisle who must reserve judgment on some items.

We are reaching a critical period in a time of our greatest national danger. The situation demands sane and constructive thinking divorced from political interest or partisan influence. We must have the facts. The stakes are entirely too high for us to take a chance on the slightest uncertainty.

The principal editorial in the Washington Post of this morning says:

> The military structure ought to be scrutinized from top to bottom.

Then it continues:

> A study by independent men of stature could help to bring to bear by appropriation time next year some of the fresh thinking everyone talks about and seemingly no one does.

That is a rather drastic castigation of this budget, but it is the considered opinion of one of the great newspapers of the Nation. The duty of such scrutiny and such thinking devolves upon this House and for the time being no one else can discharge that responsibility. It has been in the hands of the committee since January, and we now submit it to you for your adjudication.

Let us look at the fundamentals.

First, can we avoid war? Will we ever be called on to use the armaments for which we are spending this $33 billion or $35 billion? Of course, all of us are by nature optimists. We prefer to believe that there will never be occasion to defend our families, our cities, our Nation, against predatory murder and rapine, against the Tamerlanes, the Genghis Khans, the Stalins in Russia, the Mao Tse-tungs in China, the Ho Chi Minhs in Vietnam, or the Kim Il Sungs in North Korea.

We hope we shall never have to defend our Nation against these barbarians who torture body and soul as in the case of General Dean and Cardinal Mindszenty and thousands of others who have suffered unspeakable martyrdom, a martyrdom which they threaten to inflict on every American in the United States.

We are a peace loving, peace prospering people. All our interests lie along the paths of peace and international amity. We have endeavored in every way possible for the past 10 years to reach an honest and honorable agreement with Russia. We have humiliated ourselves in numerous conferences, and all without avail. Just a little more than a month ago, the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee with representatives from France, Canada, Britain, and the United States resumed discussions in London with that in view. All were agreeable except Russia. Russia alone dissented. Russia alone insisted upon maintaining the present status and continuing the race of armaments which is disturbing the whole world. The Kremlin offered only lip service and in the meantime Russia has continued to manufacture more arms; has made more progress in scientific warfare than any previous year in the history of that nation or any other nation in the world in like time.

There can be no cause for apprehension on the part of Russia. The United States by its long and consistent course of honorable associations with other nations of the world has shown itself to be a friend under all circumstances. We established the Cuban Republic when that fertile island was thrown in our lap, and we could have had it for the asking. Instead of appropriating and exploiting it as a dependency, we preferred to make it an independent nation. In the Philippines we spent billions of dollars rebuilding the war-torn islands and rehabilitating the people and establishing schools, roads, and commerce and self-government to such an extent that everyone there today is our friend. We could have taken the Philippines over, without opposition, had we entertained any disposition toward colonization. Instead we made them a free and independent people in the family of nations.

In our relations with our sister Republic, Mexico, on all occasions we have accorded her the most deferential and amicable treatment, leaving no doubt in anyone's mind of the peaceful and friendly attitude of the United States toward all the peoples of the world. We entertained the same friendship for Russia and the Russian people. We saved her in her war with Germany. But for American ships, American planes, American arms, and American food she could not possibly have survived. But no sooner was the danger past and peace assured than the Soviet Government, seizing every adjacent nation, announced her policy of extending Russian communism and Russian rule throughout the world. In pursuit of that policy she closed down the Iron Curtain and prepared to subjugate the globe by force. And from 1945 down to the present day, the factories and laboratories of Russia producing war materials have been running on 3 shifts, 24 hours a day, in the feverish effort to prepare themselves to take us over, as they have taken over Poland, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, Albania and adjacent territories. One by one their inhabitants were subjected to selective massacre and their property carried to Russia and all are today abjectly under the heel of the Russian tyrants.

When they have so often and so emphatically expressed their hatred for us, our form of government, our religion, and our way of life, what reason have we to believe that, once they have enough long-range bombers, America and Americans would receive any different treatment?

In this continuous preparation for war throughout the last decade the Soviets could have no other possible purpose than the subjugation of America, the wholesale destruction of the majority of our people, and the looting and confiscation of everything we possess to such extent that the miserable remnant of the American people would be decimated as completely as the famine-stricken Kulacks of Russia, who were starved and exterminated by the millions in the purges instituted by Stalin to establish his dictatorship.

But even if we could secure a covenant with the Soviets, it would not warrant a slackening of our preparations for defense. The Soviets have never kept a single international agreement they have ever made. That is a sweeping statement, but wholly justified by the facts.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services,

now ranking minority member of that committee, called attention to this situation when he reminded us in January that the Reds have consistently broken the Korean truce in order to build up their airpower. They realized that airpower is critical and supreme. They solemnly agreed when they signed the truce that they would not increase their forces or their war facilities. At that time they had 12 airfields. Today they have 39. When the armistice was signed, they did not have a single Mig plane. They now have 350. On the night of July 27, 1953, the day the armistice was signed, planes were detected entering North Korea from Manchuria. If they broke their word the very day the treaty was signed, what can we expect in the future?

They have all these years publicly proclaimed their hatred of us and their determination to destroy us and they have never retracted or deviated from that purpose.

But now there are alarming developments. We have always believed that our superior Air Force rendered us immune to attack. It has never occurred to us that any nation, much less backward Russia, could develop intercontinental bombers or nuclear bombs which could be used against us. Now, within the last few months it has become increasingly evident that we are losing our battle with communism. Those in a position to know have testified before House and Senate committees that Russia is attaining a frightful lead over the United States in long-range bombers and guided missiles.

Although in 1945 the United States had the most powerful Army, the greatest Navy, and the most effective Air Fleet in the world, top-ranking military officers now inform us that the Soviets have a numerical advantage in long-range bombers and the rate of production of nuclear aircraft.

With a continuation of the present trends they will have a greater striking power than we in 1958 or 1960, if not before.

General LeMay testified that even today the Soviets have more Bisons and Bears—that is the equivalent of our B–52's—in their armory than we have B–52's; and that statement is not disputed. And the ominous feature of it is that we are told by our military authorities that the United States Air Force does not now plan to increase the rate of production of the B–52's, even to equal to the combined production of the Russians in modern-type bombers. They are producing more rapidly, and we agree they are producing more rapidly, yet we have no plans whereby we propose to remedy that situation.

To further impair American defense, Russia has just announced they will soon have an intercontinental missile with a hydrogen warhead they can place anywhere in the world. There is no known defense against a ballistic missile.

Already Russia claims to be on the way to production of a missile with a practical range of 1,500 miles. That would bring within range all our European allies.

Air Force Secretary Quarles said on April 24 that in view of our past experience with Russian claims there is little room to doubt her announcement of an intercontinental missile. For example, he said Molotov boasted in 1948 that Russia had the secret of the atomic bomb. At that time we were certain nobody but the United States had the secret, but that very year they exploded their first bomb 4 years in advance of the shortest time we had reason to expect they could possibly develop it.

Again in June of 1953 Malenkov announced they had the secret of the hydrogen bomb which we considered unknown to anyone outside the United States, and the following August they fired their first hydrogen bomb.

The Russians in the past have made good on their claims, said Secretary Quarles, and there is no reason to disbelieve them now.

In this connection, while we have had reason to believe we have the most advanced scientists in the world, we are now warned by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who certainly should know what he is talking about, that the Russians are surpassing this country in the training of technicians of all kinds. They have today more young men studying in approved scientific schools than we have and they are turning out more than twice as many as the United States is training. According to estimates by the Engineers' Joint Council of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, our minimum need for engineers from our graduating classes is 40,000 each year for the next 10 years. Last year we graduated only 23,000. I have just spoken to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] here, who has been long a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also a ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and he tells me he is thoroughly familiar with that situation and fully agrees with the estimate.

Mr. Chairman, here is something of which we should take particular note. You remember very well when we used to laugh at the idea of the Russians knowing anything about mechanics. We were told that when we delivered an automobile over there it was shortly out of commission and nobody could repair it. We thought they were just inept, incapable of mechanical training. As in everything else we underrated them. But we have discovered that frequently they are outmatching our own scientists and mechanicians.

Mr. Chairman, America won the First World War and the Second World War by outproducing our enemies. What is the situation today? We are falling down on the job. Our factories have shown themselves to be remarkably deficient. Hundreds of our jet planes will not fly in battle. Out of every 100 bombers delivered, 30 do not fly. You cannot get 30 of them off the ground. And out of the remaining 70, an average of 15 always turn back before they reach the target.

That is the fault of the plants. It is inefficient production. It is inefficient supervision of our production facilities. Up to this time our plants have delivered to our military authorities only 78 B–52's, when they are the heart and life of national defense. It is the one and only weapon with which we can reach the heart of the enemy. In the coming war we must strike Moscow and the production plants of Siberia. We must drive straight to the center of Russia. Yet there is at this time only 78 planes that can deliver bombs on those targets. Out of the 78 B–52's that have been delivered only 47 have been accepted. What is the matter with our factories? What is the matter with the supervision of production in this country? What is the matter with the strategic command that temporizes with this tragic situation? We must have B–52's. Nothing else will fill the bill; still we have only had 78 delivered and out of those 78 only 47 can fly.

In February, March, and April of this year, down to May 1, our factories have delivered only 17 B–52's, while the Russian factories are in full production. Out of the 17 B–52 planes delivered to us only 2 were accepted in more than 3 months—2 of these vital planes in 3 months, and in the moment of America's greatest danger. Think of it. When only a show of strength will keep us out of war, how can we hope to avoid attack when the B–52 is the only weapon Russia fears?

These defects and these delays may have been the responsibility of the manufacturers. But what about the responsibility of the Department? Fifty-six planes were ordered by the Navy Department at a cost of $1,350,000 each. They were delivered at intervals, one by one, over a period of a year and a half. All delivered and all paid for. And not a one of them would fly. They could not even get them off the ground. The first plane was delivered and the Navy paid for it. It would not fly. The second was delivered and again the Navy paid for it. It would not fly. And so over a year and a half the remainder of the 56 planes were delivered and paid for. Who was asleep at the switch in this critical period while Russia was taking the lead in airpower?

Secretary Wilson, who comes to us from one of the most efficient production plants in the world, seems to be somewhat confused as to why or whether Russia is ahead. During the inquiry when he was before the committee, I asked him about our relative production and he declined to commit himself. I tried to get him to say "Yes" and he would not say "Yes." I tried to get him to say "No" and he would not say "No." But when he was pressed for information by the newspapers, he gave them information he would not give the committee. He said both "Yes" and "No," and at the same time. On May 2 he told the reporters, and I quote what he said:

> The best information I have is that Russia is currently building at a somewhat higher rate than we are.

But on May 9, as reported in the Washington Post of that date, he flatly denied that Russia is, and I quote again: "far outstripping the United States in terms of airpower."

I am certain that when you consider the phraseology the two statements can be harmonized.

But, again on May 8 Secretary Wilson said:

The production schedule of B–52 bombers, which has been 6 per month against the planned rate of 17 per month, will be stepped up to 20 a month.

And only 2 out of the 17 were accepted.

From January 1 to May 1, 1956, only 6 of these planes have been accepted. That is less than two a month. Is it any wonder that Russia is forging ahead of us in terms of production?

So, the newspaper men, despairing of securing detailed information from the Secretary, appealed to the President. President Eisenhower told them that the fact that Russia was ahead of us was nothing to worry about.

Nothing to worry about.

In that respect the President differs from every magazine and, so far as I am informed, from every newspaper in the United States which has referred in its news or editorial columns to Russian superiority in rate of aircraft production. The Reader's Digest, for example, with the largest circulation of any periodical in the world, and the Saturday Evening Post, with the largest circulation in the United States, have carried for the last 2 years comprehensive and emphatic articles by eminent authorities in which they predict the most ominous results unless something is done to step up our production of long-range planes. Many other periodicals have carried similar articles, a number of which have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Articles and editorials in this week's papers, notably the Washington Post, carry instructions from the civil defense authorities, who after more than 3 years study of the situation, advise all citizens to prepare food and work out a route over designated highways and at the first signal to evacuate the cities in such haste as not to wait for members of the family in other parts of the city. Gen. Earl Partridge, head of the Continental Command, told a congressional committee he could not defend this country against even a small atomic attack.

After more than a century and a half during which America has never been invaded, Americans do not take kindly to the idea of a second-best Strategic Air Command.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. President, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall condense as much as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the President, for whom I have the warmest personal regard, and whom I have followed implicitly in all defense recommendations, did not deny that Russia is outstripping us in rate of production. He did not deny that Russia now has more effective long-distance bombers than we have. He did not comment on the claim that Russia has better planes than we have.

He said:

We have the most powerful Navy in the world and it features one thing—air power.

Then he said:

We have bases around the world established for the particular purpose of using the medium bomber.

The medium bomber is the B–47 which must be based abroad or be refueled in the air. As was pointed out in the hearings we are short on tankers and we especially lack long-distance tankers. And tankers which supply bombers in midair are particularly, almost fatally vulnerable. A high-ranking officer asked significantly what chance a tanker, or a B–47 in need of fuel, would have with a pursuer on its tail.

"The strongest navy in the world" will not be a factor in the next world war. The President was talking in terms of 50 years ago—in terms at least prior to the last war. The submarine and the airplane have relegated the navy as a fighting factor to the limbo of the past. Germany had only 58 of the old-fashioned submarines, which had to surface to recharge their batteries, in the last war. But they drove our shipping from the Atlantic and all but froze New England for lack of oil. Russia has 426 modern snorkel submarines which can stay under for weeks. And airplanes flying so high and so fast they can neither be heard or seen would complete the work. But granting the navy could stay afloat, why would Russia bother to fight the Navy when her planes can fly overland all the way?

The committee report quotes:

In time of war, the great oceans become a giant, interconnected battlefield. * * * He who has command of the seas can, in his own time, assemble and motivate these vast human and material resources against the land of his enemy. * * * Once control of the seas is lost, he can do little more than postpone the inevitable defeat which he faces.

Could anything be more ridiculous? What attention would a B–52 or a Bison en route to bomb Detroit or Moscow pay to a thousand ships or 10,000 ships?

Again, the committee report quotes:

The aircraft carrier today represents one of the most important parts of our overall security program. It makes possible the location of air power in areas into which we might not otherwise be able to put United States air power. * * * The carrier introduces an element of uncertainty on the part of the other fellow. He cannot always know where they are.

General Twining said in testifying only this morning before a congressional committee that the ability of the Navy to strike telling nuclear blows in a strategic air war with Russia was out of the question. He said the contribution of Navy carrier-based planes in such an attack would be small. He also noted that the range of carrier aircraft is relatively short compared with land-based craft.

You cannot defeat Russia by nibbling around the edges and no carrier-based plane could ever reach Moscow or touch the war factories in Siberia.

General Vandenberg said more than 2 years ago that with his Air Force he could sink every carrier afloat regardless of any defense that could be provided.

And General LeMay said here the other day he could sink every carrier at sea in 2 hours.

So far as the element of uncertainty is concerned, even if the carrier were no larger than the traditional mustard seed, Russia's incomparable espionage system, which stole the atomic bomb and ran rings around our own secret service, would know where it was every minute in the 24 hours. And when in fact a carrier, with its auxiliaries and protecting escort covers miles of sea, it would be as impossible to conceal it as it would be to hide the moon. No carrier could live a day in the Atlantic much less in the Mediterranean or the North Sea.

The Navy carrier is the greatest handicap to national defense. The cost of a carrier fully equipped with its full complement of planes and auxiliaries and its defense fleet is close to a billion dollars. But the cost is its least obstructive impediment. Its construction consumes the largest amount of rare and strategic material, and employs the greatest amount of technical and skilled labor of any mechanism ever built. The Air Force now limits use of tungsten and columbite tantalite in jet engines because our suppplies are short. Russia uses considerably more in her jets. But Russia is not wasting a major part of her strategic stockpiles on carriers. The extent to which this scarcity applies is shown by the fact that only this week, the week of May 7, the Air Force turned down pleas of three leading aircraft manufacturers for permission to use more tungsten. As Chairman MAHON has frequently said the reason we cannot use more money in the building of B–52's is that we do not have the plants and facilities and specialized labor to build them. The largest allocations of material, labor, and engineering is consumed in building carriers, none of which could survive a day at sea after war started. For this reason we do not have the needed material, men, and manufacturing plants to build more B–52s, the only weapon that can defend us when war starts.

But the most significant development in our defense program is one about which less has been said than any other. In order to get a practical demonstration of the place of airpower in modern warfare, the Department staged a tremendous campaign covering 12 States simulating as nearly as possible actual wartime conditions. An equal number of planes was assigned to each side, one representing the enemy and the other the defenders. The enemy attacked and the defenders used every means to protect the homeland.

Although months were consumed in planning and arranging the test it was over in a few minutes. The defenders were protected by the usual radar screens the counterpart of those actually protecting America from attacks from abroad, but the enemy planes, by flying too low for the screens to register, took the defense by surprise. Within 17 minutes after the warning signal the enemy

bombers were in contact with the defenders and in 23 minutes, as reported in the local papers, had destroyed 80 percent of the home airbases, knocked out half the defender striking force, and taken complete control of the air. The decisive phase of the war was over in 40 minutes and the United States had lost.

We come now to the inevitable aftermath. Russia is developing a mighty war machine. We have faltered while Russia forged ahead. It is becoming increasingly apparent to our allies that we cannot protect them if the present gap between Russian planes and American planes continues to widen. Already our allies are falling away. They have little option in the matter. If they are to be under Russian's bombs and missiles, they must make their peace as best they can and they are inviting visits from the Russian leaders and Churchill is inviting the Russians to join NATO. NATO was one of the most brilliant achievements in the history of American diplomacy and it was impregnable as long as we controlled the air. And Russia used every means to destroy it. But now that there is a very definite prospect that Russia may dominate the air, our allies have no choice but to seek cover.

We are confronted by an aggressive and triumphant communistic empire reaching from the Elbe in Germany to and including a large section of Indochina. It has been victorious in the field and at the conference table. It has defeated and exterminated the finest troops France could mobilize at Dien Bien Phu, and it won everything at Geneva.

General Twining said in a speech at Boston last August that an air attack "could pour out of the Soviet Union engulfing and overwhelming not only our cities and States but our entire Nation."

And Nikita Khrushchev, who visited London smiling and left with a bitter scowl on his face, said between his teeth, "Don't shake your fist at a Russian. If anyone believes our smiles involve abandonment of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, he deceives himself poorly."

Time works against us. Based on programs already in existence, the strategic air strength of the United States will decline in relation to that of the Soviet Union until in 1960, or sooner, when without allies and without dominant air power we face the inevitable.

What Is the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WHAT IS THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

The Fleet Reserve Association is an organization composed of career enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps. The association was founded in 1924 and is chartered under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania and is listed by Dun & Bradstreet. Membership requirements are, that the applicant has not less than 6 years' service in the United States Navy or Marine Corps; that he be on active duty.

Presently, there are approximately 50,000 members of the association, 70 percent of whom are on active duty in the Navy or Marine Corps. The 30 percent who are retired are the wheelhorses for the administration of the association. Many of these men have assumed a place of importance in their respective communities. A Ladies' Auxiliary to the Fleet Reserve Association numbers approximately 12,000. These women are active in all phases of community welfare and betterment.

Branches of the Fleet Reserve Association number 200, and are located throughout the United States and wherever the American Navy serves. Overseas branches include those in Alaska; Guam; Philippine Islands (4); Japan (3); Hong Kong, China; Taipei, Formosa; Bremerhaven, Germany; Newfoundland; San Juan, P. R.; Panama; Cuba; and Naples, Italy.

One of the mandates of the constitution of this organization is that the organization aid in obtaining the best type of American manhood for the Navy and Marine Corps; and secondly, to use every effort to assist in the career incentive program of the Navy, that is presently making every effort to retain the services of highly skilled, Navy-trained, enlisted technicians.

The Mrs. United States Navy 1956 program will be, we hope, part of the answer to the question of retaining the services of the trained enlisted men. As over 60 percent of the enlisted men in the United States Navy are married, it is reasonable to assume that their wives play an important part in any career decision they may make.

Mrs. U. S. Navy 1956 Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MRS. U. S. NAVY 1956 CONTEST

The Secretary of the Navy has approved a plan submitted by the Fleet Reserve Association to sponsor a contest among wives of enlisted men (bluejackets and chief petty officers) to select an outstanding wife and confer on her the title of "Mrs. U. S. Navy 1956."

Mr. William F. Hickey, a veteran of 30 years' naval service, national president, Fleet Reserve Association, announced that the contest will be a worldwide contest since wives of Navy men on board ships and stations throughout the world will be eligible to enter the contest. The Fleet Reserve Association while sponsoring the contest will accept donations of cash and prizes from industrial firms or private organizations or individuals. However, it has been decided to limit the total value of all prizes to no more than $100,000. The list of prizes have not yet been compiled and will be announced by the Fleet Reserve Association at a later date. Among the contributors to the contest has been Mr. Joseph Massaglia, president of the Massaglia hotel chain consisting of the Wilton Hotel in Long Beach, the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, D. C., the Hotel Miramar in Santa Monica, the Waikiki Biltmore in Honolulu, and hotels in other principal cities. Mr. Massaglia will contribute to the first prize by offering an all-expense trip to Honolulu and other cities of the United States, in addition to a cash award.

The headquarters for the contest will be located in the Wilton Hotel at Long Beach, Calif. and the finals will be also held in Long Beach on September 15, 1956.

The winners will be selected on the basis of how much she has contributed to her husband's decision to make the Navy his career and how she expresses her sincerity in an essay entitled "Why I Am Proud To Be a Navy Wife." Final judging will be by enlisted men of the fleet.

The Fleet Reserve Association is an organization composed of career enlisted men, retired and on active duty of some 50,000 members and 200 local branches throughout the United States and overseas. Overseas branches include those located in Alaska; Guam; Philippine Islands; Japan; Hong Kong, China; Formosa; Germany; Puerto Rico; Panama; Cuba; and Naples, Italy. The aim of this organization is loyalty, protection and service to its members.

The intent of this contest as expressed by Mr. Hickey is to pay tribute to the wives of the career enlisted men of the United States Navy.

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Chief of Naval Personnel has assigned Lt. Comdr. George Beck, United States Navy from his office in Washington, D. C., to be naval liaison officer, and his representative in connection with the contest and to work with the Fleet Reserve Association.

The contest will be administrated without cost to the Government. Applications and contest rules are currently available on board all ships and stations as well as at branches of the Fleet Reserve Association. All entries must reach contest headquarters not later than June 15, 1956.

Brooklyn: The Wonderful Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association and president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association before the Rotary Club of Brooklyn at the Hotel St. George on May 9, 1956:

BROOKLYN: THE WONDERFUL TOWN

(Address by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of Equitable Savings & Loan Association and president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association before the Rotary Club of Brooklyn at the Hotel St. George, May 9, 1956)

President Wes Meytrott, my ladies, fellow Rotarians, and guests: This is my third visit with Rotary in Brooklyn, and I am deeply grateful for the privilege of speaking to you again. I had the honor to discuss with you in 1951 the problem of shelter. In 1952 I had another nice

visit with you. We chatted about our relationship with our neighbors. We chatted about economics, sociology, and a bit of political science. Today, I should like to continue that discussion. But, today, this address has a quite different, yet definite purpose, to inform, to shock, and to inspire to action.

As you probably know, it is my privilege to serve as president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, an organization dedicated to the economic and social development of Brooklyn in general and to the Downtown area in particular. It is an organization representing all types of enterprises, and I offer no apology for my appreciation of the great contribution that Brooklyn business, along with labor and the body politic, is making to the progress of Brooklyn.

I have great faith in the integrity of the profit system, in the sound and ethical progress of our labor movement, and in the gigantic service job that our Brooklyn body politic is doing for all of us.

To understand our community means to understand its history—Brooklyn history as part of the broad panorama of national history. For Brooklyn, believe me, is a most important part of our Nation. The recent development, and perhaps the most significant event in the history of modern Brooklyn was the War Between the States—the Civil War. That unfortunate struggle severely sapped the vitality of this young Nation; its toll of manpower and material was tremendous. Commercial banking collapsed, savings banks failed, and America became a debtor nation. Our great country faced grave economic and social problems; and sad to relate, there was no money for shelter and tax collections presented serious implications.

But our American genius for resourcefulness, our political ingenuity, solved some of these problems by the consolidation and merger of political units. Thus it was that Brooklyn, 25 years after the War Between the States, became part of the greater city of New York.

At that time, we had two vigorous production groups within the economy of Brooklyn: the first group was engaged in agriculture and fishing; the second group worked in the dense, slowly developing industrial sector of our economy; and the third, the tertiary production group—the service group—at that time contributed only a modest fraction of the total family income.

You are familiar with the history of the movement from the farm to the industrial city, a movement which provided employment to a larger percentage of our people in the industrial group, the second production group. Today, however, we no longer treat with only two production groups. We no longer consider the primary production group as consisting of men producing raw materials, men engaged in agriculture, fishing, mining, forestry and related field, and the second group of production as consisting of people working in industry as the only two production groups. A tertiary production group provides services in distributing the goods produced, furnishing utilities, transportation, financing, insurance, in medical health services, in government services and in teaching. This tertiary production group enjoys the highest income level. Therefore, it attracts people from the farm as well as industry. Brooklyn, today, has no farming. Its fishing and shell fishing industries, located in Brooklyn a century ago, have moved away. Brooklyn's family income derived from the primary production group today is nominal at best.

Our Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce tells us that manufacturers' payrolls in Brooklyn in 1955 amounted to a total of $900 million out of a total family income of $5 billion.

In the past 10 years manufacturers' payrolls have grown from $575 million to $900 million. But total family income has soared from three and a half billions to over five billion.

These figures indicate that less than 20 percent of our income is derived from industrial payrolls—in other words, less than 20 percent of income comes from what we know as the second production group. This is very important because we know that as long as our income position in the primary production group is nominal, and less than 20 percent from the second production group, it is apparent that more than 80 percent of our income comes from the tertiary production group. As I mentioned, this is the group that enjoys the highest level of income and is proof that the economy of Brooklyn is far from being that of a community relegated to the status of an anemic, underprivileged community.

Let us develop this thought further and in the light of what is ahead. Eugene Black, the great President of the International Bank, has estimated with great courage that the total income of the Western democracies will double during the next 20 years. This includes the United States and its trading allies. Now we know that during the past 10 years Brooklyn's family income increased from 3½ billion to 5 billion, an increase of 50 percent, and that all indications support Mr. Black's forecast. I am taking the liberty in including Brooklyn as a vital part of the Western democracies. Beyond the application of the laws of averages, which I call the laws of probabilities, there are other factors in Brooklyn's favor.

The average family disposable income in Brooklyn is about $5,700. Now we realize that there are areas in our suburbs which enjoy a higher average family income. For the purposes of proving my point, I shall compare the potential of Brooklyn with that of an imaginary Utopian community that enjoys a family income of $25,000, which means a disposable income of $18,000 at best. We know that we do have a few such hamlets in our suburbs. We know that heavy Federal, State and local taxation will continue because of the demands of national defense and civic improvement. It seems certain that the benefit of any increase in the average national family income will favor the more moderate income brackets. I cannot foresee any significant lowering of taxes at upper income levels in the near future. Therefore, the Brooklyn families disposable income, its purchasing power, and its standard of living will continue to increase through the normal functions of our economic progress, economic progress which is the most assured, most solid in the whole world.

Brooklyn is a great international seaport, and considering the gigantic plans of that great partnership that we call enterprise and Government, which has been made evident in that very sound deal of the New York Dock Co. with the Port Authority, it is virtually certain that our family income from shipping will also continue to increase. Every merchant ship that docks here, please remember, leaves almost $100,000 in Brooklyn.

Let me speak briefly of the tremendous potential of our own Brooklyn. The velocity of capital formation in Brooklyn is a source of much hope for still greater attainment. Let me give you a few figures. Savings banks deposits doubled in the 10 years following December 31, 1945. In 1945 the amount was two and one-half billion. In 1955 it reached the staggering figure of five billion. Savings and loan assets, which amounted to a modest $25 million in 1945 have enjoyed a sixfold increase to more than $160 million. While accurate information concerning life insurance equities and thrift deposits in commercial banks in Brooklyn is not available, I think we are on sound ground when we say that our position is better than the national per capita average, and on that basis the pro rata life insurance totals would seem to indicate an increase from seven hundred and fifty million to one billion, four hundred and seventy-five millions. Thrift deposits in commercial banks, as adjusted, can be estimated as showing an increase from three hundred millions to five hundred millions. Therefore, during the past 10 years capital formation in principal savings media have indicated almost a 100 percent increase, an increase of $3½ billion to a total of more than seven billions within a single decade. Obviously, this community is not lacking capital. What this community truly needs (in Brooklyn investments) is greater confidence on the part of the managers of this capital, following the inspiring leadership of Edward A. Richards and George C. Johnson.

In the matter of home financing, you will see from the data which you have, that more than 35 percent of our people are still compelled to seek home financing from nonbanking quarters. At this point, may I say to you that Brooklyn Savings and Loan Associations, which now provide 25 percent of the home mortgage money, are confident that within 10 years the continued increase of their resources will enable them to provide financing for every homeowner of this great borough.

Many estimates indicate that in 1956 our family income will increase by about $60 million. I am more optimistic than that conservative forecast indicates. Applying the same yardstick upon which Mr. Black's forecast was based, supported by that 50 percent annual increase in family income during the past 10 years, I visualize that by 1965 Brooklyn's family income will reach at least $7 billion. This increased income means greater business and a higher standard of living.

Education is very much a part of a high standard of living, particularly in a community where major employment is to be found in the tertiary production group, which is the service group. (And, incidentally, I am grateful to the metropolitan press for pointing up some of remarks made at the dedication of the new building of the Institute of Design and Constructoin, when I dared to say that Brooklyn is one of the greatest college towns in the world.) May I repeat that we have our Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, we have Pratt, we have Long Island University, St. John's College, our State Medical School, Brooklyn College of Pharmacy, our Brooklyn College, Brooklyn Law School, St. Francis College, St. Joseph's College, the Packer Collegiate Institute, the Community College, and now a State-chartered Institute of Design and Construction. These institutions were organized because there was great need for them. Most of them are expanding their facilities, preparing additional manpower for our tertiary production group. Our colleges have high standing. Take the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn; it is not only one of the most distinguished engineering colleges in the country, but is accredited and esteemed in every nation of the world.

The expansion of our colleges constitutes an important contribution to the expansion of our family income and to the raising of our standard of living. It is particularly timely to mention these facts today as thousands of Brooklyn students face the accomplishment of their great dream as graduates of these colleges, ready and able to join this tertiary group.

It is with some regret that I have to cast a sad note at this point. I have mentioned

the State Medical College, which is developing into a great institution. However, this college is the successor of the Long Island College of Medicine, a highly respected and accredited medical college that passed on into the hands of the State because of lack of financial support. I want to be very careful and not detract from my feeling of gratitude to the body politic for providing for the continuation of this college, but I cannot help but feel that if we are to retain the essentially free character of our Republic, we must support our free institutions. We cannot be half free and half subjects of State welfare. I am told that the first step to socialized medicine starts with the abandonment of the privately supported medical school. Somehow or other we do not always learn from the lessons of the past. We often continue repeating the errors of history. Too often we take the path of least resistance, turning to the State, the responsibilities of the individual.

This reminds me of the plight of Queen Maria Theresa, who appeared on the balcony of her imperial palace with her infant son, pleading with the Austrian-Hungarian nobles to defend her empire. The nobles assured the queen of their support, drew out their swords, and pledged their lives and blood. You know that the famous shibboleth "Vitam et Sanguinem." But, later the war effort required money. When the queen levied added taxes, the nobles refused to pay. They said to the queen—"Vitam et Sanguinem sed Avenam non." "You can have our lives and blood, but you cannot have our oats."

"Vitam et Sanguinem sed Avenam non" appears to guide our thinking on many actions. We are ready to give our lives and blood for private enterprise, but we are unwilling to give up our oats.

The world knows of no greater irony than a group of businessmen imbued with the ideals of private enterprise opposing the very minimum requirements of other sectors of private enterprise. I am referring to the applications of the Consolidated Edison Co. and of the New York Telephone Co. for rate increases. In both cases we are treating with two great corporate public servants, generous employers of large groups and enterprises that have demonstrated meticulous respect for other people's money. During the dark days of the depression these corporations continued to pay dividends on the investments of the aged, widows, and the orphans. Yet when Consolidated Edison Co. recently applied for a rate increase on a very sound basis, business groups have recorded opposition.

With respect to the telephone company I am wondering how many of us took the time and trouble to write to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, the Honorable Benjamin F. Feinberg, telling him that we value the contributions of the utilities to our economy and to our social structure very highly and that we believe that their cause is just.

It seems that history repeats itself, "Vitam et Sanguinem sed Avenam non."

My fellow Rotarians, let us make sure that the Long Island College of Medicine is the last of our educational institutions to be abandoned to the State.

At greater length I might discuss the importance of our relations with the body politic. With 80 percent of our people engaged in the tertiary production group, the service group, Federal, State, and municipal payrolls are most important. The Director of Internal Revenue has reported that tax collections at his Brooklyn office in 1955 were in excess of $1,200,000,000 dollars representing about 2 percent of the national tax collections. Unfortunately, we are unable to obtain figures from the State, but it is fair to assume that the people of Brooklyn contribute at least 20 percent of the revenue of the State. The city collector's office tells us that Brooklyn tax collections in 1955 amounted to $261,500,000, representing 36 percent of the city's revenue.

While we recognize that good housekeeping on the part of the Federal, State, and municipal governments does not permit the full and complete reallocation of tax moneys to the locality of their source, I believe that in Brooklyn we do have an ethical and moral right to say to the Federal, State, and municipal governments: "We are contributing taxes; therefore, we would like to have our share of the economic and governmental patronage."

We are told that we are very much a part of the greater city. Well, if that is so, I should like to see a few of our State offices, Federal, and municipal offices in Brooklyn.

Our professional men, our retailers, our hotels, our restaurants, and all other segments of our economy have a right to a fairer share of their tax dollars. Now how can we accomplish the objective of greater distribution of tax moneys to our own community? We have splendid leaders within our body politic. Our elected representatives, and I mean our Congressmen whom I consider members of the board of directors of the United States, our assemblymen, and our State senators, who are members of the board of directors of this great State, and our councilmen, who perform the same function on the board of directors of the great corporation of the City of New York, are real public servants of demonstrated ability and unquestioned integrity. They have done much for Brooklyn, but they can do much more if we stand solidly behind them. We must show greater interest in our own progress through our support of the body politic. We have our political clubs that have a great record as service organizatiotns in our borough. During the darkest days of our history, the political clubs demonstrated their ability to act as social welfare organizations, alleviating much human misery. Their services include effective advice and guidance for anyone who has problems and calls on them. These clubs are maintained entirely out of private contributions. Too often the need for political contributions is questioned. Aside of the very important service angle, the political clubs provide the services of several men, 3 or 4, in each election district for each party on election day. These men are known as poll watchers who contribute their time and the use of their cars to get the vote out. If the modest sum of $20 is allowed to each of them to cover the cost of their breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and the use of their car, the requirement of our political parties for this purpose alone runs several hundred thousand dollars for each in Brooklin because we have 1,441 of election districts.

Political parties are confronted with the maintenance of headquarters, entailing rent, light, telephone, clerical services representing a very substantial expense on one hand, but these are expenditures involving funds that stay in the community. In a virile, healthy community, such as Brooklyn is, our political parties should not be exposed to crucial financial problems, nor should they be dependent upon the State or National Treasuries at any time. Proper support, financial and moral, of our political leaders should make their position stronger in obtaining for Brooklyn economic and social benefits controlled by the body politic under our Constitution. This is practical, political realism.

We live in a community with an economic position second to none. Social standards are continuously increasing, and our political leadership has an unsurpassed record. Due to the character of employment of our people, and social security measures, our total family income today is subject to diminishing risk of danger caused by economic adversities than ever before in our history.

Gentlemen, our future is bright. There is light ahead of us. Can we follow the clear path of light—the light of destiny directed for us?

My dear fellow Rotarians, in speaking of Brooklyn's social improvement, its economy, and its future to you, I feel that I am speaking to true companions, men dedicated to great ideals. As I said at the outset, I am proud to be with you and confident that you will always seek and always find the greatest good for the greatest number.

Let me thank you for your gracious attention:

Brooklyn—the wonderful town

FAMILY INCOME (1)

1945		$3,500,000,000
1955	(estimated)	5,000,000,000

MANUFACTURERS PAYROLLS (1)

1947	census	$652,328,000
1955	(estimated)	818,100,000

TAX COLLECTIONS

Director of Internal Revenue (2)

	Brooklyn office (4 counties)	United States	Percent
1945	$891,651,426	$44,475,000,000	2.02
1955	1,205,329,000	62,642,000,000	1.93

Municipal figures (3)

	Brooklyn	New York City	Percent
1945	$130,616,000	$462,177,000	28.2
1955	261,506,000	728,204,000	35.9

Capital formation, Brooklyn—Principal savings media

[In millions of dollars]

	Savings and loan (4)	Savings banks (5)	Time deposits (6) commercial banks (estimated)	Life insurance (6) equities (estimated)
1945	$25	$2,470	$300	$750
1955	160	4,989	500	1,475
Increase	135	2,519	200	725
Percent	540.0	101.9	66.6	96.6

Capital formation, United States—Principal savings media (7)

[In billions of dollars]

	Savings and loan	Savings banks	Commercial banks	Life insurance
1945	$7.4	$15.3	$29.9	$37.5
1955	32.3	28.2	46.0	73.7
Increase	24.9	12.9	16.1	36.2
Percent	336.4	86.0	55.5	96.9

Source:
(1) Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.
(2) Director of Internal Revenue.
(3) Office of city collector.
(4) Savings and Loan Forum.
(5) Report of Superintendent of Banks to State Legislature.
(6) Estimated on basis of adjusted averages.
(7) National Savings & Loan League.

Summary of nonfarm mortgages of $20,000 or less recorded in Kings County, Jan. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1955

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Savings and loan associations		Insurance companies		Commercial banks		Savings banks		Individuals		Other mortgagees		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
January	311	$2,345.6	13	$91.8	17	$114.6	556	$4,479.7	556	$2,799.2	427	$2,757.2	1,880	$12,588.1
February	308	2,440.4	16	117.3	22	113.3	491	3,831.9	424	2,422.7	485	3,274.9	1,746	12,200.5
March	309	2,534.7	15	149.1	23	129.1	548	4,210.4	444	2,344.3	444	2,932.9	1,783	12,300.5
April	322	2,610.6	11	76.2	28	262.0	432	3,516.5	412	2,102.0	423	2,825.0	1,628	11,392.3
May	379	3,251.1	10	79.3	22	118.9	520	4,126.1	390	1,983.5	491	3,298.8	1,812	12,857.7
June	370	3,212.3	8	41.9	26	145.0	491	3,976.7	386	2,020.5	441	2,877.0	1,722	12,273.4
July	388	3,536.2	19	160.9	17	122.9	489	4,075.9	383	1,937.3	479	3,253.9	1,775	13,087.1
August	359	4,062.7	12	101.8	10	57.2	440	4,066.4	319	1,601.6	325	2,356.8	1,465	12,246.5
September	572	5,206.3	9	88.1	14	78.7	720	6,177.9	492	2,478.1	608	4,087.2	2,415	18,176.3
October	412	4,166.2	6	89.0	11	52.7	574	5,557.4	366	1,864.5	390	2,533.3	1,759	14,213.1
November	465	3,936.9	5	57.3	13	115.9	575	5,089.0	475	2,501.5	460	3,162.6	1,933	14,863.2
December	335	3,227.2	11	92.5	25	249.5	461	4,050.5	476	2,647.0	384	2,598.5	1,692	12,865.2
Total	4,470	40,540.2	135	1,145.2	228	1,559.8	6,297	53,158.4	5,123	26,702.2	5,357	35,958.1	21,610	159,063.9

Revolt in the Wheat Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal of April 2, 1956, entitled "Revolt in the Wheat Fields Is an Old Dakota Story."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLT IN THE WHEATFIELDS IS AN OLD DAKOTA STORY

There is word that North Dakota's Non-Partisan League is changing its political association from the Republican Party to the Democratic. This is more than a local note, both in its picturesque quality and its bearing on today's national political turmoil.

As natural rebels and radicals, the leaguers comprise a sensitive instrument for registering farm discontent. The league is a blood-brother of the Farmers Union, Minnesota's Farmer-Labor Party and Wisconsin's Progressives of the La Follette strain. It is by populism out of agrarian revolt. It was a precursor of many a New Deal operation, and in its limited geographical field it is still a thing of great vitality.

Back in 1912 there was trouble in the northern wheatfields. North Dakota voters, mainly dwellers on flat quarter sections, felt they were being exploited by the millers and grain elevators. They got together and in a fling at initiative and referendum voted for State grain elevators. The legislature, controled by Minneapolis millers, brushed them off. One representative told a farmers' delegation to go home and slop the hogs.

That tore it. An impoverished farmer named A. C. Townly, he admitted to having only "an idea, a Ford, and $16," set out to organize the Non-Partisan League. The idea was that league members should go into the Republican primaries and pick legislators pledged to their interests. The Republican Party was picked for infiltration simply because there were too few Democrats in North Dakota to provide a practical medium.

Leaguers knew what they wanted, and this was half the battle. The list of objectives included mills and elevators owned and operated by the State, hail insurance (State administered), laws for fair grading of grain, easier rural credits, tax exemption of farm improvements. The inspired organization elected Lynn Frazier, Governor, and a majority in the State house of representatives. Leaguers got what they wanted and a few embellishments as well, like a home-building association, a graduated State income tax, an 8-hour day for industrial workers and one of the early workmen's compensation laws.

The State elevator plan was reincarnated in the New Deal's ever-normal granary. The hail insurance blossomed later in the Federal crop insurance law. The Federal law to insure bank deposits and the Federal housing program of the midthirties were practically modeled on the Bank of North Dakota, a creation of Non-Partisan League influence.

All the time, as the leaguers elected governors, Congressmen, and State legislators, they kept on as political mavericks, uncomfortable and at times in downright agony in their Republican association. A typical leaguer is Senator LANGER, nominally a Republican, but perpetually a burr under the saddle of Republican leadership at Washington.

When LANGER was Governor of North Dakota he performed such league-like acts as declaring a moratorium on foreclosures for debt. He called out the National Guard to stop foreclosure sales. Nobody doubt that BILL LANGER will adjust easily and perhaps even gratefully to the league's new habitation within the Democratic Party when he runs again in 1960.

At the same time the league has been insistently local and nationalistic. In this it is like most of the spawn of populism. LANGER and Henrik Shipstead, the Minnesotan of Farmer-Labor ties, were, for example, the only Senators who voted against the San Francisco Charter. What with this and that, nobody may doubt that the leaguers will run into times of discomfort as Democrats no less than that they felt when they ran with the Republicans. They are of the strain that likes lost causes, like the Lemke candidacy for President in 1936, being never quite easy in any man's fold but their own. But they carry weight on their own grounds. There may be some changes made in North Dakota, which has gone Democratic in only 4 of the 16 presidential campaigns since Grover Cleveland.

Age of Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there appeared in a British publication entitled "The Listener," the British Broadcasting Corporation magazine, an excellent article by Congressman EUGENE MCCARTHY of the Fourth District of Minnesota.

Mr. MCCARTHY is an outstanding scholar in the field of political science and political philosophy. His mature understanding of American government, coupled with his broad experience as a legislator and teacher of political science, qualifies him to interpret the American political scene. In his article entitled "Nation's Age of Innocence Becoming One of Maturity," Congressman EUGENE MCCARTHY has related the historical growth of American participation in international relations. It is an article that should be read by every student of government and, in particular, every officer of Government. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S AGE OF INNOCENCE BECOMING ONE OF MATURITY

(By Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY)

Politics in the United States reflects the Amercan belief in the basic innoncence of Americans, a belief which has agitated the American mind since the time of colonial settlements. American colonists even before the Revolution considered themselves a people set apart and above; they were without the sense of inferiority which usually marks colonial societies. It was common for religious and civil leaders in the colonial settlements to speak as did William Stoughton in the 17th century, asserting that "God has sifted a whole nation that he might send choice grain over into this wilderness."

This belief that Americans, as inhabitants of a new land, and as people living under a new government, were themselves also new and innocent, set apart from the stream of tradition, has continued. It holds that Americans live in a condition of natural goodness, a state of existence or of mind labeled "Adamism" by R. W. B. Lewis, and one which leads us to accept, as Donald Creighton, a Canadian, has written recently, that we are the inhabitants of God's chosen continent, that in North America, Canadians and citizens of the United States are all just "folks," all members of one great big happy family.

The concept of innocence is basically antagonistic to government and government action. One of the earliest American political philosophers, Thomas P. Paine, expressed

it in these words: "Government, like dress, is the badge of lost innocence. The palaces of kings were built upon the ruins of the bowers of paradise. Were the impulses of conscience clearly and irresistibly obeyed, man would need no other lawgiver."

A point of view nearly identical with that of Paine was expressed recently by Clarence Manion, former dean of the Law School of Notre Dame University. In his book, the Key to Peace, Manion states that government is a necessary evil, and that in a community of saints the moral law would be the only law needed to provide such a community with perfect peace, complete order, and universal justice.

According to the theory of both Paine and Manion the state arises from the evil or bad will of men, and moreover this evil and bad will remains the lasting justification for government. A philosophy of government built upon this concept permits the state only regulatory functions.

This American attitude of innocence is reflected not only in the attitude toward government and government officeholders, but even more sharply in reference to political activities. Political party participation is considered degrading by many citizens. The person who claims to be nonpartisan, or an independent voter, generally makes his claim without apology, and as one who has chosen the better part.

It is popular to attribute to citizens power of discernment, simplicity, and soundness of judgment. It is not popular to call upon the voters for self-examination or self-criticism, or to ask them to question their own previous judgment.

It is common to label political campaigns at every level of government crusades. The presidential campaign of 1952 demonstrates most clearly the use of the technique of the crusade.

When candidate Stevenson in the 1952 campaign suggested that the morality of public officials reflected the general level of morality in a democracy and that in a democracy all citizens had some responsibility for political decisions, his opponent rejected the suggestion, and went on to ask whether the individual United States citizen was responsible for the fall of China, the scandal-a-day Government, or for the treadmill prosperity. The expected answer was a very positive "no."

Stevenson and other Democrats asked for patience and forebearance, especially in foreign affairs. The crusaders shouted that we had had enough of these virtues, and raised the question as to whether they were really virtues becoming to Americans.

It cannot be said with certainty that the crusading technique and the appeal to righteous simplicity was responsible for the victory of the Republican presidential candidate in 1952. There were other issues of vital concern. The appeal to innocence, however, ran throughout the GOP campaign.

The effects of the approach of innocence and simplicity have been most clearly evident, and I think most harmful, in our approach to international affairs. The current American attitude toward foreign countries and their problems as described by Mr. Creighton is very much in agreement with the views of Thomas Jefferson, who in 1823 urged the people of the United States never to take an active part in the affairs of Europe.

The early years of American history encouraged the attitude of indifference and separatism. Europe was absorbed in war; the war of 1812 and other disputes generally discouraged any move to establish closer ties with the old world on our part. At the same time the western lands were being opened to settlement.

Earlier immigration weakened the homogeneity of existing culture, but it did not strengthen the bonds between Europe and America. If anything, it had an opposite effect. Most of the immigrants came seeking asylum; most were refugees from famine, poverty, or from political oppression. If anything, their coming strengthened the antipathy toward Europe and fortified the American sense of superiority.

Involvement in World War I was looked upon as temporary, to make the world safe for democracy in one great effort, and then to return to our own affairs was the American hope. After the failure of Wilson's idealistic, if not utopian, efforts in the post-war period, the attitude of innocence and aloofness asserted itself again. The League of Nations was not perfect—therefore we would not join it.

We were certainly not ready for World War II; or, when the war ended, ready to accept great international responsibilities. We did not, however, withdraw from world affairs as we had done after World War I. The United States participated in the formation of the United Nations, and has joined in the deliberations and in the programs of this organization. We have given economic and military aid to allies and former enemies. We carried the major burden in the Korean war, and have obligated ourselves under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and through the mutual security program.

But the United States is restless in its new role in world affairs; political leaders make a point of saying that we did not seek the position we now hold, as though it would have been bad to have done so. Many Americans look back to the days when the Nation could stand aside from the struggles for power, passing judgment upon the contestants and making fine, clear choices. There remains a strong temptation to return to the isolation and pleasant simplicity of early days when power and responsibility both were limited.

No such violent change is likely. If we really ever accepted what Denis Brogan calls the "illusion of American omnipotence," we'd be disillusioned. Considerations of self-preservation and of defense make the position of the extreme isolationists untenable. Self-preservation, however, is not our only motive. There has been a change of attitude. The age of innocence and of innocents, both at home and abroad, is changing to one of greater maturity.

Prohibition of Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by A. Haverkamp, stated clerk of the Particular Synod of Iowa, of the Reformed Church of America, encouraging me in connection with my work of combating liquor advertising.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTICULAR SYNOD OF IOWA,
REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA,
Pella, Iowa, May 7, 1956.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Member, Senate, Congress U. S. A.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At the 37th annual session of the Particular of Iowa, a legislative body of the Reformed Church in America, representing a communicant membership of 31,027 souls, spread thoughout the States Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, California, Washington, and Alberta Province, Canada, convened in the Zion Reformed Church, Chapin, Iowa, a communication was received regarding liquor advertising.

The communication requested Particular Synod "to counteract excessive liquor advertisements, and that synod send a letter of encouragement to Senator WILLIAM LANGER who is sponsor of legislation in our Nation's Capitol to outlaw liquor advertising in interstate commerce."

The communication was referred to the Committee on Overtures and Judicial Business, which submitted the following report:

"Your committee is in accord with the spirit of the overture, and therefore instructs the stated clerk of the Particular Synod of Iowa, RCA, to send a letter to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator, encouraging him in his work of combating liquor advertising, and promising him our hearty personal support of the pastors and of the 162 churches of our synod."

I am very happy to have the privilege of forwarding this recommendation of the committee which was enthusiastically adopted by the Particular Synod of Iowa.

Very sincerely yours,

A. HAVERKAMP, *Stated Clerk.*

P. S.—Particular Synod was in session May 2-3, 1956.

The Bunker Hill of Desegregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article by Donald Gross in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, May 13, 1956, on the first major attempt to desegregate the Nation's schools. The stage for this was set in Boston in 1829:

THE BUNKER HILL OF DESEGREGATION

(By Donald Gross)

The Negro honor students accepted their awards politely and thanked the mayor. For outstanding scholastic achievement they had been given copies of a modest little book entitled "The Life of Benjamin Franklin." However, the students were not overly enthusiastic. They were pupils at a segregated public school and knew that the prize students from the white schools not only had received shiny Franklin medals but had been invited to a public dinner in their honor.

This happened in Boston—in 1829—and it set the stage for the first major attempt to desegregate the Nation's schools. Boston, which put up a statue to honor the first American to die under Redcoat fire—a Negro—hardly seems the place to look for racial oppression. The North of a century ago, however, practiced formal discrimination very much like the South today.

But the Negro's voice was beginning to be heard. In Boston it was the voice of a Negro by the name of William Nell. He was one of the Negro students awarded a copy of the Life of Benjamin Franklin at the Belknap School for colored children in 1829.

William Nell got to attend the dinner for the honor students that year—as part of the Negro dining-room help. He decided then,

as he later recalled, "to hasten the day when the color of the skin would be no barrier to equal school rights."

As a Boston citizen and Negro civic leader, he launched a campaign, in the 1840's, to integrate Boston's schools. It was a campaign that eventually attracted national attention and set precedents, still followed today, wherever segregation is attacked or defended.

Nell had no Supreme Court decree to help him. He began his campaign quietly by visiting the colored people who had children in school. Wouldn't they prefer to have their youngsters go to a school closer to home? Wouldn't they like a school better equipped than the school for colored children? Didn't they agree that going to school with white children would help everybody understand that whites and blacks were all Americans, deserving equal opportunity? Wouldn't it give the Negro children better opportunities when they grew up?

The response was disheartening. Life was hard enough for free Negroes in white society. The jobs they got were shabby. The pay was low. They were quickly abused when they made mistakes. There was trouble enough without asking for more. William Nell told his friends to think it over. He would be back.

He turned to the Abolitionist Party, headed by William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. These leaders promised, to assist him through publicity, by drafting petitions, and by helping to get signatures for them. The first petition, submitted to the Boston School Committee, was flatly rejected.

The integrationists steeled themselves for a long fight. But the continued intransigence of the school committee and the prodding of William Nell gradually aroused the Negro population. Meetings were held. Pamphlets were printed. Pickets were stationed at one of the Negro schools to discourage parents from sending their children to it.

Finally, in 1846, the Boston School Committee, faced with mounting pressure, agreed to a formal investigation. The result, after a lengthy debate, was a decision to retain separate schools for colored children. The majority report stated bluntly: "In our opinion, the less the colored and the white people become intermingled, the better it will be for both races. Amalgamation is degradation."

Discouraging as this was, William Nell's forces knew they had raised the issue to the level of public discussion and concern. They had also stirred the courage of certain Negro people who were willing to stake their jobs and reputations as peaceful citizens on some form of militant action.

One such Negro was Benjamin Roberts, father of Sarah Roberts. In April 1847 Sarah applied for admission to the primary school nearest her home but was refused. She, like other Negro youngsters, was requested to attend a segregated school much farther away than the white school near her home.

The following year, Roberts instructed his daughter to enter the nearby white primary school without permission. When she was rejected, he filed suit under a Massachusetts statute which provided that a child unlawfully excluded from public-school instruction could recover damages from the city or town where the exclusion took place.

Legal action was pressed to the State supreme court where Charles Sumner, later to become reconstruction leader in the United States Senate, pleaded the cause of Sarah Roberts and integrated schools in eloquent terms. Much of what he had to say was prophetic of the Supreme Court's historic decision of May 17, 1954, which was based on the premise that separate but equal school facilities do not provide equality.

"A separate school, though well endowed," Sumner argued, "would not secure that precise equality which they [the Negro children] would enjoy in the common schools. Segregation from the mass of citizens is of itself an inequality. It is a vestige of ancient intolerance against a despised people."

The State supreme court, however, handed down a decision adverse to Sumner and his client. This decision, too, was prophetic, for it served as a precedent for many of the segregation laws enacted by the South up to the present. It held that the prejudice that Sumner claimed was fostered by separate schools was "not created by law, and probably cannot be changed by law."

Boston's Negroes and their friends decided to change their tactics. They went outside Boston where communities with proportionately lower Negro populations had already integrated their schools. A campaign was started to lobby for a State law forbidding segregated schools.

Finally, in 1855, the legislature passed a bill to abolish separate schools for Negroes throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 28 of that year.

To make certain the changeover would go smoothly when it became effective the following September, William Nell spent much of his time during the summer months visiting school authorities throughout Boston, talking with Negro and white parents, calling meetings and writing pamphlets urging cooperation from both races.

When school opened Nell and a delegation of Negro mothers made the rounds of the city's schools "to see the laws of the old Bay State applied in good faith" and to iron out any difficulties that might develop. None did.

Thus ended the first struggle against public-school segregation. Efforts to do away with segregated schools in other northern cities continued through the years of the Civil War and after. It was not easy. New York City's public schools were not legally desegregated until 1884.

But, wherever citizens acted to end segregated schooling in the large cities of the North, they had Boston as a precedent and a successful example.

Acquittal of George Brigner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Jury Finds George Brigner Not Guilty," from the Mandan Daily Pioneer on April 27, 1956. It states that George Brigner, 77-year-old Dunn County farmer, was found innocent of a charge of using threats to rob Government officials of a grain marketing card in September of 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JURY FINDS GEORGE BRIGNER NOT GUILTY

George Brigner, 77-year-old Dunn County farmer, was found innocent Thursday afternoon of a charge of using threats to rob Government officials of a grain marketing card at Killdeer in September of 1954.

A United States district court jury of 8 men and 4 women returned the verdict after about 1 hour and 45 minutes deliberation.

Brigner had been charged by the Government with entering the Killdeer Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee office on September 17, 1954, and threatening two ASC officials with a jar of mysterious liquid.

It was brought out in cross-examination that Brigner had made no threats to "blow up the place."

The elderly farmer, who lives with his sister on a 160-acre farm homesteaded by his parents near Werner, denied on the witness stand that he ever made any threats to anyone.

Brigner testified he customarily planted 50 acres of wheat each year as his only crop. He said that 17 of his 1954 wheat acres had been burned by the sun and were not worth harvesting.

Brigner admitted on the stand that he had made no effort to take part in the Government's wheat acreage allotment program, stating, "I just didn't like it. I never asked anything from the Government and I never got a nickel from it in my life outside of social security."

Government agents had informed him after measuring his crop in 1954 that he had 35 harvestable acres but that he had an allowable acreage of only 29.

"A man just can't live on 29 acres of wheat," Brigner said.

Position of Democratic Party on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Honeywell News, published by Honeywell Local 1145, a splendid editorial written by Mr. Robert I. Wishart, secretary-treasurer of Honeywell Local 1145.

I advocate that every Democrat read this editorial. It represents good political judgment and is written by a man who has demonstrated his political know-how and leadership qualities in a most commendable manner.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WILL IT BE, LEFT, RIGHT, OR CENTER FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY?—CIVIL RIGHTS POSITION MUST BE FORTHRIGHT

The question before the Democratic Party today is what course to follow—left, right, or center—politically speaking, that is. The Republican Party has always been the party to the right; in other words, it has been the conservative party, the party that stood, more or less, on the status quo.

The Democratic Party, under Roosevelt and Truman, for 20 years, was the party to the left of center. By "left of center," of course, we mean a liberal party, a progressive party, a party that advocated and supported change, a party that advocated a program of advance, based upon the needs of the Nation and the needs of the people.

Under this left-of-center policy, we got social security; we got unemployment insurance; we got a farm program to protect the farmer; we got higher minimum-wage laws; we got the National Labor Relations Act; we

got a soil-conservation program; we got the Rural Electrification Act; we got all of these things that stood for programs for advancing the people of our Nation. This is left of center.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Yes, the issue today before the Democratic Party is, Shall we follow a center-of-the-road policy, or shall we continue to the left?

The answer to that is very clear: Will there ever be a period in American history when progress will not be needed?

We must bear in mind that social security, when it was proposed by President Roosevelt, was voted against by many Republicans of that day. It was considered socialistic; it was a left-of-center proposal. Yet today social security is accepted by everybody, Democrats and Republicans alike. And this is just 20 years later.

The Democratic Party must be a party of progress, as it was 20 years ago, or not only will it not win the election in 1956, but it never will win any election. It is what the party fights for that brings leadership to the people of our country, and leadership which brings people to vote for that party.

To offer the American people a little more than what the Republicans offer them is no inducement to voters. Certainly, today in America, progress is as badly needed as it was in the thirties.

TAKE THE RACE ISSUE

Today politicians are talking about the hard problem of whether to oppose the southern Democrats or to support an aggressive fight for racial tolerance. The question among some of them is which policy would be the best in an election year, which program would be best to get votes with.

We don't believe that the race issue should be determined on the basis of getting Negro votes. We think the race issue is an issue far above—should be an issue far above—partisan politics. We are proud of the fact that back 8 or 9 years ago, Local 1145 was instrumental in getting the Fair Employment Practices Commission ordinance passed in Minneapolis.

We didn't support the FEPC ordinance because we were looking for votes of a minority group. We were for the FEPC above and beyond political considerations. We were for the FEPC because it was a right thing to do.

It was a humanitarian cause; it was a Christian position, and any liberal, any decent-thinking American should be for equal rights for any minority race, regardless of how many votes they may have.

We believe that the right of a Negro to vote without fear for his life, that the right of a Negro to have a job on an equal basis with anybody else in America, are God-given rights. We think that politics should play no part in these things; and if a man is a liberal, if a man is a decent Christian, he ought to be for these things.

When Negroes in the South—yes; and in the North—are deprived of these rights—of any rights—every right-thinking American ought to aggressively fight to eliminate any discrimination, wherever it may be, and fight to eliminate it today.

WHY DELAY?

Some say we have got to delay this 10 years, or 20 years, or 30 years. Well, the South has had over 90 years to remove this vicious un-Christian policy, and they have doggedly stood firm against the rights of millions of decent American citizens simply because of their color.

This should no longer be tolerated in America, and we don't believe that 10 years or 20 years are going to change the minds of certain people here in America.

We in America are supposed to be giving leadership to the world. We are looking to allies all over the world, while the bare facts are these: If we are going to give leadership to the world, we must bear in mind that the colored race is in the great majority in this world of ours. If we are going to go before these colored races and say, "Follow our lead," they are going to look to find out how we stand before we can lead.

We believe that the Democratic Party at its national convention should take a forthright position on the question involving race relationships, and they should make it clear to America—north, south, east, and west—that it is high time that here in America we give equal rights to all of our citizens—to all Americans.

We also believe that the Democratic Party at its national convention should come out foursquare as a liberal, as a fighting political party; that it should truly be the party of Jefferson, the party of Jackson, the party of F. D. R., and the party of that great fighter, Harry Truman.

It cannot be a middle-of-the-road political party and expect the people to vote for their candidate as they did for Harry Truman in 1948 and for Franklin D. Roosevelt for four terms.

Yes; the Democratic Party is going to have to come out as a liberal, as a fighting force for good in America, if it expects small business, the workers, the farmers—the people of America—to follow.

Naming No Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1956:

NAMING NO NAMES

Harry Truman's speech in connection with the presentation of the Four Freedoms Foundation award to Averell Harriman stopped short of indorsing the New York Governor for the Democratic presidential nomination. But nothing said by Mr. Truman will discourage the rather widely held notion that he leans in the Governor's direction.

The former President went all out in praising Mr. Harriman as one of the wiser men of this day and age. The Russians, he said, were never able to pull the wool over Mr. Harriman's eyes. "He was not taken in," declared Mr. Truman, "as so many other political leaders were at that time (1945) by Russian avowals of peaceful intent. He is not taken in today, as so many of our leaders seem to be, by the smile on the face of the Kremlin."

Mr. Truman named no names. So we are left to guess the identities of the political leaders who were taken in in 1945. Presumably, Mr. Truman was one of them. At any rate, he was President at the time, he was the architect of the drastic cutbacks in the defense budget, and it was he who said in an expansive moment: "I like old Joe." Presumably also, it is the Republican leadership which, as Mr. Truman sees it, seems to be falling today for the Kremlin smile. We do not know which Republican leaders Mr. Truman had in mind. President Eisenhower is constantly cautioning the country against being taken in, and Secretary Dulles, more often than not, is denounced for talking about such things as massive retaliation—hardly the kind of language that would be used by one who is under the Kremlin's smiling spell.

This, however, is one of the nice things about making a political speech. The speaker is not obliged to name names except, as in this case, when he wants to praise someone. So it is just as well, perhaps, to concentrate on the nice things Mr. Truman said about Mr. Harriman—such things as this: "We miss his wisdom and energy and sure touch in our foreign policy today." We dare say that this and similar remarks, if passed over by the general public, are being read rather closely by Messrs. Stevenson and KEFAUVER.

Proposed Changes in Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 14, 1956, the Committee on Ways and Means conducted another executive session with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 1956, on page A3818, there appears a résumé of committee decisions with respect to this subcommittee report as of that date.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public a press release that I have issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means announcing the decisions of the committee subsequent to the issuance of that previous release.

The committee is scheduled to meet again at 10 a. m. in executive session on May 16, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee report.

The press release follows:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, today announces the tentative decisions reached by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. On March 10, 1956, Chairman COOPER announced the decision of the committee with respect to section I relating to manufacturers excise taxes and section II relating to retailers excise taxes. In announcing today's committee action, Chairman COOPER indicated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m., May 16, 1956. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

III. TAXES ON ADMISSIONS AND CLUB DUES

1. The admissions tax should apply only to events which take place in the United States, but should apply whether or not the payment is made within the United States.

2. Admissions to privately operated swimming pools, skating rinks, and other places offering participation sports should be exempt from tax, in the same manner as in the case of admissions to such places operated by State or local governmental units.

3. The Internal Revenue Service should issue new rulings under the cabaret tax to provide that where a private organization conduct an affair in a room customarily and regularly used as a cabaret and negotiates with the proprietor to provide the dinner and any other services desired, but not for the entertainment, the cabaret tax will not apply if the private organization by independent negotiations provides its own entertainment and the entertainers are not regularly employed by the proprietor either prior to or after the affairs in question. In tentatively approving this recommendation, the committee adopted a clarifying amendment to make it clear that the limitation on employment of the entertainers by the proprietor would not preclude employment on a subsequent date.

4. The proprietor, owner, or lessee of a cabaret should be required to collect the cabaret tax due from concessionaires and include such amounts when making his other payments for admissions, refreshments, service, or merchandise.

5. The cabaret tax should be made inapplicable to what are sometimes called milk bars. More specifically the cabaret tax should be made inapplicable where the following conditions are met:

(a) No alcoholic beverages or setups are served;

(b) Only light refreshments are served;

(c) Space may be provided for dancing but without any charge for dancing; and

(d) Music may be obtained from phonographs or jukeboxes or from instrumental music (in the latter case only if supplied without charge to the milk bar operator.)

6. Under present law life members are required to pay annually a tax equal to the amount paid by active resident annual members for dues or membership fees. Life members instead should, as a general rule, pay an annual tax equivalent to the tax on annual memberships providing privileges most nearly like that of the life members (but note No. 7 below).

7. As an alternative to the computation of tax in the manner provided in No. 6 above, life members should be permitted to base their tax on the actual amount paid, if they are willing to pay the tax at the same time they pay for the life membership. This principle, that the tax should be based upon the actual amount paid, should also be extended to other types of club membership fees.

8. Dues for the purposes of the present club dues tax are defined as including "any assessment, irrespective of the purpose for which made." An exception should be made to this phrase to exclude from tax, assessments for a building fund to replace a building destroyed where it was destroyed by a hurricane or other event which would qualify as a casualty in the case of property belonging to an individual. Such a fund could be built up free of the club dues tax, however, only to the extent that the building destroyed was not covered by insurance and only to the extent of the replacement cost of the destroyed building.

IV. TRANSPORTATION TAXES

1. Ferryboat service should be exempt from the application of the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property.

2. This recommendation was passed over to permit further staff study. The recommendation of the subcommittee would provide that "any movement through lines of pipe within the premises," in addition, to including any movements interpreted by the Secretary or his delegate as being within the premises under existing law, should also include any movement which constitutes an integral part of the operation of a refinery, a bulk plant, a terminal, or a gasoline plant. Present law imposes a tax equal to 4½ percent of the fare charged for the transportation of oil by pipeline, with an exemption for any movement through piplines between the premises of a refinery, bulk plant, terminal, or a gasoline plant if the movement is not a continuation of taxable transportation.

3. "Air taxis" (I. e., airplanes under 12,500 pounds gross takeoff weight) where the aircraft has a seating capacity of less than 10 adult passengers, including the pilot, and where the aircraft is not operated on an established line should be exempt from the tax on the transportation of persons in the same manner as is presently true in the case of automobile taxis.

V. COMMUNICATIONS TAXES

1. An exemption for installation charges is provided under present law in the case of local telephone service and in effect applies to long distance telephone service and telegraph service. This exemption should be extended to the other communication taxes.

2. "Local telephone service" should be redefined so as to exclude all toll telephone massages, rather than only those for which a charge of over 24 cents is made and so as to exclude private leased wires in a local exchange area. (See Nos. 3 and 5 below for the extent to which these toll telephone messages and private leased wires should be taxed.)

3. The term "toll telephone messages" should be substituted for "long-distance telephone messages" and all toll messages, whether or not under 25 cents, included in this category. Shifting toll messages of under 25 cents to this category will extend slightly the exemption presently provided for the public press in the case of long-distance telephone messages.

4. Teletypewriter services are presently included in the 10-percent tax on leased wires, teletypewriters, and talking circuits special services. Teletypewriter exchange service should be defined as a service whereby teletypewriter subscribers are connected to central offices through which communications may be established with other teletypewriter subscribers similarly connected. In the case of this service, terminal facilities would continue to be included in the tax base as they are at present. However, the exemption for common carriers (such as railroads), telephone, telegraph companies, and radio stations, presently provided in the case of the tax on leased wires, teletypewriters, and talking circuit special services should be made inapplicable in the case of the new teletypewriter exchange service tax except where the service is purchased to render communication services.

5. In lieu of the present tax on leased wires, teletypewriter and talking circuit special services, a new tax should be imposed on wire mileage. The base of this tax would be the same as the present tax on leased wires, teletypewriters, on talking circuit special services, except for the separate treatment for teletypewriter exchange services, and except for the following revisions:

(a) Leased wire services within a local exchange area and involving oral transmission (presently taxed as local telephone service) would be added to the base of this tax.

(b) The base of this tax would be limited to charges for leased wires, etc., which may be obtained only from communications common carriers or in effect will exclude what might be called interior communications systems.

(c) The base of the recommended tax would exclude terminal facilities. It is the exclusion of these terminal facilities that accounts for the selection of the new name "wire mileage tax."

6. The base of the present 8-percent tax on wire and equipment service should be revised to exclude interior communication services, that is, those not making use of the franchises of communication common carriers for carrying wires along or over public rights-of-way. This would remove from tax fire-alarm and burglar-alarm systems, which are wired to give an alarm only on the subscriber's premises, as well as other types of purely interior communications systems.

7. The method of computing the communications excise taxes now appears to require a single tax computation for all items included in a single bill. A collecting agency should be permitted to base the tax computation on totals by groups of items or on specific items normally associated together for billing purposes.

VI. DOCUMENTARY STAMP TAXES

1. The so-called entity rule should be adopted for transfers of partnership interests in the case of the documentary stamp taxes. This would mean that the stock and bond transfer taxes and real-estate conveyance taxes would not be imposed with respect to—

(a) An adjustment of the interests of the partners;

(b) The sale or other disposition by a partner of his interest;

(c) The death or retirement of a partner;

(d) The admission of a new partner; or

(e) The liquidation of a partner's interest.

However, if in any of the above cases, stocks, bonds, or real estate are distributed by the partnership to a partner in either a current or liquidating distribution, or sold to a partner, a transfer tax would be imposed. Similarly, a transfer or conveyance tax would be imposed where a partnership is considered as being terminated under section 708 (b) of the 1954 code, and where the partnership sells or otherwise transfers property subject to the transfer or conveyance tax.

2. The purchase of stamps by clearinghouses of national security exchanges should no longer be required; instead such clearinghouses should be required to make daily payment by check to an authorized Government depository of the total amount of taxes shown on the broker-members' reports.

3. The present law provides no exemptions may be granted from the documentary stamp taxes in certain cases unless the delivery or transfer of the document qualifying for exemption is accompanied by a certificate setting forth such facts as regulations may prescribe. This statutory requirement for exemption certificates under the documentary stamp taxes should be liberalized by giving the Treasury the right to waive the requirement for certificates where they appear unnecessary.

4. The transfer tax should not apply to the return of stock or certificates of indebtedness deposited as collateral security.

5. Transfers made by an executor or administrator of certificates of indebtedness to a legatee, heir, or distributee should be exempt from the tax if the value of the certificates is not greater than the amount of the tax involved. This would extend the present rule for stocks to certificates of indebtedness.

6. The stock transfer and issuance taxes should be revised as follows:

(a) In the case of the stock issuance tax, the tax rate should be 10 cents on each $100 or major fraction thereof of the actual value of the total stock involved in a transaction. The minimum tax in any transaction should be 10 cents.

(b) In the case of the stock transfer tax where there is a sale or exchanges for value the tax rate should be 5 cents on each $100 or major fraction thereof of the actual value of the total stock involved in a transaction.

The minimum tax with respect to such transactions would be 5 cents.

(c) The committee will resume consideration of this recommendation when it next meets at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 16, 1956.

Statement Urging United States Membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made by members of the board of trustees of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce urging approval of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The companies of which these businessmen are officers have farflung plants in almost every corner of the United States. A list follows of where these plants—each of which provides jobs for many American workers—are located:

STATEMENT URGING UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

As American businessmen concerned with our Nation's welfare the undersigned, members of the board of trustees of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, urge the business community and the public to support President Eisenhower in his request for approval of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Of the unifying forces within the free world, only the common love of liberty and independence has proven more important than the ties of international trade. This trade has grown in recent years under a system of economic cooperation centering on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The recent renegotiation of the general agreement, or GATT, provides for the assignment of many essential parts of the agreement to the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. It also permits the Organization, or OTC, to administer the agreement more efficiently. Of even greater importance, the formation of the OTC represents a transition from a provisional postwar system of trade cooperation to one that is both permanent and flexible.

Failure by the United States to support this system will have severe consequences for ourselves and our allies. The growth of world trade under the GATT has contributed greatly to the strength and prosperity of the coalition of non-Communist nations. We cannot reject the OTC and continue to rely on the economic cooperation that has made this trade possible.

The issue of OTC is not freer trade versus protectionism. No provision of either OTC or GATT requires the United States to lower or raise a single tariff. But we cannot reject the OTC without reversing our traditional liberal trade policy and unleashing forces abroad that will increasingly turn American exports back to our own shores and trigger the chain reaction of economic retaliation.

Disruption of world commerce by economic warfare is not an imaginary threat. The failure to cope with the problems of economic nationalism after World War I was partly responsible for the economic collapse that destroyed free enterprise in large areas of the world. This experience demonstrated the importance of a formal system of consultation and cooperation on trade matters. It also influenced our statesmen who played a leading role in the creation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The agreement has since become a bulwark of our foreign-economic policy. To undermine it now by rejecting the OTC would be the economic equivalent of dissolving our military alliances and disarming our allies.

Thus the real issue in the controversy over the OTC is whether or not the United States will continue to furnish strength and leadership to a workable system of international economic cooperation. Our Nation has accepted this responsibility in the past and we believe that it is essential for the American people and their leaders to accept it now.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president, International Business Machines Corp.; Ellsworth C. Alvord, Alvord & Alvord; Sam G. Baggett, vice president, United Fruit Co.; Richard L. Bowditch, Boston, Mass.; Henry P. Bristol, chairman, Bristol-Myers Co.; G. R. Brown, president, United Shoe Machinery Corp.; George D. Bryson, vice president, International Operations General Foods Corp.; Harry A. Bullis, chairman, General Mills, Inc.; A. G. Cameron, vice president, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Export Co.; John S. Coleman, president, Burroughs Corp.; Philip Cortney, president, Coty, Inc.; Gardner Cowles, president, Cowles Magazines, Inc.; Frederick C. Crawford, chairman, Thompson Products, Inc.; William W. Crocker, chairman, Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco; George S. Dinwiddie, president, New Orleans Public Service, Inc.; Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman, Anderson, Clayton & Co.; R. G. Follis, chairman, Standard Oil Company of California; Andrew L. Gomory, senior vice president, Manufacturers Trust Co.; Joseph P. Grace, Jr., president, W. R. Grace & Co.; William S. Gray, chairman, the Hanover Bank; Eugene S. Gregg, president, Westrex Corp.; H. J. Heinz II, president, H. J. Heinz Co.; William A. Hewitt, president, Deere & Co.; Conrad N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels Corp.; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, Studebaker-Packard Corp.; Theodore V. Houser, chairman, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; R. C. Ingersoll, president, Borg-Warner Corp.; B. Brewster Jennings, chairman, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.; H. F. Johnson, president, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.; Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc.; James A. Linen, vice president, Time, Inc.; Walter L. Lingle, Jr., Cincinnati, Ohio; Augustus C. Long, president, the Texas Co; H. N. Mallon, president, Dresser Industries, Inc.; Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co.; John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.; John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase Manhattan Bank; Thomas H. McKittrick, Blairstown, N. J.; Don G. Mitchell, chairman and president, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.; William A. Mitchell, president, the Central Trust Company of Cincinnati; Edward S. Moore, Jr., executive vice president, National Biscuit Co.; George Nebolsine, partner, Coudert Bros.; J. Wilson Newman, president, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.; Raymond T. Perring, president, the Detroit Bank; Warren Lee Pierson, chairman, Trans World Airlines, Inc.; H. F. Prioleau, president, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.; Philip D. Reed, chairman, General Electric Co.; Ralph T. Reed, president, American Express Co.; Morris S. Rosenthal, New York, N. Y.; Leo N. Shaw, executive vice president, the First National City Bank of New York; Frank P. Shepard, vice president, Bankers Trust Co.; Russell G. Smith, executive vice president, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association; Sidney A. Swensrud, chairman, Gulf Oil Corp.; Leo D. Welch, director, Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.; Ogden White, partner, White, Weld & Co.

BREAKDOWN BY STATES OF COMPANIES OF TRUSTEES WHO SIGNED STATEMENT URGING UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP IN THE OTC BY THE UNITED STATES COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

ALABAMA

Anniston: General Electric Co.

Mobile: Gulf Oil Co., Standard Oil Co., Scott Paper Co.

ARKANSAS

Jonesville: General Electric Co.

Malvern: Dresser Industries, Inc., (Magnet Cover Barium Co.).

CALIFORNIA

Anaheim: General Electric Co.

Bell: Thompson Products Co., Inc.

Berkeley: H. H. Heinz Co.

Emeryville: International Harvester Co.

Fullerton: Syvania Electric Products, Inc.

Bakersfield: Standard Oil Company of California.

El Segundo: Standard Oil Company of California.

Huntington Park: Dresser Industries, Inc. (Pacific Pumps, Inc.).

Huntington Park: Dresser Industries, Inc. (Lane-Wells Co.).

Lodi: General Mills.

Los Angeles: Coty, Inc., Bank of America, Deere & Co., General Mills, Inc., General Electric Co., Studebaker-Packard Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Texas Co.

North Hollywood: Borg-Warner Corp.

Mountain View: Sylvania Electric Co.

Oakland: Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco, General Electric Co., National Biscuit Co.

Ontario: General Electric Co.

Richmond: Standard Oil Company of California.

San Francisco: Bank of America, Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco, General Electric Co.

San Leandro: Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace)

San Jose: General Electric Co.

San Mateo: Croker First National Bank of San Francisco.

Stockton: General Mills, Inc., International Harvester Co.

Tracy: H. J. Heinz Co.

Torrance: Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.

Vallejo: General Mills, Inc.

Watsonville: H. J. Heinz Co.

Whittier: Dresser Industries, Inc. (Security Engineering Div.).

CONNECTICUT

Bridgeport: General Electric Co., Gulf Oil Co.

New Haven: Gulf Oil Co.

Norfolk: General Electric Co.

Plainville: General Electric Co.

Stamford: Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

DELAWARE

Claymont: Texas Co.

Dover: Coty, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Alvord & Alvord.

FLORIDA

Bartow: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace & Co.).

Fort Pierce: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace & Co.).

Jacksonville: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace & Co., General Mills, Inc., Gulf Oil Co.

Miami: General Mills, Inc.

Panama City: Gulf Oil Co.

Port Tampa: Gulf Oil Co.

Port Everglades: Gulf Oil Co.

Port St. Joe: Gulf Oil Co.

GEORGIA

Atlanta: Sears, Roebuck & Co., Coca Cola Corp.
Rome: General Electric Co.
Savannah: Gulf Oil Corp.

IDAHO

Idaho Falls: General Electric Co.

ILLINOIS

Bellwood: Borg-Warner Corp.
Bloomington: General Electric.
Canton: International Harvester Co.
Chicago: Borg-Warner Corp., General Mills, International Harvester Co., General Electric Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Hilton Hotels Corp., Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Chicago Heights: General Electric Co.
Cicero: General Electric Co.
Danville: General Electric Co.
Decatur: General Electric Co., Borg-Warner Corp.
DeKalb: General Electric Co.
East Moline: International Harvester Co.
Evanston: Coty, Inc., National Biscuit Co.
East St. Louis: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Effingham: Borg-Warner.
Herrin: Borg-Warner.
Hoopeston: Deere & Co.
Kankakee: General Mills, Inc.
Lawrenceville: Texas Co.
Lockport: Texas Co.
Mattoon: General Electric Co.
Marseilles: National Biscuit Co.
Moline: Deere & Co.
Melrose Park: International Harvester Co.
Morrison: General Electric Co.
Rockford: Borg-Warner Corp., General Electric Co.
Rock Falls: International Harvester Co.
Rock Island: International Harvester Co. (Farmall Works).

INDIANA

Auburn: Borg-Warner Corp.
Connersville: Roots-Connersville Blower Division, Dresser, Ind., Inc.
Decatur: General Electric.
East Chicago: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Evansville: General Foods.
Fort Wayne: International Harvester Co., General Electric Co.
Gary: Borg-Warner Corp.
Indianapolis: Borg-Warner Corp., International Harvester Co.
Linton: General Electric Co.
Michigan City: Thompson Products, Inc.
Muncie: Borg-Warner Corp.
New Castle: Borg-Warner Corp.
New Albany: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Richmond: International Harvester Co.
South Bend: Studebaker-Packard Corp.
Tell City: General Electric Co.
Wabash: General Electric Co.

IOWA

Belmond: General Mills Co.
Burlington: Sylvania Electric Co.
Cedar Rapids: Dewey & Almy Co. (W. R. Grace).
Des Moines: Deere & Co.
Dubuque: Deere & Co.
Keokuk: General Mills Co.
Muscatine: H. J. Heinz Co.
Ottumwa: Deere & Co.
Perry: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Waterloo: Deere & Co.

KANSAS

Augusta: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Wichita: General Mills, Inc.
Kansas City: Trans World Air Lines.

KENTUCKY

Hopkinsville: General Mills, Inc.
Lexington: General Electric Co.
Louisville: General Mills, Inc., General Electric Co., International Harvester Co.
Owensboro: General Electric Co.
Winchester: Sylvania Electric Co.

LOUISIANA

Alexandria: Bristol-Myers Co.
Baton Rouge: Esso Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)
Gretna: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace), Gulf Oil Corp.
Lake Charles: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
New Orleans: International Harvester Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., National Biscuit Co., Magnet Cover Barium Corp. (Dresser).

MAINE

Limerick: General Electric Co.
Madison: Scott Paper Co.
Portland: Gulf Oil Co.
Waldoboro: Sylvania Electric.
Winslow: Scott Paper Co.

MARYLAND

Baltimore: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace & Co.), General Electric Co. (two plants), Standard Oil Company of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey.

MASSACHUSETTS

Acton: Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Adams: Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Ashland: General Electric Co.
Beverly: United Shoe Machinery Co.
Boston: Sears, Roebuck & Co., Sylvania Electric Co., United Fruit Co., United Shoe Machinery Co.
Cambridge: Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Charlestown: Revere Sugar Refinery (United Fruit).
Chelsea: Gulf Oil Co.
Danvers: Sylvania Electric Co.
Dorchester: General Foods Co.
Everett: Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, General Electric Co.
Fitchburg: General Electric Co.
Holyoke: General Electric Co.
Ipswich: Sylvania Electric Co.
East Boston: General Electric Co.
Lowell: General Electric Co.
Newton: Sylvania Electric Co.
Pittsfield: General Electric Co.
Salem: Sylvania Electric Co.
Springfield: General Electric Co.
Taunton: General Electric Co.
Waltham: Sylvania Electric Co.
West Lynn: General Electric Co.
Woburn: Sylvania Electric Co.
Worcester: General Electric Co.

MICHIGAN

Battle Creek: General Foods Co.
Detroit: Burroughs Corp., Borg-Warner Co., Detroit Bank Co., General Electric Co., Studebaker-Packard Corp., Scott Paper Co., Thompson Products, Inc.
Edmore: General Electric Co.
Fruitport: Thomas Products, Inc.
Holland: H. J. Heinz Co., General Electric Co., National Biscuit Co.
Lansing: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Kalamazoo: Borg-Warner Co.
Muskegon: Borg-Warner Co.
Portland: Thompson Products, Inc.
Trenton: Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.
Utica: Studebaker-Packard Corp.
Plymouth: Burroughs Corp.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis: General Mills, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

MISSISSIPPI

Jackson: General Electric Co.

MISSOURI

Carthage: National Biscuit Co.
Joplin: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Kansas City: Bristol-Myers C., General Mills, Inc., Sears, Roebuck & Co.
St. Louis: General Electric Co., Thompson Products, Inc.
Sullivan: Thompson Products, Inc.
Trenton: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).

MONTANA

Billings: Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey (Carter Oil Co.).
Great Falls: General Mills.
Sunburst: Texas Co.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Somersworth: General Electric Co.

NEW JERSEY

Bayonne: Esso Standard Oil Co.
Bloomfield: General Electric Co.
Carteret: American Metals Corp.
Hoboken: General Foods Co., Scott Paper Co.
Linden: Esso Standard Oil Co.
Newark: General Electric Co., Bristol-Myers Co.
New Brunswick: Studebaker-Packard Co.
Paulsboro: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Perth Amboy: Standard Oil Co. of California.
Salem: H. J. Heinz Co.
Springfield: General Electric Co.
Trenton: General Electric Co.
Westville: Texas Co.
Washington: Bristol-Myers Co.

NEW MEXICO

Carlsbad: American Metals Co.

NEW YORK

New York City: American Express Co., Coty, Inc., W. R. Grace & Co., the Hanover Bank, First National City Bank of New York, Gulf Oil Corp., National Biscuit Co., Time, Inc., the Texas Co., Trans World Airlines, Cowles Magazines, Inc., Manufacturers Trust Co., Westrex Corp., Young & Rubicam, Inc., the Chase Manhattan Bank, Coudert Bros., Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., White & Case, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Morris S. Rosenthal, Bankers Trust Co., White, Weld & Co.
Albany: Gulf Oil Co.
Auburn: General Electric Co.
Bayside: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.
Batavia: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.
Beacon: National Biscuit Co.
Brockport: General Electric Co.
Buffalo: General Electric Co., General Mills, Inc., Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., Sylvania Electric Co. (2 plants).
Brooklyn: Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.
Clyde: General Electric Co.
Coxsackie: General Electric Co.
Elmira: General Electric Co.
East Syracuse: Bristol-Myers Co.
Fort Edward: General Electric Co.
Hicksville: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.
Hudson Falls: General Electric Co.
Johnson City: General Electric Co.
Ithaca: Borg-Warner Corp.
Lockport: Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Malta: General Electric Co.
Maspeth: General Electric Co.
Medina: H. J. Heinz Co.
Niagara Falls: National Biscuit Co.
Olean: Dresser Industries, Inc. (Clark Bros. Co. Div.).
Seneca Falls: Sylvania Electric Products Corp. (2 plants).
Syracuse: General Electric Co., Gulf Oil Corp.
Schenectady: General Electric Co.
Utica: General Electric Co.
Waterford: General Electric Co.
White Plains: General Foods Corp.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheboro: General Electric Co.
High Point: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.
Goldsboro: General Electric Co.
Greensboro: Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Wilmington: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).

OHIO

Alliance: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
Akron: Goodyear Tire & Rubber Export Co.

Andover: General Electric Co.
Bedford: Borg-Warner Corp.
Barberton: General Electric Co.
Bellevue: General Electric Co.
Bucyrus: General Electric Co.
Bowling Green: H. J. Heinz Co.
Cincinnati: Central Trust Co., Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace), Gulf Oil Corp., Standard Oil Company of California.
Circleville: General Electric Co.
Cleveland: General Electric Co., Sylvania Electric Products Corp., Thompson Products, Inc.
Columbus: Dresser-Ideco Co., Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace), Thompson Products, Inc.
Conneaut: General Electric Co.
Cochocton: General Electric Co.
Dayton: National Biscuit Co.
Dover: General Electric Co.
Euclid: General Electric Co., Thompson Products, Inc.
Evandale: General Electric Co.
Findley: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace & Co.)
Fremont: H. J. Heinz Co.
Jefferson: General Electric Co.
Logan: General Electric Co.
Niles: General Electric Co.
Nelsonville: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.
Rossford: General Mills, Inc.
Sandusky: Scott Paper Co.
Tiffin: General Electric Co.
Toledo: General Mills, Inc., Gulf Oil Corp., National Biscuit Co.
Warren: General Electric Co.
Willoughby: Thompson Products, Inc.
Youngstown: General Electric Co.
Wooster: Borg-Warner Corp.
Springfield: International Harvester Co.
Ottawa: Sylvania Electric Products Corp.

OKLAHOMA

Blackwell: American Metals Co.
El Reno: General Mills.
Pryor: Deere & Co.
Shawnee: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Tulsa: Davison Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).
West Tulsa: Texas Co.

OREGON

Portland: Standard Oil Company of California.

PENNSYLVANIA

Allentown: General Electric Co.
Altoona: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Bradford: Dresser Mfg. Division, Bovaird & Seyfrang Mfg. Co., (Dresser).
Bridgeville: General Electric Co.
Brookville: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Chambersburg: H. J. Heinz Co.
Chester: Scott Paper Co.
Danville: Thompson Products, Inc.
Du Bois: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Emporium: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Erie: General Electric Co.
Franklin: Borg-Warner Corp.
Hatboro: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Harrisburg: Thompson Products, Inc.
Houtzdale: Sylvania Electrict Products, Inc.
Luzerne: National Biscuit Co.
Mill Hall: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Montoursville: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
New Kinsington: General Electric Co.
Philadelphia: Burroughs Corp., General Electric Co., Gulf Oil Corp (2 plants)., Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Pittsburgh: H. J. Heinz Co.
Scranton: General Electric Co.
St. Marys: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Towanda: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Troy: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Warren: Sylvania Electrict Products, Inc.
Williamsport: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
York: National Biscuit Co., Sylvania Electric Products Corp., General Electric Co.

RHODE ISLAND

East Providence: Standard Oil Company of California.
Newport: General Electric Co.
Providence: General Electric Co., Gulf Oil Co., Socony Mobil Oil Co., Texas Co.
Tiverton: Gulf Oil Corp.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Charleston: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace), Gulf Oil Corp., Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.
Spartanburg: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).

TENNESSEE

Johnson City: General Mills.
Knoxville: Borg-Warner Corp.
Memphis: Borg-Warner Corp., Grace Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace), International Harvester Co., General Electric Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Coty, Inc.
Nashville: Davidson Chemical Co. (W. R. Grace).

TEXAS

Amarillo: General Mills, Inc., Texas Co.
Beaumont: Ideco Division (Dresser Equipment Co.), Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Baytown: Humble Oil Co. (Standard Oil of New Jersey).
Brownsville: Magcober, Inc. (Dresser Industries).
Dallas: Dresser Industries, Inc., Security Engineering Division (Dresser Industries), Sears, Roebuck & Co.
El Paso: Standard Oil Company of California, Texas Co.
Fort Worth: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Houston: Southwestern Industrial Electronics Co. (Dresser Industries), Anderson Clayton Co., General Electric Co., Gulf Oil Co., Magnet Cove Barium Corp. (Dresser Industries, Inc.).
Kenedy: General Mills, Inc.
Port Arthur: Gulf Oil Corp., Texas Co.
Port Neches: Texas Co.
Wichita Falls: General Mills, Inc.

UTAH

Ogden: General Mills, Inc.
Salt Lake: Standard Oil Company of California.

VERMONT

Burlington: General Electric Co.
Ludlow: General Electric Co.

VIRGINIA

Norfolk: Gulf Oil Co.
Winchester: H. J. Heinz Co.

WASHINGTON

Cheney: National Biscuit Co.
Everett: Scott Paper Co.
Ferndale: Socony Mobil Oil Co.
Seattle: General Electric Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Spokane: General Mills, Inc.
Tacoma: General Mills, Inc.

WEST VIRGINIA

Huntington: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Point Pleasant: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Wheeling: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

WISCONSIN

Horicon: Deere & Co.
Milwaukee: General Electric Co.
Racine: S. C. Johnson & Sons.
Waukesha: International Harvester Co.
Milwaukee: International Harvester Co.
Wausau: Borg-Warner Corp.

WYOMING

Casper: Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., Texas Co.
Greybull: Dresser Industries, Inc., Magney Cove Barium Co.

Supplemental Appropriations of the Department of Agriculture for Mediterranean Fruitfly and Burrowing Nematode

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes for the purpose of directing a couple of questions to the chairman, and also to thank the committee for its consideration of probably one of the most important, or two of the most important agricultural problems in Florida today. One has to do with the Mediterranean fruitfly infestation which was recently found to exist in both Broward and the Miami-Dade County area and the other with regard to the activity of the Department of Agriculture concerning the spreading decline, a citrus disease which has meant much in the way of the destruction of many acres of citrus crops in the State of Florida. I want to thank the committee for the serious consideration which I know it gave to both of these all-important problems. But, I want to direct these questions to the committee in order to make certain that I fully understand the program for the future. It is my understanding that there was requested of the committee $856,000 for the purpose of additional customs' inspections, and I see on page 7 of the report where the committee has actually provided a new item of appropriation of $500,000 which is less than that requested for the purpose of working out a program for the use of this additional money to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs to develop a program which will prevent passengers from embarking in foreign ports on carriers destined for the United States with dangerous articles and materials and for domestic inspections. I would like to ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Was it the opinion of the committee, and did it have testimony before it, as to whether this amount rather than the amount requested would be adequate to provide 100 percent inspection by customs in the future, it being my understanding that since 1953 there have only been spot checks and it being understood that this is one of the possible reasons and one of the possible sources of this fruitfly infestation in this area.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that the language in our report on page 7 probably expresses it much better than I can here on the floor. But, primarily the point we make is this: We went through the customs an-

nouncements and things of that sort. We have been trying to have a thorough check on everybody who lands in the United States. We did have that at one time, but then we got into this spot-checking business. Spot checks do not work. Neither is it sound to let all these things be taken aboard in foreign countries, particularly on planes and ships and then try to catch them after they get into our own country. But if you try to meet the problem by giving customs all the money it, in turn, says it will have to have in order to do this work for the Department of Agriculture, it turns out that that becomes completely out of line with what is sound. After going over this with all the witnesses, we think, and I think I reflect the views of all of us on the committee, that this amount would be enough to substantially meet the requirements of this inspection service, depending on the time element, if proper notice is given to the embarking passengers in foreign countries prior to taking off for the United States. In other words, there was evidence that if the passengers had notice before they took this contraband aboard, we would not have one-tenth the problem over here that we do. So this is now trying to reconcile what we really need for the time being, but at the same time we are telling them to review the whole thing and stop these things before leaving the foreign shores.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the chairman's explanation and the fact that the committee has shown great awareness of this problem. But, is it true that $500,000 that has been provided will be adequate to give 100 percent inspection at Customs in the areas in the State of Florida where it has been shown there is a definite need?

Mr. WHITTEN. We feel that if they will get busy on this, you can have 100 percent inspection prior to working the matter out. It is our opinion that the figures submitted by customs, which is a transfer, or at least they were in my own opinion, considerably higher than actually should be the case.

Mr. CRAMER. You feel that these funds are adequate to carry out the inspection?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to thank the chairman and to say that as of last Friday, as a matter of fact, 100 percent inspection has been put into effect in the State of Florida. I have only one additional question which I want to ask the chairman with reference to the $1,500,000 contingency fund for the control of the outbreak of insect plant disease on page 3 of the bill. As you know, that has been a very serious problem in Florida with regard to spreading decline. Is it the opinion of the committee with regard to that as well as this Mediterranean fruitfly problem that that contingency funds is adequate?

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, I may say to my friend that when we agreed on this figure and on that sum, we recognized the problem that needed to be met, otherwise, we would not have gone along with it. In our judgment, we think it is sufficient to meet the problem of the Mediterranean fruitfly threat which has developed in recent weeks. The gentleman, perhaps, is aware that it came to our attention after we had virtually gotten ready to mark up the bill. But we did reopen the hearings to hear testimony and I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is an emergency fund. We told them it was adequate to initiate the program and we are looking forward to their taking it up in detail in the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. Then it is my understanding that you do contemplate sometime during the remainder of this session that a supplemental request will be made or, in the alternative, a request made in the Senate to take care of this, which is recognized as an emergency problem in Florida.

Mr. WHITTEN. I recognize that will probably happen. I would not want to commit myself other than as I have here. This would initiate a program, pending the working out of the problem.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for the recognition which the committee has given to these two important problems in Florida and in the future, when the supplemental request is brought in, I trust it will be given the same careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would take the opportunity at this time to compliment the Department of Agriculture on its effective and prompt action in regard to the two threats that have faced the Florida citrus industry this year.

Spreading decline—burrowing nematode—is an imported disease that is seriously threatening the great groves of our State and, since its appearance in the past 2 years, considerable research and many control methods have been effected. In conjunction with the State of Florida the Department has worked diligently to search out infected areas and to control the spread of this disease.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars was appropriated from contingency funds in fiscal 1956 to make surveys of the infection which at the present time disclose, as of the 14th of May, that 878 acres of grove have been treated, 260 acres are ready for treatment and some 2,017 are being prepared for treatment. Total infection is known to have spread to 7,000 acres of our groves. Department of Agriculture requests for fiscal 1957 now total nearly $500,000 for further mapping and other steps planned to control spread of the disease and to prepare for elimination of certain areas and treatment of others. The State has fully participated in this program and has appropriated $1,800,000 for the biennium ending July 1957.

The Department has acted with sincerity and dispatch in moving to our assistance in this problem. We have been assured of their continued support as needed.

The Mediterranean fruitfly has recently been discovered in an area reaching from Pompano Beach to Kendall on the east coast of Florida. Those people familiar with the destruction caused by this infestation many years ago know how costly and dangerous it can be. Millions of boxes of fruit and millions of dollars revenue loss was suffered by the State by the previous infestation.

The fly was first identified by scientists in the Department of Agriculture on May 19 this year. Immediate action was taken on the two phases of protection needed to prevent spread of the infection and further infestation. Inspectors were immediately transferred to the State with 3,500 traps to determine areas of infestation. Ten thousand traps will soon be ready throughout the State and additional inspectors have been transferred to the area. With the interest of the White House being expressed, additional funds in the amount of $500,000 have been asked by the Department and approved today in the contingency funds to commence this work in the State. Additional supplemental appropriations requests will be made to meet the full need for fiscal 1957.

In the second phase of defense against further spread of this dangerous infestation the Department has set up $500,000 for 100 percent inspection by the Customs Bureau which has already gone into effect. Hearings were held May 9 on inspection quarantine methods for fruit shipment and will be effective this week on publication.

I think that the cooperation and action of the Department of Agriculture and customs is worthy of high commendation and I take this opportunity in the discussion of their appropriation requests in 1957 to make these remarks and point out the sincere efforts in the past of this administration to serve in the field of agriculture in a manner that is beneficial and of high importance. Their response to the need of a particular situation in a specified instance in the State of Florida is demonstrative of the attitude of the Department and its officials at all times.

The Committee on Appropriations has certainly to be complimented on its full realization of the needs of Florida in this instance in approving administration requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Pennsylvania's Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of May 12, 1956:

PENNSYLVANIA'S SCOTT

Throw a stone on the national political scene—figuratively speaking, of course—and there are very good odds that it will hit a Pennsylvanian.

More and more, these postwar years, Pennsylvania men and women have moved into

top-echelon positions of power and influence in the national organizations of both political parties.

Latest to take over a top spot is Philadelphia's Representative HUGH SCOTT, whose appointment as general counsel for the Republican National Committee was announced just yesterday by GOP Chairman Leonard Hall.

It took a lot of looking among the 48 States to find someone with the unique qualifications for general counsel. He had to be (1) a topnotch lawyer and (2) he had to have an extensive knowledge of the ins and out of politics, varying from State to State across this wide Nation, and a wide acquaintanceship among the hundreds of party leaders in the various States. Pennsylvania's SCOTT filled the bill to a "T"—from the standpoint of top legal background and from his experience as a former Republican national chairman.

As we add Congressman SCOTT's name to the growing list of Pennsylvanians in key spots on the national political scene, we have just that much more ammunition for one of those "my State versus your State" arguments.

Come to think of it, though, it isn't much of an argument—even with a Texan—over which State turns out the most leaders in national politics. Pennsylvanians can start right up at the top of the list and work their way down. The President of the United States may have been born in Texas, but, displaying the good judgment that put him in the White House, he picked Pennsylvania for his real and permanent home.

Atlas Serves Cause of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of May 3, 1956:

DETERRENCE—ATLAS SERVES CAUSE OF PEACE

San Diego has become the free world headquarters for the design and production of a weapon which ultimately could provide the decisive deterrent to world war III.

Th Atlas intercontinental ballistics missile will exert an enormous influence on international politics. The leaders of the two great global powers both spoke of such a weapon as recently as last week.

In England Red Party boss, Nikita S. Khrushchev, boasted that Russia had a projectile capable of spanning continents.

At his news conference a week ago yesterday President Eisenhower discussed the intercontinental ballistic missile in typically temperate terms. He described it as a supplement "to a capacity which already exists."

He returned again to a fact which he frequently emphasizes: the psychological value of such a weapon. "It has sort of a terrifying result upon the human mind to think of something flying off through space at several times the speed of sound and at tremendous altitudes and coming down with these great hydrogen bomb bursts."

This capacity, this asset will pay huge dividends in peace other than its role as a deterrent. Much of the research and development already accomplished can be applied toward the conquering of man's last frontier: outer space.

Only last week Willy Ley, an authority on rockets; told a group of United States Navy officers that the last obstacle to an intercontinental ballistics missile was finding a way to prevent it from burning like a meteorite when it reentered the earth atmosphere. It would appear that the Atlas' designers have crashed this heat barrier.

The decision to locate the Atlas plant in San Diego—made at the highest echelon of the Eisenhower Republican administration—does more than assign to this community an activity which will eventually require the services of close to 7,000 employees. It means that San Diego will also become an increasingly attractive site for companies supplying parts, equipment, and services needed for the Atlas and its employment.

If the community is to be congratulated on having Convair's Atlas division here, that company deserves the highest praise for what must be a superb engineering achievement. It must be remembered that the Atlas is not a guided missile; when it is launched its trajectory is fixed.

To develop an aiming mechanism accurate enough to bring the weapon to its target 5,000 miles away is a technological triumph.

H. R. 11177

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

The House on Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to join in complimenting the distinguished chairman and the very able members of his energetic committee who have labored so long and studiously to present this Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1957. This measure before us is obviously the result of the most studied effort on the part of the committee, after extensive hearings and the appearance of multitudinous witnesses, that could be exerted to provide for the full operation of the Department of Agriculture in the greatest public interest, while at the same time eliminating or reducing those items of expenditure which experience has demonstrated are of little or no value to the general welfare.

Among the great many important items provided for in this bill, there are two that have been of particular personal interest to me over the past several years. The committee has recognized the great importance of these items and very wisely insured their greater application and expansion.

The first one is the so-called school-lunch program for which I have earnestly advocated a substantial increase because I felt it was eminently justified. There is, I believe, no better investment this country can make than attempting to improve the health of our schoolchildren, the citizens of tomorrow. As we all realize, the number of students in our grade and high schools all over the country has been steadily increasing and is destined to continue so increasing for an undetermined number of years ahead. It is, then, practical as well as patriotic wisdom to reasonably guarantee that these guardians of tomorrow's national security receive during their school years the essential foundation of health that can come only from an adequate food intake during their most energetic days. The committee has seen fit to increase this item by over $16.5 million and directed the Agriculture Department to take other steps also that would appear to adequately cover the situation for the present at least, and the committee deserves the highest praise for this wise action.

In recognition of another serious problem, the control and eradication of the gypsy moth threat, the committee has provided a total of $2,295,200. It has long been authoritatively judged and warned that if the insidious infestation of this type of moth is not controlled, it would cause even greater damage than it already has to timber, recreational facilities, fruit crops, and ornamental trees. I understand that the increase in this year's bill of nearly $2 million is to encourage the use of a new technique in application of a most effective spray composition which promises to completely eliminate this dangerous insect and that an excellent cooperative program has been established between the Agriculture Department, and the various States and local governments and also private individuals and organizations. Certainly, such a program is in the general interest by promoting conservation of our physical resources and the committee has again demonstrated their patriotic wisdom in taking cognizance of the situation.

Of course, there are a great many other important provisions of this measure affecting the general welfare, such as soil conservation, agricultural marketing research and service, meat inspection to protect the general health, and so forth, all of which have been thoroughly explained by the floor managers of this bill and I do not intend to intrude unnecessarily upon the time of this House by repetitious recital. I very earnestly feel that the overall content of the measure has been conscientiously designed to economically promote our agricultural concerns in the greatest national interest, and I hope that the bill will be passed promptly and unanimously.

Senator Nixon Outspoken in 1951—Vice President Nixon Very Silent in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which ap-

peared in the May 10, 1956, isssue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial entitled "Influence, Then and Now," follows:

INFLUENCE, THEN AND NOW

1951: A Senate committee rebukes William M. Boyle for making an appointment at the RFC for the head of the American Lithofold Co. Mr. Boyle, executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, denies he used political influence to help the private firm. But according to Newsweek magazine, Senator Richard M. Nixon says: "The very fact that the introduction comes from the National Committee * * * constitutes influence."

1956: A Senate committee learns that Murray W. Chotiner went to the White House where two Presidential assistants made calls to the CAB in behalf of his clients. Mr. Chotiner, associate director of the Republican National Committee's campaign schools and former head of the regular party organizations in Los Angeles and California, as well as former campaign manager for Mr. NIXON, denies he used political influence to help his clients. But what does Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON say? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

How times do fly.

Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Bill, 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the great wisdom of the committee in including in the agriculture appropriations bill for 1957 emergency funds to combat the menace of another disastrous outbreak of an unwelcome visitor to our shores, the Mediterranian fruitfly.

This destructive insect, which threatens particularly a citrus industry vital not only to the great State of Florida which I am privileged to represent, but will affect the economy of other States as well, first reappeared in the southern tip of Florida only a few short weeks ago.

Memories of a disastrous earlier invasion of the fruitfly still lingers in Florida, and the first warning of its reappearance was answered promptly and unanimously by the Florida delegation in this House and in the other body. After conferring with leaders of the citrus industry, with officials of the Florida Plant Board, we met with officials of the Agriculture Department to outline a recommended plan for control of the fruitfly.

Time was of the essence, for the fruitfly is such nature that immediate and urgent steps must be taken not just to wipe it out where ever it exists, but to isolate it promptly when it is found, thus preventing its spread.

I am happy to say that our efforts were not unrewarded. Officials of the Agriculture Department, recognizing as we did that the fruitfly knows no politics and has no partisanship in its destructive operations, leaped into the breach to begin the fight against this deadly menace.

And similarly, the subcommittee on this bill, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has recognized the need for action now to implement the plans of the Department to control the fruitfly.

The committee has recommended, and I urge this House to concur, that $500,000 be added to the Department's contingency fund for emergency insect outbreaks, that another $500,000 be appropriated for transfer to the Bureau of Customs for 100 percent inspection of baggage coming into Florida, and that $110,300 be added for increased inspection at ports of entry.

For many years, members of the Florida delegation in Congress have recognized that the present system of spot inspection of baggage is not adequate to prevent the recurrence of the Mediterranean fruitfly, and guard against other unwelcome visitors. We do not believe the fruitfly would be with us now had there been 100 percent inspection.

But this is no time for looking backward to what might have been. We say that the subcommittee has been wise in its handling of the problem, and we are assured that the funds sought are sufficient not only for the immediate emergency work needed, but to initiate a total inspection program to avert further emergencies.

I also would like to commend the committee's action in providing adequate funds for assisting the State of Florida in its all-out fight against spreading decline of citrus, caused by a burrowing nematode which, in its long-range effects, appears to be capable of wreaking as much disaster as the fruitfly.

This, too, is a vital matter, and I am happy to be able to state here that it is not a responsibility which the State of Florida has sought to shove off on the shoulders of the Federal Government. The record will show that the State government is bearing two-thirds of the cost of the research and control programs needed.

Gas and Oil Leasing on Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the May 1956 issue of Sports Afield carries a statement by the former Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, concerning his side of the controversy over the Department of the Interior order permitting oil and gas drilling on wildlife refuges. Because this matter is of such interest to conservationists all over the United States, I am putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Secretary McKay's article, The Truth About Our Wildlife Refuges. I might add that the two articles to which Secretary McKay refers have previously been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first one, One Man Can Wipe Out Our Wildlife Refuges, by Arthur Carhart, was carried in the RECORD of May 23, pages A3537 and A3538. The second article, Refuges Doomed, was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1782 of the February 27 issue.

Secretary McKay's article, along with the note of the editor, follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR WILDLIFE REFUGES
(By Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is Sports Afield's deep conviction that the greatest safeguard to the future of our wildlife resources is America's vast army of alert, well-informed sportsmen. In so vital a part of that future as the wildlife refuge program, it is imperative that these sportsmen have access to all the facts. In this connection, Sports Afield feels privileged to present this article by Secretary Douglas McKay, offering the Department of the Interior's side of the controversy over the recent order permitting oil and gas drilling on the refuges.)

Sports Afield readers have such a very real stake in the preservation of wildlife in this country that they are entitled to nothing less than the full truth about the operations of our national wildlife refuge system.

It is unfortunate and unfair that the truth has been distorted by articles such as those appearing in recent months under the headings "One Man Can Wipe Out Our Wildlife Refuges" and "Refuges Doomed?"

In this connection a moral can be drawn from the old fable about the boy who cried wolf once too often. False prophecies of doom can do great harm to the cause of conservation. Certainly, sportsmen-conservationists cannot and will not be fooled all of the time by glibly voiced cries of alarm when no danger exists. This could lead to the very real danger that champions of conservation might fail to rally in time when an actual threat to wildlife preservation arose.

Last June, for instance, Sports Afield readers were asked to believe the absurd charge that one man—the Secretary of the Interior—could "wipe out our wildlife refuges by merely signing a typewritten order." Moreover, it was insinuated that I was actually opposed to our excellent refuge program. The only hope of salvation, you were told, lay in appealing to the Congress to protect the refuges from the Secretary of the Interior.

It is ironic, perhaps, that shortly thereafter two congressional committees rejected the protests by sportsmen-conservationists against the proposed transfer of 10,700 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge to the Department of the Army and only the refusal of the Secretary of the Interior to sign a transfer order has protected the integrity of that vitally important wildlife sanctuary.

After barking up that wrong tree, uninformed alarmists recently have stampeded off in another direction to set up their cries of "Wolf, Wolf." This time the cause of true conservation is being harmed by widespread circulation of misinformation about the stringent new regulations governing oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges.

Unfortunately, Michael Hudoba, Washington editor for Sports Afield, is among those who resorted to snap judgment rather than objective study of the new regulations. His article "Refuges Doomed?" presented an unfair and distorted picture of the effect the

new regulations will have on refuge protection.

What is a National Wildlife Refuge? Although Mr. Hudoba does not answer that question, he is quite willing to say how they should be run.

His article refers to actions which defeat the very purpose of the entire refuge system, reverse policies to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges, and now open wildlife refuges to oil and gas leasing. It does this without in any way defining what the real purpose of the wildlife refuge system is or stating the true facts with regard to the availability of wildlife refuge lands for oil and gas leasing as well as other economic uses for more than 20 years.

Anyone who is casually familiar with a Federal wildlife refuge knows that it has two principal purposes. One is the protection of game against hunting and the other is the furnishing of suitable habitat to encourage or supplement other nesting, resting, and feeding areas. Insofar as migratory birds are concerned, each of the wildlife refuges is used by the birds during only a few months of the year and in many instances only on portions of the refuges are there concentrations of such birds. The balance of the refuge lands are utilized for a variety of purposes including the production through ordinary farming methods of grain and other feeds.

In other words, wildlife refuges are not wilderness areas nor are they national parks.

Of the approximately 16 million acres of public domain that is administered in part for wildlife conservation, only half—8 million acres—is administered solely by the Fish nad Wildlife Service and about 7 million acres of that half lies in Alaska. On the other 8 million acres of land the Fish and Wildlife Service has rights along with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management for grazing, the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies. Even where the lands were withdrawn for the sole use of the Fish and Wildlife Service, oil and gas leasing was permitted in many of the withdrawal orders. A total of 1,398,089 acres has been acquired by funds appropriated for the use of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Some of these lands, particularly in the refuges along the Gulf of Mexico, were acquired subject to the reservation of mineral rights and almost all of these areas along the gulf have producing oil and gas wells. More than half a million acres of lands have been leased by the Fish and Wildlife Service and its uses are subject to the terms of these leases.

The act of June 15, 1935 specifically contemplated that grants of privileges for economic use of refuges would be made and that part of the revenue therefrom would be returned to the communities where the refuges were situated. The term "privileges" includes not onyl sharecropping, grazing, timber removal, and similar activities, but also any other economic use of the areas as does not interfere with the use of the area for its primary purpose, namely, the conservation of wildlife.

Thus, to charges that any recent action of the Department "defeats and nullifies the basic refuge purposes" is to ignore completely the facts about the multiple uses which have historically been made of the refuges.

Are the wildlife refuges doomed?

Mr. J. Clark Salyer, chief of the Branch of Wildlife Refuges of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, certainly is as well qualified to answer that question as Mr. Hudoba. While on the witness stand before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he was asked point blank:

"Now do you feel that under your regulations and operating plans, the wildlife will be protected adequately where an oil lease is entered into?"

Mr. Salyer replied:

"I do or I would be up here screaming bloody murder right now."

Is Mr. Salyer as well qualified as Mr. Hudoba to answer that question?

Mr. Salyer is a civil servant. He has no ax to grind. His record speaks for itself.

He is one of the dedicated group of wildlife conservationists who came to Washington with "Ding" Darling 22 years ago and laid the foundation on which the wildlife refuge system has grown from one-half million acres to over 17½ million acres.

Mr. Hudoba made the point that the new regulations would compel the Fish and Wildlife Service to prove the value of each acre of wildlife land. Mr. Salyer demonstrated the falsity of this conclusion in his testimony before Congress. He testified that before an oil lease could be granted the Fish and Wildlife Service would have to be satisfied that wildlife values are adequately protected. Representative Dingell then asked:

"So, in effect, the Wildlife Service, has to come forward and prove the need of protection of certain types in that area."

Mr. SALYER. "I wouldn't say we have to prove it. We have to state it."

Mr. DINGELL. "And you have to show that certain forms of action are necessary to preserve that?"

Mr. SALYER. "No, the shoe is on the other foot, with these new regulations. The oil companies have to do it."

Mr. DINGELL. "The oil companies have to do it?"

Mr. SALYER. "They have to show that they have a plan that will protect the wildlife interests."

Actually, it's a little surprising the new lease regulations didn't bring protests from oil and gas development interests. The new rules are that one-sided in their design to safeguard wildlife values on lands administered by the Department. They could not be more restrictive in favor of wildlife and still stay within the requiremen s and the intent of the various acts, treatics, and laws under which Fish and Wildlife Service areas were acquired and are administered.

An attempt has been made to mislead the public by an accusation that these revised oil and gas regulations—signed after 2½ years of study, conference and discussion by officials and experts of the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service—opened lands of the wildlife refuge program to oil and gas development for the first time.

This is not true.

Issuing leases for oil and gas exploration and drilling dates back to, and is authorized by, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. The intent of this act was later reaffirmed by amendment. The Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, and the act of June 15, 1935, relating to administration of wildlife refuges, also authorize oil and gas leasing on wildlife areas.

Under previous regulations pertaining to these acts, leases were in effect on approximately 4 percent of all wildlife areas administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Eleven separate areas were involved. The first lease for these areas was issued in 1947. From then until I became Secretary of the Interior in 1953, leases were issued on eight federally-managed wildlife areas: Creedman Coulee, Mont.; Desert Game, Nev.; White River, Ark.; Strawberry Valley, Utah; Bitter Lake, N. Mex.; Delta and Breton, La.; and Fort Peck, Mont.

Far from being the first Secretary of the Interior to open refuge lands to oil and gas leasing, I was actually the first one in the history of the Fish and Wildlife Service to close certain refuges to exploration in deference to irreplaceable wildlife values.

Soon after I took office it became obvious that Department of the Interior regulations relating to oil and gas leases, adopted in 1947, were not adequate in providing safeguards for wildlife values. Under those mildly protective rules an oil or gas lease had to be approved and issued automatically if certain minimum conditions were met by the operator-applicant. Several leases had been issued under such conditions, seemingly without anybody noticing that the Department's responsibilities for migratory birds and other wildlife were being overlooked.

I authorized a stop order on August 31, 1953, suspending leasing by the Bureau of Land Management under the 1947 regulations. The order was to stay in effect until new regulations could be drawn which would guarantee necessary protection to wildlife values on refuges, and at the same time reflect awareness of the publicly owned oil and gas reserves underground, and laws concerning those reserves. As Secretary of the Interior I cannot forsake one resource while catering to another. It would be remiss to ignore publicly owned oil reserves while safeguarding wildlife, as surely as it would be to disregard wildlife while protecting the public's rights in oil reserves under public lands.

Some unscrupulous conservation commentators charged that applications for oil and gas leases flooded the Fish and Wildlife Service as soon as the stop order was lifted and the new regulations were announced. The fact is that now, 3 months later, we can report that only the usual number of applications have been made, approximately the same number as under the old regulations. In fact, only one refuge—Lacassine Refuge in Louisiana—has been approved for oil exploration since the new regulation became effective. The new rules obviously have not encouraged oil and gas drilling operations on the refuges, as predicted.

Incidentally, applications for leases are not made to the Fish and Wildlife Service; the Bureau of Land Management is the leasing agency. One question would have set these reporters straight so their readers could have had accurate information.

The new lease regulations place absolute veto power, as well as the right to approve where wildlife values will not be harmed, with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Career wildlife management experts—some of them the same ones who have been responsible for developing the Service's refuge program over the past 22 years—will have sole authority to analyze probable effects of exploration and drilling. If they object to the proposals, no lease will be issued. This places authority where it ought to be, with the agency having primary responsibility and interest in refuge values.

This was not the case under the previous regulations. In the past it has happened more than once that in spite of Fish and Wildlife Service objections leases have been issued. The new regulations do not permit this.

Yet, it has been argued that placing responsibility for approving or rejecting lease applications with the Fish and Wildlife Service will force refuge personnel to neglect their fundamental duties and become oil and gas experts. I can't imagine a refuge manager not being delighted at the chance to have the say about what will be done on the area in his charge. I believe the refuge experts are the people who should decide what effect certain proposed activities will have on their areas. I intend to see to it that they do the deciding. Conservationists, in general, I am confident will say amen to this. If those people who are denouncing these protective segments of the code were responsible for carrying out the many mandates of the Fish and Wildlife Service I am sure they would welcome the reassurance the new regulations provide.

A look at some of the facts may tend to dispel unwarranted conclusions, and fears, and point out why so many refuge areas are not, and cannot be, entirely inviolate.

First, category A under the revised code, contains the so-called inviolate refuges, the areas on which no lease will ever be considered except in case of national emergency or when drilling may be required to protect publicly owned oil from being drained by other operations. These areas are the ones deter-

mined indispensable for rare or endangered species, remnant big game herds, and irreplaceable examples of unique plant or animal ecology. However, it should be noted that the Secretary of the Interior lacks authority to make even these refuges entirely inviolate. He can not prevent oil and gas developments where mineral rights within these refuges are privately owned.

At present category A contains about 3,200,000 acres. Of these more than 50,000 acres are subject to oil and gas rights retained by former owners. The Fish and Wildlife Service could not in the past, and cannot now, prohibit oil drilling on these 50,000 acres.

Category B, consisting of approximately 6 million acres, includes refuges designated as wilderness, recreational, and water development or marsh. These are refuges on which, the Fish and Wildlife Service has declared, oil or gas development might seriously impair or destroy usefulness of the lands for wildlife conservation purposes. Only after a complete, detailed operating program guaranteeing full protection of the particular refuge values has been approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service, will leases be issued for any of these B areas.

Of the 6-million acres of these group B refuges, more than 800,000 acres are outside the Fish and Wildlife Service's jurisdiction so far as oil and gas rights are concerned.

Of nearly 8 million acres of other National Wildlife Refuge lands, more than 2 million in the United States are available for oil and gas development, because under terms of their establishment as wildlife areas there is a provision that "nothing is to interfere with prospecting or development."

But there is reassurance in the fact that while heretofore this provision was interpreted as meaning that prospecting and developing could be permitted even over Fish and Wildlife Service objections, now operations on these areas require Fish and Wildlife Service approval. Wildlife values will be afforded protection they never had before.

Under the old regulations big-game ranges were open to leasing without consideration for wildlife values. This was true because most of these areas were administered jointly by the Bureau of Land Management for grazing and by the Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife use. As a result, in the past many leases for oil exploration were granted on game ranges without the consent or even knowledge of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This situation has been changed. Game ranges are to be accorded the same protection regarding wildlife values as all other areas in the Federal refuge program.

The frantic fear some conservationists have expressed over secondary uses on refuge lands is not justified. Multiple-use of many refuges has been pointed to with pride by both Department and Service people for years. Surplus animals have been transferred to restock underpopulated States areas. Timber—millions of board feet annually—and hay have long been harvested and sold. When certain fur animals, notably muskrats, become too numerous they are trapped and sold for their pelts. Grazing and share-crop farming have long been accepted as good refuge management practices. Numerous producing oil wells have been in operation on refuges for many years. Mr. Salyer has stated emphatically that those producing wells which are on Federal leases have not harmed wildlife values.

Over the years a good deal has been made of the fact that the law requires that 25 percent of revenues resulting from these secondary uses must go to the counties in which the refuges are located, for the local school and road funds. The point has been made that this compensation offsets loss to local tax rolls when lands are withdrawn for refuge purposes. Total revenue from these secondary uses last year was almost $2¼ million. It is clear that modern wildlife management as practiced by our refuge technicians is also good business.

Secondary uses are not limited to profit-making business. Last year 5¼ million people visited the refuges. Nature study, bird watching, biology classes, field trials for retrievers and pointing dogs and beagles, fishing, picnicking, and, on a few areas, hunting are some of the recreations that attracted these millions. We know the number of visitors will increase. Human values will have to be considered in future refuge program plans.

To make sure the people in the Fish and Wildlife Service who will be evaluating lease applications and drilling operation plans will understand fully the intent of the revised regulations definite guidelines have been prepared. These instructions tell which areas are to be inviolate refuges. They point out that where drilling may be consistent with an area's primary purpose it may be possible to gain improvements by establishing certain conditions in the lease agreement. For example, access road dikes may be used to create needed pools. Or eventually they may be cut to form nesting islands. Pest vegetation may be reduced and food plants established in sections where operations tend to spread the pest species.

To assure the refuge technicians that the new regulations have teeth in them, the instructions emphasize that refuge managers are authorized to suspend oil or gas operations where conditions of a lease are not being complied with. Indemnity bonds to guarantee conformance to approved plans are required automatically. Final approval for a lease can be given only by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He is sole judge, in case of dispute, as to compliance with operating plans.

There is no loophole. Every restriction and requirement suggested by the Fish and Wildlife Service has been incorporated in the regulations. The refuges have protection now they never had before.

Since becoming Secretary of the Interior I have frequently stated my belief that we need to expand our Federal refuge program. Nine new refuges comprising 28,095 acres have been established since January 1, 1953. The Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, of which I am Chairman, approved purchase of 30,189 acres of waterfowl habitat in 1955, and an additional 4,219 acres for the first half of 1956. Cost of these 34,408 acres of refuge land was $842,014. As of June 30, 1955, the number of refuges in our national program had increased to 276, having a total of 17,908,682 acres.

Our wildlife refuge program is healthier and bigger now than it has ever been. In addition, under the new lease regulations the refuges now have safeguards to insure their primary objectives.

Sports Afield Answers Secretary McKay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place into the RECORD an article from the current issue of Sports Afield, Michael Hudoba's report from Washington. Preceding the Washington report, is a news flash describing the unanimous committee report of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, criticizing the Department of the Interior oil and gas leasing order. I have known Michael Hudoba ever since coming to Washington and it is my observation that he does not cry "Wolf" unless there is justification for it. I also know that conservationists all over the country respect Mr. Hudoba's judgment and look to him for information on what is happening in the conservation field in Washington. The article follows:

MICHAEL HUDOBA'S REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

Flash: The following telegram was received from Mike Hudoba just before printing deadline for this issue:

"House committee scathes the Department of the Interior's wildlife refuge leasing policy. Following hearings of the wildlife refuge protection bill, H. R. 5306, introduced by Representative LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, and the new oil and gas leasing order of Secretary of the Interior McKay, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee released a highly critical report of the oil and gas leasing order. This report was signed unanimously by the committee which includes both Republicans and Democrats.

"The report charged that the Department's oil and gas leasing order did not adequately protect the refuges: 'The new regulations fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities in recent years prove to be necessary * * *. Superficially these regulations appear to give a veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service.' But the report continues: 'The veto power exists only so long as, and to the extent that, the Secretary permits the regulations to control.' The report also charged extreme administrative confusion on the leases issued, and took sharp exception to the large number of leases issued during the Secretary's stop-order suspension.

"Representative HERBERT BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the committee, revealed an agreement with the committee accepted by Secretary McKay that no further permit, entry, or disposal of a wildlife refuge area or lands under the Fish and Wildlife Service would be made without first giving the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee 60 days' notice and obtain approval of the committee for such action. The agreement accepted by Secretary McKay would put in effect the objectives of Representative METCALF'S refuge protection bill which was introduced following Sports Afield's disclosures on the threats to the refuge system by the Secretary's authority.

"It is a clear-cut victory for sportsmen."

On page 156 of this issue, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay writes his answer to this reporter's criticism of his oil and gas leasing plans for national wildlife refuges.

Secretary McKay's article, for which he requested space, and which he titled "The Truth About Our Wildlife Refuges," is carried in full.

During all the years we have covered conservation in Congress and Government, we have followed the policy of sticking to pros and cons of conservation issues for the readers. We have stepped on a lot of toes and have had more than our share of personal abuse and insinuations.

Aside from the insinuations against your reporter, Secretary McKay's article contains his justification for the oil and gas leasing order which he signed. It is the same story which your reporter has heard presented on a number of occasions, including both the hearings of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This has been repeated so often that the Secretary and his spokesmen have overlooked the error of their basic premise.

Secretary McKay states that his oil and gas leasing order gives more protection to the wildlife refuges than earlier regulations which he revised, a point for which we had already given him credit in previous stories.

However, criticism of the Secretary's new policy for issuing oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuges is based on the question of basic policy as to whether the Secretary must open all or most of the national wildlife refuges to leases and oil and gas operations.

Unless the fundamental question is studied objectively by those concerned with the future of the wildlife refuge system, its individual units will be subject to continuing depreciation from their basic purpose.

What is the truth in this issue and who has distorted what?

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 authorizes the Secretary to issue leases on public land; but does not direct him to do so. The United States Supreme Court upheld a general order by former Secretary Wilbur (*U. S.* v. *Wilbur* (283 U. S. 414 (1930))) refusing to receive applications for oil leases, stating that the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act "plainly indicate that Congress held in mind the distinction between a positive mandate to the Secretary and permission to take certain action in his discretion."

A few years later, former Secretary Ickes refused oil leases in the Federal domain. Once again, the Court upheld the Secretary in *U. S.* v. *Ickes* (143 F. (2d) 152 (App. D. C. 1944)).

Secretary McKay says he is the first Secretary in the history of the Fish and Wildlife Service to close certain refuges to oil and gas exploration to protect irreplaceable wildlife values. He also makes much of his "stop order of August 31, 1953" to suspend leasing of wildlife refuge lands while new regulations were being studied and prepared to improve the mildly protective regulations of 1947.

Since this is a basic point in the question, what is the real story?

From the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to August 31, 1953, the date of McKay's stop order, testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee shows that a total of 16 leases were issued on wildlife refuge lands during the 33 years.

Under Secretary McKay's stop order, a total of 60 leases were issued between August 1953 and December 1955, on wildlife refuge lands during 2 years.

Efforts by Representative HERBERT BONNER, (Democrat of North Carolina), chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and members of his committee to get the real story on these leases brought out numerous inconsistencies in the testimony of the Department of the Interior and required submission by the department of revised data on numbers of leases.

In addition to the 82 leases (which include 6 issued when the new regulations were signed) there was also revealed a total of 495 leases on game refuge lands.

By laborious cross-examination Chairman BONNER'S committee brought out testimony from the Fish and Wildlife Service to the effect that if there were a choice between a wildlife refuge without oil and gas operations and one subject to leases under the new regulations, the former would be preferred.

Secretary McKay says the new lease regulations place absolute veto power with the Fish and Wildlife Service—and I admit error in having written that Fish and Wildlife Service receive applications for leases.

Testimony at the hearings brought out that where an applicant for an oil and gas lease contended that his operation would not seriously impair wildlife values on the refuge contrary to Fish and Wildlife Service claims, the matter would then go to the Secretary for arbitration. Is that absolute veto power?

It is suggested that a careful study of the hearings held by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the oil and gas leasing issue, and from which Secretary McKay quotes portions of testimony to support his statements, will be more than revealing as to the reasons for concern by those supporting the refuge system.

Regardless of Secretary McKay's claims to the contrary, a leasehold gives certain privileges to the holder, and when this is on a wildlife refuge system area, there is something less than the original whole of the area needed for wildlife conservation left.

Secretary McKay ridicules the fact that we supported legislation to protect the wildlife refuge system areas from the Secretary of Interior, and points to the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge decision he made, and for which we have given him repeated credit. However, it would appear that any Secretary who was concerned with protecting the wildlife refuge system, as Secretary McKay seeks to prove, would welcome enabling legislation to help strengthen his hand for such protection.

Yes, Secretary McKay, we have cried wolf many times, and it is fortunate indeed that the sportsmen-conservationists of this country have their ears tuned so well. It is also true that there are many cases where the cry of wolf has appeared to be unnecessary for the threat did not materialize. But, for those who know the ways of animals, it is no secret that the realization they have been sighted sends them hightailing back into the hills or woods. We will probably cry wolf many more times, and may have to take them on alone if no help comes in time.

Primaries Versus Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is getting late in the year for the primary season and we are rushing toward a national election.

I think, nevertheless, that an analysis of the primary in my own State of Illinois and of primaries in other States, as contrasted to the supposed trends exhibited by the self-proclaimed polls of what is called public opinion, may still be interesting.

The election contest this year will be an election—a conscious choice by the people of the party and personalities they wish in power—and not a pushover or runaway for anybody. The election will be fought hard and, from my side of the country, at least, with honest conviction and integrity. We intend to win if the people think we deserve to win.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer excerpts from an analysis of the April Illinois primary and other primaries by Joseph C. Harsch, a very able correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor:

In the 1952 Illinois primary the Republicans obtained 68 percent of the total vote cast, compared with 32 percent for the Democrats.

In the 1952 presidential election in Illinois Dwight D. Eisenhower obtained 54.9 percent of the vote and Adlai E. Stevenson obtained 45.1 percent.

In the latest primary election in Illinois the Republicans obtained a little more than 50 percent of the total vote cast and the Democrats a little less (final totals are not in at this writing). And in Cook County Mr. Stevenson ran well ahead of Mr. Eisenhower.

One primary doesn't prove anything, as political history in the United States has demonstrated so often.

But two things about this latest primary are of extreme interest to politicians.

One is that ESTES KEFAUVER did not secure the 10 percent of writeins which his supporters had hoped for. This may have been small comfort to Stevensonians, but it was of comfort and it put him back in what one Democratic politician described as a "convalescent condition" after his misfortune in Minnesota.

Second, the Stevenson vote ran behind the Eisenhower vote, but by nothing like the proportions which public-opinion polls have been leading most people to expect whenever Mr. Eisenhower is pitted against any potential Democratic candidate.

There are probably many explanations of this second phenomenon, but there are some things about the political pattern in the United States which continue to be puzzling, and this is another one for the list.

For example, since 1952 the Democrats have:

1. Taken nine governorships and lost none.
2. Won some 500 State legislature seats and lost 5.
3. Won both Houses of Congress in a period of booming prosperity, whereas Herbert Hoover held both at his midterm election in spite of the fact that the country was in the depths of the depression.
4. Won 8 out of 9 special congressional elections.
5. Won many cities, including the surprising 1955 upset in the control of Indiana's main cities, an event which never has been explained adequately. The most surprising thing about these election results is that the Democratic Party which won them possesses no single acknowledged leader, is riven by deep internal rivalries and divisions, has no national set of policies, and has had most of its stock of old issues preempted by the Republicans.

Yet when it has gone to the polls locally it has done better than would be expected in a country which is booming with prosperity, is at peace, and is led by a President as undoubtedly popular as is Mr. Eisenhower.

There is no millstone on the Republican Party's neck today such as it had to carry into Herbert Hoover's midterm election of 1930 after the depression broke. And Mr. Hoover was not a popular President as Mr. Eisenhower is.

Yet it is a puzzling fact that the Hoover Republicans of 1930 did better than the Eisenhower Republicans of 1954. And now Adlai Stevenson, by no means a popular figure comparable to Mr. Eisenhower, comes fairly close to the Eisenhower vote in the Illinois primaries.

There are some facts about the Milwaukee vote in the Wisconsin primary which perhaps need a second look in the light of the Cook County vote in Illinois.

There was a general assumption after the Wisconsin vote that the Democrats had lost ground in the city vote in Milwaukee and the Republicans had gained.

But a reexamination of the Milwaukee vote shows that the Republicans took 67.3 percent of the primary vote in 1952 compared with 56.8 percent this time.

And if one looks at two wards which could be particularly meaningful as to labor and

Negro votes, the following comparison emerges:

The Milwaukee 12th ward is industrial. Republicans took 44.8 percent of the primary vote there in the 1952 primary. They took 40.6 percent this time.

The Milwaukee sixth ward is heavily Negro. The Republicans took 49.3 percent in the 1952 primary, and 42.9 percent this time.

None of this proves for a moment that the Democratic Party is enjoying a rising political tide in spite of Eisenhower popularity, peace, and prosperity. Each item in it does raise questions which have yet to be answered satisfactorily.

There is something puzzling about the voting pattern. It doesn't fit entirely with the polls of Eisenhower versus Stevenson or Kefauver popularity.

The voting fails to show the overwhelming Eisenhower strength which the opinion polls show.

Private Industry Can Solve Our Social and Industrial Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, public housing commission:

[From Home Builders Monthly of March 1956]

PRIVATE INDUSTRY CAN SOLVE OUR SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

(By Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, public housing commission)

America stands today on the threshold of a momentous decision. The question before the people is whether or not to continue to solve our economic and social problems within the framework of the free-enterprise system in the form of enlightened capitalism or to drift into state socialism.

Any honest thinking person will concede that the accomplishments in the rise of the standard of living in America, to heights never before experienced by any other nation, can be directly attributed to the productive results of an economy operating within an enlightened capitalistic system.

With this fact established we now find socialistic schemes being offered at every turn to solve both real and imaginary problems.

Foremost of these schemes is the physical manifestation of state socialism in the housing field in the form of public housing. Even though over 56 percent of our people are homeowners, continual pressure is being exerted to build more and more public housing. So great is the desire of the public houses to socialize housing that they are now proposing that from a third to one-half of all new housing be Government built and owned. This is taking place even though it is now admitted that public housing is not primarily built to house the indigent and needy or to clear slums.

The advocates of state socialism follow a clearly defined pattern which calls for subsidized public housing in the housing field, public power in the form of the tax-exempt and subsidized TVA approach in the power field, and at the retail business level the tax exempt, big-business farm cooperatives take over by supplying food, clothing, fuel, and other retail goods to any and all customers.

By a strange coincidence the promotion of all three of these forms of state socialism assume the same pattern. In each case a scapegoat is selected and then the propaganda machines go to work.

In the power field the regulated private power companies are represented as greedy bloodsuckers who will not go into the hinterlands to supply the rural communities with power. Never once is it explained that the utilities pay enormous local and national taxes and are regulated by utilities commissions. Besides this, uneconomic powerline projects cannot be financed just because it is desired to supply power to every sparsely settled rural area. The safety of the interests of the stockholders both small and large must always be considered by the power companies management.

TVA is held up as the answer to so-called greedy private power even though the taxpayer subsidizes outright in grants the cost of a large part of the power produced along with the public power rate reflecting lower costs due to tax exemptions at all levels.

To work socialism into the realm of small business, the local businessman in the small towns in rural communities is represented as one who gouges the farmer, so tax exempt big business cooperatives are chartered to move into this field. The general public is sold on the idea that the farmer is a member of the cooperative and therefore it is a fine thing. To carry out this fiction a form of stock known as script is given to the farmer and anyone else with each of his purchases. Then at the end of the year the script is redeemed in merchandise and the result is that the script is no more than the discount given a good customer by a private business for steady purchases and prompt payment or the green stamps issued by some privately owned stores to build up a regular trade.

In the housing field the home builder is the scapegoat for slums, blighted areas and the lack of new housing for the indigent, the needy and the lowest income groups. The great mystery of all the propaganda put out by the public housers, is why so many Members of Congress, other high officials and the American people have swallowed this flimsy case against the home builders.

From every conceivable angle it is impossible to understand how the home builder is at fault for any of the evils found in old city housing. It is the business of the home builders to construct new homes and to build rental housing with the tools of finance, materials, techniques, regulations and other requirements which are available or imposed on the builder.

The home builder does not own slum property as his function is to build and sell new housing and not to invest in old rental property. Neither does the home builder construct alley dwellings and tenements as most of the uncleared land which has come available in the lifetime of the home builder has been in the outlying areas of our cities.

Slums in blighted areas are the result of poor housekeeping and the state of repair in which housing is maintained by the owners.

The cause and cure for slums is the problem of city governments which should enforce sanitary housing codes that make it mandatory for both the tenant and owner to rectify the conditions if they constitute a public nuisance.

To offer public housing as a solution to slum clearance and redevelopment with its enormous costs and its impossibility of ever effecting the cure is comparable to returning, economically speaking, to the Dark Ages.

There is ample evidence now of record to prove that public housing does not house the needy or clear slums so there is no need to go into detail to prove that it is not the answer for redeveloping our cities. However, to clearly bring into focus the great wrong being perpetrated on the private builder when it is claimed he is failing to do the job of housing America the following comparisons showing the tools available to both public and private housers are herewith set forth.

Given financing, amortization time, and land costs comparable to that enjoyed by public housing, the private builder could build and rent for approximately the same rents as the full economic rents of public housing and still pay taxes, interest, and amortization charges.

When the advantages of public housing over private housing are shown and it is realized that slums have only been partially cleared by this method and not more than 25 percent of the public rents are written down for the needy to be housed in projects, it causes one to wonder how this socialistic scheme gets any consideration at all in the Halls of Congress.

Before it is too late the taxpayers represented by the 56 percent of the population owning their own homes, should demand that Congress either make comparable tools for housing available to private builders under proper regulations for the complete housing job and liquidate public housing or recognize that slums are the problems of each city and the cities should solve them at the local level.

Strict enforcement of comprehensive sanitary regulations will both solve the supply of low rent housing in rehabilitated safe and sanitary used housing and will also give our cities time to develop properly in the pattern needed for the automotive and atomic age.

Rent relief is the answer to housing the needy in good used housing the same as is now in operation.

Scarcely anyone at this time can tell what our cities will look like 10 years from now the same as we did not foresee the demand 10 years ago for downtown parking facilities in the quantity now needed.

It is an economic impossibility to tear down and rebuild our cities over night the same as it is a financial and economic impossibility to house all the needy and low income groups in new housing. The constant large percentage of the home owning population living in used housing cannot bear the burden of paying the rent for an increasing number of citizens living in subsidized public housing.

Before any more socialistic schemes are considered seriously in the housing, power and retail business spheres the people and Congress should fully appraise themselves of the situation.

The medium of this appraisal should be a thorough bipartisan factual study by a high level congressional investigating committee.

Private enterprise can solve all our economic and social problems at less cost and still maintain our traditional individual freedom.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Interest rate paid

Going Government rate of interest approximately 1½ to 2 percent.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Interest rate paid

Going private rate of interest approximately 4½ to 5 percent.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Financing

Money raised by tax exempt Government bonds.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Financing

Conventional private finance (often obtained by payment of a premium).

PUBLIC HOUSING

Building regulations

Limited compliance to local building codes.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Building regulations

Subject to all local code restrictions.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Taxes

No local, State, or Federal business taxes other than payments made in lieu of real-estate taxes—approximately 50 percent of assessed taxes.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Taxes

Full taxes paid. All real estate and other local, State, and Federal business taxes.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Amortization period

Forty to sixty years.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Amortization period

Twenty to thirty years.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Subsidy

Allowed and annual subsidy of 2 percent more than the going Government rate of interest. (Payment from Federal Government is equal to the interest and amortization charges on the cost of all housing projects.)

PRIVATE HOUSING

Subsidy

None.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Construction costs

Excessive.

Currently admitted in Washington, D. C., to be approximately $3,000 per rental room.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Construction costs

Twenty-five to thirty-three percent less.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Management costs

Approximately 12 to 13 percent.

PRIVATE HOUSING

Management costs

Not over 5 percent.

NOTE.—(Over 1 million public-housing units have been authorized by law to date and the subsidies paid will run into billions during the amortization period of the projects.)

Israel Seen Imperiled by Water Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, although reports of cease-fire agreements in the Middle East have recently reached our ears, the tension in that area is still acute. It is our duty, therefore, to keep as well informed as possible on developments there. To add to our knowledge of the situation, articles such as the one written by Paul W. Ward, and published in the May 13 edition of the Baltimore Sun, are of invaluable aid; and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL SEEN IMPERILED BY WATER DELAY—ENGINEERS INDICATE ADVICE OF UNITED STATES AND U. N. ENDANGERS NATION

(By Paul W. Ward)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—The United States Government had under study today a report indicating that, by yielding to Arab threats, it and the United Nations Security Council are condemning Israel to a kind of slow death.

Presenting the combined judgments of six of this country's leading water engineers, the report points up such facts as these:

1. Israel's chances of becoming a viable State, able to feed its citizens and otherwise pay its own way in the world, depend on a rapid expansion of her fresh-water supplies.

2. Israel is being compelled by the present political situation in the Middle East to exploit the little water now available to her at a rate that entails a serious risk of her life blood being turned to salt and her tillable acres being ruined, in consequence.

3. Israel, accordingly, is under strong compulsion to go ahead with its Jordan River development project in defiance of the Arabs' threats to shoot if she does and of the efforts of both John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, and Dag Hammarskjöld, United Nations Secretary General, to get her to yield to those threats.

WOULD GIVE THREATS PRIORITY

Hammarskjöld, reporting Thursday to the Security Council on his recent war-prevention mission to the Middle East, took the position that, at least until the Council itself rules otherwise, the Arabs' threats should be accorded priority over Israel's need of water.

Dulles some 3 weeks earlier had taken a like position at a press conference here and, it is understood, privately has been pressing that view upon Israel's Government.

The latter, meanwhile, has applied to the United States Government's Export-Import Bank for a $75 million loan to finance part of a 10-year water-development program. It is chiefly in connection with that loan application that the American engineers' report has come under governmental study.

ACTUALLY TWO REPORTS

In actuality, it is not 1 but 2 reports. There is, first, a 10-year master plan drawn up for Israel by J. S. Cotton, a San Francisco consulting water engineer, who had done similar work for Manchuria, Ceylon, and India.

Second, and corollary to it; it is a report by a five-man board of consultants, headed by Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering at the Johns Hopkins University, who, since unveiling the report here Monday, has been given an award by the American Water Works Association for having drafted a report, in another connection, on what constitutes reasonable water service.

Wolman, a former president of the association, has been chairman of the United States National Water Resources Committee and is a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission.

RECOMMENDS POWER DELAY

His board's report, incidentally, recommends that Israel defer its $46 million Mediterranean-Jordan Valley hydroelectric project and lists among its reasons a belief that "recent advances in the development of nuclear power are such that the construction of high-cost hydroelectric projects * * * may no longer be justified."

The other members of the Wolman board are:

Harry W. Bashore, of Mitchell, Nebr., who has helped India and Pakistan with their water problems and used to head the United States Bureau of Reclamation;

Samuel B. Morris, former dean of Stanford University's engineering school who, until he retired 6 months ago, was general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power;

John L. Savage, of Denver, who has been a consultant on water projects in Asia, Africa, the Near East, Latin America, and Australia, besides serving as a Bureau of Reclamation expert from 1924 to 1945;

John J. Hammond, of Denver, who used to be chief of the Dams Branch in that Bureau's Design Division.

EVALUATION ASKED

The Wolman board was asked by the Israeli Government to evaluate Cotton's recommendations and make recommendations of its own about carrying them out. Its report, completed March 8, was addressed in the first instance, to S. Blass, Director-General, Water Planning for Israel, Ltd., Tel Aviv.

Blass is the Israeli who thwarted the Arabs and confounded the United Nations Security Council a few years ago when the Arabs sought and got from the Council the equivalent of an injunction against Israel's Huleh Swamps drainage project. The injunction, issued one day, called for stoppage of work on the project at 8 a. m. the next.

Blass complied with the deadline but rendered the injunction moot by having the job completed by 8 a. m. He accomplished that feat by lighting the area and working all his men and equipment through the night at top speed.

SIMILAR TO JORDAN PROJECT

That project, referred to in the Wolman board's report, has similarities to the Jordan River project.

Both have been long on the drawing boards—the Huleh project for 50 years prior to the time that the Wolman board, in its initial report 10 years ago, recommended not only that Israel undertake it but accord it top priority as offering the cheapest acreage for crops in the whole country.

Both the Huleh and Jordan projects have run into Arab resistance which, backed by threats of war, has enlisted Security Council assistance, although in neither case does the land involved belong to any Arab government.

Statement Made to the President by the Nongovernmental Advisers to the United States Delegation Negotiating Tariff Agreements in Geneva, Switzerland, May 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a report released by the White House on May 4, which was made to the President by the nongovernmental advisers to the United States delegation in Geneva.

STATEMENT MADE TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE NONGOVERNMENTAL ADVISERS TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION NEGOTIATING TARIFF AGREEMENTS IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, MAY 4, 1956

Having had an opportunity to observe at first hand the tariff negotiations now drawing to a conclusion at Geneva, we are happy to report to you that the interests of our country have been well served. We have been greatly impressed by the competence of the career men from the nine departments and agencies of the Government who have handled these important negotiations. The members of the Trade Agreements Committee particularly have worked long hours for

many months with a high degree of concentration and effort.

We were particularly impressed with the unfailing concern of our negotiators to advance the broad interests of the United States. By no stretch of the imagination could the tariff negotiations, as we observed them, be called a giveaway program. The entire program is, of course, based upon reciprocal concessions and we found our negotiating teams and the Trade Agreements Committee to be bargaining in what seemed to us to be the best Yankee tradition. They insisted on obtaining concessions of full value for each concession made by the United States. There is great need for a better public knowledge of these facts.

The hard work and intelligence that went into the tariff negotiations are the more noteworthy because the present tariff session, following upon earlier negotiations, was restricted to a comparatively narrow range of trading. It required patience and persistence on the part of our representatives to obtain the many important agreements that are being reached.

On the basis of our observations in Geneva, we are strongly of the opinion that there is need for the permanent administrative machinery that is provided for in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. The adoption of this administrative machinery subscribed to by all the interested nations would clearly be in our enlightened self-interest. It would help make all our trade agreements more truly reciprocal.

It would also strengthen both the resolve and ability of the member nations to continue their efforts toward an expanding and mutually profitable world trade. It would provide an effective, continuously operating instrument in giving fuller effect to existing commitments to remove such trade barriers as currency restrictions, quotas, discriminatory taxes, and other indirect devices that limit the exchange of our goods with other nations. Failure on the part of the United States, the world's greatest trading nation, to join in setting up this organization would cause great dismay and disappointment throughout the free world at a time when the Soviet Union is stepping up its foreign economic efforts.

Accordingly, we wish to support very strongly your recommendation for adherence by the United States to the OTC.

We appreciate deeply the opportunity that has been given us to participate as observers in these tariff negotiations. It has been for all of us an interesting and rewarding experience.

ELLIOTT V. BELL,
Editor and Publisher of Business Week; Chairman, Executive Committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York.

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
Executive Vice President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Los Angeles.

BRYANT ESSICK,
President, Essick Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles.

STANLEY N. RUTTENBERG,
Director of Research, AFL-CIO, Washington.

Is It Just Ineptness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial on the natural-gas bill and the natural-gas lobby from the Sacramento (Calif.), Bee:

The United States Senate committee which probed lobbying activities in connection with the natural-gas bill makes one intriguing observation in its report.

Referring to John M. Neff, the Nebraska lawyer who offered the $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, the report says he operated in an inept fashion.

One wonders what the committee's appraisal would have been had Neff conducted his maneuvering with a slick, professional technique.

Or does the sin lie in being clumsy?

Wichita Wildlife Refuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 25, Mr. Kenneth Foree, the outdoor editor of the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., made reference to the attempt that is being made by the Army to take over a portion of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge near Fort Sill, Okla. Mr. Foree's comments, in my judgment, demand the attention of all persons who are interested in preserving one of the most attractive spots in the Southwest for recreation, and one of the finest wildlife refuges in the country. Mr. Foree's remarks are as follows:

Tuesday morning this columnist took a cut at the Army brass for resuming the attack for enveloping Wichita Wildlife Refuge near Fort Sill, Okla., via H. R. 9665 in Congress. The refuge is a spot of the Old West like it was when the white man came, with the same animals that he found then, save the redskin and grizzly, in a charming place of rolling hills visited by many people annually.

But the Army wants it, contends it is needed for firing atomic cannon, has frightened Lawton by threatening to move Fort Sill, etc.

To the Inter-American Bar Association conference this week came an Oklahoma attorney, Paul W. Updegraff, 114½ South Peters Avenue, Norman, Okla., who writes:

"The thing that the Army is not telling the people the truth about, in their attempt to take over the wildlife refuge, is that the area is not needed at all to shoot the atomic cannon.

"What the brass of the Army wants the refuge for is to make a personal game refuge for the higher echelon of the Army. Even Herman Goering in the Black Forest never had such an exclusive hunting preserve as this will provide for the Army generals.

"After all, the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and the 800,000 outdoors lovers who are now privileged to visit this beautiful, tranquil place should not thwart the will of the generals.

"If this emasculation takes place, then it will be because you, the people, are just plain too lazy to write or wire your Congressman about it. Incidentally, over 600,000 persons visiting the refuge each year came from the great Lone Star State."

How 'bout it, Texas? Got enough strength to lift a pen?

Faith and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a statement made by Alfred P. Adamo, celebrating 50 years in America.

This statement is excellent, and it expresses the appreciation of one who came from another land to our country. We can read between the lines the comparison he has made and the enjoyment of privileges, opportunities, and freedom which we of the United States have, and which people from other lands do not have.

Let every American read this fine tribute to our country and be grateful that he is an American citizen.

The statement of Mr. Adamo follows:

DEDICATION TO FAITH AND FREEDOM, MAY 4, 1956

We are gathered here tonight to dedicate this XVIII century silver plate and its inscription thereon to faith and freedom for which our forefathers fought and founded for you and me and the future generations of America.

America has been given to man by God with all its creation of beauty and abundance of wealth.

Faith and freedom are like a mighty rock of strength if you and I will stand together, protect its strength, and continue to build a better America.

Faith and freedom give man power to work to build without limitation, and to become proud to be an American citizen and be of service to his fellow man and country.

Faith and freedom are the guardians of civilization and of its character. If a man knows what he stands for he will not feel that he can invade other peoples' homes nor disturb his neighbors' peace.

Faith and freedom means that we must respect the rights of our fellow man regardless of his race, color, or creed and must all work and live together as one team. We must refrain from trying to be the owner of other people's rights and homes. America is not for the timid or fearful man, but for the energetic, vigorous, farseeing and far seeking man. This is the advantage of living in America, for which we are deeply grateful.

Faith and freedom are like the rain that falls during the month of April. It feeds the roses, the fruit trees. It brings the various beautiful blossoms and later the lucious fruit which all can enjoy.

Faith and freedom are like a gentle breeze in the middle of a hot summer.

Faith and freedom are like streams forming large rivers and uniting in the great ocean. Finally becoming so powerful that it can bear up under all obstacles.

Faith and freedom are like a mother feeding her lovely child. She is so gentle and so filled with the hope that some day her child may become a man of constructive ideas and produce good fruit. Her mother's pride will be her reward.

Faith and freedom give to man hope and promise. They are like the sun that shines before him in the day time, and like the moon and stars that illuminate his way by night.

The church is the champion of faith and freedom. She is the guardian and defender of the character and dignity of man in virtue of the permanent mission entrusted to her by God.

Communism does not recognize the principles of faith and freedom. It has nothing to offer but false promises. It can be destroyed if we quit babying, feeding, and break off all relationship.

Let us pray and hope, my friends, that God will help us and will deliver us from those evils which are among us and may He protect what America stands for.

Let us hope also that our present and future leaders will follow the American tradition of trade and friendship with all. Partnership with none.

ALFRED P. ADAMO.

Scarcity Won't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to the remarks of a former Member of this House, Jerry Voorhis, of California, who is now devoting himself to his position as executive director of the Cooperative League.

Mr. Benson looks on our abundant production of food and fibers as a catastrophe—and during his 3 years in office a number of what he would call "suitcase farmers" have been driven off the land. A number of full-time farmers have been driven off the land. Our population earning a living from agriculture grows smaller; even their per capita income is now slumping under Mr. Benson's policies.

Mr. Voorhis looks on our abundant production as a blessing, not a catastrophe. He think our farmers should be praised, not ruined, for their inventiveness in increasing production. He thinks Mr. Benson's doctrine of holding down production is totally wrong—and this is entirely apart from the question of whether Mr. Benson is correct in his notion that the way to cut production is to cut prices.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer excerpts from an article by Mr. Voorhis in the Los Angeles Free Press:

The United States is waking up to the fact that the distress of agriculture and the decline of farmers' incomes constitute a deep major national problem that has got to be solved.

The superficial approach is to say, "There is at present a surplus of farm products, so let's take measures to reduce production."

Only trouble is, it won't work. No really new ways of trying to reduce production have been suggested. And all the old ones have failed. They have failed because American farmers are too good at farming. Maybe they ought to fail as long as there are one billion hungry people in the world.

A basic cause of agricultural distress is the refusal of policy and opinion-makers in the United States to think in terms of abundant production and consumption.

Instead they insist upon "thinking" in 1890 terms about the 1950 world.

It won't work.

American farmers are geared both technologically and psychologically to produce an abundance. This column predicts that nothing—repeat nothing—is going to change this.

What can and must be changed are certain habits of thinking. Some people—in fact a good many people—still retain the idea that it is good for other people's character if they are somewhat hungry now and then.

There is no doubt that privation and sacrifice develop character—when they are necessary. If there is not enough to go around, then the finest people are the ones who deny themselves in order to leave more for others.

But it is an entirely different matter to insist that other people be in want when there is or could be enough for all. We have to learn to think in terms of distribution and consumption of an abundance of food and fiber. The Wallace-Homestead poll of farmers showed recently that farmers are already doing this. In this poll, farmers were asked which of six so-called "farm" programs they would most favor.

Fifty-three percent of them put at the top of their list the following measure: "Make the school lunch program reach twice as many children as now."

Forty-one percent said the same should be done with the special school milk program. And 38 percent proposed adoption of a food stamp plan to put food surpluses within reach of needy people.

These three measures led all others by a very substantial margin. No other proposal received support from more than 29 percent of the farmers answering the poll.

The fact is that if all the 8 million United States families whose incomes are less than $2,000 a year had adequate diets, their added consumption would equal all the so-called food surpluses of the past 3 years.

And what about the one billion people in the rest of the world who are downright hungry every day? Obviously the United States cannot sprinkle its agricultural surpluses over other countries just to be rid of them. It is no simple matter even to give food away—and not always even wise. But it does not seem beyond reason to believe that with chronic hunger on the one hand and chronic surpluses on the other, some rational plan of bringing the two together through some world food plan could be devised.

But it won't be done until we start preferring abundant production and consumption—and learning to live with them—instead of apparently preferring an artificial scarcity. Especially since attempts to impose artificial scarity on United States agriculture have never succeeded, and probably never will.

Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SURVIVAL—TRIS COFFIN BROADCAST, APRIL 4, 1956

There is one corner of the Capitol where politics ceases. Frightened men do not stop to ask each other whether he is a Democrat or Republican. This is an outwardly cheerful room. The window that invites sunlight shows the proud dome of the Capitol and the American flag fluttering in a spring breeze. A long committee table covered with a green cloth, like a pool table, takes up most of the room.

On entering this Chamber, you are struck by the look on the faces around the table. Most of them are people you know—Congressmen and reporters. But here they are not the same people you wave to in the halls or argue with at lunch. There is a set graveness in their faces, like soldiers who have just buried their buddies and have, for the moment, lost the gift of laughter.

This is a congressional committee studying the effects of atomic and hydrogen bomb attacks on the civilian population.

The witness was a handsome and very gentle person, Dr. Charles Dunham, medical director of the Atomic Energy Commission. He did not at any time use the words "horror" or "terror" and yet, when he was through, you sat stunned.

The chairman, a conscientious Congressman who runs a clothing store in California, asked Dr. Dunham a series of questions just to be sure he had all the facts.

"Let's see," said Congressman HOLIFIELD thoughtfully," the Hiroshima bomb had the power of 20,000 tons of TNT. Our latest bombs are equal to millions of tons. The sheer blast and burning of the bomb will kill tens or hundreds of thousands in a raid on a city, particularly if the fire ball touches the ground."

The doctor nodded. He had lived too long with this frightful knowledge to show any outward sign of disturbance. The only omen that he, too, hated to live daily, constantly with this information was the way he smoked. Too much.

The Congressman went on, "Then, there is the radiation damage, from the rays shed by the bomb. A lethal dose is, say, 800 roentgens or up."

The doctor nodded and said gently, "Nothing we know today can be done to increase the chances for survival of those who receive a lethal dose."

He described what happens to the body when it is hit by these invisible rays. It is like a great dose of cancer. It melts the bone marrow, which makes good blood. It removes all resistance to bacteria. And, after an attack, there is really no practical way to tell who has received a fatal dose, and who may yet be treated and brought back to the realm of the living. A doctor wandering in this maze of horror would have no idea whether the pretty child or the man had enough of their bodies shielded to prevent a fatal odse. His precious store of medicines might be wasted on the one who would die tomorrow.

Too, the angry winds may carry this radiation miles and miles away. Who knows where a breeze laden with the deadly fallout will go? It falls like a gentle white snow of ashes, and it burns wherever it touches.

Congressman HOLLIFIELD went on stubbornly, to make sure all the knowledge was spread out on an official record, "And, even among the survivors of the first week, thousands may suffer years later from leukemia, eye cataracts, shortening of life, injury to body cells?"

"Correct," the doctor said gravely.

"The cells may run wild and become cancers?" the Congressman asked.

"Yes," replied the doctor, "if exposure to radiation is sufficient."

"It may cause sterility and injure the genes?"

"That is correct."

A group of visiting high-school children filed in the rear of the chamber whispering and giggling. But the strange mood of the room affected them too. They stood as still as death. They were no longer kids on a vacation, but those who would have to inhabit this edge of doom we have willed to them.

Once, only once, was there laughter in the room.

Dr. Dunham was being questioned about shelters. What would hide a man from the

deadly radiation? He spoke of tons of earth and concrete and said, "Several persons in a canvas tent survived a radioactive fallout from a bomb during one of our Pacific tests."

Eyes lit up. Here was hope. A miracle. A few yards of canvas could shield a man. Some mysterious quality of canvas beat back the invisible rays.

It was a woman, a member of the ever-practical sex who asked, "How far away was the tent from the blast?"

Dr. Dunham said gently, "It was 180 miles away."

Then it was that laughter, a nervous, sickly laughter invaded the room. The questioner, Mrs. MARTHA GRIFFITHS, a Representative from Michigan, looked at the doctor reproachfully, but said nothing.

Another witness sat at the table, and Dr. Dunham moved away, smoking one cigarette after another.

The new speaker was also a doctor from the Atomic Energy Commission. He had studied at first hand the effect of fallout that swept hundreds of miles from a test site to the Marshall Islands. We are still examining the possible injuries to the natives who belong to no bloc of nations, have no army or guns or bombs, and have always lived a life undisturbed by our civilization.

Dr. Eugene Cronkite, for that was his name, had a sense of urgency in his strong face and the way he bit his words.

His words were like the shock of a slap on the face. He said, "Fallout may be either visible or invisible. It may contaminate the environment, food, water, clothing, and the skin. The penetrating component destroys the inner organs."

His head was bent down over his paper as he told of various attempts to cure this deadly sickness. Then, Dr. Cronkite looked up and his lips tightened. He said, "In all fairness to the public, it would be unjust to imply that we now have any means of curing radiation sickness."

The room was very still. You could hear a reporter's pencil moving over his yellow copy paper.

Finally, it was done. The words were out, and the conscience of the doctors was clear.

I walked back to the Capitol. I saw people I knew and enjoy, but when they called out to me, something was wrong. I could not force my face into a smile.

Capitol Alterations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a former colleague who served in this House with distinction, Hon. Edward Lowber Stokes, of Pennsylvania, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter, appearing in the New York Times, under the heading, "Preserve the Capitol":

TO PRESERVE CAPITOL—PLANS TO MASK ORIGINAL EAST FACADE ARE OPPOSED

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The signers of the following letter are members of the American Institute of Architects.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As a great nation grows its needs expand. Today the needs of the increased business of the Congress are threatening the destruction of the existing east front of the original central wing of the Capitol at Washington. Congress has made a preliminary appropriation to build a new east facade which will extend 40 feet beyond the front of the original building.

No doubt more space is needed. While this extension of the facade may be the most obvious way for gaining space, it is unfortunate that two misleading architectural reasons have been given in support of the proposed masking of the original facade.

First, it is claimed that the great dome of 1860 is not in the middle of the building measured from front to back. Second, it is claimed that the old east sandstone facade which was painted after the fire of the War of 1812 should not be painted again and ought to be replaced by a marble colonnade.

LATROBE DESIGN

Now it so happens that the original architects, although they were working in the classic style, showed a great deal of originality. Benjamin Latrobe didn't merely imitate, he designed in the classic idiom and he used American tobacco leaves in his capitals instead of the Greek acanthus.

The Capitol has been enlarged over the years so that the central section of the east front is the only substantial part of the original design that remains visible. Unfortunately, it is this one remaining original section which a Congress of lawmakers has now voted to replace with an imitation. Are not Americans entitled to preserve what is original and genuine?

Now for the other misleading reason for change: The dome was erected during the Lincoln administration. It replaced the original dome which had been dwarfed by the extensions for the Senate and House to the north and south, respectively. The enlarged dome had to be placed over the center of the original building. Hence, since the west front had been added to by Bullfinch, the dome is nearer to the east front. The east front, however, is the entrance and the intimate approach, whereas the west front is the front that is viewed from a distance along the Mall.

The relation of the old east front to the Lincoln dome gives the building its greatest charm and the appearance which all Americans treasure. If the old original front is screened off by a 20th century face lifting, the new front will fill up the existing forecourt. Not only would this hurt the scale of the forecourt but the dome would be partly cut off from view to those approaching from the nearby, intimate plaza.

ORIGINAL ARCHITECTS

Architect Latrobe's letters can be read today. There one finds that the lawmakers of a century and a half ago also lacked understanding of the architect's problems. We can be thankful that the original architects of the Capitol, however, at least had the support of two Presidents who had given serious study to architecture—namely, Washington and Jefferson. If President Eisenhower were made aware of the architectural loss that is threatened, we are sure that he, too, would use his influence to preserve the remaining visible facade of the original Capitol.

It is up to the American public to show architectural appreciation and to defend a monument that has been well done. The people must be heard from to prevent the obliteration of Latrobe's work.

The undersigned architects hereby testify that it is worth saving.

Ralph Walker, Antonin Raymond, Talbot F. Hamlin, James Grote Van Derpool, Lawrence G. White, Robert S. Hutchins, Arthur C. Holden, Eric Gugler, Francis I. Keally, Harvey Stevenson, Julian E. Berla, Albert Simons.

New York, May 4, 1956.

How Tight Can We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the tightening of money is worthy of the attention of our colleagues. It appeared in the May 10, 1956, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

LOAN SQUEEZE: TIGHT MONEY MAY BE PUTTING THE BRAKES ON THE BUSINESS BOOM—EQUITABLE LIFE LOANED UP—BOSTON BANK TURNS AWAY NON-NEW ENGLAND LOANS—BUT DEBT TOTALS STILL RISE

Tight money may be putting the brakes on the business boom.

Some businessmen, intent on building up inventories and adding to plants, are running into trouble in lining up loans.

Many consumers find lenders are jacking up downpayment requirements and otherwise stiffening loan terms on homes, autos, appliances, and other goods.

State and local governments, with big highway and school construction plans, in some cases are shelving projects because of higher borrowing costs.

The Federal Reserve System, which has had a big hand in the tightening of money, says its actions are necessary to head off inflation. But administration officials—notably Treasury Secretary Humphrey—fear the money squeeze may lead to a full-blown business recession.

DANGERS MINIMIZED

Wall Street Journal reporters talked with lenders and economists in 12 major cities across the United States. Most of them welcome tighter money and tend to minimize its dangers. But lenders admit that the shrinking supply of loanable funds already is forcing some would-be borrowers to alter, postpone, or cancel their plans. If money continues to tighten, the number of disappointed borrowers is sure to rise. It remains to be seen whether this would merely dampen the boom or bring on a business dip.

Many lenders report the demand for funds now is pushing at the limits of supply.

"Where is the money going to come from to finance all the expansion plans on company drawing boards?" asks Ray D. Murphy, chairman of New York City's giant Equitable Life Assurance Society. "We're loaned up for the next 6 months, and I think this is true of other companies as well."

"We're offered a lot of business from outside our regular New England area," says a Boston banker. "Ordinarily, we'd take some of it, but now we don't. We need our funds to take care of our regular customers."

"I had lunch recently with a chap who has a pretty large borrowing program in mind," recalls Thomas S. Lowe, executive vice president of Pacific Finance Co., Los Angeles. "He wants to go ahead in spite of the tightening of money. He doesn't know it yet, but he'll be slowed down, because the money just won't be there when he comes around to borrow it."

SEVERAL CAUSES

Tighter money stems from several causes. The Federal Reserve System, worried over the prospect of more inflation, is restricting the funds banks have available to lend. Individuals earlier this year were adding to their savings somewhat more slowly than a year

ago. Businessmen are borrowing heavily to finance inventories and plant expansion. And consumer demand for auto and housing loans shows no signs of easing.

The impact of tight money on woud-be borrowers so far is hard to read in the overall figures. Consumer installment debt, for example, rose by $180 million in March to a total of $28 billion—nearly $5 billion above a year earlier. Business loans of major New York City banks—which account for some 20 percent of all bank loans to business—have risen by $474 million so far this year to a total of $9.7 billion. In the like period last year, the gain was only $71 million.

But these figures and other lending totals likely would have shown bigger gains if money had not tightened. A continuing scarcity of funds may cut sharply into borrowing, lenders agree.

Edgar Beard, vice president of Pittsburgh's Potter Bank & Trust Co., who sees no indication so far that borrowing has slowed, says the future may be another matter: "If money gets tighter or scarcer, there will be a tightening of credit standards or a shortening of terms and that would affect borrowing plans."

CREDIT POLICIES ALTERED

Many lenders already are altering credit policies. Some, like the Boston banker, are refusing business from customers outside their regular area. Others are trying to screen out "speculative" loans. A number of banks are turning down many loans that run for more than a year, in an effort to remain as liquid as possible.

"The tendency for banks will be to say 'no' more often, and not to make loans where they might have in the past," says Marsden S. Blois, vice president of California's big Bank of America.

"We're not expanding and would actually refuse outside loan business," reports George S. Metcalfe, president of Roosevelt Federal Savings & Loan Association, St. Louis. "We are just taking care of our regular customers."

What—in the banker's view—happens when a would-be borrower is forced to change his plans?

When a borrower can't get a bank loan, he may try to sell some stock, says Frank W. Norris, president of Jacksonville's Barnett National Bank. An official of Atlanta's Citizens & Southern National Bank says some borrowers who've found it difficult to line up long-term loans are marking time by relying on short-term borrowing.

DELAY FOR A GOLF COURSE

Herbert Adam, vice president of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia, believes the borrowers most likely to become discouraged are those who can most easily postpone projects. As an example, he cites the case of a Philadelphia area group that is planning to seek funds to build a golf course. "They'll be waiting a little longer now," he says.

"Speculative borrowing, such as loans to finance low downpayment housing, will be hardest hit by tighter money," in the opinion of an executive of a major Los Angeles bank.

So far, few lenders have noted any slowing of the rate at which loan applications are pouring into their offices. Quite the contrary, in some cases.

"You'd think that when money was tight, borrowers would hold off," says Mr. Adam. "But it doesn't always happen that way. It's like the last trolley coming along. Everybody tried to get on it."

"Customers that have established lines of credit in a number of cases have asked to increase those lines," says an official of Atlanta's Citizens & Southern National Bank. "But the bank has asked many of them to modify their requests."

An official of Cleveland's Central National Bank says he has not noticed any customers postponing or canceling borrowing. "When steel is short," he says, "everybody rushes to buy. When money is tight, everybody runs to get lines of credit established."

FEW BORROWERS DISCOURAGED

While no borrowers are happy about higher interest rates, few are discouraged by them, the lenders report.

"If a corporation needs money, it doesn't make too much difference whether the interest rate is 4 percent or 5 percent," says the president of a large Midwestern life insurance company. "Just as in 1953—the last time money was this tight—funds will continue to be borrowed and then, when rates are down, the borrowings will be refunded."

"It's not the cost but the supply of funds that's the issue," says Sherwin C. Badger, financial vice president of New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston. "If the interest rate goes up one percentage point, the cost to the corporation rises only half as much because of the 52 percent corporate tax rate." Interest payments are deductible from taxable income.

Tighter money finds few critics among economists and lenders. Some believe total debt, or parts of it, already are too high. Others think the money squeeze may prevent debt from reaching dangerous levels.

"A VERY WISE MOVE"

Dr. John R. Stockton, director of the bureau of business research of the University of Texas, says the move by the Federal Reserve System to tighten money "was well-timed and a very wise move. The country's economy is operating at near full capacity and further expansion only runs up prices. There is no need for demand to be stimulated at a time like this."

Instead of borrowing heavily to build up inventories, says Dr. Stockton, "some of these business people should get off their chairs and get out and sell what they already have in stock." Manufacturers' inventories of durable goods at last report in March rose to a new high of $27.4 billion, on a seasonally adjusted basis.

"The Federal Reserve action was necessary," says an economist for a major Detroit bank. "All expansion phases tend to go to extremes unless someone puts on the brake." He believes home mortgage debt represents "a potential danger." "Foreclosures have been so infrequent in recent years," he adds, "that I think some people have forgotten that it's done."

AUTO, HOME LOANS

"Auto loans are higher than they should be," claims an economist for a major Los Angeles bank. "And some types of mortgage credit—where the low down payment prevents the owner from building up a real equity for some time—are higher than seems proper. There's more marginal paper than previously, but it's not tremendously dangerous—barring a major depression."

Some economists argue that tight money alone is not enough. Dr. George B. Hurff, director of the University of Florida's bureau of economics and business research, is one who favors reimposition of Government controls on consumer credit.

"Last month's increase in the discount rate (the rate at which banks borrow from the Federal Reserve) was a shotgun blast," says Dr. Hurff. "What we need are a few rifle shots to peg consumer credit."

Speech of Adlai Stevenson at a Luncheon of A. F. of L.–CIO Labor Leaders, Los Angeles, Calif., May 10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPEECH OF ADLAI STEVENSON AT A LUNCHEON OF A. F. OF L.–CIO LABOR LEADERS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MAY 10, 1956

I sometimes think that in the heat and turmoil of a primary election campaign we are in danger of losing sight of long-range objectives.

As you know, I am here to ask your support in the California Democratic presidenial primary on June 5.

And I hope to get it.

But I think we must look ahead to November, and to the next 4 years.

We must ask ourselves: What would a Republican victory in November mean in terms of jobs and social gains at home? What would it mean in terms of foreign policy?

I think we can predict what it would mean during the next 4 years on the basis of what the Republicans have done during the last 4 years. And it is of this that I would speak to you today—of the Republican record, on which the President says he is going to run.

The Republicans rode into Washington on a bandwagon 4 years ago crying loudly their promise: "Time for a change." And everything they changed—they changed for the worse.

They changed our foreign behavior—and we've lost nearly every friend we had in the world, while the Russians are gaining ground daily.

They changed our tax structure—they cut taxes for the benefit of the corporations, not the ordinary man.

They changed the character of the President's Cabinet—now they are all alike. In fact, there are three graduates of General Motors but not a single representative of the 18 million members of organized labor.

They stopped developing our natural resources for the good of all the people and began giving them away to a favored few.

They ended rent controls and slowed down on public housing.

They cut price supports—and you know what's happened to the farmers.

They packed the National Labor Relations Board with management men. And despite all their promises, they did not change one word of the Taft-Hartley Act. And I think it's past time to get ride of the union-busting provisions.

Now, of course, there are some Democratic programs for the people that the Republicans didn't change. And it's a good thing they didn't for only social security, unemployment compensation, and our other democratic defenses against depression cushioned the shock of the 1954 recession.

We wouldn't have had them if the Republican managers had done what they really wanted to do. But they know they didn't dare "sweep away the last vestige of the New Deal," as one of their orators proposed in 1952. So what they've done is conduct a

holding operation—holding still. It reminds me of the excited girl who said: "Don't do something; stand there."

They have talked loud and often about a Federal health program—but they've done nothing about it.

They have talked and talked about Federal aid to education—but it took 3 years to recommend anything but a conference.

They have talked about building highways—but it's only because a Democratic Congress has grabbed the ball there's any prospect of getting anything done.

They have talked in public about extending social security—but the administration recently came out flatly against lowering the retirement age of women to 62 years and paying benefits to workers who are disabled at 50. In short, an administration which has granted billions of dollars in tax benefits to large corporations would deny disability benefits to a man who has worked all his life, paid his social security tax, and then, at 50 years of age, while he still has a family to support, becomes totally disabled and unable to work. It is time these provisions were adopted.

The administration has changed something else in Washington. It has stopped telling the people the truth and instead is misleading them.

Recently President Eisenhower indicated that we are winning the cold war—at the very same time that the newspaper editors of the Nation said we're losing it.

They prate of peace—and boast of the brink of war we've visited.

They boast of our strength—and are contradicted by the generals.

They say all is well, and just then Ceylon joins the neutralists.

They say we have the initiative and just then the Russians challenge us to economic and political competition for the underdeveloped, uncommitted peoples.

They talk about our position in the world as if our stock were not at an all time low.

Now, all this is irresponsible.

Moreover, they tell us we are prosperous. Just the other day the Secretary of Commerce said that he felt, as he put it, "cheery" about the national economy which is, of course, most convenient in a campaign year. But the harsh fact is that thousands are being laid off in the basic automotive and farm equipment industries, and the farm depression, so long ignored by the administration, is showing ominous signs of spreading its repercussions from the Midwest to the east and the west coasts.

By prosperity, the Republican managers mean that the stock market is up and so are the profits of corporations. They believe, and they have often said, in filling the cup of corporations full to overflowing, on the chance that some of the wine of prosperity will dribble down to the rest of us.

But we Democrats believe that prosperity is built from the bottom up—that employed workers, and prosperous farmers, and successful small businessmen, together construct a sound economic foundation for all.

From President Hoover's veto of TVA to President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill, from teapot dome to Dixon-Yates, it seems to me perfectly clear that the Republican Party under General Eisenhower, remains, as it has been throughout the recent past, the party devoted to the service, not of all the people, but of the special interests.

From the record of what the Eisenhower administration has changed, from the words they have uttered and the deeds left undone, from the promises made and the promises broken—from this record of the last 4 years, it seems to me perfectly clear that the Republican Party will no better represent all the people in the next 4 years than it has in the last 4 years.

What will a Democratic victory mean next fall?

It will mean an administration that will represent all the people, not just some of them; that believes in building prosperity from the bottom up; that will deal decisively with the mounting seriousness of economic dislocation; an administration that really cares when men are out of work.

And it will mean an administration that will tell the people the truth instead of soothing them, that will lead them resolutely through our grave crisis in civil rights at home and our deteriorating complexities abroad.

And it will mean an administration that will not just talk about but will work for, yes, and fight for, the things we believe in—the right of a man to do a job, the right of a man to be treated as a full equal by his fellow men, the right to think as he pleases, the right to send his children to a good school, to live in a decent house, to farm with protection against price collapse, and to go through life unhaunted by the fear of catastrophic illness.

But these are merely the issues now before us, the battlelines drawn, the programs begun.

I think we have to look further than that this year.

It is not enough to say we Democrats propose to resume the progress that we began and the Republicans interrupted. I think we have to look ahead.

We live in a time of great challenge and great danger—an atomic age, an electronic age, an age of automatic machinery, a television age, an age of leisure.

Only the wisdom of our political leaders will determine whether we use the atom for life or for death.

Only the foresight of Government will determine whether the new automatic machines will mean a more abundant life or unemployment. The Government cannot stand aside while the second industrial revolution takes place.

Only the Government can decide whether machines will serve man, or men, machines.

And the only the Government can set the tone, if you please, of the future—can by its leadership decide whether we will seek the truth or believe the fable, widen our lives or deaden our leisure, expand our freedom or harden our hearts.

Just think what this country of ours could be.

We know how to end poverty, if we would do it.

We know how to create full employment, if we would do it.

We can conquer the killing diseases, if we would try.

We have land enough, and water enough, for even our bursting populations, if only we used it wisely.

I believe this country is moving into an age that can bring an uplifting of its citizens such as mankind has scarcely dreamed of.

This uplifting will come only as we measure prosperity not in terms of refrigerator and television sets but even more in terms of the greater goods of education, health, security, peace of mind, only as we ask not merely "how much" but "how good."

And I suggest to you that on the record—the record of its vision in building the Marshall plan, and point 4, and the United Nations, the record it made in 20 years of boldness and imagination and new ideas—I submit to you that the Democratic Party is the one best equipped to lead the Nation to the new plateau of a better life only just beyond the horizon.

So, let us face the challenge of the future with boldness, courage, and good heart. The society of California has a motto, concerning the California pioneers, which reads: "The cowards never started and the weak ones died by the way." Let us too go forward, to build an America, and to construct a world, for our children that will be a better America, and a better world, than the one we were born into.

Now, if you will permit me, I should like to say a personal word on a subject of some urgency to me.

The California presidential primary on June 5 is crucial this year. It may decide the Democratic nomination and that in turn may well decide the outcome of the November election.

I think most of you agree that a Democratic victory is essential next November. And that means, quite plainly, defeating President Eisenhower.

We are now engaged in a primary campaign to decide who can best undertake that task.

We have to ask ourselves: Who can win? Not for the sake of winning, not for the sake of personal ambition, but for the sake of getting on with the job at home and abroad.

And we have to ask ourselves: Who is going to name the Democratic candidate this year—the Republican newspapers and the Republican editors of the slick-paper magagines, yes, and the big-money men of the Republican Party; or the rank-and-file voters of the Democratic Party?

I have just been informed today that a respected national columnist reports an incident that I have known about for some time: That heavy financial contributors to the Republican Party are attempting to influence the Democratic primaries this year. A man who helped manage the 1952 Eisenhower campaign recently attended a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York in honor of a foreign visitor, and at the end of the dinner he told the guest of honor that the men at the table were among the most influential in America, that in 1952 they raised a large amount of money to elect President Eisenhower, and that a few weeks ago in 1 night they raised all the Republican money needed to defeat me in Minnesota. I feel sure Senator KEFAUVER knew nothing of this.

But, nevertheless, if this report is true, it appears that the Republican leaders who helped elect President Eisenhower in 1952 are now trying to dictate the choice of the Democratic candidate this year. If this is so, it is not unlikely their money has or will turn up in Florida or California.

Well, I have only this to say: They, or men like them, used their money to try to defeat Franklin Roosevelt, they used it to try to defeat Harry Truman, and Adlai Stevenson is proud to be in such company as that. Moreover, he has had some previous experience with operation saturation—in 1952.

And it makes me want to fight all the harder for the things I believe in.

Flash Flood Warning Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I called the attention of the House Appropriations Committee to the urgent necessity of more adequate flash flood warning systems. Since that time from all parts of the Nation I have received endorsements of my proposal for an additional appropriation of $3 million for flash flood warning systems.

The interest in this important matter is reflected by an editorial that appeared in the New York Times on May 5, 1956,

which I would like to here insert in the RECORD:

WEATHER BUREAU FUNDS

On the principle that a small fraction of a loaf is better than none we welcome the Weather Bureau appropriation for the fiscal year 1956–57 which the House of Representatives has now voted. Its most encouraging feature is an increase of $1.3 million for research, about $600,000 of which will be devoted to hurricane and tornado studies. On the other hand, meteorologists generally believe that at least three times as much is called for to do the job that should be done. At least as urgent—which last summer's catastrophe in New England amply proved—is the need for an adequate flood-warning system, especially for the flash type that caused such havoc in the wake of Diane. Next year's appropriation shows no increase on that score.

Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, is pushing for a supplementary $3 million for flash flood warning purposes. This would be only about 1 percent of the annual average flood damage—not an exorbitant premium to pay for the protection it would give. The House should take another look at the adequacy of the Weather Bureau appropriation in relation to its needs, which are the public's needs as well.

The Promise of the New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. E. Smythe Gambrell, of Atlanta, Ga., the president of the American Bar Association, has during his incumbency of that high office delivered a number of outstanding addresses in various sections of our country.

Hon. Hatton W. Sumners, a former distinguished Member of this body from Texas, has forwarded to me a copy of the address which Mr. Gambrell delivered in Dallas, Tex., on April 20 at the ninth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association.

I have read this address with keen appreciation, and under a unanimous consent request granted today, I insert President Gambrell's address herewith:

THE PROMISE OF THE NEW WORLD

(Address by E. Smythe Gambrell, Atlanta, Ga., president of the American Bar Association, at the ninth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, Dallas, Tex., April 20, 1956)

President Storey, Dr. Salazar, Mr. Justice Garwood, other distinguished guests, fellow citizens of the Americas:

May I express my warm thanks for the gracious hospitality you have accorded me here. I bring you the greetings of the American Bar Association and the legal profession of this country.

This is a truly inspiring meeting. This great audience; the eminence of those who are around us; the resonant voice of professional brotherhood; the deep respect for law which inevitably accompanies the progress of those who love freedom and their fellow man; the unifying, harmonizing note which the law thus adds to our common aspirations and the kinship of our history; all that kind and rank of ideas are racing through the mind on such an occasion as this. Whether in common law or civil law, and in whatever land, we serve as one great priesthood the common cause of justice. Ours is the happy privilege of calling men everywhere to worship at the shrine of liberty under law.

It is fitting and proper for the great brotherhood of law in this vast hemisphere to gather this week in this gracious city, in a State of great traditions. I know of no plainer call than a common loyalty to law and its appeal to reason. The world wants law. What is law? Law is the spirit of fairness and justice. It is the antithesis of greed and force. Law is the spirit of freedom—freedom according to law. It is the antithesis of autocracy and tyranny. Law is our common heritage, our common pride. We know and feel that in addition to the profound sympathies which we draw from community of history and outlook, there is the common bond of practice and of pride in the same learned, stimulating, and exhilarating profession. We at this meeting are living exhibits of the solidarity of the legal profession in the new world.

Someone has said that the things which we have in common are greater than the things which sometimes divide us. I think it would be more real to say that the things we have in common are those which do divide us—which give us each the right and power to move on independently, though in accord.

Nothing, I venture to suggest to you, is more truly calculated to keep alive and foster friendship between us than the common love of freedom and the devotion in common to those great principles of impartial justice which are the foundation—the sure foundation—of the common law and civil law. Democracy, self-government, liberty under law—these are still the passion of the people of this new world. Property we ardently desire, but freedom we will have; and faith in the constitutional structures under which that freedom has been enjoyed is the deepest force in our national existences.

With our imperishable heritage of civic ideals held in common for our separate advantage, it is indeed natural and right that we of the Americas should be generous in our praise of each other's achievements, kindly in our sympathy for each other's misfortunes, and true in our support of each other's rightful ambitions. For we must know that upon our common progress, upon the realization of our individual and just purposes, depend the peace and harmony of this hemisphere and to a large extent the welfare of mankind.

We are gathered from the length and breadth of two great continents, from the distant shores of Hudson Bay to the farthest reaches of Cape Horn. Our homelands stretch from pole to pole and cover half a world. Although in climate, in size, and in character, they range the spectrum of the globe, we are met in common purpose and mutual understanding, in quest of a single goal. The formal differences that would divide us are readily to be seen. For many of us, the patterns of life are a rich legacy of the gracious and gentle cultures of Castile, Aragon, and Portugal. For others, the manners and morals of the sturdy Anglo-Saxons have set the mold. Our ears may be attuned to the tongues of Iberia or to the language of England. As lawyers, some of us may take as the materials of our craft the work of art that is the Roman law, in its majestic symmetry and consummate order. For others of us, the medium of legal art is the accumulated wisdom of the ages, the record of a thousand years of human experience embodied in the common law. But more meaningful than our differences are the things we share. Beneath the varied surface ripples, run deep and steady currents of common purpose. Whatever heritage we prize, whatever tongue we speak, whatever law we practice and uphold, our professional quest is the same—to bring orderliness, regularity, and responsibility to our way of life. From the fusing and blending of these complementing cultures with each other, and with the many others that have invigorated the American peoples, has sprung a transforming spirit of brotherhood among men. This rich divergence in detail bids us to lift up our eyes toward the heights, to seek the higher common ground where differences are left behind. We are nearing the fulfillment of a vision, the vision of a great and devoted prophet of freedom, Father Juan Vidalsco, who clearly foresaw the dawn of a new world, of an America "peopled by men of all nations, and forming a single great family of brothers."

Today our countries of the Western Hemisphere stand as beacons to guide aspiring peoples everywhere. In this New World the fervent love of liberty is in the heart of every man, and the human soul is respected above all else. Here all stand equal before the law and none is above it. Here the long struggle of man to be free has reached its highest pinnacle. Should we fail in our resolve to keep bright the lamp of liberty, we would carry down with us the hopes of the downtrodden peoples of the world.

The blessings we enjoy are rooted in a common source and form our common heritage. From the beginnings of written history in the New World, our nations have moved together along the paths of destiny. To the bold far-sighted men who sailed in search of strange and unknown lands, this new-found continent was but a single country, bountiful and rich. To Columbus and Cortez, De Soto, and de Gama, Balboa and Pizarro, the continents they explored were not made up of separate nations. Only after the struggling of European crowns for the treasure here abundant were man-made boundaries raised to divide us. Together the lands were settled, and together in the colonies the settlers learned the hard lesson of the tyranny of distant and unresponsive government, and felt a hunger for the power to rule themselves. Whether the challenge of unconquered wilderness brought men already thirsting for freedom, or whether ordinary men who came to the New World were here imbued with a surging spirit of self-reliance, a devotion to liberty more fervent than the world had ever known welled up in all of these new lands. In the cabildos of the south and in the small colonies to the north, the ideal grew. At last it burst forth, an irrepressible clamor for emancipation and independence. Even as the colonies that were to become the United States rose up to cast off the yoke of English colonialism, to the south the men of Tupac Amaru and of Socorro rebelled against oppression. In the long struggles that followed, our peoples fought in a common cause. It is not coincidence that the great statesman and soldier Francisco Miranda served beside George Washington in the revolution of the northern colonies. Nor is it surprising that the magnificent liberator, Simon Bolivar, was a friend of Jefferson, Adams, and other leaders in the crusade that made this country free. Names like O'Higgins, Hamilton, San Martin, and Madison are written in glory together in the annals of human liberty. The battles at Concord and Carabobo, Valley Forge, and Boyaca, Yorktown and Ayacucho were fought by patriots who bled and died in a united sacrifice for freedom.

The spirit which animated our forefathers derived from the same wellsprings of thought. The stirring ideas of Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Montesquieu all merged to kindle in north and south the unquenchable flame that illuminated the struggle. Their philosophies of freedom and the dignity of man were echoed in the hearts of Americans in every colony. In his writings in pursuit of personal liberty, the great Vidalsco enumerated what he proclaimed to

be "those natural rights received from our Creator, the precious rights which we may not alienate. The free enjoyment of these rights," he continued, "is the inestimable heritage which we should leave to posterity." There is the striking parallel to be found in the ringing words of Thomas Jefferson in his Declaration of Independence for the English colonies: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Whether from Spain, Portugal, France, Britain or elsewhere, the authors of our liberty were moved by a single purpose and had a simple aim—to secure the God-given rights of mankind.

In this philosophy, the emancipated peoples of America approached the solemn task of structuring a new government to replace the oppression they had cast off. It was an article of universal agreement in this enterprise that to heed the imperatives of human equality and freedom would require that government rest upon the consent of the governed, that only the voluntary concord of the citizenry could serve as the foundation of order. In each of the score of nations then established, the model of government adopted was the republic: each man was to be given a voice in the selection of those of his fellows who would be entrusted with the authority of the state, and each was to enjoy a share in the making of the laws that would rule him.

But it was not enough to erect the institutions of free election and representative lawmaking. In their wisdom, the far-seeing men who built our constitutional democracy recognized that majority rule alone cannot safeguard the integrity of the individual. A democratic majority, left unrestrained, could prove as ruthless and tyrannical as the earlier absolutist regimes. Seeing this clearly and fearing it, the statesmen enshrined in organic law, beyond the reach of simple majorities, the personal liberties of all men, whether they be alined with the dominant forces of the community or whether they stood in lone dissent. The people thus permanently denied to government the power to interfere with rights and freedoms proclaimed to be inalienable. In the structures of our institutions of government, we put our faith in the ability of a man to decide what is good for himself. But we have reposed less faith in his ability to decide what is good for others. We have been skeptical of the wisdom of a transient and temporary majority, and we have been suspicious of those who claim the prescience to divine the common good and to lay down the patterns to which all thought and all activity must conform to achieve that good. It was recognized that the capacities, drives, wants, and needs of the human being are beyond the powers of any man or group of men to comprehend and encompass at any single time, and that only experience can furnish reliable guides. Our constitutions therefore guaranteed to the individual the right to experiment, to be different, to disagree, to choose an untried path which the rest of us might regard as sheerest folly. By limiting the powers of government in the interests of individual freedom, we have sacrificed a measure of governmental efficiency. But the sacrifice is offered to achieve what we are proud to believe is a higher good. In declaring the rights of man in our written constitutions, we sought to preserve to each the freedom to grow, to employ his God-given powers as he, in the teaching of his conscience, believes best. Our concern rose above the creation of a favorable material environment where man can dwell in comfort. It is for us the supreme function of government to keep clear the ways for the enlargement of human personality, for the realization of the man's inherent dignity, and for the development of individual integrity.

The other stone in the foundation of our governmental structures that serves as the firm base for human freedom is the familiar principle that the concentration of power in any single man or group of men entails the risks of autocracy. The pages of history teach, above all else, the dangers of absolute power in the hands of any human, no matter how good his intentions or how pure his motives. To avoid these risks, and to dissipate the corrupting force of unchecked power, the builders of our way of life dispersed the authority of government among its several functional divisions, each to serve as a control upon the others. In its usual formulation, this fundamental of government is known as the doctrine of the separation of powers.

As the history of the art of government runs, the principle is old. We find glimpses of it in Aristotle's Politics, as he recognizes the three elements of political control—the deliberative, the magisterial, and the judicative. But he did not pursue the implications of his classification, nor did he perceive, apparently, the possibility of allocating these three powers to different hands, and of using their reciprocal balances to guard against authoritarian abuse.

Centuries later, when Greek and Roman principles of ordered liberty were rediscovered and restored, John Locke, a leading philosopher of the American Revolution, resurrected the tripartite division of sovereign power and conceived of the separation as a devise for securing individual liberty. But it remained for the great political thinker Montesquieu to bring the doctrine to full fruition, and it is he who bears the title of its oracle.

In the turmoil and strife that marked the birth of our respective nations, the hard lessons of autocracy were well remembered. A principle offering promise of an enduring freedom for the individual and a means for containing the centripetal forces of power found ready acceptance. The teachings of Montesquiev, already familiar to the Founding Fathers, were put to the test of practical application. The constitutions of all our American republics reflect the impact of this ideal. In all, the normative principle of government organization, and the first principle of the social compact, is the separation of powers among three coordinate and equal branches. As a tenet embedded in a constitutional structure, the doctrine of separation was a unique contribution in man's striving to rule himself, the distinctive genius of government in the Western Hemisphere. The common plan, by dividing the three grand branches of political authority and by allocating to each a checkrein over the others, left no power unrestrained. This is, for us, the essence of the rule of law.

As the eternal order of heavenly spheres is the resultant of the gravitational forces the stars exert upon each other, so in our constitutional scheme we have sought to bring order to the lives of men and the affairs of government through the interacting forces of distinct centers of authority. Knowing that power feeds upon itself, we have set power against power as the pattern of our system. We have learned through experience that in the long run we are better advised to commit matters of government to a pattern of procedural order than to put our faith in the untrammeled discretion of some men or group of men, however wise or altruistic. Without a controlling pattern and a limiting process, our noble declarations of human rights and our great guaranties of individual freedom would be as castles built upon sand.

We of the Americas take pride in the belife that we are governed by the rule of law. We contrast our system with those we call totalitarian, where people are subjected to the whim and caprice of absolute powers. In speaking of a government of laws and not of men, we do not mean that law is self-operating and immune from mortal influence. What we do mean is that the processes of law are obeyed, that those who wield temporal power for the time being are themselves governed by law, that our lawmakers are controlled by a discipline that subordinates personal ideologies. It is simply government by principle and process, rather than by people.

An enduring truth that made itself felt in the upheaval that marked our national beginnings was the maxim that the principal custodian of liberty is the judiciary. In any land and at any time, the human rights that can be said to exist are those that the courts stand ready to enforce. Through the work of the judges, life is breathed into the language of a constitution; through their judgments and decrees the ideals of freedom are transmuted into actuality. It followed inexorably that the peoples of America, in their fervent love of fredom, should establish by almost universal consent the principle that a court should regard as void an unconstitutional law, and that the institution of judicial review should be enshrined in our constitutional jurisprudence. More than a decade before the doctrine was to be pronounced by the Supreme Court of the United States, the far-seeing Francisco Miranda had drawn up his plan of government recognizing the essential power of the judiciary to nullify unconstitutional laws. In the northern continent, Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist Papers, reviewed the guaranties of personal freedom of the United States and gave voice to the same sentiment when he added: "Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice; whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this," Hamilton continues, "all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing."

It is an awesome power that we have thus conferred upon our judges; it is a solemn responsibility that they must discharge. Freedom of the mind and of the conscience, freedom to labor as we choose and to seek our own destinies, all these depend wholly upon a judiciary free from influence. The courts are at once the conservators and the beneficiaries of the doctrine of the separation of powers. It is through the courts that the other branches are compelled to respect their appointed limits, but it is only if the independence of the judiciary is zealously maintained that its essential function can be fulfilled. In common accord, our fathers therefore set about to preserve the integrity of the judiciary branch free from encroachment by the others. They collectively have given these honored members of our profession security of tenure in office and security of compensation. The selection of judges has in large part been withdrawn from the arenas of partisan politics. The most consistent article of faith of the great liberator was his steadfast adherence to the principle of an independent judiciary. Speaking of his draft of the Bolivian constitution, Bolivar expressed his conviction in these words: "The judicial power that I propose, enjoys absolute independence; in no other plan of government is so much given it * * *. If the judicial power did not emanate from (an independent) origin, it would be impossible for it to be, in its fullest sense, the safeguard of individual rights. These rights * * * are the ones that insure liberty, equality, and security—all the guaranties of the social order. The real foundation of liberty is in the civil and criminal codes. The most terrible tyranny may be exercised by the courts, through the powerful instru-

ment of the laws. Ordinarily, the executive is no more than the custodian of public affairs; the courts are the arbiters of personal affairs, the rights of individuals. The judicial power is the measure of the welfare of the citizens; if there is liberty, if there is justice, they are made effective by this power."

These are the sources of our common heritage in the principles of liberty, the bright threads in the tapestry of our government of law, the warp and woof of the way of life we share. We have gathered tonight in the fraternity of our mutual traditions to enjoy the conviviality and good fellowship of professional brothers. In other sessions here this week, we have been concerned more directly with our professional endeavors. Recognizing the obligation of lawyers everywhere to work toward a more perfect administration of justice, we have compared ideas for solution of the problems that beset us all, and have considered means for eliminating or minimizing the differences in law that impede free and friendly relations among nations. If lasting peace and understanding are ever to come to this earth, I believe they will result not from the formal functioning of the diplomatic corps nor from official consultation of the chiefs of state. They will come from meetings like this, of men of good will animated by common ideals that transcend national boundaries, where mutual respect, understanding, and friendship are fostered.

But there is a more basic purpose that permeates our conference. The lawyer by tradition and training takes as his first concern the preservation of human liberty under law. Our predecessors at the bar in these lands were the ones who struck the spark that spread throughout the New World, leaving a love of freedom burning in every breast. They led the struggle that made us free, sacrificing their lives and fortunes to the cause. They hewed the framework of government that has preserved for us, their heirs, the blessings of the rule of law.

Today, as the threat of a global holocaust hovers over all, the lawyers of the Western World, charged to justify their glorious heritage, are faced once more by the ancient challenge to human freedom, now in a newer guise. "The destiny of America"—the words are Bolivar's—"The destiny of America has been settled irrevocably * * * the independence of America is required for the equilibrium of the world." The challenge that confronts us is to preserve the independence of our peoples, and to uphold the government of law for all mankind. It has fallen to us, it seems, to determine by our conduct and example whether societies of men are really capable of establishing good government upon sober reflection and voluntary choice, or whether men are forever destined to be oppressed by governments founded upon accident or force.

Today our countries stand together at the threshhold of a new era, at the dawn of a new day of promise. Ahead is an opportunity for unprecedented human advancement and growth. Before us lie new frontiers of science, education, industry, and commerce. New horizons in travel and communication are coming into view. New sources of energy may make man the complete master of his physical environment. To us is offered, in fuller measure than ever before, the promise of a richer and fuller life for ourselves and for those who follow us.

But this bright promise is not undimmed. Man has still to prove the capacity to control, in the political realm, the physical forces that his technology has unleashed. A restive world in bondage must be given a share in the blessings of freedom and abundance. More and more it is borne in upon us by current developments that freedom is not secure unless it is universal; that prosperity is not sound or lasting if it is merely localized or isolated; that civilization is not real or genuine on this earth if it is to be enjoyed by only the favored few.

In the current strife that has set one-half the world against the other, the struggle between communism and freedom is not alone a war of economic and military power. The greater war is the war of ideas, a spiritual conflict of religious and moral values. Our best weapon in this battle is to instill the spirit of freedom and faith in the hearts and minds of people everywhere. Even in this age of discovery, when science has released sources of energy of almost incomprehensible magnitudes, the forces of the physical world still pale in comparison with the power of man's great spiritual and political ideals. It is this power we have invoked to preserve and to spread throughout the world our precious heritage of freedom and order.

In the worldwide clash of ideology, the strongest armor of the Western World is the philosophy of law we share and uphold together. When ancient institutions are challenged and traditional ideals attacked, when unforeseen problems must be met and new frontiers must be conquered, we could only flounder blindly and aimlessly without a standard to measure against or a star to guide us. Only in a working philosophy of law and government can we find the essential sense of direction.

So long as we remain free to think for ourselves, we must, each of us, work out our own convictions regarding the functions and purpose of law. But as western advocates we must recognize that law is not devoid of purpose, and that a science of guiding human conduct must take account of the ends to be served, and the means to be employed. For us there is no separating of ends and means; for us the law cannot be defined as any rule that will be enforced, nor is law as we conceive of it simply a tool that may be used to remake the world in any image we may choose. We have learned through long experience that the validity and moral authority of a decision rests largely upon the processes and means by which the decision is reached, that the question of guilt cannot be divorced from the fairness of the methods of trial. We know that it is fatuous nonsense to talk about the utopian society without considering how that dream can be realized. In devising a government to protect and to foster the development of human personality and the dignity of man, we have chosen to put our trust more in process and pattern than in unrealistic declarations of the ends of government.

It is the Communists who have traded on common ignorance of these enduring truths, for they have sought to achieve their own version of the millenium through the ruthless and bloody use of sheer physical power. They have closed their eyes to the fact that no good can be accomplished by an evil means, and they have forgotten that the processes of law must leave an indelible mark upon the government wherein they prevail.

It is significant that the dialectic of Marx and Lenin has never produced a coherent philosophy of law. There is no rational conception of law that could support a state founded upon force and falsehood. How intimately our proud traditions of freedom are bound up with our philosophy of law can be illustrated, I think, if we ask ourselves how the totalitarian regimes behind the Iron Curtain could have been established, or how long they could have endured, if the only tools for the retention of power had been the institutions and processes of the common or the civil law. What passes for law in such regimes is only another convenient instrument of dictatorial authority. To conceive of the individual as existing solely for the exaltation of the state is to deny a place for justice between man and man between man and his government. So regarded, the individual is not a creature of God free to choose and to will, but only a product of social forces; all is inevitable and predestined. In such a system, the person who fails to fit into a current political plan is simply to be removed from the community, much as a branch would be pruned from a tree if it upset the symmetry. Individual volition, and familiar concepts like the dolus malus of the civil law and the mens rea of the common law are irrelevant in the totalitarian state. We have only to look to the travesties of justice committed in the so-called People's Courts of the Soviet Union to measure the vast gulf that separates the legal systems of the free world from those of the other half. It is not too much to say that the basic cleavage between the great powers of the world derives ultimately from the conceptions of law that prevail in each.

It would be supposed that the fundamental principles of the separation of powers would find no place in the totalitarian state. The notion that power should offset power to curb the authority of government is simply inadmissible in any philosophy that makes the state all-powerful. Separation of power is the antithesis of dictatorship. It was inevitable then, that Marx and Lenin should reject the use of checks and balances, for their dictatorship of the proletariat was nonetheless a dictatorship. The Communist theory is aptly described by the late Andrei Vishinsky, a leading authority on Soviet law, in these terms: "From top to bottom the Soviet social order is penetrated by the single general spirit of the oneness of the authority of the toiler. The program of the All-Union Communist Party * * * rejects the bourgeois principle of separation of powers."

There is of course nothing remarkable in Vishinsky's statement. Separation of powers relies upon honest differences of opinion among the three coordinate branches of government to restrain the unguarded zeal of any single branch. There is no room for such a principle in a political system that tolerates no disagreement and brooks no dissent. In Russia, an independent judiciary would be unthinkable. The courts there exist not to do justice or to protect individual freedom, but only to further the interests of the prevailing power.

The conflict with the enemies of liberty will be won, if at all, by unyielding adherence to the principles of Western civilization and by unceasing defense of our cherished ideals. We must lay firm hold on the institutions wrought at such great cost by an earlier generation of lawyers in the Americas. But we must not mistake stagnation for preservation, or changelessness for our national faith. We are all of us creatures of time. Each day marks the end of another page in the eternal story of human growth, and the turning of a new page yet unwritten. Chance and change will never cease, and there is for us no stopping, no turning back. Ours is a process of building, stone by stone, upon the lessons of the past, learning from the tragedies and triumphs of those who have gone before us in the procession of mankind, building ever better for those who are to follow.

The political creed that binds us is premised upon a simple belief: That each human being is a creature of God and endowed by Him with the dignity of individuality. Each must be free to shape his own integrity and to seek his own destiny, to develop and to grow. But growth is change. If each man is to be free to realize his own potential, to think and to build, then change is inexorable. Our peoples have set themselves free—free from physical restraint; free from ignorance and superstition; free from the delusion that rulers possess infinite wisdom; free from political doctrines that held men in bondage to government; free to work out their futures with their own minds and their own hands and in their own way, subject only to limitations that

would prevent them from interfering with the freedom of others. In the process of the emancipation of that portion of humanity, there has been released in society a driving force, an individual initiative, and an aggregate accomplishment previously unknown to the history of mankind. If we should stifle human growth in the name of security and conservatism, we would defeat the highest purpose of democracy. Whether the realm is intellectual or economic, resourcefulness and innovation must be encouraged and not suppressed. Resistance to change is a product of fear and lack of faith. It has no place among a dynamic people dedicated to the principles of ordered freedom. The cry for security is the call of the fearful and the faithless; the God-fearing man who is self-reliant and conscious of his powers calls for freedom, not security. The real security will be found not in repression, but in giving men free rein for their drives and their capacities. It is one of the paradoxes of labels that in common usage the man who puts his faith in eternal progress and growth is tagged a conservative, while the man who espouses the cause of the unchanging and stagnant social order is counted as a progressive.

Never before have the complexity and diversity of life so defied simplification and solution. Pyramiding scientific and technological advances have made us inextricably dependent upon one another. Each dependence marks a point of contact and constitutes a potential point of conflict. Each addition to our expanding populations increases these points of potential conflict not arithmetically but geometrically, since each new man must depend not upon one other but upon uncounted numbers of his fellow men. The tasks of the law have increased in proportion, for it is the function of law to ease the points of conflict between man and man and to minimize the inevitable frictions of society. The felt needs of the times have compelled us to concede an increasing role to government in the control of our daily lives. But it is a fundamental article of our mutual faith that we shall not destroy the ancient landmarks in our effort to accommodate the demands for governmental authority to cope with modern problems. The principles of our freedom must stand as fixed and immovable monuments above the ebb and flow of the currents of change. Paramount and above all other considerations, we must channel the flow of progress within the processes and limits of the structure of our form of government; the rule of law must hold firm.

The expanding role of government in the modern world intensifies the challenge to the legal profession whose obligations we bear. To guard the common heritage calls for constant vigil, for ceaseless effort in the cause of freedom. Concentration of power in a central authority tends to diminish the sense of participation in government and the role of local responsibility that fostered the conception of the state as the servant and not the master of the individual, and engendered the spirit that set us free. The flame of freedom may be extinguished unless we rekindle it with devoted service and unfaltering faith. The demands of efficiency in government regulation also have strained the limits of the doctrine of the separation of powers. In the world of today the functions of government cannot always be neatly assigned to mutually exclusive categories or watertight compartments, and some overlapping at the boundaries must be tolerated. But the resilient and flexible lines must not be broken down. Most important, the independence of the judicial branch must be preserved. The establishment of administrative tribunals outside the judicial power has been carried far in many nations. Freed of the disciplines and restraint the legal profession imposes upon the courts, these tribunals may present grave threats of absolute and unchecked power and the consequent risks of tyranny. It would be tragic indeed should the great freedoms we proclaim be lost through apathy and complacency.

In our eternal endeavor to fulfill the ideal of the rule of law, the measure of our achievement is not absolute success. In human wisdom, we know that the goal is not soon to be won, and that we in our time shall not see the dawn of the day of perfect justice. The battle for liberty can never be won and our arms laid down; there is no final victory. To succeed is only to gain the right to fight again tomorrow.

There are heartening signs that our cause may yet find vindication. Recent years have brought greater stability to our governments, a keener appreciation of fundamentals, and a rejection of alien ideologies. The close of the Second World War found the American republics joined in a solid phalanx against the powers of darkness, and ready to assume their rightful place of leadership in the work of uniting the nations of the world in an organized pursuit of lasting peace. The past week saw the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Organization of the American States, a day proclaimed by the presidents of nations throughout the hemisphere as Pan-American Day. Again the vision, the genius, and the foresight of Simon Bolivar are called to mind. In his wisdom he recognized the strength of our diversity and local responsibility, and rejected a proposal to make the Western Hemisphere a single nation. These are his words: "It is a grandiose idea to try to make one nation of all the New World, uniting all its parts by a single bond—but it is not possible, because varied climates, diverse situations, contrary interests, and dissimilar characteristics divide America—a great monarchy would be difficult to consolidate, but a great republic is impossible—a State too large in itself or its dependencies finally falls into decadence, loses its free nature, and becomes a tyranny, neglecting the principles which could preserve it, and finally lapses into despotism." But with prophetic accuracy he foresaw the opportunuity for a voluntary concord of the separate and independent nations to be formed. "How beautiful it would be," he said, "How beautiful it would be if the Isthmus of Panama should become for us that which the Isthmus of Corinth was for the Greeks. Would that some day we may have the fortune of assembling an august Congress of the Representatives of the Representatives of the several republics—to meet together and consider the high interests of peace and war."

Today the nations of the New World stand united in the love of liberty as the custodians of freedom for all humanity. It is the Americas that must lead mankind to the new birth of freedom for peoples everywhere. The glorious hopes are futile and the promise of the future will prove vain if we entrust our liberties to the written word alone; the constitution alone is not our salvation. It has fallen to us, the lawyers, nurtured in the traditions of government of law and imbued with its spirit, to preserve for all the world the light of human liberty. In our hands we hold the torch that guides the hopes and yearnings of all mankind. In firm resolve we face the solemn duty to keep it burning. The task shall not go undone.

Ruler or Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the public at large the address by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., before the Kiwanis Club of Jersey City, on April 5, 1956:

RULER OR EXECUTIVE

Mr. Chairman, fellow Kiwanians, and honored guests, I would like to speak to you for a few minutes about the trend to concentration of power in the executive department of our Government and its threat to our cherished liberty.

The Constitution of the United States expressly grants to each of us precious and inalienable rights and privileges. By implication it imposes upon each of us a continuing duty. One of those rights is that of free speech. The implied duty has been suggested by the immortal phrase, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

The theory of government embodied in our national charter is that of a separation of powers, each restrained by "checks and balances."

For example:

Article 1 of the Constitution: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article 2: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States."

Article 3: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

There are the three powers. Numerous provisions wisely keep them in balance, each with the other two. It is as nearly automatic and foolproof as human genius can devise. Gladstone termed it "The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

But no work of mortal man is ever completely automatic or foolproof, and that is where you and I come into the picture. It is our eternal vigilance that will preserve our freedom.

While we marvel at the remarkable automatic features of our Government, we don't dare leave it exclusively to its self-adjusting mechanisms. We must watch it with "eternal vigilance" lest the brake be inadequate to the power, or the steering mechanism gets jammed for lack of lubrication.

I am disturbed by the trend to concentration of power in the executive branch of our Government. Lest you think I am an alarmist, let me assure you that I have good precedent for "viewing with alarm" this trend.

For example: Henry Clay, in 1935, 120 years ago, said:

"We are in the midst of a revolution, hitherto bloodless, but tending rapidly toward a total change of the pure republican character of the Government, and to the concentration of all power in the hands of one man"—meaning the President.

Subsequent history is replete with struggles between 1 of the 3 separate powers.

The Congress has exercised its legislative power to cut down the appellate power of the courts. The court has had to slap down the legislative. In struggles between the other two powers, the executive seems to pick the winner. And there, in my opinion, lies a danger against which we citizens should be vigilant.

In his Farewell Address, Washington enjoined his successors in the executive department to: "Confine themselves within their constitutional spheres, refraining, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another." He said further, "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create * * * real despotism."

Lord James Bryce in 1889 said of our executive: "Either House of Congress can direct a committee to summon and examine a Cabinet officer, who, though he might legally refuse to attend, never does refuse. The committee, when it has got him, can do nothing more than question him. He may evade their questions, may put them off the scent by dextrous concealments. He may with impunity tell them that he means to take his own course. To his won master, the President, he standeth or falleth."

That is what has been worrying me of late years.

For example: The newspapers reported the other day that the Secretary of Defense refused to disclose to a committee of the United States Senate the nature and quantity of strategic materials now being shipped to the Soviet bloc, giving as his reason that the information is "classified" by the executive department. Our enemies know what items they can and cannot get from us. Yet the Secretary of Defense denies information to our citizens that he gives to the Communists. Sounds impossible, but it is true.

The Constitution formally sets up three separate powers of government. But there is a salutary fourth power, that is not specifically identified as such, namely: The power of the people to amend their Constitution. We have availed ourselves of that power on 22 occasions, and I am wondering whether we shouldn't avail ourselves of it for the 23d time.

For example, the treaty power has been used to set up executive agreements which have the effect of superseding the domestic law of our land.

In some instances agreements are entered into without the knowledge of the United States Senate.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, senior United States Senator from Ohio, has persistently urged an amendment to the Constitution that will limit the executive's treatymaking powers to things that are not outlawed by our Constitution and its several amendments.

You gentlemen of course know that a formal treaty requires the approval of the Senate and President, while an executive agreement can be made by the President without the knowledge of either house of Congress. The executive agreements have the same force and effect of a treaty.

When Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was a candidate for the Presidency, he said: "We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution." Subsequent to his election to the Presidency, he opposed the proposed Bricker amendment.

Mr. John Foster Dulles is reputed to be an able and experienced constitutional and international lawyer and is assumed to have known what he was talking about when on April 1952 he said: "Treaty law can override the Constitution—can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights."

Subsequently, Mr. Dulles said, "The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and they also make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution," concluded Mr. Dulles.

In the famous steel case (*Sawyer* v. *Youngstown, etc.* (343 U. S. 479)) only five of the judges of the Supreme Court condemned the presidential seizure of the mills. Three of the judges voted to uphold it on the ground that the United Nations Charter was a treaty overruling the Bill of Rights. Later, in the *Iowa* case (344 U. S. 1) the Bill of Rights barely squeaked through, with a vote of 4 to 4 sustaining the Iowa supreme court. Since then, there have been changes in the personnel of the Court which leaves the situation precarious as against the pleas for treaty law against constitutional law.

The feature of the proposed Bricker amendment that has aroused the bitterest opposition, is the provision that: "A treaty shall become effective as internal law only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty."

Next to that, the one feature that raises the opponents' gorge is the provision that "Congress shall have the power to regulate all executive agreements with any foreign power or international organization."

It is well to keep in mind that even a formal treaty requires the assent of only two-thirds of a quorum, not two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate, and that the quorum may be only a handful if nobody calls for a quorum.

What I have said gives point to the warning of Patrick Henry, American statesman and patriot, that "if treaties are made that infringe our liberties, it will be too late then to say that our constitutional rights are violated."

Even in the early days of our Republic, when government was less complex than it is today, Thomas Jefferson recognized the danger of giving free rein to a "good" man. He cautioned, "In questions of power, let no more be heard about confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

If we would avoid tyranny, we must reverse the trend to concentration of power in the hands of the executive department of Government. The proposed Bricker amendment is a step in that direction. It would be a strong link in that binding chain, safeguarding our liberties. It should have the wholehearted support of those Americans who think first of America.

Only you and I and others like us can decide whether we will have a ruler or an executive.

Baltimore Altar Boy Dies From Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are again given a tragic reminder of the need for unrelenting vigilance in maintaining the Flammable Fabrics Act, by the death of the little 10-year-old Baltimore altar boy whose cassock caught fire while he was lighting candles in the sacristy of his church.

The story is recorded in the following article by the Associated Press:

BALTIMORE ALTAR BOY DIES FROM BURNS

BALTIMORE, May 9.—Albert Longmire, 10-year-old altar boy, died yesterday of burns suffered April 25 when his cassock caught fire while he was lighting candles at St. Edward's Church.

The boy was lighting candles in the sacristy, adjacent to the altar. He ran into the church with his clothes afire.

The Reverend John Kerr interrupted a sermon to put out the flames with a woman's coat.

Remarks on Hon. Charles C. Finucane, at Dedication of San Antonio Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1956, San Antonio Dam at Pomona, Calif., was dedicated. My distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and I participated in the dedication along with civic leaders from Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties.

The featured speaker was the Honorable Charles C. Finucane, Undersecretary of the Army.

The completion of San Antonio Dam will provide flood-control protection to thousands of people in southern California. It stands as a monument to men of vision and fortitude who profited by lessons of history and who built lasting protection before floods in southern California could strike again.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Finucane's most interesting remarks at this dedication:

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to be here for the dedication of San Antonio Dam. When Congressman PAT HILLINGS asked me to speak on this occasion—an occasion of importance to all of us who recall the disastrous floods of past years—I accepted with pleasure and have been looking forward to this gathering with you.

In preparing myself for this dedication it occurred to me that you might be interested in flood control and water conservation throughout the Nation and the important role of our Army engineers in water-resource development.

After the dedication of Folsom Dam near Sacramento last week, it is heartening to see still another important flood-control structure put into service in California. Each unit completed is another step forward in the joint efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments to make sure that disastrous floods like those of last December and January experienced in California will become things of the past.

The completion of this dam is the happy ending to a story which began with another disaster—the flood of 1938. Up to then the valley had been plagued by a series of disastrous floods. San Antonio Creek had overflowed and caused considerable destruction in 1916, 1921, 1927, and 1934. The 1938 flood wrought property damage estimated at more than a million and a half dollars, put

the rail lines which serve Los Angeles out of operation for 3 weeks, and caused traffic disruption in other areas for as long as 2 months. But meanwhile, in 1936, the Federal Government had assumed responsibility for flood control on a national scale. So the response to the 1938 flood was this Federal project authorized in that same year.

Since then—encouraged perhaps by the fact that no important floods have occurred for many years—more and more people and industries have been attracted by the rich advantages of this location. The project area has grown and developed. One hundred and twenty thousand people now live here and the present value of improvements is estimated at more than $600 million. Because of this tremendous expansion, the damage that could be done to valuable residential, commercial, agricultural, and industrial properties in and near your cities of Pomona, Claremont, Chino, Ontario, and Upland by a disaster-type flood has greatly increased.

Fortunately, the area was spared during the hectic years of World War II, postwar readjustment, and the Korean campaign, when many construction programs had to be interrupted or postponed. Now San Antonio Dam is in place, providing a good measure of protection against flood damage. We cannot yet say that protection is complete, for the channel improvements on San Antonio and Chino Creeks that are an indispensable part of the project have not yet started. But the preconstruction planning work on these improvements is approximately 50-percent complete, and we can look forward to seeing them brought to completion at an orderly rate.

These works in turn are part of the Army's flood-control program for the entire Santa Ana River Basin, which dollarwise is now about 80-percent complete. Similarly the Santa Ana Basin program is but part of the Army's program in California, and that in turn is only one portion of the national flood-control program. And the flood-control program is but one aspect of the total water-resources development effort being carried out in every part of the United States.

Just as the development of enterprise here has increased the necessity for control of these waters, as throughout the United States the vast expansion of industry and commerce since the war is increasing the necessity for the development of water related sources. The amounts of water the American people use today staggers the imagination. Many streams and rivers are seriously polluted. Irrigation continues to require ever-increasing quantities as sprinkler irrigation takes hold even in the humid Eastern States. Shortage of water for city and industrial purposes have become so widespread and chronic that it is a national problem, and threatens the future growth of important cities and strategic producing areas. Consequently the progress we make with conservation and development programs may in large measure determine the future welfare of our citizens. Meanwhile there is no major river valley in the United States, except for the Mississippi, in which the Federal flood-protection program is even half-finished.

Vast though our present use of water may be, the Department of Commerce has recently estimated that it will almost double within the next 20 years. In 1975 industry will require almost three times as much water as was used for all purposes in 1900. Steam electric plants—whether atomic or conventional—will require more than we are using today for irrigation. Total use in 1975 is estimated at 453 billion gallons a day, compared with our present use of 262 billion gallons. The Department of Commerce informs us that we are coming within sight of the limits of available water for consumptive purposes, and that we are confronted with a problem that will tax the utmost foresight and ability of our planning agencies.

It is clear that we must progress steadily toward the time when we will make beneficial use of every drop of water that falls on our land, is gathered into our watercourses, and speeds to the sea. We must control that water through well-planned engineering works to keep it from doing harm, and further utilize the same or related control works to make our water perform beneficial tasks. We must make it available to supply the needs of farms, cities, and industries. This involves the prevention of water waste through conservation, and if necessary the replenishment of underground supplies. We must reduce pollution, improve navigation, and put the water to work by making it turn turbines and carry vessels. In addition, we must preserve and enhance the important values not readily measurable in money terms, such as fish, wildlife, and recreation.

Each area and region faces different kinds and combinations of water problems. In one place, the need for irrigation supply to support the regional economy may be foremost. In another locality, the need to protect potentially important areas from recurrent destruction by flooding, or to stabilize channels and maintain streamflows, may be the dominant concern. Plans and projects for each area must be determined mainly on the basis of local needs and circumstances.

Hence the Federal Government should not and cannot be solely responsible for meeting all our water problems. The job is too big for any one group of persons or interests or for any one level of government. It is my belief, and the belief of your present national administration, that we must give more thought to defining the roles, relationships, and responsibilities of non-Federal and private agencies so that each may undertake its proper share of this task. President Eisenhower expressed it this way when he signed the Flood Control Act of 1954:

"In the development of the Nation's resources I believe that the Federal role should be cooperative, not preemptive; that the costs of such development should be borne by the Federal Government with the States, local governments, and private interests. I believe also that to the greatest possible exten those directly benefiting from resource development should be responsible for it and pay for it."

In order to play a more cooperative and a better coordinated part with other interests and agencies in the development of water resources, it is necessary for the Federal Government itself to achieve greater unity and consistency in its water programs and policies.

For more than a century and a quarter, the Army, through its Corps of Engineers—the agency which built this dam—has played a vital part in the harnessing and development of water resources. Its role has steadily grown in both size and range of activities as the Nation spread westward and its economy increased in complexity. Within the last 50 years, other Federal agencies also have been formed to carry out separate and special aspects of water resource development. These programs were launched to take care of various water needs as they occurred. Changes in the course of the Nation's economic development have been reflected in changes and modifications of these programs. Often such changes were piecemeal or stopgap measures, adopted without adequate consideration of their effect upon other water-resource programs, Federal or non-Federal.

Thus the efforts of your Government became increasingly inconsistent. State and local governments and private enterprises found it difficult to coordinate their plans and programs with the Federal effort. This lack of cooperation and coordination of Federal agencies with each other and with State and local interests has been called "the greatest single weakness in the Federal Government's activities in the field of water resources development."

To cope with this problem, 2 years ago this month President Eisenhower created the Committee now known as the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. Its report and recommendations, based on 2 years of thorough study, were published last December. Like the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which also considered matters relating to water resources, it is proving an invaluable guide to executives and legislators in devising measures to improve Federal programs and policies in this field.

In addition to setting forth the need for improved coordination within the Federal Government, and for greater financial participation and initiative by non-Federal agencies, the Presidential Advisory Committee recommended an organizational plan for Federal water-resource activity, and made certain recommendations in important fields such as water rights, priorities in the use of water, the sharing of project costs, the evaluation of project benefits, and the method of authorizing projects.

The Army has been very glad to participate in the studies of the Presidential Advisory Committee and of the Hoover Commission. We believe that these studies will help bring about more efficient project operations, sounder bases of planning, simpler and more effective policies, and economies which will enable all our enterprises and agencies to proceed faster with the immense task of meeting the Nation's many pressing water needs.

We believe it will facilitate the necessary coordination between our efforts in California and those of your State Government. Few States rely so largely upon continued water-resource development to support future growth as does California, and few States have shown more initiative and enterprise in planning to meet water needs. The Army looks forward to cooperating with you by carrying out an appropriate role in which State, local, and private responsibilities are fully recognized.

We of the Army take pride in the part which the Army's construction and engineering branch, the Corps of Engineers, has played in the history of this State. From the days of Fremont and Halleck more than a 100 years ago, the Army engineers have been developing harbors and communications on your coast. They explored the highway and rail routes that opened your natural riches to development by and for the American people. Later they built the Panama Canal, linking the west coast with the East by sea as well as overland. They blasted out the rocks which made the entrance to San Francisco Bay hazardous, and opened the channel to Stockton. Later through a sub-agency, the California Debris Commission, they established the plan which has replaced the wasteful "every-man-for-himself" system that was ruining the Sacramento River with mining debris and floods. In the late 1920's they made their so-called 308 studies of California's water resources, upon which subsequent Federal water-resource programs in this State have been largely based. In making these studies, the Corps relied heavily upon material assembled by the State itself through its State engineer. Since then the Army and its engineers have continued to work with and through State and local agencies in gathering data, making plans, and constructing facilities like San Antonio Dam.

And we are very proud of the fact that on the 175th anniversary of the Corps of Engi-

neers, the State of California, through its Governor—then Earl Warren—officially recognized the Army's contributions to the development of the State. The proclamation said, in part:

"In times of peace the corps has improved the Nation's harbors and thus contributed much to the development of domestic and world trade. It has worked to harness our rivers for protection against floods, for the generation of hydroelectric power, and for the extension and advancement of waterborne commerce. * * * Throughout the years it has had a major part in the work of improving our rivers and harbors, in building dams, flood-control works, and other facilities, and in the construction of military establishments in our State."

The completion and dedication today of San Antonio Dam attest the fact that the Army's partnership with the people of California continues to be strong and productive. It will continue to be strong and productive as long as there remains a stream to be curbed and developed, a harbor to be improved, or a drop of water to be put to work, through jointly conceived plans and projects, in this State of California.

It is a distinct privilege for me to designate this dam to be known as San Antonio Dam.

We Should Concentrate More on Telling Our Own Story With Objective Commentary and Calm, Straightforward News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of May 14, 1956, C. L. Sulzberger comments critically on American propaganda programs designed for overseas consumption, and advances some excellent proposals for improving the present product. I include Mr. Sulzberger's fine article here for the information of my colleagues:

FOREIGNS AFFAIRS: WHAT'S WRONG WITH AMERICAN PROPAGANDA

PARIS, May 13.—In this era of political uncertainty and uneasy coexistence propaganda becomes increasingly important in maintaining the views and prestige of the United States among captive peoples of eastern Europe. Yet, despite millions of dollars spent, we are unsuccessful. A tour of the satellite nations provides convincing evidence that our propaganda is a flop.

This is not for lack of technical ingenuity. Both Government and privately sponsored organizations have demonstrated imagination in getting our ideas across barbed-wire frontiers and a wall of radio jamming. Programs beamed by stations of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe manage to circumvent these barriers and are heard. Pamphlets dropped from airplanes and windborne balloons have so saturated some countries that not even efficient sweeping operations of the security police have kept them from wide circulation. The criticism one hears is of the ideas themselves, not their means of distribution.

One American envoy in the area complains: "Our propaganda is utterly ineffective. Frequently our radios put out intelligence information that is entirely inaccurate or ridiculously late—information that could be verified within 10 minutes by any embassy or legation. Much that we broadcast no longer was any bearing on reality. Many political émigrée make good money compiling useless material."

STUNTS RESENTED

A friendly Ambassador in Czechoslovakia observes: "The BBC has its Bruce Lockhart, who is deeply respected here. But you have no one. Your balloons and leaflets bear foolish messages. For example, they sought to work up a campaign encouraging 10 popular demands for freedom. Leaflets and stickers were dropped bearing the mystic No. 10. This was an advertising stunt. It never took. People resented being incited to audacity by those dwelling safely abroad."

A highly intelligent Czech with pro-American sympathies adds: "All too often your radio either misses events; or it is late; or it is wrong. Once you get it through the jamming you'd like to know something.

"But the things your propaganda speaks about are frequently silly. Broadcasters give 15 minutes of statistics. Whom do they think they are talking to, professors of mathematics? Who cares about comparative steel production figures in 1952? Sometimes our emigrants working for you will denounce a man as a traitor when it simply isn't true. They are careless. This happened to a friend of mine and was infuriating."

One of our Eastern European envoys says: "The United States has always encouraged these people to overthrow the Government. Our propaganda still implies this purpose. We have done nothing or said nothing to give the impression that we will ever make our peace with this regime. Yet we must do business with it—and do. This schizophrenic attitude puzzles the local population."

The American Government sends selected films to our Embassies and legations not only to entertain them but to advertise the benefits of our society to local officials and diplomats. These movies sometimes are appalling. The Austrian chargé d' affaires in Bucharest used to attend our cinema showings. Eventually he remarked to our embarrassed minister, Robert H. Thayer: "This does you Americans more harm than good."

ALL SHOWINGS CANCELED

The writer attended an evening of films sent by our Government to Thayer's legation. The first was a 1946 picture with the sound track so worn it sounded as if Ingrid Bergman had a mouth filled with bubble gum. It had to be stopped. Then came an inferior commercial. Third was a ridiculous advertisement for Dutch tulips. Fourth was a fifth-rate thriller on Haiti. Thayer, in despair, canceled all showings scheduled for the coming week.

From Poland to the Danube Valley listeners complain that emigrees working for American radio stations have lost touch with changing local conditions. A Bulgarian anti-Communist protests: "They are like all emigree movements. They are unaware of some changes that we accept with pleasure while opposing the regime—such things as free medical care. Many people think the emigrees enjoy a better life abroad than is actually the case. Nevertheless, unfortunately, they resent it. Such is human nature."

It is embarrassing to criticize people who fled tyranny and from unhappy exile try to keep alive the flame of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. But, judging from results, their propaganda is neither conceived with sufficient skill nor adequately coordinated with our diplomatic policy.

Perhaps we should concentrate more on telling our own story, stressing forever the ideals we believe. Objective commentary and calm, straightforward news are durable psychological commodities. We cannot afford to lose touch with changing realities within the satellites. Nor should we be so blinded by emotion that we occasion resentment among those we court.

The 35th Division in World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the 35th Division, a National Guard Division, played a very important part in winning the victory in World War I.

Some of the units in that division come from Kansas City, Kans.

The dedication of the new National Guard Armory, Saturday, May 5, recalled to us oldtimers some nearly forgotten facts.

A special-feature story in the Kansas City Kansan of May 5 retells the story, recalling many interesting details:

GUARD CAMP SET UP IN WESTHEIGHT—KANSANS TRAINED HERE TEMPORARILY AFTER BEING CALLED FOR WORLD WAR I; MAJOR ROLE FOR 137TH

After the Kansas National Guard was called to Federal service on August 5, 1917, a training camp was set up in this city. The camp, a temporary one largely of tents, was in what is now called Westheight Manor.

The training center was in use for several months and was called Camp Hoel, in honor of the late J. H. Hoel, developer of Westheight. The area, which is north and west of 18th and Minnesota, had about one house in it at the time.

Now it is a heavily populated part of Kansas City, Kans. Camp Hoel was in use because the intended training center—Camp Doniphan, Fort Sill, Okla.—was full.

The United States declared war on the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey) on April 6, 1917, and Kansas guardsmen expected an early call to duty. The guardsmen had been defederalized the previous October, after service on the Mexican border.

The 137th Infantry Regiment came into existence on October 2, 1917. The 137th was comprised of the former 1st and 2d Kansas National Guard Regiments.

The 137th was part of the 35th Division and as such saw considerable action in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. It was on the morning of September 26, 1918, that the 35th, as one of the frontline units, went over the top in the drive destined to keep on until the armistice.

The division suffered 7,584 casualties during the battle.

But the story must back up a little. After 6 months of intensive training, the units of the 35th departed for embarkation. The German Army had broken through the western front and was threatening Paris.

"CHIN STRAP DIVISION"

In New York City, on the way to Europe, the 35th attracted much attention as each doughboy wore the conventional cavalryman's chin strap on his campaign hat. The wind of the plains area made the strap a necessity. At that time, there were 9,781 men from Kansas in the 35th, 14,282 from Missouri.

The 35th became known as the "chinstrap division from the West" or the "cowboy division." The 137th arrived at England on

May 7, 1917, and 2 days later arrived in France.

After several weeks of intensive training, the 137th's 3d battalion was the first to reach the frontlines. The Kansans got their first touch of action on June 2, 1917, when the Germans staged a raid on their lines.

The attack was repulsed without casualties and the regiment no longer was considered a green, untried one. Then came minor action and a rest. After a series of night marches ending September 12, near the city of Nancy, there was early morning artillery preparation which launched the first major American offensive.

MOVE TOWARD ARGONNE

The offensive wiped out the St. Mihiel salient which the Germans had driven into the Allied line in 1914. Then the 137th moved toward Argonne where the Allies were preparing another offensive.

The regiment was assigned a sector which contained the formidable Vauquois hill. The hill was regarded as impregnable and stood like a signal of death to the Kansans. It bristled with German fortifications.

Repeated French assaults against the hill had been unsuccessful and caused heavy loss. The attack by the 137th was preceded by a 3-hour bombardment with field guns massed hub to hub to blast the German positions.

After a bitter attack, with the 137th leading the 69th Brigade, the hill was taken and the advance continued. The morning of September 28, the Germans launched a stubborn counterattack but were finally repulsed with heavy loss.

HAD HEAVY LOSSES

Following heavy artillery bombardment, the 35th continued the advancement against increasing enemy pressure in the Montrebeau Woods area. The 137th then was relieved by the 1st Infantry Division.

The 137th in 5 days of action had taken every assigned objective, but had suffered extremely heavy losses, with 107 killed, 38 who died of wounds, 1,060 wounded, and 88 listed as prisoners or missing.

This represented 46 percent of the men engaged. Then came a much-needed rest. By mid-October the 137th again moved into the line near Verdun. The action was largely patroling and making exploratory raids until early November.

Then the division was moved toward St. Mihiel to join a large French-American force, which was being massed for an offensive on the fortress of Metz. The offensive never came because of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

The division spent several months in Europe after the truce, and the monotony of winter was broken only by a review of Gen. John J. Pershing and the Prince of Wales on February 17, 1919.

PARADE IN PARIS

The parade ground was a duplicate of the one in Kansas City, Mo., where the 1st and 2d Volunteers marched in review before General Grant in 1880.

After receiving orders to return to the United States, the 35th marched down the Champs Elysees in Paris to the tune of The Old Gray Mare. The 137th departed from Brest, April 11, 1919, and docked in New York 12 days later. Many Kansans were there to meet the soldiers.

After a parade in Topeka, the men of the 137th received their discharges at Camp Funston, Kans., on May 9 and 10, 1919.

The Kansas City Kansas units which went with the 35th to Federal service on August 5, 1917, and the officers:

Company A, 1st Kansas infantry (redesignated company A, 137th), Capt. A. K. Rupert, 1st Lt. W. A. Simpson, 2d Lt. William Firstenberger.

Battery E, 1st Kansas field artillery (redesignated battery E, 130 th FA), Capt. P. S. Hoyt, 1st Lt. E. W. Poindexter, 1st Lt. Frederick H. Olander, 2d Lt. R. L. Barker, 2d Lt. G. A. Russell.

Company B, 1st Kansas engineers (renamed company B, 110th engineers), Capt. D. S. James, 1st Lt. H. J. Brownlee, 1st Lt. William Weidlin, 2d Lt. Hubert Hudson.

Company C, 1st batalion Kansas engineers (renamed company C 110th engineers), Capt. Orlin Hudson, 1st Lt. C. R. Fisher, 1st Lt. Carl E. Rouse, 2d Lt. Herbert T. Barclay.

Ambulance company No. 1, Kansas sanitary train (renamed 110th sanitary train), 1st Lt. William Rhodes, 1st Lt. Clark Mangun, 1st Lt. T. L. Jones, 1st Lt. Harold Gover, 1st Lt. Ralph Hartman.

Ambulance company No. 2, Kansas sanitary train (renamed 110th sanitary train), 1st Lt. Edwin Tenney, 1st Lt. Richard Speck, 1st Lt. Adam H. Adamson, 1st Lt. A. J. Bondurant.

The small arms section of the Kansas infantry division ammunition train, commanded by Lt. Col. Frank L. Travis, which came from the Rosedale district, was redesignated the 117th ammunition train and became part of the 42d division—the Rainbow division.

All the other Kansas units were part of the 35th.

Egypt Tramples U. N. Cease-Fire Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the April 27, 1956, issue of Israel Digest gives concrete evidence of the way in which Egypt is treating the unconditional cease-fire agreement of April 18, 1956.

The information follows:

FOUR KILLED BY ARAB AMBUSH, URGENT LETTER TO U. N. SECRETARY-GENERAL BY FOREIGN MINISTER M. SHARETT

JERUSALEM.—Four civilian engineers employed by Tahal (Israel Water Authority) were ambushed and murdered in the Wadi Arava, north of Ein Yahav, on April 23. The vehicle in which they were traveling on the road from Eilat was found riddled with rifle bullets and burned. Two of the men's bodies had also been burned.

Investigation, carried out by the Israel police with the participation of United Nations observers, found that the attackers consisted of eight men who had entered Israel from Jordan territory, and that they had retreated there after the attack.

Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett, in an urgent letter to United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold, emphasized that this brutal ambush bore all of the earmarks of Fedayeen activity. In the cease-fire arranged between Israel and Egypt last week, after a series of Egyptian Fedayeen attacks in which 14 Israelis had been killed and 32 wounded, the Egyptian Government had given assurances that all Fedayeen activity would cease.

OTHER ATTACKS

The ambush of the four Israel civilians followed a series of attacks originating from Jordan in which an Israel soldier was killed, and several water pipelines blown up.

On April 18, the water pipeline between D'vir and Lahav, in the eastern Negev, was blown up in three places. Investigations revealed tracks leading toward the Jordan border.

On that same day, infiltrators opened fire upon a Lahav shepherd watching his flock in the same area.

On April 18, Jordanian National Guard men attacked an Israel patrol near N'tiv Ha'Lamed Hey in the Jerusalem corridor. An Israel soldier was killed in the exchange of fire. When the patrol had been forced to abandon its vehicle, the Jordanians towed it across the border.

On that same day, fire was directed from Jordan at an Israel guard near Ma'ale Ha'-Hamisha, in the same area.

On April 19, an Israel Army vehicle traveling near Beit Govrin, in the northeastern Negev, was fired upon from Jordan.

On April 20, the water pipeline near Goren, in western Galilee, was blown up.

On April 22, Syrians fired upon Israel fishing boats plying their trade on Lake Kinneret. Four of the boats were forced to abandon their nets.

On April 23, Jordanians fired upon an Israel unit patrolling the Lahish development area.

Economic Aspects of Retooling for the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., and director, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF RETOOLING FOR THE ATOMIC AGE

(By Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., and director, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

For many years now I have been an economic optimist. This means that even in periods of downturn, I have never for a moment doubted America's power to develop the strongest and most dynamic economy known to man. Our recent history, spelled out in terms of payrolls and incomes, has more than justified that faith.

Now, as a confirmed economic optimist, I face this awesome era called the atomic age with confidence, tempered with realism and with the belief that some degree of wholesome fear of the future can be a positive influence.

When we speak of retooling for the atomic age, we are apt to regard it as a problem in higher mathematics to be solved on the drawing board. We tend to overlook the social changes it will demand, among them perhaps the uprooting of many of our deep-seated cultural prejudices. Instictively, we will resist drastic change. We will try to retard, rather than take advantage of, the atomic forces that must upset the status quo. That is why I said that some degree of fear of the future can be a wholesome influence. Intelligent, fully realized fear of the forces to be loosed in the future must become one of the dynamic factors in our plans for retooling for the atomic age. It is the force that will jar us out of our social rut.

Let's consider the phrase "retooling for the atomic age." Let's define just what it may

mean to us today, to our families and our business.

ECONOMIC COMPETITION

First of all, in my opinion, retooling for the atomic age means reshaping today's economy for the war that is on—not a shooting war. The atomic stalemate between Soviet Russia and the United States is keeping the bombs in reserve. But there is a war—a war for survival between communism and democracy, an economic war that is ruthless and ferocious.

Soviet Russia is out to strike us where it hurts—in the pocketbook. Once she has won in the economic area, she counts on easy victory in the political arena.

The Russian big guns and jet fighters in this economic war are trade and credit competition. Threats of military penetration for the moment are soft-pedalled. Instead, they are determined to shatter free world patterns of trade and international relationships, hoping thus to weaken us. The Soviet economic and political penetration into other nations, particularly into less-developed countries, is designed to bring the United States to its knees. Full well do the Soviets know that the destiny of nations is determined by trade.

During the past 6 months, Russia has been putting on pressure. They have penetrated countries which are politically unstable and whose people are inflamed with nationalism, countries staggering under low standards of living and financial woes. To these less-developed nations the Communists are offering economic aid, loans on unrealstic terms, trade and, in addition, arms.

These are not normal commercial relations in the historical sense. They are offered at the expense of the Russian slave labor economy, a system whereby each human being exists solely for the benefit of the colossus of state. The moneys and credits are offered on the classic Marxian dogma that the end, which is world domination, justifies the means of getting there. Above all, they are designed to upset economic relationships in the free world, to alienate millions of people from the ideal of democracy. With every cent of this cut-rate interest, goes a dollar's worth of political penetration.

Let us admit that the Soviet Union's tactics are immoral, deceptive, supercharged with political guile; that their entire scheme of living and propaganda is based on godlessness and slavery. But the fact remains that Soviet Russia is still our No. 1 economic rival. And the outcome of this long trade competition for the less-developed countries will very likely determine which way, communistic or democratic, the world will go.

All of us here today, businessmen and industrialists, have a fairly clear idea of what the Soviet policy is, how it is being applied, and where. We are beginning to feel the pull. We can gage the political consequences. But I think too many of us are so busy hating and fearing communism that we are a little fuzzy about what we have to do to combat these forces. You know the story about the two psychiatrists who met on the street. One said to the other, "Hello, you are fine. But how am I?"

I think that story applies here. We know about Russia's plans in the economic war. But we seem a little ignorant about our own industrial health and national state of mind.

CAN WE AFFORD FOREIGN AID?

Economically, we are doing all right in our Nation. In 1946 our gross national product was $209 billion, equal to about $290 billion in present-day dollars. This year it will be $400 billion, 40 percent higher. Ten years ago we were producing steel at the rate of 83 million tons annually. This year it will be 128 million tons.

Signs point now to a balanced budget in the near future. In each of the past 3 years our Federal Government has collected in taxes a sum almost as large as Soviet Russia's total gross national income. Yet our taxes are not killing us.

The percentage of Soviet national income devoted to military expenditures far exceeds the percentage of our income devoted to armament purposes together with foreign aid. All this should reinforce our faith in a free economy.

It is going to cost us money to fight the economic war with Russia. Yes, billions of dollars. But we have the substance and production techniques to do it. To win, however, we need more than that.

WE CANNOT LIVE ALONE

First, I think, we must accept the basic fact that we do not live alone in the world—or that we can live alone in the world. It is not enough for free enterprise to prosper in the territorial United States. We cannot afford to permit half of the earth's population to be economically sick. Less-developed countries lack the economic vitality to resist the bullying of the Soviets. Especially, when threats are disguised in easy credit and empty promises.

Our course is clear. To meet this evil, we must spend more money and we must adopt a reexamined policy of lending more freely to other nations.

Even in the face of Russia's infiltration into less developed countries, as well as into France, Italy, Finland, and Latin America, our economic aid to other nations has averaged less than 2 percent of our national income. The amount of private lending and investment is also low. With only 7 percent of the world's population we enjoy about 37 percent of the world's consumption. Surely we should be able to multiply our loans 2 or 3 times for the sake of world stability. That would be a small price to pay.

We Americans are setting a fast pace of industrial progress. We need to keep up that pace. Our record, if clearly understood, should inspire every unprejudiced observer with the conviction that a free economy, properly nurtured, can outperform centrally planned socialistic and communistic economies. If we make it evident that we want to help by sharing our know-how and our substance, we can spur what is left of the free world into enlarging its margin of productivity over the Communist-led part of theh world.

IS OUR STORY CONVINCING?

Yes, our record should inspire vast areas to follow our methods. But are we telling our story in the right way? Are we convincing enough in our offers of aid? Does the aid we offer require military concessions? Do other nations believe we are sincere when we say we want to help them strengthen their economies so they can help themselves? Remember, the Communist world is spending over $3 billion a year merely to spread their doctrines. How much are we spending ot explain the doctrine of freedom?

Russia has built up her military strength in airpower and atomic weapons so that she feels relatively secure. At the same time, she has built her industrial machine and made economic progress. Now she is able or perhaps finds it necessary to use economic devices to further her aims abroad and expand her pattern of trade.

She has served notice that she is extending the cold war to the economic front. To prove it, she made a deal with Egypt to supply arms from Czechoslovakia—in essence an incursion into Africa and the Middle East. She offered aid to Egypt in building a huge dam on the Nile, agreed to build a steel mill in India, promised to take surplus rice from Burma in exchange for industrial equipment, and will assist Afghanistan to build factories and oil facilities. Furthermore, she will exchange technicians with India, and has invited the countries of the Middle East and southeastern Asia to request technical help when they need it. She also speaks openly of financial assistance to the less developed countries to help them raise their standards of living. Communist aid to Egypt, India, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Syria, Burma, and a number of other nations is estimated to total about $500 million during 1955 and the first few months of 1956.

This communistic challenge on the economic front may be very effective. It may turn less developed countries toward the East and away from the West. Call it evil, political, packed with lies, but let us not be lulled into security by our feeling of moral superiority. It would be suicidal for us to underestimate its political and economic potentials.

Of course, we have been trying to promote economic development in those areas which are now dealing with Russia. We have programs of Government loans and grants; we have made an effort to stimulate private investment in foreign countries. Yes, we have a technical assistance program.

LESS DEVELOPED NATIONS NEED CAPITAL

But let's face it. Capital investment funds from the United States and other countries into less developed areas is at the rate of a little more than $1 billion a year. Most of that has gone to Latin America. The less developed nations, many of them new, which today are so vital in the fierce struggle between the free world and Russia, could use twice as much as that. In self-defense we must dig deeper into our pockets.

Our foreign aid is small as compared with our military expenditures. We are increasingly dependent upon the rest of the world for raw materials and it makes sense to invest capital in less developed areas in order to assure ourselves of sources of supply.

We should give sharp thought to supplying more investment capital to these wobbly nations. Private capital would be best, in my opinion. Public money should take the form of longtime loans at low interest rates, rather than grants. Our public funds should be used mainly for power, transportation, communications and irrigation projects essential to stabilizing these governments. We might also use our agricultural surpluses to promote economic development, if that can be done without disrupting international markets.

REEXAMINE OUR PROGRAM

Oh, yes; I know we have spent billions of dollars on foreign aid. Perhaps some of it was not wisely spent. Perhaps there has been mismanagement in spots. Not always has it worked in favor of the free world. We must now vigorously reexamine our programs in light of today's threats and junk old methods once highly cherished. All this will plunge many of us into political name calling, which of course is something every politician hopes to avoid during an election year. But the urgency cuts across party lines and sectional interests.

I spoke earlier of intelligent, fully realized fear. I was trying to point out its value as a dynamic force needed to blast a throughway to national unity in our fight against Russian economic and political penetration—penetration into areas the Western World must hold. Such a wholesome fear in the face of danger can dissolve opposition of isolationist groups. It might hold in check deep-seated prejudices against some of the less developed nations because of their ancient cultures and religions, both often difficult for Americans to comprehend and tolerate. That fear could also serve to make certain that industrial interests face the galloping need for expanded foreign aid even though their narrower self-interest might be a little hurt.

CONCLUSION

We are in an economic cold war of the atomic age. Our best offensive is to spread

our technological and managerial skills to help industrially backward countries, to help them put more food in their national bellies and more dollars into uncontrolled trade with the West. If we fail to do this, regardless of the money we might save, we will be creating an economic and sociological vacuum. Into that vacuum Soviet Russia will be quick to pour her ideologies and offers of economic aid.

It is the normal fear of such a vacuum which may strengthen our national will to prevent it. It can bring unified economic effort. It can awaken every American from a dream of fruitful security.

But we should not permit fear to stampede us into unwise action. We have an economy of abundance. We have the economic strength that can meet any reasonable competition. Why should this Nation fear economic competition? It has demonstrated its leadership in industrial production and its technology. Why should it not be willing to meet the challenge in exactly the fields where it is best equipped?

For the most part, trade is unemotional and seeks only the best advantage. That is precisely why certain borderline nations have eagerly accepted the Russian overtures. The enticement of material reward took precedence over whatever objections of idealism were present. In fact, whether we like it or not, we might just as well be resigned to the fact that the political orientation of nations like Japan and Indonesia will follow the routes of trade. These two nations, for example, are simply obliged to trade if they are to survive. In facing up to this fact realistically, we should consider the very real possibility that before too long we shall have to engage in trade between ourselves and certain Iron Curtain countries. By gaining markets, we might be able to weaken their ties with Russia. Our products speak louder than political jabber from the Soviets. In fact, American goods might be the best propaganda device at our disposal to weaken the Soviet position.

America can face the atomic age with confidence and with optimism provided it does not shirk its responsibilities. The price of freedom has always been dear. Our Nation's founders bought it with their blood, their fortunes, their families, and their all. We have an opportunity to pledge a certain part of our standard of living to its continuation. Quite frankly, we have got to inconvenience ourselves for freedom; go out of our way to lay some extra money on the line to see that it is preserved. Once we set our course to pay whatever price is necessary to win the economic war, we will have broadened the mantle of freedom to cover the underdeveloped nations that are now counted borderline or behind the Iron Curtain. Only then will these nations know the newness, the freshness, the dignity, and the rewards of the American system of democratic self-government. Only then will they recognize the Soviet system for the slavery that it is—the oldest and most depraved institution in human history.

Administration's Shifting Military Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following open letter directed to the President by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr. The letter appears in the May 9, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American:

DEAR IKE: The more I think about our not supplying our men in Korea and the brave ROK troops with our most modern weapons of war, the more disturbed I get and the more I feel United States policy in the matter is a mistake.

When all is said and done—or not done—it is your policy.

Certainly the leaders of our Armed Forces don't agree with it, so it isn't their policy.

Secretary Dulles has indicated that, when he is asked by the military about this, he is obligated by his position to point to the long-range terms of the armistice, however big a bump he may have in his cheek. He has suggested that what the military leaders do is none of his business—so stop asking him and do what they think is in the best interests of the United States.

That leaves, then, only our gallant but timid allies, cosigners with us of the armistice under the bright blue flag of the United Nations.

If the Reds were to break out again in Korea I hope all our allies would rally around, but I know we would be doing 90 percent of the fighting and dying once again.

Under these circumstances, please, Ike, call the signals. If you don't and if anything should happen—you and no one else will be blamed.

I have just read that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said virtually these same things in secret testimony April 17. He said the Armed Forces may not be able to go on living up to the terms of the armistice, which, of course, the Communists began violating before the ink was dry.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.,
Editor in Chief, Hearst Newspapers.

Has the Sun Gone Down on Reality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to these words in the committee report on H. R. 11177, the Agriculture Department appropriations bill which we passed yesterday:

Farmers' Home Administration: • • • In the opinion of the committee, attention should be given to a thorough study of the organization and programs of this agency. Recent reports concerning the administration of this organization have been a source of concern to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have had reports which have been a source of concern. Valid complaints about the harshness of Farmers' Home Administration collection policies first came to my attention at a meeting in Hamilton early in December 1954.

In general, they dealt with the impossibility of meeting a repayment schedule, set up several years ago, with today's farm income—which is down about one-third from 1951.

The result has been that many farmers, among them war veterans who have entered the industry in the past few years, do not even have enough money left over to eat or to dress their children properly for school—much less buy seed and fertilizer for another crop, repair and replace machinery, or meet other obligations such as mortgage payments.

I was told that the Farmers' Home Administration Ravalli County supervisor, Mr. Hector E. Rodgers, had stated that of 131 loans in Ravalli County, 80 had been made on uneconomic farm units and that he intended to close them out. Mr. Rodgers was quoted as saying 120 acres is the minimum economic unit in the county.

I asked anyone injured to write me, giving his experiences with the Farmers' Home Administration. Each of the specific cases I received was sent over to Mr. R. B. McLeaish, FHA Administrator. He, in turn, took up each one with the Montana FHA director.

On January 22, 1955, Mr. McLeaish came to my office at my invitation to discuss the situation which, at that time, I understood to be confined to Ravalli County.

He assured me that everyone whose financial condition had changed for the worse since the original contracts were made would be given an opportunity to get money for fertilizer, for feed, seed and for living expenses, even though such withholdings might reduce the Government's share below the required payment.

Mr. McLeaish said he was exploring the possibility of rewriting the payment contracts but, at that time, he did not feel that the notes themselves could be altered.

Although a delinquency would result from release of money for other expenses, including taxes, Mr. McLeaish said all those unable to meet their payments due to a change of markets or reduced farm income would have an opportunity to work out their indebtedness. He said foreclosure was the last thing they wanted to try.

There was discussion of Mr. Rodgers' statement relative to closing out the uneconomic units. Mr. McLeaish said that since the Department had made the loans on these farms, every effort would be made to help the people solve the problem.

This understanding was confirmed in writing by Mr. McLeaish last spring.

Because I heard nothing further from those concerned, I assumed Mr. McLeaish was keeping his promise to give sympathetic consideration to each individual situation.

I was shocked to learn that he was not—and that the attempt to make over a lending agency into a collection agency and thereby change a traditional economic pattern was not confined to Ravalli County.

Just before I returned home for the Easter recess, I was visited in my office by a farmer from Broadwater County. He described the same situation in his vicinity. When I was in Montana last month, I talked to farmers in the vicinity of Townsend and Polson. Several people came to see me about this when I was in Missoula.

As new cases come in, I am continuing to call them to the attention of the Administrator. In addition, I am making my files available to the House Committee on Agriculture which is holding hearings on farm credit bills, among them mine to declare a 1-year moratorium on 4 classes of FHA loans.

The situation in Ravalli County prompted the following editorial by Editor Miles Romney of the Western News, in the May 3, 1956, issue of the weekly newspaper published at Hamilton:

HAS THE SUN GONE DOWN ON REALITY?

Elsewhere in this edition is an astounding report of a situation which affects numerous farmers of the Nation and of our country. As I contemplate the matter I ponder over whether people should be indignant or appalled or both.

Some years ago the Congress, aware of the need for providing cheap money to salvage submarginal agriculture, enacted legislation providing the machinery for financing farmers on long- and short-term basis. These were generally cases where private financing was not available, at least at that time.

Through the Federal Farm Home Administration, and its predecessor Federal agencies, thousands of farmers were provided an opportunity to finance their operations with the hope of ultimate full ownership of their farm properties. Many achieved success and others were upon the road to success when the economy of the Nation, insofar as farming is concerned, came upon a decline.

As most people hereabout are well aware prices of farm products have dropped sharply. This decline adversely affected all farmers, and what hurts farmers injures the small-business men of farming communities. In turn everyone in such communities feels the economic consequences of adverse farm prices. It is quite obvious that farmers who had borrowed funds, from no matter what source, had secured such loans when prices were high for commodities they had to sell. When these prices dropped away materially, as they have in the past several years, loans which were predicated upon the higher price plane, became difficult or impossible to pay. Farmers went to their banks and negotiated new loans based upon the current situation. Bankers were generally happy to accommodate their agrarian customers because they recognized realities.

In turn farmers who had loans from the FHA expected similar treatment. Imagine their consternation when they found stern opposition to their prayers for assistance. Instead they were in many instances told they would have to pay upon the basis of their original contracts or be sold out. They were informed, in some instances that they were operating uneconomic units and should quit farming and go to the city and get a job in industry. They encountered no friendliness, no understanding of their cherished desires for homes and farm operations. Naturally their cups are filled with bitterness.

It is apparently the policy of the Eisenhower administration that small farmers whose properties are not paid for and whose operations are not vast in scope, are not desirable in the American economy. It has been pointed out that they cannot operate upon an equal basis with the gigantic corporation farms. It has been pointed out again and again and again by responsible administration mouthpieces that there are too many farmers today, despite the sharp cut in numbers of persons engaged in agriculture. There can be no denial that the administration's policy has been aimed at reduction of farms and farmers and particularly of the small farmers.

I believe it has been the belief of numerous Americans, during the history of the Republic, that the family farm, owned by those who operate it, has been the foundation of the Nation. It certainly has been the desire to own and operate such units that called the pioneers across the Appalachian Mountains into the new lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Ohio. It lured them across the wide Missouri and thence over the plains. It called them to Utah, to Montana, to Oregon and California. Everywhere men, and their women, were seeking a home of their own, upon land of their own, where they could cultivate the soil, grow their crops and raise their families.

It was such a search by our expanding population that built America. Now there are those who would decimate our farm population. Strangely they are the same characters who screamed their lullabies of dismay and hatred upon the occasion of the destruction, for economic reasons, of the little piggies during the agricultural travail in the early 1930's.

I still think there is nothing finer than for Americans to own their own farms and homes, to operate their own small acreages, their own little shops and maintain an individuality. I think that the original idea of the Farmers' Home Administration's predecessor agencies was splendid and should be encouraged. It was not antagonistic to private banking for it filled a need in which the latter was not interested. It aimed at building a solid agrarian citizenry upon the basis of the family home. Anyone who doesn't like that foundation for America is entitled to his opinion but it is counter to our national practices of generations past, and seems to me to be bad economics.

Because of his personal attitude in handling the situation, the local administrator of FHA, one Mr. Hector Rodgers, has become anathema to Ravalli County borrowers from the agency. Certainly his usefulness in operating the agency here, from the standpoint of the people who are customers of the agency, is ended, except and unless his functions are entirely directed toward closing out the operation as quickly and as ruthlessly as is possible. If such is the aim of the Federal Government, they apparently have the right man on the job here. But I think it unwise to foist all of the blame for this imbroglio upon the shoulders of Mr. Rodgers. To be sure he probably lacks finesse in handling the situation, but he is merely a hired man. He must be taking orders from those who are his superiors in the State FHA setup. They in turn are following directions from their superiors in the national system of the agency and thence all the way up the administrative ladder to the Secretary of Agriculture, whose policies in other respects are akin to those discussed within the framework of this comment. And at the top of the heap, where final responsibility rests, is President Eisenhower himself. To be sure, he cannot be cognizant of such matters in every nook and corner of the Nation, nor can Mr. Benson, but agricultural strategy is their determination, and such goings-on as have afflicted scores of Bitter Root residents, and many, many more in other areas, is a direct consequence of their decisions. Although we may not like the indelicate manner in which Mr. Rodgers accomplishes his mission, real responsibility rests upon the shoulders of those at the top.

This is a sad situation. The administration should review the matter. It should either close the agency altogether and destroy its borrowers or it should alter its methods to bring them in line with economic realities. Nobody could make farming or any other business a success under rules based upon altogether different economic circumstances. I cannot conceive that even the contemporary administration should be so blind as to wish to ruin a healthy segment of the American economy. It is to be hoped Eisenhower and company will awaken to the damage their policy is accomplishing in this respect and speedily remedy it. The Farmers' Home Administration is not now a helping hand for the little farmers, as it was born to be, it is not what it is supposed to be, but instead constitutes a trap, into which unwary persons have been led in good faith, only to learn too late that a supposed friend is a deadly enemy. Let us hope those who have contrived this condition will relent or learn of their error before tragedy ensues.

It is almost inconceivable that just because Mr. Eisenhower knew nothing but destruction before entering the White House, due to having spent his entire manhood in the military, that he would be so blind to the needs of people in his own country.

Diamond Jubilee Assembly of New York Board of Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, New York City mayor, on hte occasion of the 75th jubilee assembly of the New York Board of Rabbis, held at Town Hall, 123 West 43d Street, New York City, on May 9, 1956:

Rabbi Rackman, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am most happy to be with you this evening to extend the greetings of the people of the city of New York, and my own good wishes, on the occasion of this 75th anniversary jubilee of the New York Board of Rabbis.

I am told that today 700 Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis are joined together in your organization to serve the world's largest Jewish community. I know that you have spoken out as the representative of Judaism in many areas, while primarily concerning yourselves with the spiritual ministrations of your flock.

I know of your work in many ways. My office is in constant touch with you, as you from time to time recommend chaplains for the agencies of our New York City government. We have found working with you easy and natural. Your corps of 91 chaplains serve Jewish people in 160 separate institutions, including voluntary hospitals, municipal hospitals, city prisons, homes for the aged, convalescent homes and youth shelters. Our departments of correction, health, and welfare are all served by chaplains through the New York Board of Rabbis. The activities of your chaplains include also visiting, the distribution of religious and inspirational literature, conduct of religious services on the Sabbath and high holy days and the observance of religious festivals.

In other areas as well, I have found your advice and counsel helpful to me, as mayor, and to the city of New York. You have not hesitated to speak out on social and economic issues, as they arise, whether it is a continuing problem of juvenile delinquency, the rise in our divorce rate, the problem of social security, the problem of automation in industry, proper division of our discriminatory immigration and naturalization laws, or questions of civil rights.

You have continued to serve as watchmen for the Jewish community, endorsing

that which is beneficial or opposing the harmful.

You have moved into the field of mass education through radio and television and your board has been a regular sponsor of religious programs of interest to all faiths of our city. Through your department of human relations, your unique Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry has created, and continues to offer, a program of lectures of pastoral counselling by outstanding medical and psychiatric authorities.

In our own city hospital, at Bellevue, you have established a department of clinic pastoral training and a department of pastoral care, thus aiding in the instruction of your own rabbis and chaplains to better meet the problems with which they are continually faced.

I know that your activities are principally financed by the great organization for good, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. I sincerely hope the day will come when work such as yours, and other institutional and charitable care, financed through Federation, is taken over by governmental agencies whether city, State, or National.

I wish you well in the future. I hope that I will be available for you to invite me back, even as a private citizen, on the occasion of your 100th aniversary, 25 years from now.

I am certain that that will be an occasion in which all the citizens of our city, of whatever religious persuasion, will join with you. I know that you state that you serve the whole Jewish community, as religion itself serves the whole human being. Without religion and faith and spiritual understanding, we are imperfect humans. Without the strength and the support that our city receives from the New York Board of Rabbis, we would be an imperfect municipality.

Again, my good wishes and congratulations on this anniversary celebration.

Thank you.

Make SUNFED a Part of Our Mutual Security Program and Avoid a Race With the U. S. S. R. as to Which Will Spend the Most

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of thoughtful and prominent citizens are speaking out in favor of channeling more of our foreign aid through the United Nations. The logic of these suggestions seems apparent to me, and I am happy to add my support to the campaign. I include herewith a statement which I made in support of SUNFED during the hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in behalf of the mutual security program for fiscal 1957. My support for the general purposes of the program is most emphatic, but I do object, as you shall see, to the emphasis and omissions which the proposals of the administration reveal.

Although not a member of this committee, I have followed with the utmost interest the testimony which you and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been receiving, particularly from the administration witnesses. One conclusion which I have reached about this testimony is that military necessity forms its leitmotiv. Not only are the President's requests wrapped up in categories which trumpet the military defense aspect and soft-pedal the nonmilitary, but also the supporting testimony consistently sounds the note of hard-headed American military need. One almost wonders, after hearing such advocacy, why we bother with the relatively insignificant technical cooperation and development assistance programs at all. One wonders, too, how anxious the nations who are slated to benefit from such assistance will be to receive their grants when they learn of the military context in which they were pushed through the American Congress. I hope that the embassies of Asian countries which read the administration's testimony for this legislation will take care to explain to their governments that the appeal of military necessity is a traditional sales technique on Capitol Hill.

If the nations which we propose to help through this legislation took the administration spokesmen completely at their word, I fear they might be frightened into other hands than our own for economic assistance. On the basis of much of the recent testimony, our own hand of economic aid lifts and pushes with the same motion. It lifts a nation's economy and pushes it into a more military posture. Our aid programs are described by the Secretary of State, before this Committee, as purely American in their origin, designed for our benefit, to economize on our defense needs, focused where we want them, and then worked out if possible in cooperation with the nations which receive them. Such a description may make the program more palatable to many American taxpayers in an election year, but I rather doubt that we can go on talking this way before a worldwide audience if we expect to retain the cooperation and respect of the underdeveloped nations which now receive such a large share of our aid. No longer can we offer foreign assistance programs designed in Washington with the assurance that if the needy nations do not accept our offer they will simply have to go without.

The Soviet Union has entered the field of economic and technical assistance and they have certain great advantages over us. The Soviet foreign aid promoters do not have to justify the expenditure of huge sums before a parliamentary forum such as ours. Not only does their dictatorial system of government not require it, but also much of what they offer abroad is based upon barter arrangements which their economy can easily support. Consequently, the agreements which they are ready to make do not become shrouded in the calculating self-interest which is wrapped about our own expenditures each year in Congress. The self-interest of the Soviets undoubtedly underlies their offers, but their system and their economy permit them to avoid professing it. In comparison, the United States must seem blatantly selfish, as our program has been presented this year.

This situation strikes me as terribly serious, Mr. Chairman, because we are only beginning to experience it, and we cannot accurately predict its effect. I regret that the administration has not demonstrated more sensitivity to the changed environment in which our economic and technical-assistance programs must henceforth be carried out. The present requests are made in the same manner as they were in the days when we had a monopoly in the economic-aid field, and the closest thing to recognition of the radically altered circumstances in which we must operate is the administration's acceptance of Senator GEORGE's suggestion that a special study be undertaken of the entire program. Perhaps the exigencies of preparing budget requests many months in advance have precluded the kind of ready adjustment to the Soviet economic offensive which we would like to see in the President's requests for fiscal 1957. Yet, even conceding such an explanation of the lack of fresh ideas in these requests, there are certain omissions from this proposed program which, to my mind, should be rectified now, without the need of any further study.

The project which I believe is essential to include in next year's mutual-security program is a United States contribution to the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. This special fund, which is commonly known as SUNFED, is an American idea, which has been repeatedly supported in principle by our delegations to the U. N. General Assembly, but which has never been put into action because of our refusal to make any financial contribution. Only 2 months ago, 2 distinguished members of this committee, Mr. BROOKS HAYS and Mr. CHESTER MERROW, issued their report on the 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at which they, as American delegates, pronounced the official United States position that the actual creation of SUNFED must await the time when substantial savings have been effected through reduction of armaments. In their fine report these Congressmen professed their disagreement with this inflexible approach, stating that they "believe that the United States must not unequivocally insist upon postponing a start toward aid of this type until disarmament becomes a reality." Furthermore, they expressed the view that it would be "of tremendous value to the United States" if we would be prepared at the next meeting of the SUNFED committee to offer constructive modifications of the plan which, if accepted, would enable us to participate.

This is very much needed advice. It is quite incongruous for the United States to find itself as the major stumbling block to the creation of SUNFED, because our Government originally developed the concept of such a special fund. One of the most vigorous suggestions for such a fund was made in the report of the United States International Development Advisory Board on March 7, 1951. This Board, appointed by President Truman, was under the chairmanship of Nelson Rockefeller, who only recently terminated several years of service under President Eisenhower.

In spite of the national emergency of the Korean war at the time which this Board drew up its report, they declared that "strengthening the economies of the underdeveloped regions and an improvement in their living levels must be considered a vital part of our own defense mobilization." The Board recommended that an international development authority be created to finance a portion of the cost of public works which are essential to the underdeveloped countries and which cannot attract loans from existing financial agencies. To use the language of economists, this report recommended an international fund, making "the fullest use of the United Nations and other international organizations," to invest in non-self-liquidating projects, to provide the fundamental economic structure needed in countries before private investment capital can undertake to develop their economies. In the underdeveloped areas of the world the prerequisites to economic expansion—such as roads, railways, ports and aidfields, hospitals and schools, irrigation and drainage, clearing of land—most of these must be provided before private investors can be attracted in support of self-liquidating or profitable activities and industries.

The SUNFED proposal aimed at getting the wealthier nations of the world, which developed their economic foundations in the expansive frontier days of the last 100 years,

to contribute a small amount of funds to an international effort to lift their less fortunate neighbors over the first hurdle to economic self-development. By combining their efforts through the existing structure of the United Nations the "have" nations would give that essential first push, through long terms loans or outright grants to the "have nots" to get them underway economically. Once this could be done, the less fortunate nations would be able to run on their own resources. The underdeveloped countries could than begin to offer to private or public investors transportation facilities for moving products to market, communication systems, a trained and healthy labor force and a growing managerial class.

The logic of this proposal seems obvious to me. One does not need an advanced degree in economics to understand the importance of building the basic structure of a country before investing in the more complicated economic enterprises which will ultimately make it self-sufficient. It is hard for me to understand how a nation as proud of its business acumen as is ours can fail to support, with dollars as well as words, the SUNFED program. What sense does it make, from a strictly financial point of view, to go on investing in technical cooperation and economic assistance as we are going when we refuse to contribute funds which would enable the "have not" countries to lay a firm groundwork for the economies which we are helping to bolster on a piecemeal basis? It cannot be said that these countries can find private investors to develop their schools and hospitals and irrigation projects, because these undertakings are not self-liquidating and do not attract foreign capital. Only through the beneficence of some private or public agency can funds be obtained for such nonprofit yielding investments.

The special United Nations fund as presently planned would begin with capital amounting to $250 million, of which the United States is asked to contribute less than one-third. If our Government would put up the $80 million requested of us, the remaining funds would not be long in following. The amount which we are asked to contribute is less than half of what the President has requested for development assistance in this year's United States program. Eighty million dollars is only slightly more than half of the amount that we are asked to contribute to our own Technical Cooperation program. Yet, by investing this relatively small amount we would find it trebled through the contributions of other members of the United Nations, and we would not need to replenish it in the same or larger amounts each year, as we do with our unilateral development funds.

I realize that it is often argued that United Nations programs do not redound to our credit, as our own assistance projects are supposed to do. Of course, many Americans argue that we receive no gratitude whatsoever from our aid programs, and, though I disagree with this idea, I do believe that the credit which we receive for our projects is less than many taxpayers would like to think. Yet, granting that we do make some friends abroad from economic and technical assistance, it is time for us to reorient our thinking on this subject and drop the purely cold-war approach to foreign aid. Whether we like it or not, the Soviet Union has entered the foreign aid business and we cannot hope to keep them out by underselling or trading on our past generosities. Instead, it is time for us to adopt an attitude of long-range self-interest, which in short-range will be humanitarian and unselfish. We should face up to the fact that the economic development of the less advanced nations of the world will be to the greater economic advantage of all trading countries, and particularly our own; and we can no longer hope unilaterally to make this economic advancement possible and win exclusive political advantage thereby.

I ask the committee to consider the wisdom of shifting more of our economic assistance to the multilateral structure of the United Nations. By so doing we challenge the Soviet Union to demonstrate their own professed selfless desire for human betterment by contributing comparable amounts. We also increase the economic value of each dollar we invest, because it will be more than matched by the contributions of other member nations. We will find too that many more projects can be undertaken effectively under U. N. auspices than our own, because many nations, for political reasons, are more willing to have multilateral rather than United States sponsored projects undertaken within their frontiers. Also, U. N. programs often find personnel to draw upon who are more qualified in languages and tropical experience than are our own. If we are truly interested in our long-range objective of a more prosperous world trade, then the above considerations are of great importance.

Gradually some of our far-seeing leaders in both private and governmental positions are beginning to expound this insight. Willard Thorp, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of SUNFED more than a year ago. The present Assistant Secretary for United Nation Affairs, Francis Wilcox, in a speech last January to the National Press Club, spoke in favor of SUNFED and expressed the hope that "ways and means will be found for the United States to participate constructively in such a fund." More recently, our Ambassador to the United Nations, John Cabot Lodge, has stated, as reported by the Washington Post of April 30, 1956, that the present world situation requires the United States to channel a larger share of its foreign aid through the U. N. The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs, issued on May 7, 1956, states in cautious bipartisan language that an increase in the absolute amount of United States contribution to the U. N. programs "might be justified," provided other nations increase their amounts.

An increasing number of private individuals and organizations have also spoken out in favor of more aid through the United Nations and more concentration upon the humane rather than the cold war aspect of economic assistance. Chester Bowles made a strong plea for our joining SUNFED in a speech to the Cleveland Council of World Affairs on April 18, 1956. Adlai Stevenson has spoken in a similar vein. Victor Reuther of the United Auto Workers and Jacob Potofsky, vice president of the AFL-CIO have also supported SUNFED, for many years. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt is prominent among the members of a new committee to support an expanded foreign-aid program, which strongly urges Congress to support SUNFED with an appropriation this year.

Mr. Chairman, it becomes apparent to me that our situation requires and public opinion is beginning to support a new concept of foreign aid which will give greater emphasis to multilateral programs and fundamental development, along with piecemeal projects. It would be an act of true statesmanship for this Committee to consider now including the long-awaited United States contribution to SUNFED as a part of this mutual security program. Such a step would redound to the benefit of our national interests and would win for this committee the utmost credit for imaginative response to the changing international situation which confronts us.

Why Shipping Association Opposes H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the experience of history in the way of accidents and development of inventions for greater safety has established a set of standard procedures and requirements in order to minimize the hazard to loss of life.

So that a ship, for example, regardless of what nation's flag it flies, may respond to a distress signal or hurricane warning, an international code as contracted with the individual nation's own signals is used. Thus, each nation's ships do not limit communication and response to its own vessels. Instead, under international agreement with uniform standards a common signal is used with an automatic alarm which is the same on all ships at sea.

Presently, under the provisions of H. R. 4090, which was given a rule for House debate and is expected to come to the floor of the House next week, a new device is proposed. This bill would require installation on cargo vessels, not passenger ships, of an automatic radio call selector device which would not come under international agreement or procedures or accepted universal criteria for safety and distress at sea.

The Pacific American Steamship Association covers, point by point, their objections to this legislation. For the information of Members, I include the association's letter which supports my conviction that H. R. 4090 should be defeated.

The letter is as follows:

PACIFIC AMERICAN
STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., May 11, 1956.

To Members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Members of Congress from Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934: AMEND COMPULSORY RADIO CALL SELECTOR ON UNITED STATES SHIPS, H. R. 4090, 84TH CONGRESS

GENTLEMEN: The above legislation has been granted a 1-hour open rule by the Rules Committee and may come up on the floor at any time, possibly next week. It would require compulsory installation of a radio alarm device on United States cargo ships. The bill was voted out of the committee by a slim margin last year and a strong minority report has been filed in opposition. Mr. MCCORMACK is the author of the bill.

The steamship industry is alert to the ned for better safety conditions at sea, but is unalterably opposed to this legislation which lays claim to improved safety, but which would accomplish no such thing. As spokesman for the Pacific coast ship operators, I would appreciate your negative

vote when it comes up. We base our position on the following considerations:

1. The bill would make it mandatory to install on United States cargo ships an as yet undeveloped call-alarm device, which duplicates an existing device in use for 30 years. It would not affect passenger vessels.

2. If the device is not installed and the bill passed, United States-flag cargo ships would be required to hire another radio operator in lieu of installation. This would mean doubling the present radio-operator complement on United States cargo ships at a cost of $12,000 per year.

3. The Communications Act already amply provides for testing new safety devices, yet this bill by-passes this procedure and seeks congressional compulsion. If every manufacturer did this, it would create chaos in Congress.

4. The patent rights to the call selector described in the bill are held by a Brooklyn firm which makes fuse boxes, and which is not prominent in the marine field. They have made only one pilot model of the device, and FCC tests, ordered by the author of the legislation, showed major defects in the model and an extraordinary number of false alarms.

5. FCC opposes the legislation as making no significant contribution to safety at sea, and because the device duplicates existing compulsory equipment.

6. The Coast Guard, custodian of safety at sea, is not in favor of this legislation.

7. The Commerce Department is opposed to the legislation as unnecessary and premature.

8. The manufacturer, the Brelco Electric Co., in the late 1940's sold a few simplified models of its device to the Government and to 1 or 2 ship lines. But it is not now in use by private ship lines because it is inadequate and ineffective. None has been bought for a number of years.

9. Other safety devices, such as radar, have had to meet the test of actual use before they are compulsory. Even now, radar is not compulsory yet is universally used as a safety device. The call selector should meet the same test of usefulness and acceptability before becoming mandatory.

10. United States ships only would be required to install the device. In certain respects, the device in question is contrary to international regulation. Any maritime safety device must be coordinated internationally to be effectual.

11. A recent disaster occurred to a ship which had an early model of the Brelco device aboard.

12. Even if the device were installed aboard, it probably would necessitate hiring another radioman just to answer the numerous routine, nonurgent, and false alarms that would ring throughout the off-duty hours. Heavy overtime charges would be an inevitable result. One radio-operator's union supports this legislaiton. Other seamen unions have not supported it, though they are no less interested in safety at sea.

13. Genuine distress calls at sea can now be received by all ships in the vicinity at any hour, automatically, by the actuating of an alarm. But if alarms ring frequently for nonurgent messages like the proverbial man who cried "Wolf", an operator could become callous to answering alarms.

If the bill should pass, it is a safe prediction that a rash of private-interest schemes of this kind will seek congressional blessing in the future. In the interest of orderly procedure and in fairness to the industry which must pay the bill for unnecessary equipment, we hope this legislation will be defeated.

Very truly yours,

R. E. MAYER, *President.*

The Communists Are on the Move With Aid, Trade, Goodwill Missions, Student Exchanges, Athletes, and Neutrality Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in an historic speech in Seattle, Wash., on February 14, 1956, Adlai E. Stevenson said:

We have been spending $40 billion a year for peace and security—and there is none. There isn't even preponderant power in the new weapons any longer, as we are now learning from escaping facts * * * the cold war has entered a new phase. The Communists are on the move again, with aid, trade, arms, goodwill missions, technical missions, student exchanges, athletes, and neutrality propaganda—while people in high places in our Government shout "No help to neutrals—you got to be for us or against us."

At an AFL-CIO luncheon in Los Angeles on May 10, Governor Stevenson reminded us of some campaign promises. He said:

The Republicans rode into Washington on a bandwagon 4 years ago crying loudly their promise: "Time for a change." And everything they changed—they changed for the worse.

They changed our foreign behavior—and we've lost nearly every friend we had in the world, while the Russians are gaining ground daily.

They changed our tax structure—they cut taxes for the benefit of the corporations, not the ordinary man.

They changed the character of the President's Cabinet—now they are all alike. In fact, there are three graduates of General Motors but not a single representative of the 18 million members of organized labor.

They stopped developing our natural resources for the good of all the people and began giving them away to a favored few.

They ended rent controls and slowed down on public housing.

They cut price supports—and you know what's happened to the farmers?

They packed the National Labor Relations Board with management men. And despite all their promises, they did not change one word of the Taft-Hartley Act. And I think it's past time to get rid of the union-busting provisions.

Now, of course, there are some Democratic programs for the people that the Republicans didn't change. And it's a good thing they didn't for only social security, unemployment compensation, and our other Democratic defenses against depression cushioned the shock of the 1954 recession.

We wouldn't have had them if the Republican managers had done what they really wanted to do. But they knew they didn't dare "sweep away the last vestige of the New Deal," as one of their orators proposed in 1952. So what they've done is conduct a holding operation—holding still. It reminds me of the excited girl who said: "Don't do something; stand there."

They have talked loud and often about a Federal health program—but they've done nothing about it.

They have talked and talked about Federal aid to education—but it took 3 years to recommend anything but a conference.

They have talked about building highways—but it's only because a Democratic Congress has grabbed the ball there's any prospect of getting anything done.

They have talked in public about extending social security—but the administration recently came out flatly against lowering the retirement age of women to 62 years and paying benefits to workers who are disabled at 50. In short, an administration which has granted billions of dollars in tax benefits to large corporations would deny disability benefits to a man who has worked all his life, paid his social-security tax, and then, at 50 years of age, while he still has a family to support, becomes totally disabled and unable to work. It is time these provisions were adopted.

The administration has changed something else in Washington. It has stopped telling the people the truth and instead is misleading them.

Recently President Eisenhower indicated that we are winning the cold war—at the very same time that the newspaper editors of the Nation said we're losing it.

They prate of peace—and boast of the brink of war we've visited.

They boast of our strength—and are contradicted by the generals.

They say all is well, and just then Ceylon joins the Neutralists.

They say we have the initiative and just then the Russians challenge us to economic and political competition for the underdeveloped, uncommitted peoples.

They talk about our position in the world as if our stock were not at an all-time low.

Now, all this is irresponsible.

We are facing the strongest and most skillful foes we have ever had to contend with, and enormous tasks must be borne if we are to win.

Our former Ambassador to Russia, George F. Kennan, who knows the foe as do few men in our country, had some important things to say at a symposium sponsored by the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art a year ago. I include this brilliant speech, by one of my constituents of whom I am very proud for the information of my colleagues:

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE IN THE ARTS

(Address by the Honorable George F. Kennan at a symposium sponsored by the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art, May 12, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, members of the International Council, friends and guests of the Museum of Modern Arts, all that I can offer to the discussion this evening consists of a few reflections based on about a quarter century of experience in the profession of diplomacy, which bears a somewhat peripheral but always friendly and, I think, sympathetic relation to the arts. I have the feeling that what I am about to say will seem to many of you to fall into the realm of the commonplace and really ought to be said to the audience that is not here rather than to the audience that is. But they are my thoughts, and if they seem to you to be commonplace, I can only say and hope that it will at least be interesting to know that what you believe in also commends itself to those who are long immersed in foreign service work.

The first thought to occur to me in this connection is one that may surprise some of you, coming from a person who is commonly supposed to be preoccupied exclusively with the international connotations

of all phenomena; but it represents a very deep conviction, and I give it to you for what it's worth. It is the belief that however great the importance of international cultural exchange from the standpoint of our relations with other countries, this is not the main reason why we Americans have need for cultural contacts with other peoples at this time. The main reason lies rather in our own need as Americans for just this sort of enrichment of our national spirit.

I am persuaded that any really creative development in the field of art or of literature is intimately connected with international contact and is, in fact, unthinkable without it. To test the proof of that proposition, I think you have only to glance at the roots of our own American culture and see how varied they are, and from how many types of soil, both in time and in space, they spring. No such culture could ever have developed in isolation, and, what is more important for us today, I am sure that no such culture can continue to retain its spiritual vigor if it is kept in isolation.

Now there are people, I am afraid, who think that cultural activity, once it is part of the tradition of a nation and once the educational facilities are there, is something that just proceeds by itself and would go on even though the respective country were entirely walled off from contact with the outside world. I am persuaded that there could be no more shallow nor dangerous assumption than this. When water is taken out of this great stream of international thought and inspiration and channeled into a closed national backwater—I have seen this happen to some extent in the Soviet Union—it quickly becomes stagnant and sterile. This is, of course, because creativeness is so intimately associated with divergence and contradictions. It is only in the reconciling of contrary phenomena that new perceptions arise as new form is created. There cannot be any progress of the spirit without trial; and trial, as Milton once observed, is by what is contrary.

It is particularly important for us Americans to be conscious of this, because in this respect great continental countries like our own are in a particular danger. In the smaller countries (I am thinking here especially of the small maritime countries of Europe), association with other people is something that you can hardly avoid. Travel becomes absolutely necessary, a knowledge of foreign languages likewise. The use of foreign educational and cultural media is common and known to practically everyone. But in the great interior spaces of our country—and, incidentally, this same thing applies to Russia—conditions are different. Here people can lead their lives with scarcely a single confrontation with that which is foreign or different.

The tendency of our own mass media today, involuntary perhaps but none the less compelling, is to eradicate even those divergencies in cultural stimuli and outlook that might otherwise spring from the real variety of tradition and psychology which we have inherited from the past of our own country. These media, as I don't need to point out to you, are centralized today and are becoming more so. Their product is increasingly standardized. They are aimed at passive amusement rather than at creative challenge. They are adjusted to mass needs rather than to the needs of that minority of people (and I think it always must be a minority) who are capable of participating in creative artistic effort and of leading other people to new levels of appreciation and expression.

I think this is a matter of great seriousness for us. I recently completed a trip across the country and back. I come from the Middle West, and I always look at it and the whole interior of this country with particular curiosity. I have no question as to the immense potential creative resources of our people in the world of the spirit. But I cannot help questioning whether those resources are likely to find anything resembling a normal degree of development and expression today, unless we can see some way or other of breaking through, as an educational experience, the monotony, and what I might almost call the narcotic effect of the modern commercial cultural product, and finding types of stimuli that are more kindly to the development of the creative spirit. In such a country as ours, faced with these facts of geography and of modern technology, the impact of foreign cultural values is needed just as rain is by the desert. And needed—I would like to reiterate this—for our sakes alone, for our development as individuals and as a nation, lest we fall into complacency, sterility, and emotional decay; lest we lose our sense of the capabilities of the human spirit, and with it much of our sensitivity to the possible meaning and wonder of life itself. For this reason I would be prepared to say, Let us by all means have the maximum cultural exchange, even if America had before it no problem whatsoever of outside opinion; even if we had no need of any sort for other people, and all that was concerned was our own development here at home.

Actually, of course, we have at this time the greatest and most urgent need to correct a number of impressions that the outside world entertains of us, impressions that are beginning to affect our international position in very important ways. I think we are gradually becoming aware for the first time of the frightening extent to which negative conceptions about us prevail to one degree or another abroad; but many of us still do not realize how largely these negative feelings are related to cultural rather than to political conditions. Here I, whose training has been in the political field, would say that I believe that many of the feelings about us which other people would think are political have their origins in the impression that we are a nation of vulgar, materialistic nouveaux riches, lacking in manners and in sensitivity, interested only in making money, contemptuous of every refinement of esthetic feeling. Now, it is true that this impression is in part deliberately fostered by others who wish us no good and would like to make us hated. It is also true that in some parts of the world, and particularly, I think, in Western Europe, these feelings are due to the fact that we have become identified in the minds of people with things and impulses of the modern age, which they hate in themselves—such things as modern technology, standardization, and mass culture, which they themselves are rapidly acquiring. And while they abuse us, they follow helplessly in what they believe to be our own path. But there is certainly a large area, and probably the predominant one, in which the prevalence of these negative feelings is the result of our own carelessness and neglect, our own failure to take any adequate measures to see that the impression we create abroad actually does reflect the real values of our civilization.

It seems to me that by and large until quite recently we have been content to leave the external projection of our cultural life almost exclusively to the blind workings of commercial interests, with results that from time to time, I can testify from personal experience, were absolutely frightening. This, of course, really has been the result of our failure to realize what the life of the spirit means to people abroad. I can think of few countries in the world where the artist, the writer, the composer, or the thinker is held in such general low esteem as he is here in our country. To the people in many other countries, for whom the prospects for material development are not so favorable as they are here, and who have never been taught to see personal relationships, and particularly the relationship between the sexes, as having the same sort of romantic glorification that distinguishes our folklore and literature—to many of these people, cultural life appears as the highest and the most hopeful form of human activity. And these people are apt to measure other civilizations by the degree to which they are considerate of cultural values and cause cultural activities to flourish within their confines.

Beyond this, of course, this world of art and the spirit has a symbolic value in international life which has been the subject of an appalling number of clichés, but is no less significant on that account. It is a fact that in the creation of beauty and in the great monumental works of the intellect, and there alone, human beings have been able to find an unfailing bridge between nations, even in the darkest moments of political bitterness and chauvinism and exclusiveness. In many years of living in totalitarian countries, both Germany and Russia, I have been struck time and time again by the fact that where every other manifestation of human life has been given some sort of a political coloration and planed, so to speak, for the political process, artistic creation, and the higher forms of scholarly thought have remained the only areas in which it was conceded, even by the totalitarians, that men of different political faith and allegiances might conceivably find a bond. Even at the blackest moments of the cultural isolation forced on the Soviet Union by Stalin—and those moments were black indeed—never was the principle really challenged that there were cultural values, universal in their meaning and their appeal, in the appreciation of which all men, regardless of class or social allegiance, could meet and find a common subject of understanding. Not even the crushing extent to which the Soviet regime tried to force the Soviet intelligentsia into the service of its own political purposes could obviate this underlying reality. In fact, subconsciously it was in a gesture of profound respect and, in a way, humility that the Soviet leaders were forced to come to the artists, to cultivate their favor and to seek their assistance in the propaganda activities of the party, knowing that these intellectuals enjoyed a form of confidence in the minds of men elsewhere which no political ideology could ever rival, and that they were capable of bestowing upon the regime a certain pattern of approval and legitimacy that nothing else could bestow. In this long, tortuous contest between the Soviet leaders and the cultural world of the people under their rule, a contest that has gone on now for some three decades, for all the terror and all the brutality, it has really been the politicians who were the supplicants, and the people who wield the pen and brush whose influence was courted. The totalitarians recognized that only if they appeared outwardly to enjoy the confidence and enthusiasm of the artists could they plausibly claim to have created a hopeful and creditable civilization. And I find it sad to think that they should have come to this appreciation so much sooner than many of our own people.

It is for these reasons that I personally attach such high importance to cultural contact as a means of combating the negative impressions about this country that mark so much of world opinion. What we have to do, of course, is to show the outside world both that we have a cultural life and that we care something about it—that we care enough about it, in fact, to give it encouragement and support here at home, and to see that it is enriched by acquaintance with similar activity elsewhere. If these impressions could only be conveyed with enough force and success to countries beyond our borders, I for my part would willingly trade the entire remaining inventory of po-

litical propaganda for the results that could be achieved by such means alone.

There are two reservations that I would like to voice about that proposition. One is concerned with what we give to others, the other is concerned with what we take from them. The first is this: We must not make the mistake of thinking that any sort of cultural product will do for interchange, as long as it is American, and that the content of our contribution is a matter of secondary importance. Of course, we can't be perfect in the arts; our things are always going to have deficiencies. A great deal is also going to depend on the modesty, naturalness, and humility with which we bring these things to other people. But we can be selective. There are a great many Americans who don't understand this. Fortunately, I think, not many of them are concerned with matters of international cultural interchange, though many of them are concerned with governmental affairs and with diplomacy. There are many who feel that we are such an interesting and glamorous people that any and all manifestations of American culture ought ipso facto to be welcome and helpful anywhere. I have seen American ambassadors, for example, in more than one instance exhibit one silly and inferior American film after the other to invited foreign audiences, in the happy confidence that no product of Hollywood could fail to be impressive and enjoyable to the foreign observer. So when we deliberately enter into this sort of exchange, let us by all means see to it that what we send is the best we can muster, and that it is something that is comprehensible and acceptable elsewhere. Above all, let us not make the common American mistake, so characteristic of the commercial media, of thinking that contributions of weak artistic talent or content are going to be accepable if only they are packaged in pretentious and elaborate frameworks of technical execution.

My second reservation relates, as I said, to what we take from others. It concerns quite simply, our graciousness as a host to foreign cultural activities in this country. It is not enough to let other people send things here and come here themselves. It is, of course, important to see that any cultural activity sponsored by foreigners that takes place within our borders is surrounded at all times with an atmosphere of hospitality and warmth, friendliness, and perceptive sympathy. Now, artists are peculiar people, sensitive people. They move unceasingly in a sort of painful half-world between the feeling of the artist and the level of public taste and appreciation. I think they can take a great deal of criticism, as long as they feel that it is honest and disinterested, but what they cannot stand is disrespect for their art itself, and they have not quite the same tolerance that most of the rest of us have for minor frustrations and tactlessness, stupidity, and bureaucracy.

Here, of course, is where our Government could be of help. Perhaps these words will reach it. The experience of foreign artists with American hospitality begins when they first come into contact with American officials abroad with regard to their visas. It is only too evident that this experience today is rarely a happy one, and I would like to raise the question once more whether this is really necessary, whether it is really beyond the resources of a great nation like ourselves to make arrangements whereby such visitors and others, too, would be given their visas in a relatively relaxed and civilized way. I would raise the question whether we have no alternative but to fingerprint them like common criminals. Let's remember that what was offensive to the Soviet student editors (and I think needlessly and undesirably so) is no less offensive to visitors from those countries with which we have long been associated by bonds of friendship. And, of course, these things are only symbolic of the treatment at all stages of their contact with this country. We have already created a situation, or we have had a situation in recent years (I hope it is passing now), in which the holding of scientific and cultural gatherings in this country has been so difficult that many well-meaning people quail at the thought of initiating them and refrain from doing so if they can. It is absolutely essential, to my mind, that we correct these conditions, that we learn as a nation to make distinguished foreign artists feel, whatever their origin or whatever the merits of their art, that they have come to a country where cultural values are respected for their own sake, where the obligations of hospitality are inviolable, and where they are surrounded at all times by appreciation and tact and good will.

While we are on these unhappy problems of security, let me mention one more thing. In recent years, it seems to me, there has grown up among us a most reprehensible habit, a totalitarian habit in fact, of judging the suitability of cultural contributions by whatever political coloration we conceive their creators to have acquired. I know of nothing sillier than this. A painting is not more or less valuable because the artist once belonged to this or that party or contributed to this or that group. The value of a symphony concert seems to me to be quite unaffected by the nature of the political regime under which the conductor may once have plied his trade. If we are going to encourage any form of artistic expression, for goodness' sake, let's do precisely that, and let's look, like mature people, to the content of what we are promoting and not to irrelvant personal attributes of those who participate. After all, cultural events are not political livestock exhibits in which we put forward human figures to be admired for the purity of their ideological features. And no matter how overwhelmingly important or significant those things may seem to some of us, they are not going to seem either interesting or pertinent to peoples abroad. To the extent that we let this sort of childishness enter into our approach to international cultural exchanges, to that extent it seems to me we are going to weaken rather than strengthen the effect of what we do.

All this is admittedly going to require something in the nature of a revolution in the attitude of many of us toward cultural activity generally as well as toward our obligations here in the international field—and that is not going to be easy. A country which is an indifferent home to its own cultural life, a country which, for example, can spend millions annually on horse racing or on the slot machines but cannot have an opera house in its own national capital, has a good distance to go, and I think there is no use deceiving ourselves about it. But we can at least begin with the realization that the realm of the spirit has a far higher rating outside of our borders than we have been accustomed to giving it at home; that a larger part of the hopes and enthusiasms of mankind are oriented to this realm than most of us have been inclined to believe; and that we are not going to make our way as we would like to make it, or find that pathway we seek to the feelings and understanding of other people, unless we learn to share something of this appreciation and this hope in the capacity of the human being to create beauty and to reach the higher and more subtle forms of apprehension of this life.

If we can learn to do this, if we can come to attach to this whole field of human endeavor a respect and a significance comparable to what is given to it abroad, then I think we will have come a great step on the way to the improvement of our international situation generally. But, as I said at the outset of this discussion, if we do that, it will not be in our external relations nor in what we mean to other people that our gain will be the greatest. These things will be important, to be sure. But our most important gain will be the gain for our own sakes, the gain in what we mean to ourselves—and in what, I suspect, life means to all of us.

Congressman Hillings Supports Old-Age Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the 5½ years that I have had the honor to serve as the Representative in Congress from California's 25th District, I have been deeply concerned with some of the problems faced by our senior citizens. I believe it worth while to discuss some of these problems at this time because they actually affect every citizen, regardless of age. If we are not senior citizens ourselves, many of us have friends or relatives in that category.

Here are some of the highlights of old-age benefits which I have supported in recent years:

First. Social-security benefits increased: Increased social-security benefits in the form of higher payments to retired persons; extension of benefits to 10 million additional workers; allow beneficiaries of social security to earn more money on occasional jobs without loss of benefits; and more generous benefits to disabled persons.

Second. Value of retirement money protected: Inflation has been checked so that retirement benefits from social security and other sources retain their value. Since 1953, the purchasing power of the dollar has remained stable.

Third. Tax laws eased: Tax laws have been liberalized to give more credit for retirement income; medical deductions have been generously increasd; single persons supporting their parents receive more favorable tax treatment; and Federal income taxes in general have been reduced so that more money is left for our own uses.

Fourth. Job opportunities: I am pleased to support the action of the Department of Labor which has put into action a program to develop more job opportunities for older workers and demonstrate to employers the best methods of hiring and retaining senior citizens on the job. Because a person is advanced in years is no reason why he should be denied employment opportunities. I favor action to prevent job discrimination on account of a person's age.

Fifth. Active medical programs: Research and services in the fields of chronic disease have been greatly intenified. Since 1953, the Congress has almost doubled appropriations for medical research, much of which has been conducted by the National Institutes of Health. During 1955, the Institutes were supporting or conducting at least 170 research projects related to aging. Congress has also provided money for

Federal-State hospital construction and vocational rehabilitation.

Sixth. Federal Council on Aging: The Federal Government has established a Federal Council on Aging made up of representatives from 12 Government agencies to render assistance to older people, recognizing the fact that such individuals have led useful lives and have contributed so much to the development of our country.

The task ahead: Mr. Speaker, we in Government must do everything possible to assure continuance of sound programs designed to assist the Nation's senior citizens. They are not seeking charity or handouts, but opportunities to live out their lives in peace and comfort. We must acknoweldge a great debt for their productive efforts during their working years. The country's older people are the fathers and mothers who have raised us and indoctrinated us with a heritage which has made America unique among all the other nations of the world.

Adequate Air Service for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to include a resolution relative to the New York-Florida proceeding, Docket No. 3051, pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board, adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives on April 25, 1956.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO RESCIND ITS DECISION AND RECOMMEND THAT NORTHEAST AIRLINES BE GRANTED PERMISSION TO FURNISH AIR SERVICE BETWEEN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES AND THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has under consideration in the New York-Florida proceeding now before it (Docket No. 3051 et al.) applications of various air carriers for authority to furnish air transportation service along the Atlantic seaboard; and

Whereas Northeast Airlines is an air carrier having its headquarters and principal place of business in Boston, serves many important cities and towns in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England, and is an applicant for authority to render air service between New England and Florida; and

Whereas an examiner of the board has recently handed down a proposed report in which he has recommended that Northeast's application in said proceeding be denied; and

Whereas exceptions to the examiner's report have been filed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in which exception has been taken to the failure of the examiner to recommend extension of Northeast to Florida, and in which it has been pointed out that extension of Northeast to Florida will provide far more first single-carrier service than proposed in any other application consolidated in the proceeding; and

Whereas Northeast Airlines, Inc., alone proposes a service which will connect the major cities and towns of New England with Florida, a service much needed by the public; and

Whereas Northeast must have access to long-haul traffic to the South if it is to have the financial strength needed for effective regional service within New England: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives of the general court commends, as in the public interest, the exceptions to the examiner's proposed report filed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with the Civil Aeronautics Board in the New York-Florida proceeding and recommends that the attorney general, on behalf of the Commonwealth, continue to seek, on brief and at oral argument before the Board, the granting of Northeast's application so that Northeast may be enabled to render its proposed new and needed one-carrier service between Massachusetts communities and Florida, and so that Northeast may be strengthened and thus enabled to render efficient one-carrier regional service within Massachusetts and between Massachusetts cities and towns and other New England communities.

An Important Opinion by United States District Judge Weinfeld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased indeed to insert herewith an important opinion rendered by United States District Judge Weinfeld:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* T. VINCENT QUINN, MARTIN SCHWAEBER, AND JAMES D. SAVER—NEW YORK, APRIL 25, 1956

(Trial resumed.)

(Jury not present.)

The COURT. Since the court recessed last night, he has carefully gone over his trial notes, considered the briefs which were submitted by counsel, some of them upon the conclusion of the argument, and has also reviewed the law. Because of the pressure under which the court has worked since adjournment there has not been full opportunity other than to prepare certain notes. Under the circumstances, the court reporter is asked not to release the statement by the court until the court has had a chance to edit what he is about to say. However, in any event, the remarks represent the disposition of the court on the motions which were made at the close of the Government's case in chief.

The defendants move for a judgment of acquittal at the close of the Government's case of the various counts contained in two separate indictments which have been consolidated and tried together. The motion is made pursuant to rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure on the ground the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction of offenses charged.

The indictment charges the defendant Quinn, who was a Member of Congress from January 1, 1949, to December 31, 1951, as a principal with violation of section 281 of title 18, and also charges the defendants Schwaeber and Saver, who were his partners in the practice of law at various times, with aiding and abetting in the commission of the offense. Section 281 in substance makes it illegal for a Member of Congress to receive or agree to receive compensation for services rendered or to be rendered in any matter before a Federal department or bureau in which the Government is interested, whether he personally or another performs the services.

In this case the charge is the receipt of compensation. The broad objective of the act is to secure the integrity of executive action against undue influence of Members of Congress upon executive officers and to insure efficiency in the conduct of public affairs. It was felt that the absence of pecuniary gain to Members of Congress would reduce or eliminate any undue influence upon executive officers or employees in those matters where they appeared before such executive officials.[1]

The issue presented in this case is novel, as Government counsel concede, in that it is the first prosecution under that statute where admittedly the defendant Quinn as a member of Congress did not personally appear nor render services before the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau involved, on behalf of any taxpayer or in any proceeding, with but one single exception, to which I shall make reference. All the services before the Bureau were rendered by either Quinn's law partners, codefendants Schwaeber or Saver, or associates of the firm. It is acknowledged that none of the clients have retained him, met him or in general that he had any contact with them. However, this circumstance in and of itself is no bar to a prosecution, providing that the Government establishes prima facie the essential elements of the offense sufficient to send the case to the jury.

Section 281 of title 18 of the United States Code, insofar as applicable, provides:

"Whoever, being a Member of * * * Congress * * *directly or indirectly receives or agrees to receive, any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest or other matter in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, agency, court martial, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and shall be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States."

Count 1 of the indictment charges as follows:

"Commencing on or about the 1st day of January 1949, and continuing thereafter until about the 31st day of December 1951, and at the several times of committing the offenses hereafter set forth in this indictment, T. Vincent Quinn was a member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, being representative of the Fifth Congressional District of New York, and also, at the several times of committing the offenses hereafter set forth in this indictment, was engaged as equal copartner in the practice of law in partnerships with Martin Schwaeber and James D. Saver, at times using the law firm name of Schwaeber, Quinn & Saver, and at other times using the law firm name of Quinn & Saver, but at all times herein maintaining a bank account at the Bank of Manhattan Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., in the name of Schwaeber, Quinn, and Saver, and after March 12, 1951, maintaining a bank account at the Chase National Bank, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., in the name of Quinn & Saver.

"(2) During the period of time from about January 1950 until about December 1951, there was under investigation and consideration by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department a certain matter consisting of a controversy, charge, accusation, and proceeding relating to income taxes due and payable on the income of Daniel D. Zell and Sophie B. Zell,

[1] *Burton* v. *United States* (202 U. S. 344).

for the year 1945, to which matter the United States was a party and in which it was directly and indirectly interested.

"(3) At New York, N. Y., in the southern district of New York, and on or about July 12, 1950, T. Vincent Quinn, herein named a defendant, being duly elected a Member of Congress and after his election and during his continuance in office, acting jointly and in concert with James D. Saver, also herein named a defendant, said defendant James D. Saver aiding, abetting, counseling, inducing, and procuring said defendant T. Vincent Quinn so to act, unlawfully did receive, directly and indirectly from Sophie B. Zell, compensation for services rendered and to be rendered by him, the said T. Vincent Quinn, and others, to wit, members of the law firm of Quinn & Saver and employees and associates of said law firm, in relation to the aforesaid matter, in which the United States was a party and was directly and indirectly interested, before the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department, said defendants well knowing that the United States was a party to said matter and was directly and indirectly interested therein, to wit, compensation in the sum of $7,500 by means of a certain check (and then the check is described) to the order of James D. Saver, which check was endorsed by said James D. Saver for deposit to the account of Schwaeber, Quinn & Saver and was deposited on or about July 11, 1950, by the said T. Vincent Quinn and James D. Saver in said law firm account of Schwaeber, Quinn & Saver, in the bank of the Manhattan Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and on or about July 12, 1950, final payment of said check in the sum of $7,500 was received by said T. Vincent Quinn and James D. Saver from the Chase National Bank at New York, N. Y., in the southern judicial district of New York and within the jurisdiction of this court, from the funds of said Sophie B. Zell, there and then on deposit, said compensation being received in return for services rendered and to be rendered by members of the law firm of Quinn & Saver, and associates and employees of said law firm, said services consisting of obtaining information pertaining to said income tax matter from officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department, and other officers and employees of the United States, as well as interceding and conferring with said officers and employees, presenting arguments, assertions, and allegations, and otherwise acting on behalf of Daniel D. Zell and Sophie B. Zell, to influence and persuade the aforesaid officers and employees in order to obtain favorable decisions and actions in and upon such controversy, charge, accusation, and proceeding."

This first count of the second indictment is the only one in which the defendant Schwaeber is not also named as a defendant, as an aider and abettor.

The remaining counts of the indictment are all of similar import, except the alleged violation is charged with respect to different matters and on different dates.

The key problem on this motion is what are the essential elements which the Government must establish and whether there is sufficient evidence from which a reasonable person might conclude that the essential elements have been established.

I hold that under the statute, and the indictment as drawn in this case, the essential elements which the prosecution must establish are:

1. That the defendant Quinn was a Member of Congress at the times referred to in the indictment. It is conceded that he was such a Member of Congress from January 1, 1949, to December 31, 1951.

2. That the defendant Quinn received, directly or indirectly, compensation derived from one or more of the matters specified in the indictment.

3. That the compensation was for services rendered either by him or another, in this case by either or both of the other defendants Schwaeber and Saver, or one of their associates in a matter before the Bureau of Internal Revenue in which the Government was an interested party.

Again it is conceded by the defendants that the Government was an interested party in each of the matters referred to in the indictment and as to which testimony was given upon the trial.

4. That Quinn knowingly accepted the compensation for the services which he knew had been rendered in matters before the Internal Revenue Bureau during the period he was a Member of Congress.

5. That the compensation was received in return for services rendered for the purpose of interceding with, or with the intent to influence and persuade, officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau to obtain favorable decisions and actions in matters pending before the Bureau.

It is not necessary to consider all the elements I have outlined. It readily occurs that a prime—if not the crucial issue—since Quinn never met the clients, was not retained by them and did not personally appear or render any services before the representatives of the Bureau—is whether he received the compensation with knowledge that it was for services rendered by one or more of his partners before the Bureau while he was a Member of Congress.

In other words, was his conduct in receiving the compensation willful—which in this case I hold to mean knowingly, deliberately and intentionally, as distinguished from accidentally or negligently. In my view it is not necessary, as the defendants contend, to find a specific criminal intent—a conscious purpose of wrongdoing, or evil motive—but nonetheless knowledge there must be that Quinn did in fact know that the compensation received by him was for services rendered before the Internal Revenue Bureau and that he also knew that such payment was for services rendered during the period he was a Member of Congress, and, fully aware of these facts, he knowingly, deliberately, and intentionally received such compensation.

Is there any competent evidence on which to go to the jury on this element, or putting it in the language used in this circuit, is there "evidence from which a reasonable person might conclude that the charge in the indictment was proved," so that the jury must decide the issue?

It is admitted that no direct evidence of knowledge such as admissions by the defendant, statements made to others or writings or documentary proof has been offered. It is recognized that this type of proof on the issue of knowledge is unusual. Reliance here is placed upon facts and circumstances from which it is contended that the reasonable inference is warranted that the defendant had actual knowledge.

But in either case, whether proof be direct, or by circumstances or by inference from circumstances, the proof must be of a character as to satisfy beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did in fact have knowledge. It should be pointed out that it is not sufficient to find that as a reasonable person Quinn should have known the facts. What must be determined is whether there is sufficient evidence upon which the jury would be warranted in finding that in fact he had actual knowledge.

That the defendants were partners or that services were rendered by one or the other of the partners or associates does not establish that Quinn knew of the receipt of the fees or that they were derived from services rendered in matters before the Bureau during his incumbency.

While partners may act for one another in civil matters this is not true so far as criminal liability is concerned, which is personal. In criminal cases a partner is not chargeable with acts of his copartners unless he has knowledge.

Let us turn to the evidence upon which the Government urges that a permissible inference of knowledge may be charged to Quinn so as to send the case to the jury.

The partnership of Schwaeber, Quinn & Saver was embarked upon in August 1948 when Quinn had not yet been nominated for Member of Congress. This firm succeeded Schwaeber & Saver. Each partner had a drawing account of $200 per week against profits. Within a short time Quinn was nominated for Member of the House of Representatives and was actively engaged in his campaign from September 1948 until his election early in November, following which he took a vacation until he assumed the duties of his public office on January 1, 1949.

Up to this point he rendered little if any service to his law firm.

Following the assumption of his duties, the Government's evidence establishes that as little as he gave of his time and services to the firm up to December 1948, he devoted even less time thereafter.

He appeared at the firm's office on Fridays in some weeks for about an hour or two, where he then took care of his public functions, such as writing letters for, and seeing, his constituents. In other weeks he was not at the office at all. There is no suggestion—indeed not a scintilla of evidence—that he took any part, direct or indirect, in his firm's work.

The Government proof, in the words of the witness called to establish his activity to show knowledge, "is that he did nothing," and at another point this witness testified: "He performed no services during the period in which he was in Congress."

It would be stating the fact to say that his relationship to his law partnership was that of an absentee partner.

There is no evidence that he ever conferred with other members of the firm as to matters, source of income, or that he was ever advised as to the matters from which fees were derived. A number of these matters antedate his membership in the firm, some by as much as almost 2 years, and in a number of others substantial services were rendered before he became a Member of Congress. In still other cases much of the work was carried on by Schwaeber when he was no longer a member of the firm, commencing in February 1951, and when there was no professional relationship between him and Quinn.

There is no basis upon which to find that Quinn knew or was informed of these services when Schwaeber was no longer his partner.

The Government relies upon the fact that in his individual income tax returns for the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, Quinn listed income from the law firms. But there is no proof of any breakdown to show that the income came from any of the matters pending before the Bureau which are the subject of the indictment, and the fact that the bulk of the firm's business concerned tax matters in so-called intelligence items before the Bureau is not sufficient, absent other proof, to bring home knowledge to him as to the source of compensation and that it was related to matters in which his partners appeared before the Bureau.

The analysis of fees as submitted by Buratt was simply a tabulation constructed from the entries in the checkbook and was a crediting of fees in particular matters, as they should have been credited for distribution according to the partnership arrangement, but made long after the event.

So far as this record goes, fees were entered in the stub of the checkbook which was used to arrive at the profit and loss statement. Nothing has been presented to warrant the inference that the defendant Quinn, who rarely put in a visit at the firm's offices,

ever saw the checkbook, which, incidentally, listed the name of the client from whom the fee was received without specifying the matter. Indeed, there is direct testimony offered by the Government that the books and work papers were never shown to Quinn.

Finally, the evidence is uncontroverted that for a period of 6 months, from April to September 1950, when some of the services in one or more of the matters were rendered, or, I believe, some of the fees were paid, Quinn was completely removed from any form of activity, congressional or otherwise, due to a severe heart attack.

The Government suggests that in 1 matter out of the 14 specified in the indictment, Quinn telephoned an Internal Revenue agent. In this matter Quinn had appeared before the Department of Justice in 1948, prior to his election as a Congressman. It had been pending since 1947, before he was a member of the law firm. In October 1948, before his election, the Department of Justice, to which the matter had been referred by the Internal Revenue Bureau, declined prosecution.

In January 1949, Quinn inquired of the regional counsel of the status and made similar inquiries on 2 occasions, 1 in February and the other in March. These calls were solely, as the witness readily acknowledged, to inquire of the status of the matter; the merits of the case were not discussed.

I cannot agree with the Government contention that this was the rendition of services of the nature contemplated under the statute. The only other alleged services claimed in this particular matter are telephone calls to the defendant Schwaeber by another agent of the Bureau assigned to make a supplemental investigation, who requested Schwaeber to supply documentation of the taxpayer's contention raised before the Department of Justice to which Schwaeber's sole response was a letter that he had nothing to add to the case.

In this instance there was no proof that the services were rendered within the contemplation of the statute before the Bureau either by Quinn or his partner, but, more important, there is no proof that he knew of the payment of the fee which occurred in January 1950, and which, as all fees, went into the common fund.

So much on the issue of knowledge.

Finally, there is not a scintilla of evidence to support the allegation of the indictment that the compensation was for services, which also included interceding with officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and "otherwise acting * * * to influence and persuade (them) in order to obtain favorable decisions and actions." There was no proof of any attempt by Quinn, directly or indirectly, or by his partners in any single respect, to support the allegation of interceding and influencing the judgment of the officers of the Bureau.

The Government concedes as much but contends this is not an element of the offense. However, it has made that very specific charge in the indictment in this case and so it is unnecessary to consider in the abstract whether, absent such allegation, an element of the offense is a purpose to intercede and to influence. The leading case of *Burton* v. *United States*,[1] as well as others, touch upon this as an element of the offense. It should be pointed out that although Count 7 in the Burton case which charged the receipt of compensation did not contain an allegation of a purpose to influence (as distinguished from Count 6 which charged an agreement to receive compensation and a specific purpose of influence), nonetheless the Supreme Court quoted with approval the judge's charge[2] under Count 7 which required the jury to find influence as an element.

In sum, the Government has failed in its case in chief to submit evidence, either direct or indirect, upon which the essential element of knowledge could be found—this apart from its admitted failure to establish that Quinn, either directly or indirectly, sought to intercede and to influence Internal Revenue officers in order to obtain favorable decisions and actions.

I hold there is no basis upon which a jury could reasonably, upon the evidence presented, draw an inference to establish beyond a reasonable doubt, actual knowledge on the part of Quinn.

The rule on a motion for a judgment of acquittal has variously been stated, but generally it is that "if a judge is of opinion that upon the evidence a reasonable mind could not find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, he must not let the jury act, because to do so would be to let it speculate without evidence adequate in law."

To submit this case to the jurors upon the evidence—or rather the lack of evidence—would permit them to engage in speculation and conjecture on the issue of knowledge. Suspicions are not a substitute for evidence.

Accordingly, the motion for a judgment of acquittal is granted.

Since the motion is granted as to Quinn, it follows it must likewise be granted as to Schweber and Saver, the codefendants who are charged with aiding and abetting.

The clerk of the court is requested to bring the jurors in.

(Jury in box.)

The COURT. Members of the jury, I am sure you know when we adjourned last night the court remained in session, and, as I told you when you left, there were certain matters of law with which you had no concern but which were to be presented to the court for argument.

We sat here until almost 6 o'clock last night, and, thereafter, the court—while the hours are not important—was engaged in a consideration of this matter. The defendants had made a motion for a directed verdict of acquittal on the ground there was insufficient evidence to go to the jury to pass upon the guilt of the defendants.

I took this motion under advisement throughout the course of the night, reviewed the evidence and the law that is applicable to the case. Now, generally, as I have just indicated to those who have been in the courtroom, there is a rule of law that "if a judge is of opinion that upon the evidence a reasonable mind could not find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, he must not let the jury act, because to do so would be to let it speculate without evidence adequate in law."

One of the principal issues in this case was whether or not there was sufficient evidence upon which a reasonable mind could draw an inference that the defendant Quinn had actual knowledge that the compensation which the Government claimed he had received came from the specific matters referred to in the indictment. You will note I said "actual knowledge," and, as I commented a few moments ago, it is not a question of whether or not as a reasonable man he should have known, it is a matter of a jury having sufficient evidence to make a determination that he in fact did know.

To make it short, I have concluded that the case is not to be submitted to you, and I have directed a verdict of acquittal of all three defendants.

Before you leave, I want to say this to you: while perhaps you would have wanted to pass upon the case, sitting in close attention as you have, the fact that you were ready to do so is just as important as if in fact you did decide the issues. Each of you was fully aware of what was going on with the case, and it was clear that you followed the testimony with perception.

With that statement I have nothing more to say than that I happen to be one judge of the court—and there are others—who never thanks a jury for their services, just as I never permit anybody to thank the Court for the rendition of a verdict. This is what you and I are called upon to do in the trial of a case. Your reward must come from the knowledge and satisfaction that you performed your task in this case, and were fully prepared to perform your task if called upon.

With that the court discharges you.

---

[1] 202 U. S. 344, 363, 365, 376; see also Record on Appeal.

[2] Judge, later Justice, VanDevanter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Range Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the State of Oregon there are many lumbermen who subscribe wholeheartedly to a comprehensive program of conservation and who practice it at every opportunity. The Pilot Rock Lumber Co. in eastern Oregon is an example of a company which tries to use 100 percent of every tree cut from its forest lands. Someone has said that in its desire to eliminate waste conservation-minded lumbermen will eventually process the shadow of the tree.

How comprehensive the conservation program of a lumber company may be is made evident in the speech Mr. Al Moltke, vice president of the Pilot Rock Lumber Co., delivered to a recent meeting of the American Society of Range Management.

Mr. President, the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., printed the speech in the issue of May 5, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have this reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANGE CONTROL SEEN LUMBERMEN'S JOB

Range management today is part of the responsibilities of all owners and managers of private forest lands. There was a time when a lumberman gave little thought to anything besides how much timber was on the tract when evaluating a purchase. His primary objective was, of course, to cut as many boards as possible from the land. Then, he was through with it. Also, his objective was to make as big a profit from the forest in the shortest possible time and that profit was only represented by timber. Many cut out and got out, made a good profit and that was all there was to it. When that stand was cut, they would get more timber and repeat the process.

In recent years many lumbermen have come to realize that there are no forest frontiers left in America. If they hope to stay in business and, by so doing, support the towns that have grown up around them and have come to depend upon their industry for their existence, then they must stay in one place, get the most productivity from the ground they own and manage. This happens to be the position of the Pilot Rock Lumber Co.

Many lumbermen have now taken a second look at the timber-growing potential of their lands for the first time They have come to realize that timber could be looked upon as a crop, and economically so, like any other crop. As much of the western forest lands could also grow grass—why not get the most from the grass potential of those lands. Several lumbermen operate cattle ranches in connection with their lumber business. However, we at Pilot Rock are staying out of the cattle business and sticking to one headache at a time.

We are earnestly trying to get maximum utilization from every tree we cut. We are also retaining the maximum payroll for lumber processing for our community. Our grass and grazing permittees are watched zealously because we know that being lumbermen we are not supposed to know or care much about our grass. To disprove this theory, we have employed an expert with practical grazing and cattle business know-how. For that job, we selected a successful retired cattleman, who learned through experience that it does not pay to overgraze.

While I can't say how many lumber operators are doing exactly as we are, I believe that today most timber operators of substantial size in the Pacific Northwest have grazing programs integrated into their forest management plans.

We are cutting our timber on a sustained-yield basis, leaving thrifty trees to grow the future crop for the future generation of loggers. In this way, we get the maximum in wood growth from our lands. This is economically feasible in view of the collateral value incorporated in our cutover lands. While consideration has been given to the wood productivity of these lands, up until recently not much thought was given to the grass productivity of the same land. We found that both crops do well together, so we have included grass in our forest management plan.

Our range management starts with seeding our skid trails to a good, locally recommended range grass. We depend upon the Forest Service recommendations to be as near correct as is presently possible in view of the fact that they have a special department set up for range management, and are familiar with our local conditions. Advice on the correct time to seed has also been taken from the Forest Service. In our area, this is considered to be either in late fall before the first snows, or on the first light snow. There is danger in waiting too long, as access to the area may become quite difficult if deep snow comes early. Thus seeding, like burning brush is limited sometimes to a very short period.

We realize that overgrazing is contrary to range conservation, so we have put a large portion of our holdings under the jurisdiction of the ranger station at Dale, Oreg. The ranger treats our lands exactly as he does Forest Service lands. In view of the fact that much of the land is integrated with national forest lands, this system works very well. This range is leased directly to a range associattion and a few private individuals, but the number of cattle they may run on these lands is decided by the ranger in charge. The area just referred to is in the John Day River country and is inside the national forest boundaries served by the Dale ranger station. Approximately 30,000 acres are involved in our private forest lands in this area.

Outside the boundaries of the national forest this cannot be done. We have employed a range manager to handle the grazing on some 60,000 acres that lie outside the forest boundaries. His responsibility is to control size of herds that the various permittees wish to run on our lands. Also, it is up to him to decide range disputes. If a permittee persists on slipping in more cattle than the range will stand, then our range manager has the unpleasant job of canceling his permit.

All of our range leases are so written that if overgrazing is practiced, then the next year's lease will not be renewed. All leases with few exceptions are written for only 1 year with a promise of renewal at our company's option. We have no trouble getting takers on that basis.

In our business, we are using large numbers of forest weed trees for chips. These chips are converted to pulp and eventually fiberboard. Removal of these trees is of value in promoting better sawtimber growth. This also aids in securing better snow compaction and thus creates a better watershed while conducting a sound logging program. Better forest watersheds aid much in controlling streamflow and contribute toward stabilization of our great hydroelectric plants now being built on the great river systems of the Northwest.

I would like to point out here that we believe that it is the duty of all conservation-minded people to protect the watershed value of their lands. It is my firm belief that the future economy of this country can be maintained as it now is, only if we give serious consideration to getting maximum conservation and utilization of the water that falls from the skies on our great forests through rain and snow.

Our forests comprise much of the area in which we live. They are the source of the water supply of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Agriculture is basically fully developed. The lumbering business will have to decline to some extent as soon as all private forests are cut. There is not enough wood growing in the forest of the Northwest to maintain all mills now operating on their present annual cutting basis. Substitutes will have to be found to take the place of wooden boards. These substitutes will be made because of available power from the river. This country's population is mushrooming rapidly. The potential of the river is the only remaining frontier to be claimed by the present and future population of the area. The water from the forest can play and will play an important part in their future standard of living.

As I have tried to point out, the forests have multiple uses. There is one important use yet that I have not mentioned, but it most certainly should be.

The rightful heritage of all red-blooded Americans is the recreation incorporated within these forests. This can also be considered as an important factor in our present economy. Much of our present business is based on equipment and supply needed for recreation. It is the policy of our company to contribute toward this use of our private lands by allowing free use of our logging road system under fair and wise control. Written permits are granted upon request. Keys to our locked gates are also issued without charge. We know that the recreational use of our forests would be wasted if not used. We do not wish to see waste of any kind. Thus, we have cooperated with our neighbors in this respect and I know of no fair request for such use that has been denied. Better public relations are our reward.

About 5,000 acres of our lands in the lower John Day River country were found to be ideal for a winter refuge for wildlife. Upon

request by the Oregon State Game Commission, we made this land available for its best natural use, a big winter refuge since 1950. This was our major contribution toward wildlife protection and as I understand from recent reports, it is proving to be all the game commission expected. Thus, I have endeavored to point out that timber, cattle, watershed, wildlife, and recreation are all an integrated part of a private forest, and can be managed without one interfering with the other.

In closing, I wish to add that we at Pilot Rock are not alone in this sort of private forest management; many other substantial lumbering industries in this country are considering carefully all of those once hidden values that lay within their forests and have set up wise multiple-purpose use of their lands. There are no new forest frontiers left to capture in America. We can only settle down and make the most and best use of what we have.

Any owner of private natural resources has a grave responsibility to be worthy of that ownership. He cannot take it with him when he dies but must pass it on to someone else. He has no right to leave his lands in poorer productivity than when he found them. It was God given and he only has the right to use just so long as he lives. A hundred years from now this same earth will still be depended on for all life. To destroy productivity is to destroy human life.

Senator Walter George's Place in Mankind's History Is Assured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President I have before me an editorial entitled "Senator WALTER GEORGE: His Place in Mankind's History Is Assured," which appeared in the issue of May 11, 1956, of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent. The editorial was written by one of the South's foremost newspaper editors and former United States Senator, Wilton E. Hall. He has expressed in this writing a sentiment which is true throughout South Carolina and the entire Nation. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WALTER GEORGE: HIS PLACE IN MANKIND'S HISTORY IS ASSURED

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE'S decision to retire from the United States Senate at the end of his term was not entirely unexpected by those close to the Washington scene.

A few days ago it was reported that the venerable Georgian's closest friends, shocked by the sudden death of Senator Alben Barkley, were imploring the Senator to retire from the strain of political life in order that he might serve his State and Nation longer in other capacities.

It was known that he had been advised by his personal physician that a prolonged election campaign might take its toll, although the beloved Georgia statesman is more vigorous at the age of 78 than many younger men.

For 33 years Senator GEORGE has represented his State in the Senate. Most of those years were spent in positions of leadership. His sure hand more than once has guided the ship of state from threatening shoals.

As he approaches retirement, his influence in the highest council in the land was never stronger, both at home and abroad. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he is a world figure whose views are important in chancelleries around the globe.

Senator GEORGE'S deep-seated interest, preservation of peace, and opportunity to extend his efforts in this cause as President Eisenhower's personal representative of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization undoubtedly influence his decision to leave the Senate.

NATO has been tottering. Its dissolution would be a blow to the cause of free men and would pose a menace to peaceful solution of the world's pressing problems. President Eisenhower could not have chosen a more able exponent than this great Georgia statesman.

A man loved and respected on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and revered by his fellow Georgians as one of the State's greatest sons, Senator GEORGE will retire with his place in mankind's history already assured.

Proposed Appropriation for the National Heart Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Dr. Paul D. White, of Boston, Mass., at a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Health, May 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. I am Dr. Paul Dudley White, of Boston, practicing physician, consultant in medicine at the Massachusetts General Hospital, teacher of graduate students in medicine at Harvard University and elsewhere, executive director of the National Advisory Heart Council, and president of the International Society of Cardiology.

I am presenting herewith a statement in support of the budget of 1957 for the National Heart Institute of the United States Public Health Service as recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council in conjunction with the Citizens' Committee, and the Budget itself.

There is no need of any extensive comment on the well known importance of heart and blood vessel diseases today as a most serious threat to the health of both young and old in this country and in many other lands. In the United States of America, it accounts for more than half of all the deaths and in this respect, as well as in toto, is an increasing problem every year.

2. The National Heart Institute as well as the private organizations dealing with heart disease, such as the major organization, namely the American Heart Association, have a very complicated function to fulfill inasmuch as they have to deal with a considerable variety of different diseases which involve the circulation including a study of the blood and of its abnormalities. It is a very important field of medicine. As to the blood, for example, solving the problem of thromboembolism (which means the formation of blood clots in the circulation and their movement from one place to another) stands high in the need for research. Why is there much less threat of this in Hong Kong than in Boston, as was told me a few weeks ago in Hong Kong by a very well trained and experienced young Chinese surgeon, a graduate of Harvard Medical School 10 years ago with several years of surgical residency at the Massachusetts General Hospital? I am sure that Dr. Wright would like to add a few words to this brief comment about the blood and its properties of clotting.

3. The next important comment that I would make is that blood-vessel disease actually comprise the major part of our field, a statement that sometimes surprises even those with some knowledge about the heart. Here again I would like Dr. Wright to amplify this observation with particular reference to the circulation in the legs and in the brain. I shall summarize the problem briefly. The simplest and most common change, a more or less natural development in aged persons, but abnormal in youth and middle age, is a loss of elasticity and hardening or stiffening of the larger arteries of the body, reducing considerably the efficiency of the circulation. This needs study with a view to its prevention in the young.

The next problem is that of serious disease of the inner coats of many arteries including the aorta itself and the large vessels supplying the circulation of the legs, a field of the greatest interest and importance which has in the past few years happily attracted the attention of able surgical pioneers who have boldly and brilliantly introduced new surgical techniques to save lives and to restore health. Even more important still, however, are the so-called atherosclerotic (softening-hardening) diseases of the cerebral (brain) and coronary (heart) arteries which by their blocking (thrombosis) or even rupture (in the brain with resulting apoplexy) account for the major part of heart and brain diseases today in this country. Thus the heart disease called coronary which leads all other forms of heart disease in the United States of America now and the cerebral involvement so distressing all over the world, as I have found it to be, are actually due to disease of the blood vessels and not to primary disease of either heart muscle or brain tissue.

Finally, one other very common cause of heart disease (ranking second after coronary atherosclerosis) and of brain and kidney diseases, namely high blood pressure of serious degree, is also vascular and due to some as yet unidentified cause of constriction of the smaller arteries of the body. Thus, it goes without saying, that a major, probably the major, part of our current research in the cardiovascular field should be directed toward the study and prevention of these various diseases of the arteries of the body. And I haven't even mentioned the veins which can also be diseased; perhaps Dr. Wright will say something about them.

4. In addition to the major problems of coronary and hypertensive heart disease, of local blood vessel diseases, and of abnormalities of the blood, there are diseases that directly affect the heart muscle and valves. The most common and important of these is rheumatic fever which, although on its way down and out, remains still a very serious threat to the children and young adults throughout the world, including the United States of America. Incidentally the actual mechanism of its production by the hemo-

lytic streptococcus remains a mystery and demands even more intensive investigation than yet accorded it.

Fourth in frequency and as a challenge so far as the heart is concerned, and remaining still at least a 95 percent mystery as to its causation is congenital heart and blood vessel disease, that is, abnormalities present at birth or found a few weeks or months thereafter. Very great advances have been made in the last decade in its diagnosis and spectacular surgical relief but almost nothing is known about its cause. Millions of dollars will undoubtedly eventually be needed to solve this problem, one of the difficulties of which is that it consists of a multitude of individual deformities and combinations thereof.

A less common but still very important disease of the heart almost always superimposed on either rheumatic valvular heart disease or congenital defects is what we call subacute bacterial or malignant endocarditis, 99 percent fatal before the introduction of the antibiotics a decade ago, but now happily some 80 percent curable. It is due to invasion of the blood stream by the streptococcus viridans.

Other less common causes of heart and blood vessel diseases still exist though rapidly on the decline. These include syphillis, diphtheria, thyrotoxicosis, beri-beri, and a few virus and parasitic diseases. We must constantly guard against any recrudescence of these threats.

5. Finally, a field that needs much cultivation and is on the borderline between circuatory, metabolic, nervous, and psychiatric disorders is that of the so-called functional problems. These include neurocirculatory asthenia, cardiac neurosis, disorders of rhythm, and even sudden death, at times without seemingly adequate structural cause. This is in part, at least, the field of psychosomatic medicine. Three days ago I took a minor part in the inauguration of a beautiful, finely equipped hospital at the little hill town of San Giovanni Rotondo in a barren part of southeastern Italy, some 450 kilometers from Rome. An excellent scientific staff is being assembled there. The unique character of this hospital is that it has been built in close proximity to a Franciscan Monastery visited annually by many thousands of pilgrims, most of whom are ill physically or with mental or spiritual problems which they are taking for solution to the world renowned saintly monk, Father Pio. Through the contributions of countless such pilgrims, rich and poor, this hospital has been built during the past 9 years and it is the hope of many of us that it can and will serve, with good control, during the decades to come as a center for the study of psychosomatic medicine which includes in considerable part circulatory disorders. Three days ago, Padre Pio at San Giovanni Rotondo and the day before yesterday the Pope in Rome in conversation with a number of us cardiologists from a dozen countries scattered over the world expressed a considerable interest in supporting such research. Following the example set by this remote town in the hills of Italy, other institutions might well be established or at least developed in research in this important field.

6. I have said enough about the problems and would now like to take up item by item the 1957 budget of the National Heart Institute.

A. Research projects: The 1957 budget of the National Advisory Heart Council has included a $6 million additional sum over the figure of the 1956 appropriation for research project and program grants. The Bureau of the Budget allowed an increase of $2,450,000 and the House added to this $1,450,000 which leaves an increase still to be requested of $2,100,000. At the hearing before the House it was stated that $1 million might be subtracted from this extra amount of $2,100,000 because of the allocation by the Bureau of the Budget of an extra $3 million for noncategorical basic research under the National Institutes of Health. Now, however, since in this category we are still well over $1 million in the red, so far as approved grants are concerned with many more applications coming up in June, which will add greatly to the deficit, we doubtless will need the total increase asked for originally of $2,100,000 in this item.

B. Research fellowships: In the same way, the increase which we requested for the 1957 budget over that for 1956 of $827,000 to bring the total to $1,700,000 still demands full support. Against this request for $827,000 additional, the Bureau of the Budget added $277,000 and the House $185,000 making a total of $462,000. This leaves a balance which we still need, according to our original request, of $365,000 for research fellowships. In our testimony before the House, we said that since $500,000 had been added to noncategorical research fellowships under the Institutes of Health, we might subtract $250,000 from our needed increase. We suggested then an increase of $115,000, but further consideration since that time of the vital need of increased duration and amounts for more experienced and long term research fellows and of the addition of foreign fellows, a source of very valuable research hitherto largely neglected, makes it quite clear that we can usefully employ the total increase requested of $827,000 which would be an addition now of $365,000 of research fellowships above the House figure.

C. Training grants: The same thing is true about training grants. The House happily added $858,000 to the budget of 1956. We had requested, after careful consideration, $958,000 which leaves still an increase to be requested of the Senate of $100,000. This should still further expand our old training programs and the development of new training in such subjects as genetics, biostatistics, biochemistry, physiology, public health, and epidemiology.

D. State control grants: We are asking, as we did originally, for an additional $1,125,000 for this important field. The reason for this is that the States are not yet able to underwrite their own full programs in the cardiovascular field even though they are at present greatly interested in the subject and are expanding their activities. The directors of the State public health programs in the cardiovascular field have already had a meeting and have shown surprising new interests and intelligent approaches which we should take advantage of this year. Eventually this doubtless should become a State activity but the time is not ripe at present for such a change.

E. Direct operations: Both the Bureau of the Budget and the House recognized the need of increase in allocation of support for intramural research and for the review and approval of grants, adding considerably to the figures of the National Advisory Heart Council 1957 budget. The National Advisory Heart Council, at the time of the preparation of the budget, was not adequately aware of these increased needs which are now well supplied, but for technical assistance there is still an item of $100,000 needed for direct operations.

F. New developments: Finally, we asked the House for $1 million for new developments for the reasons that will be stated shortly, in our 1957 budget we had requested an increase of $1,500,000, which was not recognized by the Bureau of the Budget or the House. Because of the addition of $450,000 to the research item under direct operations, we had informed the House that this item might be reduced to $1 million, but in view of the extent of new developments which has become more evident in the last few months since the House hearing we would return to the figure of $1,500,000.

We must enlist in order to expedite our researches as to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of cardiovascular disease, such as expert workers in nonmedical fields—mechanical, hydraulic, and oil engineers, investigators in the field of pure physics, of research in fabrics, and of psychology and religion, social scientists, experts in education, and even athletic directors. In this category of new developments, we are also interested in the enlistment of promising young people of undergraduate level, in college and perhaps even in high school. Another item that needs exploration for which the Senate requested the Public Health Service to spend not less than $100,000 of new funds last year, but which was not available because of the inadequacy of last year's funds, is that of geographical research in epidemiological studies, that is, studies of the relationship of the ways of life and heart disease abroad and in this country. We have continued to carry on, with some difficulty in gaining financial support, by comparing this spring the Japanese living in Honolulu in the American way of life with the Japanese in the southern part of Japan living in the old country. The data are now being assembled from this research that took place in March and April and are bound to be of considerable interest and importance, but we need many more studies of this sort. Finally, another new development which needs more expansion is that of rehabilitation in which beginnings have been made, for example, studies under the wing of Dr. Howard Rusk and myself now in progress.

G. Fluid fund: It has been further suggested by Dr. Irving Wright and others that it would be extremely helpful to have an additional $3 million fluid fund for quick use in the followup of important new leads in any of the complicated fields with which we are involved, especially in the study of arteriosclerosis, coronary heart disease, and high blood pressure. Of this I myself would approve, as I am sure the other members of the National Advisory Heart Council would do also.

H. Construction: Inasmuch as the bill for the support of construction of medical research facilities is likely soon to be passed by both bodies of the Congress, it is timely to add herewith an item for construction in the 1957 budget. This figure, which is to be matched locally, amounts to $10 million per year for 3 years. It was estimated in the hearing before the House that this figure might be $6 million. Since then it has become evident that a more realistic figure would be $10 million for the extramural construction programs of the National Heart Institute.

I. Grand total: Thus, the total increase which we are asking of the Senate for the 1957 budget as requested by the National Advisory Heart Council above that allocated by the House amounts to $8,290,000. This includes the $3 million additional fluid fund but not the sum of $10 million for construction which we had not added to our request of the House because it was being considered then in a separate bill. With the passage of this bill, however, the $10 million should be added.

The grand total which we are requesting for the National Heart Institute for 1957 resulting from the addition of the 1957 House budget and the increase now requested amounts to $33,396,000, including the additional $3 million fluid fund but not the $10 million for construction. If that is added, as we hope it will be, the grand total comes to $43,396,000, of which $24,100,000 is for extramural support, including an item of $1,500,000 for new developments, $6,296,000

for direct operations, $3 million as a fluid grant, and $10 million for construction.

7. In closing, I would like to express my appreciation of the present opportunity, of past appearances allowed me, of the encouragement afforded us by this year's better recognition (though still inadequate) of our needs by the Bureau of the Budget, by the more realistic additional help (although also still inadequate) by the action of the House, and we hope by your own action in the Senate. My service with the National Heart Institute and National Advisory Heart Council ends this fall, after 8 years of a most stimulating and interesting experience, and it would indeed be gratifying if this year we might at last achieve the goal which has been painstakingly set by the National Advisory Heart Council, in cooperation with the citizens' committee. Finally, I want to pay tribute to the devoted and efficient service throughout the years by my colleagues, both physicians and laymen and laywomen, of the National Heart Institute itself and of the National Advisory Heart Council, and to your own outstanding interest, both in the House and in the Senate, in furthering research and education in behalf of the health, not only of the inhabitants of our own country but also of th peoples throughout the world.

National Heart Institute

	1956 appropriation	1957, Bureau of Budget		National Advisory Heart Council		1957 House recommendation		Increase still to be requested at Senate hearing
		Request	Increase	Request, 1957 [1] (House hearing, February 1956)	Increase	Revised total	Increase over Budget Bureau request	
A. Grants:								
Research grants	$8, 550, 000	$11, 000, 000	$2, 450, 000	$14, 550, 000	[2] $6, 000, 000	$12, 450, 000	$1, 450, 000	$2, 100, 000
Research fellowships	873, 000	1, 150, 000	277, 000	1, 700, 000	827, 000	1, 335, 000	185, 000	365, 000
Training grants	3, 142, 000	3, 142, 000		4, 100, 000	958, 000	4, 000, 000	858, 000	100, 000
Control grants to States	1, 125, 000	1, 125, 000		2, 250, 000	1, 125, 000	1, 125, 000		1, 125, 000
New development				[3] 1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000			1, 500, 000
Total grants	13, 690, 000	16, 417, 000	2, 727, 000	24, 100, 000	10, 410, 000	18, 910, 000	2, 493, 000	5, 190, 0 0
B. Direct operations:								
Research	4, 403, 000	4, 896, 000	493, 000	[4] 5, 000, 000	597, 000	5, 346, 000	450, 000	
Review and approval of grants	134, 000	186, 000	52, 000	[5] 186, 000	52, 000	243, 000	57, 000	
Technical assistance	375, 000	407, 000	32, 000	[6] 500, 000	125, 000	407, 000		100, 000
Administration	176, 000	200, 000	24, 000	[7] 200, 000	24, 000	200, 000		
Total direct operations	5, 088, 000	5, 689, 000	601, 000	[8] 5, 886, 000	798, 000	6, 196, 000	507, 000	100, 000
C. Fluid funds								[9] 3, 000, 000
D. Construction								[10] 10, 000, 000
Total appropriation	18, 778, 000	22, 106, 000	3, 328, 000	[11] 29, 986, 000	11, 208, 000	25, 106, 000	3, 000, 000	18, 290, 000

[1] May 1956 modification by House action and since House hearing:

B. Direct operations:	
Research	[4] $5, 346, 000
Review and approval of grants	[5] 243, 000
Technical assistance	[6] 507, 000
Administration	[7] 200, 000
Total direct operations	[8] 6, 296, 000
Total appropriation	[11] 30, 396, 000
Fluid fund	[9] 3, 000, 000
Construction fund	[10] 10, 000, 000
Grand total	43, 396, 000

[2] Areas of cardiovascular research and training; needs for further development: Aging, biophysics, embryology and development, epidemiology and public health, genetics, morphology (anatomy), pathology, physiology, rehabilitation, and other, particularly arteriosclerosis (coronary in particular).

The Civil-Rights Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] at the banquet of the Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republican Clubs at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia on May 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As young people interested in improving our great Government, I know you have given a good deal of thought to what I consider the No. 1 domestic problem of our Nation—how to accomplish the goal of equal treatment for all our people. In my opinion, this has become the most deeply divisive issue our Nation has faced in this century. Moreover, how we meet the problem is a matter of profound importance to millions outside the United States yearning and struggling for a better life.

There are those in this Nation who recognize the magnitude of the problem, but prefer to look away. There are those who can see it only in extremist terms, who would compel solutions, enforced, if need be, by punitive means. There are also those who would use it for narrow political ends. There may be some in our own party who take the short-range view that this is a matter splitting the Democrats and so let's stand back and let them fight each other.

But, in the long view, in the interests of our country, this is neither a sensible nor a morally just position to take. It is inconceivable to me that the Republican Party could adopt such a view. We cannot stand aside and watch this Nation be torn apart over an issue that can and must be resolved without resort to violence or compulsion.

The Negroes in our midst are Americans and have the same right to a vote, to a decent education, to a decent job, to a decent house, and to a decent life as the rest of us.

It seems to me high time to take the civil-rights issue out of the partisan arena. The hurling of wild predictions over what can happen if we give the Negro his long-postponed rights is harmful, as is the continuing exchange of charges over who's to blame for the situation. Meanwhile, the problem is aggravated as tempers flare among the extremists on both sides and the moderates are pushed ever farther and farther back from the conflict.

I can see no partisan advantage in watching American turn against American. This is a problem that cries out for calmness and moderation; for unity and understanding. This Nation has already discovered that in the sensitive area of foreign policy, a bipartisan approach is advisable, if not downright essential. It seems to me that the matter of racial relations and the broader one of civil rights should be moving in the same direction.

Our great need right now is to build a climate of opinion in which reasonable solutions are possible, to strengthen in all ways the position of those persons who could contribute to understanding and progress toward carrying out public school integration. This encouragement can take many forms—creation of opportunities for men and women of good will to meet and discuss ways of working out solutions to particular problems; sympathetic response to school districts that take steps toward fulfillment of the Supreme Court decisions and development of moderate legislation helpful to the same aim. At the same time, we need to refrain from words and actions which hinder rather than help progress and understanding. We must resist the temptation to take partisan advantage. Any smugness on our part; any ignoring of the fact that the North, where we Republicans live, is itself not without racial tension; any vain hope that we will profit while the other side fights—this approach is not going to help solve a problem which is too big for petty self-indulgence. The Supreme Court decisions call for great changes in long-standing habits of many of our States. This must be recognized by those who are truly interested in fulfilling our national conscience in a peaceful fashion.

President Eisenhower, in my opinion, is exerting the right kind of leadership. He has stood firmly for integration of our public

schools on a steadily progressive basis. This has been a real contribution and I know he will be leading the way toward other steps as we determine what others are necessary and advisable.

In addition to exercising the great influence of his office and his own reputation for high moral principles, the President has urged the adoption of a moderate legislative program to strengthen and expand our civil-rights statutes. These proposals are supported by many Democrats as well as Republicans already and if we can create a climate of moderation and reasonableness they can be enacted.

We, as individuals and as Republicans, have an opportunity as well as a duty to lend our strength to calm voices of North and South who would find ways of doing this job that needs so badly to be done. Neither extremism nor partisanship will win the political day, any more than they will carry us toward the goal of real equality, with justice, for our fellow Americans of whatever color.

The temper of the people is, I believe, moderate on this issue. As we demonstrate our good faith and deep interest in steady progress toward solution, public good will and support will inevitably follow.

A Midwestern Editor Analyzes the Political Situation in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a lot is being written in the national magazines with reference to the political situation and estimates for 1956.

Attached is an article by Edward Lindsay, editor of the Lindsay-Schaub newspapers, which is an interpretation of the electorate and the issues as of May of this year. Many of this editor's findings are based upon action by the Eisenhower administration and the countermeasures by the opposition.

It appears to me that this is a fair interpretation of midwestern feeling at this time on most of the major issues confronting the country. This article has overcome some of the mistakes made by nationally known syndicated writers who have tended to emphasize single major issues. Mr. Lindsay has tried to bring out the overall feeling of people, founded upon the impression which the Eisenhower administration has made at the broad base of public thinking. The article is attached herewith in full from the Decatur Herald and Review and other Lindsay-Schaub newspapers, of Sunday, May 13, 1956:

The overriding political fact of this 1956 election year seems to be majority satisfaction with the performance of the Eisenhower administration. The peace and prosperity theme is being accepted. Efforts at creating a rallying point for dissenters have shown vitality for a short time and then tended to dissipate.

Despite the congressional hearings staged by the Democratic majority in an effort to show that the United States is falling behind in military preparedness, the defense bill voted by the House without a dissenting vote provided only a little less money than the President asked for.

The great furor caused by the effort in both Houses to create a something-for-everybody farm bill has subsided with the President's veto and the inability of political observers to read anything that resembles a farm revolt into the results of primary elections held since the veto.

Democratic Members of Congress and Democratic candidates for the presidential nomination have found themselves in a dilemma in which they cannot get attention unless they make extreme proposals and extreme proposals invariably generate more opposition than support.

It seems to me that we are in one of those eras in which the public instinctively resents anything that can be read as monkeying with peace and prosperity. The Republicans at the moment are the beneficiaries of this in the way that the Democrats were the beneficiaries of a situation which some Republicans characterized with the crack: You don't shoot Santa Claus.

None of this is to say that all Republican Members of Congress will benefit from the national rosy glow in which President Eisenhower sits.

There are pockets of unemployment. There are industries and areas in which local maladjustments may be reflected in a protest vote against Republican Congressmen and possibly against a Republican President.

There is some indication in local areas of a swing away from long established ideas that were sure-fire vote getters for the Democrats. An example of this is in the Northwest where there is a strong indication that the voters are pulling away from their traditional enthusiasm for public power.

In the main, the Eisenhower administration has adopted the basic tenets of the New Deal in those areas that have wide public support. In the public power issue it is in a position to quote Franklin Roosevelt himself in considering public power as a yardstick against which to measure the effectiveness of private power activities. The only difference is that the Eisenhower administration has tried, and now finally with some success, to permit private power to demonstate its competency against the yardstick.

There is some indication that such strata of Democratic strength as the labor union vote and the Negro vote are now breaking up. It remains to be seen whether or not the South, which was not so solid in 1952, will remain fluid or tend to return to its historical single-party behavior.

The Eisenhower administration seems to have developed a considerable ability to withstand attack and to temper its policies to meet changing conditions, whether political or real.

The poise and self-confidence of the President have been demonstrated in recent weeks by his veto of the farm bill and the confusion he has created in Democratic ranks on the farm issue. Democratic Members of Congress seem to be genuinely uncertain as to whether or not they dare to refuse to pass the farm bill in substantially the form asked for by the President. So far the Democrats have been willing to stand on the soil bank plan without the President's prepayment provision. Whether or not they will have the courage to confront him for price supports for feed grains, and in this way invite a second veto, remains to be seen.

The President's change of pace in foreign policy is another indication of strength. He has known since before his election that it would be necessary for the United States to stand for liberalizing of trade policies for Japan and for our allies, if not for ourselves, in dealing with Red China. Now, in an election year, he has had the courage to say this.

Moreover, he has been willing to initiate an expansion of what the Democrats call the point 4 program of economic aid to backward countries. This program is being pushed as an extension in the activities in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with some indication that private capital will be invited to participate wth Government in the development of needy countries.

The Democrats are unable to attack these policies but only to snipe at them a little, and ineffectively.

International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, even though I will probably have to interrupt the trip to fly back to the United States for the House debate on my school construction bill, I am looking forward to attending sessions of the International Labor Organization conference in Geneva, Switzerland, next month.

As the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, I have been designated by Speaker SAM RAYBURN to serve along with the senior Republican member of the committee, Congressman SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., of Wynnewood, Pa., as a congressional adviser to the American delegation at this international conference. The delegation we will advise consists officially of one employee representative, one employer representative, and a Government official. Other countries are similarly represented.

Of course when the Soviet Union sends a delegation to this conference the idea of anyone in the delegation being an "employer representative" or employee representative" is ridiculous on its face, because all delegates from the Soviet Union are, by the very nature of the Communist system, Soviet government officials. But that would hardly be a reason to refuse to allow American participation, although that has been the proposal of some of our big business organizations.

As a matter of fact, the ILO is one of the best forums we have—we in the free world—for showing up the tryranny and reaction of Soviet policies. The free nations completely dominate the policies of the ILO, and it is a wonder Russia even participates, since so much of the work of the ILO centers on the attempt of free nations to eliminate the type of regimentation of workers so typical of the Soviet system.

It is, therefore, hardly coincidental that just before its delegation goes off to an ILO conference at which the quesion of forced labor will be voted on, the Soviet Union has suddenly repealed or modified its long-standing decrees providing harsh penalties or jail terms for quitting a job or trying to change jobs. Russia is now said, also, to be opening

up some of its forced labor camps, and otherwise relaxing its barbarian policies against its own people.

And, in one of the most revealing episodes of all, the Soviets have suggested to Russian "unions" that they should engage more often in "a good wrangle" with the Soviet industrial management people—but not to the point of strikes, of course.

COLD WAR TACTICS

All of these developments sound a real warning to us in our efforts to counteract Communist propaganda drives in the so-called uncommitted parts of the world. While Russia takes steps like these to make the world think she is becoming more civilized, we in this country have been arguing over American participation in ILO. Some of our industrial leaders have even gone so far as to express dismay that the Communist delegates at these conferences could in some way subvert America or other free nations.

This does not make us look very strong or very confident about our own economic system. It sounds as if we are fearful of seeing free competition in the world of ideas as between our kind of industrial democracy and the Soviet system of economic repression and regimentation. The truth is that our brand of economics always shows up much better than the Communist variety if we place the two solidly in contrast in world gatherings like the ILO.

This Administration has been showing amazing timidity about the slave labor issue, even though this issue was originally raised in the ILO by the United States—under previous administrations. The Eisenhower administration is so afriad of providing ammunition to the Republican isolationists and Bricker amendment supporters in Congress that it has dodged and twisted and ducked in trying to avoid facing the issue in the ILO. Now, however, the decision is that the United States delegation will be free to support moves to bar from world trade goods produced by forced labor. But for a while, high-level State Department opposition almost made us look rather silly on this. That kind of timidity plays right into the hands of the Communists.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a resident of my district, I am inserting a letter I received recently for the information of other Members of Congress. The letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAWSON: I understand that the United States Public Health Service is sponsoring a bill to spend upward of $2 million of tax money to promote fluoridation of American drinking water.

Are we to have our tax money used to brain wash us with such obvious untruths as the AMA Journal (December 10, 1955, p. 1475) comes out with? They recommend boiling to remove fluorine from water. Fluorine can be highly concentrated by boiling; it cannot be boiled out. Nor is it a neutrient as they say. It is inorganic and cannot be assimilated by humans or animals. During the period when teeth are forming, between the ages of 3 and 9, it can harden enamel, but 17 to 35 of every thousand have dark fluorine stains that disfigure them for life. After the teeth erupt the fluorine can only accumulate in the bones to rot or make brittle, and if fluorine is no more toxic than salt of vitamin A as they say, how come hog remedies containing it warn not to give it to farrowing pigs because it causes abortion? What about pregnant women?

This bill should be killed. If it is not, at least please see that any committee is made up of people who are not controlled by the AMA or fluorine interests.

Please read this to Congress and enter it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

Associate Professor MABEL FRAZER.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Providence Hospital, Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, typical of the courage and determination of the West is the important role played by the Catholic Sisters of Providence, who came to the Oregon Territory in December 1856, when Mother Joseph braved the frontier wilds to found Providence Academy, in nearby Vancouver, Wash., on the great Columbia River.

The Catholic Sisters, of Providence have played a significant and humanitarian role in the health and well-being of our people in Portland and the Pacific Northwest, operating three fine hospitals in the Portland area—Providence and St. Vincent's in Portland, and St. Joseph's in Vancouver, Wash. The Sisters of Providence have devoted themselves to helping the sick, the poor, the needy, the aged, and the orphans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on Providence Hospital by Gerry Pratt, from the Northwest rotogravure magazine of the Sunday Oregonian for May 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANKS BE TO PROVIDENCE

(By Gerry Pratt)

High in the attic of the big rambling schoolhouse that is Providence Academy, tucked away in a quite corner, rests a tired but brave-looking little red trunk. Inside, folded among the old wax, the three books and the well-worn tools, is a story of the West. For this was the trunk and these were the tools of Mother Joseph of the Sisters of Providence.

A strong, heavy-boned women with the courage of David and the faith of Daniel, she helped hew this civilization from the unsettled wilds of the Pacific Northwest. In the beginning she led a band of five, and between them they faced more dangers than many a sourdough.

When they stepped onto the banks of the Columbia in 1856, after steaming north from San Francisco, they faced the job of planting the seed of charity in the West—of establishing the order of Providence in the wilderness.

They did it well. Beginning December 8, 1856, when she founded Providence Academy in Vancouver, Mother Joseph launched a campaign of building that stretched from New Westminister in British Columbia to Oakland, Calif. St. Joseph's hospital in Vancouver, Wash., Providence and St. Vincent's in Portland are only three of the 34 institutions she left to those who came after her.

But the academy, serving as home for the aged, orphanage and now a parochial school for youngsters from nursery age through the 12th grade, was Mother Joseph's first love. It was her cornerstone, and she built it from nothing but the few tools packed away in her red trunk.

That was 100 years ago, and today that little trunk, which has been retired since Mother Joseph's death on January 18, 1902, is being dusted off and brought out from its hiding place in the red brick schoolhouse in Vancouver, Wash. With the trunk comes the story it has to tell.

It was a hot and dusty day in 1876 when the stagecoach carrying Mother Joseph through the bandit territory of Colorado came to a rattling stop in a rocky canyon. At her feet, in a small black overnight bag were 200 silver dollars.

The nun had been down in the mine shafts of Montana, across the range lands of Idaho and Colorado collecting the money to help pay the debts of the schools, orphanages, and hospital her Sisters were busy building in the Northwest.

It wasn't much money—but to Mother Joseph it was indeed precious. She was thinking of the money and the need of it and was praying when she stepped into the bright sunlight to face the cocked pistols of two robbers.

Her diary tells what happened. None of the passengers dared resist or to stay in the coach for fear of being shot by the desperate men. "Pray, pray, pray," said Mother Joseph as she dropped her heavy bag at the feet of the bandits.

With the outlaw pistols pointed at them, the passengers were ordered to return to the coach and leave their bags heaped in the roadway. Mother Joseph, of whom some said had the faith that could move mountains, was praying audibly to St. Joseph and reminding him of his duties in protecting her and hers. A sudden impulse seized her.

"You there—Mister, Mister," she said in a loud and commanding voice to the younger of the two armed men. The other passengers cowed and tried to hush her. But she persisted.

"My boy," she called again, and the young robber looked up. "My boy, please hand me my bag—no, not that one—the little black one. Yes, that's it. There is nothing in there for you."

Gingerly, his gun pointed straight at her midsection, the bandit raised the bag and handed it into the outstretched hand of the nun.

"Thank you—and God bless you, young man," she said, as she stepped into the coach still praying for all to hear. And as the thieves returned to their looting and the coach rolled off, she gave the young man a gracious nod and tucked the bag, complete with its $200, under her feet.

Such was the faith of Mother Joseph, and such was the faith of those who followed her.

At Providence Academy there is a Sister Stanislaus—known to the children as Sister "Santa Claus," as much for her kind nature

as for the awkward pronunciation of her name. She knew Mother Joseph and worked with her before the turn of the century.

"I can still see her—complete with saw and hammer at her girth—striding through the school and praying aloud while she worked," said the little old nun, in recalling some of the memories from the trunk.

"There was the year the Columbia burst its banks. It was a hard year, and there was not much to keep the orphans through the winter. The water kept rising until it reached the edge of the school's small vegetable garden upon which we relied for much of our winter stores.

"Suddenly Mother Joseph appeared from one of her work corners with a statue of St. Joseph—she had carved it from Douglas fir. She placed it at the water's edge and ordered: 'Go no farther.' There wasn't a doubt in her mind that the water would stop.

"She turned her back on it and walked away. The river never rose another inch."

When the city of Vancouver came to the big, stone academy Mother Joseph had built for the orphans, the old, the poor, and the needy, officials levied a water rate against the prosperous-looking school.

"Forty-six dollars a month," the water inspector said, in offering the city's water service to the school.

"Thank you," replied Mother Joseph. "I'll build my own well." And she did. It still stands ready and serviceable on the old schoolgrounds.

This then was the driving force—the guiding spirit of the early Sisters of Providence. Hers was the gift of organization—the talent of a builder. She designed the big school down to its smallest detail. She hand-carved the intricate altar of the chapel and the big ornate chapel doors. She made wax figures of the Christ child and spent hour upon hour at the fine needlework for the vestments of the priests who said mass there.

She is remembered, that brave, strong, inspired nun who came to this land 100 years ago, wherever there are sick in need of care, homeless in need of love and wherever you see the distinctive habit of the Sisters of Providence.

But only the mute tools and treasures of the tiny red trunk can tell the true story of Mother Joseph and those first sisters of the West. These bear the signs of grueling wear, show the marks of painful labor and tell the story of the hope that made the work of Providence possible.

This band will be remembered for its colorful exploits—riding in special habit through the wooded trails, plunging into mine shafts and tramping across the wheat plains in search of funds. Mother Joseph once stood undaunted before a band of scalp-hunting Indians and was spared because of her dignity and bravery.

It is so that the glitter of these works won't hide the gold of the heart behind them that the trunk is being brought from retirement.

A Fine Report About United States Mistakes in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the fall of last year a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the chairman of which subcommittee being our distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI, spent 2 months studying the Middle East, south and southeast Asia for the purpose of a report to the Congress. The subcommittee constituting the mission consisted of 6 members. They traveled nearly 31,000 miles and visited 25 countries, starting in Greece and ending up in Japan. This subcommittee performed an important mission.

I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and all the members of the subcommittee for the sacrifices they made in the performance of their trying task and for their constructive report.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized as one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the House of Representatives. His knowledge of foreign affairs is profound. He is recognized as one of our outstanding Members in the field of foreign affairs. And this is particularly important to our country at this trying period of the world's history. The people of his district are justified in feeling proud of him and the fine character of service which he is rendering as their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

The subcommittee made a most interesting and constructive report of 213 pages. It is one of the finest reports which I have ever read made by any committee or subcommittee. Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and all the members of his subcommittee for the excellent contribution that they have made in their report.

In my extension of remarks, I include a deserving editorial about Mr. ZABLICKI and his subcommittee entitled "A Fine Report About United States Mistakes in Asia," appearing in the Milwaukee Journal of May 13, 1956:

Congressional committee reports are usually pretty dull fare, fit for filing. Occasionally, however, one comes along that is as interesting as it is informative. Such a report is that of the study mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

If you'd like a stimulating armchair trip through a most important part of the world, a real insight into the tangled affairs of the Middle East, sound explanations of why the West is having such headaches in Asia, this is your dish.

The mission, headed by Wisconsin's CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, Milwaukee, spent 2 months last fall studying the Middle East, south and southeast Asia. The 6 members traveled more than 30,800 miles, visited 25 countries, started in Greece and ended up in Japan. When they got back to Washington they studiously worked out their comprehensive report.

Actually, there's nothing quite like it. Books are written about individual nations, or even geographical areas. But no one has offered a panoramic sweep of the vital areas fringing Communist Russia and China that form today's major battleground between freedom and tyranny. This the study mission, with aid from its staff members and assistance from the State and Defense Departments, has done.

Here is a quick education in the geography, history, economics, religion and politics of the 25 nations visited, plus a discussion of each nation's problems with its neighbors and with the United States.

There are significant conclusions, too, about American policies toward individual countries and, more important, toward the whole of free Asia.

The study mission found neutralism on the increase. It blamed this on changed Communist tactics and on American acceptance of "the Communists into respectable society at Geneva." It said the conviction is strengthening in Asia that the United States stands with the colonial powers of Europe rather than with Asian peoples. It complained that we are still not doing a good job on human relations in our various aid programs, and added:

"The key thing is not the amount of aid, it is the manner. It is not enough to analyze figures; we must do a better job of analyzing people. This is where the Communists have left us far behind."

The report is 213 pages long. It is interestingly written. It has many maps. It will tell you most of what you need to know to be considered informed about a part of the world that is going to be important to Americans for a long time.

Congressman ZABLOCKI will be glad to provide copies of the study mission report to those requesting them. Requests should be addressed to him at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Practising Law Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the Practising Law Institute, a nonprofit educational institute, was founded 23 years ago in New York by Attorney Harold P. Seligson. Since that time it has achieved international recognition in the field of postlegal education. It is performing incomparable public service in keeping the profession informed of the development of the law and its related techniques. As a practicing lawyer and a lecturer for the institute, I have long felt the record of its achievements should be made part of the official archives of this Government.

In April 1956, the Reporter, official publication of Phi Alpha Delta, a national law fraternity, published a most interesting and instructive article on the history and work of the institute. I now have the pleasure of presenting it:

One of the most encouraging recent developments in our profession has been lawyers' increasing attendance at postadmission education programs. Many are conducted under the auspices of bar associations and law schools; particularly effective work is being done in California, Texas, Pennsylvania, New York, and Boston.

Still in the foreground of this brightened continuing education picture is the Practising Law Institute, which 23 years ago became the Nation's pioneer in professional instruction for practicing lawyers. During 1955, approximately 10,000 lawyers attended PLI Saturday forums, summer courses, evening lectures, and special programs, spending a total of 190,000 man-hours on practical professional education.

The institute's courses are largely held in New York City, where its programs are enthusiastically received. Over 2,000 lawyers attended PLI's evening courses last year. Its 1955 summer session was attended by some

1,500 attorneys from all parts of the Nation, while the year's Saturday forums drew attendances totaling over 5,000, of whom about one-third came from 20 States outside New York. PLI monographs distributed in the United States and Canada now total 1,500,000 copies.

SUMMER SESSION

The summer program, in which 5 full days are spent on each subject, covers the practitioner's problems in a variety of fields. In addition to courses in trial technique, medical proof, taxation, and estate planning, the summer session includes special annual programs for patent attorneys and members of corporation legal departments. The latter, for instance, began in 1952 with general lectures for corporation staff lawyers; in 1953 there were panel discussion on legal aspects of marketing; in 1954 the subject was legal aspects of corporate management, and in 1955 the program was built around the concept of preventive law in discussing effective functioning of the corporate law department.

The 1956 summer session will provide 15 courses over 4 weeks, beginning July 9. As in the past, lawyers from all parts of the country will come to New York for 1 or more weeks of stimulating training. A week-by-week schedule of the summer session follows:

Week of July 9: Public prosecutors, current problems in patent law, trial preparation.

Week of July 16: Corporate-law departments, Federal taxation, estate planning, trial technique.

Week of July 23: Secured transactions, closed corporations and taxes, advanced estate planning, medical aspects of litigation.

Week of July 30: Labor-law problems, real estate and taxes, representing estate fiduciaries, advanced medical proof.

A $50,000 grant made by the Carnegie Corp. in 1953 has enabled PLI to furnish scholarships for prosecuting attorneys who otherwise would be unable to attend its public-prosecutor's course. This week-long summer program, designed to help prosecutors improve their professional skills, has been praised by J. Edgar Hoover and endorsed by the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys. Lecturers in the course are public prosecutors of specialized experience. Panel discussions provide opportunity for questions from enrollees, numbering about 150 each summer, who find that the exchange of ideas with prosecuting attorneys from different areas gives them fresh viewpoints and new approaches to their problems.

ADVANCED-LEVEL PROGRAMS FEATURE SATURDAY AND WEEKEND FORUMS

Development of programs on an advanced level for lawyers well up in their specialties has been perhaps the most significant of the institute's recent activities. Outstanding among these programs is the Saturday or weekend forum, where typical problems in a particular area of practice are presented to large audiences by discussion panels composed of experts including Government lawyers wherever appropriate.

In forums on aspects of commercial practice careful consideration is given to the business background, as well as the tax aspects and legal problems. PLI has long recognized the importance of tax matters; its courses on Federal taxation have been particularly successful, and more than 10 years ago were sponsored on a national basis by the section on taxation of the American Bar Association. In recent years it has sought to furnish lawyers with a better understanding of the financial, economic, and business aspects of their clients' problems.

FORUMS GIVE OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The Institute's Saturday forums have sometimes rendered important public service apart from their usefulness to members of the bar. A program on the 1954 Revenue Code was held while the bill was still pending in Congress, after having passed the House. Exchanges between government lawyers and private tax practitioners brought to light flaws in the House bill. Many revision in the law as finally passed, stemmed from suggestions made by PLI panel members and audience questioners.

Similarly, at the October 1955, forum on Negotiating Settlements in Personal Injury Actions, the 700 lawyers present were asked if they would like to have insurance company claim offices open evenings for settlement conferences. The enthusiastic response from attorneys too busy for daytime negotiations led the Maryland Casualty Co. to open its offices one night a week. Eight other casualty insurance companies shortly followed suit. A large number of claims have been settled at these evening sessions, thus helping to reduce the volume of negligence cases which clog the court calendars.

MONOGRAPHS ARE OFTEN REVISED AND EXPANDED

Mindful of the need to keep attorneys abreast of new developments in their specialties and related fields, PLI continually brings up to date its more than 70 monographs and adds news titles. The Institute's widely used series, Fundamentals of Federal Taxation, which analyzes Federal income, estate and gift tax law and practice, has been revised in the light of the 1954 Revenue Code. The board of editors for the revision is headed by Prof. Robert Anthoine of Columbia University Law School and includes Norris Darrell of Sullivan & Cromwell; Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School; Thomas N. Tarleau of Willkie, Owen, Farr, Gallagher & Walton; Weston Vernon, Jr., of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley; Dean William C. Warren of Columbia University Law School, and 21 other distinguished tax experts.

Other PLI monograph series deal with Trial Practice and General Practice. The price of the Institute's publications remains at its original modest level (usually $1.50 or $2 a copy), even though revision has doubled the number of pages in many of these handy, pocket-size books. Recent monographs include Income Taxation of Estates, and Trusts, Secured Transactions, Discovery Proceedings Under the Federal Rules, and Federal Pre-Trial and Jury Trial Procedure. Among the lately revised titles are Estate Planning, Preparation and Trial of Tax Cases, Corporate Practice, and Understanding the Antitrust Laws.

PLI PROGRAM FOR YOUNG LAWYER INCLUDES SCHOLARSHIPS, LOANS

The Practicing Law Institute still feels that one of its primary tasks is to help the young lawyer obtain practical knowledge during his first years at the bar. For instance, Harold P. Seligson's well-known monograph, Building a Practice (revised in October 1955), tells him how to organize an office and how to obtain and deal with clients. The General Practice evening course (20 two-hour sessions) provides training in the lawyer's approach, working methods and techniques in each of the major fields of practice. Courses in trial preparation and trial technique furnish a thorough grounding in the strategy and tactics of the courtroom.

PLI provides scholarships for worthy young lawyers wishing to enroll in appropriate courses. These, in the form of both outright gifts and long-term loans, are financed from the Robert P. Patterson fund, established by the Institute in 1952 in honor of the late Secretary of War, who was its president at the time of his death.

Harold P. Seligson, the founder of the Institute and originator of many of the methods used in post-admission education, is still its director and guiding spirit. PLI's trustees include judges, law professors, and outstanding lawyers, headed by President Nicholas Kelley of Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes; Board Chairman Arthur A. Ballantine of Dewey, Ballantine, Bushby, Palmer & Wood; Vice President James A. Fowler, Jr., of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel, & Ohl; Treasurer Alfred McCormack of Cravath, Swaine & Moore; and Secretary Ralph Montgomery Arkush. The offices of the Institute, which is chartered by the State of New York as a nonprofit educational institute, are at 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

The Practicing Law Institute, like other organizations whose purpose is to extend continuing legal education, has had great success in what is still an experimental field. PLI constantly seeks new and better methods for the fulfillment of this purpose, as do the hundreds of lawyers who share their skill and knowledge as authors, lecturers, and panel members. These men, whose efforts bring the bar ever closer to a high level of extensive postgraduate education comparable to that of the medical profession, find their greatest encouragement in the fact that each year more lawyers attend programs like those conducted by PLI. Attorneys and the public have increasingly come to recognize the value of continuing education in raising the bar's professional standards and insuring the better administration of justice. Public recognition and higher standards are both measures of the success of the Practicing Law Institute and its kindred organizations, but such measures can satisfy these institutions only in the process of being surpassed.

Investigation of Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement which I made earlier today concerning the operation of our regulatory agencies in their relation to small business and our free-enterprise economy, under unanimous consent, I ask to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD statements which I made at the opening of these investigations.

The statements follow:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

This subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee is commencing hearings this morning on the organization and procedures of the Federal regulatory commissions and agencies. Our hearings today will deal with the Federal Trade Commission.

This Commission is charged with the duty of enforcing the antitrust laws and other statutes in the public interest. Other regulatory commissions and agencies enforce other statutes and issue regulations which vitally affect small business. These agencies and commissions were established to carry out policies laid down by Congress. These policies basically are for the regulation of commerce. Power to regulate commerce is given Congress by section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

In several instances Congress has delegated its power in this field under specific policy guides and with specific objectives to agencies of the Government. In no instance does any of these agencies have the power to regulate commerce except as specifically provided for by Congress. At no place in the

Constitution can it be found that any power to regulate commerce is delegated to the President.

In approving the legislation which established the regulatory agencies and commissions, Congress carefully and deliberately provided for such regulation to be independent of the executive branch of the Government. The constitutional and statutory concepts regarding the independence of these agencies and commissions have been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of cases, an important one of which was *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 602). That case arose after the President of the United States removed the late William H. Humphrey as a Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, on the ground, as the President said, that "the aims and purposes of the administration with respect to the work of the Commission can be carried out most effectively with personnel of my own selection." The Supreme Court held that the President of the United States was without authority to effect such removal of Commissioner Humphrey. In reaching this decision, the Court reviewed both the legislative history and the constitutional concepts underlying the FTC and said among other things the following:

"It is charged with the enforcement of no policy except the policy of the law. Its duties are neither political nor executive, but predominantly quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative.

"The Federal Trade Commission is an administrative body created by Congress to carry into effect legislative policies embodied in the statute in accordance with the legislative standard therein prescribed, and to perform other specified duties as a legislative or as a judicial aid. Such a body cannot in any proper sense be characterized as an arm or an eye of the executive. Its duties are performed without executive leave and, in the contemplation of the statute, must be free from executive control."

The Court further stated with reference to passage of the Federal Trade Commission Act:

"The debates in both Houses demonstrated that the prevailing view was that the Commission was not to be 'subject to anybody in the Government but * * * only to the people of the United States; free from 'political domination or control' or the 'probability or possibility of such a thing'; to be 'separate and apart from any existing department of the Government—not subject to the orders of the President'."

And here the Court spoke as it has many times before and since, on the separation of powers of our Government, as follows:

"The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of Government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential coequality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there."

However, as I pointed out on February 23, 1955, when our subcommittee was organized in this session of Congress, this committee has received a number of disturbing reports, in the press and otherwise, about the regulatory agencies, the FTC and other commissions. According to these reports the Hoover Commission reorganization for these commissions has effected radical changes in their basic concepts. Specifically the Hoover Commission plans make the chairman of each commission responsible to the President, to serve at the pleasure of the President. They give the chairman complete control and direction over the administration of the commission. Some of these reports suggest secretive and mysterious connections between the White House and these commissions.

For example an Associated Press story appearing in the press on March 3 of this year was to the effect that counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission had been cited for contempt of a district court of the United States for refusing to produce certain SEC records in a public court trial. It appears that SEC insisted that this Commission is responsible to the executive branch of the Government, and is privileged to keep its records secret from the judicial branch. Yet the records in question were involved in a quasi-judicial action of that Commission which was properly under review by the court.

On last Tuesday, July 12, the Chairman of the SEC refused to tell a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate whether or not he had talked with anyone in the White House about the issuance of an order that the SEC postpone hearings. It is significant that the Chairman of the SEC did not claim privilege of secrecy on the ground that this was in the public interest or necessary to the security of the country. He claimed it a privilege to keep secret whether or not the President of the United States or his aids had influenced actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Recently there has been considerable discussion in the press and elsewhere concerning some alleged overlapping consideration and action by the White House respecting the recent quasi-judicial handling of the Civil Aeronautics Board of a matter involving one very large and another small airline. If these reports concerning that matter should prove to be true, it would seem that not only are there connecting wires between the White House and the CAB but in that instance they became crossed and short circuited.

Earlier, Business Week magazine carried a lead article on what it titled "Republicans Reshape the FTC." This article appeared in the issue of June 5, 1954, said that the Federal Trade Commisison was undergoing a change "in makeup, in philosophy, in organization." This article went on to say:

"Basically, of course, FTC remains an enforcement agency. * * * FTC's job has in no way changed, but the way it intends to carry it out has changed. As compared to the way the Democrats did things, the Republicans are making it easier for the businessman who is up on the FTC carpet, harder for the FTC lawyers handling the cases. * * * Some observers say that, as a practical matter, FTC is setting standards of proof that will make the lawyers' job almost impossible. * * * Finally, FTC has just adopted a complete reorganization program. The immediate significance of the reorganization, however, is that it gives (Chairman) Howrey the chance to name his own team. When the plan becomes effective July 1, the Republican majority will really have come into its own."

Clearly, one of the reasons the Congress had in mind for establishing the Federal Trade Commission as an agency independent of the President was to make certain that in the enforcement of antimonopoly laws it would remain free from political influence and not become involved in political considerations in the handling of antimonopoly matters.

The Congress realized that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is subject to the direction of a political appointee, subject to removal at the pleasure of the President. Consequently, the Congress had every reason to believe that the Attorney General in his directing and prosecution of antimonopoly cases would do so in a manner in keeping with the views of the White House. Support is indicated for that belief in a recent press report to the effect that the Attorney General flew to Denver last summer to discuss with the President of the United States what should be done by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice about the proposed Bethlehem-Youngstown steel merger. It was to eliminate the problem of having all antimonopoly law enforcement in such hands that the Congress established the Commission independent of the Executive.

It is our purpose, therefore, to determine through these hearings whether it is true, as we frequently hear, that these supposedly independent commissions have become political puppets on telephone wires leading from the White House or from a political committee. Specifically, we expect to find out whether or not the reorganizations which have resulted from Hoover Commission proposals or otherwise have changed the effectiveness of these commissions in carrying out their responsibilities. This committee expects to inquire whether the conduct of these commissions and their officials make for effective enforcement of the laws assigned to them. We are interested in determining whether the Federal Trade Commission is effectively enforcing the statutes designed to protect small business against monopolistic practices and unfair methods of competition and whether the Commission is operating independently of Executive direction.

I am advised that at the FTC there have been at least two reorganizations within the Commission since the Hoover Commission submitted its recommendations on this Commission. We believe it is proper for us to inquire into the purposes of those reorganizations and the effects upon small business. At a later date the committee will make inquiry into specific legal cases undertaken by the Commission.

This subcommittee recognizes, as does the House Small Business Committee, the vital importance and the high purpose of the job which the FTC has to perform in the public interest. I am personally keenly aware of these things, as are several members of our committee staff—who were former employees of the Commission. It is intended that these investigations shall be constructive and, we trust, helpful in carrying out the mandate of Congress, and in assisting the Commission in being useful and more effective in reaching its declared goals and objectives, free from improper influences exercised upon its decisions in the public interest.

THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Our hearings today will concern themselves with the operations and functions of the Federal Power Commission. As provided for in the provisions of the rules of the House of Representatives—this statement is somewhat repetitious—the purposes of these hearings were stated in my public announcement. At the opening of these hearings it was to determine whether these agencies have ceased to be independent, as intended originally by Congress.

As we know, the Federal Power Commission was reorganized under Hoover Commission Proposal No. 9, I believe. That plan provides for the appointment of a Chairman by the President. The position is responsible to the President and the Chairman serves at the pleasure of the President. Under this plan the Chairman has complete control and direction of the Commission.

In addition, this committee has been informed that the Chairman of the Federal Power Comission and others directly connected with the executive branch of the Government instigated and brought about

a further reorganization of the Federal Power Commission.

Information before us concerns these latter shake-ups and shiftings of the organization of personnel resulting in the removal from key regulatory policy positions of public officials and public servants of long years of expcrience who have dedicated themselves and have spent a large part of their lives in the public policy specified in the laws enacted by Congress to be administered by the Federal Power Commission.

It is our information that control over the policies and functions and duties previously asserted by these men has fallen into the hands of a relatively few employees without experience in serving the public interest in the field of the Federal Power Commission. On the contrary, these employees have come to their positions with the thought in mind that the public policy expressed in the laws entrusted to the Federal Power Commission, they are not in sympathy with them, and they should not, therefore, be enforced.

It is our purpose to determine whether any of these facts are true as they have been brought to the attention of this committee.

We are mindful that the Federal Power Act, as amended, and with particular reference to title 16, United States Code Annotated, section 803 of the code, provides that combinations, agreements or arrangements or understandings, expressed or implied, to limit the output of electric energy, to restrain trade or to fix, maintain, or increase the prices of electrical energy or services are prohibited by this act.

The information before us does not indicate that the Federal Power Commission has given full force and effect to that expression of public policy. Failure in that regard is looked upon as dangerous to the maintenance of our free competitive enterprise system and detrimental to a small, vigorous element of our economy.

Now, that sounds like a big order, but we probably will be able to cover these matters without too much time of the members of the Commission. Also we are in the closing days of the Congress, as you know, also.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

This subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee is resuming hearings this morning on the organization and procedures of the Federal regulatory commissions and agencies. Our hearings today will deal with the Federal Communications Commission.

At the outset, I would like to repeat again the subcommittee's jurisdiction and purpose in holding these hearings.

House Resolution 114, approved by the House on January 27, 1955, directed this committee to study the problems of all types of small business existing, arising, or that may arise with particular reference to whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business. Subcommittee No. 1 was established by the full committee to carry out this congressional directive.

The Federal Communications Commission and the other regulatory agencies were created by the Congress for the purpose of carrying out legislative policies of the Congress. In no instance does any of these agencies have the power to regulate any phase of commerce except as specifically provided by the Congress.

In approving the legislation which established the regulatory agencies and commissions, Congress carefully and deliberately provided for such regulation to be independent of the executive branch of the Government and the industries to be regulated.

Moreover, the independence of these agencies and commissions from the executive branch has long been recognized by the Supreme Court as an important part of our constitutional doctrine of separation of powers. As stated by the Court in an important case:

The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of Government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential coequality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there." (*Humphrey's Executor v. U. S.* (295 U. S. 602)).

With particular reference to the Communications Act, 1934, Congress attempted to strengthen the independence of the Federal Communications Commission from political control of the executive branch by providing that not more than 4 of the 7 Commissioners shall be from the same party. To keep the Commission free from industry control, Congress provided that no Commissioner could be financially interested in any corporation or firm subject to regulation by the Commission.

In this connection this committee has received a number of disturbing reports indicating that the Federal Communications Commission is not in fact an independent agency or acting independently. There have been brought to our attention reports from individuals, Government officials, and the press that the Commission has become responsive not to principles and policies set forth by Congress, but instead the Commission has become responsive to, or under the influence and control of the White House, and the industry which the Commission is empowered to regulate. Such reports, if true, would vitally affect small and independent business in the communications industry and would prevent adequate consideration by the Commission of their problems.

I would like to give a few specific examples to show the nature of the reports that have come to the attention of the subcommittee.

We have received reports of changes in personnel and procedures in the FCC. For instance, as early as January 19, 1953, one of the leading trade publications, Broadcasting and Telecasting magazine, reported:

"After a 20-year patronage drought, it isn't difficult to understand the desire of the Republicans to shake loose as many jobs as possible in official Washington. But in their zeal to run the opposition out of office and reward the loyal party workers, there are signs that they intend to use a meat-ax rather than a scalpel.

"The reports are somewhat disquieting, at this stage, as they pertain to the FCC. There is the expressed attitude, for example, that the new Chairman should be an outsider who will have no compunctions about terminating the tenures of staff-level people, to make way for the GOP newcomers."

Reports which this committee has received from the FCC have detailed the changes in the personnel that have taken place since 1953 and they are substantial. At the same time officials of the Commission have advised members of this committee that the major networks have the power to hire and fire those who do not speak or vote in the networks' interests. That there may be substance in such charges as indicated by the fact that the Commission in a great majority of cases has appeared to follow policies approved by the networks but detrimental to independent and small-business segments of the communications industry.

This committee also has received reports with respect to policy changes. For example, it has been stated that aside from patronage one of the motivations behind personnel changes was to get a reversal of the staff position that in granting communication licenses, preference should be given to those not already holding a dominant position in the communications industry.

The press reported in April 1953, that Commissioner Hyde would be appointed as chairman only on a probationary basis. Later it was further reported:

"President Eisenhower announced Mr. Hyde's appointment from Augusta, Ga., where he was vacationing, on Saturday, April 18. He said the appointment would be for a 1-year term—establishing another FCC precedent."

Broadcasting-Telecasting magazine, one of the leading industry journals in the communications field, stated with respect to Mr. Hyde's appointment as Chairman:

"To be watched with great interest will be Mr. Hyde's policy views on a number of important issues. These include educational television reservations * * *, color television, pay-as-you-go TV, large screen theater television and perhaps more important, questions of diversification of ownership of more than one class of station by newspapers or others identified with media for the dissemination of information."

In its editorial of April 27, 1953, Broadcasting-Telecasting said:

"With Mr. Hyde as Chairman, things won't happen automatically. Mr. Hyde knows that he has to act. He probably can count on at least three members to vote with him in making staff changes. By June 30 he will have his fourth Republican member as the replacement for Commissioner and Ex-Chairman Paul A. Walker. It is to be hoped that this man will be a practical broadcaster.

"Mr. Hyde's appointment is for 1 year—an innovation probably deemed expedient to assuage hungry party men who wanted a new face as Chairman. If he doesn't achieve the desired result, the President will be free to name his successor a year hence."

This committee will look into these and other similar reports to determine whether they are true, and if so, what effect they have had upon the policies and decisions of the FCC in relation to small business in the communications industry.

The committee has received reports that political favoritism and influence have played a part in granting TV licenses. This matter will also be a subject of this inquiry.

Another important matter brought to the attention of the subcommittee has been reports that the FCC has changed its position with respect to the need for diversification of ownership and control of the media of mass information. In 1953 dominant members of the communications industry began clamoring for a change in the FCC policy which had long prevailed that a person not already strongly established in the communications industry should be given preference in the granting of new licenses. Those strongly entrenched in the industry sought to become even more firmly established by reversing this policy. Their success is indicated by a case decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on January 19 of this year. In this case the court said:

"In the case at bar there appears some suggestion that the Commission has changed, or is changing, its view as to the dominant importance of local ownership and as to the evil of a concentration of the media of mass information" (*Pinellas Broadcasting Company v. FCC*).

In this case the court pointed out that this change of policy on the part of the Commission could well be addressed to the attention of Congress.

This committee is interested in obtaining the facts behind these and other reports and in determining which segment of our business economy would benefit by the apparent changes in the philosophy and practices of

the FCC. Is it the small-business man who will not be given the chance to own radio and television facilities in his local community? Will the citizens of the United States be benefited if they get their news, or advertising from only one or a limited source—a source with no real interest in local problems but with regional or national power over what people will see and hear? Will not such policy changes on the part of the FCC present the ultimate danger of information and thought control?

In conducting this inquiry this committee is mindful of the fact that other congressional committees are making extensive investigations into certain aspects of the communications industry. The committee has been in contact with these committees and will not duplicate their work. Instead the facts developed by such committees will be considered by this subcommittee in preparing its report on its inquiry into the Federal Communications Commission's organization and operations.

Proposed Changes in Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Ways and Means met further in executive session with respect to recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems.

For the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release I have issued announcing the decisions made today by the committee in regard to the subcommittee recommendations.

The committee is scheduled to meet again at 10 a. m. in executive session on May 17, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee report.

The press release follows:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 1956, and May 14, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 1956, and May 15, 1956, and appear on pages A3818 and A3918, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 17, 1956. A table of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the Committee today are as follows:

"VI. DOCUMENTARY STAMP TAXES

"1 through 6 (b): Approved by the committee on May 14, 1956.

"6. (c) In the case of transfers which do not constitute sales or exchanges for value no transfer tax should be imposed.

"7. An exemption is presently provided from the stock issuance tax in the case of common trust funds maintained by a bank for the collective investment of moneys contributed by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, etc. This exemption should be extended to include a fund maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of assets of qualified pension trusts of which it is a trustee or cotrustee.

"8. The stock issuance tax should not be applicable to the mere dedication of the earned surplus of a corporation to its capital account.

"9. In the case of statutory mergers and consolidations, at present, both a stock issuance and a stock transfer tax are imposed. Only the issuance tax should be applicable in these cases where the stock is issued directly by the acquiring corporation to the stockholders of the acquired, or consolidated, corporation.

"10. In the case of odd-lot transactions no tax should be imposed on the sale of an odd lot of stock (100 shares or the unit of trading on an exchange) by an odd-lot dealer..

"11. The committee deleted recommendation 11 which provided that no transfer tax should be imposed with respect to the transfer from one revocable trust to another where both trusts have the same grantor. This recommendation is included within the scope of recommendation 6 (c).

"VII. OCCUPATIONAL TAXES AND TAXES ON WAGERING AND COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

"1. The present tax on billiard and pool table of $20 per year per alley, or table, does not apply to billiard and pool tables in a hospital where no charge is made for the use of the tables, or to bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables maintained exclusively for the use of members of the Armed Forces if no charge is made for the use of the alleys or tables. These exemptions should be extended to include bowling alleys or billiard and pool tables maintained without charge by nonprofit organizations or by agencies of the United States Government.

"2. In the case of the wagering tax, the law should be changed so that an agent who refuses or is unable to name his principal shall be deemed prima facie to be the principal, for purposes of the 10 percent excise on wagering.

"3. The definition of a coin-operated amusement device should include devices which are actuated by remote control without the use of a coin.

"VIII. EXEMPTION AND REFUND PROCEDURES

"1. A more uniform system of exemptions and refunds or credits should be adopted for manufacturers' sales (or resales) for further manufacture, for export, to State and local governments, and for fuel supplies, etc., for certain vessels and aircraft. Such rules should also be followed where applicable, in the case of retailers taxes and the taxes on communications and transportation. This should be done by providing for the permanent registration of purchasers for any of the exempt purposes and tax-free sales should be made only to such purchasers. Tax-free sales would not require the use of exemption certificates but would be evidenced by a notation on the sales invoice of the registration number of the exempt purchaser. Where a sale is made by the initial manufacturer on a tax-paid basis and the purchaser subsequently uses or sells the article for one of the prescribed exempt purposes, a refund or credit should be allowed upon proof of such a sale. The refund or credit would be allowed whether or not there had been an indication at the time of the initial purchase that the article was intended for use for one of the specified exempt purposes. The refund or credit should be made through the initial manufacturer except in the case of purchases by another manufacturer directly from the initial manufacturer where used or sold for a taxable purpose. In this latter case the refund or credit should be made directly to the second manufacturer and based upon his purchase price of the article in question.

"2. The crediting devices with respect to tires (also inner tubes and auto radios and television sets) presently available for application against the excise tax on automobiles and trucks should be extended so that credits with respect to tires, etc., are available for crediting against any manufacturers' excise tax.

"3. With respect to tires, tubes, and auto radio and television sets mounted on, or incorporated in, other articles sold for export or to State or local governmental units, tax-free sales of the tires, etc. (or credits or refunds) should be allowed in the same manner as in the case of other articles sold for export or to State or local governmental units.

"4. Provision should be made in the statute that, where clocks are combined with other articles subject to a manufacturers' tax, the manufacturers' tax should apply to the entire combination in the manner now prescribed by ruling.

"5. It should be made clear that parts or components, which when incorporated in another article are free of tax as a result of Public Law 367, 84th Congress, 1st session, are, nevertheless, considered as taxable when sold as repair or replacement parts.

"6. It should be made clear that automobile parts and accessories, radio and television components, and camera lenses are subject to tax where they are used by the manufacturer as repair or replacement parts.

"7. In the case of documentary stamp taxes, the period of limitations should commence running in the case of an assessment from the time the stamp tax is paid, rather than from the time the tax became due. The redemption provisions in present law with respect to documentary stamp taxes should be revised by deleting from the redemption provision those cases where stamps have been improperly or unnecessarily used and where the rates and duties have wrongfully been collected. Also, the provision relating to the 3-year period of redemption (from the date of purchase) should be applicable only to unused stamps.

"8. The treatment presently provided by ruling exempting State and local governmental units from the tax on real-estate conveyances (but imposing the tax on the other party) should be added to the statute, but no distinction should be made between transfers or acquisitions for governmental, as distinct from proprietary, functions.

"9. In the case of the club dues tax, an indication of written consent from members, rather than the execution of a power of attorney, should be acceptable in the future as a basis on which to allow a refund or credit. The procedure followed should be substantially the same as that now followed in the cases of manufacturers' excises.

"10. It should be made clear that a refund on an initiation fee repaid to a member who is withdrawing from a club is payable irrespective of when the initial payment was made by the taxpayer.

"11. It should be made clear that a refund of the cabaret tax, or the tax on the

transportation of oil by pipeline, should be made where the amount of the tax has been repaid to the consumer of the service or where the consumer of a service gives permission to the performer of the service to the allowance of the credit or refund. Thus, the refund or credit in the case of these taxes is not intended to be limited to only those cases where the collector of the taxes has borne the burden of the taxes.

"IX. FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS

"1. A uniform procedure should be provided with respect to all floor stock refunds of manufacturers' excises permitted by the Internal Revenue Code. To this end the following changes in existing law should be made:

"(a) Dealers should be given a period of 2 months and 10 days after the rate reduction date for filing their refund claims with the manufacturer. Manufacturer should be given an additional period of at least 1 month, or possibly as much as 3 months, for compiling dealers' claims and filing a single claim with the Government.

"(b) Instead of paying dealers' claims prior to, or at, the time of filing their claims with the Government, manufacturers should be required to state that within 30 days after they receive a refund or credit they will pass it on to their dealers.

"(c) The filing of claims by manufacturers should be integrated with the filing of their quarterly excise tax returns.

"2. The requirement that gasoline prices be reduced to reflect the floor-stock refund should be repealed.

"3. The technical error in the 1954 code which provides for floor-stock refunds on automotive parts and accessories should be corrected by the deletion of provision for such refunds.

"4. A statutory time limit for the claiming of floor-stock refunds should be provided with respect to the tax reduction provided for in present law in the case of tax-paid imported sugar or imported products composed in chief value of manufactured sugar.

"5. Claimants for refunds in the case of alcoholic beverages and cigarettes should not be required to keep detailed records relating to the price reduction provision for these products, since no such price reduction provision is now contained in the law in the case of the taxes on alcoholic beverages and cigarettes."

At the 10 a. m. executive session on May 17, 1956, the committee will resume consideration of the subcommittee report with section X, page 9, relating to general recommendations.

Maligned Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-Evening News which discusses and comments on some misconceptions concerning the State Department of the United States:

After baseball, the most popular American sport has been belittling the State Department. It is manned, we are told, by "striped pants boys" who drink tea and talk with Oxford accents. When it comes to negotiating with other nations, so the story goes, we are invariably duped and defeated.

This listens well, but is far from the truth. Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, and now executive director of Columbia University's American Assembly, who has observed our foreign policy for many years, defends the Department. No longer is it, as it once was, a refuge for party hacks and contributors to campaign funds. Its 2,250 members, a number comparing favorably with Great Britain's 813, are almost entirely professional. It is filled with experts who are of great assistance to our transient Secretaries of State.

The Department is not perfect. It could use more money. The money it does have is efficiently handled, and produces a diplomatic corps that can hold its head up with that of any other nation.

Gov. Adlai Stevenson's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because of certain distortions of the true record of Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, with respect to old-age assistance, my colleague and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable CECIL R. KING, and myself have found it necessary to correct the record by issuing a public statement which is quoted below:

Congressman CECIL R. KING, Democrat, California, and Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, California, both from southern California, today issued the following joint statement in answer to an attack on Gov. Adlai Stevenson's record on social security and old-age assistance:

"We have worked long and hard for the needed revision and expansion of our social security and public assistance laws. We feel that it is necessary to correct the erroneous and distorted statements now being circulated in California regarding the constructive record of Gov. Adlai Stevenson on old-age assistance.

"We wish also to emphasize the accomplishments of Governor Stevenson in Illinois. The facts are that no Governor in the history of Illinois—indeed few Governors in the Nation have done more for the older people than Adlai E. Stevenson.

"In his very first address—his Inaugural Address—Governor Stevenson called on the Illinois Legislature to raise old-age pensions, and within 3 months, old-age pensions were raised by 18 percent.

"Governor Stevenson's 4-year Public Aid program made available $128 million more for old-age pensions and other forms of assistance than was spent in the previous 4 years under a Republican governor.

"At Governor Stevenson's urging, the Illinois Legislature passed a modern Public Assistance Code which repealed the antiquated 'Pauper Law' and is now considered a model law throughout the Nation.

"On 134 occasions in 4 years under Governor Stevenson, the Republican legislature in Illinois tried to pass bills for roads, bridges, pensions and other purposes without appropriating 1 cent to finance them, and Governor Stevenson insisted that the funds be provided before he would approve the bills.

"Governor Stevenson at no time made the statement which the pamphlet quotes him as making about old-age pensions.

"The Illinois Public Aid Commission at no time during Governor Stevenson's administration cut old-age pensions by 10 percent. According to the current Executive Director of the Commission, Mr. Garrett W. Keaster, there was no such cut during Governor Stevenson's administration.

"It is our sincere belief that real progress in social security and public assistance can best be achieved with Governor Adlai Stevenson as President of the United States."

The 35th Division in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, more recent history of the 35th Division and especially the 137th Infantry in World War II was highlighted last week when in Kansas City, Kans., the citizens dedicated a million-dollar National Guard Armory, in which there were no Federal funds.

The following special feature article in the Kansas City Kansan of Friday, May 4, retells some of the experiences of our local guardsmen in World War II, where they hung up an enviable record of combat:

STRONG ROLE BY GUARD IN GREAT WAR—SIX HUNDRED FROM HERE IN 35TH WENT INTO FEDERAL SERVICE IN 1940, FOUGHT THROUGH TO VICTORY

About 600 Kansas City, Kans., men, all members of the National Guard units in the 35th Infantry Division, were ordered into Federal service on December 23, 1940, less than a year before Pearl Harbor.

Departing as integral units, they were to be transported, trained, drilled, and toughened for 3½ years in the United States before entering the final great conflict, the recapture of France and assault into Germany itself.

At the end of the war, the original units bore little resemblance to their original form, both in organization and personnel. Many men were dead. Others were wounded.

DOWN TO 20 PERCENT

Replacements, transfers, and the decimation of battle had reduced some units to as little as 20 percent of the original complement of men from the States of Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska, of which the 35th is composed in peacetime.

Seven units from Kansas City, Kans., departed for Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Little Rock, Ark., early in 1941, for the beginning of training. The units and their commanders at that time were:

Headquarters Battery, 3d Battalion, 127th Field Artillery, Capt. Leo A. Swoboda.

Headquarters Battery, 2d Battalion, 127th Field Artillery, Capt. Harry L. Lyon.

Medical Detachment, 161st Field Artillery, Maj. Louis B. Gloyne.

Thirty-fifth Signal Company, 1st Lt. Clyde V. Adams.

Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 137th Infantry, 1st Lt. Don A. Starry.

Company "G," 137th Infantry, commanded by 1st Lt. Merle C. Barlett, as Capt. Mahlon S. Weed, who had commanded the company for 15 years, was temporarily absent at the Infantry School at Ft. Benning, Ga.

Band, 127th Field Artillery, Warrant Officer Charles M. Nixon.

After basic training the division participated in maneuvers in Louisiana and on re-

turn to Camp Robinson furnished cadres for new organizations being formed. Thus many men trained in the division saw combat long before the division was committed in the invasion of Hitler's Europe.

Stateside duty for the division stretched from California to Alabama. Finally in January, 1944, they moved to Camp Butner, N. C., for final polish before going overseas.

ON THREE TRANSPORTS

The division departed from New York City on May 12, 1944, aboard three transports shortly before D-day June 6.

The first elements of the 35th arrived at newly-won Omaha Beach in the vicinity of Cooleville Sur-Mere at 3 p. m. on July 5.

The division received its baptism of fire in the campaign which led to the capture of St. Lo, fighting its way through the vast checkerboard of fields and meadows bordered by the never-to-be-forgotten hedgerows.

These hedgerows had been converted by the Germans into fortresses, impenetrable to the eye, which concealed foxholes, machinegun and mortar emplacements, and excellent screening for sniping parties. The Germans exploited these natural embankments to the utmost.

AFTER BITTER BATTLE

The Stars and Stripes floated over St. Lo after one of the most bitter battles on French soil.

From July 25, 1944 to September, the 35th was engaged in the campaign for northern France which culminated with the bitter, intense battle at Mortain.

After V–E day, members of the German general staff stated the war was lost when their counterattack at Mortain-Avranches failed.

Fighting across France continued, with the 35th participating in major battles and campaigns. On December 12, four men of the 137th Infantry Regiment became the first men in the division to cross into Germany.

During this action the division received the heaviest artillery concentrations it received during the entire war. Following this the 137th Indantry Regiment was transferred to the 20th Corps and was ordered to advance with all speed to assist in the attempt to relieve the 101st Airborne Division surrounded in Bastogne.

FANATICAL RESISTANCE

Maintaining an advance against fanatical resistance, after 22 days of extreme cold and heavy casualties, the 137th was pinched out of the line by the converging offensive. The regiment returned to the Metz area with frostbite and fresh wounds on January 18, 1945.

The division joined the offensive east to Hitler's fortress and the 137th joined in the final cleanup of the last enemy pocket held west of the Rhine, known as "88 alley."

Through the spring the 35th continued to fight, reaching the river Elbe on April 16, 1945, where with all other Allied units it was instructed to consolidate positions and to await contact by the advancing Russian units from the east.

In 10 months of almost continuous action on the western front, from Omaha Beach through France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, and to within a few hours drive of Berlin, the 35th had traveled a twisting, fighting path of more than 1,600 combat miles.

BATTLEFIELD APPOINTMENTS

Over 150 enlisted men had received battlefield appointments as second lieutenants. Over 4,000 battle awards had been won by Santa Fe officers and men, including a congressional Medal of Honor to Staff Sgt. Junior J. Spurrier of company G, 134th infantry.

A highlight of occupation was on July 10, 1945, when the 137th Regiment moved to Grimberges, Belgium, to provide the guard of honor for President Truman en route to the Pottsdam Conference.

In August the 137th Infantry came back to the United States, followed in September by the rest of the division. Reassembling at Camp Breckenridge, Ky., the division was mustered out of Federal service by December 1, 1945.

The Pitiful Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have become aware of the fact that the most effective opponent of abuses in the internal-security program is a former Republican Senator from the State of Washington, the Honorable Harry P. Cain. Mr. Cain, now Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, has been shocked and scandalized by the injustices to individuals almost inevitable in the present system.

In equity, I should point out that former Senator Cain has not sought to aggrandize the publicity he has received in this dispute by running for political office again. I should point out that in the Senate itself he worked hard to uncover the true facts about the smear stories against Mrs. Anne Rosenberg, who was the victim of a brutal attack when she was nominated by former President Truman as Assistant Secretary of Defense but whom the Senate cleared and confirmed.

Senator Cain made a speech in New York the other night, and its charges disturb me. They should disturb all of us who are concerned about the American system of fair play and the nature of true security.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch quoting from Senator Cain's speech and expressing some opinions about President Eisenhower's direct responsibility for the abuses of the internal security system:

THE PITIFUL FACT

Former Senator Harry P. Cain has had a lot to say about the blundering, damaging character of the Eisenhower administration's internal security program. But nothing the State of Washington Republican has said in the last year and a half goes as far as his address before the Jewish Labor Committee at the National Trade Union Conference on Civil Rights in New York.

Mr. Cain undoubtedly gave much thought to what he said and so we quote his words in substantial text rather than select phrases from them. Speaking as an Eisenhower appointee to the Subversive Activities Control Board, he said:

"In 3 years of effort, we have found no spies or traitors, saboteurs or Communists in positions of trust.

"But the pitiful fact is that hundreds and hundreds of faithful public servants have been suspended.

"There is no provision that the hearing board and the agency head must reach a decision within a stated period of time. They can take whatever time they want, and many of them take a painful and inexcusable amount of it.

"This is the 20th-century American tragedy. When people are charged, heard, and then restored after months of anguished waiting, they get their jobs back, but their usefulness as citizens is largely over.

"They are not likely ever again to have an original thought, and if they do, you may be certain they will not dare to express it."

This would be condemnation enough of the security program, but former Senator Cain went on to say something even more condemnatory. Actually the system, so he said, may even create security risks in that a Government employee, unjustly fired and unable to find other work, might eventually become a prey to enemy agents.

How can this situation continue after President Eisenhower has issued internal security directives which, so the President said, were designed to protect those unjustly accused?

Mr. Cain's answer is simplicity itself. Out of his extensive experience with this problem, Mr. Cain says that the President's directives "have often been ignored without his knowledge."

This criticism of the Eisenhower administration was so sharp and so direct that the President was asked about it at his press conference. His generalized comments lacked a lot of coming to grips with the issue. The President said that he had not read the Cain speech, that he knew about the suspended Sidney Hatkin (to which Mr. Cain had alluded) and that the case was in the hands of Air Force Secretary Quarles in whom he has "utmost confidence."

Continuing in this unspecific vein, President Eisenhower went on to say that the security program came under Attorney General Brownell to whom "White House doors were always open." As for his knowledge of the program, he said "they" brought him reports "of what was going on in terms of numbers rather than names."

In short, the numbers racket is still being worked on the President by his top advisers. Either Harry P. Cain is right or he is not. Either it is true or not true that not a single spy, traitor, saboteur or Communist has been found in a place of trust in 3 years.

Can it be possible that there is no way for the President to learn the facts so he can function as the responsible head of the Government in this vital matter? Can it be that his time for his duties is so limited he cannot meet at least briefly with one of his appointees and hear firsthand the information he so obviously lacks?

Granted that President Eisenhower is overwhelmed with responsibilities, surely he can find time to give attention to the welfare, fair treatment and morale of Government employees.

No Joint Commissions To Stop Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Victor Reuther, assistant to the president of the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO, addressed the Young Presidents' Organization in Hollywood, Fla., April 27.

Alexander R. Hammer, of the New York Times, reported Mr. Reuther's remarks to this meeting. He said:

The labor official reiterated the belief expressed before by organized labor that "automation and atomic power has put the world on the threshold of undreamed of opportunities."

"We do not approach these promises of technological advance with any sense of fear," he continued. "But we do insist that they be met with intelligent planning in order that we may be able to cushion the impact upon our social structure. Failure to plan, resistance to change, could result in serious dislocation. It is a community and national responsibility to see that no industrial worker be forced to pay the price of any technological advance."

Mr. Reuther suggested that each basic industry should establish joint commissions of inquiry to make certain that management and labor at every industry level is prepared to meet the shock of automation. "As yet," he added, "there have been no such meetings."

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that each basic industry should establish joint commissions to deal with automation has very grave implications. Our system of private enterprise is regulated by the forces of competition. When an industry establishes a joint commission, such as Mr. Reuther suggests, there will be little competition between its members in the form of improved products and better productive methods to reduce costs to the consumer and thus expand markets to make more and better jobs possible for workers.

Since 1939 the establishment of joint industry and labor-management committees has been the solution advanced by Walter and Victor Reuther to meet every problem. When World War II required the conversion of the automobile industry for defense, the Reuthers proposed a joint labor-management program to accomplish this task. Fortunately, this program was never adopted. Conversion took place. The weapons of war were made and we got on with the job. When the war was over, the Reuthers again advanced the same formula to meet the problems of reconversion. Again their advice as rejected. We are now told that a new crisis is upon us, namely, the introduction of automation and atomic power, and the same solution is again advanced.

The joint industry-labor committees, suggested by the Reuthers, were tried by Mussolini in Italy in the 1920's. They were the keystone of fascism. I do not want to see our competitive system lost and a cartelized industrial structure substituted in its place. The American people would never be content with such a system.

If competition were to be superseded by joint commissions operating at industry levels, they would in turn have to be supervised by Government over which the people would have some control. This is the easy, sure road to socialism. This is the reason that every problem always meets with he same recommended solution. It is in keeping with the socialistic aspirations of the Reuthers which have animated all of their actions since they first became prominent in the labor movement.

Automation is a fancy word for an evolutionary process which has been taking place ever since the start of the industrial revolution. We have made constant shifts of employment from one industry to another, from one occupation to another, and they have been met without hardship when our economy was operating at a high level of output. By reducing the cost of Government and by creating an atmosphere conducive to the expansion of private enterprise, we can secure the advantages of automation and atomic power without having to sacrifice our basic economic freedoms and without unemployment.

In Defense of States Rights Against the Unwarranted Assumption of Powers by the Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of an excellent address delivered by the distinguished attorney general of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., before the Judicial Conference of Virginia in Richmond on May 4, 1956. Attorney General Almond is a former member of the House of Representatives, having served in the 79th and 80th Congresses from the Sixth District of Virginia.

The address is as follows:

Hon. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR. (attorney general of Virginia). Mr. President, honored and distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched and grateful for that very generous introduction. I am indeed delighted that my wife could be present and hear it. [Laughter.] The distinguished Associate Justice who accords me that generous introduction carries with him, resting in his vest pocket, the power of injunction, therefore of necessity my remarks must be brief.

It is with a deep feeling of trepidation that I accepted this high assignment. When it suddenly and lately became apparent that Dean Sebring's illness would not permit his appearance, Mr. Chief Justice Hudgins had no time to think of a competent substitute. His most expeditious and effective—if not fortunate and judicious—remedy was mandamus. It was in personam and ex parte without recourse to higher authority. In fact, under the impact of the overwhelming and ever mounting weight of incontrovertible evidence, I have lately been driven to the conclusion that there no longer exists such higher authority in the American judicial system.

Since Mr. Justice Sebring had selected as his topic "The Public Responsibility of the Lawyer" I would like to obliquely adapt it to my dire and forelorn distress as Attorney General of Virginia and challenge the "public responsibility" of my brethren at the bar to assist me in devising effectual procedural means for the issuance of certiorari from the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia directed to the Supreme Court of the United States in that monumental exposition of sociological hallucination under the style of *Davis* v. *Prince Edward County*.

In thinking of the great and boundless arena of the public responsibility of the lawyer, I should like to focus your searching and penetrating attention and concern on, and to appeal to the profoundest depths of your loyalty on, what I believe to be the sensitivity of your sacred and inescapable obligation of duty to face, thwart, and defeat by whatever legal, honorable, and constitutional means available the deliberate, palpable, and brazen onslaught, raging with reckless abandon before your very eyes, to destroy our constitutional system of government.

Ready, willing, and eager to abide the consequences—whatever they may be—I hurl this challenge not only at the bar—I throw it out to the bench, the Congress, the law schools, the institutions of learning, and to the legislative and executive branches of the State governments. Too long and too deeply have we been submerged in the lethargy of indifference, stalked by the shadow of fear and clinging to the delusive phantom of hope that right and justice will prevail of its own accord—that truth crushed beneath the heel of tyranny will rise again from the ruins of a polluted and desecrated temple.

The flagrant disregard of the Constitution in the field of education is but one symptom of this judicial plague. The incendiary conflagration rages with ever widening and consuming scope. State lines, territory, jurisdiction and sovereignty are being crumbled and obliterated. Federal paramount rights, Federal preemption, implied supercession, national polity, economic equality, national uniformity, social equality ride head on in the chariot of judicial legislation, brushing Congress aside and trampling the 10th amendment into the dust of oblivion under the lash of an aggregation of charioteers who hurdle all barriers by amending the Constitution at will in violation of article V thereof and flaunt such as the supreme law of the land.

They tell us with pious gusto that they can't turn the clock back to *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1896. They cannot look to the Constitution as a prop and comfort of their judicial peregrination. It is becoming even more apparent every day in Virginia and other States that we can't turn the clock back to May 17, 1954.

The triumph of judicial mediocrity has stilled the great juristic voices of the past—made mockery of their erudition—corroded their genius—desecrated their fame and abnegated their illustrious contribution to constitutional virtue and stability.

In the Erie Railroad case Mr. Justice Brandeis, a renowned liberal, has this to say: "* * * there stands, as a perpetual protest against its repetition, the Constitution of the United States, which recognizes and preserves the autonomy and independence of the State, independence in their legislative and independence in their judicial departments. Supervision over either the legislative or the judicial action of the States is in no case permissible except as to matters by the Constitution specifically authorized or delegated to the United States. Any interference with either, except as thus permitted, is an invasion of the authority of the State, and, to that extent, a denial of its independence."

There is a school of thought, in my judgment all too prevalent, which advances the argument that the Constitution is a living thing, susceptible to growth, and must be adaptable and flexible enough to meet changes in the social and economic life of the country. That argument loses its validity when applied in destruction of the very foundation and pillars of our constitutional Government. That argument then is in derogation of the very principles which underlie a written constitution. A constitution cannot be written by any branch of

our Government without ceasing to be a constitution. Conditions may require that the Constitution be changed, but let it be done by amendment in the manner provided therein. It is nothing but a sterile scrap of paper if it must yield to the insidious argument of flexibility induced by expediency or the pressures of the moment.

Judge Cooley, in his treatise on Constitutional Limitations, seventh edition, pages 88–89, made this very direct statement: "A constitution is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some other time."

Mr. Justice Brewer, in his address before the Virginia Bar Association in 1906, said: "I know there are changed conditions and different social and business life from that which obtained when the Constitution was framed. It may be that new laws are necessary—possible amendments to the Constitution—but it must always be remembered that this is a Government of and by the people, and if additions and changes are necessary, let them be made in the appointed way. Never let the courts attempt to change laws or the Constitution to meet what they think present conditions require. When they do this they clearly usurp powers belonging to the legislature and the people."

As far back as ex parte Milligan, it is said in that case, "The Constitution never yields to treaty or enactment; it neither changes with time nor does it in theory bend to the force of circumstance; its principles cannot be set aside to meet supposed necessities."

The Constitution cannot be a "living document" except that it be an abiding document. It can neither abide nor endure unless we combine and marshall every force in the Nation dedicated to its preservation.

Authorities might be pyramided supportive of the devastative logic and soundness of our position. Dissenting in *Truax* v. *Corrigan*, 250 U. S. 312, and *Otis* v. *Parker*, 187 U. S. 606, we find the commanding stature of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, another great liberal, who observed: "There is nothing that I more deprecate than the use of the 14th amendment beyond the absolute compulsion of its words to prevent the making of social experiments that an important part of a community desires, in the insulated chambers afforded by the several States, even though the experiments may seem futile or even noxious to me and to those whose judgment I most respect. * * * Considerable latitude must be allowed for difference of view, as well as for possible peculiar conditions which this Court can know but imperfectly, if at all."

Again, in *Baldwin* v. *Missouri*, 281 U. S. 586, I quote Justice Holmes: "I have not yet adequately expressed the more than anxiety that I feel at the ever-increasing scope given to the 14th amendment in cutting down what I believe to be the constitutional rights of the States. * * * I cannot believe that the amendment was intended to give us carte blanche to embody our economic or moral beliefs in its prohibitions."

The truth of the matter is that we have been asleep at the switch while this judicial juggernaut has rolled on heedless of the constitutional limitations expressly imposed on Federal power. In the last 20 years the Supreme Court has reversed more established constitutional constructions than were changed by that Court in all the preceding years of its history. Most of these reversals have been at the expense of the constitutional rights of the States.

For the past 20 years appointments to the Supreme Bench have been made without regard to fitness or ability. The appointive power has been desecrated and degraded to the extent of political depravity for the purpose of paying political debts or for the purpose of buttressing dubious political programs and consolidating the political support of minority pressure groups. Democratic Presidents have packed and the Republican President has laid the capstone by stacking. [Laughter.]

Judicial experience, erudition, and high attainment in the profession of law have been liabilities to disqualify instead of attributes of qualification. These appointments have been confirmed by the Senate with hardly a passing glance, and thus our present constitutional crisis has fastened its tentacles upon a trusting and unsuspecting people.

Unless the States mobilize their power and hurl it against this tragic travesty upon our constitutional system, their inevitable fate is ultimate consignment to the role of dependent Federal satellites bereft of sovereignty, dignity, and integrity.

This is a matter not of isolated sectional or provincial concern. It is a dagger pointed at the heart of every State in the Union and at the heart of the Union itself.

As the impact of the exercise of arrogated powers lays its heavy hand of unconstitutional encroachment on the reserved prerogatives of other States, they, too, are beginning to realize that the effect of this judicial usurpation is national in the scope of its destructive effect. Under the determined prodding and leadership of a group of State's attorneys general, in which Virginia is playing a very humble role, they are rallying to that philosophy of government which springs from the historic concept of an "indestructible Union of indestructible States."

In the meantime, the charioteers who prescribe without appeal, even to the people, the limitless bounds of their own unchecked powers continue their unbridled assault upon the citadel of State's rights in defiance of that Constitution which they have taken an oath to uphold and defend.

On April 2, 1956, the Court in a 6 to 3 opinion delivered by the Chief Justice struck down the antisubversive statutes of 42 States and 2 Territories in the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, leaving these States utterly defenseless in their own courts against Communist assaults directed against their very existence. It was of little or no moment to the majority that in so doing they exonerated from a merited punishment of 20 years in the penitentiary and a $10,000 fine one of the most dangerous and notorious Communists on the American scene. In a well-recognized field of concurrent Federal-State jurisdiction they applied the so-called doctrine of Federal preemption, holding that Congress had "occupied the field to the exclusion of parallel State legislation." In their eager-beaver assault upon States rights they supplied pseudo congressional intent in total disregard of express congressional intent to the contrary. The Smith Act appears in title 18 of the United States Code. The majority deliberately swept aside section 3231 of that title, which provides: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

In true neophyte fashion they repudiated the sage counsel of John Marshall in *Cohens* v. *Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 433), when he said: "To interfere with the penal laws of a State, when they * * * have for their sole object internal government of the country, is a very serious measure, which Congress cannot be supposed to adopt lightly or inconsiderately * * *. It would be taken deliberately and the intention would be clearly and unequivocally expressed."

On April 9, in a 5-to-4 decision, *Slochower* v. *Board of Education of the City of New York*, in which the Chief Justice joined with the majority, the Court applied, with fantastic reasoning, the due process and privilege and immunities clauses of the 14th amendment in nullification of a provision in the charter of the city of New York "designed to eliminate from public employment individuals who refused to answer legally authorized inquiries as to the official conduct of any officer or employee of the city * * * on the grounds that his answer would tend to incriminate him."

Here, a sovereign State has been slapped down in the exercise of its right to set up standards of qualifications for those who would teach in its public-school system. Here, the Court has said that a State has no valid concern over the fitness of a teacher working in the sensitive area of a schoolroom where he "shapes the attitude of young minds toward the society in which they live" (*Adler* v. *Board of Education* (342 U. E. 485)). Professor Slochower had refused to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party during the years 1940–41. Aside from being a deliberate and palpable invasion of States rights, this decision gives aid and comfort to the Communist Party in its avowed purpose to infiltrate governmental employment and to pollute the minds of youth with its despicable ideology. The very safeguards so carefully designed for the protection and perpetuation of our system and form of government are being distorted into weapons for the destruction of the Constitution and the institutions of this Republic. We are spending billions for defense against that dreaded assault from abroad which may be hurled against us at any moment through the satanic machinations of the Kremlin, while at home the highest Court in the land has decreed that a sovereign State may not eliminate from the public payroll a teacher of its youth who hid behind the fifth amendment in his refusal to say whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party at a given time. On April 23 the Court in a 5-to-4 decision (*Griffin and Crenshaw* v. *The People of the State of Illinois*) in which the Chief Justice joined with the majority, struck down the Illinois statute providing the procedure for appeals in noncapital and capital criminal offenses. Under the Illinois statute the terms of appeal were open to all. The majority opinion admitted that a State could deny an appeal altogether in a criminal case without violating Federal due process, but held that when a State does grant appellate review it must pay for the transcript of the record if the appellant is too poor to pay for it himself. The Court says that failure to do so was adjudged to be in violation of due process and equal protection. The effect of this decision is to make all defendants in criminal cases economically equal before the bar of justice. While delving into the area of economic equality the Court could just as logically go a step further and require a State to furnish a poor man counsel at the same price a rich man would pay for his out of his own pocket, or prevent a State from fixing bail at a reasonable sum on the ground that a rich man could raise it and a poor man could not. Since this decision applies to past as well as future convictions of crime in a State court, the country is confronted with the appalling danger of the release upon society of thousands of convicted felons now serving terms in the State penitentiaries. This sweeping abridgement of the rights of the States will have terrific impact on the laws of at least 19 States "and will create a host of problems affecting the States of an unknown multitude of indigent convicts."

These abominable decisions, we are told, constitute the supreme law of the land while the present court, like Lady MacBeth, can say, "What need we fear who knows it, where none can call our power to account?"

All of this and worse to follow, I fear, has been brought about because we, the people, have permitted a premium to be placed on judicial mediocrity.

A grave responsibility rests upon Congress. I advocate that Congress should by enact-

ment require that no nomination to the Supreme Court shall be confirmed unless the nominee shall have had at least a stipulated amount of service on a State Supreme Court or a Federal Circuit Court of Appeals; that the legislatures of 39 States—excluding those States with representatives then on the bench as well as any whose posts are vacant—shall have the privilege of submitting directly to the President its choice of one qualified citizen of such State, with confirmation by the Senate to be so restricted if the Senate finds such nominee otherwise qualified. If the State legislature be not in session, then the endorsement and recommendation shall be by petition of the members thereon attested and certified as the legislature may by statute prescribe. I know of no other way to assure that fitness and qualification necessary to restore the highest court in the land to that position of prestige and respect which it should at all times command. If an amendment to the Constitution be neecssary, it is right to start that process now.

The courts of Virginia do not sit in judgment for purposes of self-stultification. They do not accept that which is incredible or contrary to human experience. The doctrine of nonstultification has repeatedly been applied to alleged factual situations. Why should it stop there? Is there any organic law in the Nation commanding more respect and enjoining more allegience, the oath to uphold and defend which is more sacred and binding than the Constitution of the United States as ordained and ratified by the people?

When the Supreme Court of the United States transgresses the organic law with impunity, when it records for posterity its utter contempt for the rights of a sovereign State and invades the exclusive jurisdiction of a State court, when it substitutes itself for the people and arrogates unto itself a power which is the sole prerogative of a State, when it proceeds to amend the Constitution in flagrant violation of its plain terms, does such conduct become the supreme law of the land and fasten its shackles upon the courts of last resort of the several States? If such State courts permit themselves, through sheer lack of fortitude, to be so manacled, then they not only sit in self-stultification, they are accepting with sanction that which is incredible in law and fact, they are compounding a dangerous usurpation of power subversive to the Constitution which they are under obligation to uphold and defend.

It is no answer to say that refusal to accept that which is plainly and palpably wrong will meet the fate of reversal. Let the Supreme Court of the United States pyramid its own comedy of errors—a tragic drama in which it has no peers.

In the language of a great President: "We, even here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth." [Applause.]

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in all of the debate of the soil-bank program, I heard much on the subject of the payments and how much they should be, but I heard little on the conservation aspect of the program. Since conservation is the true essence of the program and since it means so much to generations of Americans yet unborn, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye Gazette, which quotes some timely words of D. A. Williams, Administrator of the United States Conservation Service. I urge that particular note be taken of the tribute to the men who work in the Soil Conservation Service. The editorial follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

There's a rich reward in soil-conservation work, and in the Burlington area as well as throughout this section of the country, men are giving liberally of their time and energy that the program be advanced.

Worth passing on is the comment of D. A. Williams, Administrator of the United States Conservation Service. He says:

"Something more than material benefit is impelling American landowners and operators to become conservation farmers or ranchers. Something more than the established fact that soil and water conservation increases farm buying power is motivating businessmen and countless others to support conservation work.

"A farmer or rancher finds pleasure in the beauty of his conservation-treated fields, pastures, woodlands, and wildlife areas. And I feel that all the rest of us share his pleasure as we drive by or fly over his acres; or, when we're extra fortunate, have a chance to feel healthy soil or vigorous sod beneath our feet, or join the owner in harvesting a wildlife crop more abundant now than a few years ago.

"But there is another important motivating force for conservation.

"I believe it is the fast-growing realization in every community I know about that wise use and treatment of soil is a moral responsibility—that soil is a gift of the Creator, and that we, all of us, have a steward's responsibility for it.

"Unless we pause to consider the spiritual man, we may be amazed by this spread of the soil stewardship concept in a time when we are troubled by temporary crop surpluses and when only 1 person in 25 actually tills the soil for a living.

"Unless we accept as a fact that men do recognize the spiritual values of soil and water conservation, we are unable to explain fully the personal sacrifices thousands of them make to serve as members of the governing boards of nearly 2,700 locally-organized and manager soil conservation districts. These men—and there are some women on these governing boards—already are conservation farmers or ranchers. They already are personally reaping the material benefits of greater net income, lower production costs, and greater efficiency in the use of labor and machinery that comes with conservation.

"But these local leaders cannot, and do not, expect material gain from their services as district supervisors, commissioners, or directors. They receive no salaries. In some States, they are not even reimbursed in part for their expenses.

"They surely must be motivated by the truth of the Psalmist's words: 'The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof * * *' They are heeding the Creator's command, when He placed man in the Garden of Eden, 'to dress it and to keep it.'

"I believe that the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service have this same conception. How else would we explain the countless extra hours, beyond the call of duty, which they devote to soil and water conservation?

"And, throughout the Nation, ministers are providing the spiritual leadership of soil stewardship. Thousands of them each year take soil stewardship as the text of sermons, and provide a continuing leadership among their congregations for recognition that the earth truly is the Lord's.

"To those of us who are soil conservationists by profession as well as by conviction, this expanding conception of soil stewardship is indeed heartening.

"For we know that man and soil remain inseparable, all technological and cultural advances notwithstanding.

"Man still obtains his food and most of his clothing and shelter from the dust of the earth. And this 'dust of the earth,' when kept in the balance in which it was created, is a wonderful composite of minerals and myriads of living, decaying plants and animals. It is a storehouse of abundance for past, present, and future generations—a tremendous reservoir to trap and store for use more of the water which at one time may come in raging floods and at another season become insufficient for the needs of thirsty crops, animals, cities, and industries, and man himself."

Limitations on Colorado River Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, Mr. Raymond A. Hill, one of the most prominent consulting engineers in the West, presented a paper before the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce entitled "Limitations on Supply of Water From Colorado River." This paper voices again the previous warnings by Mr. Hill, and the very real fears of many in the West regarding the availability of Colorado River water for fulfillment of the paper obligations of the Colorado River compact and other documents.

It also points another warning to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the construction and operation schedules of the recently authorized upper Colorado River storage project.

Lastly, it points to the fact that no delays should be permitted in the consideration of H. R. 10105 and H. R. 10106. These bills would allocate funds and provide authority for the augmentation of Colorado River Basin water supplies by the use of cloud-seeding techniques.

Mr. Hill's paper is as follows:

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California claims the right to divert 1,212,000 acre-feet annually from Colorado River under contracts entered into with the Secretary of the Interior of the United States. The validity of these contracts is being challenged by the State of Arizona in the present suit between Arizona and California now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. Irrespective of the outcome of this litigation, there is little possibility that the flow of Colorado River will be large enough to satisfy this right of diversion by the Metropolitan Water District.

The Congress of the United States has just authorized the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project. The first unit of this project will be Glen Canyon Dam on Colorado River, located a short distance above Lees Ferry, the point of division of the waters between the upper basin and the

lower basin. It is the expressed intention of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to proceed immediately with the construction of Glen Canyon Dam to provide a gross storage capacity of 26 million acre-feet and a net usable capacity of 20 million acre-feet. The effect of this reservoir upon the supply of water available for use in the lower basin is thus a matter that can no longer be ignored.

The Colorado River compact, to which California is a party, was entered into in 1922 at Santa Fe, N. Mex. The upper basin was then apportioned 7.5 million acre-feet per year to cover its consumptive uses of water, and the upper basin would eventually consume this quantity if it were not for the provision in article III (d) that reads:

"The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lees Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75, million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series begining with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

This provision, which is the only limitation upon upper basin uses that is directly measurable, will become controlling because there is not enough water in the river to cover 7.5 million acre-feet per year depletion of the natural flow at Lees Ferry and the delivery of 75 million acre feet in each 10 consecutive years.

The compact also provides that the upper basin shall supply one-half of all water to be delivered to Mexico that cannot be met out of surplus. There will be no surplus unless the flow of Colorado River should be much greater in the future than it has been in the past 40 years; hence, the responsibility for deliveries to Mexico must be shared by the upper basin. The treaty between the United States and Mexico provides that 1.5 million acre-feet per year shall be delivered at the international boundary pursuant to an agreed schedule. It is recognized that it will not be possible to limit deliveries at all times to the scheduled amounts and it is estimated that 1,700,000 acre-feet of water will have to be passed into Mexico each year. If the upper basin States are made responsible for one-half of this, 850,000 acre-feet plus 7.5 million, making a total of 8.35 million acre-feet per year will have to be delivered at Lees Ferry.

The question of vital significance to southern California is: Can there be any reliance on the delivery at Lees Ferry of more than 8,350,000 acre-feet of water per year after Glen Canyon is built? The answer is "No," for at least 15 years, probably never again.

The historical flow of Colorado River during the past 32 years has averaged a little less than 12 million acre-feet per year. During this same time the natural flow has been depleted less than 1.9 million acre-feet per year by upstream uses. Hence, the natural undepleted runoff of Colorado River during the 32 years from March 1924 to March 1956 was only 13.8 million acre-feet per year. The delivery of 8.35 million acre-feet per year at Lees Ferry during this period would have left only 5.45 million acre-feet per year as the supply available to the upper basin. This is only 73 percent of the quantity apportioned to the upper basin. It should be evident from these figures alone that the flow at Lees Ferry cannot be expected to exceed 8,350,000 acre-feet per year after presently authorized works in the upper basin are completed.

It is also significant that, if Glen Canyon Dam had been built in 1929, it would have taken 8 years to fill the reservoir, even if there were no evaporation loss nor any increase in the depletion of the stream flow above Lees Ferry, but reservoir losses would automatically add about 1 million acre-feet per year to the depletion. Actually, if Glen Canyon Reservoir had been completed in the spring of 1929, it would not have filled until the flood of 1941, even if there had been no increase in water use within the basin or any diversions of water by Utah or Colorado out of the basin.

Enough projects are now under construction or authorized for construction in the upper basin to add another million acre-feet per year depletion of the flow of Colorado River. If these projects are brought to completion by the time Glen Canyon Reservoir is put in service, it could take at least 15 years to fill that reservoir. This is the minimum period of restricted flow at Lees Ferry that should be considered in any planning for the future of southern California.

If upstream depletions caused by reservoir evaporation, other consumptive uses within the basin, and transmountain diversions should amount to 3 million acre-feet per year in excess of historical depletions, making a total of less than 5 million acre-feet per year depletion in the upper basin, then, assuming runoff in the future similar to that in the past:

(a) Glen Canyon Reservoir starting empty in 1927 would not have filled until 1949:

(b) There would have been only 2 million acre-feet of spill in 1949 and 4 million acre-feet of spill in 1952; and

(c) At the end of March 1956 there would have been only 4 million acre-feet of usable water left in Glen Canyon Reservoir.

It should be obvious that when the gates at Glen Canyon Dam are closed and storage commences there will be a period of at least 15 years in which the flow at Lees Ferry will not be more than 8,350,000 acre-feet per year. It is also probable and almost certain that Lake Mead never will fill within the lifetime of anyone in this room unless it is full before the gates are closed at Glen Canyon Dam.

This will require cutting back releases of water from Lake Mead to the minimum needed to satisfy present uses in the United States and to comply with the treaty between the United States and Mexico.

Historical depletions of Colorado River between Lees Ferry and the International Boundary have increased during the past 15 years from about 4 million acre-feet per year to 6 million acre-feet per year. The flow across the International Boundary near Yuma has progressively diminished, approaching the practical minimum of 1,700,000 acre-feet per year. Hence, without any increased diversions or losses in the United States below Lees Ferry, a total of 7,700,000 acre-feet of water will be required at Lees Ferry to satisfy present uses. This leaves only 650,000 acre-feet per year as the margin of supply available to meet increased uses along Colorado River and increased diversions through the Colorado River aqueduct.

Even if every drop of this water were made available to the Metropolitan Water District in addition to its current diversions, the total would be far less than the 1,212,000 acre-feet per year for which the district has contracted. There is no likelihood that all of this 650,000 acre-feet will be available to the Metropolitan Water District. A substantial part can and will be used on the Parker Indian Reservation and additional water will be used in the Welton-Mohawk project, both of which are now only partially developed. Agricultural uses in California may also consume some of this difference between future deliveries at Lees Ferry and present uses below Lees Ferry.

In brief, no one should now claim that the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will be able to divert 1,212,000 acre-feet of water per year from the Colorado River. There is just not enough water in that stream to make this possible. It follows that water from some other source must be made available for use in southern California by the time the gates are closed at Glen Canyon Dam.

Unionist Hits "Double Standard" in Political Party Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Saturday, April 28, reported an address by Victor Reuther, assistant to the president of the industrial union department, AFL-CIO, before a meeting of the Young Presidents' Organization at Hollywood Beach, Fla. The New York Times report said:

Abolition of the double standard in political contributions was advocated today by Victor Reuther.

Assistant to the president of the industrial union department, AFL-CIO, Mr. Reuther said "there is a serious gap in our political structure, when management considers it unethical for 100,000 workers each to make $1 contributions in support of party candidates, while a few rich people at a single dinner can raise such an amount unchallenged."

The United States Department of Justice recently lost a case brought against the United Auto Workers Union in Michigan for raising funds among members to finance a television program in support of a political candidate. The Supreme Court has agreed to review the decision next fall.

Speaking to nearly 400 company executives at the sixth annual convention of the Young President's Organization at the Hollywood Beach Hotel here, Mr. Reuther urged that the range of political financial support be limited to $2 to $5 a person.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice is not pressing a suit against the United Automobile Workers to prevent any worker of group of workers from making a voluntary contribution to any political cause. On the contrary, it has taken the United Automobile Workers to court as it believes the union has clearly violated the Corrupt Practices Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Neither of these laws prevents the solicitation of dollar contributions, or in fact contributions for any nominal amount, from union members. The suit is not designed to interfere with the activities of the so-called political action committees of the unon if the funds are contributed voluntarily by individuals to a union political committee for such purpose. The reason that the Department of Justice pressed the suit against the UAW of Michigan is that television programs in support of political candidates were being financed with union dues money as a so-called educational program. It is important that the public understand the real issue in this case. Mr. Reuther's remarks as reported by the New York Times give a completely misleading story as to the purpose of the suit against the union.

It must be remembered that most of the contracts under which the members of the UAW operate provide for a union shop. In other words, the union member has no choice as to whether he wishes to finance a television program in support or in opposition to any par-

ticular candidate. He pays his dues, or he loses his job. It is for this reason that a very serious question has arisen with respect to political activities of unions.

No one questions the right of union members to make contributions outside of union dues for political purposes, provided these contributions are freely given without coercion. Certainly Mr. Reuther is not charging that those who attend political fund-raising dinners have been coerced to do so.

I favor reasonable limits on campaign contributions, but I am also concerned that all campaign contributions should be voluntary contributions in support of candidates and philosophies of one's choice.

Mr. Reuther also suggests that political financial support be limited to $2 or $5 a person. Any such limits would make it impossible for an unorganized group who wishes to advance a political candidate or a political program to present its story. It would entrench organized groups with permanent political power. This philosophy is completely at variance with that of our Founding Fathers.

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1956]

UNIONIST HITS DOUBLE STANDARD IN POLITICAL PARTY CONTRIBUTIONS

(By Alexander R. Hammer)

HOLLYWOOD BEACH, FLA., April 27.—Abolition of the double standard in political contributions was advocated today by Victor Reuther.

Assistant to the president of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, Mr. Reuther said there is a serious gap in our political structure, when management considers it unethical for 100,000 workers each to make $1 contributions in support of party candidates, while a few rich people at a single dinner can raise such an amount unchallenged.

The United States Department of Justice recently lost a case brought against the United Auto Workers Union in Michigan for raising funds among members to finance a television program in support of a political candidate. The Supreme Court has agreed to review the decision next fall.

Speaking to nearly 400 company executives at the sixth annual convention of the Young Presidents' Organization at the Hollywood Beach Hotel here, Mr. Reuther urged that the range of political financial support be limited to $2 or $5 a person.

Clarence B. Randall, special consultant to President Eisenhower on foreign economic policies, told the group that he was deeply concerned over the inroads being made by the Soviet Union's economic cold war.

"It is the ultimate test between their way of life and ours," Mr. Randall said. "What Russia can do today for an undeveloped country is much easier than what can be done by democracy under free enterprise. These undeveloped countries have no capital and no means of creating capital. This allows Russia to supply them with machines in exchange for the raw material that they want and we do not need."

Mr. Reuther strongly urged that crime and corruption be rooted out of labor, business and politics. As to labor, he said:

"Whenever a trade union official abuses the trust placed in him, he should be thrown out of the union and put into jail. In the cell next to him should be the insurance agent who slipped him a bribe or gave him a kickback. The same is true of the public official who goes wrong."

The labor official reiterated the belief expressed before by organized labor that "automation and atomic power has put the world on the threshold of undreamed-of opportunities."

"We do not approach these promises of technological advance with any sense of fear," he continued. "But we do insist that they be met with intelligent planning in order that we may be able to cushion the impact upon our social structure. Failure to plan, resistance to change, could result in serious dislocation. It is a community and national responsibility to see that no industrial worker be forced to pay the price of any technological advance."

Mr. Reuther suggested that each basic industry should establish joint commissions of inquiry to make certain that management and labor at every industry level is prepared to meet the shock of automation. "As yet," he added, "there have been no such meetings."

He also called for an increase in the minimum hourly wage scale from $1 to at least $1.25. "We cannot say we are living in a truly democratic economy while millions are being asked to live on the substandard wage of $40 a week."

Closing with a final look at the international field, Mr. Reuther said that "the contest between the free world and the slave world will be won by the nation that can contribute most by raising living standards and individual security throughout the world, rather than by the preponderance of military strength alone."

PROTECTIONISM DYING

Mr. Randall, who formerly was chairman of the Inland Steel Corp., emphasized that although "protectionism" is dying and will eventually be driven from our economy, we still have a group in this country that would close our markets to foreign products.

"There is no way that Government by tariff or any such means can benefit one section of an economy without damaging another," he added.

Mr. Randall said that most of the undeveloped foreign countries have a group of dedicated men at the top. However, he continued, they are not interested in free enterprise, but are turning to some form of statism.

Their reason for doing so, he added, is that after looking at America, they feel that "free enterprise" is a cult of selfishness, with no responsibility for the welfare of all the people.

"Our job is to combat this belief by showing them that the strength of free enterprise lies in the freedom maintained for the individual. The whip is no substitute for a desire to do the best. Free enterprise will be preserved only to the extent that executives of the future sense their social responsibility."

United States Shipping Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article regarding the boom in United States shipping was carried by the May 11 issue of the Seafarers Log, the official organ of the Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL–CIO. It is one kind of boom that we have had all too little of, and want to see continue. The article itself exemplifies why the Seafarers Log in 1955 was awarded first prize for general editorial excellence by the International Labor Press of America. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES ENJOYING SPRING BOOM IN SHIPPING

Seafarers will start manning three reserve fleet Victory ships shortly in the middle of a moderate shipping boom which has been a pleasant but unexpected surprise to the United States merchant marine. Were it not for the availability of reserve fleet ships indications are that both the Government and private industry would be extremely hard-pressed to find shipping space for cargoes.

The three Victorys broken out thus far are the *High Point Victory*, Bull Line; *Lynfield Victory*, Waterman, and the *MacAlester Victory*, Robin Line. These ships are being assigned to the Military Sea Transportation Service either to run in Operation Blue Jay to northern defense bases, or replace other MSTS ships diverted for the northern supply line. All told, 113 ships will be used on this run.

However, the Blue Jay run is only one factor in the spring shipping boom which finds all privately owned ships, both freighters and tankers, working, and prospects of considerable breakouts of reserve ships for normal commercial operations.

There are several other contributing factors. One of them is the heavy offseason demand for oil which has kept all tankers in service at a time they are normally laying up.

COAL SHIPMENTS HEAVY

Coal shipments are also far in excess of normal, prompted by an extremely bad winter in Europe and an economic boom, both of which depleted European coal supplies. Heavy grain shipments have been stimulated by unfavorable spring planting conditions in Russia and elsewhere.

To top it all off, the United States is energetically selling United States farm surplus to the tune of $1.5 billion this year, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is studying a proposal to create a United States surplus food stockpile. Emergency food relief organizations are also getting further United States Government aid.

The present cargo picture of a scarcity of available ship space points up the need for a permanent tramp fleet of sufficient size, one capable of handling fluctuations in cargo demands. Such a fleet under the United States flag is obtainable only through a program of Government subsidy aid.

CARGO RATES UP

The lack of an adequate tramp fleet has sent cargo rates soaring. Ships that were transferred to runaway flags were supposed to be "available" for United States needs, but th world shipping market is such that these ex-United States ships can profitably do business anywhere. Between July 1, 1952, and December 31, 1955, 298 ships representing better than 2 million tons were transferred to the runaway flags with United States approval. Approximately 11,000 to 12,000 United States jobs went with the transfers.

RUSSIA ENTERS MARKET

For example, the Soviet Union's new economic aid policy and active purchases of grain abroad are putting a strain on world shipping. One United States official said that Russian participation in world trade has had the effect of raising grain-hauling prices $5 a ton in the last 3 months.

The official, Herbert K. Hyde of the General Services Administration, said that the Russians are bidding for ships at any rate and have succeeded in diverting 106 foreign-flag vessels to her trade. The result is that the United States is having difficulty in obtaining shipping to haul strategic materials for this country's defense needs.

The Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a concurrent resolution passed by the California State Legislature in our community. We are proud to honor the new Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A great many of these fine Americans live and work in the community I represent in Congress. I want to join with many others in paying tribute to their daily achievements and their contribution to our wonderful America.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE LOS ANGELES TEMPLE OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

(By Hon. Patrick D. McGee, 64th District; Hon. Frank Lanterman, 48th District; Hon. Bruce F. Allen, 29th District; (list is so extensive will just copy last names—lee) Backstrand, Beaver, Bee, Belotti, Bonelli, Bradley, Brady, Brown, Burke, Caldecott, Casey, Chapel, Coolidge, Collier, Conrad, Davis, Dickey, Dills, Dolwig, Donahoe, Doyle, Elliott, Erwin, Gaffney, Geddes, Grant, Hansen, Hawkins, Hegland, Henderson, Holmes, Johnson, Kelley, Kilpatrick, Klocksiem, Levering, Lincoln, Lindsay, Lowrey, Luckel, MacBride, Maloney, Marsh, Masterson, McCollister, McFall, McMillan, Meyers, Miller, Munnell, Nielsen, Nisbet, O'Connell, Pattee, Porter, Rees, Rumford, Sankary, Schrade, Sedgwick, Shell, Smith, Stanley, Stewart, Thomas, Unruh, Weinberger, Wilson)

Whereas the people of the State of California have recently witnessed the completion and dedication of a beautiful and majestic edifice of worship and service—the Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints; and

Whereas this notable achievement will be an impressive reminder of the part played by the heroic Mormon people toward the exploration and colonization of California in the midyears of the 19th century; and

Whereas the first contribution came when the good ship *Brooklyn*, under command of Samuel Brannan, arrived at San Francisco, July 31, 1846, bringing 230 people, many of whom figured notably in the early history of the bay region; and

Whereas the second contribution was the Mormon Battalion, a body of 500 men enlisted at Council Bluffs, Iowa, as United States Infantry, under orders to explore and chart a highway for transcontinental traffic between Santa Fe and San Diego. This body of men served as military patrol at San Diego and Cajon Pass. In Los Angeles they built Fort Moore and assisted in raising the United States Flag, July 4, 1847. This marked the beginning of California-United States history; and

Whereas the third contribution was the colonization of San Bernardino in 1851 by a group of 437 people who made their way from Utah in 150 wagons. They became the founders of that beautiful city; and

Whereas in the past 30 years approximately 150,000 of these intelligent and enterprising people have settled in California and have made notable contributions to the progress and prosperity of this State in business, finance, manufacture, agriculture and industry, as well as in the cultural fields of literature, music, entertainment and education; and

Whereas in this same period of time these devout and progressive people have erected more than 200 places of worship in the communities of California—chapels, recreation halls, auditoriums and welfare centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Legislature of the State of California convey to the officials and members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints the congratulations of the State of California upon the completion and dedication of the great temple in Los Angeles, and commend the church and its people upon the contributions made to the progress of the Commonwealth of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to President Daniel O. McKay at the general headquarters of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, and to the Honorable Hugh C. Smith, 1021 Zelzah Avenue, Granada Hills.

Appalling Record of Supreme Court Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, Judge Walter B. Jones, of Montgomery, Ala., is one of the ablest trial judges in America. He has been a profound student of the law for more than 40 years. He is the founder and president of Jones Law School, Montgomery, Ala. Judge Jones has served as president of the Alabama State Bar Association, and for years has been a member of the State bar commission and the board of examiners for the State bar association.

Judge Jones writes the column Off the Bench for the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala. Recently Judge Jones wrote an article on The Appalling Record of Supreme Court Appointments in which he expresses the low opinion that he has for the ability of the present members of the Supreme Court. Judge Jones' opinion of the Court is shared by millions of Americans, and especially by the good lawyers of America.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article written by Judge Jones:

OFF THE BENCH

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

APPALLING RECORD OF SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS

While there has always been some criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, its individual Chief Justices and Associate Justices, and the manner in which they conduct themselves, yet, I doubt if ever in the history of our country, has there been such widespread criticism of the Court and its rulings and such widespread dissatisfaction with those appointed to the Supreme Court. This has been particularly true since the so-called New Deal began on March 4, 1933; and today all over the country, among all classes of people, especially among the millions and millions of good American people who believe in maintaining the separation of powers, in keeping the three great departments of the Government, the executive, the legislative, and judicial, each confined to its own separate and constitutional sphere. Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, who recently introduced legislation to require that all those appointed to the United States Supreme Court, must have had at least 5 years' experience on the bench, either in the Federal or State courts, said:

"The Supreme Court should be the finest collection of trained and experienced jurists which can be assembled."

The Senators words have been quoted all over the country and the Wall Street Journal recently had this to say:

"That remark was made by Senator SMATHERS in introducing legislation to require all United States Supreme Court appointees to have had 5 years' experience on the bench, either in the Federal or State courts.

"Both the remark and the Florida Senator's bill express a philosophy with which most lawyers and laymen can agree. Unfortunately, it is an ideal which is rarely reached; appointments to the High Court, as to the rest of the Federal judiciary, some times are considered from the same viewpoint as postmasterships. A political debt must be paid, or a political obligation created. And politicians consider it a masterful plan when both the debt and the obligation can be effected at one stroke, as in the court-packing plan of the thirties.

"Although that proposal to nullify the approach to legal questions of the 'nine old men' failed, the idea that the Court is a place for patronage persists. Some Presidents, it is true, try to come closer to the ideal of experienced and trained jurists than do others under the system.

"And what happens under the system? Inexperienced jurists are inclined to interpret the law—or the Constitution—not as it is but as it should be in their view. Untrained jurists sometimes go beyond the responsibility of determining the legality of statutes and the effect is decisions which transgress the responsibility of Congress to legislate.

"The fact is that of the present time members of the Supreme Court there are but three with any former judicial experience at all. Two were Federal Court of Appeals jurists and one was a police court judge. Six of them, including the Chief Justice, never presided in any courtroom until they took their seat on the highest court in the land.

"The justices themselves are not to be blamed for the faults of the system. The greatest legal minds are not always found on the bench, of course. They may be in universities or in private practice. And it would be a pity, perhaps, to exclude these people as Mr. SMATHERS' bill does, though even great minds benefit from experience, and those who possess them are quickest to admit it.

"It is probably idle to point out that no law is really needed to change the system. The Senate need accept no Federal bench appointee of any Chief Executive if the Senate thinks the appointee unworthy. The Senate can, of course, set its own standards concerning experience and training and it can reject those men who do not meet the standards.

"It would be equally idle, though, politics being politics, to suppose that those standards will be very much higher than the possession of a law degree until the Senators themselves want the system changed."

If we look back and consider separately each of the appointments to the Supreme Court made since 1933, we find that not a single one of the judges was really appointed solely because of his judicial experience, his great ability as a lawyer or because he was outstanding in the profession. It is appalling to look back and consider the causes which moved the appointment during the last quarter of a century of the members of our highest Court. I find these reasons: Get a probable presidential candidate out of the way, where he cannot annoy the appointing power; kick some attorney general or Government functionary upstairs and make room in his office for another political appointee; appoint one because he is a great friend of Senator so-so. Appoint one because he can be depended upon to follow the political thinking of the President in power; appoint one because he will be acceptable to powerful minority groups which give thousands and thousands of dollars to the political party campaign chest; appoint one because his economic philosophy squares with that of the appointing power—these are some of the reasons given in recent years when appointments were made to the Supreme Court bench. These things should not be.

Public Housing—A Failure or Success After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Home Builders Monthly of August 1955:

PUBLIC HOUSING—A FAILURE OR SUCCESS AFTER 15 YEARS

(By Joseph H. Deckman)

It has been 15 years since the first public housing authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937 was built in Washington, D. C.

The construction of public housing on a large scale in Washington stirred up much controversy between the exponents of private housing versus the advocates of Government ownership of a large segment of the citizens homes.

It was claimed by the public housers that Government housing would clear the slums and provide low-rent housing for low-income groups.

After exhaustive investigation by those who believe in private enterprise it was found that public housing does not fulfill its promises except in a token manner for publicity purposes. What few slums that have been cleared and the small number of low-income people who have been housed has all taken place at great expense to the taxpayer. Aside from this there has been a dangerous weakening of the foundation of our American way of life which is based on private ownership of the tools of production and the home of the citizens.

Now that a 15-year time interval has elapsed since the construction and operation of a number of various types of public-housing projects, it is fitting that a review of claims and conjectures be made in the cold light of actual experience.

In Washington the total cost value of public housing of all types is approximately $50 million.

Not all of this housing is typical, so-called low-rent public housing as over two millions of dollars in cost is represented by permanent war housing. Another project, Langston Terrace, is a holdover from the admitted socialized housing era of Tugwell and Company. There is also less than a million dollars represented in the old Alley Dwelling Authority experiment.

Because of the lack of detailed information on the public housing built under the Housing Act of 1949, the investigation herein set forth will consist of an analysis of the 5 projects constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

These 5 projects, completed in 1940–41, totaled approximately $7 million in cost and are comprised of Carrollsburg dwellings, Ellen Wilson dwellings, Fort Dupont dwellings, Frederick Douglass dwellings, and Kelly Miller dwellings. Three of these projects were erected in former slum areas and two were constructed on vacant land. All of these projects were constructed with 2½ percent interest bearing loans and 60-year repayment terms in amortization.

The type of construction varies from brick and block to a completely frame project. As a whole, these projects can be considered of typical construction for low-rent housing which is in direct contrast to the current proposal of National Capital Housing Authority, to erect eight-story, elevator, public-housing apartments.

Almost all of the laymen who support public housing do so because they believe that it will clear slums and house the needy.

Nothing could be further from the truth as only a token amount of the slums of Washington have been cleared at enormous expense. While 3 out of 5 of the projects constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937, only 1 out of 8 projects under the United States Housing Act of 1949 were built in former slum areas. Two other projects in slum areas are in the negotiation stage.

From the pattern of slum sites versus vacant or sparsely settled land it can be readily seen that public housers plan to build about three times as much housing on vacant land as they do in slum locations. Slum clearance then becomes the tail which wags the dog to obtain more and more money to squander on socialized housing.

On the subject of housing the needy in public housing this is the tear jerker which is used to obtain appropriations, but there has never been any intention to house more than a fraction of the needy in public housing.

Proof of this statement is found in the testimony of John Ihlder, one of the country's leading public housers when testifying before the Burton committee in 1944. At that time he stated that the United States Housing Auhority officials in the early days had set a policy of not housing anyone who could not pay the economic rents set by the public housers. These rents were supposed to cover all costs of operation, maintenance and debt service except the profit taken by private owners of rental property.

It was after much discussion Mr. Ihlder stated that a policy was worked out to house not more than 25 percent of relief tenants or those who could not pay economic rents in NCHA properties. (This statement can be found on p. 165, pt. 1, of the Burton committee hearings on S. Res. 184.)

Since 1944 the percentage of needy tenants in the NCHA projects under study has dwindled from 25 percent to 13.3 percent at the time of the annual report for 1954.

The 13.3 percent figure was found by analyzing the financial statement from the NCHA 1954 report for the properties in question. On page 41 of the report it states that $681,099 was collected in rents. After obtaining the so-called economic rents for each project from NCHA it was found they would total approximately $785,299 if collected.

This makes a difference of $104,200 between rents collected and the stated economic rent. Reduced to a percentage basis it shows that only 13.3 percent of the tenants did not pay the economic rent.

Carrying this policy to its final conclusion for housing the needy in public housing it would necessitate that over seven times as much public housing would have to be built as there are families in need of rent relief.

The cost of this procedure, the same as the policy for slum clearance as earlier outlined, would break the country or throw it into state socialism before the slums are cleared or the needy housed.

To further prove that public housing does not house the needy, a check was made on the current relief rolls in Washington. It was found that out of 2,400 family rent relief cases only 480 or 20 percent are living in public housing. Of the 6,000 single persons receiving rent relief only 230 or 4 percent are housed in public housing. Furthermore, if the policy of 1944 is still in effect the District of Columbia Public Welfare Department will have to pay the full economic rents for their relief families. (Statement by John Ihlder, Burton committee hearings, p. 175, book 1.)

Even the most rabid supporters of public housing must admit in the light of these facts that public housing does not house the needy.

The irony of the situation is the fact that the Federal Government pays an annual subsidy to the local housing authorities in an amount equal to the interest and amortization charges on each project for the purpose of writing down the rents for needy tenants. This subsidy is pledged to be paid from the Public Treasury for the entire period for which the project is financed and this is not less than 45 years and in the case under study is 60 years.

On the subject of taxes it is not mandatory by law that the local housing authorities pay real estate taxes.

However, in Washington NCHA produces much grist for its propaganda mill by making payments in lieu of taxes. The uninformed are led to believe that these payments are about equal to the real estate taxes paid by private owners of apartments.

Actually, the payments are less than 50 percent of the taxes paid by the private owners. By checking the projects under study at the District of Columbia Tax Assessors office it was found that if the projects were privately owned they would pay $112,843.78 per year in taxes. The payment in lieu of taxes as found on page 41 of the NCHA Annual Report is $51,642. This then is better than a 50-percent tax subsidy enjoyed by public housing over private ownership.

On the subject of rents it is also significant to note that since the projects were constructed in 1940–41 with much publicity about their low economic rents, these rents have been raised approximately 50 percent across the board in all projects. During rent control the public housing rents were raised whereas private rents were frozen.

A further study into public rents discloses the important fact that the so-called economic rents set by NCHA do not actually cover all costs except a builder's profit as claimed at the time of the Burton hearings in 1944.

The fact is that the economic rents set by NCHA do not actually cover all costs except a builder's profit as claimed at the time of the Burton hearings in 1944.

The following financial table illustrates graphically the fact that the economic rents as now set by NCHA do not cover full costs including interest and amortization charges. In the financial statement on page 41 of the NCHA 1954 annual report there is no pro-

vision for any amortization payment. The charge for interest on bonds and notes is $137,064, while the annual interest payment is only $87,588. Other than this interest figure, full taxes and the addition of an annual amount for amortization based on 60 years, all the other expense items are taken from the NCHA report.

The $984,212.78 is the amount which should be collected to arrive at a true economic rent. The difference between this amount and the so-called economic rent of $785,299 is approximately $200,000. This should be pro rated to each apartment rent for a true comparison to private rents. Reducing this $200,000 to a rental-room basis per month based on the projects 5,608 rental rooms, it is found an additional rent of $2.95 per month per room is needed.

Analysis of project expenses to determine a true economic rent

Cost of land and improvement	$7,000,700.00
Rents collected (actual)	681,000.00
So-called economic rent if collected	785,299.00
Operating expenses:	
Management	89,802.00
Services	39,921.00
Utilities	166,871.00
Repairs, etc	232,933.00
Taxes if privately owned	112,843.78
General expense	19,989.00
Depreciation	117,482.00
Interest (annual average) 2½ percent	87,588.00
Total revised expenses	867,429.78
Curtail—annual $7,007,000 divided by 60 years	116,783.00
Total annual expenses and curtail	984,212.78

To reduce the rent question to simple language, it can best be shown by using a typical example.

In 1940 the economic rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Fort Dupont Dwellings was set at $33 per month. At the present time this rent is now listed at $50.50 per month. If the true economic rent were to be charged and additional sum amounting to 4 rental rooms times $2.95 per room, or $11.80 per month, should be added for a 2-bedroom apartment. This produces an economic rent of $62.30 per month for a 2-bedroom apartment and not $50.50 per month, as stated by NCHA.

This true rent just about equals the rent charged by private owners of rental housing which was built 15 years ago of comparable minimum standard construction and equipment to that of the public housing.

The big differences in comparing the rents is the fact that private enterprise rents will come down after the 20 to 25 year life of the mortgages on the property whereas the public housing rents will remain at the same level or higher for another 45 years. Also the private rents are based on payment of full taxes and annual interest rate of from 4½ to 5 percent and the life of the mortgage is not over 25 years.

If 2½-percent money and 60 years financing were available, the rents of private enterprise for comparable housing would be lower and still include taxes and a profit. The reason that private enterprise can do the job better is due to the fact that private builders can build for approximately 25 percent less than the public housers and the private management costs are from 3½ percent to 5 percent while the projects under study show a management cost of over 12 percent.

In summing up the public versus private housing controversy it is clearly shown that after 15 years of operating typical housing developments, that public housing is a failure on all counts. The question is then raised as to the answer to slum clearance and housing the needy.

This answer is found within the framework of the free-enterprise system which must do the job if we are to preserve our American way of life.

Slums, if they are to be cleared must be done by a public agency. After they are cleared and a master plan for land use is drawn up, the land should be offered to the highest private bidder who will have to pay full taxes for its use.

If low-rent housing is planned then private enterprise should be given the tools of low-interest rates and long-terms amortization to keep the rents down. However, rent ceilings should be imposed on the owners for the privilege of receiving these special considerations. Then if anyone cannot pay these low taxpaying private rents, that segment of society will have to be cared for by public welfare the same as they are being cared for now.

Coupled with the low-rent housing rebuilt in slums or other designated areas should be strict enforcement of a housing and sanitation code which would prohibit blight and slums from poor living habits and the owners neglect of property.

From what has been set forth in this study it should be crystal clear to every one that no more public housing should be built until private enterprise has a chance to do the job with the proper legal and financial tools. Furthermore, this case study points up the need for a nationwide investigation of all local public housing authorities to find out how much slum clearance and housing of the needy has taken place for the billions of dollars that have already been spent on the great socialized housing experiment.

NOTE.—As we go to press we have learned of the Senate-House conference committee's decision concerning public housing.

Joe Deckman's public housing committee can take a major share of credit for paring down the Senate request of 135,000 units to 45,000 units.

This came about because Joe's committee spent much midnight oil. The last minute letters sent to all Members of the House of Representatives by this association's committee was successful in achieving this 11th hour compromise.—J. W. P.

Reed Versus Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald states the case of our Federal revenue system quite well. The Washington Post will not enter in this field often if it continues to pay attention to the views of Congressman DAN REED:

REED VERSUS ANDREWS

"This proposal," said Representative DANIEL A. REED the other day of the plan of former Commissioner of Internal Revenue T. Coleman Andrews for abolishing the income tax, "is like trying to cure the patient by killing him. It is totally unrealistic. So long as our Government requires billions for our security and other essential operations, the income tax is the only practical and fair method of raising most of this revenue."

As the senior Republican member and former chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. REED is the ideal person to answer Mr. Andrews. The income tax not only is essential to the operation of the Government but it is supported by the American people as the least objectionable and most equitable form of taxation. Mr. Andrews' crusade to abolish the income tax has about as much chance as a proposal to abolish the Federal Government. It is appropriate that a man of Mr. REED's impeccable conservatism should reply to Mr. Andrews' radical and nonsensical scheme.

Symbols on the Dollar Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson of democracy on every dollar bill in the symbols depicted there. Unfortunately, few of our citizens know the meaning or origin of these symbols, although they see them every day in the year.

An article has just come to my attention which explains these symbols. This is a vitally informative article which deals with an important aspect of the heritage and tradition of the American people, and as such it deserves wide circulation. I am certain everyone will appreciate and profit by this information.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article entitled "On Every Dollar Bill," which is published in the May 1956 issue of the Christopher News Notes. It is as follows:

ON EVERY DOLLAR BILL

There's a powerful lesson on every dollar bill. Take a look at the back of one—the green side—i. e., the greenback. The two circles represent both sides of the great seal of the United States.

Do you know what the circular symbol on the left of the back of a dollar bill means? Ask a few friends if they understand the significance of the pyramid shown there, and the eye above it.

We made many tests an found that not one person in a hundred could explain the meaning behind these symbols, even though they are on every one of the billion and a half one-dollar bills now in circulation.

RAY BOLGER HELPS

So we decided to dig up the facts for one of our weekly Christopher television films. Hollywood star Ray Bolger appeared in the program and explained in a fascinating way both the spiritual and historical lesson symbolized on the back of every dollar bill. We have already received so many requests from all over the country for a detailed explanation that we thought it well to summarize it here in the News Notes.

ORIGIN OF SYMBOLS

The founders of our country thought it so important to express the basic truths of our Nation in the great seal that the matter was brought before Congress on the very afternoon of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

Three great leaders, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams were appointed as a committee of three to prepare the seal. Six years later, on June 20, 1782,

after exhaustive study and largely through the efforts of William Barton and Charles Thomson, Congress passed a resolution approving the final design of the great seal.

DETAILS WITH A MEANING

Here are some of the significant details we found through our research:

1. Pyramid: First of all, note the pyramid in the left hand circle. It represents the material strength of our country. In the words of William Barton, who played such an important part in designing it, it stands for "strength and duration."

2. Eye: Directly above the pyramid is the "Eye of God" which, though separate, completes the pyramid. It emphasizes the importance of putting the spiritual welfare of our country above its material prosperity. Our Founding Fathers[1] firmly believed that our strength was rooted in God and that our progress must always be under the watchful eye of Providence.

3. Under God: The words "Annuit Coeptis" circling the top of the Seal are once again a significant proof of the faith of the Founding Fathers and this Nation's dependence on God. These words mean: "He (God) has favored our undertakings."

4. New order: Now look at the three Latin words directly under the pyramid, "Novus Ordo Seclorum" which mean "A new order of ages." They signify that this new republic, which had just been founded, introduced a new age in the life and freedom of the people of the world, that it ushered in a new era in which the people themselves would be able to exercise their God-given rights to self-government.

5. Started in 1776: The Roman numerals—MDCCLXXVI—at the base of the pyramid add up to 1776, the beginning of the United States as an independent Nation.

THE CIRCLE AT THE RIGHT

Now take a look at the right-hand circle on the back of the dollar bill.

1. Eagle: It first became our national emblem in 1782 when it was chosen for the Great Seal as a symbol of strength and victory.

2. States' rights: The shield on the eagle's breast signifies self-reliance. It contains 13 stripes as a reminder that each individual State, with its basic rights and responsibilities, was expected to help protect the freedom of all the States.

3. The role of Congress: The bar across the top of the shield stands for Congress—as the unifying and binding force between the States. The colors of the bar and stripes are red, white, and blue in the Seal itself. Red, signifies hardiness and valor; white, purity and innocence; and blue, vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

4. Peace comes first: In the right talon or claw of the eagle, you will note an olive branch and if you examine it closely, you will see that it has 13 olive leaves. * * * In the eagle's left talon is a bundle of 13 arrows. Symbolizing the power of peace and war, the olive branch and the arrows are a reminder to the 13 states of their obligation first to work for peace and against war.

5. Ring of light: Finally, above the eagle's head is a ring of light in gold, surrounding 13 stars of silver on a blue field. The stars denoted "a new State taking its place and rank among other sovereign powers."

So you can see how important the Great Seal of the United States really is. In its design our Founding Fathers drew a lesson that was meant to be handed down for generations to come.

It may interest you to know that the Great Seal is used on official documents, medals, currency, official stationery and publications, and in several other ways under the supervision of the Secretary of State, who is custodian of the Seal.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

If you take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with these facts about the Great Seal, you'll be in a position to do a little missionary work in passing them on to others. Here are a few suggestions:

1. Take a dollar bill and explain the meaningful details to members of your own family, your friends and fellow workers.

2. Tell teachers to explain these symbols in every classroom.

3. Remind your local newspapers, radio and television stations that they can perform a public service by bringing these facts to the attention of the public as part of the great American heritage that each and all have a right to know.

IF YOU WON'T, WHO WILL?

In these days when there is widespread criticism of how little is known about the high ideals on which our Nation is founded, it is up to those who believe in God to use every opportunity to keep all Americans ever conscious of the fact that our whole concept of liberty is rooted in divine truth.

If you won't who will?

By doing nothing, you may be aiding those who slowly but surely are striving to despiritualize every phase of public and private life. Their chief strength is the failure of the average good citizen to make his voice heard.

Here is an opportunity for you to spread far and wide a few simple facts. Doing something positive and constructive like this is far more effective than merely complaining about what's wrong with your country—and your world.

Don't forget for one moment what you, personally and individually can do. If you are tempted to do nothing, recall the solemn warning of Jesus Christ: "He that is not with me, is against me" (Matthew 12: 30).

[1] In the book, The History of the Seal of the United States, by Gaillard Hunt, published by the State Department in 1909, it states on page 12 that Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams explicitly approved the inclusion of the Eye of Providence in the Seal. Then on page 42, Mr. Hunt quotes: "The pyramid signifies strength and duration. The Eye over it and the motto allude to the many signal interpositions of Providence in favor of the American cause." In the Encyclopedia Britannica under the topic, Seal of the United States, it states that Benjamin Franklin first suggested the "eye of Providence in a radiant triangle."

Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader of May 15, 1956:

SUCCESS STORY

Wilkes-Barre received some favorable publicity in the Nation's Capital when the Washington Post and Times Herald carried a three-column story in its Sunday issue about Corneal John Mack, vice president and general manager of the Mayflower Hotel, one of the most famous in the world. Mr. Mack is a native of this city, a fact which was included in the article.

Mr. Mack joined the staff of the Mayflower in 1924, 3 months before it was officially opened. In 1 year, he was chief accountant and in 1931 he was executive assistant. Ten years later, he was general manager.

Mr. Mack now directs a staff of 800. Since the days of Calvin Coolidge, he has been host to every President and Vice President of the United States as well as Cabinet members and assorted other officials. Many members of the Senate and House of Representatives reside in the hotel which is the scene of scores of big social events annually. Last year the Mayflower served 325,000 person in its dining rooms. Wilkes-Barreans make it their headquarters when they visit the Capital.

In the three decades he has lived there, Mr. Mack has become one of Washington's leading citizens. He has been honored with the presidency of the Cosmopolitan Club and the Merrick Boys' Club. He is a director of the Washington Board of Trade. He also is on the boards of the Washington Hotel Association and the American Hotel Association.

His hometown is very proud of the Neal Mack success story. It makes interesting reading.

Bandung—One Year After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include, in my extension, remarks made in a forum in which I participated on the program The Georgetown University Forum of April 15, 1956, Bandung—One Year After, with my valued friend, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador from the Philippines and one of the world's great statesmen, and a fine representative of his country; His Excellency Aga Shahi, Counselor, Embassy of Pakistan, Washington, D. C., and Secretary General and member of the Pakistan delegation to the Asian-African Conference in Bandung. The moderator was Matthew Warren.

Mr. WARREN. "Bandung—One Year After," is the topic for the 491st consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be, "Bandung—One Year After." The participants are His Excellency General Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador from the Philippines; His Excellency Mohammed Ali is ill, and in his absence we welcome the Honorable Aga Shahi, consular of the Embassy of Pakistan, Washington, D. C., secretary-general and member of the Pakistan delegation to the Asian-African conference in Bandung; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Congressman from Massachusetts, majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with your name and address to Georgetown University Forum,

Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

April 18 marks the first anniversary of the famous Bandung Conference in which representatives from Asian and African nations met to deliberate some of the foremost issues facing the world today. Colonialism and imperialism, peace and national security were widely discussed. The impression created by this conference throughout the world was that a new and powerful third force, a moral force was in the making, a force for peace and justice based on the experiences of these former colonial nations.

This period of Bandung's first anniversary is a most appropriate occasion for a sober evaluation of the conference on the basis of developments in the past year.

General, to open our discussion, I would like to ask you to review the objectives of the conference.

General ROMULO. As I remember it, the conference had four objectives: First, to promote goodwill and cooperation among the nations of Asia and Africa, to explore our vast and mutual as well as common interests, to establish and further friendliness and neighborly relations; second, to consider social, economic, and cultural problems and relations of the countries represented; third, to consider problems of special interest to Asian and African peoples, for example, problems affecting national sovereignty and of racialism and colonialism; and last, to view the position of Asia and Africa and their peoples in the world today, and the contribution they can make to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

Those are the four objectives that made us go to Bandung, Indonesia, to attend that Bandung conference.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, General. Mr. Shahi.

Mr. SHAHI. This conference was a unique assemblage of nations from the continents of Asia and Africa. As the President of Indonesia stated in his opening address, "It was the first intercontinental conference of the so-called colored nations of the world in its history." The number of states represented were 29. As many as 13 of them had achieved their independence in the decade since the Second World War. In population they comprised over half of mankind.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman MCCORMACK, What were the results of this conference now, to begin our evaluation, in the eyes of Congress?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The people of America and the Members of Congress, in particular, followed the Bandung Conference very closely. It was the first meeting of its kind of Asian and African nations, all seeking independence and liberty and freedom, and many of them participating in the conference recently emerging from an era of colonialism. Throughout our history colonial peoples of the world have looked to the United States as the champion of liberty and independence. The names of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and many other Americans are just as well known in lands and among peoples of Asia and Africa as they are in the United States. Our emergence from colonialism to independence stood as an inspiration to those people, and to many others throughout the world, seeking the right of free determination.

For a long while I had been thinking about what contribution I could make in my own little way as a Member of Congress toward, and in an affirmative way, obtaining those objectives that all people who want to be free under the law seek, and at the same time, combating the viciousness of communism.

The Bandung Conference attracted my attention. The bravery of the men who participated there in their utterances against international communism, and to the face of leaders, powerful leaders of Communist nations, commanded my respect as well as the respect of other Members of Congress. It was really the Bandung resolution and the speeches, the utterances and the actions that took place there that was the culminating influence in my drafting the resolution that I did against colonialism and Communist imperialism, and which passed both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate by a unanimous vote of Members of both bodies.

The Bandung Conference was, I repeat, the contributing influence which crystalized my thoughts and my action.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you. Mr. Shahi, I would like to ask you if you feel we can now speak of the spirit of Bandung as being forcefully alive today?

Mr. SHAHI. Well, I would say that in some directions the spirit of Bandung is forcefully alive today. By these directions I mean the strong moral support extended by the conference to all peoples who are waging a national struggle for freedom from colonial rule. If you will just consider what has happened in the past year: Morocco and Tunisia have emerged as full sovereign independent states. The Sudan has achieved its independence. The Gold Coast and Malaya are at the very threshold of their independence. Therefore, in this direction, the spirit of Bandung waxes strong. But, on the other hand, one cannot but note with great concern certain recent events which have assailed the spirit. There have been attacks from both within the region and from outside on the spirit of Bandung. I refer in particular to the sustained attacks which certain statesmen of Asia have made against those countries which have thought it in the interest of their security to enter into collective defense arrangements with the West. And, also, there have been attacks by the Soviet Union on such arrangements, which have been misrepresented as aggressive alliances, when in fact they are purely for self-defense.

Mr. WARREN. General, would you please give us your reaction to the results of this conference?

General ROMULO. Yes; I will be glad to do that. First of all, I would consider Bandung more as an influence than as a spirit, that the influence of Bandung has been all pervasive and this was felt in the United Nations and in other elements of the world community. In the United Nations, for example, we decided to have a better representation of Asia in the Security Council. The Bandung Declaration made it emphatic that the Asian nations wanted better representation in the Security Council.

The last session of the General Assembly approved the representation of Asia in the Security Council through the election for 1 year of Yugoslavia, first, and then the Philippines after Yugoslavia. Well, the election of the Philippines is a spearheading movement started in Bandung for better representation of Asia in the Security Council.

Then, again, when you consider this new shift in tactics of Soviet Russia, where they are emphasizing the economic offensive, I think this is something that they learned through the discussions in the Political Committee and Economic Committee of Bundung. Because there they saw how all the Asian nations were grateful to the United States for the economic aid given to these countries by the United States, and so made it clear in their statements in that committee. So much so that one of the declarations in the Bandung statement specifies economic aid. This did not escape the so-called collective leadership in the Kremlin. They followed that conference very closely. They saw the effect of economic aid on those delegates, and now they are trying to imitate this economic-aid offensive that the United States started 5 years ago, and they are trying to encroach on that same economic aid that heretofore has been a United States monopoly.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think the spirit of Bandung is something that might undergo strain but cannot be destroyed. It is based upon truths. it is based upon soundness. However, there are strains directed, which the distinguished representative of Pakistan, Mr. Shahi, referred to, and my good friend General Romulo referred to. Within those countries they must differentiate between real friends and the voices of false prophets. They must realize that promises from certain directions would mean domination and ultimate enslavement. They must be able to differentiate between those who represent the forces of good and the forces of evil in the world. I think I can safely say that the United States of America represents the forces of goodness. The great majority of our people are against colonialism. The great majority of our people are sympathetic to the aspirations of the people of countries that participated in the Bandung Conference, and other countries seeking their emancipation and freedom.

We are only too willing to do what we can to assist. On the other hand, as I said, the voices of the false prophets represented by Communist Russia, must not be heeded in the best interest of their own country.

I think the Bandung Conference, successful as it was, must be implemented in a practical way. The leaders of those countries who want to improve the lot of their people, and that is real statesmanship, are entitled to the support of our country. I think it is in the best interest of the United States, as the nation having a rendevous with destiny, whether we like it or not, as if selected by God to be the leader of the forces of goodness in the world today, should affirmatively and effectively do those things which will cooperate with the leaders of those nations in building a stabilized government and a stabilized economy, and bringing to the people of those countries hope and confidence. I think that our country could do more, for example, in the direction of what is termed point 4 programs and projects.

I am hopeful that the leaders of those countries that participated in the Bandung Conference, in conference with the leaders of my country, will emphasize the economic uplift of their people as an important means toward bringing about stability and perseverance and strengthening of their nations.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Shahi, do you feel the result of this conference was to establish a better bulwark against further aggression of Communist imperialism and colonialism?

Mr. SHAHI. It is very difficult to answer this question. Communist influence has tended to expand, firstly, in the Stalinist epoch, by means of outside force and encouragement of subversive movements. It would appear with the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that there has been a change in strategy and tactics. Now, the Soviet Union has proclaimed to the world that it has made fundamental revisions in Marxist theory, that it no longer regards war as inevitable, and that there could be more than one road to socialism, in an attempt to convince the uncommitted nations of the world that they have nothing to fear from communism.

Side by side with this there is a determined attempt to effect a political and economic penetration of these regions by the offer of aid, economic aid, and also by the declaration of unreserved support to the national liberation movement in the Asian-African region.

But the Asian-African countries which were represented in Bandung do not have a unity of outlook in regard to the best means to cope with the Communist forces directed from the outside. Some of these countries believe that their salvation lies in collective security arrangements, and there-

fore they have allied themselves to the West. But a number of important countries consider that their safety is best assured by a neutral policy, in other words, remaining outside these alliances. Of course, it is true that internally they are trying to raise the standards of living of their countries. But how far they can succeed can only be answered in time. In that sense, therefore, I do not think that it represents a bulwark against aggression.

Mr. WARREN. General, you were present at this conference, and so, of course, was Chou En-lai, the leader of the Communist Chinese. What was your impression of him?

General ROMULO. My impression of Chou En-lai is that he went there with Dale Carnegie's book, How To Make Friends and Influence People, in his hip pocket. The contrast in his attitude in Geneva, when he was there, and his attitude in Bandung, was quite marked, in the sense that in Geneva he was aloof, irascible, arrogant; in Bandung he was affable, cordial, friendly, humble, he was a good actor. But we must also admit that he is a very clever operator. When he saw me for the first time and met me for the first time in the home of the Prime Minister of Indonesia, he greeted me with one word, "Neighbor." And I answered him, "Yes, geographically."

Then, of course, he operated as if he were under the protecting wing of Prime Minister Nehru. Prime Minister Nehru was really the mother hen. He took him under his wing, gave parties in his honor, and invited the other delegates. In fact, the first dinner I attended was a dinner given by Prime Minister Nehru in honor of Chou En-lai. He had in that dinner only two of us, the Foreign Minister of Thailand and myself. So, Prime Minister Nehru was really the mother hen who was protecting or guiding Chou En-lai in that conference. However, I felt that the spirit of Bandung, or the influence of Bandung in our stand against aggression influenced Chou En-lai to such an extent that he had to make that proposal to negotiate Formosa on the very eve of the adjournment of the conference. He saw the strong feeling against aggression, and I am quite sure that the strong feeling against aggression in Bandung was transmitted by Chou En-lai to Soviet Russia.

So, while Bandung might not be a bastion against aggression, it served to pinpoint or to underscore to Soviet Russia and to Peiping the strong feeling against aggression by the representativees of 29 Asian and African nations assembled in Bandung.

Now, I agree with Mr. Shahi that since Bandung there has ben quite a lot of strain from the region against those of us who have decided to enter into security alliances. Mr. Shahi will remember the argument that I had with Prime Minister Nehru, when in the Political Committee Mr. Nehru for almost two hours attacked the security alliances, and after his speech I answered him and called his attention to the fact that it was important for us, nations like the Philippines, Pakistan and Thailand, to enter into a security alliance like the SEATO, because, unlike, I said, Prime Minister Nehru, we cannot face the world and challenge the world as he did when he made the statement in his speech that morning and said, "The whole world can go to blazes, but India will remain alone." So, I told him that most of the countries represented around the table were small countries like the Philippines, and none of us could boast of the power and the size of India, and so therefore none of us could say that the whole world can go to blazes and like India we would stand alone.

Then I told him that while it is true that the empires of yesterday on which the sun was said never to set were disappearing one by one from Asia, what we fear today is the shadowy empire of communism on which the sun never rises.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Shahi, we don't all understand here in America India's position of neutralism. Perhaps you could address yourself to that point.

Mr. SHAHI. Well, sir, you have asked me a very difficult question. This is the policy of Prime Minister Nehru of India, and certainly my country, which is a neighbor of his, has not been quite able to understand this policy. As far as we can see, it may suit India, and it may be possible for India to steer a neutral course, particularly when there is a kind of balance or near balance between the two great super powers of the world, and therefore there might be an advantage purely from the national point of view for a country like India not to commit itself and take a stand, but by throwing its weight sometimes on one scale, sometimes on the other, to enhance its own importance and its role in international relations and therefore build up national influence.

On the other hand, countries like mine do not think that this is a policy which would be right and proper, and they feel that but for the great strength of the United States of America, it would not have been possible for any country to play a neutral role because there would be only one super power which would dominate the world.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman, what is the American public opinion? Is it responsive now to the real significance of this conference? What should we know about it that we don't?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think the Congress is thoroughly appreciative of what took place at Bandung, its significance. I think also in Congress there is some doubt about the position of Mr. Nehru. I know that my feeling is that the fact that he finds nothing good in any country but the Soviet Union bloc, tends to overextend my patience. I also know that at some time or other in my life I have to choose one side or the other, and so must nations at some time or other choose one side or the other.

I have been very much disturbed with the fact that he has never indicated even remotely anything favorable to not necessarily the United States but to those countries that are associated with us. He overlooks the fact that there is not one foot of territory that any other country has that we want. There is nothing that the United States wants but to make its contribution toward a stabilized world, in other words, world peace. I think the best evidence of the state of mind of the American people is shown by what we did some 10 years ago in fulfilling our promises to the Philippines. It is my opinion that we have to remain strong, but at the same time remaining strong militarily isn't the sole answer. We have to do those dynamic things, such as represented by point 4, that enables the leaders of other countries who want to be free under the law to strengthen themselves with their people, and to bring hope and confidence into the minds of their people.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, Congressman. I am sorry, but our time is up for further discussion of today's topic, "Bandung—One Year After." You have attended the weekly discussion program, the Georgetown University Radio Forum, broadcast of which was transcribed in the Raymond Reiss Studio on the campus of historic Georgetown University in Washington, D. C.

Next week you will hear discussed, "Medical Education: Whose Responsibility?" Our panel at that time will consist of Congressman ANTONI SADLAK, Republican Member of Congress from Connecticut; Mr. E. J. Ade, director of public relations, the National Fund for Medical Education; Dr. Francis M. Forster, dean of the Georgetown University Medical Center.

This program has been presented in the interest of public education by Georgetown University. Your moderator: Matthew Warren.

Clark Sings New Tune in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 12 edition of the Norfolk Journal and Guide:

CLARK SINGS NEW TUNE IN DIXIE—COLORED GI'S NOT WORST IN FRONTLINE—RETIRED COMMANDER NOW INSULTS MEN HE PRAISED IN ITALY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—John "Rover" Jordan, as a war correspondent for the Journal and Guide, spent 9 months covering the 92d Infantry Division in Italy during World War II. Working mostly with frontline troops, Jordan sent more than 500 news releases and many pictures from the fighting front.)

(By John "Rover" Jordan)

Gen. Mark W. Clark has been brainwashed in South Carolina. Either that, or he was sadly misunderstood in Italy back in 1944.

The general's recent statement that he opposes integration in the armed services because of his experiences with the 92d Infantry Division during World War II, is not only considered insulting to the men who fought and died under his command—but it is also an illogical appraisal of the whole nonsegregation policy.

Stating that he opposed integration in 1950 just as he does today, General Clark, now retired, said that colored troops of the 92d Division "bolted from the enemy" and that it was "the worst" division he ever commanded.

The general, now president of The Citadel, a military college in South Carolina, was speaking before the Southern Regional Conference of State Governments meeting in Charleston—where such a statement would be quite popular.

To begin with General Clark's opposition to intergrated troops based upon alleged shortcomings of the thoroughly segregated 92d Division is not logical because there just isn't any comparison between a strictly Jim Crow outfit and an integrated one.

Seventy-five percent of the ills that beset the embattled 92d Division were traceable directly to the ancient and cruel policy of racial segregation. This was pointed out time and time again by Journal and Guide war correspondents who were on the front lines with the 92d Division throughout its campaign on the Italian front in 1944–45. In many instances the Guide correspondent was with soldiers in frontline positions during fierce fighting—a spot where General Clark was never seen.

The 92d Division was frequently referred to as an all-Negro division. That is far from true. About three-fourths of the division's officers were white. In fact, white officers held just about all of the important positions—from commanding general down to company commander.

Most of the colored officers were lieutenants. Somehow, in this segregated setup, the colored officers gained promotions very slowly.

A majority of the white officers were from the South and had racial attitudes to prove it. This brings into focus one of the chief ills of the division:

White southern officers with their inherent prejudices from the start had little confidence in the colored soldiers. And, consequently, the troops had little confidence or respect for the officers.

This unfortunate situation was particularly prevalent in two of the division's regiments. The most efficient unit of the 92d Division was generally conceded to be the 370th Regiment, which entered frontline positions as a combat team in August 1944 under command of Col. Raymond G. Sherman.

Colonel Sherman's men fought heroically for two months before the division's other two regiments were brought up. The 370th struck hard across the Arno River north of Pisa on August 30, 1944, advancing up into the Serchio River Valley sector of the Germans' Gothic line.

Men of the 370th went on to capture the city of Lucca and before the end of September 1944 pressed into Pietasantra, a battle-scarred town in the Apennine Mountains.

While the hard-hitting units of "Three-Seven-Oh" (the 370th combat team) were keeping the Germans busy in the extreme eastern section of the line, General Clark's Allied Army troops further to the west were blasting through Futa Pass on the road to Balogna, gateway to the Po Valley.

General Clark wanted to capture Balogna very badly and he decided to go all out to do it. During early September the general threw elements of three American divisions into the drive through the Futa Pass area, the objective being a quick advance to Balogna.

With 3 other correspondents, I talked with General Clark and General Sir Harold Alexander, commander of British forces in Italy, when the 2 commanders visited the Futa Pass forward area in September 1944.

With men and tanks moving in a steady stream to forward positions, General Clark, spreading a map before us, confidently predicted:

"We will capture Balogna by tomorrow afternoon * * *"

At that moment, rugged infantry fighters of the 88th Division (white) were making an impressive show as they moved up along a nearby road.

Right on schedule, General Clark hurled his Allied units—including the white American divisions—into the drive for Balogna.

But something went wrong. Balogna did not fall the next day. Nor the next week; nor the next month.

In fact, the Germans continued to hold Balogna until the big allied push some 9 months later, in the spring of 1945.

I don't recall that General Clark has ever said that the American troops who failed at Futa Pass had "bolted from the enemy."

On that memorable day at Futa Pass—I made it a point to ask General Clark what he thought of the colored troops of the 370th combat team.

"They're doing a good job," General Clark assured me.

And they were. Colonel Sherman's men had spirit and pride. After a couple of weeks in the line they were fighting like veterans. In about 60 days, the two other regiments of the 92d Division were committed to combat, taking positions in the line adjacent to the 370's sector. The 92d Task Force held an Allied sector of the line beginning at the Ligurian Sea and extending inland through mountains for about 14 kilometers.

On several occasions I was assured by officers of Allied forces that the sole mission of the 92d Division was to hold the line; to probe and jab and keep the Germans busy with limited attacks and spirited patrol action. Because of the rugged, mountainous terrain for miles and miles to the north, it simply was not practical to attempt a major advance on the eastern sector. The big breakthrough had to come in the central section of the line, the nearest route through the mountains to the Po Valley.

So, from the outset, the 92d Division wasn't supposed to go anywhere. Their job was to hold the line, keep the Krauts busy, provide diversionary thrusts.

We knew that. Gen. Edward M. Almond, commander of the 92d Task Force, knew it. And, of course, General Clark knew it.

Sometimes that can be the cruelest kind of war, a company attack on a hill; a patrol thrust to capture prisoners; constant jabbing and patroling; fire fights at company strength. And then, of course, the enemy wasn't exactly dormant either. They fought back fanatically.

During the first 3 months of combat, 92d Division units did their job, performing as we thought just as well as other divisions on the Italian front. It was obvious that world spotlight was focused on the 92d, since it was the only division with all colored enlisted personnel.

They were on the spot and we knew it. That is why I was constantly trying to evaluate this unique task force. I frequently discussed this with General Almond.

"I wouldn't say that the 92d is the best division in Italy," General Almond told me confidentially, "neither would I say it was the worst. I think we are doing our job."

In November of 1945, scores of 92d Division heroes were given awards and commendations in a formal ceremony at Viareggio, a resort town on the Italian Riviera which served as headquarters for the division.

General Clark, himself, was on hand to make a speech and pin medals on the honored men. The Allied forces commander on that occasion had words of praise for the 92d Division.

In that hectic year of war, when the Germans had his Allied army bogged down at the Gothic Line, General Clark lauded the work of the grimy dogfaces of the 92d Division. And he pinned medals on their chests.

But this is another year, 1956, and there are no more Germans to capture. And General Clark, always a man of firm ambitions, now finds himself in another role, in another land—South Carolina.

By speaking out against integration and discrediting men who fought and died under his command, General Clark may be happy to know that he is now a hero of the white citizens councils and other hate groups.

Perhaps they will give him a medal.

Battle for Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the May 7 issue of the Alabama Farm Bureau News contained an editorial entitled "Battle for Truth" written by its fine editor, W. T. Maynor. This editorial pays tribute to the brilliant editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, Grover Cleveland Hall, Jr., who has gained nationwide recognition by his Askelon series of editorials. The article is as follows:

BATTLE FOR TRUTH—IT'S A NEWSPAPER FIGHT—BUT IT MEANS MORE THAN JUST THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

(By W. T. Maynor)

An impressive new chapter in the history of American journalism is being written by a young Southern newspaperman. Grover Cleveland Hall, Jr., editor of the 125-year-old Montgomery Advertiser, is the author, or perhaps the prime mover, since it began with his relentless battle for fair and honest presentation of one particular type of news story and the developments are still being recorded.

The ideal is as old as journalism itself, but Mr. Hall's approach was unique in that it trained a pitiless spotlight upon the output of fellow editors throughout the Nation and showed them up before the people they are dedicated to serve. There are many indications that his campaign is having a wholesome effect.

Using as his basic thesis the oft-quoted but not always observed axiom that the business of a newspaper is to tell the truth regardless of the consequences, he is having a lot of serious fun peeling the hide of hypocrisy from a lot of people and probing the vitals of the institutions they head. It started not by design but by spontaneous reaction to an obvious need.

During the many weeks when Alabama was besieged by swarms of northern and foreign reporters sent to cover the Montgomery bus boycott and the incidents resulting from the efforts of an element of the Negro population and some extremists to shatter our traditional segregated educational system, many of the newsmen came to Mr. Hall's office for background discussions.

The youthful editor, who succeeded his Pulitzer prize-winning father as chief of one of the South's oldest and most distinguished newspapers, obliged them with such friendly candor that some of them apparently changed their preconceived ideas about race relationships in the South and wrote objective stories home. Others continued to turn out tripe. Meanwhile, Hall was getting in some licks of his own—chiding the reporters for coming all the way to Montgomery to get a story that existed, often in even more striking form, in their own backyards.

The climax came when the southern editor challenged the editor of the New York Post to do something about it. He proposed to go to New York and investigate racial segregation and discrimination if the Post editor would collaborate and assign to work with him the same able reporter who had been sent to Montgomery. Both would publish the stories. The New Yorker, however, insisted that Hall do the story in collaboration with a Negro reporter, described as an expert on the subject. Hall declined this as an "inadequate arrangement," and there the matter rested.

But not for long.

Other newspapers and national magazines, notably the U. S. News & World Report, gave wide publicity to the challenge. Many agreed with Hall that race incidents in the North and Midwest had been "played down" or ignored while newspapers, abetted by politicians, pointed the finger of scorn at the South.

Figuratively using his editorial pen as a cudgel, the Montgomery editor started beating the heads of editors "up Nawth." His text was taken from David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (11 Samuel 1: 20) in which the Biblical poet voiced the wish that the misfortunes of his friends be not made known to their heathen enemies:

"The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places; how are the mighty fallen.

"Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph * * *."

His theme was that "it is a sorrowful fact that wherever the Negro migrates in significant numbers, he encounters rejection," but that this fact was not admitted, nor incidents proving it published, in areas in the North whence came loudest criticism of the South.

Since then, day after day, he has pounded out editorials and put reporters on long distance telephones with tape recorders to in-

terview editors and public officials in other sections. The "Askelon" series has laid bare the attitude of the northern press.

For example: that a race riot must happen under a Confederate magnolia blossom to be news that's fit to print; that what the northern press would refer to as a mob in Alabama is discreetly called a crowd in Detroit, its lawless actions buried on far inside pages while Alabama's troubles are blazoned on page 1 in large type; that few if any newspapers of repute publish portraits of Negro brides on their society pages; that in Dearborn, Mich., population 130,000, not a single Negro is permitted to live, and the same is true of other all-white incorporated municipalities around the Detroit area; that the racial issue has been raised even in the Milwaukee mayoralty race, where the Negro population is only 5½ percent; that segregation and discrimination are practiced in St. Louis, Washington, New York, Chicago, Toledo and other cities, where violence frequently erupts—but the hometown newspapers "publish it not in Askelon."

The Advertiser editor proclaims, as most southerners have insisted all along if they gave it any thought at all, that the question of race relationships is an American, not a southern, dilemma. Citing flagrant examples of newspapers whose editorial pages "bleed like a Hapsburg in admonishing the South to cease race discrimination immediately if not sooner," he asks:

"How in the world did they think this arrant hypocrisy could be overlooked permanently? You might say that, in this respect, the genius of the northern press is its stupidity. Certainly it is practicing patent medicine vis-a-vis the South."

Nor does he spare his southern newspaper brethren. If editors in Birmingham, Dallas, and other southern cities would take up the battle for unbiased reporting there's no estimating the good it would do, he insists. An editor and one competent reporter could blast the editorial walls of "Askelon" until the inhabitants thereof would demand that their newspapers give them all the news, truthfully.

He has been given at least one assist by a neighbor, Editor Ed Field of the Selma Times-Journal. While in Washington recently accompanying a group of Alabama Farm Bureau leaders, Mr. Field sent back a two-column editorial titled "Uneasy Quiet Along the Potomac." He wrote that the Nation's Capital "is not as complacent about integration as propagandists would have you believe. Instead, the white citizens are seriously disturbed over a gradual process of subservience to Federal fiat which is turning the Capital City into a Negro community * * * Some say that as many as 13,000 white families moved out of Washington last year alone."

Mr. Hall recognizes that pressures brought to bear for school integration, and elimination of color lines elsewhere, since the United States Supreme Court's 1954 edict has set back amicable race relationships in the South immeasurably. He deplores that many sober-minded citizens who used to pride themselves on being "moderates" have become anti-Negro, or anti-white, as the case may be. While describing himself as a moderate, he concedes that he has revised his own viewpoint to some extent in recent months.

Once he was castigated on the floor of the State senate for his seeming editorial acceptance of the "inevitability" of racial integration; but the Senator who attacked him later mare public apology and praised Hall for his more recent observations and the "Askelon" series.

Now he's convinced that such a change in our educational customs can come only in the dim and distant future, if at all. Why? Not for moral reasons, as he sees it, but due to the resistance of a whole people to changes in their way of life by force. The same folks who think nothing of crowding into an elevator with Negroes (vertical transoprtation) resist legal efforts to force them to comingle on a bus (horizontal transportation).

They certainly are resisting integration in the schools, and will continue to do so.

This view is shared by some of the most thoughtful observers of the national scene. Discussing the Supreme Court's order in his syndicated column, noted columnist David Lawrence, editor of U. S. News & World Report, recalled the Nation's experience with what he referred to as another "social experiment," the 18th (prohibition) amendment. Public sentiment was gradually built up against it; Federal prohibition laws were so universally disregarded and resisted that adoption of the repeal amendment came with amazing rapidity. The States now have sole power in this respect; it was returned to the status of a local rather than a national issue.

Mr. Lawrence concludes that due to resistance on the part of the people, integration of the races in all schools throughout the United States is a long way off, "years and years, and maybe never."

So, where does the "Askelon" campaign leave the situation?

It certainly does not solve all the problems, and is not intended to. As a correspondent for the Kansas City Star wrote, Hall "has set out to prove that repression of Negro minorities is not strictly a Southern blight. He has succeeded beyond his hopes * * *." What does Hall think?

"This is a newspaper fight," the Advertiser editor said in an interview. "The possibilities are unlimited. Any editor with one reporter could keep it going 365 days a year. These exposés are not going to solve any of our problems. But if we can get the country thinking in terms of 'an American dilemma' rather than a 'Southern problem,' the people of the North will be more tolerant in their demands on us down here. A newspaper's business is to report the truth, regardless of the consequences. And to whatever extent that can be accomplished, to that extent will be the relief of the colored man in the North.

"We are trying to fill the journalistic gap by pointing out that where the Negro presents problems in numbers, he is rejected—candidly in the South, pharisaically in the North."

But while his battle is a journalistic one as he sees it, there is no doubt that it is having other and far-reaching effects. Some northern papers, including the New York Post, already are taking a closer look at their racial situations. The Associated Press and many of its members, prodded by Hall, are finding that there is news in racial strife everywhere, if anywhere.

The implications are not confined to newspaper ethics nor to the specific problems now beginning to be published in at least some parts of Askelon. People everywhere, whether Hall intended so or not, are looking toward Washington to question what's happening to the old-fashioned principle of States rights and individual liberties; people who believe in equal opportunities and protection for all under our system of government but who insist that age-old customs cannot be changed by Federal fiat, are reacquainting themselves with the current trend. Because the whole thing was triggered by that fateful integration decree of May 7, 1954, and the people wonder to what unlimited extent the reasoning which the Court employed in arriving at it may be used in future attempts to regulate other aspects of our daily life.

The Moral Is Crystal Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the President has expressed publicly his opposition to the so-called antisegregation amendment to the pending school-construction legislation. The President's position on this matter is quite obviously one of expediency, as he knows that no such legislation can be forced through Congress that expressly denies funds to a great portion of this country.

In view of recent actions along these lines taken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its administration of the Federal Airport Act, it would be well for Congress to analyze the President's real intentions respecting the school legislation.

By an overwhelming vote, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce defeated an attempt to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to deny funds to airports for construction of separate facilities where racial separation is practiced. The Federal Airport Act makes no requirement that integrated facilities shall be a condition precedent to an airport's receiving Federal assistance.

In abject defiance of the expressed intent of Congress, the Department of Commerce, through the CAA, has written this policy into its regulations, and is denying assistance to airports for construction of terminal facilities where plans call for separate facilities in accordance with State laws. Quite obviously, this policy was dictated from the White House.

Are we so naive as to believe that the President, particularly in an election year when he is a candidate, is not going to extend this same policy to the administration of the school-construction legislation, if enacted?

We need not be fooled by the President's pronouncements regarding the antisegregation amendment or the school-construction legislation. This fact is pointed out clearly in the following editorial, taken from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger, under date of May 9, 1956:

THE MORAL IS CRYSTAL CLEAR

We hope advocates of Federal aid to education in Mississippi and the South have derived some lesson from recent action by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, denying Federal funds for construction at airports where segregation is practiced. Our own Jackson Airport has been adversely (but negligibly) affected by this arbitrary decree.

Actually, Federal allocations for local airport improvements and additions have been reduced only from $40,000 to $35,000 by the CAA ruling, a comparative drop in the bucket in relation to the overall $85,000 program in which local funds are matched with Government money. This is entirely beside the point. The matter involves principle rather than principal.

The fact remains that a Federal agency, in this case the CAA, apparently can of its own authority prescribe conditions under which Federal funds may be granted or withheld to State or local authorities. If Washington agencies can deny funds for construction of segregated airport facilities, another agency can exercise the same authority in the case of segregated schools.

Conceding again that the CAA ruling in this particular instance is relatively unimportant, it unmistakably represents a dangerous and highly undesirable precedent for others in Washington to follow in prescribing rules and policies related to Federal aid. We invite the attention of all Mississippians to this phraseology in the CAA decree—"where duplicate facilities are provided that are intended for segregated use, the areas involved will be excluded from Federal aid."

Unlike other recent blows at the South's traditional practice of racial separation, the CAA ruling has prompted but little comment among southern leaders. City and State officials are expressing a cheerful willingness to pay all costs for segregated airport facilities which may be objectionable to Federal officials. This is especially true in the case of Jackson's municipal airport which, of course, will maintain the status quo.

The same attitude must and will continue to prevail with regard to education. Let those among us who cry loudly for Federal dollars in aid to schools pay heed to what has happened in the case of Jackson's airport and those of other southern cities denied Federal funds because of segregation. If Washington can prescribe terms and conditions for local airport construction, it can do so with regard to local schools receiving Federal moneys for their support. The moral is painfully clear and inescapable.

A School of War in Time of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following excellent editorial which appeared in the May 8, 1956, issue of the Hartford Courant:

A SCHOOL OF WAR IN TIME OF PEACE

This has been a year in which a number of diverse and venerable institutions have celebrated their 75th birthday. The University of Connecticut was established in 1881; so was the Boston Symphony Orchestra; and so was one of the United States Army's senior schools, the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. It must have been quite a year, 1881.

Perhaps none of these septuagenarian institutions has contributed as much to the country as a whole as the Army school. It is one of some 58 separate Army-operated or sponsored schools, which offer about 300 courses for officers and an equal number for enlisted men. But it is the only one that teaches the use of the combined arms and services in combat. It is there that officers selected to take high command and staff positions learn how the Army fights with major units. General Eisenhower is a graduate, class of 1926. In World War II some 18,000 officers went through the course. In World War I General Pershing felt that, without the staff training afforded by the school, the tremendous problems of combat, supply and transportation could not have been solved.

Yet, strangely enough, Leavenworth has always been a stepchild of the Nation's educational system. Only this year are plans taking shape for an academic building designed to meet the instructional needs. Most of the present school buildings are converted gymnasiums or riding halls. In peacetime, when the school is serving its most useful purpose of training officers for combat, it can't command the interest of Congress. Its anniversary today should serve to remind the Nation at large that a dedicated institution, constantly reviewing and improving doctrine and programs, is constantly at work against the time of need.

Chicago, Ill., as a Site for National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is presently pending before the House legislation to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a meeting held on May 9, 1956. This resolution requests the United States Congress to designate the city of Chicago as the site for the proposed National Library of Medicine, and sets forth very sound and positive reasons why the city of Chicago should be selected:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL OF CITY OF CHICAGO REQUESTING UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO DESIGNATE CITY OF CHICAGO AS SITE FOR PROPOSED NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill providing for the removal to a more accessible location, the world's largest medical library; an invaluable instrument for medical and scientific research, with its more than 650,000 volumes accumulated since its foundation by the United States Army in Washington, D. C., over 75 years ago; and

"Whereas the library is now crowded into a Civil War building; its services handicapped for lack of space and its safety and protection jeopardized by the danger of fire or other natural hazards; and

"Whereas the bill provides for the renaming of the library as the National Library of Medicine and most aptly transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense to that of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and further provides that the new library may and should be moved to a location more readily available to centers of medical research than is its present inadequate site; and

"Whereas Chicago is already the Nation's No. 1 Medical Center, offering unsurpassed facilities for medical treatment, teaching and research in the fields of medicine and surgery; is also the transportation hub of the United States for air, bus, rail, and automobile travel; and

"Whereas, if moved to Chicago and housed in a modern fireproof structure, the new library would be a storehouse of knowledge, enhancing the city's fame as a world medical center, and establishing it as the most acceptable and desirable location for the benefit of all interested parties from all parts of the Nation desiring access to the historic volumes; and

"Whereas His Honor, Mayor Daley, is leading the drive to present Chicago's claim for congressional recognition of its preeminent position in the medical field by locating the new library within the confines of the city; and will soon appoint a civic committee to take charge of the campaign: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Council of Chicago in regular session does hereby unanimously endorse the campaign for placing Chicago's unmatchable qualifications as a site for the medical library, and respectfully memorializes the Congress to give prompt attention to Chicago's plea; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Illinois and the Representatives in the Congress from the Chicago area and all other districts of the State, with the request that they give their official and personal support to the nonpartisan civic movement to bring to Chicago the largest and most authentic medical library in the world, in keeping with Chicago's great reputation for education and scientific achievement."

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook ss:

I, John C. Marcin, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held on Wednesday, the 9th day of May A. D. 1956.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 14th day of May A. D. 1956.

[SEAL] JOHN C. MARCIN,
City Clerk.

Now Hear This—Don't Let Flag Wavers Get You Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following challenging article written by Arthur F. Lenehan, able staff writer and columnist of the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News. His proposal for a return of some unabashed flag waving is one in which all real American can heartily concur:

NOW HEAR THIS—DON'T LET FLAG WAVERS GET YOU DOWN

(By Arthur F. Lenehan)

It seems like a long time ago that American men were fighting the losing battle for a rock in the Philippines called Corregidor.

One of the most dramatic facets of the story that came out of that tragic place was the willingness of many of those men to risk death so that the American flag could keep flying.

Few remember that, time after time, shell fragments cut the lines that held the flag aloft and sent it fluttering earthward. Each time, until the last, someone rushed from cover to catch the flag before it touched the tortured ground. Each time, until the end, the lines were knotted and raised once more.

It seems like more years than it really is that men fought to the top of Mount Surabachi on Iwo Jima to plant the colors.

It was only last year that Austrian prisoners came out from behind the Iron Curtain to report that American flags made from scraps of colored paper were appearing in Soviet slave camps. This in spite of the fact that the men responsible—imprisoned Americans—realized they faced beating and solitary confinement for their acts.

Not many people seem to remember that, either.

Forgotten, too, in all too many cases, is that old-fashioned custom, flying the flag.

Why?

Maybe it's because flag waving has become a term of contempt.

Some prominent flag wavers are the cause of this. They operate on the assumption that the flag is a cloak to be worn only by them.

These particular flag wavers once were dubbed self-appointed Emily Posts of patriotism by someone. If you didn't do things according to their prejudices and beliefs, they put you down in their little black book as unpatriotic. They convinced some people that criticism of them was an affront to flag and country.

People who weren't unpatriotic naturally got a little mad about such goings on. Trouble was, they got mad at flag waving as well as the flag wavers.

As things stand now, a good segment of the American people belittle flag waving. They think it mawkish to hang one in front of the house on appropriate occasions.

Perhaps, in time, that attitude will change.

Right now seems as a good a time as any.

Coming up on the calendar are days like Armed Forces Day, Memorial Day, and Flag Day.

It would be nice to see some unabashed flag waving once more—something that showed, if only minutely, some of the respect for the flag held by the men at Corregidor, Iwo Jima, and in Soviet prison camps.

The flag, after all, is an outward sign of the inner principles of people. It is what we make it. A man named Franklin K. Lane once put that thought very well. He said this of our flag:

"I am what you make me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, the dream of what a people may become. I am all that you hope to be, and have courage to try for. I swing before your eyes a bright gleam of color, the pictured suggestion of that big thing which makes this great Nation great. My stars and my stripes are your dreams and your labors. They are bright with cheer, brilliant with courage, firm with faith, because you have made them so out of your hearts. For you are the makers of the flag and it is well that you glory in the making."

Statement of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to set forth a statement which I presented to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with regard to S. 3593—companion bill, H. R. 10237—a bill to give recognition of Government employee union representatives in presenting points of view on personnel policies including grievances to the heads of the various Federal governmental departments.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS OF MISSOURI

I am glad the the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is holding hearings on S. 3593 (companion bill, H. R. 10237), a bill to give recognition of Government employee union representatives in presenting points of view on personnel policies including grievances to the heads of the various Federal governmental departments.

For many years I have advocated a more formal recognition of our various Federal employee unions in matters affecting our Federal personnel practices. I have never put my ideas in bill form and I am not certain just how legislation should be worded in accomplishing the objectives I have felt were proper and worthwhile. Certainly on the face, S. 3593 and H. R. 10237, seem to accomplish these objectives and I trust that the committee, after it has studied the matter, will reach this conclusion, and above all, that the committee will report out favorably a bill that will accomplish the objectives we have in mind.

It seems to me axiomatic that to have good employee relations, and to have the most efficient results from employees, we must have good employee relations, the employees must have a basic voice in the decisions affecting the physical surroundings where they work, the social relations which go to make up the atmosphere in which they work, and the general personnel system which regulates the manner in which they work, when they work, how they are to be promoted, have a chahge of duty, etc.

If there were no such things as unions representing the views of the employees on their working conditions, etc., good management would require that it establish some democratic process whereby the views of the employees could be determined. How much healthier it is, however, to have the employees set up their own machinery and organization for accomplishing this desirable end. Dictatorship whether deciding living conditions in a society or working conditions in an office or plant, however benevolent, is not the way to get the best employee relations. I believe most modern businessmen have found this to be true.

The Federal Government has the identical problem that any private business has in this area. The only difference lies in the area of employee compensation and the right in private enterprise of the employees to use their basic economic weapon of strike. In the matter of employee compensation and certain basic areas of employment practices the Federal employee's weapon is the right he has collectively or singly like any other citizen to petition the Congress. In settling any manner of difference between the Federal Government and the Federal employee the right to strike, of course must not be employed and in its stead the right to petition the Congress must be substituted.

Incidentally, I want to state that though I disagreed with a great deal of the thinking of the postal employees in the last session of the Congress on some of the matters in their petition to the Congress, not for 1 minute did I question or object to the strong manner in which they came down to petition the Congress. I might have taken exception to some of the tactics they employed when their petitioning zeal seemed to get the best of them, but at all times I publicly stated they were entirely within their rights and that Congress must anticipate strong petitioning, knowing that these employees and the unions representing them, took, and take, no exception to the idea that the right to strike cannot ever be theirs.

I would say one final thing, and I hope it is not taken by labor leaders unkindly. I know it will not be taken by the farsighted labor leaders unkindly. Union leaders themselves sometimes forget that they are merely representatives of others and that their purpose is to help those they represent, not to perpetuate themselves in power. Because unions have attained the point where they are both legally and socially recognized in our society, they must now face up to certain restrictions necessary to keep labor dictators off the backs of the working men.

The day, I believe, is now past when the plea for labor leader responsibility can be passed off as merely an underhanded method of trying to prevent union organization. It is perfectly true that in the past this underhanded method was used and used effectively. There is no question that attempts are still being made to utilize it. However, as I have said, unionism is now strong enough to drive back these underhanded attacks. Unionism's greatest present danger is the labor dictator who is using the labor movement to further his own personal ends. Accordingly, I am hopeful that whatever bill is passed out by the Senate committee will have a due regard for the basic rights of the employee in relation to his labor representative.

I appreciate having the opportunity of presenting my views on this important matter to the committee. I intend to insert this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be available to others.

Compulsory Inspection of Poultry and Poultry Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products.

This is a companion bill to H. R. 10527 and H. R. 10514.

Connecticut, with a poultry industry annually valued at some $70 million, not including baby chicks, is vitally interested in the adoption of Senate bill S. 3588. It is one of those rare industry proposals that serve both producers and consumers and, at the same time, promise greater agricultural stability.

The State of Connecticut has long recognized the need of slaughterhouse supervision. Licensing and inspections became statutory requirements at least as early as 1930. Steps are now being taken by our Department of Agriculture to amend previous regulations and adopt a new code comparable to the sanitary requirements of Senate bill 3588.

Income from poultry ranks first in Connecticut's cash farm income. Our broiler producers form one of the last bastions where their farms are owned and operated by the farmers themselves. As a result, the quality of the poultry produced on our Connecticut broiler farms can not be surpassed by any other area in the United States.

Broiler production now in excess of 25 million annually, increased 177 percent in Connecticut between 1940 and 1950. From 1950 to 1954 it was up an-

other 80 percent and still growing in importance.

Connecticut action is influenced to a large extent by the price and sanitary code of the New York City market. This code requires, among other things, rigid inspection of eviscerated poultry coming into the city.

Many Connecticut plants are voluntarily conforming with the New York requirements. Others would like to under the compulsory requirements of Senate bill 3588.

There are 166 licensed poultry slaughterhouses in Connecticut. Five of these alone are processing more than 1,500,000 pounds of poultry weekly.

Over 20 percent of the poultry produced in the United States today is under a voluntary poultry inspection program administered by the Poultry Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture. This Department has had 27 years of experience in administering the voluntary poultry inspection program. It would seem to be only logical that those people with the experience and know-how would be the proper ones to be assigned the task of administering a mandatory program. The expense of this voluntary program has been borne by the industry. Under the mandatory inspection program for red meat, the expense is borne by the Federal Government. It appears to me that to continue requiring poultry meat to bear the cost of inspection and at the same time subsidizing red meat inspection is most unfair.

The mere fact that the poultrymen in Connecticut have requested this legislation, along with other poultry areas, indicates their interests in providing high quality poultry for the consumer's table.

I hope we can get some prompt action on this necessary legislation.

Military Supplies Go Forward to Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the latest disclosure that the United States continues to supply arms to Saudi Arabia, as evidenced by the loading of reported bomb casings, rockets, and 76-millimeter shells on the *Monterrey* at South Port, N. C., highlights the dangerous, impossible, and contradictory position in which the administration has placed itself by supplying arms and ammunition to the Arab nations and at the same time denying arms and ammunition to Israel.

If it is a shipment of military supplies to Saudi Arabia, it is labeled a routine operation, but the shipment of such equipment to Israel, we are told, would be an arms race. We have supplied Iraq with arms and Saudi Arabia with arms and offered arms to Egypt. And yet, in questioning before the Congress, Mr. Dulles has said, "America is not the traditional supplier of arms to the Middle East."

It seems that if the Arab nations need further encouragement to truculence, we have given it to them. We can only incite Arab belligerence by our willingness to be wooed and won. We know full well that appeasement is not the road to peace. We know as well that an imbalance of power in any region of the world is a threat to the peace. It is that very premise upon which our own defense strategy is based.

This latest shipment of ammunition to Saudi Arabia emphasizes our failure to cope directly and intelligently with the Middle East situation. We are inviting disaster and bankrupting our moral leadership.

If the United States continues to sell arms to the Arab nations, it cannot at the same time deny Israel the defensive weapons which could restore the balance of power and more surely insure the peace.

Cleveland Pioneers Again in Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on the many occasions that I have addressed this House about various housing programs, I have emphasized the awareness of all the citizens of Cleveland for more and better housing. Our people feel that they have established a unique partnership between the private citizen, business enterprises and Government at all levels toward making Cleveland a better place to live. This partnership has been so successful that Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, cited Cleveland as an example when he addressed the United States Conference of Mayors recently. But throughout our programs, the backbone has been private enterprise.

The Christian Science Monitor of May 9, 1956, has published an interesting article about our "Operation Demonstrate," which the writer describes as "a major and effective movement against potential slums." Since this article discusses both its successes and setbacks, other Members might find it a helpful guide for projects in their own communities.

Under leave granted by unanimous consent, the article is appended herewith:

CLEVELAND: HOW TO BEAT SLUMS
(By Robert C. Bergenheim)

CLEVELAND.—Imagination, good business sense, and local pride can turn the tide against slums and preserve healthy neighborhoods. Cleveland is proving just that.

A group of private citizens here pitched in to prove to homeowners through demonstration that well kept properties are worth more than dilapidated, gloomy structures.

The national interest which has developed in Cleveland's experiment is proof of the true proportions of this program of arresting blight. National statistics show that more than 24 million dwelling units in the United States are in need of repair.

In Cleveland alone one-third of the 300,000 dwelling units were found in need of repair or renovation. An additional 36,000 are beyond saving and must be demolished. There are many cities—particularly the older ones—which are far worse off than Cleveland.

Cleveland citizens and public officials fully recognize the urgency of the problem. Many cities are well under way with Federal urban-renewal projects. So is Cleveland. But, in addition, private enterprises have joined together in Cleveland as a major and effective movement against potential slums.

Six months ago a nonprofit organization—Cleveland Modernization, Inc.—was established, with an 18-member advisory committee representing every segment of community interest. This group supports "Operation Demonstrate." It is being studied by communities with similar problems from coast to coast.

Operation Demonstrate—or OD, as it is being called—is an all-out effort by private enterprise to keep sound residential housing from sliding downhill into slums. It wants to save neighborhoods while they still have their local charm and value. Working with OD has been the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, a national, nonprofit organization which hopes to use Cleveland as an example of what can be done to save neighborhoods.

DRAMATIC STEPS NEEDED

Local and family pride are factors just as important as comfort and protection of the real-estate owner's pocketbook. Blight is such a slow, creeping process that it takes dramatic action as supplied by OD in Cleveland to open the public's eyes to the danger.

Instead of telling homeowners what a remodeling job can mean to them, OD has shown them. The slogan "Paint up, fix up, and clean up" doesn't inspire many homeowners to action. But concrete examples of the wonders of the paintbrush, hammer, and saw can stir the imagination, especially if it is a neighbor doing the sprucing up.

Most dramatic part of the Cleveland project has been the remodeling of two houses that were slated for demolition in a Federal urban-redevelopment area.

With the permission of Mayor Anthony Celebrezze and other city officials, these houses were moved to the mall. Architects decorators, and home suppliers were turned loose on them. One was turned into a home of traditional design, the other to contemporary.

These were the first two demonstration houses. Others have been tackled in various sections of the city. Public interest has gone beyond initial expectations. More than 40,000 persons visited the 2 model homes on the mall in the first 4 months they were open.

National magazines, local newspapers, radio and television stations have joined with bankers, real estate firms, contractors, painters, department stores, and many other groups to sell the idea of Operation Demonstrate.

The unprecedented enthusiasm of some of the outside interests has caused some local criticism, however. For example, one local observer claims that the houses moved to the mall were more than redecorated. "They were rebuilt. Only a few pieces of the original lumber survived," he said.

Such a job, he continued, proves only one thing—that with unlimited financial resources any house can be made modern and beautiful.

In defense, some supporters of OD say that visitors to these model homes are not expected to make all the changes shown but

might come away with one small idea which they wish to adopt for their own home.

Expensive decorations supplied by downtown department stores and local merchants also made the model houses good ammunition for the "before and after" photographs for national magazines.

While serving this purpose, some viewers were discouraged, realizing that their modest incomes in no way equipped them to duplicate these show places.

Sponsors of Operation Demonstrate, however, say they are more than satisfied with the success of their project. They say that during the first 2 months of the program remodeling permits issued in the city increased 22 percent in number and 49 percent in value compared with corresponding months of the previous year.

Last year $34 million was spent in Cleveland for additions and alterations. In the same period new construction totaled $44 million, according to permits issued.

Some observers, however, do not concede that these percentages are significant nor are necessarily due to Operation Demonstrate.

Realizing that money spent on remodeling must be considered as a wise investment, Operation Demonstrate set out to prove that remodeling protects a homeowner's financial position.

One 75-year-old house bought by the Cleveland Real Estate Board for $5,300, for example, brought an offer of $10,800 after $2,500 was spent on it, OD officials report.

Such figures have not gone entirely unchallenged by some local observers.

For example, they point to an elaborate remodeling job of a big Victorian-style house in a Negro area where most large houses have been converted into multifamily houses. Local merchants reportedly put between $35,000 and $40,000 into this house that may now sell for approximately $20,000, critics say.

STUMBLING BLOCKS

This sort of situation highlights one of the major dangers to any program aimed at dramatizing the preservation of properties. If a group of community goes overboard on remodeling, the total effect for that particular project is lost. As previously stated, it only proves that with enough money any house can be made as good as new.

A modest remodeling job is more likely to win public approval and get owners to follow suit. It would be practical.

Supporters of Operation Demonstrate constantly warn other civic-minded groups around the country of such dangers. "Biting off more than you can chew is the worst mistake of all," warns Harold Eckes, cochairman of OD.

Other stumbling blocks can be too ambitious programs by outside interests who leave the scene as soon as their needs for the project are satisfied.

Before doing anything, Cleveland OD officials warn other groups to get all their plans on paper, as well as commitments from those who are going to support, work on, and take an interest in the project. Deciding what the operating budget must be and raising it are fundamental steps.

Financial aid for individual property owners expected to go along with the neighborhood conservation program also must be considered. To the owner of a $5,300 house the initial investment of $2,500 for remodeling is often out of the question. On the other hand, a family looking for an $8,000 home might be persuaded to buy a $5,300 house and remodel it, as OD claims often can be done. A rundown house often hides its true value under a shabby exterior or a peeling coat of paint.

When OD started in Cleveland 6 months ago open end mortgages were difficult to get. FHA home-modernization loans require full payment within 3 years, which makes monthly payments too high for many persons.

Operation Demonstrate recognized this bottleneck immediately.

LIBERAL TERMS OFFERED

Five local banks—the Cleveland Trust Co., National City Bank, Society for Savings, Central National Bank, and the Union Bank of Commerce—developed a liberalized remodeling loan, repayable over a period of 8 or more years. Increased monthly payments, therefore, were kept within the reach of the homeowner.

Another stumbling block currently is being removed. The local building code specifies that remodeling must conform with a new construction code. A special home rehabilitation code is currently being tested in the Garden Valley area of Cleveland. After it has been tested and if it proves adequate, supporters of OD will push for its adoption for the entire city.

While recognizing the importance of remodeling, Cleveland Modernization, Inc., has done much to advance urban renewal plans for the city. Formed by 100 of the city's largest corporations, this foundation set up a $2 million revolving fund. At present the city is concentrating on two redevelopment projects, Longwood and Garden Valley.

Longwood, no more than 1 mile from downtown Cleveland, has turned from a dreary slum area into a revitalized, progressive community.

Garden Valley is 2 miles southeast of Longwood. Instead of waiting for approval of Federal funds, the foundation and the five commercial banks formed a $2 million mortgage pool to pick up all the mortgages on Garden Valley's private housing if necessary and to underwrite the entire central residential area rebuilding if necessary. Months were saved by this move by private enterprise.

Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, used Cleveland as an example of what can be done by integration of Federal, State, city, and private business interests in an address before the United States Conference of Mayors this year.

"One advantage Cleveland has enjoyed in late years," he said, "was the habit early established of viewing itself with critical eyes. * * * Cleveland has looked again and again with the vision of what can be built. As a result, in its central areas, this city has cleared or is now clearing more than 26 square miles of land—or about 17,000 acres—for transformation into decent, commodious, and financially sound living space. And Cleveland continues to look forward. It's motto might be, "What's past is prolog,'" Mr. Cole suggested.

Federal Aid Trap Becomes Apparent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for Federal aid to education comes at a time when the power of our States and local communities is in the greatest danger. The following editorial from the Greenville (S. C.) News ably points out the fallacy of Federal aid in this field:

FEDERAL AID TRAP BECOMES APPARENT

We are pleased to note that the Saturday Evening Post has taken a stand in opposition to Federal aid to education in an editorial in a recent issue.

It is evidence that the fallacies of the plans proposed in Congress by the administration and, before that, by the Democratic Party, are being seen by more and more people the country over.

Likewise, more people are being altered to the dangers inherent in any program which invites the Federal Government to step into what has been and should be purely a State or local matter.

The Post doubts that the administration program calling for the spending of $2,020 million for buildings over the next 5 years meets a genuine need.

The White House Conference on Education, for instance, came to the conclusion that "no State represented has a demonstrated incapacity to build the schools it will need." The resources, the Post says, are there. Schoolroom shortages do not arise in ghost towns and depressed areas with falling population.

The fact is that the States which need the most new schools, those which have experienced rapid population growth, are among the wealthiest States of the 48 and, therefore, best able to meet their own needs.

The Post continues in this vein:

"Since the last war there has been a heavy migration of footloose Americans from the country into certain industrial centers, from the cities into suburban developments, and from the South to the West and North. These people's children are often described as if they were 17-year locusts, a plague to be countered only by an appeal to the disaster squads of the Federal bureaucracy. But they are, in fact, future citizens, future taxpayers, evidence of thriving growth and an increase in property values.

"Breaking down the list of 48 States and the District of Columbia, and comparing school enrollments for 1935 and 1955, it appears that 1 group of 12 shows a combined loss over the 20-year period of 712,729. This includes Arkansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia.

"Another group reports a combined gain of 797,610 pupils. This includes a large number of States and the District of Columbia. New Jersey and New York have increases of less than 5 percent, while the rise in eight others—Alabama, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin and the District—ranged from 6 to 10 percent. hardly an unmanageable amount for local resources. Eleven States in this group—Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah and Wyoming—accounted for an increase of 463,000 in the grand total. That can hardly be described as a crisis.

"The really big upswing in enrollments is confined to 15 States: Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Virginia and Washington. Of their total increase, amounting to 4,122,846, more than half or 2,118,719, was reported by three States—California (1,306,573), Michigan (421,473) and Texas (390,673).

"Not one of the States showing large increases in school enrollment can properly be described as "poor." Most of them, for the record, deny that they want Federal aid.

"Federal money always brings—sooner or later—Federal controls. To commit the schools to the supervision of an absentee bureaucracy would be to abdicate home rule in perhaps the most important single area of our public activities."

In a speech in Charleston Governor Timmerman made much the same point with reference to South Carolina.

Federal aid to education, he said, would be "sugar-coated taxation" (the Federal Gov-

ernment would have to tax the people of the States to raise the funds) and the entering wedge of Federal control. He cited what South Carolina had done for its schools in recent years and asserted that the States could take care of its own without Federal interference.

What South Carolina is doing, the other States can do. We must do all in our power to avoid being dragged into the Federal aid net by those States whose politicians seem to welcome Federal control along with Federal money.

Federal Aid for Rural Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an editorial from the Boston Herald of Tuesday, May 15, 1956, entitled "The Little Federal Baby." It comments wisely on the importance of local responsibility in matters of government.

The National House has just passed a bill to provide $7,500,000 a year for 5 years for Federal aid to the States for rural library service. We are reminded of the young lady who pleaded in extenuation for a child born out of wedlock that it was such a wee baby.

Federal aid totaling $37,500,000 is a little enough child, born with a life expectancy of 5 years. But Federal aid babies have been known to thrive and to far outlive their expected span.

The argument for this new aid is that about 27 million people in the United States, 90 percent of them in rural areas, are without access to local public library services. The presumption is that if the Federal Government baited the States by a Federal aid arrangement with matching funds, these rural areas would get some bookmobiles or other library facilities, and thereafter public opinion would force the States to maintain and even improve such service.

And we must concede that sometimes this demonstration device works, as note the experience in this State described in the article at the end of this editorial.

But the Federal dollar prod never stops there. At the end of 5 years there will still be room for improvement in library service, and the Federal Government will feel called upon to press ever forward. By then Federal aid to libraries will be too firmly established to be upset.

Now, this means a waning of the sense of local responsibility. Communities will cease to care particularly about their libraries if the Federal Government has shouldered even part of the burden. There will be less concern about efficiency, since some of the money comes from that ill-defined source of limitless funds, the Federal Government.

Even without Federal aid the States aren't doing too bad a job. The numbers of counties without adequate library service has been reduced by 38.8 percent in 8 years. In 5 years the number of persons without library service has been reduced by 23 percent.

With the customary American urge to get things done overnight or next week at the most, the proponents of Federal aid would speed this up. But the speeding up will be at the cost of the additional Federal administrative costs, the inevitable Federal supervision of State library expenditures, and a further weakening of local enterprise. Somehow the baby, no matter how wee, would be better not born at all.

LIBRARIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts is 1 of 3 States (with Delaware and Rhode Island) where no person is without local library service, though 4 towns are served only by the State's bookmobile. Through the State's interlibrary service any person can borrow virtually any book in any library in Massachusetts, though with possible delay.

The State serves rural areas through three regional districts. The Fall River and Pittsfield districts each operate a bookmobile, with 1 librarian, 1 clerk-chauffeur, and 1 clerk on a budget of $12,000 a year.

The Greenfield district, however, has twice the budget and staff, and much more equipment. The reason: in 1950–52 Marshall Field supplied $36,500 for a demonstration of rural library service, and thereafter the citizens, working through the Franklin-Hampshire Rural Library Association in 12 communities from 200 to 3,000 population, insisted that this standard be maintained, and the legislature has complied. This is what proponents hope Federal aid will do.

The present State library budget is just over $100,000 a year. To get Federal aid of $110,000 the State would have to supply $128,000, making a total available of $233,000, well over twice present expenditures.

Battle for Air Route Is No Child's Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert the following article that appeared on the editorial page of the May 14 issue of the Portland Press Herald, one of Maine's daily newspapers:

BATTLE FOR AIR ROUTE IS NO CHILD'S PLAY

To keep matters in perspective on this business of Northeast Airlines' application to become the third carrier between New York and Miami it is instructive to contemplate the entire cast of characters, big and little, all of whom are playing the game for keeps.

Specifically we had in mind that no one around here ought to conclude that too much loud shouting was coming from this quarter. Loud shouting may not carry the day but failure to shout might lose it.

For exhibit A we offer the report of the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner who gave the nod to Delta Airlines. An inch-thick compendium of infinite complexity, it encompassed the arguments not only of Delta and Northeast but of Capital, Colonial, Riddle, Pan American, North American, and Resort Airlines, all of which also sought to compete on the Nation's heaviest air route.

Needless to say all hands rolled every ball they could find down the alley on the theory that some of them were bound to hit. And make no mistake, those rolled by big boys like Delta and Pan American rumbled appreciably louder than the others. There was a lot of noise too from Eastern and National Airlines which now share the route and which saw all manner of dire consequences to their own fortunes if the CAB lets a third company into the act.

Exhibit B is an item in the New York Times reporting a parade of delegates from all airlines concerned which has been steadily filing through the office of Mayor Wagner of New York City who is plumping not for Delta or for Northeast but for Pan American. It is clear that the view of New York City carries much weight and equally evident that it is bearing as much against the New England interest as any favoring Delta.

Our purpose here is to suggest the size and nature of the opposition and to emphasize the lengths to which it is going to gain its ends. Patently the game is no child's play which is why Maine interests must exploit to the utmost every legitimate tactic and all proper channels of influence prior to the final decision of the full membership of the CAB.

Detroit Labor Leaders Organized Milk Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ambitious and aggressive labor leaders in Detroit were responsible for the milk strike which occurred in the Detroit area last March. So that the people of this country and specially the farmers may fully understand the situation, I am including as part of my remarks an advertisement which appeared in a Michigan newspaper by the Michigan Milk Producers Association.

It points out, Mr. Speaker, that these ambitious leaders organized the milk strike for the purpose of taking over the dairy farmers who supply milk to the Detroit market. It is obvious that labor union practices in this instance and the business of hardworking independent dairy farmers do not mix. The advertisement follows:

HERE ARE THE FACTS ABOUT THE MILK STRIKE

The ill-advised milk strike, in which organized labor endeavored to "take over" the dairy farmers of the Detroit milk shed, proved one thing: That labor union practices and the business of independent farmers don't mix.

It became evident from the start that the instigators were not striking the dairies for a higher price. They had, in fact, agreed with dairies they would take the prevailing market price for farmers' milk.

Instead, they directed their attack against the dairy farmers' own organization, the Michigan Milk Producers Association, which they aimed to control or destroy. In this attempt, forces within organized labor sought to capitalize on the economic plight of the farmer and exploited a minority group of farmers to their own ends.

There should be no misunderstanding the fact that MMPA is a dairy farmers' cooperative, operated by the farmers, for the farmers, to cooperatively market their milk and protect their economic interests. It was the propaganda line of the strike leaders to mislead the farmers and the public in this respect.

The obviously false claim of strike leaders that they won a price increase was a part of this propaganda technique. Actually, nothing good for the dairy farmer resulted from the strike. Rather, only harm was accomplished, the seeds of dissension were sown, and the real issues and facts were wilfully misrepresented.

WHAT CAUSED THE STRIKE?

The strike stemmed from the ambition of a few within organized labor to control the Detroit milk market and to collect union dues from dairy farmers who ship milk to that market. To accomplish this, the strike organizers turned farmer against farmer in their drive to destroy his cooperative organization.

WHO WERE THE STRIKE LEADERS?

Major leadership and direction came from organized labor. Joined with these professionals were a former union organizer and a small group of dairy farmers who have consistently opposed the methods and policies of MMPA and sought this means of imposing their will on the MMPA membership.

WHAT WERE THE REAL ISSUES?

This was not a strike for a higher price for milk nor did it accomplish any economic advantage for farmers. The real issue was recognition of the so-called fair-share group, organized labor's front, for the purpose of dues collecting and check-off. By this action, the strike directors sought to gain control of the assets and functions of MMPA.

WHO WON THE PRICE INCREASE?

The bargaining power of MMPA, carried out in an ultimatum voted at the March 28 delegates' meeting, was alone responsible for the price increase gained on April 1. The class I price of $5 would have been achieved sooner and without ultimatum if obstructionist tactics of strike leaders and others had not blocked price negotiations carried on by the MMPA Detroit sales committee.

WHAT ARE THE ECONOMIC FACTS?

The increased price of $5 per hundredweight applies only to that portion of the milk used for bottling and fluid purposes. It is not a net price to the farmer, who must pay marketing and shipping costs. Only part of the milk can be sold at this price, the rest must be used for manufactured products at the prevailing market price.

OUTSIDE MILK A PROBLEM

Another factor not to be overlooked is the deluge of milk which results in any market where a higher than average price prevails. Competition from outside the milkshed can cause havoc for regular producers, even to the extent of losing their market.

No one realizes more fully the serious problems of the dairy farmer than does the MMPA, whose affairs are directed by these self-same farmers. The present farmer price squeeze is the Nation's No. 1 problem. It cannot be solved by mob action nor by looking for help from agitators outside the ranks of agriculture. They have their own ax to grind.

From Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been drawn to an article in a British magazine entitled "Time and Tide" in the April 14, 1956, issue. This article dealing with the points of view of Communists and others behind the Iron Curtain which are of great interest to those of us in the free world are, I believe, sufficiently unusual to justify the study of my colleagues. I therefore include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the understanding that, of course, I am not in any position to certify as to its accuracy.

The article follows:

THE NEW PROGRAM

(From a correspondent)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This article is based on information received from countries behind the Iron Curtain. It presents the point of view of circles close to the leading Communists and gives their interpretation of events in the U. S. S. R. which are puzzling western public opinion.)

The task that confronted the Soviet leaders after Stalin's death were of such magnitude that a long period of time was necesary in order to reassess the situation and to prepare a new political and economic program.

This delicate period of transition was entrusted to Mr. Malenkov, whose task was to reassure and mollify the population after the shock of Stalin's death. This he did by promises of individual legal and civil rights and by increasing the production of consumer goods.

Meanwhile the real team was feverishly at work preparing the new program. During this transitional period the satellite and foreign Communist Parties were for months without guidance from Moscow. Moscow was too busy and was not ready with its long range policy.

The major task was to formulate the new Five Year Plan in conjunction with an economic policy for the whole Communist bloc. Each satellite was to become an integral part of the Soviet master plan.

When it became clear that the internal situation in the U. S. S. R. was consolidating, the only danger that remained was the instability of the Far Eastern situation. China's claim to Formosa might well provide a major conflagration and throw Moscow's long term program out of gear.

The object of the visit of Messrs. Khrushchev, Bulganin and Mikoyan to Peking in the autumn of 1954 was to inform Mr. Mao Tse-tung of the long range objectives and to induce him to abandon any plan for drastic action regarding Formosa. He was offered all-out help to build up China within the next 10 years as a military power on a par with Russia and the United States of America and eventually he acquiesced.

The new program being ready and the transitional period successfully weathered without internal troubles, Mr. Malenkov was directed to pass the Government over to the new team. The usual face-saving admission of errors was made and they then began the implementation of the new Party line.

Western speculations at this time regarding Mr. Malenkov's demotion evoked much gaiety in leading Communist circles in Moscow.

The convocation of the 20th party congress was timed to correspond with the beginning of the new 5-year plan. Open criticism of Stalin was postponed until then, in order to back it with the authority of this supreme party organ. Although the attack was expected, the impact of Mr. Khrushchev's speech on the delegates was tremendous; one of them, Mr. Bierut, secretary of the Polish United Workers Party (Communist), died soon afterward in Moscow. Satellite delegates returned home with mixed feelings. They had been told that, as a result of the success of Soviet foreign policy, at least 5 years of peace could now be guaranteed.

This period was to be used for development in two directions; for the consolidation and development of the economic potential of the Soviet orbit on the one side and for the weakening of the unity and potential strength of the capitalist world on the other.

Competitive coexistence must be worked for boldly and with self-confidence, without losing sight of the unchanging basic principles of Communist dogma. The emphasis was laid on competition, not on coexistence; it was made clear that this was a change only in tactics, not in ultimate aim.

The delegates were told that the Soviet goal was to achieve a new balance of world power by increasing the strength and influence of the Communist bloc and by correspondingly weakening the capitalist world. When this new balance of world power was achieved, war would automatically become unnecessary for the final world victory of communism.

The second major success of Soviet foreign policy was to be seen in the worldwide spread of anticolonialism and of the rise of liberation movements in dependent countries. The scope of all such activities was to be considerably enlarged.

The control of the southern sea route between Europe and Asia, via Suez, would be wrenched from the hands of the colonialist powers. Since Asia was already dominated by the triangle U. S. S. R.-China-India and the Arab-Moslem fringe was being successfully wooed, it was now Africa's turn to awake.

Under the combined pressure of coexistence disarmament and anticolonialist liberation movements, the western alliances and bases would gradually disappear.

The role of each satellite state in this general plan had been carefully drafted, and they were to receive instructions for common action. One of the most important aspects of the Soviet plan for the satellites is the policy regarding their emigres. The existence of these emigres in western countries is seen as a major stumbling block for the Communists in their attempt to deceive the West.

The satellite program for handling this situation was launched some time ago. It was divided into two phases. During the first the unity and organization of the emigres had to be destroyed. They were to be offered complete rehabilitation if they returned to their own countries. Some would return, and this would spread suspicion and would help to disrupt and demoralize the organizations. The majority, however, should remain abroad.

During the second phase those who remained in the West would be organized and their potential political possibilities exploited on patriotic grounds, as was done with the Auslandsdeutsche by the Germans. More emigres would be allowed to leave the satellite countries for the West, in order to strengthen their bonds with the mother country.

The tone of the discussions in Moscow was one of boundless optimism and of uncritical faith in the success of all the projected plans.

The satellite delegates, having an intimate knowledge of the realities of the situation in the USSR and in their own countries, were much less optimistic than their Soviet partners and felt that the promise of the future was too dazzling to be true.

They have been convinced by the Russians that the danger of nuclear warfare has disappeared for at least 5 years. They agree with the Soviet assessment that the economic plans for both the USSR and for their own countries are promising, but they are convinced that, in order to realize them, further sacrifice and privation will be necessary, and improvement in living conditions will have to be postponed until after the plan is fulfilled.

They foresee many difficulties ahead. The inner political situation in the Soviet orbit will be increasingly difficult, as the Russian leadership will be faced by an opposition on two fronts—one of anti-Stalinism and the other of pro-Stalinist elements within both the party and the population.

The ideological readaptation of Marx-Leninism to the new conditions will be no

easy task, owing to the lack of ideological and philosophical cadres within the Party. Those already in existence are practically useless, because of the fact that under Stalin they were trained to repeat and interpret ideas ordered from above. They have therefore lost all the creative ability which is so badly needed under present conditions.

The wavy line of Soviet foreign policy has not impressed the delegates from the other socialist states. They remember the switch from the militant revolutionary policy in the early twenties to a courting of the West by Chicherin. This is turn was replaced by the cold hostile technique of Litvinov's period. Then came the sudden abandonment of isolation by the U. S. S. R. in 1934, when she joined the Leauge of Nations and flirted with France.

Coexistence, visits, banquets and smiles were the order of the day, until they were brutally interrupted by the Soviet-Hitler alliance. Only Hitler's treachery brought the Soviet Union into the western alliance. This period of coexistence was also abandoned when the German menace disappeared.

Despite Russian statements about the unlimited possibilities of the present coexistence tactics, the satellite delegates were convinced that, after so many painful lessons over the years, the West would not again be fooled and mistake a tactical wave for a flood of genuine goodwill.

Our Youth and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, Mr. Orville F. Rush made a speech entitled "Our Youth and America's Future," before the Rotary Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Speech by Orville F. Rush before the Rotary Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex., May 10, 1956)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the Albuquerque Rotary Club, it is a distinct honor and a real pleasure to speak to you for a few moments today on a subject which demands the immediate attention of every community in America today—the subject of juvenile crime.

As the father of seven children, as a citizen of the greatest Nation on earth, as an exhorter of the Methodist Church, and as a Rotarian and a Shriner, I am interested in the youth of our country.

Naturally it is disturbing to me, as it is to every citizen whose thoughts are on the future of our Nation, to read newspaper accounts day after day, from Maine to California, of youthful murderers, robbers, auto thieves, and almost unbelievable vandalism.

On any given day in any big city in America today the chances are better than even that a person will find articles concerning juvenile crimes similar to those I found in Washington newspapers at the time I was preparing this speech. Let me read a few excerpts from my hometown papers to prove my point.

Headline No. 1: "Twin, 14, Found Guilty in Cub Scout Murder." This was the story of a 14-year-old boy in an eastern State who beat a 9-year-old boy to death to get $15 he thought the child was carrying. (Washington Post, April 6, 1956.)

Headline No. 2: "Neighbor Boy, 14, Beats Woman in Robbery Try." This story dealt with a 14-year-old boy who bludgeoned a housewife with a baseball bat because he needed money. (Washington Post, April 5, 1956.)

Headline No. 3: "Boys, 11, Accused of $50,000 Ruin in Widow's Home." This article related that two little boys, 11 years old, admitted destroying $50,000 worth of furnishings in the home of a wealthy widow. Expensive antique furniture and china were reported smashed, valuable paintings and Persian rugs were shredded with knives and brown dye was sprinkled over floors and walls. (Washington Post, April 4, 1956.)

Then there was a headline in a recent issue of the St. Louis Democrat: "16-Year-Old Killer Says Probation Led to Murder." This was the story of a sallow-faced 16-year-old youth who said he "got panicky" during the course of attempting to rob a merchant so he shot and killed the victim. He was trying to get money to repair his convertible automobile. The irony of this particular case is the youthful killer's statement to a newspaper reporter. I quote: "They should have locked me up when I stole the first car. I was 13 or 14 then. They let me off too light. They gave me probation." On two different occasions this little boy received probation. Once for car theft, once for breaking and entering. The third time he must have felt he could get away with murder—so he murdered. Whether he will get away with that remains to be seen. (St. Louis, Mo., Democrat, January 30, 1956.)

Juvenile delinquency is nothing new. I feel sure that every generation, from Adam and Eve to our own, has had to cope with this problem. But today, with our ever expanding population, crowded conditions in the big cities, negligent parents, and a lack of chores for boys to perform, it is becoming an increasing menace to America's future.

America's enviable position in the world of today has been attained through the efforts of God-fearing generations of men and women who were taugh as children to love God, but fear transgression; to love their parents, but respect them; to behave in school or take the results; to respect authority and the rights of others or be disciplined accordingly.

From the newspaper accounts of youthful depredations, magazine and news stories on the immorality and negligent attitude of parents, and my personal knowledge of the lack of religious training and lack of discipline of our youngsters, I feel it is time for the adults of America to pull up short and say to ourselves: "What am I doing to insure America's future greatness for my son, for my daughter, for my neighbor's children?"

America's future in the world of tomorrow, regardless of all the new inventions scientists might effect, depends a great deal upon what you and I, as citizens, parents and Rotarians, do for our children of today. It depends upon what we teach them in the home, the school and the church. It depends upon the examples we set in the home, in our everyday contact with our neighbors, in our church activities, and in our business dealings. It depends upon the playgrounds we provide for the youngsters in our future housing developments to give them a place to play in crowded surroundings. It depends upon the interest parents take in their children's activities in school and in organizations such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Cub Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls.

Yes, America's position in the world of tomorrow depends upon a lot of factors, but the parents hold the balance of power if they care to use it to insure America's future.

That children need a field to play in, whether it be football, baseball, basketball, or games of any kind, is aptly demonstrated by a story I heard once concerning the spirit of a convict playing football:

"Alabama Pitts was big, rough and tough, but he played a clean game of football. One day Sing Sing Prison was playing some Catholic University in New York. Pitts was playing tackle. The player opposite him slapped Pitts twice, called him yellow, and tried to make him mad. Pitts glared at him but took no further notice.

"A priest standing near the play saw it. The prisoners won the game. After the game the priest asked Pitts why he did not slap back.

"Pitts replied, 'Father, that boy was broken-hearted because his team was losing. They couldn't get a play through my spot. If I had hit him back there might have been a free-for-all fight and then we would have been barred from future outside games. This game means a lot to every man in Sing Sing. I couldn't take a chance on ruining it. And you know, Father, if I had a chance as a boy to play football, I wouldn't be in Sing Sing now.'"

The end result of an unhappy home life, with no parental love and no recreational facilities, is aptly illustrated in the following case: A few weeks ago a 17-year-old boy in an eastern State stole a car. The 19-year-old brother of the car owner saw the youth drive off and gave chase with a friend. They cornered the thief a few blocks away and the thief stabbed the 19-year-old boy to death. He was later arrested, admitted the stabbing and said: "I did it. So what? Hang me."

But the story does not end there. In the January 6, 1956, issue of a local newspaper the accused killer is alleged to have said to a reporter: "I just can't fit. I began to get into fights in the fourth grade. It's a wonder I didn't kill before this." A newspaper reporter found that this boy had a burning hatred for everything from the time he was 10 years of age. He had a bitter home life. He had nothing to do at home, nothing to play with, and no recreational facilities at home or in the neighborhood.

This boy asserted that on one occasion 400 boys and girls signed a petition to the businessmen of his home town to build them a recreational center, but he said: "All they built were additions to their stores."

So this boy indirectly lays the blame for his plight on nothing to do at home and the failure of a group of businessmen to heed the pleas of 400 boys and girls for a recreation center. This, of course, might not be the real reason at all, but it's possible, and it's something for any civic-minded group of people like you to think about.

A good question at this point would be: "Are the recreation facilities in Albuquerque adequate?"

TEENAGERS

When our teenagers decide to take things into their own hands, they can do a better job with each other than you and I can do. The impact of being ostracized by boys and girls of their own age group is terrific. It's all right to talk about what juveniles do, but it does not accomplish anything until we, as adults, formulate some plan to help prevent youthful crimes.

Recently, a group of teenagers met at a church near my house for a panel discussion on teenage problems. Their main gripes were these:

1. Our parents don't trust us.

2. Our parents set poor examples for us to follow.

3. They say "Don't take a drink and drive." But then, they go out, get tight, weave all over the street, and think it's all right.

4. They won't let us use the family car.

The use of the family automobile has become a big factor in arguments between teenagers and their parents. A 15-year-old boy in a western State used the family car on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights. When he asked for the use of it on Monday his mother said, "No." The boy lost all sense of reason. He killed his mother and grandmother, then waited for his father. When his dad came home they talked and joked together, then his dad started toward the kitchen and the boy killed him.

In a midwestern State a 16-year-old boy asked his mother for the car. She refused. He got his dad's shotgun, killed his mother, sister, and little brother, and then he took the car.

A 14-year-old boy is serving a life sentence in an eastern State today as a result of killing his mother, father, and little sister merely because his dad refused him the use of the car one night for a date.

A timid-looking 16-year-old lad in a northern State said bad marks in school and the use of the car led to an argument with his family, so that night he shot and killed his parents, took their hoarded money and car, and left the State. He was apprehended a thousand miles away.

DISCIPLINE

The word discipline seems to shock a lot of our present-day parents, particularly mothers. By discipline I do not mean you have to beat your child with a strap. There is nothing worse for a child. There is a vast difference between discipline and beating on a child.

Discipline should start at age 1, as soon as a child learns to comprehend things; religious training at age 2. Master the child or the child will master you. Send them to their rooms. Cut their allowance. Deny them TV, comic books, etc. They'll come around. Children need discipline as much as they need love. Those parents who feel they are wise in not spanking their children when they need spanking are overlooking God's inspired words in the Bible.

Let's prove the truth of these verses by contemporary cases. An 18-year-old boy got mad at his Dad because his Dad told him he should not marry a 15-year-old girl. He stole his Dad's car, got his 15-year-old girl and went on a 5-day crime spree. He robbed and killed 5 people in 5 States during that time.

When asked why, he said: "I've been spoiled, badly spoiled."

Proverbs 13, verse 24, reads: "He that spareth his rod hateth his son."

Proverbs 3, verse 12, reads: "For whom the Lord loveth he correcteth: Even as a Father the son in whom he delighteth."

Love is just as important to children as discipline. Not long ago, I read where a little boy, 12 years old, put a .22 rifle to his stomach, then said, "Nobody loves me" and pulled the trigger.

Children from broken homes so often feel they are not wanted and not loved. Their affection is divided. To use the modern vernacular, they feel "all shook up inside." They lack a feeling of security and security is essential to a child's well-being.

Some time ago I was reading Father Keller's book, Three Minutes a Day. It contained a story on love versus hate which I would like to pass on to you. The story runs thusly:

"High up in the Rockies there lived a small boy and his mother. One day after he had been punished severely, the lad ran to the edge of a precipice and shouted back at his mother, 'I hate you! I hate you!'

"In a deep stentorian voice the lad heard the echo say, 'I hate you!' Thoroughly frightened, the boy ran back to his mother, and sobbed: 'Who is that bad man over there who shouted, "I hate you"?'

"Taking the boy's hand, the mother led him back to the edge of the precipice. 'Now, Sonny,' she said, 'Call out, "I love you. I love you."'

"The little boy did as she told him. Clearly and sweetly the echo came repeating the words.

"'My child,' said the mother, taking the youngster into her arms, 'That is the law of life—what you give, you get'."

For nearly 20 years now I have had my office in Washington, D. C. During that time, I have seen many new faces come and go in political circles and governmental agencies. But one man, for whom I have the highest veneration and most profound respect, was head of a very fine Government Bureau in Washington when I got there and he is still there, standing like a stone wall against crime, corruption in high office, communism, and anything indecent or alien to our American way of life. Today he stands as one of the great Americans of our time and his accomplishments in his chosen field are too numerous to mention. I speak of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When Mr. Hoover speaks on the subject of juvenile crime, or parole violators, or the value of Sunday School training—America listens—and rightly so. He made a speech on April 10, 1956, before the National Parole Conference in Washington, D. C. He said a lot of things in that speech that were shocking and should put America on notice. One thing Mr. Hoover said was particularly shocking to me as a taxpayer and it was this, I quote:

"We complain about high taxes, but last year crime cost every man, woman, and child in these United States $122, or a staggering estimated total of $20 billion. Perhaps this figure could become more meaningful if we realized that for every $1 spent on education, crime costs $1.46; and for every $1 which went to the churches of the Nation $13 went to crime."

In the November 1952 issue of the Rotarian Mr. Hoover had an article titled "You Versus Crime" in which he said:

"We begin to grasp an idea of the cost of crime in terms of money when we note that in one group of 381 of America's larger cities the estimated value of automobiles stolen during the year of 1951 amounted to $95,312,596 and at the present rate of increase it will be even higher for the year 1952. * * *

"Persons under 21 represented more than 30 percent of the 95,600 persons arrested for crimes against property. Of the 2,060 15-year-old boys and girls arrested during the pertinent 6-month period of 1952, 401 (19.5 percent) had prior fingerprint records. Forty-four and nine-tenths percent of the 12,955 young people in the age 20 bracket who were arrested during the same period had prior fingerprint records."

When you hear cold, bare facts such as those, it makes you stop and think.

I quoted those statistics from the 1952 issue of the Rotarian because I wanted to prove to you that our crime situation is getting progressively worse instead of better. And here is my proof: FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover stated in a press release, dated September 26, 1955, "An estimated 1,128,350 major crimes were reported for the period from January to June 1955, only 7,790 less than the 1,136,140 total for the similar period in 1954. If the trend continues for the remainder of the year, 1955 will be the fourth consecutive year in which more than 2 million major crimes will have been committed. * * * During the first 6 months of 1955 a major crime was committed every 13.9 seconds. * * * There was 1 major crime committed for each 144 persons in the general population of the United States during the first 6 months of 1955. This figure is based on the January 1, 1955, estimate which set the population at 162,865,000. * * * Victims of killers in the United States totaled 6,240, while 55,410 people were assaulted by rapists or potential killers. Robbers jeopardized more than 30,000 individuals. * * * 109,830 automobiles were reported stolen during the first half of 1955."

I am not going to give you any more statistics, but these I felt were necessary in order to give you a well-rounded picture of the problem America is facing today. Statistics serve a wonderful purpose as they reflect in summary form what might take pages on end to reflect otherwise.

Former United States Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, a great public speaker and storyteller, used to quote statistics, then tell a story as to why he made his statistics brief. This was his story:

"A coed, standing near the edge of a college swimming pool, dropped her camera in the deep end of the pool. She was talking to a group of boys at the time, but ignored them entirely and asked a 65-year-old professor to retrieve her camera for her.

"He said he would be glad to, but why would she ask an old man like him to retrieve her camera with all the young, handsome boys around. She replied: 'Professor, I'm sure you don't remember me, but I was in your statistics class last year, and I am convinced that you can go down deeper, stay longer, and come up drier than any man I ever knew.'"

Another important contribution of enlightenment on the subject of juvenile crime was contained in the January 14, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report. It was a very interesting article titled "Why Law Fails To Stop Teen-Age Crime." This magazine sent inquiries to prominent men throughout the Nation who were considered authorities on the subject. The answers given by these authorities to the questions propounded by the magazine make sense to me.

After all the answers were in, the editors summarized what the judges and law enforcement officials told U. S. News & World Report about teen-age delinquency, and here it is. I will read first the causes and secondly the cures recommended:

"THE CAUSES

"A general and growing disregard for constituted authority.

"Weak discipline in home and schools.

"Juvenile courts too lenient.

"Too many repeaters turned loose on probation.

"Lack of good institutions for reforming young delinquents.

"Shortage of trained probation officers to handle youngsters turned loose.

"Too many vicious comic books.

"Shortage of policemen trained in handling youngsters."

"THE CURES

"Parents should show respect for law and teach it to their youngsters.

"Firmer control—spankings when needed.

"Quit coddling young hoodlums.

"Crack down on repeaters, put them in institutions.

"Provide reformatories that reform, staff them with psychiatrists.

"Train more probation officers, let them concentrate on youths who can be saved.

"Control comics, encourage other reading.

"Train more police, put them out walking neighborhood beats."

As the subject of religion is so controversial it was not listed as a cure in the summary above. Maybe it's not a cure, but certainly religion is a preventive measure. If we, as parents, teach our children to love and respect God, follow His commandments and fear violation of His commandments, a youngster will be started out on the right track. If we, as parents, set an example for our children to follow by attending Sunday school and church regularly, our children feel there must be something to it or we would not be so anxious to go every Sun-

day. The only trouble my wife and I have about taking all our children to church at one time, is we have to get there early or we can't find enough space for all nine of us to sit together. It will be even more involved in the future as I have acquired a daughter-in-law and a grandchild in the past couple of years. We marry early down in my native State of Alabama.

Not long ago I read a newspaper article which related the story of a boy 17, who turned to God too late. For some reason, he decided to ransack a home one night in which there resided a 17-year-old girl. She woke up, saw him, screamed and he stabbed her to death in his panic of being recognized. He was apprehended, tried, convicted and sentenced to be hung. He died a thousand deaths waiting for the execution. He spent his final hours sobbing and praying. Two hours before midnight he was dressed in gallows garb. He was on the verge of collapse. Sixty-six minutes before the hour of execution, the Governor commuted his sentence to 99 years. The boy said, "My God, my God, my God," and collapsed.

If he had learned more about God between the years of 2 and 6, it might not have happened. He had turned to God too late. Let's you and I be sure that our children do not turn to God too late. Let us follow some commonsense principles.

Niagara Falls is a beautiful sight, but its utilitarian value is lost until the falls are harnessed with generators and dynamos and other equipment necessary to convert the uncontrolled power of falling water to useful electricity.

Every child is born with a certain amount of uncontrolled power. Some have more than others. That power must be harnessed if society is to realize any utilitarian value from the child as a good citizen. But we do not use generators, dams, and dynamos to convert the energy of a child to useful channels. We use love, reason, family ties, discipline, church, school, playgrounds, Boy Scouts boys' clubs, girls' clubs to correctly harness and channel our children's power.

If we fail to use all of the facets at our command, we are being negligent in our duties as parents and as citizens. The power of Rotary International is great. Many of America's finest and most influential citizens are in our ranks. But if we fail to use our power for good in any community we are falling down on the job.

One of the greatest truths ever uttered by Albert Pike, founder of Scottish Rite Masonry, was his expression: "What a man does for himself dies with him—but what he does for his community lives forever."

I do not know what your local juvenile problem is here in Albuquerque, nor do I know what the Albuquerque Rotary Club is doing for the youth of this community. But I do know the need for adult assistance to youth is great throughout the country and many localities are endowed with wide-awake citizens, civic clubs, corporations, and organizations which are sparking movements to help our youth.

Here is just one example of what can be done. Some time aga the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. sponsored an oratorical contest for teenagers. It created a great deal of interest throughout the United States. Over 10,000 youngsters entered their individual entries and I was fortunate enough to hear a 16-year-old girl by the name of Elizabeth Ellen Evans deliver her winning oration. It was magnificent. It proves one great point, that regardless of the shocking criminal acts today of many of our youths, there are still millions of young adults in their teens, who have been taught love of God, love of Nation, love of parents, and respect for authority and the rights of others. In the hands of such fine, patriotic youths as Elizabeth Ellen Evans, America's future will be safe. With such outstanding and public spirited groups as Rotary to help guide our youths, America's future will be safe.

CAB Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a column written by Marquis Childs, published by the Washington Post and Times Herald and other newspapers on May 16. Mr. Childs devoted this column to a discussion of some of the matters which concern subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. The article follows:

TRAVEL BOOM AND LOWER FARES
(By Marquis Childs)

The rush of American tourists going abroad is already on in a volume, both for the number of individuals and for the dollars they spend, that will set a new record this year. Steamships are booked solid into the late summer and it is becoming difficult to get an airplane reservation.

What is happening is that a sector of the public that would never have dreamed of going to Europe or South America today is being persuaded by lower fares, the seductive travel ads, and the quick crossing by plane to venture for the first time out of the country.

In 1929, the peak travel year before World War II, 517,000 Americans went overseas and spent $693 million.

In 1954, the latest full year for which there are estimates, the number was 912,000, spending $1,358,000,000. But on the basis of the half-year estimate available for 1955—514,000 tourists spending $705 million—the number of individuals was well over a million and the money spent $1.4 billion. Thus the total has doubled since 1929, while the population was increasing by roughly one-third.

But there are indications that the surface has hardly been scratched and that, with lower fares and more facilities, the overseas tourist trade will double and perhaps even double again within a decade.

The other day North American Airlines, which pioneered domestic air-coach service and has been struggling to get a foot in the door for scheduled as against nonscheduled service, applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a permit to fly from Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York to Luxembourg for a one-way tourist fare of $145 to $158.

The start this caused the air industry can be imagined in view of the fact that the one-way tourist fare to Paris is now $310. Not long afterward, both Trans World Airlines and Pan American World Airways announced they would ask the International Air Transport Association to sanction lowered fares for certain types of service.

Luxembourg, which has not had direct service from America, is delighted at the prospect and the Government has now proposed that a bilateral agreement be negotiated which would permit a Luxembourg airline to come to the United States. Picturesque Luxembourg, central to most capitals, has one of the best airports in Europe.

The key to overseas fares is held by the International Air Transport Association, to which the airlines of every country belong. Director general of IATA is Sir William Percival Hildreth. A witness recently before a House subcommittee looking into the cartel-monopoly aspects of air rate-making, Sir William was charming, affable, but somewhat evasive.

He was asked why it is possible to fly air coach from New York to Los Angeles, roughly 2,500 miles, for $80 while the New York-Paris flight, about 3,200 miles, costs $310. The following exchange occurred with Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

"Sir WILLIAM. The answer is that the terrific developments here, the expertise, has produced a wonderful thing. I hope we can match it, but give us a chance.

"Mr. QUIGLEY. Do they suddenly lose their expertness when they get out over the Atlantic? Is the TWA initiative and expertise still available when we get headed toward Paris—is that not still available?

"Sir WILLIAM. No, sir. I think that is not quite a fair question, you see. In the States, one country, no currency problems, one control and an enlightened one at that—the nation with its high standard of living demands this great development.

"On the Atlantic, you are not dealing just with the Americans. It is conceivable that if the whole Atlantic traffic were in the hands of 4 or 5 Americans, you might—God forgive me for saying this but I am trying to be honest—you might get a more efficient thing, because after all if you get little airlines flying because their government wants the prestige of a flag line, and you get a lot of them, little ones, you do not get quite the same degree of overall efficiency."

The pressure to reduce fares both on routes at home and overseas will become irresistible in view of fairly conclusive evidence that it is not the cost factor which keeps them where they are today.

Despite the growth of the past decade, something like a revolution in travel is in sight. A new type of steamship is being designed that will provide minimum service for a 5- or 6-day crossing to Europe at a one-way cost that may be as low as $125 to $140. The grand tour to Europe is no longer for the privileged few of wealth. It is in sight for millions of Americans.

Report Jap Textile Competition Felt in Kendall Firm Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the importation of Japanese textile goods is already having an adverse effect on our American industry. The following news story points out what is taking place at a plant in my district. This will happen everywhere unless cheap Japanese goods are restricted in their flow to American shores:

IN PELZER: REPORT JAP TEXTILE COMPETITION FELT IN KENDALL FIRM PAYROLL

PELZER, May 10.—Japanese competition in textiles is now being felt in the payrolls of the Kendall Co.'s Pelzer plants, according to a recent statement by J. B. Baker, manager. Drastic changes in the cloth styles have been in process since the fourth quarter of last year at the Pelzer upper plant.

CHANGES FORCED

This plant, one of the Nation's leading producers of broadcloths and poplins, has been forced to make extensive loom schedule changes and to reduce operating hours on all of the plant's 40-inch cam looms from 6 to 5 days, Mr. Baker said.

He estimated this has reduced the plant's payroll by more than $5,000 per week.

Mr. Baker said that market reports show the demand for American-made cotton broadcloth and poplin has been steadily dropping during the past 6 months while Japanese imports of grey cloth and finished garments continue in substantial volume.

AFFECTS TWO WAYS

This has affected the Pelzer payroll in two ways, Mr. Baker stated. First, it has been necessary to change most of the broadcloth looms to print cloth—a type of cloth requiring much less weave room labor; and, secondly, in order to hold down rising inventories, the operating schedule on the 40-inch cam looms at the upper plant has been reduced from 6 to 5 days.

Address by Col. José Luis Cruz Salazar, Ambassador of Guatemala, at Dallas Council of World Affairs, Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an address by Col. José Luis Cruz Salazar, Ambassador of Guatemala, at Dallas Council of World Affairs, Dallas, Tex., on May 15, 1956.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and Texans, it is always a privilegé and a pleasure for a Latin American to be invited to speak in Texas, to any group of Texans. That is true not only because of the immense economic, political, and social importance of your great State, and of the kind hospitality of your people, but it is especially so because the people of Texas, bordering as you do on Latin America, are more acutely aware of our problems than are the people of many other sections of the United States.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I feel a very special pleasure in being asked to address this particular group of Texans, the Dallas Council on World Affairs. Since I have been the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States the one thing that has impressed me so much is the keen interest of your citizens in world problems, and of the splendid educational job that is being done in so many of your communities through such forums as this.

In the course of my talk, I shall have much to say regarding my belief in the urgent need for a vast educational program throughout our hemisphere to combat the subversive propaganda of Communist imperialism. Permit me to say at the outset that one of the most effective roles in such a program can be played by groups such as this. I look forward to the day that we will be holding discussion forums like yours in every country in Latin America—not only in our large cities but even in our towns and villages. Of course, in our smaller communities it would not be possible to hold meetings on such an elaborate scale as your most impressive program here in Dallas. Nor would it be necessary. But they could be patterned along similar lines and designed to achieve identical objectives.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I propose today to discuss the new Communist economic offensive in the underdeveloped areas, which is causing so much consternation in the West. I propose to submit for your thoughtful and critical consideration, my personal views as to why the underdeveloped areas are so vulnerable to such an offensive, and also, some suggestions as to how it can be not only countered, but even turned to our advantage.

Since my personal experience is confined the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, I shall keep my discussion on a hemispheric basis. However, I am sure that the basic factors existing in Latin America are equally present in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

Insofar as Latin America is concerned, the new Red offensive is just getting under way. Nevertheless, we Guatemalans already see ample evidence that a tremendous new Communist drive is being prepared for Latin America, while the tactics may differ somewhat from those being used in other areas, I am sure that the overall strategy will be the same. Let me cite some recent developments, which we in Guatemala cannot help but regard as ominous.

1. Recent press dispatches reported that Vicente Lombardo Toledano, who organized and for more than 20 years directed, the Communist labor movement in Latin America, has been quietly purged by the Communist high command. Succeeding him is a three-man board, one of the members of which is none other than Juan José Arévalo, the former president of Guatemala, and the man who betrayed my country to the international Communist conspiracy.

2. Jacobo Arbenz, who succeeded Arévalo to the presidency, and who was deposed in the liberation movement led by Carlos Castillo Armas, has for several months been living behind the Iron Curtain, in Prague, Czechoslovakia. At least twice he is known to have visited Moscow.

3. Several of the leading Guatemalan Communists, who are now living in exile in neighboring republics, are known to have slipped across the border recently for brief, clandestine conferences with the Red underground, which we know still exists in our country.

4. Our friends throughout all of Latin America advise us that there is a noticeable increase in Communist activity in their countries, and that for the most part, this new activity seems to be mostly in the form of high-level conferences.

Please, my friends, do not underestimate the significance of these devolpments. Juan José Arévalo engineered the greatest success that the Communists have thus far achieved in this hemisphere, even though it proved to be only temporary, the principal tool that he used, in the betrayal of Guatemala, was a labor movement that was completely in control of the Communists.

Moreover, throughout its 20-odd years of existence, the Communist labor movement in Latin America, which is called the CTAL (Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina) has been the principal courier service of the Communist apparatus in Latin America. It has been used to transfer communist instructions to the various Latin American countries, and as the chief instrument to disseminate propaganda. Arévalo's elevation to the top command of this organization is not only a reward for his past services, it also presages a new program, so important that the Communist masters felt it essential to cast aside one of its most loyal adherents in the Americas, Lombardo, and replace him with newer, tougher leaders.

The prolonged residence of Arbenz in Czechoslovakia is equally significant. We have good reason to believe that Arbenz is being prepared for an important new role in the imperialistic designs of international communism in Latin America. Let us not forget that it was under Arbenz that the Communists felt sufficiently confident to throw off the disguise they had maintained throughout Arévalo's regime, and publicly reveal that they were completely in control of our government.

Also, the clandestine visits to Guatemala by Communist leaders who have been formally charged with murder, is a significant thing. These men risked their lives to hold those conferences with their underground colleagues in my country. Why? Certainly they must have had a most important reason.

And so, adding these developments together with the reports we get from other Latin American countries, we are most certain that a new aggressive campaign is being prepared, aimed at our subversion. And Guatemala, which was once their greatest success in the Western Hemisphere, and which 2 years ago became their greatest setback anywhere, should be obviously regarded as a key objective in this new campaign.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must inform you, with deep regret, that vast areas in Latin America today are vulnerable to the kind of an economic offensive that the Communists are beginning to launch. I will say to you that as long as any part of our hemisphere is vulnerable, our entire hemisphere is threatened. You Texans, who are so familiar with our interhemispheric trade—not only the things that the United States sells to Latin America, but even more important, the materials you receive from us—I am sure that you will agree with that statement.

Allow me to point out why I feel that we are so vulnerable.

1. There exists in every country in Latin America, among nearly all classes of our people, the passionate desire to develop our resources and improve the living standards of our people.

2. However, the great masses of our people, even among our educated classes, have only the slightest concept of the true meaning of democracy; of the vast benefits the individual receives in a dynamic democratic society. Most important, there is even less understanding of the grave responsibilities that all individuals living in a democracy must assume, if those benefits are to be attained.

3. Also among our masses, and even among our intellectuals, there is a tragic lack of understanding of the real nature of communism, particularly of the menace it represents to our freedom and security, and to the peace of this hemisphere.

The desire to develop economies and raise living standards is not, in itself, an evil or a dangerous thing. Quite the contrary. Under proper direction, it can be a most tremendous good, not only for our own Latin American people, but for the entire world.

The danger stems from the fact that this almost uncontrollable desire is coupled with such a serious lack of understanding of the two great ideologies that are contesting everywhere for the minds of men. It stems from the great opportunity that is presented to the cynical demagogues of communism who have displayed such great ingenuity in seizing upon the just aspirations of people and perverting them to their imperialistis aims.

My own country, Guatemala, offers a graphic example. In 1944, whne we overthrew the last of the old-school dictators who had ruled our country for nearly a century, we had little understanding of democracy, and even less of the nature of communism and the tactics of its exponents. Had we realized what was happening when Arevalo began betraying our Nation to communism, the conspiracy would certainly have been crushed in a matter of days.

But at that time Arevalo was successfully masquerading as a liberal. His Communist followers were assoicating themselves with every one of our legitimate national political, social, and economic aspirations. Indeed, the most ardent Communist and fellow travelers had somehow succeeded in join-

ing ranks with our most extreme nationalistic elements.

So, by the time enough of us awakened to the true nature of Arevalo's program, the Communists had secured such a firm grip on our country that it took us nearly a decade to throw it off.

It seems to me a bitter thing that the lesson we learned at such great cost, in Guatemala, has been forgotten so quickly, by so many, in the Western World. Less than 2 short years ago Guatemala was in the headlines of the newspapers throughout the hemisphere.

Today the case of Guatemala is still well remembered behind the Iron Curtain. Indeed the presence of Arbenz and other leading Guatemalan Communists in the Iron Curtain countries, indicates that the Guatemalan case is being subjected to the closest study by the Red Political strategists, and the lessons it contains are being used as a guide in shaping the new program for Latin America.

In the Western Hemisphere, except in a few instances, the Guatemalan case has faded to a vague memory, its lessons all but lost.

As a result Arevalo and Arbenz are regarded even today, by many befuddled Latin American intellectuals, as "genuine liberals." And throughout Latin America, proven Communists are still locking arms with extreme nationalists. Could you imagine such a mesalliance, if our Latin nationalists had the slightest concept of the true nature of communism? For surely the two are the most absolute of contradictions.

As the new economic offensive gathers momentum in Latin America, we can expect the voices of many misguided liberals and nationalists to be raised in a clamor for increased trade with the Iron Curtain countries, and the use of Communist technicians in the development of our economies. Moreover, unless we move promptly to counterattack, the things they say will make much sense, to the poorly informed masses.

So, we come to the all-important question. What must we do about it? How can we conter the Communist economic offensive in the Western Hemisphere?

Without professing to know all of the answer, I submit for your consideration, a program which I believe contains a good portion of the answer. It is a program of education, and demonstration. And in both phases I believe Guatemala can make valuable contributions.

We of Guatemala are convinced that there is a need for an intensive educational program, throughout the hemisphere, along the following lines:

1. To bring to all classes of people an understanding of the true significance of democracy as a political philosophy, with special emphasis on the obligations and the rights of each citizen.

2. To inform the governments and the people of the hemisphere of the day-to-day and week-to-week activities of the Communists and of the tactics they employ.

3. To convince all social classes of the true nature of communism, and in particular, of its imperialistic objectives.

It is in this program that I feel groups such as this can play such an important part. But we must go even further than you attempt here. We must find ways of reaching all of our people, lest democracy become only the political doctrine of a small, intellectual minority. We must find ways of convincing the semiliterate and even the illiterate as well as the educated people.

Such a program must employ every known media of mass information, and undoubtedly, even new media will have to be devised. It must be conducted in the classrooms, the churches and the homes; in the press, on the radio, and through television and motion pictures; from the political platform and from forums such as this.

While private groups and individuals must carry the great burden of such a program, I believe that governments, too, must do their share. And since the offensive against us is planned and executed on a hemispheric scale, I think that our defenses, also, must be on a hemispheric basis, perhaps centered in some special agency.

It has been frequently, and I believe wisely said, that the fight against communism cannot be won by bullets and bombs alone. I will go further. I say that it cannot be won by words alone.

Surely it is necessary for us to maintain our military strength. Surely we must undertake a vast educational program. But I believe at least one additional factor is essential. We must demonstrate to the people of the underdeveloped countries, that their economies can progress more rapidly, and their living standards rise more quickly, under democracy and free enterprise, than they could under Communist dictatorship.

We in Guatemala can help substantially in the educational phase of the program, by making available to political students throughout the hemisphere, our considerable knowledge of Communist tactics, which we acquired at so much cost.

But in this second, the demonstration phase of the program, we feel that we can make a contribution that no other country on earth can offer, at this time. We are confident that we will be able to demonstrate beyond any reasonable challenge, the fact that greater progress can be achieved under democracy than under communism. For we are the only democratic country in the world today, that has had the actual experience of communism.

The new, democratic government of Guatemala is commencing a long-range development program, in which we expect to invest more than $250 million during a 5-year period. While this may seem a modest amount by your Texas standards, it is a very substantial sum for a small Central American republic.

Moreover, the governemnt's investment is only a fraction of that which we are confident will be undertaken by private enterprise, which is counted on to play the key role in our economic development. The government's job is to build highways, schools, dams, and harbors and the like; to undertake public health programs, agrarian reforms, and other essential programs that are not attractive to private investment. But as new roads and disease control open up great new areas for development, we count on the private investor to dig the mines, till the lands, build the factories and mills, and supply essential services.

Already we have hundreds of miles of new highways under construction, and our program is commencing to produce results.

It is true that we suffered a brief setback when the coffee boom abruptly collapsed, throwing us into a short depression. As you know 79 percent of our export earnings result from the sale of coffee, and the price of coffee, which had reached a high of $95 a quintal in New York at the close of the Arbenz regime, dropped to as low as $50 a quintal shortly after the new government took office.

However, this brief setback will serve to make our eventual success even more dramatic, because it will have been achieved in the face of serious adversity.

Our program in which the economical cooperation of the United States has played an important part, is now making enough headway, that we are convinced that within another year we will be able to point to a substantial rise in living standards, particularly among our poor people.

And then we intend to suggest to our sister republics in Latin America, and to the underdeveloped nations everywhere, that they send to Guatemala their most qualified observers, to see and to evaluate the things we are doing under a democratic government.

We shall say to these observers: "Look well at these things we are doing, and at the gains we have already achieved for our people under a few short years of democracy. Compare them with the utter lack of progress under our 10 years of Communist domination. Then go back to your homelands, and tell your people to stop listening to empty promises, that you have seen with your own eyes the things that are actually being done."

Ladies and gentlemen, I cannot conceive of a more effective way than that, to counter the Communist economic offensive in the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in conclusion let me thank you for the attention you have given my remarks, and in all humility, let me express the hope that you may find some value, in the suggestions I have made in regards to the complex problems that are facing us all.

Chotiner-Nixon-White House: Too Many Loose Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TOO MANY LOOSE ENDS

Everybody back up a week—back up 8 days to be exact. Back up 8 days because that is the only way to get proper perspective on the political aspects of those White House telephone calls in behalf of Murray M. Chotiner.

Mr. Chotiner is the breezy California lawyer who is not only a friend of RICHARD M. NIXON, but also was campaign manager for the Vice President. He was to have testified before the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee a week ago Thursday, April 26, concerning the alleged graft in Army clothing contracts.

Somehow or other Mr. Chotiner did not keep to his schedule. When he finally appeared just a week later to the day, he denied that he intentionally broke an agreement to testify earlier. The chairman, Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, observed cryptically: "There may have been and there may not have been a misunderstanding."

Misunderstanding or not, the delay in Mr. Chotiner's testimony gave Vice President NIXON an opportunity and the Vice President has never been one to pass up opportunities. The Vice President hied himself that very day to the White House and proceeded to chart his own course to the President.

At the end of the charting session, Richard NIXON told reporters he had informed the President that in the event Mr. Eisenhower and the GOP convention "desired" him to serve again, he "would be honored to accept the nomination." Press Secretary Hagerty added that the President had asked him to say "that he was delighted."

A week later Mr. Chotiner finds it more convenient, if still not comfortable, to meet with the Senate subcommittee. He discloses that his clients include Herman Kravitz, convicted as an embezzler on a Govern-

ment contract in 1954, and Marco Reginelli, described by subcommittee counsel as "the top hoodlum of the New Jersey-Philadelphia area."

But Mr. Chotiner's really important disclosure is that Maxwell M. Rabb and Charles F. Willis, Jr., two White House staff advisers to President Eisenhower, made telephone calls concerning Chotiner clients. Did he attempt to use the name or influence of the Vice President? Oh, no. Or to use Mr. Chotiner's words: "Unequivocally no!" Just the same, word got around that somebody at the White House was making inquiries on behalf of clients of Murray M. Chotiner.

And so the sequence is this:

First. Mr. Chotiner is scheduled to appear before a Senate subcommittee where he will give testimony embarrassing to both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON.

Second. Mr. Chotiner does not appear on schedule, but waits a week.

Third. Vice President NIXON meantime obtains clearance for his announcement that he would like to run again in 1956.

Fourth. After all this gets into the record and Mr. NIXON's candidacy is widely accepted then Mr. Chotiner makes the kind of disclosure that would have been a shocking scandal back in the Truman administration when William M. Boyle, Jr., Howard McGrath, and Matthew J. Connelly were denounced by the press for their influence calls to Government agencies.

Yes, back up 8 days and then back up 5 years. It is October 5, 1951. A Senator is speaking—a member of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee. He is California's promising young RICHARD M. NIXON and he is on the trail of Democratic influence in the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Says the future Vice President:

"This inquiry has too many loose ends to call it closed, and I think we'll have to resume hearings."

And that, we suspect, is just what a lot of people are going to think about this whole Chotiner-Nixon-White House influence business, now beginning slowly to unfold.

Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Kenyon College and all of Ohio has sustained a great loss in the sudden and unexpected death of Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers. Champion of higher standards for American colleges and universities, his leadership will be missed from coast to coast. As a part of my remarks I include the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 9, 1956]

DR. CHALMERS, KENYON COLLEGE PRESIDENT, DIES

Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers, president of Kenyon College, died last night in Cape Cod Hospital, Hyannis, Mass., it was reported by officials at the Gambier, Ohio, college.

He died of a cerebral hemorrhage. Dr. Chalmers was stricken while visiting his retired secretary, Gladys Parker.

Dr. Chalmers became the 16th president of the college in 1937. He had been president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., from 1934 until moving to Kenyon.

Dr. Chalmers had long been known as an opponent of Government aid to liberal arts colleges. He claimed the shaping of young minds should remain free of Government regulation.

Plans had just been completed by Dr. Chalmers for the fifth in a series of conferences on "The Essentials of Freedom" to be held at Kenyon April 4–7, 1957.

This series, close to Dr. Chalmers' heart, is supported by a $25,000 grant from the Fund for the Republic. The series was begun by Dr. Chalmers in 1946 and brought him special pride.

Always forthright in his opinions, Dr. Chalmers was known as a particular champion of higher standards for American colleges and universities.

In a Cleveland speech, he asserted universities would make a serious mistake if they used the coming increase in student population merely to expand rather than to lift their standards.

Last year he told his college's Cleveland alumni that, as a result of higher standards, "thousands of young people of normal abilities would surprise themselves by using their own minds in a way and to an extent they do not now think of."

Dr. Chalmers was born in Waukesha, Wis., February 7, 1904, the son of William Everett Chalmers, a Baptist minister.

He took his bachelor's degree from Brown University in 1928 and then went to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar. Oxford gave him both a bachelor's and a master's degree. He also received a master's degree from Harvard University later, and then won his doctor of philosophy degree from Harvard.

He began his career as an instructor in English at Mount Holyoke College in 1929 and became assistant professor there in 1933, the year before he became president of Rockford College.

He was married on September 3, 1929, to Roberta Teale Swartz, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who survives him with their four children: Ann, a student at Radcliffe College; Jeoffrey, a student at Harvard, and twin sons, Stephen and John.

Among the organizations in which Dr. Chalmers was active were the Modern Language Association, the American Association of University Professors, American Association of Rhodes Scholars, and Phi Beta Kappa.

A Kenyon College spokesman said the funeral would be at Harvard on Thursday or Friday. Burial will be at Mount Auburn, Cambridge, Mass.

Actions Speak Louder Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the way to live in peace with one's neighbors is to act neighborly toward one another. Burma's relations with the State of Israel are a good example of how to do it. I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of May 12, 1956:

BURMA'S GOOD DEED

A generous and friendly Burma, without fanfare or noticeable self-esteem, has agreed to put a million acres of land into cultivation of wheat for Israel.

For this practical good deed, Burma is deserving of the free world's plaudits as well as the gratitude of the beneficiary country.

Burma prides herself on her neutrality and in taking this step probably risks the ire of some of her Moslem neighbors who are solidly against Israel. But evidently Burma's neutralism does not supersede humanitarianism, and in this respect the boastful neutralism of India will suffer by comparison. Premier Nehru apparently has no ear for friendly overtures from Israel.

Patman Bills Call for Wide Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members will be greatly interested in Ed Wimmer's newspaper column of May 14 dealing with two extremely important bills of our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Mr. Wimmer has quite correctly stated that for 30 years "Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has been in the forefront of every major legislative battle to insure freedom of opportunity in the American marketplace."

While I entirely agree with that statement, it would only be fair to add, however, that it understates the stature and the record of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in that he has also been a leader and in the forefront of major legislative battles for the public interest and for the common people, on all kinds of issues.

Mr. Wimmer's column is as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 14, 1956]

PATMAN BILLS CALL FOR WIDE PUBLIC SUPPORT; SEEK CHANGES IN INCOME TAX RATES

(By Ed Wimmer)

For 30 years or more, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has been in the forefront of every major legislative battle to insure freedom of opportunity in the American marketplace. He was our speaker in Cincinnati 20 years ago, when the fight to win passage of the Robinson-Patman Act was launched, and despite periodic tides of bitter criticism, his convictions have never wavered.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, his present sponsorship of two extremely important bills, is receiving widespread attention and support. One is his bill, H. R. 9067, which he terms "A Prescription for Mergeritis"—a bill designed to graduate corporate income taxes with a view to encourage small and medium size business to stay in business, and discourage the uneconomic growth of giant business.

Mr. Patman points out that combined personal and corporate income taxes now amount to about one-fourth of the national income, resulting in fundamental changes in our economy—none of which are good. He fully supports the position taken in this column, that our tax structure is—channeling all available income for investment into a few super-giant corporations—thus squeezing out smaller competitors and taking possession of the Nation's wealth.

Under present tax rates, a taxable (company) income of $25,000 is hit for a combined normal and surtax amounting to $7,500.

Under Patman's proposal (9067) the tax would drop to $5,500, or a minus change of 26 percent. Taxable business earnings of $100,000 would down-drop from $56,500 to $22,000. Proposed reductions ending at the $10 million earnings level.

Increased rates on earnings under H. R. 9067 would amount to only 1 percent on $50 million, but would jump to a 28 percent increased tax on earnings of $1 billion and up. There is no doubt but what such changes would strengthen the smaller companies and leave them with more money to plough back into their operations, and the merger-fever could go down a little. The latter is certainly a deadly disease that does to the economic body what cancer does to the human body.

All the experts are now agreed, that reducing the pressure of rising costs on one hand and diminishing returns on the other, is a must if the older small- and medium-sized businesses are to survive, and if venture capital is to take up the slack on the beginner front.

Sylvia Porter, columnist, brought the danger home in figures showing that "82 percent of the companies in the $5,000 to $25,000 class," in a survey of 33 industries, "had lost their bank credit." The same survey revealed that half the companies in the $25,000 to $100,000 class are also out of the bank credit picture.

This is at a time when employment is breaking all records, and in a nation dependent upon credit for its prosperity.

On another Patman battlefront, the fight to win passage of H. R. 11, a bill to close the loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act, is nearing a showdown. The loophole was opened last year when Standard Oil won a court decision that made price discrimination lawful if a supplier believed he was meeting competition, even when his price favoritism tended to create monopoly.

Stated differently, so long as H. R. 11 hangs in the balance (S. 11 in the Senate), a manufacturer can charge a chain or other big buyer lower prices than he charges his other customers and the Government must prove that he did not think he was doing something wrong because he thought he was meeting competition lawfully.

H. R. 11 would remove this silly defense that allows the giants to receive enormous price advantages and other concessions, thus freezing out of the market place the established small business, and the hopeful beginner. In the early thirties, PATMAN headed an investigation that turned up secret discounts of $42 million going to one chain. Two highly reputable corporations were kicking back $30,000 a month each to one buyer, and the biggest manufacturers testified they were powerless to resist the pressure put upon them.

H. R. 11 has been tied up in the Judiciary Committee, but a petition, signed by some 200 of a needed 218 signatures of House Members, is expected to bring the bill to a vote before Congress adjourns. Certainly, every last American has a vital stake in both H. R. 11 and H. R. 9067, for both are measures to further insure freedom of opportunity to all.

When Is a Shortage Not a Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address I made before the National Federation of Independent Scrap Yard Dealers, Inc., at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, on May 12, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, although I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak to you tonight, I am not quite so certain that all of you will be very happy with some of the things I have to say, but if all of you like some of the things I say and some of you like all of them, I will be content. If nothing else, I will get you to thinking about the important controversial matters that should concern citizens and taxpayers all of the time, but to which too frequently they pay too little attention except in election year.

It has been my happy privilege to serve for many years on two very important committees of the House of Representatives. One of them is the House Small Business Committee which, as you probably know, is a special committee authorized merely to investigate, study, and report to the Congress on problems affecting small business. The other committee is the Banking and Currency Committee which, despite its name, deals with many important matters other than banking and currency. Some of your members know from experience that we have jurisdiction over all control legislation, and more particularly the Export Control Act, which can and does touch your business rather closely. That is a standing committee which has jurisdiction not only to investigate and study, but also to report bills to the House for enactment into law.

The House Small Business Committee is one of the few committees of Congress which has been truly nonpartisan. I cannot recall a single recommendation from that committee which did not have bipartisan support. The welfare and progress of small business is of the foremost concern to the Nation's economy. Small business has a recognized place in the ecenomic fabric of the United States and is the backbone of the American free enterprise system. However, small business cannot continue to exist nor can it compete with big business in this great age of economic advancement unless small business is given a fair chance and at least an equal opportunity to compete with big business.

The criticisms which have come from the House Select Committee on Small Business were always made constructively, never destructively, and always made without regard to the political affiliations of the appointee against whom directed. Therefore you should bear in mind that if I say something critical it is deliberately intended to be critical but is just as deliberately intended not to be political.

I sincerely believe that my Republican colleagues on the Small Business Committee will endorse what I say. My Republican colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee may differ with my conclusions or opinions, but none of them can challenge any of the facts that I will present to you.

As the year rolls on you will hear more and more that small business is the backbone of the free enterprise system in our economy and that big business, aided by big business in Government, is more and more throttling small business.

While none of you are "small" in the colloquial sense, all of you are small business in accordance with our legal definition. Each of you represents a business which is independently-owned and not dominant in your industry. The Defense Department had an arbitrary legal definition that any firm with 500 employees or more was not small business, and any firm with less than 500 employees was small. The reason for the change of the definition is important. The Congress found that small business must be protected against the depredations of big business and of big Government, and accordingly enacted into law many aids, safeguards, and even preferences to and for small business. These laws were enacted because the facts as developed in many of our hearings sustained by volumes of testimony and documentary evidence demanded them.

Almost a year ago we enacted a law repealing this arbitrary Defense Department definition and making it mandatory that the definition as cited in the Small Business Act, which I have enunciated before, be uniformly applied in all Government agencies.

Now I do not care whether that policy has not been implemented and enforced by the Defense Department because the Secretary of the Department of Defense, Charlie Wilson, is big business or favors big business or because his subordinates unbeknown to him have failed to do so for fear of antagonizing the boss. You and I are not concerned with the motives, good or bad. We are concerned however that the Congressional committees that urged that policy upon him before enacting the law were told that the policy was a good one and should be the rule. We are more concerned with the simple incontrovertible fact that a concededly good doctrine was not voluntarily effectuated and the Congress was compelled to and did mandate it. The same agency (the Department of Defense) continues to ignore and flout the law. That is typical of how small business is being mistreated by the executive branch of the Government.

We get fine speeches from the top echelon about broadening the base, integrating small business into Government procurement, both military and civilian, and about requiring the big prime contractors to subcontract a fair portion of their contracts to small business.

I was amazed, literally astounded, to find that these high-sounding, well-worded directives of the top echelon of the Department of Defense took 6 to 9 months to reach the personnel in the field and then too frequently they were promptly ignored by the people charged with enforcing them.

I am amused and at the same time terrified by the Government economists who prate about our prosperity and stability. Our national gross income is stable, they tell us. Of course it is when you add big-business incomes to farmers' income to small-business income. The total of this gross is about the same for 1955 as for 1954. But they do not tell us that the gross income of big business is up over $1,200,000,000 and the gross income of the rest of our economy is down by a billion dollars. They tell us that bankruptcies for the whole country are no more than in the previous year. Of course. But big-business failures have practically disappeared and those of the rest of our economy have nearly doubled.

They tell us that the number of business firms has remained stable in the last few years. That is, there has been no change. They do not tell you that in the prior 3 years our economy grew to the extent of 50,000 new firms a year.

The distressed condition of the small-business community is ample proof of the ineffectiveness of the present administration in dealing with small-business problems.

In the first 6 months of 1952 firms with $250,000 in assets netted profits, after taxes, of close to $175 million. Last year for the same period they netted only $60,000,000. From 1952 to 1955 these small-business firms had 40 percent less funds available for reinvestment and expansion. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five saw an increase of $4 billion in profits after taxes for big business.

A recent survey has shown that 10,000 small companies will need $100 million this year to fulfill their contracts.

Big business can borrow long-term money at low rates from the insurance companies; they can sell bonds to the banks and invest-

ment houses or sell stock to underwriters and the public. Small business does not have these opportunities.

If your bankers have not told you yet, they will. They will say: "The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are afraid of inflation. They are tightening up on credit. They are raising reserve requirements so we will have less to lend. They are making us buy more Government bonds for the same reasons. They are raising the discount rates so we must charge you more interest so you cannot afford to borrow."

When new buildings are being constructed there is an increased demand for steel. When there is an increased demand for steel there is an increased demand for your product. Stop the new building and you reverse the trend. That is precisely what this administration has done. Without mortgage money there can be no building. Therefore less steel and less scrap is needed. Last year it was anticipated that there would be new building starts in 1956 of anywhere from 1,200,000 to 1,300,000. At the beginning of this year the estimate was revised downwards to 1 million starts. The April statistics indicate there will be a drop of 50 percent in many high-production areas. The reason—no mortgage money. The reason for no mortgage money can be laid directly at the door of this administration.

Congress set up a Small Business Administration, which should be able to help you, but don't be too optimistic about that. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, both big-business men, control the Loan Policy Board of that Administration. Believe me, the Congress wants the Small Business Administration to succeed in serving you.

If it does not serve you, it is not for want of a good law. The authority is there, and the money is there. We cannot compel the administration to do a good job. Under our system of government the Congress enacts the laws, the President and his appointees execute and administer them.

It is safe to say that in the field of industry there are certain jobs which are so tough that only the small-business man can be persuaded to take them over. Your business is a typical illustration. The scrap dealers of America perform a vital, but I am afraid at times, a thankless job for the American economy. Scrap, whether it is steel, copper, aluminum, or the other metals, must be gathered and put back into our productive economy, if our economy is to survive.

This is especially true today when we are undergoing a period of great demand and great expansion for primary metals, which, in turn, has resulted in an acute shortage of these metals. We became aware of the importance of scrap during the war; we are now learning that it is just as important to our civilian economy, as it was to our wartime economy.

I regret to say that there appear to be many in responsible positions in the present administration who regard the small-business men who are engaged in the scrap industry as country cousins of the large integrated producers. They are to be tolerated but not actively supported or helped.

In the main, stockpile policy, export policy, and Government aids to production appear all to be weighted in the favor of large integrated producers; but if the American economy and our ability to successfully defend ourselves in times of war requires policies designed to encourage and protect large integrated producers, it also requires the same policies to encourage and protect the other equally important segments of the industry—small-business men who reclaim scrap and the small-business men who are dependent upon such scrap for their sources of supply.

Unfortunately, the Government not only fails to take positive steps to aid such small-business people but also does not even try to understand their problems. It has not gathered adequate facts or information upon which to make any determination about action to aid them. An example well known by all of you is the fact that there has not yet been completed by any Government agency an adequate survey of steel scrap available in the United States and the statistical position of steep-scrap dealers in our economy.

The House Small Business Committee has received numerous complaints from both the small-business men in the steel industry who are the nonintegrated producer and the small-business men who are the scrap dealers. The interest of these two groups would appear to be in conflict; but no real answer can be given because Government agencies have not bothered to gather the facts.

It is impossible to get any factual basis for departmental decisions. I am safe in charging that at least as to scrap metals, they appear to be operating in a vacuum.

Of course there is another problem of scrap dealers which I am afraid does not get too much sympathetic understanding—especially from the producers. That is the fact that you are an intensely competitive industry, and very sensitive to the laws of supply and demand. Nobody, of course, complains when the laws of supply and demand force your prices down to low and almost ruinous levels. However, if the same laws force the price of scrap up, the hue and cry is raised that prices are too high. If you must bear the risk of a low price, you are certainly entitled to the benefits of a high price where it is the result of competitive adjustment to the laws of supply and demand.

There is here involved, however, another extremely important point which your members of this industry know full well, but which the executive departments of our Government completely ignore. They certainly give no evidence of paying any attention to it. I now am talking about our national security.

If you think I am playing politics with anything so vital, let me assure you that I place our Nation's interest first. That party politics is always placed in a secondary position by me under such circumstances is best evidenced by the record I made as an active member of my committees, when I tore into Democrats and Democratic appointees under similar circumstances.

I will content myself now with placing before you the simple facts as they are documented before the Congress and you draw the conclusions.

Four times in a comparatively short time scrap was in such short supply as to require embargoes against its export.

Now, don't misunderstand. I am not now urging an embargo. The responsibility of that decision is not mine. But if it were, I could not make it, because of lack of information.

What is worse is that the executive departments charged with getting the information and making the decision do not have the facts and have not sought to obtain them.

Please send for the hearings before the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees of this year and read them.

We have on the statute books of our country two laws which are about to expire and which are about to be extended by the Congress. Both deal with scrap metals. Neither law should be extended unless there is a shortage or a potential shortage. The fact gathering for the basis of congressional action as well as Presidential executive departmental action is vested in the Department of Commerce, headed by big businessman Secretary Weeks.

Now let's observe how he performs his function.

When our Small Business Committee was flooded with complaints about scrap metals we went to the Government sources for our answers. We got a lot of gobbledegook by way of reply.

Secretary Weeks last December said, and I quote: "The steel scrap export situation has been under close surveillance and virtually continuous review for more than a year and a half."

Excellent. Certainly here come the facts. Listen to the next sentence from the same letter. Again I quote:

"Within the last 2 weeks, I have instructed the Business and Defense Service Administration in conjunction with the representatives of large and small members of the iron and steel industry to make an immediate and exhaustive review of all the current aspects of the domestic scrap situation, including supply, consumption, and future requirements."

Fine. After all, let us be fair. I concede that a year and a half of close surveillance is not immediate. But tell me, What was it if it wasn't an exhaustive review?

Surely, it was not boondoggling.

But didn't the Secretary also say it has been under virtually continuous review? Then why another review?

You would go broke, if you operated that way. But you are only small business and this is the way big business operates your Government.

I am going to be charitable. Christmas was only 2 weeks away when he ordered the survey. Christmas came and went and so did Easter, and still no answer.

In the meantime, the first of the laws I mentioned before is called up before the House Banking and Currency Committee for extension. Secretary Weeks sends up his Assistant Secretary to tell us the law should be extended for 3 years, that is the law under which you get your scrap export licenses and under which the Secretary can say how much, if any, scrap may be exported.

He tells us it is a good law, a workable law, it gives him all the authority he needs, just extend it for 3 years. You need not be a legislator to know that a man really must be a prophet to look ahead that far and say he needs an emergency measure for that many years.

Not pretending to have any prophetic powers, I say to the Department representative: Please give us the facts for this record. If they are classified or secret, say so, and we will take them in executive session. Oh, no, they say, they are not in that category, you can have them.

Fine. Come on. Give out. We are all ears.

Oh, wait a minute. Mr. Congressman, we don't have the facts.

I quote from Secretary McClellan speaking for his boss, Secretary Weeks:

"Secretary MCCLELLAN. * * * What that major inventory is nobody knows. It has never been taken in this country, and to my knowledge in any other. I think it would be helpful if we could get it, but that is the inventory which we do not have.

"Mr. MULTER. Isn't your Department in a position to get that information?

"Secretary MCCLELLAN. No, sir; not yet.

"Mr. MULTER. Why not?

"Secretary MCCLELLAN. We don't have the information. (Appropriation.)

"Mr. MULTER. Has your Department asked for the appropriation to get it?

"Secretary MCCLELLAN. I don't believe so specifically.

"Mr. MULTER. Then I don't think it is fair for you to tell us you can't get it, because you don't have the money and your Department has not asked for the money for that. This is an item of information you should

get and you can't get it unless you get money. I think you should go before the Appropriations Committee to get the money.

"Secretary McCLELLAN. That may be forthcoming.

"Mr. MULTER. Have you any idea when?

"Secretary McCLELLAN. No, sir. I am not even certain that it will, but I think that it is one of the elements in this particular thing which has to be taken into account. It is the one unknown factor, which up to this time has only been estimated and never really evaluated specifically.

"Mr. MULTER. Can you tell us for how long your Department has felt that that was information you should have?

"Secretary McCLELLAN. I know ever since we have been concerned with the steel-scrap situation, we have tried to evaluate what that market is, but without inventory.

"Mr. MULTER. How long is that period of time?

"Secretary McCLELLAN. To the best of my knowledge, it has gone back for at least a year or year and a half that we have been worrying about that. We have sought the cooperation of the people in the industry, to help us evaluate that inventory."

But let us not overlook that he nevertheless insisted throughout his testimony that there was no shortage of steel scrap. I begged, I pleaded, I hammered. He stuck to his guns.

That was his testimony on February 23, 1956. He had the last word as follows, and I quote again: "That is an unknown factor, but one we are convinced in the light of the record is adequate at this time." Remember he was talking about steel scrap.

That is certainly a positive enough statement even though the factual vacuum is still present.

In April 1956, we move over to the House Ways and Means Committee. It is considering the second of the two bills I mentioned.

This bill (H. R. 8636) is to extend for 1 year—note how much more realistic the Executive has become—not 3 years, but 1 year, the lifting or exempting of payment of custom duties and import taxes on scrap metals being brought into this country. The only reason for that being done is because there is a shortage.

Accordingly, Secretary Weeks writes to the Ways and Means Committee. On April 17, 1956, he answers the committee's inquiry of January 26, 1956, and says, quote:

"The Department of Commerce favors enactment of H. R. 8636 because the types of metal scrap (e. g., iron, steel, aluminum, magnesium, molybdenum, and nickel) covered by the bill are in short supply. The continued suspension of the duties and taxes should encourage imports and increase the amounts of these raw materials to domestic industries. * * *"

He also tells us that the Bureau of the Budget (that means the President) approves his report just quoted from.

You may indulge the assumption that it took 3 months to answer an inquiry about what has been continuously examined, reviewed, and surveyed while the Department made an inspection. I use that word for lack of a better one to give the Department credit for doing something additional about the matter.

They are on the ball now. So I walk across the Capitol to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which, on April 19, 1956, is hearing witnesses on H. R. 9052. Remember that is the one in which the House Banking and Currency Committee was told by Secretary Weeks' Commerce Department there is no shortage of steel scrap.

Finally and at last. Now we will get the facts. Listen. Secretary Weeks' Commerce Department speaking, quote:

"As regards the depletion of our national inventory, we find ourselves in a position of not having sufficient information either in Government or in industry to arrive at a sound judgment."

Twice during our lifetime, scrap has gone abroad only to be converted into bullets, bombs, and armaments with which to kill and maim our boys.

I know of no group of men and women that is more patriotic than you, or who would not sacrifice their business when the safety and security of our country require it. You have done that before and you are ready to do it again, if necessary. But for God's sake, for the sake of our great country, let us at least get at the facts.

I am sure you are as terrified and as horrified as I am at this disclosure.

Congress can only make the laws. It cannot enforce or administer them. At the risk of being accused of partisanship, I say the only remedy available to us is to elect to the presidency of our great country a man who will make appointments to high Government positions of only such men who understand the needs of our country and of all of its people, big and small alike, and who will devote themselvse to executing our laws in the spirit in which they were intended to operate, doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

I apologize for having introduced such a somber note into what was intended to be a festive evening. Thank you for listening to me.

Address on Interposition by R. L. Woodward, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, these are trying times. The people of the Commonwealth of Virginia are facing a crisis brought about by the decision enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States of America on May 17, 1954. Contrary to all precedent, they enunciated the principle that has caused and will cause a deterioration in race relations throughout the width and breadth of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We are fortunate indeed in having leaders who are willing to express themselves and to stand up for the principles enunciated by our Founding Fathers. One of these leaders is the Honorable R. L. Woodward, Jr., of Suffolk, Va. Mr. Woodward is an outstanding Virginian, a man who is intensively interested in the welfare of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia. He has rendered valuable services to his State as well as his community.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an address made by Mr. Woodward which forcefully presents the problem and enunciates principles that were the bedrock of this country when it was founded and when our Constitution was adopted. I commend the address to every Member of this body as well as the citizens of America in the hope that people in other sections of this country will realize the problem that we in the South face today, and in the further hope that they will understand what is happening to them as a result of a grasping Federal judiciary that is steadily and stealthily, like a thief in the night, taking from the people of this great country their rights and privileges as well as depriving the States of their sovereignty. We cannot sit idly by and let this happen to us if we expect to retain our freedoms that were wrought out for us by the Founding Fathers of this great country.

The address follows:

ADDRESS ON INTERPOSITION BY R. L. WOODWARD, JR.

I have no special competence on the subject assigned me which is said to be a legal matter and, by some people, to be indefinable. However, I have always believed that law is not law simply because it is written. Law rests upon two simple factors: The first being commonsense and the other the will of the people. Otherwise, there can be no law that can be effective.

The problem that confronts us is probably the most serious problem that has confronted us in our life and, potentially, can be the most serious problem to confront us during the rest of our existence. The problem transcends the matter of "segregation or integration" which impelled the problem. The problem is national, and its solution is as vital to any or all of the States as it is to us because it involves the structure of the kind of government under which we shall live.

Now, who precipitated the matter that brought on the problem? It has been a peaceful matter for some eighty-odd years, and evolving events would have kept it peaceful had it not been for politicians whose greed for votes allowed them to debase their character by advocating a cause in which they had no heart or belief, and from which, in social practice, they had, and still do, hold themselves aloof. For misdirected preachers pleading the fallacious ministerial doctrine of the equality and brotherhood of man, for professional educators seeking Federal aid to education through their parent organization—the National Education Association, for crackpot liberals and do-gooders and Communists contributing to and prodding the NAACP—all aided by a type of journalism distorting events out of proportion to their importance, misleading the people and violating the ethics of the profession, until the President of the United States called for the end of segregation, forthwith, in the District of Columbia, bringing in the blacks and running out the whites; and a Kremlinlike Supreme Court, with their ears and minds attuned to the election returns, emasculated the historic interpretation of the 14th amendment by former, more learned courts, and made an erroneous political decision that sanctioned a more erroneous social decree gathered from the books of psychologists and psychiatrists, everyone of whom were under suspicion by the Department of Justice and the Attorney General's Office as being fellow travelers in Russian philosophy. Both decision and decree were subversive of the right, interests, and liberties of the people, and invasive of the rights reserved to the States in the Constitution.

And there, gentlemen, is where, through the medium of our accredited representatives legally assembled in the historic legislative halls of the mother of States—the State that initiated the Constitutional Convention, whose sons wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the statute of religious liberty, and were most influential in writing the Constitution itself—we, in all of the dignity traditional with this great Commonwealth, stop to inquire. Interpose, to determine the background of man's approach to government, historically, in the western tradition, its in-

fluence, and more specifically, the intent in the establishment of our own Government—all to the end that the invocation of interposition will provide time sufficient to prove, beyond doubt, that the Supreme Court did illegally invade the rights reserved to the States and that such invasion is against the will of the people who, in the pride and jealousy of their sovereignty in the several States of the Union, will demand, through appropriate means, that the Congress plainly set out limitations upon the Court and preserve our form and concept of government from further illegal and unwarranted attempts of the Court to amend the Constitution. Otherwise, we may have created a Frankenstein, destroying the very freedom we, in the perfection of our governmental processes, thought we had achieved.

Now, what is the historical approach to government in the western tradition? The searching approach upon which our Government is founded? It is the search for individual freedom and personal security. It has been a difficult task, and the history of the Western World shows that most of its upheavals have been in the search of the maximum amount of freedom along with the minimum amount of security consistent with order.

Man realized that complete freedom would result in anarchy and complete security would restrain and direct his every act and movement. He, therefore, had to erect a government or State that would achieve his goal. In its simplest form, the State is an institution for individual, collective, and national security. It also provides protection from external aggression and internal disorder. So man deliberately yielded a part of his freedom in the interest of his personal security and the protection of his property by fashioning a State or government to achieve that purpose. In so doing, he placed ultimate sovereignty in himself, and placed limits and restraints within which the State must work. It was a confederation with his neighbors, so to speak, a compact for mutual interests.

But let no one ever persuade you that man did, or intended to, yield his sovereignty to the State or, after fashioning a State peculiar to his environment, intend to yield any State's sovereignty or any State's rights except those he specifically allocated to the Union.

Throughout the history of our country, from the *Mayflower* compact of 1620 and the great State papers I have referred to, man has always been sovereign and the State has been servant, and every key document which went into the building of this Nation acknowledged that philosophy and pledged fidelity to it.

Are we of this generation less resolute, less determined and courageous, than our forefathers? Are we to abandon this priceless heritage that has carried us to our present position of achievement? Are we so unmindful and careless of our future that we will stand aside while our conscientious convictions tell us that a dictatorial Supreme Court has subverted our rights and liberties and invaded the prerogatives left to the States? Are we to be misled by a press that tells us that the means to thwart this invasion—the same political philosophy used by the founders of the Constitution—is fantasy? That this philosophy cannot obtain when the history of this Nation shows that it can? In short, is there no recourse to the people beyond a Supreme Tribunal that is judge, jury, and counsel in respect to its own acts?

I do not believe we will be pushed aside, and I shall attempt to provide you with the background of interposition with the hope that you and all others to whom I shall address these remarks, shall be loyal to a historic philosophy almost as old as our Government itself. It will not fail if you are loyal and resolute. If it does fail, we may as well abandon our State borders and our State constitutions, and become so many wards of a dictatorial, autocratic, and centralized authority.

Now what is interposition, that the Virginia-Pilot and Mr. Robert Whitehead, the delegate from Nelson County, call nullification and fantasy? It is just what the word implies. It is a position in between the decision of the Supreme Court and our idea of the sovereignty of the States and rights reserved to them and to the people, under article 10 of the Bill of Rights, being the 10th amendment of the Constitution. It is a waiting period, through orderly processes, to establish the legality or illegality of the Court's decision. Don't forget that the rights are not only reserved to the States, but to the people, also.

What is nullification? It is the refusal of a State to enforce a Federal law within its borders. If the decision of the court is illegal, it is void and, therefore, cannot be nullified.

What is fantasy? It is a hallucination with no foundation. But interposition cannot be fantasy because it has definite effective precedents that establish its foundation.

What are these precedents? Let me seek to establish them.

In 1765 the British Government wrote rules for the governance of the Colonies, such as the Stamp Act, the Sugar Act, etc. The rules were considered onerous and burdensome by the Colonies, and there was a great deal of agitation, tension, and rebellion on account of these rules, and many speeches about taxation without representation. At this time, Patrick Henry made his famous speech, "Give me liberty or give me death." With conditions steadily deteriorating, the Colonies, on July 4, 1776, said, "We are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, specifying all rights that would naturally accrue to a sovereign nation as reserved to each State, such as the right to levy war, etc. The Revolutionary War ensued. In 1782 the British Government, having been defeated, acknowledged the independence of the Colonies, not collectively, but individually, as independent States, and named and denominated each one separately, relinquishing all rights, claims, interests, and proprieties therein.

In 1787 the State of Virginia initiated a Constitutional Convention with the hope of overcoming some of the imperfections of the Articles of Confederation existing between the various States. The first one, held at Annapolis, Md., had an insufficient number of delegates present to accomplish the objective. So Virginia called another convention which met in Philadelphia with George Washington presiding. Seventy-four delegates were appointed to this Convention. Sixteen did not attend; 9 refused to go, 1 of whom was James Madison who later expressed his regret for not attending; Patrick Henry refused, because he thought it to be a trap. The Convention met secretly on May 14, 1787, and the draft of the Constitution was not completed and sent to the various States for ratification until September 1787. It was extremely difficult of ratification, just barely passing some States, and it was not ratified by North Carolina until May 1789, and by Rhode Island until November 1790. During all of this time, both States operated as separate and sovereign nations, not affiliated with the Union. The people were skeptical about it and dissatisfied, but the Bill of Rights was finally written to clarify the instrument, and was adopted as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in December 1791.

In 1792 South Carolina entered a claim against the State of Georgia. Georgia refused the claim and interposed against the decision of the Supreme Court, and in 1795 the 11th amendment was added to the Constitution spelling out the fact that no State could have an action against another.

In 1798 Congress enacted three laws known as the Alien and Sedition Acts. The first gave authority to deport all aliens dangerous to the peace, etc. of the Nation. The second authorized the confinement of all aliens 14 years old and over. The third made it a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment for anyone, by the spoken or written word, to reflect discredit upon the Congress or the President of the United States. This third act stirred Mr. Jefferson, Vice President of the United States. The Assembly of Kentucky was in session, and they sent representatives to Mr. Jefferson who wrote, anonymously, the first Kentucky resolution of "interposition" on November 16, 1798. On December 21, 1798, James Madison wrote the Virginia Resolution of Interposition. On November 4, 1799, the second Kentucky resolution was written which was a reply to the Federalists who were seeking to centralize authority. In 1801, the acts expired and nothing was done to enforce them. The Kentucky Resolution of Interposition was directly responsible for Mr. Jefferson's election to the Presidency.

In 1812 the Conscription Act was passed. Some of the New England States resisted, and Maine interposed, did not conscript men, and nothing transpired.

In 1832 South Carolina passed an "Ordinance of Nullification" resisting duties on articles such as wool, etc., which they felt reacted unfavorably in world trade against their product, which was cotton. In 1833, through the intercessions of Henry Clay, Congress repealed the act.

This ordinance was plainly unconstitutional because it was about import duties, the levying of which was specified as a right of the Union in the Constitution.

Some of you gentlemen may have seen and read an article I wrote in the Suffolk-News Herald on February 17, 1956, setting up the foundation of interposition as not being fantasy. It was reprinted in the Virginia Beach Sun-News and in the Richmond News Leader, whose editor revived interposition. Shortly after that article appeared, which was in the editorial rooms of the Virginian-Pilot on the regular exchange basis existing between newspapers, such as those mentioned, there appeared 2 editorials in the Virginian-Pilot, captioned "The Foundation of Interposition," Nos. 1 and 2. Both editorials said, in effect, that interposition was fantasy, without foundation. They did not refer to my article which, I believe, prompted the editorial. Instead, they took from the Washington Post an extract from the biography of James Madison, by Robert Brant, and set it up in a box next to one of the editorials in what appeared to be an effort to use what Mr. Madison said to indicate their view. But Mr. Madison was speaking about a matter which is in no sense analogous with the problem now confronting us. To this extent, the Virginian-Pilot was trying to reinforce its statement that interposition is fantasy, which it cannot sustain by reason, but continues to champion to mislead the people. Before the referendum on February 9, 1956, to amend article 141 of the Virginia constitution, they used 3 people on their TV station to speak against the referendum, and only 1 for it. It has offered no solution nor alternatives for the States' efforts to formulate a plan and has offered no stand for itself on the matter of segregation. So don't be misled by this paper's editorials.

In 1859 a slave by the name of Glover escaped into the State of Wisconsin. Under the law, he should have been returned to his owner, but he was freed by radical abolitionists, and although the Court ruled that

he should be returned, Wisconsin interposed and nothing was done about it.

Now, who is more competent to speak on the rights of the States than Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson. Said Mr. Madison in his plea for the ratification of the Constitution: "The powers delegated to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain to the States are numerous and indefined. Federal powers will be principally on external objects, such as war, peace, negotiation and foreign commerce. The powers reserved to the States will extend to all objects which, in the ordinary cause of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the States. The operations of the Federal Government will be extensive in time of war, those of the States in times of peace and prosperity."

Said Mr. Jefferson in his inaugural address: "I believe in honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none, the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwark against antirepublican tendencies." Those remarks are plain about States' rights.

I have thus tried to provide you with some information regarding the background of "Interposition." Perhaps I have kept you too long. I thank you for your kind and courteous attention to my remarks, which I hope have been of some help.

In closing, let me ask each one in this room to join with me in the hope and prayer that the flag of Virginia shall be secured to the top of the mast of resolution, always to wave resplendent and unruffled in the breeze of courage, and that its motto, known throughout the free world, shall be notice to all men, whether they be 9 or 900 million men, that Virginians will never yield to tyranny and unwittingly create an obligarchy for our eventual enslavement. It has been a pleasure to be with you.

Winning Essays by Students of Pius X High School, Paramount, Calif., 23d Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the three winning essays of the students of Pius X High School in the great 23d District in a nationally sponsored essay contest on America, Beacon of Hope, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary. The three were chosen to receive awards presented by Private Earl W. Odell Auxiliary to South Gate, Calif., VFW, Post 1732.

The judges of this intersting contest were: Vesta Bruner, South Gate city librarian; Raymond F. Reardon, principal of South Gate Junior High School; and Peter Stevens, attorney and president of South Gate Lions Club.

The first-place essay will be entered into district competition for possible further honors. It was written by Bonnie Williams, 8215 Alhambra Avenue, Paramount, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and all my colleagues join with me in congratulating these young American citizens in these spendidly considered essays.

Following is the first-place essay by Miss Williams:

AMERICA, THE BEACON OF HOPE

Liberty, yes, there stands the Lady of Liberty with a torch of fire burning in her hand. A smile of welcome she beams forth as English, Spanish, Dutch, and Russian come to her shores. Here they seek the future and that is bright with the hope of freedom, happiness, and equality. Yes, hope, the true beacon and symbol of America.

The Statute of Liberty wasn't standing in New York Harbor when the first pilgrims made that long and treacherous journey across the Atlantic, but her torch was burning deeply in the hearts of each one of them. It was a quiet, steady light that sang with a song of hope. Each of our forefathers, great men like Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin, knew that song, for wasn't their cry of independence a song of hope for a great and free nation?

Then there was an interval when the Nation just grew. She welcomed every nationality from many shores. It was a peaceful time with no great disputes or arguments to upset the country. But then came a time for decision. Was the light of hope, the beacon of freedom to be snuffed out? Yes, this was a great conflict, a decision not to tarry with. Many men's lives depended on it and our great President rose to the occasion and made it, "The Union, it must be preserved." The Civil War was a gruesome chapter in our Nation's history, but it was no doubt a necessary one. The great words of Lincoln once written en route to the scene of bloodshed on Gettysburg will forever burn in the hearts of free men, "Four score and seven years ago our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." The years have come and gone since Lincoln made his famous address, but it has not been forgotten.

It was a hard job building the Nation after civil strife but with hope in the hearts of our fathers their dream came true and their children could once again live in peace.

Then the great day came for the lady, herself. She was brought to our shores, a gift from a grateful people who had sent many of their own to our country. Being the symbol of hope the lady was given the place of honor in our country. She was enshrined alone on her island where she bids goodbye to Americans and a welcome to immigrants through the years. As time passes she has seen the Nation grow, New York has become a city of skyscrapers, thousands of immigrants have found a haven of hope within her spreading arms. She has seen sweethearts, mothers, and children watch their loved ones go to war and she had stood on sentinel duty until the brave soldier has returned to the peace for which he fought.

Yes, the Statue of Liberty is a true symbol of hope for our country. She stands with burning love and eager arms to welcome any stranger who has lost his faith and hope in life. Refugees from all over the world flock to her shores, their eyes shine brightly with the prospect of a free and happy life. They stand before her and although they cannot read the words upon her base they feel deep in their hearts their meaning: "Give me your poor, your tired, your huddled masses, and I will give you freedom." To them this great statue represents America the beacon of hope.

Following is the winning essay of Miss Danielle Vracin, 9723 Downey Avenue, Downey, Calif.:

AMERICA, BEACON OF HOPE

The stinging wind of a leaden December day swirled in short piercing drafts around a little group of men and women huddled together on the desolate shores of the New World. One by one they sank to their knees, bowed their heads, and prayed. Their prayer was one of thanksgiving. For, after all the long endured hardships, freedom was now theirs. It was also a plea for protection and strength against an unseen foe who lurked in the shadows of the unknown, in that darkness which excludes the light of truth, and obscures freedom.

These few were but the first of many to come. They were the pilgrims who blazed the trail through a wilderness so that others might follow. These brave pioneers lit the beacon of hope and held it high so that all might see it and walk without fear of stumbling.

Soon tales of the wonderous modern Promised Land across the sea were told. More people came. Some searched for adventure. Some for a better life. But deep within the hearts of all, there burned a desire for something greater. That desire was freedom, and America gave them the hope of finding it again.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States have played the most important part, for they were the two main attractions that brought people sreaming ino the newly discovered, free country. It can be proven in many ways that the United States is truly a great country for men dedicated their entire lives to keep it free to all men. George Washington, who was our first president, Patrick Henry, an ordinary man, unknown, until he said the famous words "give me liberty or give me death," and Abraham Lincoln, who abolished slavery, are just three examples.

The past history of our country is something of which we can be proud. It is a heritage that can be examined under the strongest light. Our relationships with other countries of the world have been truthful and honest. It is rightfully so because the fundamental principles of our Founding Fathers were based on truth, honesty, and integrity.

Our love and respect for this great country is a duty that we owe not only to our fellow men, but also to God. It is also our duty to see that it forever remains a harbor of safety to all those who seek peace and happiness.

Today in New York harbor stands the towering Statue of Liberty. It faces Europe with its torch of light forever burning brightly. It bids all men to follow its Beacon of Hope to a Land where freedom truly rings from sea to shining sea.

The winning essay of Miss Carol Goodrich, 1707 North Willow Street, Compton, Calif., follows:

AMERICA, BEACON OF HOPE

For generation after generation America has worked toward an end. As a beacon of hope and light for people and nations all over the world, she has stood tall and strong for that which is highest, noblest, and best.

The Pilgrims came to this raw, new country to escape religious persecution, and in doing so they led the way for other people who sought freedom of religion and a new way of life. They settled in colonies and in time wrote the Declaration of Independence which made a America a Republic. Then came the Bill of Rights which gave everyone freedom of speech, religion, press, and so forth. These documents for freedom became the backbone of the America of today, and the dream of hundreds of thousands of people; starving, ambitious, courageous, desperate people from other countries.

Down through the years America has built her economical and governmental systems to make her stand out as a democratic and

prosperous country. Many other nations look to us for financial and industrial aid, and advisory services. These aids are very important and are their lifelines; however, they do not always ask for material aid. They need spiritual assistance as well to keep that fire of faith burning within their hearts. Behind the Iron Curtain faith is especially needed to permit the people who are imprisoned and impoverished live on from day to day with a hope of the future. From across the ocean we Americans give that hope in the form of leaflets dropped from airplanes, and the Voice of Freedom heard where it is needed most.

The family also plays a big part in building courage and confidence to conquer the friendship of foreign lands, and trust that eventually the world will be at peace. It is true that the family of today isn't as closely knit as of past years. This is partly due to the greater number of diversions outside the home and family. The family of yesteryear, as a whole, was larger than today. The older children had to help the younger ones, and in doing so taught and guided them. The mothers stayed home and managed their home and family instead of working as so many do now. Even with this difference, the families of yesterday and today all work for the same thing. To uphold the principles of freedom, faith, and trust. It is their duty to teach their children from their cradle days that America, as a Christian Nation, is the most promising in the world.

The security of this Nation and its people has been threatened many times in the past and will continue to be threatened in the future. But the common bond of democracy and faith in all of our ideals has proven too formidable for our assailants in the past, and with the help of God, will prove the same for any assailants in the future.

America has been called "the new country," and by being new she has not had traditions and proprieties to follow. She has molded her Government, from the Constitution, into the just rule for her people that it is today. By being just and merciful, she is the beacon of hope that shines and beckons for all who need her.

The Yeast of Liberty Must Be Encouraged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, American political prestige in Eastern Europe is being sapped by skillful Soviet diplomacy and propaganda. One way to meet the situation is to cease treating the satellite countries as an unimportant, uniform bloc, a mere adjunct of Soviet empire, C. L. Sulzberger suggests in the New York Times.

Beneath the gray uniformity of communism, the interests of these countries remain disparate.

He concludes:

Let us remind the East of the mere existence of life's simpler pleasures. Now that there is talk of greater freedom, let us again intrude our Western culture. The yeast of liberty must be encouraged while we wait to measure the sincerity, depth, and durability of the Soviet new look.

Mr. Sulzberger makes an important contribution to our understanding of the situation we are faced with and I include his article here for this reason:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: SOME DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SATELLITES

PARIS, May 15.—American political prestige in Eastern Europe is being sapped by skillful Soviet diplomacy and propaganda. Our attitude is made to appear static and unreasonable. Communist leaders in the satellites argue: "You kept insisting that Moscow's policy must change. You set out a bill of particulars to be met: An Austrian peace treaty, concrete moves toward disarmament. You denounced Stalinism as a threat to the world and proclaimed fears of military force.

"But now the Kremlin has dropped Stalin and outlawed the inevitability of war. Yet you announce the U. S. S. R. is more dangerous than it ever was before. The Russians agreed on Austria. They are demobilizing hundreds of thousands of soldiers. What have you people done to meet them halfway?"

The answer to this question is not simple. To respond that we mistrust Moscow on the basis of its record is inadequate if true. To imply that we fear the outcome of competitive coexistence with a monolithic ideology merely weakens our psychological position.

We should do some rethinking. The Russians have changed their line. We must therefore offer something new. We cannot afford indefinitely to pursue a Fabian policy if we are to retain any influence in Eastern Europe.

THE INDIVIDUAL APPROACH

One way to face the situation is to cease treating the satellite countries as an unimportant, uniform bloc, a mere adjunct of Soviet empire, and to discuss with them their separate problems. These interests, beneath the gray uniformity of communism, remain disparate. Can we not explore diversities more skillfully?

Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria retain strong pan-Slavic feeling of kinship for Russia, but the Poles, despite blood ties, harbor a traditional dislike. Bulgaria and Rumania are religiously Orthodox. But Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland are strongly Roman Catholic. Czechoslovakia and Hungary border on the west—the German Federal Republic, and Austria. Bulgaria touches Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia. Even Rumania has contact with the independent communistic Yugoslavs. Only Poland is completely sandwiched between segments of the Soviet empire.

The Poles and Czechs have deep concern in East German rearmament. The stronger this German satellite becomes the more, automatically, Poland and Czechoslovakia look to Moscow for protection. Both countries fear that some day Teuton refugees will return to Silesia and Sudetenland.

The Hungarians and Rumanians have historical and racial mistrust of their Slavic neighbors. The Bulgarians are deeply interested in Macedonia but care nothing about Germany's future. To them foreign policy revolves about closer relations with Yugoslavia and possible federation with that country.

There are different levels of freedom, of initiative, and even of Communist organization among the satellies. The Poles by nature insist upon more liberty of action. "Our party is in better shape than others," say their Communists, "because we fought the Germans. Poland was never tainted with collaboration as in Hungary. Make no mistake, even we Communists prize our liberty. Throughout our history Poles have joined many liberation movements—in Italy, France, and even America. Ours will inevitably and must inevitably be a different form of communism from Russia's. It is not our destiny to be satellites."

Now that Stalin is outmoded the Russians try to blame all past mistakes upon his dictatorship. The day may come when he is held responsible for the Katyn massacre of Polish officers and the delay in military advances that permitted Warsaw's destruction.

THE CRY FOR LIBERTY

A new cry for liberty is rising. Said a Communist intellectual recently in Warsaw: "Now we should publish Koestler's Darkness at Noon. After all, what it condemns is Stalinism. And Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls? We ban it only because it attacked the brutality of André Marty's butchers in Spain. Now we agree on what Marty did."

Let us take advantage of this ferment and press for publication of such provocative books. There is a deep-seated craving within the satellites to travel to the West and test comparative freedoms. Do we fear to let them satisfy this appetite?

Hankering for happiness is one of mankind's most contagious diseases. Russian youngsters visiting the Polish ski resort of Zakopane were astonished by the relative freedom from inhibition and the sophistication of the Poles. "Why can't our girls be attractive?" asked young Russian men. Meanwhile their girls locked themselves in rooms to smoke European cigarettes and arranged sly deals with friends to send them lipstick and powder.

Let us remind the East of the mere existence of life's simpler pleasures. Now that there is talk of greater freedom, let us again intrude our western culture. The yeast of liberty must be encouraged while we wait to measure the sincerity, depth, and durability of the Soviet new look.

Macedonia—An Integral Part of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Pan-Macedonian Association of the United States and Canada met recently in Boston, Mass., for the 20th District Pan-Macedonian Convention. Among the papers presented at this meeting was a scholarly presentation by a prominent Greek-American citizen of New England, Mr. Elias Gagalis, of Lawrence, Mass., on the so-called Macedonian problem.

Mr. Gagalis is president of the Pan-Macedonian Association and on the basis of the historical data he presented to the convention, the membership adopted the following declaration of principles by unanimous vote:

First. Macedonia is not a nation but a geographic term.

Second. Ethnologically and historically, Macedonia has always been, as is now, an integral part of Greece.

Third. The clamor raised for "Autonomy" is in reality a camouflaged demand of the Bulgarian Communists whose ulterior motive is annexation of Macedonia to Bulgaria.

Fourth. In the United States and Canada the autonomy of Macedonia is sponsored by certain Bulgarian organizations, namely, the Macedonian American People's League, which is included in the list of subversive organizations in the

United States as published by Attorney General Clark, and the Macedonian political organization.

Fifth. These organizations are Bulgarian to the core disguising themselves as Macedonian and preaching unceasingly about the Macedonian question and Macedonian autonomy when they really seek the attachment of this Greek province to Bulgaria under the guise of autonomy.

Sixth. A Macedonian problem does not exist today. Those who try to create or resurrect one are only perpetuating enmities and feelings, which, in the past, have prevented the rapproachment of the Balkan people.

Seventh. It is important that the American people realize the true nature of these Bulgarian organizations and not permit themselves to be fooled by their deceptive writings and claims. The continued existence and the unhindered activities of these supposedly Macedonian political organizations, constitute an ugly discord in the traditional basic policy of the United States in southeast Europe: The maintenance of the integrity and independence of Greece.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the address of Mr. Gagalis to the convention.

The material follows:

Many and varied are the ways and tactics of the predatory Communist imperialism. But the insidiousness of the Communist tactics aiming at snatching the Greek province of Macedonia and bringing it behind the Iron Curtain remains unmatched in the annals of Communist expansionism.

In this, as in many other instances, Communist imperialism has been following the same traditional line of the old Slav imperialism. Russia has never concealed her interest in the Slavs of the Balkans or her sympathy with their drive toward the Aegean. It was the Congress of Berlin in the last century which defeated her drive toward the Aegean. She has never given up her idea.

When the traditional tactics of imperialist expansionism failed, the Slav Communists formented civil strife in Greece, aiding and abetting the Communist guerrillas whose avowed objective was the dismemberment of Greece and the imposition of a Communist dictatorship in that stricken country.

The American public will find it difficult to believe that even in our midst—in Indianapolis, Ind., and elsewhere in the United States—tools of Communist satellite Bulgaria, such as the Macedonian Political Organization, have been clamoring and agitating for the detachment of the Greek province of Macedonia from the Greek motherland; and they do this in full cognizance of the fact that the population of that province is purely Greek. Mr. Mark Ethridge, the distinguished publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, who was the American member of the United Nations Balkan Inquiry Commission in 1947, writes that "the ruthless cynicism of Russia's satellite politicos in urging that Greece surrender the province of Macedonia is best realized if one takes into consideration the fact that in all Greek Macedonia there are only at the best estimate about 85,000 Slavic-speaking peoples, some of whom consider themselves Greek, as against 1,500,000 Greeks."

The acquisition of Macedonia by the Slavs was only the first step in the plan of Russia and her satellites. Greece herself was and still is the objective of the new Communist colonialism. And, as Mr. Ethridge readily recognized, "if Macedonia and Thrace were detached from Greece, that country could not survive. It would perhaps quickly sue for admission into the Soviet orbit. * * * And the implications of the fall of Greece should be sobering to all of us."

The following pages aim at presenting a brief historical background to the so-called Macedonian problem.

I. THE SO-CALLED MACEDONIAN PROBLEM

1. From the breakup of the Roman Empire to the Bulgarian schism (circa A. D. 500 to 1872)

During the Dark Ages which followed the breakup of the Roman Empire, the Slav tribes—Serbs, Bulgars and others—invaded the Balkans. After occupying what is today Serbia and Bulgaria, they spread farther south over Macedonia, almost to the gates of Thessaloniki.

The indigenous Greek or Hellenized population continued to occupy most of the towns (inland towns such as Monastir, Kastoria, Kozani, Lapsista, Verria, Naoussa, Serres, Melenikon, Nevrokop, etc., always remained strongholds of Hellenism), the coastal districts (including the whole of the Chalkidike Peninsula) and numerous inland pockets. The extent to which, during the ensuing centuries, the Greeks hellenized the Slavs, or the Slavs absorbed the Greeks, is a matter of controversy, and it would be unnecessary to dwell upon it now.

At the end of the 14th century, the Turks invaded the Balkans, and after the decisive battle of Kossovo, in 1389, Macedonia fell under the Ottoman sway. The conqueror Sultan Murat first introduced large numbers of Turkish settlers from Anatolia who colonized the place and became thereafter the dominant element in the country, outnumbering both Greeks and Slavs.

During the following 5 centuries of Ottoman rule, the "rayahs," as the Christian subjects of the Sultan Ports were called, retained their religious and ecclesiastical organization. At the time of the Turkish conquest, three ecclesiastic authorities exercised jurisdiction over parts of Macedonia: the Patriarchs of Constantinople (Greek) and Ipek (Serb) and the Archbishop of Ochrida (Bulgar). By the end of the 18th century, the Patriarchate of Ipek and the Archbishopric of Ochrida had disappeared owing to various political and financial vissicitudes, and the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised sole jurisdiction over the Orthodox Christians throughout Macedonia.

With the revival of Slav national sentiment in the Balkans in the 19th century, a revival which was encouraged by the Russian Panslavist Society in Moscow, the Bulgarians began to agitate for their own national church, independent of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. Although the Oecumenical Patriarchate was prepared to make concessions by appointing Bulgarian Archbishops to all Archdioceses in Bulgaria proper, it refused to accept the creation of Bulgarian Archbishoprics in Macedonia proper where the population was mixed (Greek and Slav), the coexistence of two Archbishops in one and the same archdiocese being contrary to Canon Law.

This dispute finally led to the Bulgarian schism in 1872. The Ottoman Government, under Russian pressure, had already (1870) officially recognized the Bulgarians as a separate "millet" (nation) and authorized the setting up of an independent Bulgarian church called the Bulgarian Exarchate, under an Exarch, residing at Constantinople. This was followed some time later by the issue of "berats" (letters patent) to a number of Bulgarian Archbishops in various parts of Macedonia.

From that time onward, there was increasing tension between Greeks and Bulgars in all the regions affected where there happened to be Slavophone (i e. Slav speaking) elements among the population.

2. From the Bulgarian schism to the outbreak of the Balkan Wars (1872–1912)

In 1878, Russia, after a victorious campaign, compelled Turkey to recognize the independence of Bulgaria. By the Treaty of San Stefano the new Bulgarian State was given the whole of Macedonia to the East, North and West of Thessaloniki (not included), as far as the borders of Albania. Great Britain vetoed this Treaty as being unfair to the Greeks of Macedonia who would thus have been placed under an alien yoke. The Treaty of Berlin (1878), to which all the Great Powers were parties, created a semi-independent Bulgarian Prinicpality under the suzerainty of the Sultan in Northern Bulgaria, and an Autonomous Province of Eastern Rumelia, under a governor appointed by the Sultan, in Southern Bulgaria. Seven years later, in 1885, Eastern Rumelia proclaimed its union with Bulgaria by a coup d'etat. Macedonia remained a Turkish province.

In the years that followed, the Bulgarian state and church devoted their whole efforts to awakening among the Slavophone population of Macedonia a Bulgarian national consciousness. Bulgarian (Exarchist) churches and schools were opened in the villages and towns. These efforts were on the whole not successful. In many parts of Macedonia, the Slavophone population remained loyal to the Oecumenical Patriarchate and continued to attend Greek churches and Greek schools. Some villages went over en masse to the exarchate; in others, parts of the population became Exarchist, while the others remained Patriarchist. There were villages in which there were 2 churches and 2 schools, one Patriarchist (Greek) and the other Exarchist (Bulgarian).

In 1895–96 two Macedonian revolutionary committees were set up in Sofia for the purpose of working for the liberation of Macedonia from the Turks and its union with Bulgaria. Later armed bands were sent by the committees into Macedonia to coerce the Slavophone population into declaring themselves Bulgarian and going over to the Exarchate. This militant action was directed not only against the Greeks but also against the Serbs who were not disposed to look on while Bulgaria extended its influence over the Slavophones in the Skoplje and other regions immediately adjacent to the frontiers of Serbia.

Committees were formed both in Greece and Serbia which in their turn dispatched bands into Macedonia to protect the Slavophone villages against the terrorism of the Bulgarian bands. A protracted and bitter struggle ensued on Turkish soil for the possession of the bodies and souls of the Slavophone Macedonians, a struggle which lasted until 1908, the year of the proclamation of the Turkish constitution by the young Turks. The masters of the country, the Turks, looked on complacently at this internecine strife between the various Christian elements and only intervened with a heavy hand whenever a Turkish official or landowner was killed by the bands.

By this time, the "Macedonian question" had assumed an international aspect and active propaganda was carried on by the Macedonian revolutionary committee strongly supported by the Bulgarian Government in order to interest foreign public opinion in their cause.

The Bulgarian claim was based on language. The Bulgarians argued that the Slavophones of Macedonia spoke a dialect akin to Bulgarian and must therefore all be regarded as Bulgars. The Serbs countered this argument by saying that the Slavophones could not be genuine Bulgars, as they had retained the "slava," an exclusively Serb custom. The Greek point of view was that, whatever the racial origins or linguistic affinities of these people, many of

them had never ceased to regard themselves as Greek, and that "national conscience," i. e., the willingness of an individual to identify himself with this or that nation, should be the determining test of national allegiance. There was no more moral justification for bullying a Slavophone Macedonian, who wished to be considered Greek, into declaring himself a Bulgar than, for instance, for forcing an Alsatian who considered himself French despite his German origin and speech, to admit himself a German, or an English-speaking Irish nationalist to call himself a loyal Irishman.

The Bulgarian movement eventually became a split by internal dissensions due to a difference of opinion between the leaders on the question of tactics. One section, called the Exterior Macedonia Revolutionary Organization, whose leader was Boris Sarafov and which represented the out-and-out Bulgarian Nationalists, were for the immediate annexation of Macedonia to Bulgaria. The other section, called the Interior M. R. O. (IMRO), founded by Sandanski in 1895, wanted to proceed by stages. They preferred to work for an autonomous Macedonia, a slogan which was more likely to win support among Western liberals than Sarafov's annexationist program. Ultimate union with Bulgaria, they felt sure, would only be a question of time and could always be attained by a coup d'etat similar to the coup d'etat of 1885 which had brought about the union of eastern Rumelia with Bulgaria once the administration of that province had passed into Bulgarian hands. These divisions later penetrated IMRO itself in which there was a nationalist and an autonomist wing. Incidentally, the American branch of the Interior Macedonia Revolutionary Organization was organized in 1928 under the name of Macedonia Political Organization with its headquarters in Indianapolis, Ind. They have also adopted the slogan "Macedonia for the Macedonians" and for 28 years now they have been preaching unceasingly about the "Macedonian question" and Macedonian autonomy. In 1924 Todar Alexandrov, leader of the autonomists, signed a common declaration of policy at Vienna with Dimitar Vlahov, leader of the Macedonian Communist group "Obedinena," on the basis of an autonomous Macedonia within a Socialist Balkan federation. There was acute antagonism between the two opposing Bulgarian factions, with frequent assassinations of leading members by members of the rival faction.

In 1904 the Ottoman Government, yielding to pressure on the part of the Great Powers, consented to introduce extensive administrative and fiscal reforms in Macedonia.

The territory to which the Macedonian Reforms applied included the three vilayets of Selanik (Thessaloniki), Monastir (Bitolj) and Uskub (Skoplje) which were united into a single administrative unit governed from Thessaloniki by an Inspector General, Hilmi Pasha. This territory covered an area of approximately 68,000 sq. km. (26,000 sq. miles) with a population (according to the census) carried out by Hilmi Pasha in all three vilayets in 1905) of 3,171,690. Hilmi Pasha's census have the following figures of population:

Moslems (Islam)	1,720,007
Greeks (Run Milleti)	648,962
Bulgars (Bulgar-Milleti)	557,734
Serbs (Sirp-Milleti)	167,601
Various (Jews and others)	77,386
Total	3,171,690

After the proclamation of the Turkish Constitution in 1908, the internal conflict between the various bands came temporarily to a standstill, and the nationalist policy pursued by the Young Turks, now in power at Constantinople, brought about a gradual rapproachement between the governments of Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria. This rapprochement in 1912 was converted into a military alliance, and in October of that year the Balkan Allies, accusing the Ottoman Government of not fulfilling its promises of reform, attacked Turkey.

3. From the outbreak of the Balkan Wars to the end of the First World War (1912 to 1918)

No previous agreement had been arrived at between all the Balkan states as to the ultimate distribution of territory to be taken from Turkey. The lack of agreement between the Balkan allies on the distribution of the spoils led to the inevitable rupture. After the defeat of the Turks, the Bulgarian Army in June 1913 suddenly turned on their allies. Defeated by both Serbs and Greeks, Bulgaria was compelled to sue for peace and thus the Second Balkan War was brought to an end, through Rumanian mediation, by the signature of the Treaty of Bucharest (August 10, 1913).

By the Treaty of Bucharest, Macedonia was divided up between the three Balkan states—Grece, Serbia, and Bulgaria.

A further territorial adjustment took place after the First World War when Bulgaria was compelled by the Treaty of Neuilly (November 27, 1919) to cede the district of Strumitza to Yugoslavia.

Thus the areas of Macedonia respectively in the possession of Greece, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, after the First World War, were the following:

	Square kilometer	*Square miles*
Greek (Aegean) Macedonia	34,602	13,360
Yugoslav (Vardar) Macedonia	26,776	10,338
Bulgarian (Pirin) Macedonia	6,794	2,623
Total area	67,172	26,321

There have been no further territorial adjustments since that date.

During the period between the outbreak of the First Balkan War and the end of the First World War, certain movements of population took place between the various parts of Macedonia assigned to the three countries. Many of the Exarchist Slavophones in Central Macedonia fled at the time of the defeat of the Bulgarian Army in Bulgaria. After the signature of the Treaty of Bucharest, the Greek inhabitants of the regions ceded to Bulgaria (Strumitza-Melenikon) emigated to Greek Macedonia. It is noteworthy that among these were the Slavophones of Strumitza who have always been stanch Patriarchists. Most of the Greek population of Monastir, ceded to Serbia, also withdrew to Greece.

At the same time, the Bulgarian exarchate ceased to exercise jurisdiction in the parts of Macedonia ceded to Greece and Serbia. In Greek Macedonia, the patriarchate of Constantinople resumed its authority over all the Orthodox inhabitants, while in Serbian Macedonia jurisdiction passed to the Serb patriarchate. The Bulgarian churches and schools previously maintained by the exarchate became Greek or Serb, except in the small part of Macedonia ceded to Bulgaria where all patriarchist churches and schools became Bulgarian.

4. Following the First World War

The years which immediately followed the end of the First World War and of the Greco-Turkish War which was its continuation, saw profound changes come about in the structure of the population of Greek Macedonia.

Bulgaria in 1915 had thrown in her lot with Germany in the hope of annexing both Greek and Serbian Macedonia in the event of a German victory. The penalty of her defeat and her crimes during the occupation was the restoration of western Thrace to Greece, and of the Strumitza, Bossilegrad, and Tsaribrod districts to Yugoslavia. The Bulgarian wartime occupation of eastern Macedonia, during which nearly the whole of the Greek population of that province had been deported to forced labor in Bulgaria, had left behind a legacy of great bitterness between the two peoples. It was felt by the peacemakers that the position both of the Greek minority in Bulgaria, still fairly numerous in southern Bulgaria (eastern Rumelia), and of the Bulgarian minority in Greece would be rendered extremely difficult in the midst of a hostile environment.

Accordingly, the Treaty of Neuilly, which put an end to the state of hostilities between Bulgaria and the Entente Powers, was accompanied by a Greco-Bulgarian Convention which provided for the voluntary migration of the respective minorities in the two countries. The emigrants were to be compensated for their property in full on the basis of a valuation to be carried out by an international commission. In order to heal all the wounds of the past, the convention's provisions were made retroactive so that the many Greek refugees who had been forced to leave eastern Rumelia in 1906 and the equally numerous Bulgarian refugees who had left Macedonia during or before the Balkan Wars might also benefit from the compensation clauses.

Under this agreement, some 25,000 Greeks quit Bulgaria and some 50,000 Slavophones of Bulgarian sympathies left Greece. Most of the Slavophone population east of the Vardar emigrated, so that today, there are hardly any Slavophones left in the eastern half of Greek Macedonia.

On the other hand, the Slavophones in the western half, that is, west of the Vardar, did not avail themselves to any extent of the provisions of the convention. They preferred to remain where they were.

The above partial Greco-Bulgarian exchange of populations was followed by a more sweeping exchange between Greece and Turkey. Following on the disastrous termination of the Anatolian War, Greece found herself forced, by the Lausanne Convention of January 1923, to consent to a compulsory emigration of Anatolian and Thracian Greeks to Greece against a corresponding compulsory emigration of Turks from Macedonia and other Greek territories to Turkey. Under this arrangement, 348,00 Turks left Greek Macedonia and 638,000 Greek refugees from Turkey and Russia were installed in their place.

The effects of these migrations on the population of Greek Macedonia is reflected in the figures of the 1928 census as below:

		Percent
Greeks	1,237,000	88.1
Slavophones	82,000	5.8
Various	93,000	6.1
	1,412,000	100.0

The American president of the League of Nations Greek Refguees Settlement Commission, Mr. Charles O. Howland, was able to report to the Council of the League that "the result of the settlement in Macedonia of about 500,000 rural and 300,000 urban refugees, followed by the emigration in 1923–24 of 348,000 Moslems, has been radically to change the ethnical composition of the poulation of Greek Macedonia and definitely to hellenize that province."[1]

It is important to note these facts because Bulgaria and, more recently, Yugoslavia have often chosen to ignore the profound changes which, since the First World War, have so thoroughly completed the hellenization of

[1] League of Nations-Greek Refugee Settlement, Geneva 1926 (p. 207). The number of refugees definitely settled in Macedonia was 638,000, as there was a certain amount of redistribution made after Mr. Howland's statement.

southern Macedonia. They talk of Aegean Macedonia as if it were a country entirely inhabited by Slavophones. At the last Greek census—that of 1940—Greek Macedonia had a population of 1,759,130, of whom only some 85,000 were Slavophones. Taking the population of Vardar (Yugoslav) Macedonia today at about 1 million[2] and that of Pirin (Bulgarian) Macedonia at 240,000,[3] one sees that the purely Greek population of Greek Macedonia alone exceeds that of Vardar and Pirin Macedonia combined.

The above figures show how absurd and unnatural it would be to include the Greeks of Macedonia in a State which would be under the complete domination of one or other of the Slav States. As Hugh Seton-Watson, an authority on the Balkans, well puts it in his recent book, Eastern Europe Between the Wars 1918–1941 (p. 317): "The creation of an independent Macedonian State can hardly be considered a serious political proposal. The natural commercial outlet and capital of Macedonia is Salonica, an essentially Greek city, which no Greek patriot could consider abandoning. Moreover, that portion of Macedonia which from 1918 has belonged to Greece is inhabited, predominantly, by Greeks. To unite a solidly Greek province with a solidly Slav province, cutting both off from their kinsmen in the north and in the south is absurd. The Greeks and Slavs are capable of living peacefully side by side, but not as citizens of an artificially created new state."

When the Germans invaded Greece and Yugoslavia on April 6, 1941, Bulgarian armies moved immediately into Greek Thrace and Greek Macedonia and, after committing again terrible atrocities against the Greek population, began to settle Bulgarians in that area, aiming at permanent annexation after the final victory of their Axis allies. Moreover, at a conference held at Semmering (Austria), late in April 1941, the Bulgarian delegation expressed the desire to occupy Thessaloniki. However, this city remained under German military administration throughout the war.

---

[2] The Yugoslav census of 1921 gave the population as 818,377.

[3] Dimitar Vlahov gave this figure in an article in Borea (Oct. 20, 1948), accusing Bulgaria of suppressing the national rights of 240,000 Pirin Macedonians. The Bulgarian census of 1925 gives the population as 186,167.

The Case for a Friend in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article with reference to our very friendly ally, Turkey, appeared in the May 7 issue of Life magazine. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THE CASE FOR A FRIEND IN NEED—A TOP UNITED STATES INDUSTRIALIST FORESEES BRIGHT FUTURE BEYOND TURKEY'S TRIALS

(By Clarence B. Randall)

Far out to the east, guarding the right flank of the free nations, stands the gallant Republic of Turkey. Along 1,500 miles of border her strong army faces the source of danger, keeping watch to the north and east round the clock.

For the Turks this is not a new posture of defense. Throughout 3 centuries of history and 13 wars with Russia, the Turks have manned the same mountain passes and guarded the same dark waters of the Black Sea. They were thus on guard before Washington crossed the Delaware, and the posture they now maintain is taken not because of American aid but out of deep conviction. It is more effective because of modern arms we have made available, but if the Turkish soldiers were barefoot and armed only with stones and clubs they would still be manning those passes and patrolling those coasts—and thus contributing to our security. So when Americans grumble to me about American aid to Turkey, I ask if they have ever reflected upon Turkish aid to America.

Seldom in history has any nation, not excluding the United States, gone so far so fast as has modern Turkey since May 19, 1919. That was the day when Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who was renamed Ataturk (father of the Turks) by a people grateful for his leadership, landed at Samsun on the Black Sea and plunged into the task of transforming a series of medieval communities into a new country.

Now America's 19th century is reproducing itself in Turkey. Her leaders in government and business dream the same great dreams that our leaders dreamed. Eventually many of theirs will probably come true, as did ours. Her population, like ours, is fused from many racial strains. Above all she has chosen democracy, as we did.

We opened up our country by driving transcontinental railroads from coast to coast. The Turks cut new highways into remote areas to reach villages that the old regime had deliberately kept inaccessible. Trucks now carry the farmer's produce from the villages to the sea. The traffic goes the other way, too; the roads bring the villages new ideas, new principles of government and education. And with easier communication comes the possibility of direct and cohesive national leadership for the whole country.

But just as it was not all success for us in the roaring 19th century, so the new Turkey suffers some severe growing pains of its own. We Americans are apt to remember those things that we did well and to forget our failures, but actually we too made many mistakes. For each great achievement in railroad building we built one that was badly conceived and inadequately financed.

The Turks too have occasionally been carried away by the heady excitement of rapid growth and have committed precious resources to projects that were either premature or improvident or both.

Take for example their steep plant at Karabuk. One can wonder whether the large capital required for a modern diversified steel plant might not have been better allocated to some other more urgent project in a nation whose funds are desperately short. I can understand and sympathize with Turkey's motives in spending for steel. Steel is a symbol of modernization and a steel plant offers protection against the ruthless pricing policies of European steel cartels. But priorities are needed in spending scarce capital, and the Turks perhaps should have put steel further down the list.

For security reasons the steel plant was built well inland from the Black Sea. So Karabuk stands 70 miles from a port and from its coal supply at Zonguldak, 100 from its nearest market and 600 from the ore source at Divrigi. The Turkish economy may have to pay heavily for this strategic but uneconomic location.

Unlike Karabuk, most of Turkey's great new industrial projects have been wisely conceived and boldly undertaken. All but completed is the Seyhan Dam, dedicated last month, which will produce 280 million kilowatt-hours of electric power annually and irrigate nearly 600,000 acres. Seyhan power will supply the cities of Adana, Mersin, and Tarsus, growing industrial centers. Five other combined irrigation and power plants will be finished in the next 2 years, as well as several sizable coal-fired generating plants. A dozen new cement plants are under construction and at least that many sugar factories. Sugar will probably be available for export before the current year is ended. A new nitrogen plant is expected to supply a third of the country's requirements in nitrogenous fertilizers and a sulfuric acid plant has been started. Modern loading, unloading, and storage facilities have been contracted for at most of the principal harbors. New steel silos will greatly increase grain storage capacity, and refrigeration has been provided for fish and meat products. Five combination passenger and freight ships and 11 cargo ships have been bought. Everywhere there are signs of the prodigious national effort.

No one can fail to admire the courage with which this country of 24 million people has tackled this huge task, but their boldness has created new problems. The cost has been staggering and, because no reservoir of private capital has been available, the financing has had to be provided through public funds. Substantial debt has been incurred abroad and the spending of such large amounts within the country has brought inflation. Turkey's export trade is growing, but inevitably it falls short of providing enough foreign exchange for raw materials and spare parts, plus the completion at the same time of these vast new public enterprises. Priorities for the allocation of scarce dollars, pounds, and other currencies have to be clearly determined and firmly kept.

All of this is now recognized by the Turkish Cabinet and the Grand National Assembly. They know that the tremendous advances which their people have made since the war could be halted if inflation should rob them of their improved standard of living and discourage foreign investment. They know that their exports must pay for their imports.

As stanch members of NATO, the Turks also know that their military expenditures cannot be reduced in the foreseeable future. So they have recently asked the Turkish people to make the same effort to establish financial stability that they have given to building industry and military might.

FACING UP TO THE PROBLEM

The Government has drawn up a balanced budget which has been approved by the Assembly. This was followed at once by a series of decrees that struck at inflation and faced up to the financial problems created by Turkey's effort to do so much so fast. The Central Bank is to control credit rigidly. The various state enterprises are to be required to operate within the limit of their own revenues and denied help from the governmental budget. New public investments will be restricted to projects that can rapidly improve Turkey's credit situation abroad. Bank credits to private undertakings will be limited to those that will be immediately productive. Speculative enterprises will not be permitted. No increases in agricultural subsidies are to be allowed. A new import policy calls for enforcement of rigid priorities.

Officials of the Turkish Government believe that the country's financial problems, admittedly acute, are relatively short term. They believe that within 2 or 3 years the postwar building program should begin to pay off in new productivity and Turkey will need to buy less abroad. A good crop year in 1956 would help tremendously, and nature cooperated last winter by supplying the

most extensive blanket of snow in recorded history.

Turkey's long-term prospects are excellent. Once she passes the current squeeze she will be on her way, and it lies within her power in another generation to become a truly great nation.

She has impressive resources. Take minerals, for example. Her production of chrome plays an important part in supplying the needs of the United States and the rest of the free world. Her iron ore is first class in quality and sufficient in quantity to support her own steel industry for a long period. She has enormous reserves of lignite and at Zonguldak on the Black Sea she has bituminous coal estimated to be sufficient for 100 years.

American and European companies have now started intensive exploration for oil and the prospects are thought to be encouraging. A projected new refinery to be built by private capital at Istanbul should effect great savings in foreign exchange. Some crude production and refining are already being carried on.

Salt and sulfur are being produced for domestic consumption. Awaiting large-scale exploitation are: copper, manganese, mercury, antimony, asbestos, magnesite, boracite, emery, and meerschaum.

Great progress has been made in agriculture, especially in the semiarid regions of the Anatolian plateau. Some varieties of Turkish wheat are already establishing an enviable position in the highly competititve world market. Turkish tobacco is of course known everywhere and if the terms of trade were better it would be in even stronger demand. Figs and nuts are important export items. Turkey grows excellent fruits in great profusion. I have never eaten better melons than Turkish melons and, heresy though it may be, I say that Turkish orange juice is the best in the world. Let Florida, Arizona, and California do their worst; I stand on that statement.

Among luxury foods Turkey has a completely undeveloped asset in her fish. In Chicago I can buy Dover sole flown from England. It is far superior to the various substitutes sold as sole in American hotels, but if I were free to choose I would take Turkish sole every time. The only reason I do not buy it is because no Turk has yet set out to market it in Europe and the United States. When he does that he will add Turkish swordfish, Turkish turbot, lobster from the Sea of Marmara, and a wide variety of other exotic and delicious seafoods and thereby provide his country with an important new weapon in its campaign to balance its trade. Perhaps he will add a sideline of frozen orange juice.

HEN FIRST, EGG SECOND

And speaking both of and for Americans, I assure my Turkish friends that a big dollar-earning tourist trade is ready to come their way if they will only make a little more determined effort to seek it and take care of it. The new hotels at Istanbul are a fine beginning, and the new highways beckon invitingly. But here the hen must definitely precede the egg; more hotels must be there before the travelers come.

The district of Antalya along the Mediterranean might well become a Riviera of the future. There the sea in midwinter is warmer than the waters of the Bosporus in July, and the long beaches of soft golden sand are among the finest in the world. Landward from the coast rise the towering Taurus Mountains. A half hour hour's automobile ride will take you to a picnic in a forest by a rushing stream ,and if you go still higher, you will find yourself knee-deep in snow.

This fabulous Antalya district is rich in archaeological treasure. Here are ruins from the Greek and Roman civilizations, such as the theater of Aspendus which could seat 15,000 persons, and which is still used. Here was the winter seat of the great Seljuk Empire which in the Middle Ages ruled from the Caspian Sea to the Indian Ocean.

But the greatest of all the resources of modern Turkey is the spirit of her people. They are determined that nothing shall stop them from getting ahead. The courage and optimism with which they are attacking their new tasks are infectious. Much that they are undertaking is new to them, and though they learn modern techniques quickly, they urgently need more people trained in the essential skills of an industrial society.

Most of all, it seems to me, they need men and women who understand what we call management. The organizing and disciplining of the staff of their great new enterprises requires supervisory skill of a high order, and few Turks have had an opportunity to acquire that sort of experience. It is all very well for them to send their able young men to our colleges to study agriculture, electrical engineering, transportation and so on, but I should like to see them send equally capable trainees to our business schools to study economics, accounting and the principles of management.

The impact of American education is already great. Everywhere in Turkish Government or business offices one encounters men trained at century-old Robert College of Istanbul or some of the other schools established by American philanthropy. Americans could have done nothing more enlightened or better calculated to serve the cause of ultimate peace than the establishment of those schools.

In one respect Turkey's new and vigorous democracy differs from ours, and I mention this only because I am so extremely fond of the Turks. They are inordinately sensitive to criticism. As a nation and as individuals they are apt to be hurt by frank statements about themselves that Americans would take in stride. They have not yet reached that robust state where men may have strong differences on political and economic questions and still live together in harmony.

But Turkish loyalties are true and intense. Above all the Turks believe in the future of their country and not in a narrow nationalistic sense, for the Turkey of the future will serve the welfare of the entire world through her strength and the wisdom of her leaders.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*—
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, ———, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, ———, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*___
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Healey, James C., *N. Y*_____.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*___
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Relationship Between the United States and Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. Don Alberto Martin Artajo, Foreign Minister of Spain, delivered at Fordham University, April 16, 1956, at a special convocation in "Tribute to Spain." Dr. Artajo's discussion of the historical and present relationship between the United States and Spain is extremely informative. I believe it warrants the attention of all Members of Congress, as well as the general public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President, professors, and students at Fordham University, ladies and gentlemen, in my life, not short indeed, as a man of laws and servant of that system of law that the state is and should be, I have had the honor of graduating as a lawyer from the University of Madrid, heiress of the Complutense of Alcala, founded by Cardinal Cisneros, and to become later a professor of its faculty of political and economical sciences. But neither my legal work nor my service to the Government of my country would have ever led me to think of the academic honors received later on, when I became part of the Spanish Government during a difficult period of our history. In the last few years I have been honored with the title of doctor honoris causa, by the Angelic Institute of Rome and the University of St. Thomas of Manila. And now, on this occasion that I shall never forget, I am honored in the same manner by the famous Fordham University.

The Spanish university student who came for the first time to North America in 1939 to participate in a Pax Romana Congress and who has continued to work always, to the extent of his ability, for the cause of Christian peace in the world, is deeply moved today by the honor bestowed upon him by this famous university, founded by the church over a century ago and entrusted to the Jesuit order, the worthy work of a Spanish saint, Saint Ignatius of Loyola. I myself was educated in a Jesuit school as are my children today.

Adding to my satisfaction is the fact that this is an American university, a splendid product of the vigorous cultural life of this great country with which Spain maintains such close and cordial relations. I cannot forget that in the discovery, colonization and evangelizing of vast territories of the United States, the Spanish names of Ponce de Leon, Soto, Cabeza de Vaca and other distinguished captains often appear, as well as those of viceroys and explorers like Revillagigedo, Bucarelli, and Malaespona; and above all, the exemplary figure of Fray Junipero Serra, the humble friar of Majorca to whom California owes its first development. I do not forget either, that when the moment came for the United States to fight for its independence, Spain contributed appreciably to it, with the power her dominion in both worlds gave her. If there were some disagreements later between our two countries, providence has determined that at the end of the Second World War, Spain and the United States be tied together again by bonds of rich friendship of which I foresee the greatest profit for our mutual benefit and that of international peace.

I have always felt a great esteem for the American people. I remember that when I was called upon by my chief of state to direct for him the foreign policy of Spain, in August of 1945, I made a statement to the press in which I said that the government of our country, inspired by the concepts of freedom and authority, would ultimately arrive at a full understanding with the English speaking countries. That idea, which might have seemed bold at the time, became a reality in the fall of 1953, when Spain and the United States signed agreements of military and economic assistance which are, undoubtedly, among the most important international documents of our times.

My present trip to the United States, during which I have been so warmly welcomed by the authorities and the people of this noble Nation, is a direct result of the good understanding between the United States and Spain. From 1953 on, our two countries have entered a new era in their relationship, which I hope will be to their utmost advantage as well as that of world peace. Standing before an audience so well qualified in every respect, in which my words will find an echo of intelligence and understanding, I wish to dedicate some minutes to talk to you about the relations of our two countries, in the past as well as in the present and the future.

A CENTURY OF RELATIONS BETWEEN SPAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

The relations between Spain and the United States were born under the sign of friendship. When the founders of the United States of America wanted their independence, Spain was governing many of the territories that are today a part of this great federation. Our Government was sympathetic from the very first to the movement of emancipation of the early English Colonies and it collaborated with them in the diplomatic field and with the delivery of arms, munitions, and money, as well as with the movements of its troops and fleets in Europe and America. Msgr. Fulton Sheen, auxiliary bishop of New York, mentioned not long ago the extent of our military assistance to the United States on that occasion: 219 cannons and 30,000 rifles with the necessary ammunition, 4,000 field tents, 30,000 uniforms, 12,000 bombs, and 200 artillery carriages, all of it free. Spain donated also to the American cause, the sum—significant in those times—of $5 million, and it offered Gen. Charles Lee a blank check which he could use to cover the expenses of the war. That very friendly cooperation was sealed by the Treaty of Friendship, Limits, and Navigation, signed in 1795 between the United States and Spain in San Lorenzo del Excorial, by which Spain granted free navigation in the Mississippi and both countries established their boundaries. The territorial differences that arose later were settled with a diplomatic instrument, the Treaty of Friendship, Settlement of Differences, and Limits, signed in Washington in 1819 and by which—the text said—as a pledge of "a solid and unshakable peace between the two powers," Spain ceded to the United States, with a generosity hard to conceive today, the two Floridas, with their adjacent islands and the boundary was set to the west of the Mississippi River.

After this first period of harmony and understanding, the emancipation of the sister countries of Spanish America completely changed the geopolitical picture of the New World. It was the era of the Monroe message, that established a new international doctrine, and of repeated friction over the island of Cuba, the last pearl of the Spanish crown in America. Our differences with the United States, complicated by an episode of sad remembrance whose historical injustice has been recognized by researchers in this country, inevitably led to the war that ended with the peace treaty signed in Paris the 10th of December of 1898, and by which Spain lost the remainder of her overseas empire, the beloved islands of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

After the war and all its consequences, which completely changed Spain's way of living and her role in the world, our relations with the United States went back to normal with the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce in 1902. We entered an era of friendly relations then which lasted until the international confusion caused by the Second World War and the biased predominance attained by the Soviet Union began to distort the impression that the American statesmen had of things in Spain.

THE UNITED STATES RECTIFIES EARLIER ERRORS

In 1946 Spain was sacrificed to the policy of appeasement of Soviet Russia and because of the hate of international communism which had clearly been defeated on the battlefield of our Civil War. All of the heroic will of the Spanish people, the spirit of national independence, the Spartan decision of General Franco, and above all, the help of God, were needed for Spain to resist victoriously that overwhelming aggression directed by international communism.

It was evident, nevertheless, and so stated General Franco on several occasions, that the United States felt neither hate nor ill-will toward Spain. Accordingly, when the threats of Soviet Russia forced the United States to develop its European policy on a new basis, voices with a fair sense of justice were heard in America, who demanded an end to the wrongful sanctions against Spain and the establishment of better political, military, and economic relations between the country which had assumed the role of champion of freedom in the world against Communist slavery and the country which, after overthrowing communism on its own soil, formed the stanchest military and—above all—spiritual bulwark against the advance of communism in Europe.

I still remember with deep feeling the visit of Admiral Sherman to the Spanish Chief of State in July 1951, carrying the message from President Truman and the Department of Defense of the United States. In that frank and cordial meeting between military men the basis was built for a mutual understanding which has been since developed by Ambassadors Griffis, McVeagh, Dunn, and

Lodge for the United States and Ambassadors Lequerica and Areilza for Spain. Thanks to these men and to the missions of Generals Spry and Kissner and their agreements with our General Vigon, negotiations between our two countries reached their peak on September 26, 1953, when three agreements were signed, which have since then happily governed our relations.

CHARACTER OF OUR ALLIANCE WITH THE UNITED STATES

It will soon be 3 years since the signing of the Spanish-American pacts, which have functioned fully and satisfactorily, and on this occasion it seems opportune to recall and analyze the principal characteristics and especially the ideological basis upon which they were founded.

Our American allies have conducted themselves in Spain with consummate correctness in all respects. Our internal life has followed the course, exacted by our history, our temperament, and our interest, along the path of a natural evolution which, with the help of God, has restored order, justice, and prosperity. It is possible that a few men, of good intentions but scant historical experience, consider that in our country one does not find all the ideal conditions of a democratic regime. I would repeat here what I said in 1951 before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Madrid: the Spanish people love liberty above all else, but they have had to suffer too much from licentiousness of opinion, in a country where there can be found by the hundreds of thousands the victims of Communist tyranny, to permit liberty to be exploited by enemies of freedom. We administer our victory and guide our policies to conform to Christian, national, and social ideals that are the fruit of our own secular culture and of our recent historic experience.

But if we wish to be honest with ourselves, we must not hide the fact that our agreements with the United States, signed 3 years ago, begin to look old and are not sufficiently adequate to the new European realities. The atomic arms and the guided missiles appear also in the offensive arsenal of the Soviet Union and have increased the risks of Spain in her participation in the European defense. We cannot limit ourselves to the construction of air bases, which, by their proximity to our great cities increase our dangers in case of conflict. We consider it ineluctable that the military collaboration between the United States and Spain must fully extend to strengthen the Spanish Army, equipping it with modern weapons and bringing up to date all installations and armament of our soldiers. That is why we request a complete collaboration to equip our national army adequately, without submitting our economy to the tremendous burden of meeting the needs of the armed forces perfectly adapted to the role that would correspond to them in a possible war.

This is, in our opinion, an urgent need of the times we are living, if we want to guard against future threats, in our strategic position as the extreme bulwark in Europe, between two seas and on the Strait of Gibraltar.

THE ECONOMIC AID TO SPAIN

Let us continue with the analysis of the Spanish-American pacts, especially that of economic aid. Here also, if we are to be sincere, we must express our desire for a careful revision of the foundations on which rest the aid of the United States to our economy. We cannot forget that Spain was not included in the Marshall plan for European recovery, a plan which has distributed generously among various countries the very large amount of $55 billion. That service to meet the needs of free Europe has permitted the reconstruction of the means of production and transport, and has restored the industries and the economies of the countries thus favored with this generous assistance, so much so, that it can be said that it has saved Europe from destruction and has restored its prosperity, in spite of the immense destruction of war, in a vast and more efficient manner than after the war of 1914–1918. Our country was left outside of this assistance and it is natural that there has been a regrettable delay in the development of our programs of production and industrialization, as compared with the other countries of Europe, which were more fortunate although not more deserving of United States aid. Was not our national war of liberation the first and the most bloody chapter in the defense of Europe against communism? The great damages done during that war could not be repaired completely during the Second World War. The gold of the Bank of Spain, valued at 1,734 million gold pesetas, equivalent to more than $334 million, in 1936, as well as individual savings were looted by the Red government of Madrid and are still in the vaults of the banks of Russia. Certainly, if you will excuse this easy irony, no country in Europe deserved and needed more the generous aid of the Marshall plan, given precisely to stimulate the defense against communist. The present aid to Spain, as it was agreed upon in 1953 is also insufficient. It would be convenient to fill in some manner the delay in the reestablishment of the Spanish economy, giving Spain the same opportunities accorded other countries in Europe through a more generous and better understood assistance. We cannot feel satisfied with the distribution of the assistance granted to us, although we are truly grateful for the sales of agricultural reserves and the assistance extended by the United States Caritas. We shall be much more grateful, naturally, for the investments made in capital goods and in industrial equipment that would permit an increase in our output and would raise the standard of living of our people.

With no other help save that of God, and the hard work of all Spaniards, we have accomplished wonders in our country, restoring our agriculture, increasing industrialization, discovering new sources of energy, and developing the possibilities of our production and our foreign trade to the utmost. The American tourists who now visit Spain constantly to admire her beauties and art treasures, usually realize what our national reconstruction efforts mean, performed exclusively by us without any external aid. What great heights could we not attain for the welfare of our people if the American aid were more generous and liberal, not only in official allotments, but also in other free credits which would reinforce our economy in the manifold fields of national production?

SPANISH-AMERICAN CULTURAL EXCHANGE

I would like to refer to another very interesting aspect of the relations between Spain and the United States; to the cultural relations. We cannot conceive the free association between our peoples if we do not try to establish among them spiritual ties of mutual understanding and common ideals in the development of the other activities, assuring the continued and intimate understanding to which we aspire.

The Embassy of the United States in Madrid, as well as ours in Washington, through their cultural sections, render an efficient service to our mutual relations. We see with satisfaction the work performed in Spain by the United States Information Service of your Embassy in seven of the principal cities, and with vast activities in conferences, publications, libraries, motion pictures, etc. On our part we intend to intensify as far as our means will permit, the Spanish cultural activities in the United States, creating if possible one or several Spanish cultural agencies properly endowed. An essential part of this work is that of scholarships granted mutually for teachers and students. I am most happy to acknowledge the recent extension to Spain of the Fulbright program, wherein $600,000 will be invested, for a period of 3 years, in this fruitful exchange of Spanish and American students. Besides this scholarship program, sponsored by your State Department, and the technical exchange which has been going on for some time, we are also grateful that some of your private foundations, like the old and worthy Del Amo Foundation, are participating in this scientific exchange. I hope that the day is not far off when the Rockefeller, Ford, and other important foundations that afford so many benefits and stimulation to most countries, will dedicate also part of their activities to Spain.

That is why we desire close cultural ties with the United States, in which process I deem it essential to encourage further the study of the Spanish language and of our culture, which has been done in the United States for some time. Before our Civil War and the Second World War, a fruitful exchange between the universities of the United States and Spain was established, fostered by philanthropic students of Spanish culture, to whom today I wish to pay my heartfelt homage. First of all, to the memory of the late Mr. Archer F. Huntington, founder of the Spanish Society of America and the Spanish Library of Congress. I extend my cordial greetings to his widow, Mrs. Anna Huntington.

THE LOYALTY OF SPAIN

With this I finish this rather long speech. I have spoken from my heart trusting in your kind and intelligent indulgence. I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the academic honor bestowed upon me by this splendid university, and for the opportunity that has been granted to me to express with all loyalty my ideas in this new era in the relations between Spain and the United States in which Spain enters with full historic understanding and without fear in the future.

There is, among the artistic treasures of the Museo del Prado, a painting of El Greco, the famous Gentleman With the Hand on His Chest, which portrays the symbol of the highest quality of Spanish chivalry. The face of this man expresses admirably his mystic and humanitarian spirit. The hand on his chest, grasping the hilt of a sword proclaims his unwavering determination to act in the defense of his ideals. Thus, Spain, like that gentleman of Toledo, is always inspired in the highest ideals of humanity, loyalty to her friends, and willing to make all kinds of sacrifices in the defense of freedom and civilization.

Poll of Political Preferences of High School Students Throughout the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky recently extended the right to vote to persons between the ages 18 to 21. We were, therefore, particularly interested in the poll conducted by Wesleyan University to determine the political preferences of high school students throughout the Nation. The total vote in that poll was 433,253 from 12,140 classrooms and it was divided as follows:

Eisenhower (59.76 percent)	258,927
Knowland (1.63 percent)	7,072
Stevenson (19.19 percent)	83,130
Kefauver (17.29 percent)	74,900
Miscellaneous writeins (2.13 percent)	9,224
Total (100 percent)	433,253
Republican candidates (61.94 percent)	268,372
Democratic candidates (37.83 percent)	163,915
Unidentifiable by party (0.23 percent)	966
Total (100 percent)	433,253

President Eisenhower received a clear majority in every State except 5 (Georgia, 44 percent; Louisiana, 47 percent; Minnesota, 43 percent; Mississippi, 46 percent; and South Carolina, 41 percent), and he was the leading candidate in all States. Vice President NIXON received the largest writein vote.

In the Farm Belt, constituting the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, Republicans received 103,093 votes; Democrats received 57,631 votes; others 227.

In the so-called solid South, consisting of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, Republicans received 69,074; Democrats received 56,917; others 584.

The vote for each candidate whose name was on the ballot State by State was as follows:

State	Eisenhower	Knowland	Stevenson	Kefauver
Alabama	7,597	248	4,696	2,090
Arizona	938	37	289	168
Arkansas	2,269	86	1,039	903
California	7,951	276	2,731	1,607
Colorado	2,743	47	1,043	549
Connecticut	3,643	69	974	355
Delaware	169	5	71	46
Florida	8,532	181	2,294	1,930
Georgia	3,967	242	3,021	1,205
Idaho	1,363	42	330	326
Illinois	17,612	351	4,941	3,435
Indiana	8,603	203	2,044	2,116
Iowa	6,667	184	1,139	2,541
Kansas	4,687	134	1,099	940
Kentucky	6,665	118	2,110	2,069
Louisiana	3,944	130	3,226	817
Maine	3,064	43	542	391
Maryland	2,402	63	527	556
Massachusetts	6,956	129	1,810	1,159
Michigan	9,223	141	1,796	1,786
Minnesota	5,135	119	1,811	4,860
Mississippi	2,261	116	1,576	597
Missouri	10,399	355	3,482	4,240
Montana	3,280	154	1,001	1,317
Nebraska	3,346	120	465	912
Nevada	455	9	78	72
New Hampshire	1,487	32	159	449
New Jersey	3,959	86	895	677
New Mexico	2,104	70	749	533
New York	5,532	100	971	615
North Carolina	6,914	188	3,654	2,590
North Dakota	3,384	111	479	1,945
Ohio	18,509	420	4,621	4,031
Oklahoma	2,072	73	1,236	939
Oregon	2,064	39	589	512
Pennsylvania	25,960	624	8,134	6,227
Rhode Island	1,290	30	304	227
South Carolina	2,689	189	2,025	852
South Dakota	1,464	66	212	618
Tennessee	7,037	155	1,583	4,828
Texas	10,543	440	4,598	3,245
Utah	826	33	210	100
Vermont	930	30	113	131
Virginia	7,551	221	3,383	1,639
Washington	1,804	55	819	526
West Virginia	4,972	114	2,164	1,643
Wisconsin	10,581	324	1,388	4,859
Wyoming	1,174	36	39	376
Alaska	17	0	0	1
District of Columbia	131	1	52	28
Other	1,002	33	418	322

President Eisenhower was asked at his May 4 press conference to comment on the poll and whether his landslide vote among the high school seniors and juniors resulted from his appealing repeatedly to the youth of the country to take an active interest in their Government and get ready for their responsibilities of citizenship. He replied:

Well, someone brought in that survey, showed it to me, and I would be less than human if I said I didn't get a lift out of it. Of course I did, because I like youngsters—as a matter of fact, I probably trust them more than lots of people do. [Laughter.] But I think the main thing to be commented upon in that survey is this: The youngsters are taking such an interest in their Government, the policies that are being applied, and the people that are trying to run them.

Now, maybe their judgments are based upon less exact information than you people have. But the fact is that they are taking the interest. Interest in our Government is the one thing that is necessary if this type of Government is to be successful over the years.

The young people must do it, and they must continue through their lives; so I applaud them for taking the interest and going to the trouble of doing all this. I thank every one of them that think I am doing O. K.

Thomas O'Neill, a well-known political analyst, interprets the poll as evidence of a change in the political preference of the young people to the Republican Party. In his April 30, 1956, column in the Baltimore Sun he stated:

Hints that the Democrats may be in for a long siege of dark days appear in a novel presidential preference poll just completed by Wesleyan University. The university consulted the political preferences of nearly half a million students in junior and senior high schools across the Nation in a poll of presidential favorites for November. Like their seniors in other straw votes, the school boys and girls plumped heavily for Mr. Eisenhower, a result which even the Democratic Committee could have anticipated. The chill for the Democrats lay in evidence that the upcoming generation of new voters is shifting to a Republican orientation after a long period in which a stout Democratic asset was that party's appeal to a preponderance of first-voters at each succeeding election. Even Democrats who are ready to concede the reelection of Mr. Eisenhower have looked forward to a comeback in 1960 when he would be ineligible to run. Now they must consider the prospect of more extensive defeats unless a new attraction for young voters can be discovered and developed. * * * Across the Nation, an astonishing 62 percent of the students preferred a Republican over a Democratic President, including the Southern States. This proportion is a sharp reversal of the findings that most persons of voting age consider themselves Democrats and suggest that the new generation of voters will extend Republican rule at Washington incalculably beyond the present administration. President Eisenhower's personal popularity was only in part responsible for the strong Republican showing. His share of the total vote was slightly less than 59 percent.

Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, May 4 was the eighth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. It hardly seems possible, in view of the many accomplishments of this young Nation, that so short a period has elapsed since the date it first achieved independence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared commemorating this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE

It is with particular pleasure that I extend my congratulations to the State of Israel on the eighth anniversary of its independence. One cannot think of this State, so new to the family of nations, without marveling at its remarkable achievements during the short span of its existence.

In spite of the almost continual border difficulties which have consumed so much of her time, which have sapped so much of her energy, and which have resulted in such a tragic drain on her manpower, Israel has made impressive progress in shaping a modern, thriving country.

Since that momentous May 14 in 1948 when the Jewish provisional government under David Ben Gurion proclaimed the State of Israel, with Chaim Weizmann as President, the Jewish Government, in addition to its eternal struggle for survival in the conflict-riddled Middle East, has dealt with many other challenging problems. These have included the absorbing of many survivors of Nazi tyranny, of providing food, housing and education facilities for its mushrooming population, and, finally, of directing the Israeli economy toward a firmer and more independent base through long-range agricultural and industrial programs.

Evidence of Israel's success in meeting these challenges are everywhere to be found. Though the housing problem is still far from solved, the thousands of tents which were thrown up in such haste to accommodate the staggering influx of refugees have already been replaced with less primitive housing. And construction of permanent housing is constantly in process. To meet the overwhelming food shortage, barren desert wastes have been converted into fertile fields by the use of improved technological skills, and increased irrigation. Moreover, industrial output has more than doubled since the establishment of Israel's independence. Largely through the use of outside funds, billions of dollars have been wisely invested in such industrial enterprises as those relating to steel construction, and heavy manufacturing, and in chemical and textile plants—to name a few.

But in meeting the problems of an infant country trying to acquire the basic essentials of life, the Israelis have not neglected the development of their magnificent and ancient traditions of learning and culture. When Israel was but 6 months old, the Knesset passed the Compulsory Education Law which established universal, free and compulsory education for all children from 5 to 14. Since then, the Israelis have been constantly facing the formidable problems of school and teacher shortages, which are complicated by language differences among the pupils.

Quite clearly, in the light of these striking accomplishments, the Israelis have given proof of a vigor and resourcefulness in the molding of their splendid new nation which will not only continue to contribute toward the development of a stable, prosperous state, but which will ultimately have a beneficial influence throughout the whole Middle East. Let us hope that soon the swords of that area may be beaten into plowshares, and that Israel may devote herself fully, in peace, to the development and enrichment of her great and ancient heritage.

The Farm Problem—GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of May 11, 1956, relating to the farm problem.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1956.

A farm editor went to Washington recently, and his comments on what he found in the way of attitudes towards the farm situation are worthy of note. The editor, Art Thompson of Wallace's Farmer magazine, does his research and writing out in the corn and hog country of the great farm State of Iowa. His day-to-day work is with farm people and farm problems, and his writings indicate he understands them. In fact, he's long been a real farmer and was operating his own farm until he took his present job a few months back. So, he's got a first-hand knowledge of the farm situation.

But, in Washington he got a shock. He found a vacuum, as far as appreciation of the economic illness of agriculture in these times of prosperity for other segments of the country is concerned. "The people," he says, "don't quite believe you, even in parts of the Department of Agriculture, when you tell them what is happening to farm income. They listen, but they do not really hear." Yet, he adds, perhaps some of them shouldn't be blamed too severely. After all, about the only time they probably think hard about farm prices is when they go to the grocery store for the family shopping.

And, of course, it's a fact that they won't find price cuts there that serve to fully reflect some of the cuts that have taken place in farm prices. And, also, as Thompson points out, these are people who hear the Secretary of Agriculture "carry on about the record level of land values and the terrible evil of price supports." Another reason he finds it hard to blame the city people for lack of understanding is the obvious one that few city newspapers and magazines treat the farm problem with sympathy. When statistics come out on farm income, he says, they're just likely to wind up somewhere on the inside page of that big-city newspaper.

So, there are good reasons for the failure of the city resident to grasp what has been happening out in the farm country, while business has been booming along with record earnings. There is one thing, though, that will finally jolt people in the city, says farm editor Thompson. That will develop, he says, as the slump in farm buying hurts business more and more. To illustrate what can, and is, happening, he cited the fact that a number of farm machinery companies around the country have been forced to slash production, lay off men, and announce cuts in company earnings to their stockholders.

Yes, that can serve to bring the farm problem close to home for many city people. A lot of them fail to realize that agriculture, despite the decline in farm population, is still a mighty big customer for the products of the steel mills, the rubber plants, the oil industry, the chemical plants, and the producer of consumer goods. A slump in farm buying can be the dynamite that jars the rest of the country into a realization that the farm economy needs real, far-reaching help to boost farm income.

Northwest farmers can help make their bushels work for better farm living by marketing them through their own cooperative organization—that's GTA, the co-op way.

Interdependence of American Labor and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, various attempts have been made in recent months by high administration officials to divide the American people by setting workers against farmers, and vice versa. Some of us have tried to emphasize in our replies that American labor and American agriculture have more interests in common than in conflict.

In the May issue of Textile Labor, the official publication of the Textile Workers of America, AFL-CIO, Governor Orville L. Freeman of Minnesota has contributed an article entitled "Linking Workers and Farmers."

I ask unanimous consent that this constructive and clearheaded account of the interdependence of American labor and agriculture be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINKING WORKERS AND FARMERS
(By Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota)

This is an age of constantly and rapidly increasing interdependence. It is more certain than ever that the continued well-being of any large segment of our economy is dependent upon the prosperity of other groups. This is particularly true of farmers and workers. For it is obvious that the greatest market for food and fiber produced in the United States lies with the American wage earners; and agriculture is a $13 million customer of industry and labor. Ten million people are employed in the marketing and processing of farm products, and 6 million more are employed in plants producing specific farm needs. The interests that farmers and laborers have in common are far greater and more important than any which might seem to conflict. It is therefore not only logical but essential for these groups to work together to achieve their common goals.

Effective farmer-labor cooperation, however logical and important it may be, has been difficult to achieve. The chief reason is lack of understanding. Organizations of each group begin, as they should, by working for limited economic goals. These goals are very important to the group itself, but the indirect benefits that inure to others are not so obvious. When a labor union secures higher wages for its members, the general public, including farmers, may be led to believe that such labor gains have merely resulted in increased prices. There should be a far more general recognition of the fact that the great progress of our American economic system is based on mass production, which could not have attained its present success without the mass purchasing power that results from good wages.

Likewise, when farmers organize to secure higher prices, the general public, including laborers, may be led to believe that such gains have merely resulted in higher food costs. The fact is that the price the farmer gets for his product is the only wage he receives for his labor. When wage-earners recognize this, it is easy for them to understand the interests that farmers and workers have in common.

The general welfare of all of the people would be advanced by a more thorough and widespread understanding of these relationships. This is especially important because special interests, opposed to the goals shared by farm and labor groups, sometimes follow "divide and conquer" tactics. The best way to counteract them is, of course, conscious and effective effort, on the part of both farm and labor groups, to publicize the facts.

Education, publicity and experience can bring about an understanding of the interests and goals which workers and farmers have in common—an understanding that is essential if these goals are to be reached. In Minnesota, organized labor has recognized the importance of such understanding and has carried out efforts directed toward explaining its position to farmers. Some farm organizations and their leaders have done likewise. But results require more than better understanding alone.

The most conspicuous illustration of farmer-labor cooperation in Minnesota is the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. Attempts at such cooperation through political action began a generation ago. Neither farm organizations nor labor unions as such became a part of the political party. But their leaders and their members joined and actively participated, first in the Farmer-Labor Party and then in its successor, the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of today.

The DFL party of Minnesota is not composed exclusively of farmers and workers. It faithfully and democratically represents the interests of all the people—encluding small business and the professions. But since farmers and workers constitute so large a portion of "all of the people" their interests are very well represented.

When the labor section of our party platform is written, it is not done by a committee of writers merely trying to coin phrases that will win the labor vote. It is done by members who have been active in the labor movement, seeking to express what is needed in the interest of labor. And when the draft is written it must be explained in such a way that the nonlabor members of the party will understand and support it.

This in itself is an excellent educational process. For when the farmer delegates who share in the formulation and adoption of the platform go back to their own rural communities, they can explain to their neighbors the reasons for the platform provisions.

This kind of cooperative effort through a political party is particularly important today. For the greater part of our Nation's history, farm and labor groups gave comparatively little attention to political action, but rather sought to attain their ends through economic means. Two recent developments have altered this situation.

First, Government action is becoming increasingly important to both groups. Laws which assist—or in other cases, seriously restrict—union organization and collective bargaining are matters for Government. And in the area of farming, a national program to promote a sound agricultural economy is currently of critical importance. Labor and agriculture are being forced by circumstances into some kind of political activity. They can and do act through political pressure for or against specific legis-

lation. They can also act through the broader mechanism of a political party, thus sharing and participating to a greater extent in choosing candidates and making policy.

In the second place, there is a noticeable trend in both labor and agriculture to widen their interests and expand the scope of their goals. Labor is interested, for example, in far more than wages, working conditions and rules for collective bargaining. It is interested in education, health, social security, human rights and international relations. Government action is decisive in all these fields.

There are many advantages in following the pattern we are working out in Minnesota, a pattern which—instead of following the practice in some countries of organizing a political party for each separate economic group—encourages the working together of many such groups, in a party with a liberal program dedicated to the common interests of all the people. I believe this to be more in line with our American tradition, and more likely to be effective. And I am sure that the interaction, within a party, of several different points of view results in an understanding and a spirit of cooperation that is essential to the operation of democratic government.

In Minnesota countless rank-and-file union members as well as union officers participate in the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party ar regular party members, rather than as official representatives of their organizations. The same is true of farmers and others. Their ability and vision has contributed immeasurably to our success. Democratic ideals and methods must today stand the test and prove their worth, not only in the United States but throughout the world. And democratic principles and practices within the political party are in themselves a part of this process. I can think of no better area in which labor and agriculture can work together to promote the better living and the greater freedom that we all want.

The Polish Constitution: Symbol of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, among the many brave and gallant peoples presently enslaved by the Communist conspiracy are the people of Poland. It is altogether fitting that their millions of friends in America and throughout the free world note the 165th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, which remains one of the great documents in man's long struggle to be free and independent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in commemoration of this important anniversary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION: SYMBOL OF FREEDOM

Today we are commemorating the 165th anniversary of Poland's constitution, and I am grateful for the opportunity to assure the Polish people in our own country as well as the millions of our Polish friends behind the Iron Curtain that we have not forgotten the plight of Poland.

This anniversary is one of the great events in the long history of Poland. For it was by the constitution of May 3, 1791, that it was decreed that Poland would be a nation of freedom, based on laws made by the people. It contains this statement: "All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people."

The road to constitutional reform was not an easy one, although Poland was one of the first of the pioneers of liberalism in Europe. In 1347, Poland established the first complete code of laws existing then in Christian Europe. In 1413, the leaders of Poland and Lithuania executed an agreement, the language of which proclaimed the brotherhood of nations for the first time in history. In 1430, the security of the individual was recognized and safeguarded by law in Poland, and as this same law was constantly broadened, it became the nucleus of Poland's unparalleled political and religious liberties.

For 2 years preceding the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791, the Polish Diet held intense discussions until there was general concurrence in the character of the constitution. The resultant document included many of the political principles and constitutional practices of the countries most advanced in democracy at that time. It contained many of the forms and practices found in our own Constitution as well as in the British. Such things as the separation of powers, bicameral legislation, the elements of cabinet responsibility, the independent judiciary, and majority rule, all these and more are found in the Polish constitution.

It may readily be seen that the fact that Poland succeeded in these early days to achieve such great progress was due almost entirely to the genius of the Polish people themselves. The descendants of these same democratically minded people have now been thrust ruthlessly under a terroristic, totalitarian police state.

For the sake of these Poles under the Soviet oppression let us all now rededicate ourselves to the cause of constitutional democracy. We know with certainty that the day will come when the Polish people and their oppressed neighbors in Eastern Europe will be enabled to throw off the chains that bind them. We are also confident that the free men in our own great Nation will help assure the return of Poland to its traditional position of honor among the free nations of the world.

Statement by Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Obligation of Soviet Union To Remove Troops From Rumania and Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pointing out the obligation resting on the Soviet Union to remove its troops from Rumania and Hungary, with the coming into effect of the Austrian State Treaty.

The citation is from pages 8 and 9 of Executive Report No. 8 of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is dated June 15, 1955, nearly a year ago; but it is even more pertinent today than it was when first made.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY

10. WITHDRAWAL OF SOVIET FORCES FROM SATELLITES

When the State Treaty with Austria comes into effect, there will no longer be a peace-treaty basis for the Soviet Union to maintain its troops in Rumania and Hungary to protect its lines of communication to Austria.

The committee asked the Secretary of State whether steps will be taken to ascertain whether Soviet troops will be withdrawn from these countries in compliance with the terms of the peace treaties. Mr. Dulles recalled that some provisions of the treaties of peace with Rumania and Hungary, as well as Bulgaria, have been flagrantly violated in the past. He stated, however, that the Department is actively studying "to see what basis we have for asking for the withdrawal of troops" since "one consequence of the making of the treaty should be withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and Rumania."

The committee fully supports the Department of State in its efforts to seek full compliance with those provisions of these treaties relating not only to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Rumania and Hungary, but also to treaty limitations imposed on the size of the armed forces which Rumania, and Hungary, and Bulgaria as well, may maintain.

Nomination of Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas as National Commander, Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech by Mr. Stuart A. Lindman, given at the last convention of the Disabled American Veterans, at which time Mr. Lindman placed in nomination for national commander of the Disabled American Veterans the name of a distinguished Minnesotan, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas. General Maas was at one time a Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I recall him vividly. For many years I served with him on the same committee, and I am a great admirer of his.

Mr. THYE. General Maas was a great soldier and a very able Member of Congress. I know he is serving the Disabled Veterans in a most commendable manner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And he is a citizen of which any State would be proud.

Mr. THYE. Yes; and we are very proud of him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATION OF MAJ. GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS FOR NATIONAL COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

(By Stuart A. Lindman, commander, Minneapolis Chapter No. 1)

Mr. Commander and fellow delegates, it is a distinct honor to address the chosen of America's disabled defenders.

We have deliberated and debated, denounced and discussed, charged and praised, and reveled in good fellowship this past week. Comes now the climax of our convention, that hour when we look through our ranks for the man behind whom, more than any other, we will rally to the call.

We have served, sacrificed, and continue to suffer; we are brothers and sisters all; pain is our common denominator.

Only two symbols are paid for with a higher price than our proud emblem and standard, the Cross, the Star of David. And we shall not break faith with those who have died. To be mindful of our venerable chaplain's words, "He's not heavy, Father, he's my brother." Now is the hour when we name the man who carries the most of our burden; now is the hour when we name our spokesman * * * spokesman not in name only, but with the complete charge of aggressive leadership. We of the DAV count no cost to ourselves too great in the continued service of country and, in particular, our responsibilities to the war's disabled, their dependents, and their survivors. We so charge each leader of our DAV, local, State, district, and national.

In the critical year ahead we must be prepared to divide and roll the enemy's attack; to make ready the guard against any and every, even seemingly passive recommendation, bill, or declaration in or out of the halls of Congress, which might be adverse to war's disabled and their dependents. Our call is articulate.

I bring forth today the name of one who personifies the purposes of the DAV, namely: To uphold and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States; to fight for the realization of true American ideals; to work for the betterment of the disabled; to cooperate with Government officials; to serve comrades, community, and country.

This man's record parallels our purpose. Here is the man who has distinguished himself in his many fields of endeavor.

He entered the Marine Corps in 1917; served with marine aviation in the Azores, and in 1926 accepted a Marine Reserve commission. In 1941 he served at sea on the staff of Adm. William Halsey. In 1942 he served with Admiral Fletcher in the Solomons campaign. He served as Marine Corps observer with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Australia and New Guinea. He was awarded the Silver Star for service with the Army Air Force. He won the Legion of Merit in combat. In 1945 he assumed command of the Awase Air Base on Okinawa, where he was wounded by enemy action. On June 1, 1950, he was promoted to brigadier general. Progressive blindness overtook him in 1952, and August 1 of that year he was retired.

Not only has he distinguished himself on the field of battle, but also in the halls of Congress. He was first elected to the Congress in 1926 at the early age of 27. He served from 1927 to 1933, and again from 1935 to 1945. During his career in Congress he specialized in legislation promoting aviation, national defense, and measures to improve the unemployment situation. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House he sponsored several international conferences designed to bring about better relations with foreign powers.

As a member of the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Policies Board, he was named chairman in September of 1950 of a special committee to clarify the status of thousands of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Reserves during the limited mobilization. He advises the Secretary of Defense on Reserve legislation; he is chairman of the board of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association; he is legislative chairman of the Reserve Officers' Association; he is a past commander in chief of the Military Order of the World Wars.

He holds a degree of doctor of laws, awarded by the College of St. Thomas, his alma mater.

To borrow some of the words of the Honorable LAURENCE CURTIS, spoken in the House of Representatives a few days ago: The DAV, under the command of this gentleman will "not permit the disabled veterans to become mere forgotten heroes, to be relegated to the economic scrap pile, for the future welfare of our country is inevitably linked with the welfare of the disabled war veterans."

Here is one whose integrity will allow us not to use only his name in our good cause, but whose loyalty to the troops will dictate his going forth to do battle with our every adversary, whose creed of honor will dictate his strengthening the gains and friendships we have won and established through these years on the legislative battlefield. He will hold the ground won. Even as those before us have called him from the ranks, have reached out and virtually plucked him from the battle for service in a higher eschelon only because of his meritorious service, even so, in our beloved DAV, this man is beholden to none, has never become embroiled in the politics of our struggles and growth. He is truly the man whom we can serve unitedly. Promised nothing, nor having been promised, he owes none. He works only for the common good. He is free of mind and of program. His service has in no way been shackled, nor would his strength of purpose allow same. There can be no dissenting voice in the choice of a commander as strong and noble as this leader.

There is no great credit for selection of this man due any one individual or collective group. As you hear, ours will not be the first organization to extend a call for his training, talent, experience, his heart and mind and very being.

Surely, here is one who has Divine guidance.

The 15th Psalm of David answers: "Who shall dwell in God's holy hill?"

He that walketh uprightly.
He that worketh righteousness.
He who speaks the truth in his heart.
He who back-biteth not with his tongue.
He who takes not reproach against his neighbor.
He who condemns the vile.
He who swears to his own hurt and changeth not.
He who takes no reward against the innocent.

I want to be with that man and for that man, and I'm sure you do, too.

In this choice can we proudly manifest the great heart of the Disabled American Veterans. We here will call forth, for the first time in history, the champion of America's nonservice disabled, the chairman of the President's Committee on Employment to the Physically Handicapped, to now also serve those who have sacrificed parts of body and health in the service of country.

I need not review the uncertain year ahead; if we knew not the critical area we enter, we would not be here in convention assembled. It is paramount our leader be of noble stature. To paraphrase the Psalmist, "The good walk on every side, when the morally purest men are exalted."

We, the chosen of, by, and for America's disabled defenders, having aided in maintaining the honor and integrity and supremacy of our country, holding in remembrance the sacrifices in common made, and drawn together by strong bonds of respect and mutual suffering, will solemnly and firmly reassociate ourselves together in exalting to the post of National Commander of the DAV, the man whose name I place in nomination at this time.

Let his sight be our light. We have seen all of the terror and hells of war; now would to God that in this man's sacrifice he can give us the light, the insight to encourage in all people the spirit of understanding which will guard against future wars.

Gentlemen, I give you the name and nomination of Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas.

The Cure of Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, certainly no organization has done more to combat juvenile delinquency than the Boys' Clubs of America, which will mark their 50th anniversary this year. Undoubtedly, one of the contributing factors to the success of the Boys' Clubs of America has been the able leadership of such persons as the Honorable Herbert Hoover, who has served as chairman of this organization for the past 20 years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech he recently made at the dedication of the new Columbia Park Boys' Club building in San Francisco, outlining the worthwhile work being done by Boys' Clubs everywhere.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CURE OF DELINQUENCY AND THE MAKING OF GOOD CITIZENS

(An address by the Honorable Herbert Hoover at the cornerstone laying of the new building of the Columbia Park Boys Club, San Francisco, Calif.)

It is an honor to participate here in the laying of the cornerstone for a new building of the Columbia Park Boys Club. This was one of the earliest boys clubs established in the United States. It was due to that great San Francisco spirit Maj. Sidney Peixotto, and it has shed blessing on this city now for 61 years.

I have been on this team for only 20 years as chairman of the national board. In my time alone I have witnessed the number of clubs double—from 200 to over 400. I have seen them established in 300 towns and cities. This is no paper organization. To build and equip a club like this cost from $300,000 to $500,000. We have in this 20 years had the satisfaction of the growth of a nationwide investment in these clubs from $20 million to over $120 million.

The clubs have become one of the great character building institutions of our country. They turn out every year thousands of assured loyal and patriotic citizens. And every club is a voluntary institution supported by the generosity of the citizens of their city. There is no governmental hand in them.

Our country is greatly agitated over the growth of teen-age delinquency. There are a multitude of proposed remedies. Most of them gyrate around ideas of how mothers and fathers and teachers can do a better job. Most of these remedies ignore four primary forces insofar as our congested districts are concerned.

First. These boys are endowed with dynamic energy. The world is new and must be fully explored. They have an impelling desire for adventure, discovery, and great undertakings. They have competition and combat in their bones. Their primary instinct is to hunt in a pack in search for adventure and joy.

Second. We have laid pavements and cement over most of their out-of-door space in our congested city districts.

Third. These boys can no longer find outlets for their energies in the woods or on the streams and the animals to be captured.

Fourth. We send these youngsters to school for 6 or 8 hours during the day and we leave them to the paved streets for the evenings, and Saturdays and Sundays.

Do you wonder that with these innate qualities and the surroundings that these boys conspire by gangs to engage in destructive joy and the excitement of battle?

This is where the Boys Clubs come in. Here we provide a place where gang spirit and competition expend themselves in organized games. If the youngsters need to do combat, they are given the gloves and operate under rules of sportsmanship. Here in these clubs they expand their creative spirits through the mysteries of woodworking, machine tools, books, and musical instruments. Here they find their bent for future life. Here they conduct their own government and their own discipline. Here they receive constant sympathetic friendliness and guidance from a trained staff of devoted men and women. When they are in these rooms, mother has no anxieties and father broods over no homecoming chastisement.

These clubs are the greatest cure for delinquency in our country. I could prove it to you by the statistics from 300 cities. In one Chicago district alone, the number of boys in the hands of the police every year decreased from 80 percent to only 12 percent.

There are facts which cannot be ignored. The boy members of these clubs cannot afford streetcar or bus fares. Their walking distance is about 1 mile. Thus the clubs become a bright spot of decency within a 2-mile radius or a little more. And there are 3 million pavement boys in the United States. The Nation needs more of these clubs.

Today is the day of the Columbia Park Boys' Club. Its chairman, Mr. Costello, its board of directors of leading citizens, and its director, Mr. Julian Hargrove, have undertaken to erect this modern building and equipment at a cost of about $500,000. Their support has come from generous citizens of San Francisco, the contribution of materials from many manufacturers and contractors. And especially among these contributions has been the free labor from the labor unions. The club needs more support to complete its new building and its operation. That support costs less than police, the courts, and the reformatories, for here is a white spot in delinquency, a stimulant and a training and creation of good citizens. This will be a better city because of it.

My admiration goes out to all who have a part in it.

Score One for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of April 17, 1956:

SCORE ONE FOR INDIA

India has come forward with a suggestion somewhat more fitting to her avowed role of neutralism in the cold war.

India proposes a year's postponement of the nationwide elections in Vietnam, which had been set for July under the 1954 Geneva agreement ending the Indochina war.

This is sensible—if for no other reason than the fact South Vietnam won't agree to holding these elections. She is within her rights on this because she never was a signatory to the pact which turned over half the country to the Communists.

President Diem, of South Vietnam, contends the anti-Communist side couldn't get a fair count in these elections with the Reds controlling the more populous North Vietnam. He is supported in this stand by the United States and Britain. But he risks widespread criticism for blocking democratic processes.

Postponement of the issue for a year would save face all around. India's proposal should find ready acceptance, even from Russia.

Eighty-fifth Birthday Anniversary of Mrs. Elizabeth Lambert Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Arizona Daily Star of Wednesday, March 28, 1956, concerning the 85th birthday of Mrs. Elizabeth Lambert Wood, who has devoted her life and material means to the benefit of mankind; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article from the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press of Wednesday, March 14, 1956, describing the philosophy which has always actuated Mrs. Wood.

There being no objection, the news stories were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Arizona Daily Star of March 28, 1956]

MRS. WOOD WILL BE 85 SATURDAY—PHILANTHROPIST TO BE HONORED BY FRIENDS

Mrs. Elizabeth Lambert Wood—Mother Wood to thousands of southern Arizona youngsters—will be honored for her services to youth this weekend when she reaches her 85th birthday.

The pioneer rancher of the Oracle Mountain area will celebrate her birthday Saturday and on Sunday friends will gather at the Triangle Y ranch camp—the mountain area she donated to the Tucson YMCA—to congratulate her.

Mrs. Wood first gave Peppersauce Canyon, an attractive wooded area, to the city of Tucson and then later to the Salvation Army for a district camp. In 1948 she gave the Tucson Young Men's Christian Association her Crooked G ranch, which has been established as the Triangle Y ranch camp.

The camp has grown from 28 youngsters per period to a year-round program. Future plans call for a building program, including a conservation classroom and the establishment of an early western American museum at Mrs. Wood's Hilltop House. The museum's library will feature books on the early West, and writers, ministers, and others will be able to use it for research and writing.

At the Triangle Y camp this Sunday, from 2 p. m. to 6 p. m., many of Mrs. Wood's friends from southern Arizona will come to pay respects. The camp board of the Tucson YMCA has set aside the day as Mother Wood Day. Camp board president, Abe Chanin, has invited Tucsonans to visit the Triangle Y this Sunday.

Governor McFarland noted the occasion by congratulating Mrs. Wood and saying: "The impact of your life and worthwhile deeds on the community and its citizens is indicated in some degree by the spontaneous outpouring of affection by the people who honor you. I join the host of your friends in wishing you many more years of successful and happy living."

Mrs. Wood, whose grandfather developed the Lambert cherry in Oregon, is a pioneer of the Oracle Mountain area. She has written many children's books and poems.

She gives this as her secret of living: "I would say, have a good time at whatever you are doing, or have to do. As a child I laughed often. Glancing back over years of health and activity, I wonder if my laughing did not contribute to my sound mind and body."

[From the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press of March 14, 1956]

BYPATHS OF HISTORY

(By Guy Allison)

To what habits of living does an 85-year-old woman writer of "Wild West" stories attribute her buoyant outlook on life?

Among the remarkable persons with whom we have claimed warm friendship for years is Mrs. Elizabeth Lambert Wood, now spending the winter at her desert ranch near Oracle, Ariz. Mrs. Wood is a popular western story writer, daughter of the fruit grower who created the Lambert cherry, which is known all over our country. We both have summer homes within 10 miles of each other on the low lying peninsula which extends 27 miles northward from the mouth of the Columbia River. Never ceasing to wonder at the virility of mind and body of Mrs. Wood, this writer recently wrote to her and asked her:

"What have you discovered about the art of living?"

Here is the answer just received from this rootin', tootin', shootin' octogenarian.

"My long time friend, Guy Allison, author of this widely read column, traveler and historian, knowing that I am within a few days of my 85th birthday, asked me the secret of my active life at an age reached by relatively few people. Basically, I would say, have a good time at whatever you are doing, or have to do.

"As a child I laughed often, as the eighth of 10 children. My laughing often irked others, and I was frequently admonished, 'When you grow older life won't seem so funny.'

"Glancing back over years of health and activity, I wonder if my laughing did not contribute to my sound body which has never needed the touch of a knife. My life has been enjoyed in the company of the salt of the earth, beginning with a wonderful grandfather, my own father, my husband, son, daughter, grandson, sister, brothers, aunts and uncles, nieces and nephews. Through them I learned the priceless riches of family and friends.

"The greatest discovery of all? Have faith in God. I try to remember to accept His bounty with humility. Get as much excitement out of finding the first wild strawberry in spring, as in climbing a mountain or setting off for Europe.

"Blot out disappointment in people and events. Early learn to acknowledge that no competition confronts anyone except to outstrip himself. It is necessary in climbing

to see that those beside you are also happy in their work.

"Face danger unafraid, knowing that God is with you, directing you to meet the challenge. Pay bills promptly; keep your credit and conscience clean. Work for hours each day at something that delights you, that quickens your creative ability. Delight also in learning something worthwhile each day—perhaps the memorizing of some beautiful poem or the Sermon on the Mount.

"Get a thrill out of everything—eating, sleeping, working, visiting. This is a world in which each of us is essential. Again I say, above all, let your faith in God grow day by day. Daily whet your taste for beauty. Melt out of heart and mind every uncharitable estimate of your neighbor. First in the morning throw out the window all distaste for a job, your fellow workmen, and the world about us."

So we have from this dear friend a view of life which is most exhilarating. I thought you might enjoy hearing how she has attained such rich living at such an advanced age.

Indian Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Oliver LaFarge, president of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. The letter of the distinguished Mr. LaFarge was printed in the New York Times of Sunday, May 13.

I call attention to it particularly with respect to calendar No. 1748, H. R. 5566, to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Its passage by the Senate, which I hope will come about at an early date, will do much to permit the settlement of Indian claims.

The letter of Mr. LaFarge is a distinct contribution to an understanding of the measure and its purpose.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN CLAIMS SUPPORTED—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CRITICIZED FOR SEEKING REVERSAL OF COURTS

(AUTHOR'S NOTES.—The writer of the following letter is president of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. He is the author of Laughing Boy and other books about the Southwest.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Most Americans know that in past years the Federal Government has violated a series of solemn agreements with our Indian fellow citizens. Few realize, however, that the Indians today face a broken promise as outrageous as any in the Nation's history.

Until 1946 every Indian tribe was barred by law from seeking redress in the courts for wrongs done by the United States. As a measure of justice and humanity Congress then established a special commission to hear and finally determine all unsettled Indian claims. Acting in reliance upon that pledge of fair treatment, the tribes have vigorously prosecuted their claims for 10 years, including, in some cases, the expenditure of thousands of dollars of their own funds for research and legal expenses.

In 1955 the Otoe and Missouria tribe won a significant victory when the Court of Claims, affirming a commission holding, ruled that the Indians were entitled to compensation under the law for the taking by the Government of lands which they formerly possessed under so-called "original Indian title"; that is, ownership based upon exclusive use and occupancy, rather than upon "recognition" by the United States. The Supreme Court subsequently refused to review that decision.

DEFEAT WITHOUT TRIAL

The Department of Justice, which lost th Otoe and Missouria case on the merits, now is asking Congress to reverse the courts through legislation. Specifically, the department urges that the Indian Claims Commission Act be changed to eliminate original Indian title claims from its coverage. Any such amendment, if adopted, automatically would defeat more than two-thirds of the claims on file without even the formality of a trial.

The chief arguments of the Department in support of its position are not based upon justice or morality, but rather are based on the contention that Congress in 1946 did not intend to compensate Indians for the loss of lands held by original Indian title, and upon the supposed high cost to the Government of righting past wrongs.

The argument as to congressional intent originally was presented in great detail to the Court of Claims, and was flatly rejected by that court in a unanimous, carefully reasoned opinion. The argument as to the alleged excessive cost—purportedly $5 billion—utilizes not facts but estimates that are demonstrably exaggerated. Actual experience in prior Indian claims litigation indicates that these figures on possible judgments are more than 25 times the amounts which reasonably can be expected.

REPREHENSIBLE ACT

In seeking by false representations to scare Congress into revoking a remedial statute 10 years after it was passed, the actions of the Department of Justice are reprehensible on their face. At least equally disgraceful is the premise that their day in court should be withheld from an impoverished and deserving people because of the supposed high cost of doing justice.

Indians throughout the country took on new hope when the Indian Claims Commission was established. Through recoveries for old injuries, the tribes intended to finance the future social and economic rehabilitation of their members. To destroy these hopes by changing the law at a time when the claims are on the verge of final settlement would be a sorry breach of faith from which the Indians might not recover for generations.

OLIVER LAFARGE.

NEW YORK, *May 9, 1956.*

The Kansas National Guard Prior to World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, our memories of national guardsmen in World War I and World War II, are apt to cause us to forget some of their earlier history, of which we are reminded in these stories of early day history which appeared in a special edition of the Kansas City Kansan, May 5, in connection with the dedication of a million dollar armory.

Citizens of Kansas City, Kans., guardsmen served along with units from other States on the Mexican border, as shown by this article:

CITY FURNISHED GUARDSMEN FOR DUTY ON BORDER

Kansas City, Kans., furnished an infantry company when President Woodrow Wilson ordered the National Guard into Federal service to guard the Mexican border following Pancho Villa's raid on Columbus, N. M., in 1916.

This was Company A, 1st Kansas infantry, which later became Company A, 137th Infantry, and was commanded by Capt. Archie Rupert.

The two Kansas infantry regiments mobilized at Fort Riley, Kans., early in June and were moved by train to Eagle Pass, Tex., where for several months they trained and did guard duty along the Rio Grande.

They were then moved to San Antonio, Tex., by truck, the first time in the history of the United States Army that an infantry regiment, with all its equipment, was moved from one station to another by truck.

A provisional division was formed in San Antonio and maneuvered to Austin and back. The soldiers, carrying full pack, covered the 180 miles round trip on foot.

While at Austin the troops were reviewed about September 1 by Maj. Gen. Frederick Funston, department commander, who was to die about 2 months later. The famous Kansas soldier had commanded the 20th Kansas volunteer infantry, an ancestor regiment of the 1st Kansas Infantry and the 137th Infantry, in the Philippines in 1899.

The two Kansas regiments were moved back to Fort Riley in November, and were mustered out of Federal service and back into State service.

And an earlier, less well-remembered conflict, the Spanish-American War, Kansas played a part, which is interwoven into the history of the 137th Infantry:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY LINEAL DESCENDENT OF OLD 20TH

The present 137th Infantry of the Kansas National Guard is the lineal descendent of the 20th Kansas Volunteer Infantry Regiment which served in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Islands.

And it has been assigned the battle streamers and other honors of the famous 20th Kansas Regiment.

At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, Kansas City, Kans., was the home station of an infantry company of National Guard and rather than order out the existing regiments intact, Gov. John W. Leedy, of Kansas, ordered the recruiting of additional volunteer regiments for Federal service.

There was considerable controversy concerning the order and the result was that whole companies of national guardsmen enlisted as groups in the newly formed regiments. The extent of the enlistments was so great that the Department of the Army has officially recognized the present 137th Infantry Division as the lineal descendant of that regiment.

Company B, of the 20th Kansas Regiment, was from Kansas City, Kans., and probably is best remembered through the exploits of one of its late citizens, Sgt. William B. Trembley, who was awarded the Medal of Honor while a member of that unit. Although the regiment did not arrive in the Philippines until after the peace treaty with Spain had been signed, the Philippine In-

surgents had revolted and that regiment participated in the campaign to quell the revolt.

The regiment was commanded by Frederick Funston, who held the rank of colonel at that time, and he, Sergeant Trembley, and Edward White were awarded Congressional Medals of Honor for their activities in the crossing of the Bag Bag River in the Philippines.

Following the Spanish-American War, the regiment was reorganized as the 1st Infantry, Kansas National Guard, which later became the present 137th Infantry, Kansas National Guard.

House Leaders To Be Joint Commencement Speakers at Syracuse University on June 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced to the House that two of our most distinguished legislators are to receive honorary degrees from the Syracuse University on June 4. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, through the RECORD, an editorial and an article which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal relating to this forthcoming event:

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 8, 1956]

CONGRESS LEADERS TO GIVE ADDRESSES AT HILL GRADUATION JUNE 4—RAYBURN, MARTIN HONORED—INVITATIONS ACCEPTED

The Democratic and Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have accepted bids to be joint commencement speakers at Syracuse University on Monday, June 4.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, and former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, will share the commencement platform and receive honorary degrees.

This was confirmed today by the Herald-Journal's Washington Bureau. Official announcement by Syracuse University is expected tomorrow. Last year's speaker was Governor Harriman.

RAYBURN and MARTIN, bachelors and personal friends, have been playing musical chairs in Congress for many years. When Democrats control the House, RAYBURN is Speaker. When Republicans take over, MARTIN wields the gavel.

LONG TIME IN OFFICE

The two men presided at their parties' national political conventions in 1952 and are expected to play the same roles at the 1956 conventions in August.

RAYBURN, a lawyer, has the longest consecutive service in Congress, 22 terms or 44 years. Previously, he served in the Texas Legislature.

MARTIN, a newspaper publisher, has served 16 terms or 32 years, and is outranked in service by only 4 Republicans, including Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn, and Representative DANIEL REED, of Dunkirk. MARTIN served in the Massachusetts Legislature before moving to Washington.

RAYBURN, who was 74 on January 6, is almost 3 years older than MARTIN, who won't reach his 72d birthday until November 3.

PARTY RULERS

MARTIN is an easygoing, pleasant man who can be tough on occasion, but RAYBURN never lets down ruling his party with an iron hand.

He won a victory in the Texas primary this week, teaming up with his protege Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, to take control of the Texas delegation to the national convention away from Governor Allan Shivers.

Representative MARTIN has spoken in Rochester on several occasions, but his visit next month will be his first to Syracuse, at least in recent years. It will also be Speaker RAYBURN's first visit to Syracuse.

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 9, 1956]

NO ALPHONSE GASTON ACT, BUT AN AMERICAN POLITICAL TRADITION

Syracusans and central New Yorkers, along with the other guests of Syracuse University, are in for a treat at next month's graduation exercises: Two landmarks of American politics in their familiar pose of sharing the same rostrum.

Some of us would hesitate to issue a joint invitation to two Members of the House of Representatives who lead opposing factions. But SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts have been sharing the Speakership of the House, at least working in tandem for so long, that what would be more natural, even during a partisan election year?

Speaker RAYBURN doesn't visit the White House these days as often as Minority Leader MARTIN. We read his comments, and after the war, saw him on TV, from 1940 on until MARTIN first succeeded him as Speaker in the 80th Congress. They've exchanged gavels once more since then (in the 83d), and it is Speaker SAM, now, and, JOE MARTIN is the voice of the minority.

Both men are in their early 75's. Both have been so long identified with the House of Representatives that we find it difficult to recall a session when their names didn't appear on the roster.

You have to go back to 1913 when Champ Clark, of Missouri, was ruling the House with an iron hand to find the first RAYBURN entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. JOE MARTIN went to Congress 16 years later, being first elected to the 69th in 1925 when Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, was Speaker.

Every 4 years, the Speaker and the minority leader, no matter who bears the title, part company. That's at national convention time. Both blossomed into gavel wielding stars in 1952.

They part company, too, on votes and issues usually on something like tariffs or farm aid. When they give the sign, however, appropriation bills sail through like greased lightning. Or any measure they deem "for the good of the Nation" which has been often in the years of war and of a nervous peace.

It is natural, and appropriate, they should appear on the Syracuse University stage. After all, that has become a habit with SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN. Note, too, we haven't had to employ the identification of Republican or Democrat once. There was no need.

The Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was flattered that my friend and associate on the Small Business Committee of this House required yesterday nearly 7 pages of the RECORD in response to some suggestions I made on this floor quite recently.

However, in thousands of words of talk for the RECORD, I must insist that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] failed to answer my points satisfactorily.

I said in my suggestions that the full committee has not held a single meeting during the first 5 months of this session of Congress, except for a short assembly in pursuance of the resolution for more money to spend in investigations.

I have not yet heard any answer as to why the committee has no meetings.

Why have a committee that does not meet?

My second point was the subcommittees of small business are wandering far afield from matters pertaining to small enterprise and invading areas of which are properly the concern of standing committees of this House.

Here again there was lament and protest but no explanation or expression of regret.

My third point was that much of the $330,000 granted by this House for use of the committee was wasted in pursuits as useless as a fox-terrier dog chasing the community cats. I said, and I repeat, we have reams of pages covering hearings, but not as many pages of report as might be found in a small-town telephone directory.

I say again to my worthy chairman and friend: When do we meet as a committee; when do we agree on an agenda within our realm, and when do we report on the matters that cost so much of the public money?

Two Vital Hearings on Air Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under the present air-service pattern, no airline is certificated to furnish direct service from the San Francisco Bay area to Tokyo and points beyond. To allow the natural development of business and social association between our residents and the Orient, it is vitally important that approval of Pan American World Airways, Inc., application be granted by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is currently conducting hearings on this case. I am submitting the following editorial, from the San Francisco Examiner, substantiating the need we have for this service and that of the great circle route from the west coast to London, Paris, and beyond:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of May 8, 1956]

TWO VITAL HEARINGS ON AIR ROUTES

Two hearings this month will go far toward determining how important a place San Francisco shall hold on the great world air routes of the future. Success in both

hearings is, we believe, essential to the city's role as an international trade center.

The Civil Aeronautics Board will reopen hearings in Washington May 15 on Pan American World Airways' application to fly great circle to Tokyo. The following week hearings will be held here on the applications of Pan American and Trans World Airlines to fly great circle from the west coast to London, Paris, and beyond.

The stake is great because, as jet passenger planes come into service, the shorter great circle lanes will get more and more of the travel now moving along the earth's waist. More and more cities will be overflown because of increasing flight ranges. The cities that nail down places as terminals on these great circle routes will emerge as the international air centers of tomorrow.

Though for a year the city has been pursuing, with great success, a policy of fighting aggressively for new routes and services, the policy came too late to keep San Francisco abreast of its neighboring cities in the great circle competition. Los Angeles has a phenomenally successful great circle service to the Scandinavian countries; Seattle has one to the Orient.

Success in the forthcoming hearings would enable San Francisco to catch up and even develop a lead over its neighbors. For instance, Pan American's proposed schedule on the great circle to Europe would start and finish here 4 of 7 weekly flights, and the other 3 would land here. On the same line's proposed great circle to Asia, San Francisco would remain the major terminal as it is now on the longer waist route.

It should be so. The San Francisco area presently generates the largest single volume of traffic to and from the Orient. And, much to everybody's surprise, the CAB's most recent study showed this area generating more traffic to Europe than the Los Angeles area.

We are glad to report that city and civic officials here (and in surrounding cities too) are alert to the importance of the hearings. They are prepared to push hard. We are also glad to note that the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce is sending an official to New York this week to make personal bids to Sabena Belgian Airlines and KLM, Royal Dutch Airlines, both of which are eyeing the west coast. This is the kind of aggressiveness that wins commercial air battles.

Supplemental Appropriations of the Department of Agriculture for the Mediterranean Fruitfly

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to express gratification for the prompt action which the Congress has taken to meet an emergency situation in Florida which can have dire consequences for the entire Nation and particularly the southern one-third of the United States. I speak of the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida which was located in Miami but has now been found as far north as west Palm Beach, which is in my own congressional district. As soon as the first word of the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida was heard, the State of Florida went into action, as well as the Florida congressional delegation, which called upon the Department of Agriculture to lend all possible aid. I want to commend not only the State of Florida, but the Department of Agriculture as well, for the very fine cooperation that has been extended and is continuing to meet this problem.

Senator HOLLAND, who is a member of the Appropriations and Agriculture Committees of the Senate, joined by Senator SMATHERS, presented the problem to the necessary committees of the Senate and had the experts from Florida and the Department of Agriculture to explain the extent of the problem. Our own House Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, headed by its very able chairman, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, when contacted by the Florida House Members, was most sympathetic to our problem. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] took the unusual step of opening up his committee's hearings, which had already been concluded, to allow testimony to be presented to the committee so that the emergency situation could be dealt with effectively. I think this is one of the finest examples of showing how rapidly Congress can and does step forward to meet those situations which are in the national welfare. I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for expressing its concern about the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in south Florida. The committee stated in its report:

> The committee is concerned about the recent discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in southern Florida. It feels that every necessary action must be taken immediately to control and eliminate this threat to the citrus industry of the country.

In the appropriation bill reported from the committee, and acted upon by the House, increases are given for $500,000 for the contingency fund for emergency outbreaks of insects; $500,000 to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs for increased baggage checks to prevent importation of dangerous insects; and $110,300 for increased inspection at ports of entry.

As I stated at the beginning, the Mediterranean fruitfly has now been found in West Palm Beach, which is some 70 miles north of the first located infestation in Florida. This means that the problem is larger than first anticipated, and I feel that we will have to call upon the Congress for additional funds when the full extent of the infestation is known. Work is going ahead rapidly now to discover this information. I feel sure that the committee which has acted so promptly in initiating a program to combat the Mediterranean fruitfly, will give the same careful consideration to requests for supplemental appropriations so that this infestation may be completely controlled.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Personal Property Made Available for Distribution to and Real Property Disposed of to Educational and Public Health Institutions, January 1 Through March 31, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare showing a State-by-State list of real and personal property distributed during the quarter January 1, 1956, through March 31, 1956. This property was made available to educational and public-health institutions in accordance with Public Law 61 of the 84th Congress:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions, Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1956 (acquisition cost)

[In accordance with sec. 5, Public Law 61, 84th Cong.]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$54,716,724	$3,006,998	$57,723,722
Alabama	1,327,895		1,327,895
Arizona	659,147	53,567	712,714
Arkansas	487,735	3,538	491,273
California	5,016,531	193,715	5,210,246
Colorado	557,238	14,805	572,043
Connecticut	543,558		543,558
Delaware	355,633		355,633
Florida	2,687,350	800	2,688,150
Georgia	1,269,436	3,100	1,272,536
Idaho			
Illinois	2,927,273		2,927,273
Indiana	1,294,709		1,294,709
Iowa	1,260,609		1,260,609
Kansas	537,102		537,102
Kentucky	1,012,276		1,012,276
Louisiana	1,121,102		1,121,102
Maine	260,877		260,877
Maryland	1,349,571		1,349,571
Massachusetts	1,328,471		1,328,471
Michigan	1,435,454	10,512	1,445,966
Minnesota	1,110,240		1,110,240
Mississippi	805,037	185,801	990,838
Missouri	1,584,471		1,584,471
Montana	186,012		186,012
Nebraska	619,542		619,542
Nevada	72,666		72,666
New Hampshire	176,083		176,083
New Jersey	868,271		868,271
New Mexico	264,454		264,454
New York	2,547,389		2,547,389
North Carolina	1,405,932		1,405,932
North Dakota	148,194	111,630	259,824
Ohio	2,254,359	1,895,408	4,149,767
Oklahoma	705,587	128,373	833,960
Oregon	747,807	14,528	762,335
Pennsylvania	2,241,587		2,241,587
Rhode Island	564,552		564,552
South Carolina	584,929		584,929
South Dakota	652,791	75,582	728,373
Tennessee	1,277,462		1,277,462
Texas	2,821,068	265,677	3,086,745
Utah	402,230		402,230
Vermont	239,417		239,417
Virginia	1,678,502		1,678,502
Washington	1,551,298	39,854	1,591,152
West Virginia	950,079		950,079
Wisconsin	1,194,820	2,308	1,197,128
Wyoming	143,197		143,197
Alaska	107,494		107,494
Dist. of Col	367,070		367,070
Hawaii	275,846	7,800	283,646
Puerto Rico	736,371		736,371
Virgin Islands			

The Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 1956 issue of the Nation's Business, a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

AGRICULTURE

Although milk production is expected to exceed last year's record by another 2 percent or 3 percent, the consumption of total fluid milk has increased even more. As a result farmers were receiving slightly higher prices for their dairy products while Government purchases and stocks have declined.

The possible effects on future market prospects of raising of price supports on dairy products may be found by reviewing the past 3 years. For the marketing year beginning April 1, 1953, manufacturing milk was supported at $3.74 per hundredweight, 90 percent of parity; actual average price received was $3.46. CCC bought 11,200 million pounds (milk equivalent) of dairy products at the support price. In 1954 the support price dropped to $3.15, 75 percent of parity; the average price was $3.16. CCC bought only 5,700 million pounds. Last year the support price remained at $3.15 and the average price rose to $3.19. CCC bought 4,600 million pounds.

As of March 28, 1956, excess stocks of cheese and nonfat dried-milk solids were less than one-fifth of the peak inventory built up under 90 percent supports.

Thus it appears that stable and improved dairy farm incomes depend on greater production efficiency, merchandising effort and competitive prices, and a minimum of price-depressing accumulation in Government stocks.

While most of the figures given in the article are true, it would seem that the conclusions reached are misleading. On March 28, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation had 225.7 million pounds of uncommitted stocks of cheese and 40.7 million pounds of uncommitted stocks of nonfat dried milk. The peak inventory of cheese was reached on September 29, 1954, when the CCC held a total of 435.7 million pounds. Peak inventory of nonfat dried milk was reached on April 28, 1954, when the CCC held a total of 599.3 million pounds. As of March 28, 1956, excess uncommitted stocks of cheese and nonfat dried milk were, therefore, a little more than one-fourth of the peak inventory.

The article gives the impression that there is no longer a dairy problem. If the following information is considered along with the chamber of commerce article, we get a truer picture of the dairy industry.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the CCC loss on dairy price support operations was $130,704,719.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the loss was $440,274,495.

For the 1956 fiscal year from July 1, 1955, to January 31, 1956, the loss has been $250,101,280 and 5 months of this fiscal year are not included in this figure. Purchases by CCC during April and May of this year have been considerably larger than a year ago.

E. M. Norton, secretary of the National Milk Producers Federation, has said that dairymen suffered a $600 million a year setback when price supports were dropped to 75 percent of parity in April 1954. Since then they have been battling a serious price-cost squeeze. If the $600 million is added to the loss by the Government on price-support operations since April 1954, the impact on the national economy caused by the drop in price supports is more evident.

It is true that the consumption of both fluid milk and manufactured dairy products has increased among the nonfarm population in the past 2 years, but it is interesting to note how much of this increase has been due to Government donations of dairy products and the special school milk program and not to the reasons given in the last paragraph of the above article. Per capita consumption of all dairy products in 1953 was 682 pounds of which 14 pounds came from CCC donations and other programs.

In 1954, the total per capita consumption of dairy products was 691 pounds of which 21 pounds came from CCC donations and other programs.

In 1955, the per capita consumption of dairy products was 699 pounds of which 29 pounds came from CCC donations and other programs such as the special school milk program.

In other words "merchandising effort and competitive prices" accounted for an increase of 2 pounds per capita in 1954 and 1955, over 1953. There was no increase at all in per capital consumption from commercial sources in 1955 over 1954.

The fact that farmers have shown "greater production efficiency" is borne out by the fact that production increased from 123.5 billion pounds of milk in 1955 to an estimated 127 billion pounds for 1956.

After reviewing the above facts and figures, we are still wondering if it would not have been possible to carry out the same kind of a program under 90 percent price supports.

Concentration of 95 Percent of Federal Research Funds in a Few Big Firms To Be Investigated by Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors Corp., said yesterday that United States leadership in the free world depends on speeding technological progress. Speaking at the dedication ceremonies for GMC's new $100 million technical center in Detroit, Mr. Curtice warned that our country was engaged in a great competitive struggle for survival and was being challenged particularly in the technological area. "We must put more emphasis on basic research, pure research," he declared.

During the past 5 years, as my friend and colleague FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, New Jersey, pointed out in a speech on the floor on May 9, the United States has spent $22 billion on such research, nearly half the total amount spent in such pursuits since 1860. One of the things which disturbs me most is the revelation that in the 7 months ending January 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded research and development contracts amounting to almost $1 billion, to be more precise, $982 million, and of this huge sum only 5 percent went to firms having 500 employees or less.

At the conclusion of the discussion, in which several Members of the House participated, Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, of the Select Committee on Small Business said:

I assure the gentleman from New Jersey, however, that our committee will do all it can to gather revealing information on this important subject and report this information to the House.

The response to this discussion has been exceptional and I include here some of the comments that have been made upon it as well as a letter from George J. Burger, Jr., of the National Federation of Independent Business. The text of Congressman THOMPSON's legislative measure, House Resolution 452, to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development work is also included:

[From the Trenton Evening Times of May 16, 1956]

STRANGLING SMALL BUSINESS

Even the most casual study of bankruptcy statistics, a dismal subject at best, inspires genuine anxiety concerning the future of small business. Independent business enterprises with moderate resources are finding the struggle for survival increasingly difficult and it is becoming distressingly apparent that they are not helped by administration policies.

The problem of the weakening position of small business in the Nation's economy inspired forthright and enlightening discussion in Congress a few days ago when Representative THOMPSON, of New Jersey, introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the amount and proportion of funds distributed by Federal departments and agencies for research and development facilities.

Introduction of the resolution had been preceded by a great deal of revealing inquiry and was followed by a discussion which accented in striking fashion the extent to which Federal research funds are devoted to the interests of big business. In fact, as Representative THOMPSON charged, 95 percent of Government money for this purpose is concentrated on the research activities of a few great enterprises.

"Obviously," as he insisted, "these firms that are able to have a substantial part of their experimental and research and development activities financed by the Federal Government will have a great lead, sometimes an insurmountable lead, in the commercial race."

Research is as essential as it is expensive. Without it an industry cannot keep pace with the march of progress. When great corporations have this vital cost assumed for them by the Federal Government, their advantages in the competitive field are increased immeasurably.

The great disparity in allocations of money for this purpose constitutes an injustice with fatal possibilities with respect to the survival of relatively small-business enterprises. Mr. THOMPSON has accordingly performed an important public service by raising the issue so effectively in Congress.

[From the Newark News of May 14, 1956]

CAPITAL COMMENT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

HOUSE EXPLORES PRIVATE RESEARCH WITH TAX MONEY

WASHINGTON.—The House of Representatives recently took a look at one aspect of the growth of big-business control of our economy and our Government which, strangely enough, is nurtured by public money provided by all of us as taxpayers.

Soon after the discussion in the House about the outlay of Government money for scientific development and research, and how the bulk of it goes to a few corporations, former President Harry Truman coined a phrase for this spreading control of big business over our Government. He called it "a new feudalism" in a message to the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action.

Said Truman, "Centers of private power, beyond democratic control are exerting greater and greater influence over our national life, driving small business to the wall and strangling individual enterprise."

DISCERNS DANGER

Two days earlier in the House Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, Fourth District of New Jersey, had precipitated the discussion of Government research money and what happens to it. Recognizing the need of a big-scale research and development program, most of which is for defense, he warned of the danger to the free competitive enterprise system in the way the Defense Department is funneling most research contracts to big companies.

For example, the Department's figures for the 7 months ending January 31, this year, show that only 5 percent of nearly a billion dollars in research contracts during that period went to firms having 500 or fewer employees. It was pointed out during the debate by Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Small Business Commitee, that "this 5 percent of the money could be compared with about 45 percent of the manufacturing activities carried on by firms with less than 500 employees."

The increasingly large contribution of our taxpayers to research by private companies was revealed in figures presented by Thompson. They showed that, of the $4.21 billions expended for research and development in 1955—which compares with $1.75 billions in 1946—the Federal Government contributed $2.42 billion or 57 percent. Private industry supplied 41 percent—$1.71 billion. The rest came from nonprofit institutions. While Government, itself, did most such research not many years ago, now 75 percent is done by private industry and a large part of that at public expense.

OTHER ADVANTAGES

Along with the money, the favored corporations get other advantages that help them to expand their control over our economy. As explained by Thompson:

"Obviously these firms that are able to have a substantial part of their experimental and research and development activities financed by the Federal Government will have a great lead, sometimes an insurmountable lead, in the commercial race. The firms that receive the research and development contracts are in a position to hire, preempt and control the available research personnel, the supply of which, as we know, is now critically short. These companies will gain the know-how and have the inside track with new products and new processes.

"Furthermore * * * when the Department of Defense grants a contract for research and development work, it actually allows the private firm receiving the contract to take out the patents on patentable inventions it makes with the use of Government money."

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have talked with our president, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, about your March 30 letter, and he has asked me to tell you that he is personally much in accord with your idea of promoting a study into the problem of federally financed research and development work and all its ramifications into the business world.

Beyond doubt, findings resulting from such a study could have much value in helping the Congress to appraise the role smaller, independent business can play in connection with these contracts and in connection with work resulting from such activity. At the same time it could go far toward helping to remove whatever arbitrary roadblocks have been thrown in small business' path.

It goes without saying that many of the helpful innovations which have strengthened our productive muscle have come right out of the minds and work of smaller businessmen. This segment of our economy continues to have a tremendous potential in this direction, provided its capabilities are fully used.

Mr. Harder has asked me to remind you, however, that since it is our policy to take a stand on legislation only after polling our membership, and that since we have not had a chance to poll our members on your bill, he cannot commit the Federation as an organization. Perhaps if we had had some earlier notice we might have been able to poll, just as we are polling currently your and Senator FULBRIGHT'S tax reduction bills, and possibly, assuming membership favorable vote, secure the widespread expressions you desire.

We know you understand our position, and with very best wishes,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER, Jr.,
Assistant to President.

[From Labor]

NEWS OF CONGRESS—SENATE GROUP TRIMS DOWN PENSION BILL AS IKE ASKED—MILITARY FUNDS HELD AMPLE; CHARGE UNCLE SAM HELPS MAKE "BIG BIZ" BIGGER

(By Albert H. Jenkins)

MAKES "BIG BIZ" BIGGER

Some significant facts and figures on how Uncle Sam's huge expenditures for scientific research and developments are distributed were given to the House this week by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, New Jersey. Among them were these:

1. In the year beginning next July, the Government will provide $2.2 billion for research. Of each dollar, 85 cents will go for developing new weapons, and only 15 cents for studies and improvements in such fields as labor, health, welfare, commerce, and agriculture.

2. Last year, the Federal Government provided 55 percent of the $4.2 billion spent on research, and private corporations put up only 41 percent.

3. Of the Government's research billions, 95 percent is going to a few big corporations, and only 5 percent to smaller firms.

4. The big corporations get the patents on discoveries and developments they make with the Government's money, THOMPSON pointed out.

He said these patents, and the big corporations' almost complete monopoly of Government research money, are helping to make big business still bigger and more powerful.

Resolution

Resolved, That the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, created by H. R. 114, acting as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the amount and proportion of funds distributed by Federal departments and agencies for research and development facilities and work to the various segments of industry and the various size and classes of firms, (2) the methods, standards, and criteria being used by the Federal departments and agencies for distributing such Federal funds among various competing firms and size and classes of firms, (3) the methods and procedures adopted by the Federal departments and agencies to safeguard the interest of small business in research and development work and to assure broad participation by such firms in federally sponsored and federally aided research and development programs, and the extent of the success of such methods and procedures, (4) the extent to which the award of Federal research and development contracts determines the distribution of Federal contracts for procurement of supplies and services, (5) the extent to which the granting of Federal funds for research and development work influences or determines the employment by small business of scientific and technically trained research personnel, and (6) the procedures and methods in use by Federal departments and agencies concerning the assignment of patents and the licensing of patented inventions made or developed with the assistance or use of Federal funds.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Problems Confronting Union Members in Coming Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 3, W. P. Kennedy, president of the

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, one of the most distinguished labor leaders in America, addressed a meeting of the New York State legislative board of the Trainmen's Union. The meeting was at Albany, N. Y.

In the course of that speech, Mr. Kennedy made a number of political observations on the duties and problems that confront union members in regard to the coming elections. Mr. Kennedy was kind enough to make some remarks about me. I do not know whether I deserve the gracious tribute paid me by him, but I value it coming from a friend and from a man whom I so greatly respect and admire. I have not yet made up my mind whether I am going to be a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate, but whether I run or not, I will always value this expression of confidence by Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kennedy's speech, which includes many important observations quite beyond the passing reference to my possible candidacy, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it appeared in a recent issue of the Trainman News, the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trainman News of May 7, 1956]

LET'S POOL OUR VOTES, SAYS WPK—BACKS LEHMAN FOR SENATOR IN NEW YORK

ALBANY, N. Y.—Collective efforts have been the salvation of labor in improving working conditions and wages, and the same collective effort must be turned to the needs of politics and government.

That message was given by President W. P. Kennedy at a luncheon during the reorganization meetings of the New York State Legislative Boards of the BRT and LA here May 3, where he also gave a hearty endorsement to Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, who is up for reelection.

The business of government is, or should be, the concern of all, he said, and added that the best way to do an efficient job after registering and voting is to pool our political efforts with those of others, in groups and through such groups in political parties.

He called for an expansion of that political unity in supporting Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, and other liberal candidates in New York.

"The great Empire State of New York has its important and impressive quota to be nominated and elected this year. Your United States Senator up for election is truly a great man—a big man in the affairs of our Nation. His outstanding services as your governor for several terms has been dwarfed by his aggressive, militant and statesmanlike conduct in the United States Senate," said President Kennedy.

FINEST RECORD

"The record of independence, honesty, integrity, courage and vigor of my good friend and New York's Senator, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, is such that he deserves renomination and reelection by an overwhelming approval of the voters of this great State. His election is sorely needed, not only for you in New York, but for all America and for the world at large.

"We need and should have HERBERT LEHMAN in the United States Senate to lend his able assistance in the cause of liberty and justice. He is one of our best friends—not only of labor, but for all of the people. He is rightfully termed 'the Conscience of the United States Senate.'

"The election of liberals as President, Vice President, and in the Senate would be ineffectual without a substantial majority in the House of Representatives.

"The New York delegation in the House consists of 45 Congressmen—the largest delegation. It is very important that the New York liberal Congressmen be renominated and reelected—and the reactionaries, often referred to as the old guard, be defeated, if possible in the primary, and certainly in the general election.

"There is a definite trend toward the nomination and election of candidates who will serve all of the people. New York needs more Congressmen who help in the House like Senator LEHMAN does in the Senate."

The BRT and LA, said President Kennedy, will continue their age-old custom of being nonpartisan in elections. Members of the brotherhood are active in all political parties, he said, except the Communist, and of those "We do not want any. They would find our membership hard and difficult to get along with."

The BRT has developed a good habit of scanning the record of political issues of vital interest to workers, the farmers, and the people in general, he said, and from this search decisions are made on supporting candidates.

Elections this year are of grave importance locally, in the Nation and over the world, said President Kennedy.

"In a world endangered by Communist influence abroad and with economic uncertainty and political confusion at home, the stakes in the primaries and in the general elections this year are enormous. * * * We should insist that the major political parties nominate their most qualified candidates and include planks in their platforms on the important domestic and foreign issues before the American people," he said.

"We in the labor movement, in the farm organizations, and in the civic groups must do our part in presenting the issues clearly and understandingly to the people."

He warned of the dangers of complacency, and pointed to the experience in 1946 when a complacent vote gave us the terribly bad 80th Congress and the Taft-Hartley law and uneven and unfair tax laws.

"In other instances we have watched national administrations almost forget the workers and the farmers in their eagerness to serve their small clique, who appeared to be their heaviest campaign contributors," he said.

"We must overcome the complacencies of the past. We must all qualify and vote. It's the wise thing to do. It's the only way we can assure ourselves of holding our economic and social gains of the past 2 decades. It's our only chance to go forward to the better ways of living—we cannot stand still, we either move forward or backward—and who among us wants to go back to those demoralizing days of the 1930's?

"WORLD IS WATCHING

"People throughout the world, who love liberty and want its freedoms preserved are anxiously watching and waiting the results of our primaries and elections. We must not fail them. We must not fail ourselves. There is so much depending on what we do in America this year.

"The office of the Chief Executive of the United States is a most important one. On the shoulders of our next President will rest the responsibility for the general welfare and the preparedness of our 166 millions of people and there will be millions and millions of people in the critical areas of the world who will look hopefully to America for guidance.

"The next four critical and difficult years will require a lot of hard and vigorous work. As much as we may desire to do so, there just isn't any plausible way of successfully delegating the important and essential duties of our chief executive. We cannot accept the idea that our national administration can be liberal in its foreign policies and at the same time serve the most decadent reactionaries at home.

"We want and we need a President who will serve all of the people, not just a privileged few—one who believes that our great natural resources belong to—and should be used for—all of the people, instead of being given away for exploitation by selected groups or individuals for personal gain. Our next President should be a person who believes that what is good for the workers, the farmers, the housekeepers, and the small business people, is also good for America.

"We regard the office of the Vice President as one of importance—not to be offered as a consolation prize. Events of the past months makes us more than ever conscious of the importance of an office, whose occupant is only a heartbeat away from that of the Chief Executive.

"We deplore a political expediency whereby a liberal is counterbalanced with a conservative as a candidate for Vice President, or vice versa. The succession in office makes both the President and the Vice President equally important. The people should so regard it, even if the politicians have no regard for the desires of the people.

"While we discuss the importance of national officials, we must not overlook the national officials to be elected from the several States. Along with the President and Vice President, there will be 33 United States Senators and the entire House of Representatives—435—a delegation from each State."

The task ahead is big, he said, but it need not be so difficult if each individual does his or her share by voting in all elections, and pool their voting with that of others seeking the same goal.

BACK MAN, NOT PARTY

The most important thing, he said, is voting for the candidates who serve your interests, regardless of their party affiliation.

"Our labor unions were put at an unfair disadvantage by our enemies who controlled the 80th Congress and passed the Taft-Hartley law over the veto of the President. That act, among other antilabor provisions, amended section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act, by putting labor unions in with national banks and corporations organized under the authority of Congress," said President Kennedy.

"To overcome the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley law we organized the Trainmen's Political Education League. The league provides facility whereby the members, employees, and friends of the brotherhood can legally carry on needed nonpartisan political activities in support of favorable candidates for public office.

"TPEL affords you and your friends the opportunity to effectively take an active part in the selecting of capable public officials who will be friendly to your interests.

"It is the best way you can help keep your Government working for all of the people. We must ever be alert to the fact that a TPEL contribution is needed from each of you and from each member of your lodge. Our friendly candidates need financial support. We can give that needed support through TPEL. A membership card is issued to all making a contribution of $1 or more."

He cited some of the vital issues facing the Nation—will power companies be given franchise to sell publicly created power from the Niagara Falls development?

Or will we follow the fine Canadian example, where the people get full advantage of public power through the Ontario Public Power Authority?

GOP GIVEAWAYS

He hit hard at GOP administration efforts to give away natural resources at the Hells Canyon site, attempts to destroy progress made in public power, flood control, and conservation.

"We must take care," said President Kennedy, "or we will be seeing national scandals that will make the Teapot Dome-Fall-Doheny scandals of the early twenties look like pink tea parties in comparison."

America is full of traditionally liberal, militant people, he said, people who love the good life of freedom and abundance for all.

"We want to conserve, at any cost, our invaluable heritage of time-tested customs and institutions in the forward march to economic, social, and political security."

President Kennedy went on to say:

"Thomas Jefferson recognized the forces of liberalism and reaction when he wrote, 'Men by their very constitutions are naturally divided into two parties, those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most wise depository of the public interest.'

"Our political party alinements are not so well defined as in the quotation from Jefferson. We have liberals and reactionaries in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. That is why we, as a labor union, must remain nonpartisan—supporting liberals where we find them in both parties. In that way we attempt to meet the challenges of our time by courageously joining with those who believe the people to be the best depository of the public interest.

"If I were a voter in New York, I don't see how I could turn in any direction but to the Democratic Party. In Gov. Averill H. Harriman you have a liberal as described by Jefferson, who serves well the interests of all the people in the State. He is doing a good job and his administration is following the pattern set by his illustrious predecessors—Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman. I hope you good voters will give him a majority in both houses of the legislature.

"The uneasy restlessness of the people since January 1953 seems to show less and less confidence in President Eisenhower and the Republican Party. Despite all of the favorable publicity in the newspapers and magazines, on the television and over the radio, there's a definite trend in the opposite direction.

"PARTIES SHIFT

"The 30 Republican governors in 1953 have dwindled to 21, with the Democrats increasing their number from 18 to 27. Five hundred and five State legislators have been added to the Democratic column in the same period. Hundreds of Republican strongholds in counties and cities in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, the New England States, and in other sections of the country have turned Democratic—all of this indicates the people's resentment against the administration's failure to provide for the general welfare. It is evident that what is good for General Motors is not good for and is not wanted by the people.

"The New York Legislative Boards of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary have the obligations of directing the course our members should take in the primary and general elections. The officers and members of the boards must not fail in pushing forward our collective political efforts to where all will be registered and all will vote in the primary election, June 5, and in the general election, November 6, 1956, is an important political year. You can make it one for the people. May God grant you the wisdom to do so."

The Industrialization of Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the eventual success of our foreign-aid program will be measured by the ability of the countries receiving assistance from us to establish their own economies on a sustaining basis with increased standards of living for their peoples. If this is accomplished it will be more difficult for discontented elements to seek salvation through communism and left-wing socialism.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles realize that our governmental foreign aid must lay the groundwork for increased investment of private capital if real progress is to be made in raising world living standards. Some of the private capital will, of course, consist of foreign investments by our citizens and citizens from other developed countries, but a great deal of the new investment must consist of native funds and savings originating in the underdeveloped area.

The recent session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations discussed the problem of the industrialization of underdeveloped countries. This subject has had an important place on the agenda of the Council for many years. Dr. John C. Baker, President Eisenhower's representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, reviewed the United States accomplishments in furthering industrialization in these areas. He emphasized the great contribution which has been made by private American firms who have not only invested their capital abroad, but, what is more important, have contributed techniques and know-how. For example, he said the Goodyear Time & Rubber plant in Indonesia employs 1,400 people, of whom only some twenty are Americans and Europeans. The company has carried on an active training program to give Indonesians positions of responsibility as rapidly as possible. They have also sent young Indonesians to Akron, Ohio, to acquire special technical skills here.

The problem of the industrialization of underdeveloped countries is one which must be attacked on many different fronts. The United States contributes technical assistance through bilateral aid. We also support the United Nations technical-assistance program. We will shortly be considering the President's program for an extension of foreign economic aid. These investments will pay dividends to the American taxpayers if they prepare a climate in which private investment, both foreign and indigenous, can thrive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Baker's statement to the Council printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN C. BAKER, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, ON INDUSTRIALIZATION OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. President, peace and economic well-being are the twin objectives of our world today. In these last few days, hopes for peace burn more brightly, thanks to the efforts of the United Nations, its Secretary General and its member states. Here, in the Economic and Social Council, interest is focused on the improvement of economic well-being in all nations. We, who are gathered here, bear a heavy responsibility for progress on those pressing problems of economic development, the solution of which is so important to men in so many nations.

There is an old saying that a problem carefully defined is a problem half-solved. This may well prove true for the problem we are considering today—the industrialization of underdeveloped countries.

Real progress toward economic and social improvement is made only when countries produce more goods and services for their peoples. This applies to all nations. Underdeveloped countries, therefore, are—and rightly so—eager to obtain the means by which they themselves can produce sorely needed manufactured goods in local factories, with local labor. To help them along this road is an opportunity that should be welcomed by all members of the United Nations. As far as my own country is concerned, President Eisenhower again recognized the necessity to do so in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors last Saturday.

What direction should the work of the United Nations on problems of industrialization take over the next few years? My own Government has very carefully examined the documentation which the Secretary General has prepared in response to the request of the Council. Since this matter is to be considered in the Economic Committee, we shall be discussing our detailed views on the next steps that might be taken in that body.

At this time, however, I should like to commend the Secretary General for his very informative and comprehensive survey of the work already being done in the United Nations and the specialized agencies on industrialization of underdeveloped areas. It is an impressive picture of widespread activities.

As to the proposals for a future program of work in this field, we feel that the Council should carefully examine the problems involved before taking final decisions. This matter is much too important for the underdeveloped countries to permit hasty action. My delegation for one would want to hear more from these countries as to their own views on the direction in which we ought to go before we decide on further action. Furthermore, before we decide on any action program we shall have to answer the question whether it will be merely designed to fill gaps in existing work programs or to develop a unified overall program in the field of industrialization. It will be necessary to assign priorities in any such work program in the light of resources available to the United Nations. As pointed out by the delegations of Canada and Yugoslavia, we shall also have to face and resolve far-reaching problems of organization and finance, of coordination and integration. The role of the regional economic commissions, the specialized agencies, and the United Nations Technical Assistance Program will have to be determined.

In this connection, we must constantly keep in mind that there are, of course, no

stereotyped patterns of economic development applicable to all countries or even to many countries. Different countries have different needs and different possibilities. Development must take into account available resources, local attitudes, social and legal structures, customs, and practices. In some areas small-scale industry and transportation may be most in need of improvement. In others, the emphasis may have to be on strengthening governmental administration and increasing industrial productivity. In all cases, managerial and technical skills must keep pace with development, if development is to be effective.

Certain preliminary steps must be taken by all underdeveloped countries before they can prepare balanced programs of industrial development. It is in this connection, we feel, that the United Nations can be most immediately helpful. As Ambassador Stikker so rightly argued in his statement to the Council last Friday, "When we try to visualize the sequence of industrial development in any given territory, it would seem logical to fix our attention first of all on the resources available in the way of raw materials, power, transportation, and labor." This is, of course, the first area of work suggested by the Secretary-General in his proposals for a future work program on industrialization. It seems to us that a knowledge of resources available for the production of power is basic to any evaluation of an underdeveloped country's potential for industrialization.

Let there be no misunderstanding, when I emphasize this need for a stock-taking of available resources. Countries cannot be sharply divided into two categories—those which are inherently manufacturing countries and those which are inherently agricultural or raw-material producing countries. If standards of living throughout the world are to be substantially increased; if the peoples of the underdeveloped countries are to enjoy a greatly increased supply of manufactured goods; if their standards of living are to be augmented beyond the bare necessities of life, the world's manufacturing capacity will have to be greatly expanded everywhere.

The industrially advanced countries could not, even with their large industrial potential and under conditions of continuous full employment, supply all the manufactures the whole world needs. Such a growth of manufacturing must inevitably involve greater industrialization in underdeveloped areas.

It has sometimes been suggested that there is a conflict of interest between the more developed countries and the aspirations for greater industrialization of the less developed countries. We do not share such views. On the contrary, greater industrialization of the underdeveloped areas is in the interest of all countries. The best customers of industrialized countries are prosperous, developed countries. A significant portion of the world's exports of manufactured goods moves, not to the less developed, but to other industrialized countries.

We should not assume that the pattern of industrialized and under developed countries which exists today is a permanent pattern. It may be a fairly rational pattern in the light of the present distribution of capital, skills and technological knowledge. It may not be so in the light of future developments. The world is still young in the exploration of the resources with which nature is endowed it, and of the ways in which these resources can be utilized. And many a country which thinks itself poor in resources may find that, by taking careful stock of what it has, it will discover possibilities for economic developments now unknown. Even more, as technology develops, apparently useless resources may become of great value.

As one student of this subject has observed, "A resource at any time and place is a function of the prevailing technology * * * More than one-seventh of the solid content of the earth's crust is aluminum, but this becomes a resource only when a people attains a very high level of scientific and industrial efficiency. Whether waterfalls are sources of heat, light and power, or merely obstacles to navigation, depends upon the people who own the waterfalls. The real fact of the matter is that we never know how rich any country is in resources until it begins to industrialize, to develop real needs and markets for natural resources and to develop a large class of scientifically trained citizens who know how to locate resources and recognize them when they see them."

This is not to imply, of course, that industrialization in the narrow sense of manfacturing is the only road to economic development. Economic development means advancement in many fields—in agriculture, mining, transportation, communications, power, and in the skills and capacities of people. All these are mutually reinforcing elements in the process of development. And they are all competing claimants for the limited resources available, particularly capital. The wise apportionment of scarce resources among these elements must necessarily vary with time and circumstance.

We in the United States appreciate the magnitude of the job that confronts the underdeveloped countries in the field of industrialization. During our own industrial development we have had to deal with many of the same problems which now confront these countries. The American people are the first to recognize the benefits to be obtained from diversification and industrialization. For these reasons, they have welcomed the opportunity to assist the process of industrialization in underdeveloped countries. This assistance has taken various from both through private enterprise and through our foreign aid programs—the extension of industrial know-how, the erection of manufacturing enterprises, the provision of capital resources to facilitate industrial development.

With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to cite a few of the ways in which our business enterprise and our Government have been contributing to the industrial growth and the increasing economic vitality of underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

The key importance of management and other supervisory and labor skills to successful industrialization has long been recognized. One of the important reasons why my Government has urged other countries to encourage direct private foreign investment is that such investment necessarily involves the export of managerial and technical know-how as well as capital. Over the years, American industry has in this way made a real contribution to industrial development in underdeveloped countries. In particular, American industry has been extremely successful in training local citizens to take over key positions in the industrial plants established in other countries.

Some of the most important locally owned business enterprises in underdeveloped countries have been established by nationals who at one time worked for United States companies. For some time, the larger American companies have made a practice of maintaining training courses for their workers and employees, in many cases bringing the employees to the United States for further training. For example, in Brazil during the 4 years, 1946–49, a total of 6,750 employees completed training courses offered by 58 companies controlled by American capital. Also 63 employees of these companies were sent to the United States for training in 1949 alone.

General Electric, one of the largest and oldest American companies operating in Brazil, is an outstanding example of how private foreign investment in Latin America has assisted industrialization in underdeveloped areas. The company has been closely integrated, directly or indirectly, with almost every phase of Brazil's development over the past 40 years. Generators, motors, transformers and heavy electrical equipment produced by the company have played a major part in Brazil's hydroelectric development, in the electrification of her railroads, in the improvement of her urban transport, and in the realization of such projects as the great Volta Redonda steel mill. General Electric's 5,300 employees probably constitute the largest employee group of any foreign-owned manufacturing company in Brazil. Today, only 41 of these employees are American citizens, mostly specialists and technicians; the rest are local personnel. Since 1930, the company has trained 216 Brazilian engineers. The company also offers training courses for students in Brazilian technical schools. In addition, it gives special courses in X-ray technique for doctors in the Brazilian public health service, and other similar courses for specialized groups.

Since the end of the war, Sears Roebuck & Co. in Latin America has been responsible for the establishment of a large number of new local industries which have been given contracts to provide goods for sale in the Sears stores.

Sears no longer uses Latin America as an outlet for goods made in the United States. Today, over 60 percent of its Latin American merchandise is manufactured by Latin Americans in Latin America. In Brazil, 90 percent of the goods sold by Sears is locally manufactured.

Atul Products, Ltd., located in India, is one example of how American private industry stands ready to work with a locally controlled and managed enterprise. The company was established in 1952 to manufacture dyestuffs and pharmaceuticals. Ninety percent of its capital was locally subscribed and 10 percent was provided by the American Cyanamid Co. The American firm has no share in the actual management of the plant, but it has provided much of the necessary technical assistance. The dyes produced by this enterprise now fill a substantial part of the demands of the textile and other industries in India. Its production of sulfa drugs and antibiotics makes possible more effective implementation of the country's health program.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant in Indonesia produces automobiles and truck tires and also bicycle tires for the domestic market. Located in West Java, it employs about 1,400 people, of whom only some 20 are Americans or Europeans. The company carries on an active training program under a policy of giving Indonesians positions of responsibility as soon as they qualify. It has also sent promising Indonesians to its Akron plant to learn special technical skills or to receive training in business operations.

Governmental efforts are increasingly supplementing the achievements of private enterprise. During the first years of its operations, our technical assistance program, now administered by the International Cooperation Administration, was largely confined to fields other than industry. Over the past 2 or 3 years, however, there has been a steady growth in the industrial component of the program. We expect that this growth will continue. We stand ready to consider requests for this kind of assistance to the extent that funds and the necessary technical personnel are available.

Under our bilateral technical assistance program over 14,000 persons from underdeveloped countries have been brought to the United States to observe and learn produc-

tion techniques, engineering and research, applied science in industry, and management, marketing, and distribution practices. We have dispatched 800 American consultants to advise on all aspects of industrial technology and on managerial practices. During 1955 alone we have provided 300,000 items in the form of technical literature, special industrial reports, technical films, and exhibits to assist countries lacking basic modern technical information and training materials. We have cooperated with underdeveloped countries to develop projects in such fields as coal, steel, petroleum, power, and mineral products, and for a variety of manufacturing industries.

A typical example of the results achieved under this program is the improvement in manufacturing processes in India. Recently, over a period of 6 months, American field engineers joined with Indian plant managers in examining production methods in 39 Indian plants manufacturing 27 different products, ranging from a great iron and steel works to a razor plant factory employing 15 workmen.

The shapes and sizes of steel products manufactured at the iron and steel works were simplified, and single production orders were limited to a minimum of 20 tons each in order to assure more efficient operation. As a result, the steel output of the plant will increase by almost 180,000 tons annually. Introduction of mechanically mined ores will permit the plant to raise its pig-iron production by 226,000 tons annually.

The razor-blade factory was idle because its management believed that the quality of their output could not meet competition and that continued production would be unprofitable. After 2 months of assistance by an American technician, the plant is now in full operation turning out razor blades meeting world competitive standards. This was accomplished not by new investment or by displacement of labor, but by rehabilitating existing equipment, retraining workmen in its operation and maintenance, and reorganizing quality control procedures.

Our Export-Import Bank for years has been making credits available, not only to help finance basic development in fields such as transportation, power, communications, and public health, but also for a wide variety of manufacturing projects. During the last 6 months of 1955, the bank financed exports of machinery and equipment for a paper plant in Brazil; rayon-spinning machines for India; thermopower equipment for Iran; equipment for a rolling mill and sulfur plant in Mexico; cement plant machinery for Guatemala; and the components for a tire and tube factory in the Philippines.

One of the great industrial projects financed by the bank has been the Volta Redonda steel plant in Brazil, to which I have already referred. Beginning in 1940, the bank has loaned a total of $105 million to assist the construction and expansion of this steel plant, whose annual ingot capacity is now being increased to 1 million tons.

Two recent loans of the Export-Import Bank illustrate how its resources can be used in association with private enterprise to assist in the establishment of industrial plants in underdeveloped countries. In each case, the bank made a loan to a corporation entirely owned and controlled by local citizens—one in Colombia, the other in Brazil. At the same time, each of these corporations entered into an arrangement with an American company for use of the company's technical processes. Under these arrangements, Colombia will manufacture refrigerator equipment and Brazil will manufacture automobile bearings.

A measure of the response of the American economy to the requirements of the underdeveloped countries arising out of their industrial development is our exports of capital goods to those countries. In 1938, exports of producers' durable equipment to underdeveloped countries were valued at about $300 million; in 1955 they had increased to $1.7 billion. After allowing for price increases since 1938, the United States is currently exporting to underdeveloped countries from 2½ to 3 times the quantity of these producers' goods that it exported in the period just before World War II.

I have been speaking of ways in which the United States has directly assisted countries in the process of development. All of you are, of course, familiar with the support we have also given to similar efforts through such multilateral programs as United Nations Technical Assistance, the International Bank, and other specialized agencies working in the field of economic development.

Mr. President, in some areas the industrialization of underdeveloped countries is only beginning. In others, it has already made great strides. In all underdeveloped countries people are eagerly striving to acquire the means and the skills on which to build a better economic and social life. I have indicated some of the ways in which the people of the United States, in accordance with the American tradition, have contributed to this tremendous world revolution of our times. In this tradition, we shall continue to work with the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to the best of our abilities in the years ahead.

Before concluding, may I revert to a matter brought to our attention with such eloquence and force by the distinguished representative of France. He emphasized that industrialization will have genuine validity and meaning only if it respects the dignity and enhances the welfare of the individual. Truly, industrialization should never become an end in itself. Industrialization must serve the individual—not the individual serve industrialization.

In my own country, as industrialization has spread and become more complex, we have become increasingly concerned with the human element in this equation, with the health, satisfaction, and well-being of the worker. For we have found that in many ways this human element is the most important in the whole process.

To me, one of the most laudable aspects of the attack on the problem of industrialization in many underdeveloped countries is their determination to preserve as much as possible of the fabric of their national characteristics, culture, and traditions—disappearance of which would indeed be a great loss to them and to the whole world. For these countries are truly concerned with the question raised in that well known Biblical saying: "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to assure you and the members of this Council that my delegation will do everything possible in committee to assist in working out the foundations of a United Nations program which will effectively contribute to the industrialization of the underdeveloped countries. Such a program will have our firm support.

Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Bill, 1957

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, complete devastation of our Nation's fruit and vegetable crops could become a reality if the Mediterranean fruitfly recently discovered in Florida is not completely eradicated immediately.

The fly is now infesting fruit and vegetable crops at numerous spots in both Dade and Broward Counties, Fla. It was first found April 18, in Miami Shores, Fla., near the Miami International Airport. Pest-control experts of the United States Department of Agriculture and others were immediately rushed to the area after it had been definitely ascertained that adult Mediterranean fruitflies were present.

I have high praise for those in the United States Department of Agriculture who went into action so quickly to identify this menace and to curb it. Check points were set up around the infested area, extensive surveying by trappings is continuing in order to determine the locale of the infestation. Steps for eradication have already begun. Undoubtedly, the Department's recognition of the dangers facing the entire United States and their prompt action will save the Nation's major crops and untold millions of dollars.

The Mediterranean fruitfly has defeated all but one attempt by man to eradicate it. It has won and stopped entirely fruit and vegetable growing in Spain, Italy, Algeria, South Africa, Egypt, Tasmania, France, Greece, Brazil, Madagascar, Hawaiian Islands, and in the Holy Land. Crops can only be grown there if each fruit or host is individually bagged.

Only in Florida has the pest been stopped. That was in 1929. The United States Department of Agriculture knew then as it knows now, that the Mediterranean fly has a capability of spreading and wiping out the entire crop of fruit and vegetables grown in the United States. They know definitely that it could infest all of the west coast area, the entire tier of Southern States, and while there is no definite proof as to how far north the fly could live and exist, nobody wants to find out. This last infestation of 1929 was brought under control and completely eradicated, but it took 5,000 men, 18 months, and $7½ million, as well as the assistance of the National Guard. The pest was found in 20 Florida counties before eradication was completed.

The present infested area is in Dade County in an 18-square-mile area surrounding the Miami International Airport. The infestation has also been found in South Broward County, on Miami Beach, and the most recent at Kendall, Fla., which is 8 miles south of the International Airport and in the heart of the great fruit and vegetable district of Dade County. Indications are that new infestations will continue to be found as trapping activities are extended.

Reaction and response of the local people and governmental units have been prompt and willing. Growers and pro-

ducers have voluntarily offered men and equipment. The county commissioners of Dade County made available immediately $25,000 for State plant officials and for the United States Department of Agriculture to meet immediate payrolls. The State cabinet is making $100,000 available immediately and will supply for the State's participation a million dollars, or whatever sum is necessary.

A State quarantine on Dade County was invoked, and a Federal quarantine followed.

Federal assistance and participation is needed and requested. Any quarantine and inspection, to be effective, must be under Federal control. This will require the assignment of many personnel during the entire emergency. In addition, in the national interest, the Federal Government has a vital part to play in the eradication and control programs.

The United States Department of Agriculture has prepared a budget request for funds to meet this emergency; and that the budget request is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am sure that the entire committee appreciates and recognizes the seriousness of this problem. We can't emphasize too strongly that action must be prompt and that whatever money needs to be spent should be spent to completely eradicate this pest. It is very obvious that $1 spent now will save hundreds of dollars later.

In behalf of the entire Florida delegation, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the members of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who at my request extended to us the great courtesy of hearing this emergency matter and including it in the record and their report on the Agricultural Appropriation Act, although the regular public hearings of this subcommittee have been concluded for some time.

Our Armed Services: Defense Against the Common Enemy, or Defense Against Each Other

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States declares:

SECTION 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * * to * * * provide for the common defense * * * of the United States;

* * * * * *

To raise and support armies * * *;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

As a peace-loving, peace-prospering nation, we have nevertheless long recognized that we must maintain our armed services at top military strength in the interest of assuring adequate defense against the common enemy.

The morning press and radio tell us that, as the latest step in our program of defense, it has been suggested that 2 of the 3 Military Departments engaged concurrently in missiles research programs—whether offensive missiles or defensive missiles—should stage a "duel." This proposed duel will pit the Army's "Nike"—developed through research at taxpayers' expense—against the Navy's "Talos," also developed through research at taxpayers' expense. It is interesting that both happen to be ground to air weapons.

It is conceded that missiles will serve both as offensive weapons and as defensive weapons, but it is difficult to understand justification for planning one to finality only to prove that the other—developed to finality—is outmoded, ineffectual, and useless.

As ridiculous as the proposed duel may seem to some, it is good that the proposal has been made; in fact, the proposal is a sound one in light of the status quo of armed services' activities, and the author of the idea is to be commended. Good that it happened, and a sound proposal, because it gives emphasis to the conclusion of many of us that Congress and the President have a clear and present duty to call a halt to Army against Navy, Navy against Air Force, Air Force against Army, and so forth.

It is clear that each of the three military departments is going ahead—independent of each other—in multimillion—or billion—dollar missiles' research programs. Further, that each is prosecuting its individual research program to finality.

To what end?

So that the Congress, the President, and the taxpayers can stand by to witness the spectacle of a gigantic duel between the Army, Air Force, and Navy aimed at proving that two ultimate missiles can and should be discarded in favor of a third ultimate missile.

Missile airframes are missile airframes; launching bases for missiles are launching bases for missiles; propellants are propellants, and warheads are warheads. These are the common denominators in our research programs, and the unknowns are being pursued in at least three different military laboratories.

If these programs were pulled into one military department—or better yet, pulled into one research department directly under the Secretary of Defense—only one program, the best both offensively and defensively, would be pushed to finality. All research talent, know-how, brains, energy, and funds would be commonly pooled toward a common goal for the common defense.

On May 10, 1956, the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, during debate on the Armed Services Appropriation Bill, stood in the Well of the House to tell us General Curtis LeMay within the past 2 weeks—in commenting on our supercarrier Navy—has said that his bombers could sink every carrier at sea in 2 hours.

Is the next duel to be between the Navy's carrier *Forrestal* and the B–52 of the Strategic Air Force: Or will we have a warmup by testing the B–47 against the *Nautilus?*

The next duel, Mr. Speaker, should be between the taxpayers and those who have failed, refused, or been unable to unify the armed services.

The burden, under the Federal Constitution, is that of the Congress.

Freedom of the Press: Is There a Paper Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a physical sense the press of the United States has a capacity that is extraordinary. But in its coverage of vitally important political issues that now face the Nation, only a few papers treat them vigorously and fearlessly. One of these is The Tablet, published by Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, which is always refreshing to read.

The April 28 edition of that paper features two important news stories on its first page: First, an address by Bryton Barron concerning distortion of history in the Department of State and, second, the NKVD seizure of Russian seamen in the United States. It is obvious that such matters should receive fuller treatment in our press.

An informative editorial in the April 28 issue comments on the indicated situation. Under leave to extend, I include the editorial:

IS THERE A PAPER CURTAIN?

As the circulation of the Tablet increases steadily in all parts of the United States, letters from recent subscribers indicate one reason for the increase, namely, the printing of news not available in other papers. Why such news does not appear elsewhere is not easy to understand, since it is common property and available to the daily press and to the news services.

For instance, this week on page one are two articles: one a lengthy summary of an address delivered by retired State Department historian Bryton Barron and an article on recent hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee at which a Soviet NKVD agent testified. Both of these stories were available to the daily press and the news services, but how many Americans had the opportunity of reading them in their local papers? The New York Times, with 96 pages of news on April 22, for example, did not find space for the Senate subcommittee release. Both stories were ignored. Why? We do not know.

Again, there was the case of House Resolution 6376, passed by the House of Representatives professedly to provide for mentally ill Alaskans. In three articles in March The Tablet exposed loopholes in the language of the bill which would permit a political nuisance from the United States to be transported to Alaska on the pretext he was mentally ill. The series elicited a tremendous reaction from all parts of the United States. Senators and Congressmen were urged to insert the articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, yet it was only on Monday that they were finally inserted by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois. Meanwhile, the daily press has maintained a blank silence on the

subject. Newspapers which sent two or more gossip columnists to Monaco to report on a wedding would not assign one correspondent to expose the menace of H. R. 6376 to the freedom of American citizens for their readers.

Why? We still do not have the answer. Is there a Paper Curtain as well as an Iron Curtain and a Bamboo Curtain? There is a broader question, too: Why the lack of interest shown by the daily press in the infiltration of Communists in the departments of our Government? Has the American press been intimated or subsidized? Again we do not know. But the fact remains that The Tablet should not be virtually the only press medium to be giving its readers such news.

Then there was the recent outrage of five Soviet seamen who had sought refuge in this country being compelled by Soviet secret police to board a Scandinavian Airlines plane at Idlewild Airport to be transported to an uncertain but unenviable fate in Red Russia. It took place on American soil and American Government officials stood by unprotesting. Yet the metropolitan papers, which daily find petty things to become indignant about found nothing significant enough for editorial comment in the disgraceful incident.

We must pose to our readers a question which we have been asked many times and still cannot answer: Is their a Paper Curtain which is brain-washing our people by withholding news unfavorable to the Communist conspiracy?

Proposed Changes in Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Ways and Means met further in executive session with respect to recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems.

For the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release I have issued announcing the decisions made today by the committee in regard to the subcommittee recommendations.

The committee is scheduled to meet again at 10 a. m. in executive session on May 21, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee report.

The press release follows:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, and 16, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for May 10, 15, and 16, 1956, and appear on pages A3818, A3918, and A3965, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m., on Monday, May 21, 1956. A table of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today, are as follows:

X. GENERAL

1. Uncertainty with respect to the tax to be paid upon the sale of installment accounts at less than face value should be resolved by statute. The administrative rule now in effect requires payment of tax upon the face value of installment accounts irrespective of the selling price. However, an exception is made in bankruptcy and receivership cases where the taxpayment is based on the selling price. This rule should be codified and extended to similar sales made in other legally distressed situations.

2. It should be made clear that the type of contract recognized under Louisiana law, which is similar to an installment contract, qualifies for the privilege of deferred tax payments as an installment contract.

3. Statutory authority should be given to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to authorize by regulations that a person, who is liable for the filing of returns with respect to the retailers' taxes and the transportation of property tax, may designate his supplier or shipper to perform such acts as are required of him in connection with the filing of the returns relating to these taxes.

4. The subcommittee has agreed to ask the State Department for a report on the question of whether or not the present foreign diplomatic exemptions should be continued and if so the proper extent of such exemptions.

5. Exemptions from manufacturers, retailers, transportation, and communication excise taxes should be provided for elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities operated by nonprofit organizations.

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

The committee began consideration of the recommendations contained in this section and will resume consideration of section XI when it next meets on Monday, May 21, 1956.

Power for Peace and the Foundation for Religious Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the splendid works of the Foundation for Religious Action in connection with the observance of Armed Forces Day.

To broaden and deepen the meaning of Armed Forces Day, May 19, 1956, and the Armed Forces Day slogan, "Power for peace," the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order and the Department of Defense are jointly emphasizing the spiritual factor in observance of this event.

The suggestion for such a program stemmed from the foundation and has the aim of emphasizing America's need to strengthen her national power for peace in all its phases—spiritual, psychological, and educational, as well as political, economic, and military. Nothing less is demanded if we, as a people, are to meet the prolonged crisis which we face along with free men everywhere.

The foundation is bringing the "power for peace" observance to the attention of church and synagogue authorities of the principal denominations and interdenominational councils, and in the Washington area to a number of individual churches and synagogues.

The foundation has endeavored to focus attention on both the debt of all Americans to those who serve in the Armed Forces and the contribution made by the churches and the chaplains of the services to the Nation and its Armed Forces.

The Foundation for Religious Action in the Social Order was established in 1953 to emphasize in an age of material greatness the importance of the spiritual, to interpret the importance of the religious dimension in practical affairs and to spell out what Americans can do to act in a world crisis. The foundation is an action body and does not sponsor discussions of dogma or church unity, nor does it engage in evangelism with a view to making converts for any church or doctrine.

In observing Armed Forces Day, we should all remember that our national security depends on a deep and abiding religious faith. Religious faith fosters attitudes that contribute to peace among men. With peace as our objective, the cultivation of spiritual factors in our daily living will build and strengthen the fabric of our national security.

H. R. 9836, a Bill To Provide for the Regulation of Interstate Transportation of Migrant Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached letter from the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, in which they express their support H. R. 9836, a bill to provide for the regulation of interstate transportation of migrant farm workers:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Gentlemen: This is the statement of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, in favor of H. R. 9836, introduced

by Congressman BEAMER to provide for the regulation of interstate transportation of migrant farm workers. Such regulation is long overdue. A companion measure, S. 3391, introduced jointly by Senators MAGNUSON and BRICKER, passed the Senate on a call of the calendar under date of April 30, 1956. Both the Department of Labor and the Interstate Commerce Commission are in favor of the enactment of this legislation.

Repeatedly, official and private studies of the migrant labor problem have pointed out the crowded, uncomfortable and dangerous conditions to which our migrants are subjected in the long hauls from Florida to New York and from Texas to Michigan. Dilapidated trucks filled with human cargo travel our highways day and night to meet the seasonal needs of agriculture. If livestock was being hauled the truck would have to meet certain standards of safety. But for humans, anything goes. The trips to which they are subjected in order to get work are often nightmares. Their feet swell from the long hours of standing. They are exposed to the heat, cold, and rain. In case of accidents, which are all too frequent, no benefits are provided by insurance.

How long are we, as Americans, going to let this disgraceful situation continue? We have a chance to correct it, with benefit to workers, farmers, and the public.

Let us pass the Magnuson-Beamer bill at this session of the Congress and give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to regulate the conditions under which migrant workers are transported.

Our organization wishes to be recorded in favor of this humanitarian legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

HARTMAN BARBER,
General Representative.

Uncle Sam, Colonizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha World-Herald recently published an editorial which seems to me to be most timely. This editorial points out the one aspect of our foreign-aid program which is often missed and lost by many people, namely, the United States is simply following in the footsteps of other colonizing nations. This editorial points out this fact—these old colonizers of past history are now second and third rate nations because they spent their efforts and taxes to remake the world in their own image.

I am sure the World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., is performing a most valuable service in pointing out this aspect of our foreign aid program.

The editorial follows:

UNCLE SAM, COLONIZER

We stay-at-home Americans get only a keyhole view of our foreign-aid program.

Congress appropriates the money, we pay the taxes—and that's about all we know. We have no sense of how this huge, worldwide spending is affecting the people of other lands. Or how it is causing them to feel toward distant, mysterious Uncle Sam.

Bob Considine talks about that elsewhere on this page.

He's about the travelingest reporter in the business, has visited almost every country to which Americans are admitted. Recently he ha sbeen watching the atomic tests in the Pacific.

Listen:

"What an incredible change has overcome us in 15 fleeting years.

"Now there is hardly a place on the face of the earth that is not marked by an American family, an American structure, an American grave. In a split moment of time, as time is measured historically, we have taken over (from the British) the so-called white man's burden. We have become colonizers without compare. We build airfields, teach school, show people what end of a hoe to use, and jab wonder drugs in arms of assorted colors in places that weren't in our best atlases a few short years ago."

In other words, we Americans have become the latter-day successors to the conquering Spanish and Portuguese and Dutch, the Napoleonic French, and the Victorian British.

All of them, in their day, supreme. All of them swaggeringly confident that they could recreate the world's underprivileged and dispossessed in the image of a Great White Father.

And where are they now, these colonizing nations? Without exception, in the ranks of the second-rate. Despised and reviled and cast out from the lands in which they once tried, according to their lights, to uplift and do good.

Now we Americans have come to our moment of glory. We are rich beyond imagination, surfeited with treasure and surpluses, eager to be a big brother to all.

So what do we do? Using modern techniques, wielding the dollar instead of the sword, we have become, as the knowledgeable Mr. Considine puts it, colonizers without compare. We have set off down the path which has led so many great and powerful nations to destruction.

The Balance of Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pennsylvania Labor Journal:

THE BALANCE OF ECONOMY

(By John A. Feigel, President, Pittsburgh Central Labor Union)

The American system of free enterprise rests upon a proper balance of agriculture, labor, and business. It is constantly changing and developing to improve our already high living standards. Let us take a quick look at the part played by all three and the balance thus obtained.

THE AMERICAN FARMER

American agriculture differs sharply from the agriculture of countries not yet industrialized. In China or India, for example, the average farmer cultivates his land to provide almost all of the things his family consumes. The American farmer, like most other Americans, tends to specialize. He concentrates on producing those crops or raw materials to which his land is especially suited and which are in demand. He exchanged these products for money to buy the manufactured goods he needs, the food he does not produce himself, and the services he wants. Much of his work is made easier by machinery, and that too is usually specialized. The money a farmer receives for his crop is used in three principal ways: (1) to pay production costs, which usually include seed, labor, maintenance, feed, and sometimes, rent or mortgage payments; (2) to pay others for goods and services; (3) to save and invest. This last he may do either by lending the money to others (by opening a bank account or buying insurance or securities) or by investing it directly in his own farm so that his next crop may bring him a better return.

Notice that all of these expenditures bring the farmer into contact with the economic activities of others. His product supplies consumers or other producers. His payments for seed, feed, labor, goods, and services help to create the demand that keeps industry productive. Thus, people as widely varied and scattered as a barber in Omaha, a worker on an assembly line in Detroit, a college professor in Massachusetts, a chemist in Delaware, and a trucker in Philadelphia, all benefit from the economic activity of a grain farmer in Iowa.

Specialization creates not only opportunity for economic advancement, but also increased dependence on others. Specialization means that the individual becomes an expert at one job, but it also means that he must depend upon other specialists for the products he needs but does not produce himself.

THE AMERICAN WORKER

By far the largest number of Americans make their living in our free enterprise system by working for others. In this group, there is much more specialization than in any other.

Actually, a great many Americans who work for wages or salaries are also capitalists because they have invested savings and, through stock ownership, are part owners of productive property.

The point is simply that they are paid for their labor. In our country, people in a great variety of occupations are working people. We all have the opportunity to change our occupation if we want to and have the ability. And our system of free schools permits us to develop needed abilities.

As American industries have constantly grown and employed more and more people, relations between management and employees have necessarily become more impersonal and complex. Therefore, the individual worker often finds it difficult to obtain the best return for his labor entirely by himself. To represent the employee in his relations with management, trade unions have been formed.

Sometimes, of course, the managers of a company and the representatives of the union fail to agree, and there are strikes. The workers exercise their right to strike if they are not satisfied with the terms offered. This right to strike within the framework of our laws is fundamental in our system.

THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN

Many Americans who work for a salary call themselves businessmen because they make their living from business enterprise. However, I should like to use the word in a more restricted sense. A businessman, as I use it, will mean one who owns or largely controls a productive enterprise.

The role of the businessman so defined is similar to that of the farmer and differs somewhat from that of the man who works for wages or salary. Only a part of the businessman's income comes from his labor. This does not mean that he works less than others—often he works longer hours than his employees. What it does mean is that a part of his earnings is a reward for the risk he takes. He makes an investment of money in the hope that he can sell a certain amount of goods or services. He is responsible for the costs of his enterprise—wages and salaries, materials, and rent. He expects to sell enough to meet business, personal, and family expenses and have something left over. But he can never be sure of success. This is the risk he takes. Some-

times his success is very great. The great private fortunes, of which America has had more than any other country, have usually resulted from a substantial risk that paid off. Opportunities for the accumulation of such fortunes, however, have in recent decades been limited by the people through various laws.

The great majority of American businessmen operate small business—that is, stores, garages, real estate, and other service agencies, or small manufacturing or processing plants. The difference between such enterprises and what we call big business is very great. Most large businesses in the United States are owned by a great many people, rather than by individuals. When a farmer or worker invests his savings or profits in stocks, or in banks and insurance companies that own stocks, he becomes a part owner of a business. Our large businesses are owned by many thousands of individuals holding a few shares each. One of the largest, American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is owned by more than a million stockholders.

Every one who works in such a business, no matter what he is paid, is an employee. The president is an employee, and as such he does not take risks in the same sense as the small-business man we have been discussing. As a stockholder—and there may be many others whose holdings are far greater than his. So the risks of big business are taken by the investors, which include millions of "little people." In conclusion, we may fairly ask: What has been the record of our free enterprise economic system? To most of us the answers are obvious enough. But they bear repeating. Because our system emphasizes the freedom, enterprise, courage, and imagination of the individual, it gives the American citizen assurance that he can make of his life what he will, that he is as good as his neighbor, that he counts.

Basic Objectives of the United Steelworkers of America in Their 1956 Contract Negotiations With the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following basic objectives of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO in their 1956 contract negotiations with the steel industry:

The International Wage Policy Committee of the United Steelworkers of America, meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., in accordance with the constitution and laws of the United Steelworkers of America, adopts the following basic objectives as the wage policy for 1956 negotiations, to the extent contractually appropriate:

HIGHER WAGES

The economic needs of the members of the United Steelworkers of America, their greatly increasing productivity, the record profitability of the industry, and the economic situation of the country as a whole, all require that a substantial wage increase be negotiated with the industry.

WEEKEND PREMIUM DAY

For those companies where it is not already part of the contract, the time is overdue for the institution of premium pay for all work performed on Saturday and Sunday as such.

SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

A noncontributory supplemental unemployment benefit plan shall be established along the practical and feasible lines advocated by the union, financed by and limited to fixed employer contributions to a general fund from which, upon sound insurance principles, benefits shall be paid. The plan shall provide eligible employees up to 52 weeks of adequate benefits against the ravages of unemployment and shall encourage stabilization of employment.

INSURANCE AND PENSIONS

For those companies where present insurance plans are on a contributory cents-per-hour basis, these plans shall be revised, enlarged and improved to provide adequate insurance benefits for members of the United Steelworkers of America and their families on a benefit basis at employer expense. For those companies where present insurance plans are on a noncontributory basis, such plans should be revised, enlarged and improved to provide adequate insurance benefits for members of the United Steelworkers of America and their families. Where contractually appropriate, pension plans in the industry shall be improved by liberalizing their provisions and by providing adequate retirement and disability pensions for all retired employees.

UNION SHOP

The time is overdue for the employers in the industry, who have not already done so, to agree with the union on the full union shop.

HOLIDAYS AND VACATIONS

Additional paid holidays, greater vacation benefits and liberalization of eligibility requirements for holiday and vacation pay shall be provided. Premium pay shall be paid to all employees who work on a holiday in addition to the regular holiday pay.

BETTER CONTRACT TERMS

In addition to the foregoing, improved provisions shall be negotiated with respect to shift premiums, hours of work, overtime, severance pay, incentives, reporting allowance, seniority, preferential hiring upon layoff or when plants or departments are discontinued, military-service apprenticeships, local working conditions, grievance and arbitration machinery, contracting out, safety and health, jury pay, and supplemental workmen's compensation. All remaining geographical wage differentials and wage and salary differentials and inequities shall be eliminated, and, where necessary, provision shall be made for review and modernization of job classifications and the job classification manual. Every effort shall be made to negotiate a master agreement for each company and uniform expiration dates.

Each negotiating committee shall conduct a complete review of existing agreements with the objective of obtaining these and additional improvements and in order to remedy deficiencies which have been disclosed by arbitration proceedings or in the operation of the contract. Every effort shall be made to incorporate in the new agreements beneficial provisions previously made part of the basic agreements and those set forth in prior wage policies.

Forced Labor in Mainland China and in Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Communist countries use forced labor. It is used as a means of political coercion and also as the regular and normal means of carrying out state plans and projects for economic development.

On April 27, Dr. John C. Baker, the president of Ohio University and the United States Representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, addressed the Council regarding a report prepared by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Director General of the International Labor Office on forced labor in mainland China and Albania. His statement is of great significance.

Under leave, I am including it as an extension of my remarks:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE
UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., April 27, 1956.

FORCED LABOR (MAINLAND CHINA AND ALBANIA)

(Statement by Dr. John C. Baker, United States Representative in the Economic and Social Council)

One of the most important functions of the United Nations is the preservation and advancement of human dignity and human rights. It is a field in which the United Nations, to be effective, must exercise ceaseless vigilance and untiring activity.

The Charter itself reflects the concern which the founders of the United Nations felt for this important work, since the only Commission it mentions is the Commission on Human Rights.

One of the most discouraging of the various aspects of violations of human rights is the existence of forced labor. So much so, in fact, that many people wish we could close our eyes and ignore its existence. There are other abuses of human rights which we do not discuss. That fact could furnish an excuse for the Council to avoid this subject. But unfortunately, the violations of human freedom and dignity in this area have been so extensive that the conscience of the world will not let us ignore them. In fact it was through the medium of a nongovernmental organization that the problem was first brought to our attention.

New incontrovertible facts on this unhappy subject are set forth in the report before us prepared by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Director General of the International Labor Office (E/2815). The material in this report has already been investigated by an ILO Forced Labor Committee, composed of three eminent men of unquestioned integrity—Mr. Paul Ruegger of Switzerland, a former President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Mr. Cesar Charlone, a former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay and Mr. T. P. Goonetilleke, former district judge in Ceylon.

After thorough examination of the facts the Committee reached the "firm conviction that there exists in the world today definite systems of forced labor (a) as a means of political coercion or education, and (b) as a regular and normal means of carrying out State plans and projects for economic development." These general conclusions confirmed decisions made by the previous UN–ILO Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor about the existence of forced labor in the Soviet Union and in the countries under its direct influence. This new report is of special importance because it conclusively establishes that the same system also exists under the Communist regime on Mainland China and in Albania, two areas which were not covered in the previous report.

It is not our function to go into great detail on the information contained in the bulky document before us. The details are there for all to read. It is our responsibility, however, to appraise and evaluate. Much of the information, it should be noted, came directly from official organs of the two areas

concerned. Other information came from victims of the system who have since escaped and have had an opportunity to tell the world about what they experienced.

First a few words about Albania. The Albanian Penal Code makes elaborate provisions for "corrective labor" and banishment of citizens to concentration and labor camps. Over the past 10 years some 40 political prisons and concentration camps have been in operation in Albania, at one time or another, in which approximately 16,000 people have perished. Among these are included distinguished persons whose only crime was that of being born into a social group considered hostile by the Communist government. Innocent Albanian women and children have been forced to labor under conditions already well known to this Council.

After examining the material which reflected these conditions the ILO Forced Labor Committee concluded:

"In view of the declared purpose of the (Albanian) Penal Code and the wide and flexible manner in which the definitions which it contains concerning acts considered contrary to the interests of the state can be interpreted, the legislation in force in Albania could constitute a basis for a system of forced labor for political purposes, aiming at the correction of those who are opposed to the ideology of the government.

"Forced labor for economic purposes appears to have been established in the form of extensive projects based on legislative and administrative provisions which authorize the recruiting, mobilization, and direction of workers for carrying out the economic plans of the state.

"The penalties imposed for failure to fulfill the standards set for individual output and the system of labor discipline permit, among other sanctions, the imposition of forced labor as a corrective measure."

Thus the world has once again been brought face to face with oppression of human beings on a systematic and widespread basis. The fact that Albania has but a small population does not diminish the moral reaction we instinctively feel toward such a situation.

It is even more shocking to know that this form of modern slavery has also been introduced to the mainland of China by the Chinese Communist regime. Although information has long been available that the Chinese Communists were employing forced labor systems and other severe forms of punishment which are contrary to provisions of the United Nations Charter, it was only in 1954 that the Chinese Communists themselves revealed the vast extent and systematic nature of this program by adopting laws and regulations putting forced labor on a permanent basis.

The institution which has been imposed upon the Chinese people is closely patterned after the experience and practice of the U. S. S. R. This is no accident. Lo Jui-Ching, Minister of Public Security and head of the Communist Chinese MVD, himself made this clear when he submitted the new forced-labor law to the Government Administration Council in 1954 by stating: "During the process of preparation, assistance was received from Soviet legal experts, and many discussions were held and revisions made."

The report before us contains laws, regulation and policy statements from Communist China which discuss the administration and purposes of their forced labor system. It includes the full forced labor code of Communist China—the regulations governing reform through labor. It also contains material from eye-witness sources. The information shows that wide segments of the population are considered as class enemies and treated like criminal elements, that a major purpose of the system is to compel allegiance to the political views of the ruling regime, and that the system is used for economic purposes.

The system is directed, first and foremost, to eliminating any shades of opinion and thought which differ from those of the regime. This was made clear as early as 1949 by Mao Tse-tung in his essay "On the Peoples Democratic [sic] Dictatorship": "The reactionaries must be deprived of the right to voice their opinions; only the people" [and Mao explicitly meant that in Communist China only certain types of persons are "people"] "have that right. Those belonging to reactionary classes or groups would be given a chance to reform themselves through labor into new persons, but only on condition that they do not rebel, sabotage, or create disturbances." Mao stated that this could be referred to as a "benevolent policy" but that it would be "compulsorily imposed upon those originally from enemy classes . . . If they do not want to work the people's state will force them to do so."

What this means in forced labor camps was revealed in a broadcast from Peiping on October 18, 1951 concerning the Ching-ho Forced Labor Camp: "When Chairman Mao Tse-tung's treatise on people's democratic dictatorship and the policy of reform through labor were explained to the criminals, they showed signs of violent mental revolt. Some of them burst into tears, some lost their appetite for food, some wrote death notes, and some attempted suicide or escape. To meet the situation, responsible officials of the farm made the criminals fully understand that reform through labor was a liberal measure taken by the people and the state for the sake of giving the counterrevolutionaries a new life and was therefore their only means of having a new future."

Mr. Chairman, this process is praised in the Chinese Communist press as a significant contribution to the national economy and was adopted with that end in view. Production figures have been given by the Chinese Communist press which show that they consider forced labor to be of considerable economic importance. These figures can be found in the documents before us. On September 7, 1954, furthermore, the Peiping Peoples Daily revealed that 83 percent of the persons in confinement in Communist China had been assigned to forced labor and indicated that they were doing such jobs as cutting timber, constructing buildings, and building water conservation installations, railways and highways. Shortly over a month later it stated: "Production from corrective labor . . . has now reached impressive proportions, and is playing a real role in national economic reconstruction," a comment similar to that of Lo Jui Ching that: "Production under the reformatory labor program has contributed significantly to the supply of commodities to meet the requirements of basic national development."

It is thus clear that forced labor is used in Communist China for both political and economic purposes. The vast extent of the system is revealed by the production figures cited by their own sources and by the fact that the regulations make elaborate provisions for various types of forced labor institutions, including provisions for camps of 3000 or more prisoners.

The ILO committee, after examining this extensive material, concluded:

1. "The guiding principle . . . is that persons hostile to the regime (described usually as 'counter-revolutionary elements, feudal landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists') must be deprived of political rights and compelled to reform through labor."

2. "In application of this principle, the legislation has set up a very highly organized system of forced labor, in prisons and labor camps, for the purpose of political coercion and education."

3. "(This) system of forced labor * * * is being used on a vast scale for carrying out state programs of economic development, (and) * * * the government is thus conscripting labor on a large scale to further its economic plans."

4. "(This) legislation * * * does not appear to be of a temporary or emergency character or resulting from the need for reconstruction but is inspired by a definite policy laid down by the legislators of the People's Republic."

5. "The elaborateness of the machinery set up by the legislation and the figures mentioned in * * * newspaper articles * * * convince (the committee) that forced labor exists on a very large scale, and that the number of persons involved represents a considerable proportion of the total population."

6. "(While) * * * the legislation contains certain provisions which should secure reasonably good treatment for prisoners and persons in forced labor camps * * * from the other information before it * * * the Committee must have serious doubts as to the extent to which these legislative provisions are actually applied in practice. The many concordant reports of abuses in the procedure for sentence, in the conditions and treatment of prisoners, and in the 'disciplinary measures' taken cannot be ignored."

It is tragic that such serious revelations should be made at a time when there have been reports of improved conditions in some forced labor camps in the ideological center of the system—the U. S. S. R. Many reported improvements, for example, apparently followed the dramatic strikes at Vorkuta and elsewhere. In addition, many people were apparently released as a result of the 1953 amnesty, although persons sentenced to forced labor for political reasons were not among them. The September 1955 amesty may have released many more although it is impossible to verify this. There have also been reports that the aspects of the penal code which were most strongly criticized by the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor may be under revision, and there have even been objections recently by Soviet officials against the system of labor direction.

The ILO Forced Labor Committee, perhaps with these reports in mind, recognized that there has been some improvement in the situation in certain countries since 1953, but concluded "while this in itself is satisfactory it cannot be considered as a major advance since the Committee is firmly of the opinion that the systems mentioned above should in any case be completely abolished."

There is as yet absolutely no evidence that the U. S. S. R. has taken steps to abolish its forced labor system, or significantly altered its political and economic role in Soviet society, and we cannot even accurately assess the causes for these changes which have taken place. Nevertheless ,it is possible that world opinion, as expressed through this Council, has played its role.

The United Nations can take pride in the fact that our investigations of the forced-labor issue have undoubtedly materially helped to improve the lot of a great number of fellow human beings.

There is no evidence, I repeat, that any steps are being taken to abolish the system itself. And I am sure that this is the result for which the Economic and Social Council has always striven. The purposes and principles of the United Nations demand that United Nations efforts continue until that end is reached.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to the specific action which we can take at this session. It relates in large measure to the ILO. The International Labor Organization has quietly and without fanfare during the past quarter of a century been working toward elimination of various aspects of forced labor.

Now it is carrying forward work preparatory to consideration by the International Labor Conference of the broad problems of forced labor as set forth in the U. N.-ILO ad hoc committee report of 1953.

The United Nations should be in wholehearted agreement with this work of the ILO. It carries forward on a practical, workaday plane much of the same effort we have made in the Economic and Social Council. The ILO, as the international organization with special competence in labor problems, can confidently be relied upon by us to press forward vigorously to eliminate systems of forced labor wherever they are found.

Together with the delegations of Ecuador, the Netherlands, France, and the United Kingdom, the United States has cosponsored a resolution designed to facilitate this. As in the past, it condemns the existence of forced labor for political and economic purposes. It requests the ILO to continue its work in the field and to report on forced labor to the Council in its annual report. It also includes a request to the Secretary General to transmit any information he may receive to the ILO for its information and use, including information of a nature which ordinarily would be circulated only under the provisions of resolution 75 (V).

The total effect of this resolution would be to place the subject in the hands of a competent group of men in a responsible and experienced organization who will press forward to seek to eliminate forced labor as rapidly as possible. It will be possible for us to review the subject periodically on the basis of the ILO reports, or if the situation warrants to take it up as a special agenda item in the future. It is our hope that the trends in world thinking and relations have come to the place where all delegations can support this resolution.

Pike County Farm Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper comment from the Pike County Republican, of Pittsfield, Ill.:

[From the Pike County Republican of May 9, 1956]

SHOCKING LOSS FIGURE

An inkling of the serious financial crisis Pike County farmers endured during 1955 appears in the Farm Management Cooperators survey conducted under the supervision of Farm Adviser Herb Wendler. A summary of this survey appears elsewhere in this issue.

It is important because it is based on accurate cost studies of 22 farming operations in Pike County. It does not mean that all farmers suffered as heavily as the 22 cooperating, but it does indicate serious trouble.

The 22 farmers had an average loss of $7,260 for the year, or a total for the 22 of $159,764.

These conditions developed during a period of rigid high price supports on basic crops, as the flexible program was not effective until late fall.

Everyone in Pike County joins in a fervent prayer that the new farm program, based more closely on the age-old law of supply and demand, will help to correct this shocking farm financial situation.

Heavy loss during years of national prosperity is an anachronism that must be ended. However, it would be futile to try to end it by continuing the same old legislation under which this unfortunate situation developed.

[From the Pike County Republican of May 9, 1956]

SURVEY SHOWS 22 FARMERS HERE HAD BIG LOSS IN 1955—AVERAGE LOSS OF $7,260 PER FARMER DURING YEAR

A survey by Farm Adviser Herb Wendler, based on the management records of the 22 farmers who cooperate in the special annual study, shows 1955 as a year of staggering loss.

Here is Mr. Wendler's summary and comment:

How did our Pike County farmers do in 1955? The only accurate records I have available are those from our 22 farm management cooperators.

Let's start with the startling figure. In 1955 these 22 cooperators had a net loss of $159,764. In round figures that's a loss of $7,260 per farmer. I am wondering how many businesses in Pittsfield would fold up with such a loss.

One operator had a net management return. It was small. Following the principle of not quoting specific farm examples, no individual farm figures are quoted in full. Most farmers on the accrual basis of accounting paid no social-security taxes.

We like to speak in terms of returns per $100 worth of feed fed to the different classes of livestock. In 1954 hogs returned $150; in 1955 the figure was $100 (break-even on feed only). For beef cattle in 1954 the feed return was $123 per $100 worth fed; for 1955 this was $98. The dairy cattle situation dropped from $176 in 1954 to $131 in 1955. Normally we would expect our farmers to receive $138 instead of the $100 they received in 1955 from hogs. From beef cattle they would need $131 instead of $98. And from dairy we would need $206 instead of $131.

Perhaps the net return per tillable acre might give you the picture from a different angle. However, these returns are based on six counties (Schuyler, Brown, Pike, Adams, Hancock, and Fulton). We will quote the farms with a soil productivity rating of 50 to 64, or near average in productivity. For 1955 11 beef farms with an average of 216 tillable acres had a negative return (loss) per tillable acre of $40.48. Twenty-two hog farms with an average of 238 tillable acres had a negative return of $25.56. Five mixed livestock farms with an average of 139 tillable acres had a negative return of $38.05.

In these figures we conclude the beef farmer is hardest hit. Might I add that this group also suffered a loss in 1954 although it wasn't nearly so large (about one-third of 1955's loss).

Since 1954 is mentioned, I'd like to quote the net management return for these cooperators in that year. It was $8,801. By adding the 1954 positive figure of $8,801 to the 1955 negative figure of $159,764 we find this small group of farmers had a drop in net management returns of $168,565.

It is possible for a few farmers to make a profit while the majority are losing money, but no rural community can make progress while this condition exists.

Some farmers can do a little to help themselves, but they cannot do the job by themselves.

The hog farmer can practice some self-help. I have seen the figures quoted that if we could cut 50 pounds off of all 250 to 160 pound hogs going to market at the present time, prices would jump as much as $1.10 per hundredweight. This would be a result in the cut in lard tonnage alone.

Big Business and the H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the unique feature of our free-enterprise system is that each business unit, regardless of its size, can play a part in furthering the welfare of all of us. Big business plays a particularly important role in furthering research activities which are completely beyond the scope of smaller enterprises. This is true in spite of the statements by Mr. T. K. Quinn, the professional anti-big-business witness whose statements I reviewed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year.

Mr. Quinn said "original inventions are no more plentiful, proportionately, in big than in small organizations." Mr. Quinn argues that "in the electrical-appliance industry, the better clothes-washingmachines have not been produced by the monster companies but by relatively small, independent companies specializing in one or two products. This is also true of ranges, vacuum cleaners, radios, toasters, mixers, home-freezers, fans, clocks, heaters, air-conditioning units, and so forth." Mr. Quinn may know something about toasters and mixers, but he does not claim to be an atomic scientist.

One accomplishment of big business which means more to the security of all of us than anything else is the production of the hydrogen bomb. Here the role of big business is undisputed. What is more significant, I firmly believe that our scientists, through their efforts in developing the hydrogen bomb, are on the way toward the development of peaceful applications of the fusion process.

Henry J. Taylor recently described the activities of the Du Pont Co. in producing the plant facilities and the bomb itself at the huge Savannah River plant of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Speaker, the fee charged the Government by the Du Pont Co. for assuming this tremendous responsibility was $1.

I wonder where we would be today if we had followed the advice of Mr. Quinn and destroyed the vast organizations which are capable of doing this kind of a job for all of us.

Mr. H. J. Taylor, the noted journalist and radio commentator, recently described the Savannah River project in an article in the Reader's Digest. In accordance with leave previously granted, I am including Mr. Taylor's article as an extension of my remarks:

INSIDE THE H-BOMB PLANT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The hydrogen-bomb plant is the largest construction achievement in the history of the world. The site, larger than Chicago, covers 315 square miles, stretches through three South Carolina counties. The great secret plant runs for 27 miles along the Savannah River. It cost $1,400 million.

There are 280 permanent buildings. Many are as heavily constructed as the battleship *Missouri*. Nearly all are windowless. Some are enormous gray monsters billowing skyward in tier after tier of concrete and steel, shaped unlike anything previously designed by man—and some are actually not populated by a single man, because the process inside is so deadly.

Some have a definite, sober majesty. Others are low and rambling, with annexes and entrances that you enter as if you were coming into the yawning mouth of a giant snake. Still other tremendous buildings consist of row after row of aluminum-colored tubes, trellises, retorts, and tanks, thrown up bare, without walls, for the fumes from their strange processes would be poisonous if confined by walls and the ventilation problem impossible. In fact, some fumes at this stage are so lethal they are carried to a tower 400 feet tall, and burned high in the sky—an eerie, even frightening sight at night, the wild flames licking upward in a blazing whirlpool.

Pumping stations and power stations are everywhere. An incredible quantity of water is needed to cool the atomic reactors, enough to serve the city of Philadelphia. In its chores, this water is pushed through 85 miles of underground mains. Little is consumed; it is simply circulated and returned to the Savannah River. Overhead powerlines weave among the buildings for some 128 miles. The plant uses as much electricity as the entire State of Delaware.

Every man who enters this place is photographed. Each building is surrounded by its own immense circuit of barbed wire and a secret protection system. There are armed sentries and squads of radio-equipped patrol cars hovering near every series of barriers. Even the plant's general manager and security chiefs, who guided me throughout, must stop for full identification at every alarm post and checkpoint. That they had passed through the barrier a few minutes before, and had been identified, made no difference.

How did this all start, in the first place?

Our A-bomb had been a success. Nuclear fission, or the splitting of the atom, had been achieved. We had learned the secret of the transmutation of the elements, changing one element to another. We had made an A-bomb so powerful that it had, at Bikini, lifted 10 million tons of water to a height of 2 miles—equivalent to the tonnage of the United States wartime fleet. But after the U. S. S. R. exploded their A-bomb in August 1949, it was decided to attempt the creation of the even more powerful H-bomb.

The known fact that our A-bomb generated temperatures up to 50 million degrees Centigrade led to the successful creation of the H-bomb. The sun, which gives off energy in changing hydrogen to helium, burns at some 20 million degrees Centigrade. Scientists reasoned that an A-bomb explosion could produce a fusion reaction like that of the sun if the proper materials were at hand. The atomic bomb could thus be used as a trigger for a fusion bomb. That bomb, in turn, would ignite and fuse or bring together two of the heavier isotopes of hydrogen.

The decision to attempt the H-bomb was made at the White House on January 31, 1950. But the manufacturing challenge was appalling. The hydrogen bomb would have to contain fusionable products similar to those in the stars, and produce incredibly high temperatures. Savanah River scientists told me that first estimates were that such material would cost a million dollars a pound. It would have to be carried to the target under refrigeration of 400 degrees Fahrenheit below zero. The bomb itself would weight at least 130,000 pounds, and so could not be transported by air.

The material now used was conceived later on in the realm of pure science. But it took this 315-square-mile plant to make that product.

In the beginning, technical production difficulties, and the sheer immensity of the factory-construction problem, were so great no assurance could be given that such a nuclear product could be made. However, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.—which had built and operated the Hanford, Wash., plutonium unit—accepted an Atomic Energy Commission letter of contract on August 1, 1950, and took on the project, including responsibility for thousands of subcontractors, at a fixed fee of $1.

When the engineers started looking for sites they started looking for rivers, because so much water would be needed to cool off the atomic furnaces. But the investigation also dealt with many other factors. In all, some 114 sites were examined. In November 1950 a joint review committee chose the area south of Aiken on the quiet Savannah River.

Six villages were made into ghost towns—like Ellenton. The name still appears in the post office guide, but not a soul remains. Dusty houses cluster the short main street. The wind bangs their doors open and shut on creaking hinges. For these houses stand today in the heart of the secret area. In all, 1,500 families had to be moved and resettled.

Meanwhile, Du Pont's engineering work had started. It wound up a series of 2 million blueprints. In a roll of paper 24 inches wide they would stretch from Atlanta to Seattle. The dirt excavated would cover the same distance, in the form of a wall 10 feet high and 6 feet wide.

Construction started in February 1951. The number of workers reached a peak of 38,500 in September 1952. The average age of the engineering and supervisory group was only 40.

Today there is an operating force of around 8,500 people. All personnel live off the secret site.

A world safety record was established during the building of the plant. Men worked for more than 6 million exposure hours without a single lost-time injury—a record unparalleled in the construction industry.

The first output was tested near Eniwetok atoll in the Pacific on November 1, 1952. That bomb was called "Mike." It was too big to be dropped from an airplane. It wiped out the island of Elugelab, on which it was shot, leaving in its place a crater 175 feet deep and a mile wide—big enough to hold 14 Pentagon buildings.

That single bomb had more force than the combined weight of all the bombs dropped on Germany and Japan throughout World War II.

In 1954, another H-bomb, by now so developed that it could be airborne, was exploded in the Pacific. It produced several-fold the force of the first one.

The first step toward making the H-bomb is the arrival at the plant of polished slugs of uranium. One pound of this material (only the size of a golf ball because of its great weight) has the same potential energy as enough TNT to fill the Yankee Stadium. The uranium slugs are assembled inside long tubes called fuel rods. The target material this atomic fuel is to bombard is assembled inside similar rods in such a way as to provide a self-sustaining chain reaction. The methods call for applied nuclear science of the highest level and involve, of course, several of the most basic secrets of production.

Roughly speaking, the materials that are to react on one another in the nuclear furnace, the reactor, are now ready. And here came the next construction challenge. Previous reactors were atomic piles using graphite in the nuclear process. H-bomb materials required designing a tank-like reactor on a completely new theory. The tank could be made of aluminum. It would be surrounded by graphite, and then by a concrete shield. But it would have to be filled with "heavy" water.

This fluid is a phenomenon. It looks like plain water, but weighs more. Of the hydrogen atoms in plain water, one in every 6,250 weighs twice as much as the rest. Every time you use 52 gallons of water in everyday living, you use 1 ounce of "heavy" water. This amounts to 1 pound in every 3 tons of water—if you can get it out. The H-bomb plant miraculously "gets it out" by the thousands of tons, whereas only a small quantity existed previously throughout the world.

In the H-bomb process, neutrons fly out from the uranium at high speeds. They are the "spark" for the powerful nuclear reaction. But they travel 30 million miles per hour; it is necessary to slow them down before they are efficient; otherwise they may bypass the atomic targets in the other rods that they are supposed to convert. The heavy water is used to slow down the neutrons. They are kept submerged in this strange fluid, which is called the "moderator."

Finding a way to produce vast quantities of heavy water made possible the success of the radically new reactors. These are great, tiered, heavily constructed buildings. There are five of them, all alike, the heart and core of the plant: buildings R, L, P, K, and C. The working force call them "Roger," "Lilly," "Polly," "Kitty" and "Charley."

There are 5 reactors instead of 1, not because all are necessary to make 1 H-bomb, but to multiply the output. For it is incorrect to assume that once our country has a suitable "stockpile" of atomic weapons we have a true and standing supply. Atomic bombs deteriorate in storage. They must be freshened, replenished, "recharged." That is why there is continuous atomic-materials production, and why the output is on a permanent basis.

An atomic bomb is an uncontrolled reaction. A reactor operation is a controlled reaction. When loaded rods are put in the reactor, the tremendous potential energy locked up in their atoms must be released gradually. The nuclear operation requires controls so fantastically sensitive that human operation is impossible. The pulse of the reaction must be recorded continuously. Speed in electronic calculators and signal systems is imperative to monitor it and also to set in motion the nuclear corrective measures required to compensate for the slightest changes. The whole operation is controlled by another industrial super-marvel—instrumentation.

The H-plant's instrumentation includes more than 100,000 dials. Some scales weigh invisible specks one billion times smaller than a gram. Other instruments clock speeds of atomic particles to one thousandth of a millionth of a second. Miraculous pumps whirl faster than the speed of sound. You can see immense doors open and close themselves in perfect unison. Some of the machines weigh 250,000 pounds, yet they must operate with micrometer-like precision. They are, in fact, built by watchmakers.

The fission products, or ashes from the atomic fuel, are intensely deadly, radioactive. To handle them, robots take over. To avoid radioactive fatality, the incredibly difficult operations had to be designed to continue indefinitely without ever stopping for maintenance, and completely without human contact.

Here you see robot hands, remotely directed, so delicate in their touch that they could pluck a hair from your head. You see huge robot derricks and electric trolleys inching their way through tunnels and down tracks under electronic control, as if guided by brains from another world.

Equipment maintenance and other intricate changes are made on signal by means of these weird workmen among the forest of machines. They throw switches as a man might do, repair leaking pipes, transfer faulty machinery, install replacements, and even flash a battery of lights, like a pinball machine, if they fumble something.

Technicians scan the operations from outside the vast building through a telescope in the wall. When I asked why the robots needed watching one scientist replied: "Well, it's lonesome in there. We keep our eye on them to see that they don't go over in a corner and sulk."

At intervals, discarded machines or tools, if radioactive, are transported to a burial ground down by the river. There even the trucks that haul them are buried forever.

The atomic end-products emerge separated. The uranium fuel, repurified, is returned for reprocessing into slugs, to be used again. Some plutonium has been created, useful in the A-bomb. Cobalt has been made radioactive; it will be packaged in the form of wafers, each slightly larger than a dime, and shipped for use in the medical profession as a substitute for radium. Isotopes are sent to outside laboratories for experiments toward better agriculture, better forestry, better industry, better health. The poisoned material for which no use is yet known is stored underground in batteries of giant sunken tanks, each the size of a 10-story building, awaiting a day when science will discover some utilization.

And finally comes the material for the H-bomb, now purified and lethal. It is ready to be assembled into the weapons which today guard the peace of the world.

None of Washington's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial from the Indianapolis News of April 25, 1956, entitled "None of Washington's Business":

NONE OF WASHINGTON'S BUSINESS

The question of whether four State conservation department employees are "guilty" or "not guilty" of ridiculous charges that they violated the Hatch Act will be aired at a United States Civil Service Commission hearing next month.

The outcome of the hearing is not important. But the reasoning of Washington bureaucrats that underlies the hearing is of great importance.

It is a disturbing example of the continuing trend on the Potomac to dictate the affairs of sovereign States.

The Hatch Act was passed more than 20 years ago with the basic aim of prohibiting political activity by Federal employees.

Yet, because four Indiana State employees solicited voluntary contributions to the Republican Party, the United States Civil Service Commission held up its hands in horror and cried "coercion."

The Hatch Act was violated, the Commission said, because the conservation department was receiving an allotment of $67,000 in Federal funds and hence the department employees come under the Commission's purview.

Indiana Attorney General Edwin K. Steers says the charges will be refuted.

It makes no difference, actually, whether the men are "guilty" or not. The affair is simply no business of the Federal Government.

The only punishment that can be given is to deprive the conservation department of the small allotment of Federal funds. Since Gov. George N. Craig several months ago rejected the allotment in a spirited defense of States' rights, that punishment would be meaningless.

There never was a valid reason for such a hearing to be called. But it does afford another opportunity for Indiana to make another fighting stand against Washington dictation.

And if it serves to remind an additional number of Hoosiers that the danger of Federal control always accompanies Federal aid, then it will not be a waste of time.

Comments of Menominee Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Shawano Evening Leader in its issue of Friday, May 11, 1956, reprinted 2 editorials, 1 from the Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis., and 1 from the Appleton Post Crescent, Appleton, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent to include the reprints of these two editorials as they appeared in the Shawano Evening Leader. The Menomine Indian Reservation is located just a few miles from Shawano, Wis.

COMMENTS ON MENOMINEE PROBLEMS

The problems of the Menominee Indian Tribe as termination nears have drawn widespread comment.

We present here the recent comments of two Wisconsin daily newspapers.

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

It remains to be seeen, in this election year, whether last week's meeting of the State Menominee Indian study committee settled more political controversy than it raised.

Certainly the former is to be hoped for, because the problems involved in termination of Federal trusteeship over the Menomines and their magnificant central Wisconsin forest are complex enough without partisan politics being added as a disruptive ingredient.

The committee, created by the last legislature to help the Menominees prepare for termination by December 31, 1958, is made up of tribal representatives, legislators, supervisors of counties adjoining the reservation and State department officials. Working with the committee are technicians from the University of Wisconsin.

Last Friday the committee sidestepped endorsement of a congressional bill by Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Milwaukee, which would permit the transfer of property to the tribe only when the tribe and the Secretary of the Interior agreed upon a termination plan, but would end Federal supervision and benefits on December 31, 1958.

William Proxmire, Democratic candidate for governor, has predicted a "nightmare of injustice" if the bill is not passed. But at the meeting Attorney General Thomson, study committee chairman and a Republican candidate for governor, said he believed the bill would "create more problems than it solved."

The committee, however, did adopt a policy statement approving preservation of the Menominee forest under sustained yield timber management, one of the objectives of the Reuss bill. It also endorsed a noncontroversial bill by Representative LAIRD (Rep., Marshfield) to appropriate Federal funds for termination studies. It also asked Congress to amend the termination law to avoid possible complications by premature allocation of property rights to individual tribal members. LAIRD has since introduced a bill to accomplish the latter purpose.

Both Democrats and Republicans may choose to make political capital of the committee actions. But if there is disagreement, let it be on a responsible level. The interests will be poorly served by bickering and unfounded charges at a time when not even tentative recommendations have been made by the trained personnel now digging into the difficult problems involved.

THE APPLETON POST-CRESCENT

It has been said that some of the leaders and members of the Menominee Indian tribe are probably wishing that the political campaigns would end quickly. There are signs that the Democrats in their anxiety to defeat the Republicans are willing to use the tribe and its problems as clubs without regard to the unfortunate consequences for the Indians themselves.

Thus some of the Democratic candidates have already issued charges that the Republicans have unworthy motives as the State administration works out the problems of Indian self-government, in consultation with the tribe, under legislation adopted by a Republican-controlled Congress that provides for the release of the Indians from Federal Government wardship at the end of 1958. Not too subtly, some of the Democratic oratory has hinted that the Republicans want to be a party to the despoliation of the Indians' magnificent forest reserves by private interests.

Not only is the suggestion a base one, but it can be refuted so easily by the clearly visible record as to cause some curiosity about why the Democrats dared to make it. Perhaps they don't think that many persons are informed sufficiently about the details and that the political dividend is worth the risk.

The fact is that such a charge impugns not only the elected officials at Madison, but several dozens of nonpartisan technicians of the University of Wisconsin and the State administrative agencies, not to mention the leadership of the tribe and the chairmen of the Shawano and Oconto county boards.

For these are the men who are sitting as members and consultants of the commission set up by the last legislature to work out a civil government and political freedom program for the 3,200 members of the Menominee Reservation. The task is admittedly a challenging one. No one has said the problems will be easily solved. Some thoughtful persons are aware that there are some doubts that a way can be fashioned to permit the cooperative ownership and protection and sustained-yield management of the forest for the Indians' economic benefit, within the taxation requirements of a modern local government operating without exceptional State or Federal subsidies.

But the important fact is that the answers are being sought, that some of the best brains available are dedicated to the task, and that the legislature from now on will get the facts. If it is then shown that the problems cannot be solved within the terms of the "emancipation" act of the Congress effective in 1959, the Congress will have ample opportunity to take new action to suit the facts as they are found to exist. Meanwhile it will be clear to all fair-minded persons with the slightest knowledge of this matter that caterwauling from the sidelines with political intent and purpose can only make the solution more difficult.

Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I include in my remarks an essay written by Mr. Rodney Nicholson from Parkers Chapel High School, El Dorado, Ark., which placed fifth in the national essay contest conducted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. I commend this essay to the attention of every Member of Congress. I am sure all of us join in congratulations to this fine young man for his contribution to this program.

Under leave granted, to extend my remarks, I include the essay:

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE HANDICAPPED THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

Independence is a wind of freedom within the soul of man. Independence is the spirit of a man free from the sustaining support of another man, free from control over his mind, his thoughts, and his works. Independence is the faith of a man in himself, in his ability as an individual to develop and direct his talents and his life.

Employment, whether directly controlled by another, or guided from within the personality is a foundation requirement without which independence could never be attained. This is a decree from God written into the nature of life itself.

The union of these distinct ideas of independence and employment is found in the poetry of Carl Sandburg, woven into a single expression of beauty and truth.

"I know a Jew fish crier down on Maxwell
Street with a voice like
A north wind blowing over corn stubble in
January.

He dangles herring before prospective customers evincing a joy
Identical with that of Pavlowa dancing.

His face is that of a man terribly glad to be
selling fish, terribly glad
That God made fish, and customers to
whom he may call his
Wares from a pushcart."

The need of employment is for every man. It holds no exception, whether the man is strong and able and alooks on his world from clear eyes, or whether his eyes are dim and he is halt and lame.

But for the physically disabled the task of securing employment to build an independent life is beset with difficulty. We must understand these difficulties if we are to help the disabled to help themselves.

The disabled must adjust themselves mentally to their disability.

They must develop their capacities and natural skill to a higher degree than that required of one who is able bodied.

They must overcome the natural resistance and prejudice of employers.

They must prove their worth, competing with sound men in the production of goods and services.

The darkness of misunderstanding that still clouds the truth about disabled people remains a foremost crippling difficulty. If not dispelled, this difficulty can cause society to doom its physically disabled to a living death of uselessness and cruel despair.

Must the crippled and the physically deformed stand on the corner of a street to sell items for scant pennies?

Should people recovered from a disease be thought a hazard to health and never allowed to work?

Are the blind better for nothing than to be idle in their darkness, their very lives dependent on another's charity?

A disabled person needs constructive assistance in solving those difficulties. If this assistance is not available the person will likely become a burden to his society, able to hold scant happiness for himself or for others. This is a tragedy too intense to be ignored or looked lightly upon by anyone.

The entire working force of the country of America nears 63 million. Of these, approximately one-quarter of a million become disabled each year. While millions of these disabled are gainfully employed, there were in 1953 some 200,000 who were not—more people than comprise the entire working force of the country of Norway.

Many of these unemployed are supported at public expense. With proper training and rehabilitation, they could be placed on jobs fitted to their ability and personality. Being thus employed they would make valuable contributions to the working force of America. They would achieve a pride in themselves and respect of others as self-supporting citizens.

It is of evident importance then to the economy of this Nation that our disabled be rehabilitated, trained, and placed in profitable, productive employment.

Our Government has recognized this need and great strides have been made in its direction. But at best Government efforts rehabilitate less than 100,000 disabled persons each year; much remains to be done.

In 1953, while addressing the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, President Truman said in essence:

"The Nation's rehabilitation and placement programs should be expanded until large enough to give proper assistance to all who need it.

"Helping the physically disabled is not a matter of charity, done only for their happiness and comfort. We need them as productive workers, as taxpayers and citizens. Helping the disabled is a matter of economics as well as social justice."

The President closed saying, "We cannot afford to waste our human resources any more than our natural resources. We must husband them both if we are to succeed in building strength and security and peace for ourselves and the free world."

Truly by becoming personally independent, people form the soul of an independent nation. In turn, the free nation rewards them a finer degree of personal independence.

Independence has never been gained for a person solely because of his physical power. Independence is a harvest of the mental and spiritual struggle, the victory and the disappointment of individual effort.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, stricken in early manhood by paralysis, rendered a cripple for life, became one of the greatest and most beloved leaders the world has ever known.

The Apostle Paul, suffering bodily affliction, learned and followed the trade of a tentmaker. He established churches, writing them epistles which comprise now more than half the books of the New Testament. As the first great missionary of the Christian faith, Paul has had an influence on humanity felt even stronger today than when it began centuries ago. Justifiably he could say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

The years between the lives of these men are rich with the contributions of disabled people. Science, medicine, literature, music, none of the arts or professions could have attained their present degree of excellence lacking these contributions.

Physically disabled people we meet each day have directed their lives into doing a worthwhile job. They have achieved a greatness no less than those who have won fame and recognition.

These people are the friends who share our joys and our disappointments, sharing in all the ways of friends who enrich life with a finer meaning.

They are the neighbors who have homes along our street.

They are the artists and thinkers, the teachers and the statesmen, the engineers and the builders of America.

Creating, sharing, planning, building, the disabled work with us as people dependent on one another—yet independent with a burning individual freedom lighting the way to work and the way to live.

The equality of job opportunity is the birthright of every American. For one handicapped this birthright must be protected by an understanding of his problems and by the assistance in helping him to secure a job. With employment as a solid foundation he can seek the highest fulfillment of his life, an achievement aided and enriched by a personal independence; the wind of freedom within the soul of a man.

Public Power at Niagara—The First Step Has Been Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I learned with a great deal of gratification and pleasure that last night the Senate passed Senator LEHMAN's bill, S. 1823, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes. By its action, the Senate gave its approval to a principle which I have long advocated, that this great natural resource should be developed by public authority for the benefit of the people.

The first great step toward harnessing the power potential of the Niagara's waters was taken last night. It now remains for this House to approve this redevelopment project.

Because of my deep concern and feeling about the importance of this project and its value not only to the people of New York, but to the Nation as well, I am today introducing a bill identical in every respect with the bill passed last night. I do this to make unequivocal my position in support of the measure and the project which it envisions.

Delay in the passage of this act will be exceedingly costly. Too much water has already flowed, unutilized, over the falls at Niagara. Each second, an additional 23,000 cubic feet of water is lost. With it goes the potential electric energy that might have been produced. What a tremendous loss that is for the consumers of electrical power in the area. What a waste in terms of the benefits that would be derived from this electricity.

I respectfully urge each of my colleagues in the House to give this legislation his earnest support and his vote, so that the harnessing of our share of the Niagara power may begin. The benefits that will be derived therefrom will redound to the ultimate good of all the people of our Nation.

Postmaster General Summerfield Asserts the Post Office Department Has No Intention of Changing Existing Regulations Affecting Rights and Privileges of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a recently publicized statement concerning certain regulations of the Post Office Department indicating, if enforced, might affect certain rights of employees in the postal service. Of course, I am opposed, as you are, to regulations that would jeopardize the privileges of those employed in the postal service of our country.

I addressed an inquiry to the Postmaster General concerning this matter. It occurred to me Members would be interested in my inquiry and the reply of the Department. Here they are:

MAY 15, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
The Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL SUMMERFIELD: Postal employee leaders have called my attention to regulations of the Department which they charge might be used to curtail the rights of the Department's 500,000 employees. Postal leaders say that the policy could curtail the rights of employees to take action for the improvement of their working conditions and benefits without prior approval of the Department.

The controversial regulation, they say, appeared in the March 28 edition of the Postal Manual. It reads as follows:

"Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

Union officials tell me that is a violation of the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912 which, as you know, specifically gives Federal workers the right to petition Congress as to improvement in their benefits and working conditions as well as the airing of their grievances. Federal workers tell us the regulation would prevent employees from having their grievances and personnel matters aired within the Department.

It would seem to me that, if the contention of the postal employees is a correct one, and that the Department has issued regulations as described in their complaint to me, you should have an explanation therefor. I will appreciate if you will let me know when you issued these regulations, also why they were issued. Apparently they must be recent or I would have had complaints prior to this.

Knowing the fairness of your attitude toward the problems of the employees in the postal service, I am sure you must have reason for the issuance of this regulation.

Respectfully submitted,
EDWARD H. REES,
Member of Congress.

MAY 17, 1956.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REES: Your letter of May 15, 1956, states that postal employee leaders have called your attention to certain regulations of the Department which they charge might be used to curtail the rights of employees. If the facts concerning postal regulations were as represented to you by these employee union leaders, I would be the first to share your deep concern in the matter. The claim that these rules are intended to restrict employee rights of free speech simply is not true. Here are the facts:

In 1949, the previous Post Office Department management issued a restriction on campaigns for changes in the mail service on the part of Postal Transportation Service employees. This regulation was reprinted recently in a revised chapter of the new Postal Manual.

It is this regulation which a few of the employee leaders have chosen to distort and misinterpret in an apparent attempt to influence legislation. The Department had no intention whatever of changing any existing privileges of employees and made this fact clear to anyone who inquired. In fact, the chapter of the Postal Manual which reprinted this old regulation made specific reference to part 741 of the same chapter which clearly stated the Department's intent and policy to protect fully the rights of employees.

Part 741 specifically provides for "the presenting by any person or groups of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof" and that "the right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or any Member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

Thus, these rights to present any grievance to Congress or any Member thereof, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or any committee or member thereof, are specifically set forth. Further, in a sincere effort to provide proper recognition for employee organizations, this same chapter of the Postal Manual recognizes the right to organize and contains the following instruction to all postal field management: "Consultation with employee organizations concerning mutual problems is not only the sensible course, but also the policy of the Department."

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, May 13, we honored the mothers throughout the Nation on their special day that has been set aside and known as Mother's Day. Whether young or old, we all rejoice in the love, affection, and tender care we have received from Mother.

I was so inspired by a Mother's Day poem composed by one of my constituents, Mr. Ike Williford, of Eldorado, Ill., that I wanted to have it included in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and friends:

MOTHER

I see her feeble hands now etched,
With marks of toil and care.
The ones that took me in her arms,
And held me closely there.

When childhood steps were hard to take,
She seemed to understand.
And shielded me from lots of falls,
With those old wrinkled hands.

I wonder now what are her thoughts,
As she sits there alone.
When time hangs heavy on her hands,
And all the children gone.

Perhaps she thinks of days gone by,
When times were not so good.
And those old hands worked late at night,
To earn our livelihood.

If Mother could recall her years,
Her past life to amend.
I'm sure that she would quickly choose,
Those same steps o'er again.

This world is filled with noble works,
Whose fame shall ever grow.
Yet Mother's hands have done far more,
Than anything I know.

—*Ike Williford.*

A Court of Professors and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the question of qualifications for Justices of the Supreme Court was raised at the time of the formation of our Government. Alexander Hamilton is reported to have said that we need not ever worry about that as any President would always appoint the very best legal minds and those with the most judicial experience to the Supreme Court. Mr. Hamilton was a great and patriotic man. He simply could not foresee a time in America when any President would appoint other than our very best lawyers and judges to the high bench. Unfortunately, Hamilton was wrong. We have indeed fallen upon such evil days. The Supreme Court today is destroying the individual liberties of our people, our local communities and our States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to this House an editorial which appeared in the Easley (S. C.) Progress. Our grassroots local newspapers such as the Easley Progress are ably pointing out to our people the dangers of the day.

A COURT OF PROFESSORS AND POLITICIANS

One would ordinarily think that the Supreme Court of the United States would be composed of lawyers or judges with long experience. An act is now before Congress to require that any judge on the Supreme Court

of the United States should have had at least 5 years' experience as a judge of a lower Federal court or the supreme court of a State. Yet only 1 of the 9 present judges would pass this simple test. Only 2 more had any prior judicial experience, 1 of them 1 year on the Federal bench, the other (Hugo Black) 18 months as a police court judge. The proposed law means that the people are gradually waking up to an alarming situation—that these men of great power do not understand the power they have because of lack of experience, and are grasping so much additional power as to threaten dictatorship.

Senator Kuchel's Character and Accomplishments Endorsed Editorially

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, those who know and work with Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California's outstanding junior Senator, are personally aware of his outstanding personal character and ability. These were the subject of a recent editorial in the Long Beach Press Telegram, which sums up his record and concludes that it calls for his retention as a Member of the other body. The editorial is as follows:

CHARACTER, ACCOMPLISHMENT CALL FOR RETENTION OF KUCHEL

When THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of nearby Anaheim, was appointed to the United States Senate by Gov. Earl Warren in December of 1952, this newspaper remarked that there was every good reason to anticipate that Mr. KUCHEL would do credit to Warren's record for picking good men for important appointments.

We have never had reason to regret that prediction. Senator KUCHEL has proved competent, conscientious, and effective in the high post to which he was named. He served so well in the early stages of his tenure in the Senate that the voters of California, in 1954, elected him in his own right to serve out the term of former Senator, and now Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

That term expires at the close of this year, and Senator KUCHEL is again before the voters for reelection. His continued effective service since the 1954 balloting calls for another resounding vote of approval at the polls June 5 for this man of demonstrated integrity.

Senator KUCHEL has supported President Eisenhower in the field of international affairs and national defense—not as a blind follower but because he regarded Eisenhower's policies as the soundest approach to desired objectives. On issues of domestic interest, he has exercised notable independent judgment.

On many questions of direct interest to our own region, Senator KUCHEL has acted with dispatch and effectiveness. He had a key part in bringing about favorable action on the replacement of finger wings at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital. His bill providing a research program on smog is now the law. The plight of the fishing industry in this area, the problem of sea erosion at the nearby Orange County beaches, and any number of such matters have received his prompt attention.

Senator KUCHEL's friendship for Long Beach has been emphatically demonstrated on many occasions, outstanding among these being his action on tideland matters. Shortly after taking office, he gave able aid in the restoration of the tidelands to the control of the States.

Then, when a bill was introduced in the State legislature which would have seized all of Long Beach's tidelands oil income, Senator KUCHEL joined Senator KNOWLAND in publicly voicing opposition to this extreme proposal. His statement was one of the significant factors in swinging the tide against the seizure bill in the 1955 legislature and bringing about instead an interim investigation of the problem.

We in Long Beach must not forget this notable contribution to our cause, made in the name of fairness and justice to a member of the State's family of communities.

Clearly, Senator KUCHEL has earned the support of the voters of this area in his bid for reelection. He is a Republican, but Democrats as well as Republicans have shown, at a number of statewide elections, that they recognize TOM KUCHEL as a public servant deserving of support, regardless of partisan considerations. He should be retained in the United States Senate.

Precinct Vote Clears Air for All of Texas Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the San Antonio Express of May 7, 1956, having to do with the effect of the recent Democratic precinct conventions, carried overwhelmingly by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

PRECINCT VOTE CLEARS AIR FOR ALL OF TEXAS POLITICS

Texas Democrats spoke up Saturday for party responsibility, moderation, and for orderly processes under the law.

At their precinct conventions, Democrats voted 4 to 1 in the State and 3 to 1 in Bexar County for the Democratic leadership of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. The issues were drawn clearly. Convention delegates said they want Democrats to run their party affairs; that they prefer moderate, middle-ground leadership; and that they do not recognize the discredited doctrine of interposition.

We think the precinct convention results clear the political air for all of Texas. There is a large segment of Texas citizens who have forgotten the bitter days of the Civil War era and no longer think Republicanism is a foreign political philosophy. Many of those in the ranks of Gov. Allan Shivers will find political ideals of their liking in the Republican Party.

If this overwhelming vote for Democratic Party regularity results in a strong two-party system in Texas, it will be for the State's best political interest. The trend has been for a stronger Republican Party. Saturday's convention voting should serve to strengthen that trend.

But all Texans—Democrats and Republicans alike—can find cause for celebration in the manner in which Democrats ignored interposition and all the evils such a doctrine might bring into being if it were taken seriously by any considerable number of citizens. That fantastic doctrine, rattled about Texas in the heat of preconvention campaigns, found no support in the showdown test Saturday night, we are happy to learn.

Shall We Finance Nehru's Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of May 8, 1956:

SHALL WE FINANCE NEHRU'S SOCIALISM?

India's Prime Minister Nehru soon will be coming to this country on what he calls a "goodwill" visit. As Will Rogers would have said, this means he's going to be a little slow in telling us how much money he wants.

Certainly Nehru isn't coming to the United States because of any love for us or our institutions. According to him, we were to blame for the Korean War. His anti-American utterances in recent years would fill a book, and he has been especially critical of our free-enterprise system—but never unwilling to accept our aid.

He is coming to the United States, let us remember, after being assured by Khrushchev and Bulganin that India can get everything she desires, in the way of technical aid, financing, materials, etc., from Soviet Russia. Apparently Mr. Nehru doesn't quite trust these Soviet offers, although he feels much closer to Russian and Chinese Communists than to Americans. At least he wants to find out what Washington will offer. So it behooves us to examine Mr. Nehru's program for India, as recently revealed.

India's governing Congress Party is on record as favoring a "socialistic pattern of society." And Prime Minister Nehru implemented this with the statement that "I certainly do not consider that free enterprise has anything to do with the concept of democracy. I do not want to give private enterprise a place which it has in some countries where it is virtually a demigod. If private enterprise clashes with the interests of the country as a whole, it will have to be put down or perhaps have to go, root, trunk and branch."

The socialist aims of the Nehru government are clear in its so-called Company Law of 1955. Its 649 clauses and 12 schedules cover all aspects of company management, limiting salaries of managers and empowering the government to change systems of management if it deems this necessary. The government will be able by August 15, 1960, to determine whether managers could continue to hold their jobs. The Nehru regime makes itself the final authority on the way a company should be run. This is nationalization by the back door.

New Delhi's Minister for Planning, Gulzarilal Nanda, believes his country will need around $2,300,000,000 of foreign capital to reach the goals of its second "Five-Year Plan" starting next year. This huge amount of foreign capital can come only from the United States, since the Russians are not in the lending or giveaway business. It can

come only from the American Government, because American investors and private corporations already have learned about India, to their heavy cost.

There are Americans like Chester Bowles and Harold Stassen who think we should give Nehru everything he asks for, and put up with his anti-Americanism, in order to keep India more or less on the side of the free world. We think Mr. Nehru should be told very bluntly, when he reaches Washington, that we are tired of his backbiting and will not underwrite his socialism and "neutralism." Let him take India in any direction he pleases, but not on our backs. That messy and backward subcontinent never will be on our side so long as Nehru and his kind govern it. Yet Mr. Nehru dares not get in bed with Communist Russia. Mr. President, give him to Chester Bowles and Eleanor Roosevelt.

Vursell and Nelsen Against Hoover REA Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a radio-broadcast discussion participated in between Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of REA, and my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES W. VURSELL, on May 10, 1956.

This is one in a weekly series of interesting and informative broadcasts on farm problems by Mr. VURSELL, carried by several radio stations in the 23d Congressional District of southern Illinois.

The matter follows:

VURSELL AND NELSEN AGAINST HOOVER REA REPORT

My friends, this is your Congressman, CHARLES W. VURSELL. In this broadcast today I have a pleasant surprise for you. I am honored to have with me on this program the top Administrator of REA, Mr. Ancher Nelsen.

Mr. Nelsen has directed this organization, nationwide, from his office in Washington for the past 2 years, and I am safe in saying that no administrator is more highly respected or has done a finer job in helping to bring light and power, and REA telephone service, to the farmers since this organization started than has Mr. Nelsen, who will participate in a brief discussion with me today.

However, before calling upon Mr. Nelsen, as your Congressman, I want to make a short statement. It has been my pleasure to serve in the Congress for 14 years, where I have had an opportunity to see REA grow, and an opportunity to help it to expand its growth—through always seeing to it that we in the Congress constantly provided adequate funds for its operation and development.

When I came to Congress, the REA organization was about 6 years old, and about 47 percent of the farmers had been reached with its service. Today, about 95 percent of the farmers of the Nation receive light and power. Of all of the billions of dollars I have helped to appropriate over the past 14 years, none of it, in my judgment, has done as much to aid the farmers, to lift the drudgery from farm work and farm women, and build up the economic welfare of our Nation as has the money we have loaned to REA cooperatives.

This organization has turned on the light and power in the farm homes of America. It has helped to modernize and make farm life more enjoyable. It has brought about a condition that helps to keep more of our fine young men and women on the farms of our country.

By making electricity available to the farmers, they have spent billions of dollars for electrical appliances, which has helped to employ labor, increase business, and build up the economy of the Nation.

Let me tell you what REA has done for Illinois: The 27 cooperatives in Illinois have extended REA service to over 95 percent of the farms in our State. Up to January 1, 1956, these cooperatives have borrowed from the Government $84,510,000, and paid back to the Government in interest $8,950,838, and repaid on principal $18,167,359. This includes a current balance of $5,147,854 of payments made ahead of schedule. In other words, they have paid interest and payments due, and have a prepayment for the future to their credit of $5,147,854.

The fine thing about it is that the record throughout the 48 States is almost as good as the record in Illinois.

In my congressional district, the 5 REA cooperatives have borrowed a total to date of $17 million from REA, and have invested $15,600,000 of that amount, with which they have built and now operate 8,400 miles of line, and serve 28,600 rural customers, who are my constituents. These REA cooperatives are also paying their loans ahead of schedule.

At the close of 1955, they had paid $6,600,000 on principal and interest due on their loans, of which $2,400,000 was paid in advance on principal.

Now, my friends, you have heard quite a bit of talk about the Hoover Report, which sought to change the loan and financing status of REA. As a Member of Congress, I would like to say to you: first, I am opposed to making any change in the present set up of REA, and second, in my judgment, the Congress that brought into being the REA, and has helped to nurture its growth for 20 years, is so proud of its accomplishments that you need not have any fear that we will permit its present organization to be handicapped, or changed, in any way, that would mar the fine record it has been making.

Mr. Nelsen, I am going to ask you to comment on any of the phases of REA that come to your attention at the present time. I know my people will be glad to hear this information from the very top of this great organization.

Mr. NELSEN. Well, Congressman, first may I say that I appreciate the opportunity of appearing on this program with you. I think it is a compliment to me and a compliment to the program.

The rural electrification program has been one of the outstanding contributions to rural America. I say that to you as a farmer. I happen to own and operate a farm in Minnesota. I helped organize the system that serves my farm, and I know farming with kerosene lamps, and it isn't easy. When electric power came out there it was a great contribution.

One of the things we have tried to do in the years I have been acting as Administrator is to try to apply some of the commonsense business administration that we learned on the farm—we have tried to apply that to Government. We have tried to make loans where they are necessary—where they are needed. We have not tried to outbid anyone else, but we are trying to do what is necesary.

We have encouraged that the farmers, directors and managers assume more responsibility and learn more about the business of runing their cooperatives. Therefore, they become stronger; because it is necessary to understand your responsibilities to do a good job.

We have encouraged greater financial strength. We encourage the cooperatives to have their rate structure such that will permit them to acquire greater ownership and less Government equity, and more farmer equity—and, therefore, owning it. So right across the board, our objective has been to do what any good farmer wants to do; that is, to own and operate and understand the business. And we have been very successful in that respect, because today we find the financial picture with REA cooperatives nationwide to be the best in its history. We find at the present time over $80 million of advance payments to the Government of the United States. We find that only about 13 of the cooperatives are behind in their payments. We find also that about 700 to 900 have paid advance payments to the Government. So, I think, when you add the total score we find ourselves in a very strong position.

And I want to say regarding the Hoover Committee report, we hear so much talk about it—I think mostly politically inspired, because we had Hoover Committee reports under previous administrations—and they are recommendations to the Congress for consideration. But our position on the present report is this: that we felt the recommendations in that report went far beyond where they should go, and had not had adequate study, and, therefore, we in REA recommended against it. The Secretary of Agriculture supported our position, and the President of the United States supported our position, and, on top of that, the Congress has supported our position, so, I think, we are in fine shape. We are financially strong. The farmers are getting electricity. We are paying back our loans. And, as a farmer, I feel very proud of what the rest of the farmers nationwide have done.

Mr. VURSELL. Now, that is fine, Mr. Nelsen. If there is anything further you would like to say I note we have almost 2 minutes of time.

Mr. NELSEN. Well, you may be interested also in the telephone program. That is part of our responsibility. We started out, I think the first year with about a $4 million loan program. Gradually that has gone up. Today it runs around $80 million per year.

A part of the contribution that the telephone program makes to rural telephone is the competition. The Bell companies and the independent companies are all doing a little more just because we are in it to push them a little bit. Incidentally, a big percentage of our loans are made to the small independent companies who have difficulty in getting finances. So we are trying to improve rural telephones. In this past year we had the most successful year in the history of rural telephony in the extension of telephone service to farm people.

Mr. VURSELL. That is fine, Mr. Nelsen. I see our time is almost up, but I want to compliment you for the very fine job you have done. I am delighted to have you here with me on this program today. I know our listeners are as well.

This is your Congressman, CHARLES W. VURSELL, signing off until this same time over this same station next week.

Texas' Man Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the El Paso Herald Post of May 7, 1956, and Houston Press of May 7, 1956:

TEXAS' MAN JOHNSON

Now, more than ever, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON stacks up as a major factor in the Democratic presidential convention to be held in Chicago in August.

Senator JOHNSON'S decisive victory over Governor Allan Shivers—hitherto undefeated—in Saturday's precinct conventions gives him control of the big Texas delegation at the National Convention.

He is almost certain to be a favorite-son candidate, and whether or not he becomes a serious contender for the presidential nomination, he will be in a position of strong influence on the convention's decisions—both as to the choice of a candidate and the writing of the platform.

LYNDON JOHNSON, as majority leader in the Senate and as a force in the Democratic Party, not only is a skilled politician but has constantly been an exponent of moderation—in contrast to some of the extremists who have sought to dominate the party.

The Senator's victory greatly improves the outlook for the moderate policies he stands for.

Perhaps even those conservatives whose peculiar campaign for Shivers stultified them and him will see at least a ray of light.

Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week, May 6-13, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this June will mark the 50th anniversary of the Federal food and drug laws and the Meat Inspection Act.

The distinguished Governor of Connecticut, Abraham A. Ribicoff, has issued an official statement declaring the week of May 6–13 as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week.

The Governor's statement is as follows:

The 50th anniversary of the signing by President Theodore Roosevelt of the first Federal Food and Drug Act will be celebrated during June 1956.

We in Connecticut are particularly honored to observe this occasion because our State has always pioneered in insuring the purity, integrity, and abundance of our food, drug, and cosmetic supplies. Connecticut's first State law in this field was enacted some 20 years before the first Federal act.

Furthermore, our agricultural experimental station was the first in the country, established 82 years ago, and devoting part of its efforts ever since to specific problems of protecting the health of our citizens.

As Governor of Connecticut, I am happy to declare the week of May 6–13, 1956 as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week.

Interested citizens, in cooperation with members of the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, are urged to mark this occasion with appropriate commemorative activities to foster public recognition of the many benefits derived from Federal, State, and local food, drug, and cosmetic laws.

When Will Our Allies Support Themselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the May 12 edition of the Saginaw News entitled "When Will Our Allies Support Themselves?":

WHEN WILL OUR ALLIES SUPPORT THEMSELVES?

The American people have been invited to continue pouring out their billions of earnings in foreign aid for another 10 years, or even a generation. The goal: "To accelerate the day when the Soviet Union will be a decent state to do business with."

This is the premise on which Secretary of State Dulles presses his case against cutting the $4.9 billion foreign aid bill. It is a premise which alters radically the people's understanding of a foreign aid policy which they have, until now, been willing to support in the belief that an end could be seen.

There may be no end to this policy of United States aid as a substitute for the NATO countries' assumption of their own economic support. And the NATO member nations are but part of this program of international subsidy. It spreads also to the so-called underdeveloped peoples to discourage their courtship with communism.

Ten years or a generation more of American billions shared in this endless pursuit of friends and support of old allies who, after 10 years of our assistance still can't stand alone, seems utterly futile.

Ten years ago the United States launched on a program of foreign aid whose purpose was understandable and, if the American people have to say so themselves, generous beyond all precedent. It was to restore war-devastated countries, allies and former enemies alike. It was to help them rebuild their economies. Then later the aim was to help allies develop military defenses against the unveiled imperialistic intentions of the Soviet Government.

The American people were given to understand that, once the economies of free nations had grown sound again, those governments would be able to stand up to the Communists.

The American people have given $55 billion of their earnings to this foreign-aid program. It has gone far beyond the bounds of disaster relief and the basic outfitting of military units.

Now we are being asked to continue this aid indefinitely, because our friends aren't able to afford their military establishments. It is a question whether they ever will. This raises serious doubt as to whether, in the long run, it is feasible, let alone sensible, to base the West's anti-Communist defense on so shaky an economic foundation.

Mr. Dulles deserves high praise for the imaginative construction he has given to NATO as an articulate alliance of friendly nations inside the United Nations. As an independent council, it also can bring unity of action, or at least formidable pressure, on the bigger, ideologically divided U. N.

If we fail to see the connection between this unfolding new approach and the endless subsidization of our friends, however, it is because nothing has been shown on the dollar side other than to suggest more of the same.

Rather than assisting Western Europe and some of these underdeveloped nations toward independent economic strength, is there not also concern that by our perpetual supplying of aid we have slackened their own will to recover and advance?

Congress is showing reluctance to accept the continuing heavy foreign-aid commitment. The greatness of America was built not on dollars but on ideals. America is distinctive in the world today only because it has defended at every turn the blessed heritage bestowed upon it by the Founding Fathers. Americans cannot build other nations in America's image through dollars. In bypassing the foundations of our strength and wealth simply to share the fruits, we may be perpetuating a disservice, which is the last thing Mr. Dulles or any of us could want.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley at Dinner Honoring the Ambassador of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at a dinner tendered His Excellency Masayuki Tani, Ambassador of Japan, by the Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, on May 15, 1956:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., AT DINNER TENDERED HIS EXCELLENCY MASAYUKI TANI, AMBASSADOR OF JAPAN, BY THE JAPANESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 15, 1956

I am most pleased to be included amongst the distinguished friends and members of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York at the chamber's annual dinner. Happy birthday and banzi.

I also deeply appreciate being given the opportunity to share the speaking honors with your president and with the Ambassador of Japan to the United States.

You can well imagine that it is difficult for me to select an appropriate subject on which to address you as your chamber has so many times been addressed by experts on every phase of Japanese-American relations and, obviously, I can lay no claim to being an expert on that subject.

I have, however, had instructive experience with the formulation of national and international policies of trade and commerce as a Cabinet member. I have also traveled the world over as an "observing salesman." I have been in Japan several times.

Consequently, I have been able to observe, firsthand, the working of different trade policies on the domestic and international economy of many nations in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves economically from the devastations of war. I have seen the struggle of nations to recapture their lost foreign markets to provide an outlet for their restored domestic production. I have had the opportunity of talking with government officials, businessmen, manufacturers, bank-

ers—with all classes of people in all walks of life. Naturally, I have formed certain opinions from these experiences. Although each country has its own special and peculiar problems there are, nevertheless, certain universal economic truths applicable to all.

Your chamber is dedicated to the improvement of relations between Japan and the United States, particularly in the fields of commerce and trade. This recommends that I should devote my remarks to certain basic general observations which are within the framework of your chamber's objectives and purposes.

It has been repeatedly said, from the highest official sources, that Japan is the eastern bulwark against communism. To be a strong and effective bulwark against communism, Japan must have a strong and viable economy, with political stability. To be in that position Japan must, first, be economically and industrially rehabilitated from the ravages of war; second, she must have access to required raw materials at costs making her manufactured products competitive in world markets; and, third, Japan must have world markets available in which she can competitively sell her manufactured products.

Let me express it another way, as this is the very heart of the Japanese problem. The viability of Japan's economy is inextricably bound to a foreign trade cycle whereby food and raw materials are imported into Japan, the same materials being processed there into finished goods and the finished goods then exported for foreign exchange to finance the import of more goods and raw materials.

Japan is at present dependent on friendly countries for an assured supply of the foods and materials vital to her existence. Up to the recent past, Japan has been able to pay for her requirements with United States dollars, and while this may continue for some while the more likely prospect should be that Japan will turn to the countries of Asia and Africa, as well as this hemisphere, for her food and raw material supply. She should be able to sell to those countries, from which she buys, and all nations of the free world should unite to assist her in placing her manufactured produce in these areas where they can so easily and successfully be absorbed in exchange.

No one can deny that the United States has a clear understanding of this problem and has been doing and is doing everything posible to solve it.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly shown his clear understanding of it and has reaffirmed his understanding by enunciating it as the American policy toward Japan.

Let us select a few quotations from the President. A year ago he said: "Japan cannot live, and Japan cannot remain in the free world unless something is done to allow her to make a living.

"Now, if we will not give her money, if we will not trade with here, if we will not allow her to trade with the Reds, if we will not try to defend in any way the Southeast Asian area where she has a partial trade opportunity, what is to happen to Japan? It is going to the Communists."

As early as December 23, 1954, in letters to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, he wrote:

"A stronger and more stable Japanese economy is of major importance to Japan and to the free world. Our current efforts to expand Japan's trading opportunities by inducing other countries to join us in lowering trade barriers against Japanese goods is an important link in our overall security effort."

As recently as April 21 of this year, President Eisenhower added to his prepared address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the following most striking observations. I quote:

"Let me take one example, just to show you how these things work out. Let us take Japan. There is no one in this room who needs a blueprint of how important it is to us that Japan stay outside the Iron Curtain. A nation of 90 million industrious and inventive people, tied in with Communist China and with the Soviets, would indeed pose a threat to us that would be very grave indeed.

"Japan is 90 million people living on fewer ariable acres than there are in the State of California. How are they going to live? Well, they have got to trade. They have got to deal with other people outside. We won't trade with them. Every day—well, if not every day, every week, there comes to Government, including to my desk, pleas for greater protection against Japanese goods.

"Now this is not wholly one-sided, because some of our citizens have found out that last year—I think my figures are correct—while we were buying $60 million worth of cotton textile goods from Japan they bought $120 million worth of our cotton. So even that problem is not clear in exactly what you should do.

"But anyway, we won't trade with them, so they can't make a living with us except on a minor scale. But we get tired, properly—we can't be trying to sustain any other nation just with our money. So we don't just give them the millions by which they can go and buy all the things they need abroad.

"But the next thing we come up against: we are very certain in our own minds that some of these nations—not all the United States people, but some of them, are very loud in their denunciation of any country that trades with the Communist countries. So the Japanese can't trade with their natural markets, with Manchuria and China. So finally all of those southeastern markets—all the southeastern Asian markets have largely destroyed—they are so poor they can't support Japan.

"So what does Japan do? Where are we chasing her? Chasing her to one place. She has to look less to us and more to her mainland next to her. She has to, now, begin to look rather longingly, unless something is done. Now that is the kind of cross-purpose that comes up, and this goes on around the world. Britain and France and Germany, indeed every country with which we deal, has some problem different economically from our own."

It is most significant that the President should have taken this important audience to make his position so positive.

Now the significant fact is that this policy to assist Japan in every way to rehabilitate herself and become self-supporting is not a partisan policy. It is free from even the suspicion of partisan political motives. It is not a Republican or a Democratic policy. It is an American policy. It has been carried on by the past three administrations.

Also, reciprocal tariff treaties to facilitate the freer exchange of goods between nations were initiated and authorized by law under a Democratic administration, principally under the advocacy of my dear friend, the late Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. I was in the Cabinet at that time. This policy of the reciprocal tariff treaties has been supported by the Roosevelt, Truman and now by the Eisenhower administrations.

Thirty-nine nations have entered into an agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—commonly called GATT. This multi-nation agreement has liberalized tariffs amongst the participating nations on a reciprocity basis.

There is now before the Congress of the United States a bill to approve OTC, the international organization set up by 31 nations last year in Geneva to implement and to provide the organizational machinery to carry out the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. If this bill now before the Congress is not enacted into law some other similar legislation will have to be enacted to redeem our agreement under GATT or else the whole structure of reciprocal tariffs will fall.

President Eisenhower's special commission, headed by Clarence Randall, supported the underlying objectives of reciprocal tariff making.

From this record of legislative history and the declarations of the executive branch of our Government made over the past 25 years, we can safely say that these reciprocal tariff treaties are now an established part of America's national as well as international trade policy. It is a policy to which over 39 nations have subscribed and on which they are now predicating their trade policies and programs.

I have labored these points to emphasize that a freer exchange of goods amongst nations—helping nations to help themselves to earn a living—and the whole policy of reciprocal tariffs—is a two-way street. Furthermore, I repeat, reciprocal tariff treaty making is not only our national domestic policy but also a matter of our international commitment.

To depart from this policy at this time would be a breach of agreed policy. A policy on which all GATT participating nations in the free world have relied. Such a change would cause a serious economic rupture in many "tender" places and in some might lead to a loss of friends behind the Iron Curtain.

From the record to date, however, there should be every assurance to Japan that the United States will do its part to contribute to the success of her effort to become self-sustaining. The present liberal trade and tariff policy toward Japan must be pursued if Japan is to be able to play the part in the Western World which is expected of her.

Last June in Geneva, the United States concluded an agreement under which Japan was granted substantial tariff concessions upon many products exported to the United States and in return the United States received reciprocal concessions upon some American commodities, but it is certain that substantially more tariff concessions must be granted if Japan is to even approximate a balance of trade. However, considerable progress is noted.

Of course, our domestic economy must be adequately protected against illegitimate international competition and dumping, but for the prosperity of our domestic economy it is now pretty well recognized that we must promote our foreign markets for our exportable surpluses, and to do this we must make it possible for our foreign customers to buy from us by our purchasing from them.

But let us pause here a moment.

The damaging effects of Japan's increasing exports to the United States on our domestic production, as claimed by some American industries, are grossly misrepresented. For instance, one would get the impression from the present flareup that Japan's textiles were being imported into the United States at a rate destructive of the American textile industry. The fact of the matter is that the total textiles exported by Japan to the United States are about 1.5 percent of the United States textile production. This 1.5 percent is negligible to the United States, and in the light of the magnitude of her textile production, but vital for Japan.

Furthermore, Japan has always been, and is, one of the largest purchasers of American goods. She buys very much more from the United States than she sells to the United States. Let me cite one example of this, the one which is so controversial at the moment. In 1955 Japan purchased $120 million of raw cotton from the United States—the largest purchase of cotton made of United States raw cotton by any nation in the world—and only sold cotton fabrics of all kinds to the United States of $50 million. The balance of trade is heavily against Japan.

I believe that our trade and tariff policies have proved to be most constructive to Japan and are long steps forward to better relationship and understanding between all nations and peoples. We have a long way to go, but I for one do not despair of the future if we cleave to our course with determination and good will.

Mr. Araki, former ambassador to the United States, and now governor of the Bank of Japan, last June said:

"I feel gratified at the unmistakable evidences of a notable economic recovery of our country after the war, and I believe it is the desire of our entire nation to see this trend well kept up and advanced on a really sound basis for the future."

I have witnessed the great achievement of Japan. She has gone a long way toward economic rehabilitation but she still has a much longer road to go to permanent economic stability. Any instability in Japan at the present moment could readily cause serious political repercussions and undo the progress thus far made. The whole free world has a stake in Japan's emerging as a political and economic stable and strong nation with a people dedicated to freedom and peace.

I will close with one other observation.

All human relationships—yes, even international relations—are based upon mutual confidence. Confidence flows from mutual understanding of dissimilarities as well as similarities. Nothing promotes understanding between peoples as much as doing business together. We get to know the ideology, the thinking and peculiarities of each other in doing business together. Principally, we learn how to agree with each other—how to get along together. Trade and commerce are basic points of contact.

In this sense, the American businessman, doing business in another country, can be considered an ambassador of good will of the American people—a missionary of the American way of life. He has opportunities and responsibilities to promote good will amongst men.

And, above all, peace, and enduring peace, must be founded on reciprocal confidence and mutual understanding, and peace is the universal aspiration of all peoples.

International trade agreements are usually and properly called treaties of commerce and friendship. Every American businessman abroad is a salesman for America and is thus a part of a great mission—the mission of restoring confidence to mankind by making friends with the peoples of the world.

Having a great admiration for and confidence in the industry and determination of the Japanese people to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, I am certain of their ultimately achieving a sound and prosperous well-being in the family of free nations.

A wise and practical course has been set by the policies I have outlined.

Your chamber has done and can do much to achieve its objective of ever-improving commercial and friendly relations between Japan and the United States.

Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the rehabilitation of the handicapped is a sound concept; both humanitarian and economic values are easily understood and generally accepted. Tremendous progress has been made in rehabilitation in recent years, and I am confident that more will be done in the future. Particularly, it is hoped that the 84th Congress will adopt H. R. 5859 into law—this is the bill providing for a Federal Agency for Handicapped which I introduced during the first session.

Efforts of the Federal Government to rehabilitate handicapped civilians began with the passage of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in 1920. Under this early law, services were confined principally to vocational training, counseling, and job placement. Before that time, a few States had demonstrated the possibilities of vocational rehabilitation. The scope of the services furnished in the rehabilitation process was broadened by extensive amendments in 1943.

Although tremendous progress had been made, there was a lag between the practical application of rehabilitation techniques and the rapidly advancing technical knowledge and research. President Eisenhower, in his first message on the state of the Union, recommended to the Congress that it enact legislation to strengthen and substantially expand the Nation's resources for the rehabilitation of handicaped persons. In line with these recommendations, the 83d Congress enacted into law improvements in services, administrative practices, and methods of financing which are required to take full advantage of new scientific knowledge and of administrative experience gained in recent years.

While retaining the basic features of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the law was strengthened materially. More money has been made available to hire and train additional staff to assist the States in creating additional rehabilitation facilities, particularly rehabilitation centers and sheltered workshops for the severely disabled.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that approximately 100,000 people per year have some sort of physical handicap imposed upon them as a result of an accident, either as a total or permanent disability. Add to these the number who are handicapped as a result of illness or congenital defects and you arrive at the staggering estimate by the American Medical Association that there are some 55 million in our population in some degree disabled. Certainly aiding the handicapped is a duty we all owe our country. Not only can these people be helped to regain their former place in society, but can also become breadwinners for their families and pay their fair share of the cost of government.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of greeting Miss Theresa Maria Drzal, 512 Bradley Place, Johnstown, who arrived in Washington to receive an award from Vice President RICHARD NIXON. This young lady from my district won third place in the 1956 national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and has the unique ability of winning prizes. In addition to receiving this magnificent award, Miss Drzal placed: First in the Cambria County medical contest; first in the Cambria County handicapped essay contest, and first in the Pennsylvania State handicapped essay contest. Theresa will graduate from Johnstown Central Catholic High School on May 22 and will enroll in the Johnstown Mercy Hospital School of Nursing in August. So eloquent is the essay which merited her third place in the 1956 national essay contest, that I believe it is truly worthy of reproducing in the RECORD. I trust that my colleagues will take time to read it and understand more fully the feelings, perseverance, and initiative of our handicapped.

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE HANDICAPPED THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

(By Miss Theresa Marie Drzal)

The ultimate and innate desire of every handicapped person is to attain as great a degree of independence as possible—to achieve as much as possible for himself and his family. The question is: How can a handicapped person develop at least a certain degree of independence?

The surest means of independence is through employment. When a handicapped person gains employment, the door to society is opened to him. His life is no longer a day to day existence, for each day is a new adventure filled with hope and promise. He has been given something to work for, someone to work for, and a responsibility to shoulder. He is no longer like an old shoe which is tossed into the corner because it is worn. He is no longer a person shunned by society and even by his own family. He is again an individual with likes and dislikes, whims and fancies. By achieving independence through employment, a handicapped person gains or regains economic, spiritual, and social stability. He becomes self-supporting. He no longer has to rely on any one person. Thus, he attains the independence he so desires.

Strictly speaking, the handicapped are friends, relatives, or neighbors with physical impairments. Some of these impairments can be seen; others, not seen. Some people were born with them—others received them through illness or injuries. A great majority of these people can be helped through the public service of rehabilitation which is actually the process of assisting the disabled to select suitable jobs and to prepare them for a designated vocation through counseling, training physical restoration, and placement in employment.

Rehabilitation is the best means of preparing a handicapped person for employment and independence. In 1947, the American Mercury reported much progress in the rehabilitation of handicapped persons by industry and of Government agencies setting

up rehabilitation centers. Even now this progress is continuing. Occupational therapy schools, vocational training schools, and other such organizations have done much to prepare a handicapped person for employment. Industry, business, Government, agriculture—all are explorable fields for the rehabilitated physically handicapped.

After the rehabilitation or "adaptation period" is over, the handicapped person is as good a worker if not better than the nonhandicapped person, as proven by the following facts:

1. The handicapped person avoids accidents.

2. The handicapped person is rarely absent from his job.

3. The handicapped person quits less often.

4. The handicapped person is quick to recognize opportunity and seize it with a will and vigor.

Federal, State, and local governments advocate employment of the physically handicapped. This is not all "speechmaking" on their part for many handicapped people are employed in Government jobs. Many, too, are presently employed successfully in industry, business, and on administrative, teaching, maintenance, service, and other school staffs. All told, approximately 7 million men and women with physical impairments are now employed—evidence that the handicapped are competent, dependable, loyal, and capable workers.

Since the handicapped person is a part of the democracy in which we live, it is only fair and just that he be accorded the rights and privileges belonging to him under this democracy. In our democracy everyone has a fair opportunity to employ himself in the work for which he is adapted—no matter what his race, creed, color—or physical condition. Everyone has a fair opportunity to attain independence through employment.

The physically handicapped should be employed because as a group they produce. They are a part of our manpower resources and serve as a reservoir of manpower to contradict manpower shortages.

It is clear that if the handicapped are refused jobs they are refused independence, and many would be forced to go on public assistance for their support and that of their families. This, too, would impose an unnecessary tax burden on the general public. However, by granting employment to the handicapped, this tax burden is lifted, and the handicapped person becomes a taxpayer instead of a tax consumer. Dividends are many as proven by the following statistics. Most of the 56,000 men and women rehabilitated in 1954 had no earnings whatever. A few earned at the rate of $15 million a year. After rehabilitation and employment they are earning at the rate of $102 million a year. At this rate within 3 years they will return in income taxes to the Government the money spent for their rehabilitation. In the following years they will contribute in taxes about $10 for every dollar spent on their rehabilitation. Above all, they achieve independence and have the satisfaction of contributing their share toward the support of the Government.

Many employers bring up the argument that hiring a handicapped person influences their insurance rates. They are in error by this statement, for there is no provision in workmen's compensation insurance policies or rates that penalizes an employer for hiring handicapped workers. Very few jobs require physical perfection. Therefore there is no need for prejudice. Instead, an employer should give a handicapped person the means of attaining independence.

There are many living proofs of the fact that the best means of independence for the handicapped is through employment. Perhaps foremost in the minds of all is Helen Keller, blind and deaf as a result of a childhood illness. She is now an excellent author, tourist, and lecturer. Bob Smith, celebrated quadruple amputee of the Korean war, is another example. He now works for the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D. C. and supports a family with his earnings. The following are some examples not so widely known. Grace Layton, Valley City, N. Dak., is a charming girl of 19 who had a brilliant future in art and design. Then polio struck and left her paralyzed, unable to move her arms or the lower part of her body. She now does charcoal cketches with the brush held in her mouth and realizes a fine profit from their sale for use on Christmas and Easter cards. Another example is Charley Boswell, of Birmingham, Ala., sole supporter and father of his family. Charley lost his sight in World War II, but thanks to rehabilitation regained independence through employment. A younger example is that of Johnny Krise, of Johnstown, Pa., who has deformed hands and lower arms. At the age of 15, he is a sophomore in high school and is a newsboy on Saturdays and after school hours. This is an accomplishment equaled by few normal boys.

These words of President Eisenhower show the need and desirability of using the handicapped to fill vacancies and other openings in employment.

"I share with thousands of other Americans a deep interest in the future of the handicapped people in this country. Our Nation can ill afford to lose the productive power and the talents of those who are idle today because they are disabled. We need them as active, productive citizens."

It is in conclusion, therefore, a proven fact that there is no surer way to economic, spiritual, and social independence for the handicapped than through employment.

Petition To Secure Discharge of H. R. 11 From Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on the Speaker's desk is a petition to secure the discharge of H. R. 11 from committee. This petition should receive the support of many Members of Congress.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a decision of the circuit court of appeals for the seventh circuit holding that the company involved in that case had established a good-faith defense, and thus its price discriminations were not illegal as the Federal Trade Commission had charged.

This latest court decision highlights the weakness of the recent statement issued by members of the Federal Trade Commission to the effect that H. R. 11 is not necessary and that it is premature.

The members of the Federal Trade Commission have said that the Commission could issue complaints under the first court decision with respect to a good-faith defense.

Now this decision by the seventh circuit court of appeals would appear to have eliminated any grounds for action where good faith is a defense. Thus, it seems crystal clear that the members of the Federal Trade Commission have been mistaken and they should, therefore, support H. R. 11.

Small business is in serious trouble. The passage of H. R. 11 will help small-business men throughout the United States.

Johnson Victory Gives Texas Harmonious Delegation to Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle of May 7, 1956:

JOHNSON VICTORY GIVES TEXAS HARMONIOUS DELEGATION TO CHICAGO

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S sweeping victory in the precinct conventions in Texas Saturday had ramified significance. As a result of it, Texas will send to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in August a delegation expected to be the most harmonious since 1936. In that year President Roosevelt was seeking nomination for a second term and the Texas delegation supported him. Four years later, however, President Roosevelt sought a third term and Texas Democrats split, starting the acrimonious differences which have characterized the Texas delegations since that time.

With Senator JOHNSON heading the Texas delegation and Speaker SAM RAYBURN lending support, the delegation will have no difficulty in being seated at the national convention and the delegates probably will be harmonious under the Johnson, Rayburn leadership.

The victory adds stature to Senator JOHNSON'S position as the favorite son of the Texas delegation for the presidential nomination. He already has been endorsed for the nomination by such party stalwarts as Senators HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Gov. Edwin Johnson of Colorado. This support, plus the big 56 votes which the Texas delegation has in the Democratic National Convention, will place Senator JOHNSON in a strong bargaining position. This will give Texas more influence in the actual naming of the presidential nominee than it has had in many years.

The widespread and overwhelming nature of Senator JOHNSON'S Texas victory enhances his stature in the Senate, where he is the majority leader.

In Harris County, the margin of victory was close between the forces of Senator JOHNSON and those of Gov. Allan Shivers, as far as county-convention control is concerned. The JOHNSON forces, which backed Attorney J. Edwin Smith for temporary chairman of Tuesday's county convention, had a 3-to-2 edge in the number of boxes won, however. The Shivers forces, which campaigned as State-righters, carried the big-voting south, southwest, and west precincts in and around Houston to narrow the margin on county-convention votes.

Due to the fair-play rules proposed by County Democratic Chairman Presley E. Werlein, Jr., and adopted by a liberal-controlled Democratic executive committee, the precinct conventions in Harris County were more clear-cut and free of tumult than they have been for many years. Liberals and conservatives alike are to be commended for

the adoption of the fair-play rules, which seek to assure that majority rule will prevail. That is the democratic way, the American way, to hold elections.

What Price Forgiveness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 17, 1956:

WHAT PRICE FORGIVENESS?

On Saturday, April 22, the board of trustees of the American University of Washington declined to consider a request from this committee that it reinstate Prof. Herbert Fuchs. Mr. Fuchs, as you may recall, is a professor of law whom the university barred from the classroom after he testified before a congressional investigating committee on his Communist past and gave the names of former Communist associates.

According to press reports in the Washington papers, the board was asked if it wanted to consider reopening the Fuchs case. "No one said anything and the matter was not taken under consideration," President Anderson of the university is quoted as saying.

Thus, at least so far as the university is concerned, the Fuchs case is closed. Professor Fuchs, whose contract expires this June, is out of a job, and his chances of continuing his academic career as a teacher are dim.

For Professor Fuchs and his family, this is a personal tragedy. But serious as his personal situation is, the action taken against him raises grave issues of public policy and morality.

President Anderson of the American University expressed himself on these issues when he said shortly after Prof. Fuchs first told the House Un-American Activities Committee of his Communist past: "He made a serious mistake in the past, which he recognized and declared. The American University therefore would support his right as a citizen to pursue his chosen professional activities. To take any other position at this time would be beneath the dignity of the institution with a Christian relationship and commitments."

A few days later Prof. Fuchs appeared for a second time before the House Un-American Activities Committee and named associates in Government service who had been fellow members of the Communist Party. Twenty-four hours later the university barred him from the classroom. Now it has permanently barred him from the university.

The American Committee for Cultural Freedom, Inc., has made an intensive study of this case; and on the basis of the material which resulted from this study, it appears that Prof. Fuchs, who was praised when he first testified before the committee, was subsequently dismissed because he had cooperated fully with the congressional committee and had named former associates.

The university's action is thus unusually significant. Politically, it establishes a precedent calculated to discourage others from breaking with the Communist Party for fear of similar reprisals. It hampers the work of future investigations and plays into the hands of the Communist Party itself.

We know of a number of cases in which universities have continued to employ teachers who have pleaded the fifth amendment and have refused to cooperate with congressional committees. In this case, we have the situation of a teacher who after cooperating fully with a congressional committee has been made the victim of economic and professional reprisals.

As for the moral issue, the action taken against Fuchs raises one of the urgent questions of our day: What price forgiveness? In pledging his support to Fuchs after he first testified before the House committee, President Anderson himself underscored the moral problem when he said that to punish Fuchs for his past would be "beneath the dignity of the institution with a Christian relationship * * *" Despite this, the university has inflicted a life sentence of condemnation on Mr. Fuchs.

Now that the American University has closed its books on Mr. Fuchs, the problem remains: What can still be done? For our part, the committee is pledged to help Mr. Fuchs continue his professional career, and we shall do our best both as individuals and in our collective capacity as a committee to make this possible.

PAUL HAYS,
American Committee for Cultural Freedom, Inc.
NEW YORK.

The Voice of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the sentiment expressed in the editorial in the Abilene Reporter News of May 9, 1956, reflects the attitude of many people in Texas and in the Nation. It is hoped that for the sake of harmony and the welfare of all, the results of the recent elections in Texas may ameliorate unkind feelings and bring about cooperations greatly needed in party and governmental affairs.

The editorial follows:

THE VOICE OF TEXAS

This was an important week for various aspirants for the Democratic presidential nomination, with preference primaries in half a dozen States at stake.

But these contest were all but smothered by what happend in Texas last Saturday when as never before Democrats of all shades of opinion went to their precinct conventions to register a choice between unity and an end to bickering on the one hand and continued intraparty strife and turmoil on the other.

The answer was an overwhelming approval of unity and moderation under its principal exponent in State and Nation—LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Senate majority leader. The smashing nature of this victory was the biggest single piece of political news since Ike Eisenhower said "Yes." The scheduled primaries in various States this week will constitute a sort of anticlimax.

You may be sure that the national campaign headquarters of both major parties will study the results in Texas with avid interest, and from now on as never before the several vocal and receptive Democratic aspirants for the presidential nomination will be conscious of the power and influence of LYNDON JOHNSON in formulating a platform and choice of a standard bearer.

JOHNSON'S plea for an end to factionalism in Texas and his postprecinct convention statement welcoming to "this great big tent" everyone "who wants to be a Democrat and who believes in democracy" should go a long way toward healing the wounds occasioned by the contest between himself and Governor Shivers for State leadership in the national convention. He gave credit for the "big tent" where it was due: to the people.

Export Control Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the next several days this Congress will be considering the extension of the Export Control Act of 1949, H. R. 9052. This legislation will extend the act for a period of 2 years from its present termination date of June 30, 1956.

Under the provisions of this legislation, tremendous quantities of steel scrap have been shipped to foreign nations at an alarming rate. In 1954 some 1,260,000 tons of iron and steel scrap were shipped to foreign nations, while in 1955 almost 5 million tons have been shipped abroad. The inventory of supplies of scrap on hand has been shrinking and the most liberal estimates of scrap on hand would indicate only a 90-day supply.

The prices of scrap have risen very rapidly in recent months. Many domestic users of scrap have been compelled to substitute with higher priced purchases of pig iron.

Since the shipping cost of high-quality scrap is no greater than the shipping cost of low-quality scrap, it is understandable why the best grades of scrap should be destined to foreign markets to the dertiment of American scrap needs and with the resulting raising of prices of scrap iron and steel, pig iron and the resulting steel products.

Submitted herewtih is a joint letter from Mr. Ben Moreell, chairman of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., and E. T. Weir, chairman of the National Steel Corp., pointing out the absurdity and the danger in the continued export of large quantities of scrap. It is my considered judgment that the export quotas must be limited in the enactment of this legislation so that the tremendous scrap exports of 1955 should not be duplicated to the detriment of our defense efforts.

MAY 15, 1956.

Representative CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VANIK: The undersigned are deeply concerned about the grave situation now confronting our country as a result of the uncontrolled exportation of iron and steel scrap. This matter was discussed in considerable detail at recent hearings on the proposed extension of the Export Control Act which were conducted by the House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency. The House committee issued a report

on April 12, 1956, in which the committee calls attention to the serious situation arising from the large-scale exports of iron and steel scrap during 1955, which are continuing in 1956. At this writing the Senate committee has not yet reported on its meeting of April 30, 1956.

The House commitee in its report shares our grave concern. It specifically says:

"The testimony before the committee indicates that we cannot permit scrap exports to continue at the present rate of 5 million tons a year. The committee realizes that the needs of our allies abroad must be considered. It would be too disruptive of our international relations to cut off scrap exports completely at this time. But some means must be found, either through agreements with the foreign producers to whom we are now exporting scrap, or through imposition of stricter controls under the Export Control Act, to reduce exports of scrap to a level where we can be reasonably sure of an adequate supply of scrap for domestic needs."

We believe that this situation merits the serious consideration of every Member of Congress because of its current and prospective adverse effects on our domestic economy and on our national defense potential.

Iron and steel scrap is unfortunately named. Undoubtedly the layman thinks of it as waste material or "junk." Nothing could be farther from the truth. In reality, iron and steel scrap is a vital, limited, and, in fact, irreplaceable raw material of the steel mills and foundries of our country.

As a raw material, iron and steel scrap is even more valuable than iron ore because it is already refined and for that reason can be more quickly and economically converted into new steel. Furthermore, certain of the finer qualities of steel, which are essential for national defense purposes, can be made only by using steel scrap.

Against these facts and against the serious, long-range raw materials problem of the iron and steel industry, it is not only absurd but dangerous to permit the current large-scale exportation of scrap from the United States.

The reserves of iron ore within the United States are known, they are limited, and they are being depleted. They cannot support the future needs of our country for either peacetime or defense purposes. For that reason, the iron and steel industry has worked strenuously to develop dependable reserves abroad—chiefly in Canada, South America, and Africa. Even so, the present combined domestic and foreign iron ore reserves are not sufficient for the future steel production that a rapidly growing population and an increasing consumption will require. Continuing discovery and development of additional foreign sources is a plainly indicated need.

Substantial quantities of iron ore are now being brought in from these foreign sources, even though the cost is higher than would apply to the same amount of ore available from domestic sources. Steel companies are doing this to extend the limited domestic reserves as much as possible and thereby protect our country's position.

Under this circumstance, we repeat, the continued export of large quantities of scrap is both absurd and dangerous. This statement can be demonstrated by simple arithmetic. In 1956 it will be necessary to import about 25 million tons of iron ore. In 1955 approximately 5 million tons of scrap—equivalent to 9 million tons of iron ore—were exported. The effect was to cancel out more than one-third of the protection which the steel companies are seeking to give to the deficient raw materials position of the United States.

It has been contended that the exportation of scrap is not serious because consumers' stocks of scrap are at a record high level. Apparently our Departments of Commerce and State subscribe to this view.

Actually, all that this means from a practical standpoint is that there is a 3 months supply of scrap on hand. Against the long-range situation which is now serious, and will become more so as time goes on, this supply affords no protection. The all-important fact is that the United States simply cannot afford to diminish further its reserves of the raw materials for the production of iron and steel. Iron and steel scrap is a vital raw material and whatever amount of it leaves this country is a permanent loss which cannot be made up in any way.

It certainly seems pointless for steel companies to bring iron ore from foreign sources that have explored, acquired and developed at enormous expense when incoming ore boats are being passed by shiploads of scrap on the way out—and with each ton of outgoing scrap neutralizing about two tons of incoming iron ore.

This is not a mere economic problem of the iron and steel industry. It is a matter that bears directly on the present and future safety and wellbeing of our country. The Commerce and State Departments, in our opinion, are dangerously shortsighted in the view they take of it. The export of scrap must be controlled. The only apparent remedy is Congressional action.

The control of excessive exports of any strategic material is provided for by the Export Control Act, now in force. Where stockpiles of such materials, sufficient to protect the defense needs of the United States are available, an argument could be made for removing control from exports. In the case of iron and steel scrap, there is no such stockpile. In fact, no one knows at present how much scrap can be obtained from our so-called hidden reserves. But there is every indication that those reserves are being rapidly depleted and, should an emergency arise, the steel industry could discharge its obligations to the country only with great difficulty, if at all.

We trust that this serious and important matter will have the prompt consideration of the Congress and that you will give your support to the proper limitation of iron and steel scrap exports.

Sincerely,

BEN MOREELL,
Chairman, J. & L. Steel Corp.
E. T. WEIR,
Chairman, National Steel Corp.

Power and Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Rural Electrification of May 18, 1956:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION: POWER AND PLENTY

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

Exactly 20 years ago this month, President Frankin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Norris-Rayburn Act establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. That action began the creation of the largest new commercial industry and new consumer market for the products of industry in a generation.

In 1936, only one-tenth of America's farms were electrified, and this for a simple reason. Rural electrification was not an economical business because prohibitive prices were being charged to install rural electric lines and prohibitive rates were being required by the only existing power suppliers. In this situation Government intervened from two directions.

The Rural Electrification Act made it possible to create nearly 1,000 electric cooperatives. These now serve 4 million farms, homes, and rural establishments that could not afford the prohibitive rates of the pre-1936 era. The law helped rural people help themselves. It allowed them to obtain all of the conveniences and laborsaving benefits of electricity by extending to them the credit facilities of the Federal Government in the form of loans which they are repaying with interest.

This was also the time when the great TVA and Bonneville hydroelectric resource projects were coming into existence. They provided electricity at wholesale costs which were less than half the rate which power companies demanded, and they also served as a powerful competitive influence. For the first time the American people had a yardstick with which to measure the fair and possibl costs of electricity, and one which is very useful even outside the areas of public-power development.

The rural electrification program helps the Nation as a whole, not just farmers. It provides a good example of the benefits that more electricity at lower cost spreads among all of our people.

In the next 20 years, farmers in the United States are going to spend $24 billion on electric appliances and equipment. That is an average of $5,300 per farm. In the next 5 years the purchases will amount to $5.3 billion, or $1,100 per farm. To date, about $3 billion has been spent in building REA-financed rural electric lines. That has meant work for thousands of people in the construction industry and a significant demand for products supplied by industry such as poles, transformers, and wire.

In 1953, REA reappraised the relationship between the cost of supplying electricity to rural consumers and the use of electricity by those consumers, and they found that for every $1 spent in construction of facilities, about $4 was spent by the consumers for apparatus that utilized electric energy. That means a tremendous market for consumer goods was created by this program; already it has brought about sales in excess of $12 billion for appliances and electric farm equipment. Over the next 20 years the consumption of electricity by these consumers is expected to rise 4 to 5 times above the present level, and this fact also means that a great many more appliances and items of farm machinery will be purchased to account for this increased consumption.

During the next 2 decades, for instance, farmers will spend $81 million on air conditioners, $144 million on freezers, and $156 million on television receivers. They will buy more than $400 million worth of lights and wiring for their homes, and over $50 million worth of electric clothes dryers.

It should be noted, too, that these are just initial purchases. At the same time farmers will be replacing old and wornout appliances, in some cases at a greater rate. In this period they will replace almost $25 million worth of dryers, more than $200 million worth of freezers, over $500 million worth of wiring and lighting, another $500 million worth of refrigerators, and over $300 million worth of television receivers. In maintaining the rural electric systems, almost a million and a half power poles are purchased annually. About the same number of miles of wire have been strung to serve the more than 14 million people who are receiving electricity as a result of this program.

Over the years, the Federal rural electrification and public power programs have demonstrated that electric rates, like anything else, can no more be divorced from consumer

use of electricity than an automobile can from gasoline. The evidence that in any given community there is a consistent correlation between the prices and the use of various products is strong. As prices go down, the use of the product goes up—anywhere—and vice versa. It is one of the fundamental laws of economics.

The Tennessee Valley Authority provides a good example. Consumption of electricity in the Tennessee Valley area increased by leaps and bounds when TVA's lower wholesale rates, and consequently the distributor's resale rates, became effective. In 1934, the first year of these new wholesale rates, the Tennessee Electric Power Co. increased its sale of ranges and refrigerators more than 300 percent over the average preceding years; sales of water heaters increased better than 700 hundred percent. The power company's total sales of electric appliances was three times as great as the previous year. For the years 1935 and 1936, the volume of appliance sales was about four times that of 1933.

All in all, the rural electrification program has provided the industries involved in making electrical equipment a significant boost, increasing the total market for their products by over 10 percent. This affects everyone. Obviously, all industries and workers in all occupations benefit by this substantial contribution to our economy. And in addition to these very substantial considerations, studios also show that wherever Federal hydroelectric projects have been developed a competitive influence is created that spreads like ripples from a stone dropped in a pond. The farther away this influence of Federal power development, of course, the less the competitive influence, and therefore the higher the power rates.

As a result of his own experience, the American farmer, through his rural electric systems, has been a strong advocate of developing all of the feasible hydroelectric power possible. He learned the hard way that the key to obtaining the greatest benefit from electrictly is keeping the supply plentiful and the the costs down, and he is convinced that the lessons he has learned over the past 20 years can be applied in cities and suburbs everywhere.

Unfortunately, however, in the last few years there has been a regrettable deterioration in the maintenance of progressive resource-development programs—a trend that has already gone far enough to be a threat to the entire economic health of our Nation. It began when the Eisenhower administration canceled the Interior Department's support for a Federal high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River. That was followed by administrative moves to weaken the so-called preference rights which rural electric and other non-profit power distributors have as customers for Federal power, under laws dating back to 1902.

Along the way, Federal power agencies such as the Tenneessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, and the Southwestern Power Administration have been weakened, and there have been constant compromises with the commercial utility monopolists, compromises which appease them but really never satisfy them because their appetite is apparently insatiable. They want all or nothing—extension of their monopoly to include Federal hydro projects or no Federal hydro developments at all.

The Eisenhower administration has advocated a "partnership with local interests" for hydro development. One would think that such a plan would benefit municipal and rural electric systems, for they are truly the Nation's locally owned and locally controlled electric utility enterprises. But instead, "partnership" has been a sugary phrase used to excuse the surrender of Federal responsibility to the great utility companies. A great and successful American experiment that was begun 20 years ago has fallen upon evil days.

What's Behind NAACP?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Frederick Woltman, as it appeared in the New York World Telegram of May 12, 1956, should be of interest to our colleagues:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE NAACP?

(By Frederick Woltman)

One year short of a century after the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a race riot erupted in the city made famous by the Great Emancipator. The year was 1908 and the city was Springfield, Ill. Dozens of Negroes were killed or wounded; thousands driven from town.

Out of this bloody event was born the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The year before, William English Walling, a millionaire southern social reformer, and his wife were arrested while traveling in Russia and were quickly released. Comparing notes late, he concluded that the Negro in the United States was treated less humanly than the Jew in Czarist Russia. He wrote a magazine article, Race War in the North.

Mary White Ovington, a Brooklyn settlement worker, read it. She phoned Dr. Henry Moskowitz, a prominent New Yorker and an intimate friend of Alfred E. Smith. (His wife, Belle Moskowitz, became the governor's chief adviser and political strategist.)

The Walling-Ovington-Moskowitz trio got together in a tiny Manhattan apartment. They talked over the Springfield affair and decided to try to rally together a large and powerful body of citizens to fight for political and civil rights for the Negro.

Oswald Garrison Villard, the noted editor, drafted a call timed to coincide with Lincoln's birthday centennary. It said, among other things, "If Mr. Lincoln could revisit this country in the flesh, he would be disheartened and discouraged.

The call went out February 12, 1909. It was signed by 53 educators, writers, social workers, clergymen, and publicists. Among them, Jane Addams, Prof. John Dewey, William Lloyd Garrison, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Lincoln Steffens, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and William Dean Howells. With a few exceptions, all were white.

There followed a conference at Cooper Union and the NAACP was in business. Its basic philosophy was that a racial injustice to one Negro affected all Negroes and blighted the health of American civilization. Its objective from the start was to secure for the Negro the rights and privileges accorded other citizens. And do it within the framework of the American constitutional system.

For the next couple of decades, the NAACP was struggling, ill-financed, but persistent. It was uphill going.

Today, after 47 years, it has become the largest—and oldest—civil rights organization in the country. Its national office, two floors of Freedom House, 20 West 40th Street, serves as a watchdog over Negro rights throughout the Nation.

It has 310,000 members, who pay dues from $2 for straight membership to $500 for life membership. There are 1,300 branches—at least one in every State but New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Maine.

Although no color records are kept, 10 to 15 percent of the 310,000 are white. Sixty percent of the total live in the South.

Since 1909, there have been three presidents, all whites. The first, Moorfield Storey, had been secretary to Massachusetts' abolitionist Senator, Charles Sumner. Later he became president of the American Bar Association. A Columbia University literature professor, Joel E. Spingarn, was second. The third is his brother, Arthur B. Spingarn, a New York lawyer.

NAACP's operating heads, on the other hand, have mostly been Negroes. Such as James Weldon Johnson; Walter White, who until his death on March 21, 1955 had for years been its moving spirit; and Roy Wilkins, its present executive secretary.

Its top executive board is strictly interracial, with the 48 directors divided about 50–50 between Negroes and Whites.

The directors today include Eric Johnston, Oscar Hammerstein II, Senators Herbert H. Lehman and Wayne Morse, Walter Reuther, Dr. Ralph C. Bunche, Judge William H. Hastie, Rabbi Judah Cahn, and George K. Hunton, secretary of the Catholic Interracial Council.

Recently, Alabama's legislature ordered an investigation into whether the NAACP is Communist-dominated. And Georgia's attorney general charged it with "subversion" in the NAACP's antisegregation crusade.

But J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, had this to say about it:

"Equality, freedom, and tolerance are essential in a democratic government. The NAACP has done much to preserve these principles and to perpetuate the desires of our Founding Fathers."

And Francis Cardinal Spellman declared: "Despite many misunderstandings and difficulties and much opposition, the NAACP has made tremendous progress in the struggle to secure for the colored citizens of the United States that place in our civil life to which they are entitled in accordance with the rights that proceed from our common Creator, and are proclaimed in the American Constitution."

Militant and highly articulate, the NAACP registers as a lobby, hence is nontax exempt. It frankly tries to influence civil rights legislation in Washington as well as the State capitals. It works hard at it.

Indeed, it doesn't even stop to keep a scrapbook of newspaper or magazine clippings. "We'd be swamped if we did," says Henry Lee Moon, NAACP's public relations director. "We're too busy. We're not a research outfit."

Publicity and education are its principal tools. Besides a monthly magazine, the Crisis (50,000 circulation), and the NAACP Bulletin, its national office got out 14 pamphlets and brochures last year—altogether about a million and a half pieces of literature.

One pamphlet by Roy Wilkins takes up the Southern States which are defying the Supreme Court order to integrate white and Negro pupils in the public schools. Its title: "The War Against the United States." While challenging and provocative in tone, NAACP's printed output is generally held to be scrupulously accruate as to facts.

Headquarters also supplies posters, factual ammunition, advice and speakers to its local branches. Holding Mississippi to be the worst offender of all the Southern States, it recently sent out a poster headed: "Stamp out Mississippiism.

Inscribed on a tombstone beneath was this: "George W. Lee, killed May 7, 1955; Lamar Smith, killed August 13, 1955; Emmett Till, killed August 28, 1955; Clinton Melton, killed December 3, 1955."

All told, the NAACP has poured millions into its educational program over the years. Last year's national budget came to over $600,000, with but a handful of the gifts falling into the $1,000 category. The total income, including branches and other activities, reached $1.2 million.

Included was $311,000 for NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., a sepa-

rate unit, which is tax exempt. These contributions ranged from $1 to $50,000.

Headed by Thurgood Marshall, NAACP's chief counsel, the Fund has a staff of six full-time paid attorneys; and a reservoir of at least 40 volunteer lawyers around the country, many of them eminent members of the bar.

About 500 requests for legal support passed through the Fund's office for screening in 1955. A large percentage originated locally, either from branches or from individuals and Negro groups with no NAACP affiliation. One such was the Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott.

Often, in the South, the NAACP is accused of moving into an otherwise contented Negro community and stirring up trouble. Often, according to Mr. Moon, the discontent is indigenous as in Montgomery where the NAACP was unaware of the brewing resentment—and it had no hand whatsoever in the boycott which was as peaceful as it was successful.

Only after the city indicted 100 of the Negro leaders on a conspiracy charge, did the Fund step in with legal defense.

"Great progress" has been made in breaking down racial barriers since NAACP was founded in 1909, its leaders say. That year, for instance, 75 Negroes were lynched. The public almost overwhelmingly took lynchings as a matter of course; as punishment for the rape of white women. The NAACP made a survey and found that less than one-sixth of 5,000 lynchings over a 30-year period involved sex crime accusations even by the lynch mobs themselves. It hammered away at the national conscience. Gradually opinion turned.

In 1955 the Nation had three lynchings, all in Mississippi, according to the NAACP's own count. (NAACP excludes "race-hate" killings unless three or more persons act in concert.) Progress came in other directions, too.

"Segregation in public places and recreation has been banned," the NAACP says. "Negroes are voting freely in most States except Mississippi. The Jim Crow car in interstate travel has been derailed."

Over 2,000 Negro students now attend a score or more of southern colleges which excluded them as recently as 1950. A quarter of a million colored boys and girls attended public schools with white boys and girls in States that separated them less than 2 years ago. Fifteen States have job equality laws. Segregation in the Armed Services has been eliminated.

For all of this, the NAACP takes a large share of the credit. The fact is that since 1909 it has pressed literally hundreds of cases in the courts as well as the law-making bodies to help establish equal treatment under the law.

Its greatest victory came on May 17, 1954, when the Supreme Court unanimously declared public school segregation to be a violation of the Constitution. No court since the famous Dred Scott decision of 1857 had ruled on so vital an issue in the field of racial relations.

More than any other person, Thurgood Marshall was responsible for pushing the historic school-segregation case through to a final triumph for the NAACP. Now 47, Mr. Marshall joined its legal staff in 1938 as a special counsel. His salary was $2,400.

Since then, he has spent much of his time pleading civil rights cases before the higher courts and is now regarded in his profession as one of the finest constitutional lawyers in the country. Out of 16 cases he has argued before the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Marshall has won 14.

This is a remarkable score in itself. It becomes considerably more so in light of the fact that all 16 were appeals from lower court decisions, the toughest of all to win. In private practice, he could easily quadruple his present salary of $14,000.

So formidable an opponent had he become, in fact, that when the segregation case landed finally before the highest court of the land, North Carolina brought in as its chief counsel the dean of constitutional law of our time, the late John W. Davis, former Democratic candidate for President. Mr. Davis presented the State's case and lost.

Before May 17, 1954, the law of the land with respect to minority rights was based on the separate-but-equal doctrine, laid down by the Supreme Court in 1896. In other words, in the use of public facilities, including the schools, Negroes could be segregated provided their facilities were equal to those of the whites.

The hitch here was that it didn't work. There was no way to enforce the equal proviso.

In many southern communities, colored children attended school in shacks; white children in modern structures.

In 1940, 44 years after the separate-but-equal doctrine became law, Mississippi's per capita school expenditures were $7.24 per year for colored pupils and $41.71 for whites. Even by 1952, the ratio was still $35.27 to $117.43. And in 1952, Mississippi paid its Negro teachers $776 a year; its white teachers $1,191.

In no small measure due to NAACP agitation, many segregated States made a great deal of progress equalizing school facilities. But, on a voluntary basis, it seemed impossible. For the Federal Office of Education estimated it would cost $1.5 billion to bring Negro school plants up to the level of the whites.

The holdouts, says the NAACP, were those States which are now attempting to circumvent the desegregation order. The NAACP lists them as Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

Communist propaganda abroad, of course, has always harped on a favorite theme—that Negroes are universally abused as inferiors in America.

Within an hour after Chief Justice Earl Warren handed down the integration opinion, the Voice of America was broadcasting it all over Eastern Europe in the languages of Albania, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Latvia, the Ukraine, and the Georgian Republic; later to Red China in Mandarin, Cantonese and the Amoy dialect.

It was the Autherine Lucy case—of the Negro coed who unsuccessfully sought to force the issue at the University of Alabama—that further projected the NAACP into the forefront. Mr. Marshall was her counsel.

Its southern critics' attacks are running the gamut. One of the mildest is that NAACP is pushing too fast. Another, that it's trying to ram equality down the throats of the southerners. And that it is masterminding all Negro unrest.

Louisiana, reviving a 1924 statute directed against the Ku Klux Klan, has moved to oust the NAACP from the State.

Meanwhile, the NAACP is standing pat on the Supreme Court's decision. And determined to do everything in its power to implement it.

We Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of April 12, 1956:

WE DISSENT

Twice in a week the United States Supreme Court has handed down decisions that invade States rights.

In both cases, the Court cited the Federal Constitution to nullify a basic principle of the Union—the principle that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

On April 2, the Court ruled that State penal laws against subversive activities are unenforcible because Congress has preempted the field with Federal legislation. This decision adversely affects the police powers of the States, which under the Constitution are definitely reserved to them.

On April 9, the Court overturned a decision of New York State's distinguished court of appeals and virtually repealed a section of New York City's charter relating to municipal officials and employees. This decision, involving a dismissed college professor, diminishes the right of States and local governments to hire and fire within the terms of State or local law. The decision not only does violence to the constitutional doctrine of States rights—it also invaded the domain of education, which has always been deemed a State and local function.

Both decisions unquestionably give aid and comfort to Communists and their fellow travelers. But that is perhaps not the main point at issue. The main point is that the Supreme Court, as now composed, has labored to set up, by tortuous reasoning, new doctrines which 4 of its 9 members dispute.

In the school case, a Brooklyn college professor refused to answer questions about communism before a committee of the United States Senate, pleading the fifth amendment. The New York charter requires the dismissal of any employee of the city who "utilizes the privilege against self-incrimination to avoid answering a question relating to his official conduct." On advice of the city's corporation counsel, the professor was summarily dismissed and went to court.

The New York Court of Appeals held that the educator had a right to invoke the fifth amendment to avoid self-incrimination—and for no other reason—but that the city was thereby bound to discharge him under its charter, which was really a condition of employment.

The United States Supreme Court has reversed that ruling. The Court, however, actually rested its majority decision not on the 5th amendment, but on the "due process of law" clause, which is a very different thing, appearing in the 14th amendment, and which, the New York court had found, did not apply.

Better law, in our lay belief, is expressed in the two dissents.

Justices Reed, Minton, and Burton said: "In reliance upon the due process clause of our Constitution the Court strikes deep into the authority of New York to protect its local governmental institutions."

Justice Harlan sustained the New York Court of Appeals in holding that "the assertion of the privilege against self-incrimination" by a New York City employee "is equivalent to resignation."

Justice Harlan likewise implied that the Supreme Court, to reach its majority opinion, went beyond its jurisdiction. Respecting the fifth amendment, he said:

"On the record, I would affirm the decision of the court of appeals.

"A different question would be presented under the privileges and immunities clause of the 14th amendment. But that question was not raised below and is therefore not open here."

Army Engineers Fight Upstream Watershed Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, addressed to Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, with reference to the position and attitude of the Army engineers on watershed projects which have been submitted to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate under the provisions of Public Law 566.

The attitude taken by the Army engineers in this matter is beyond my comprehension. I agree thoroughly with everything which Mr. Triggs so well says in his letter:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: During the congressional hearings that preceded the enactment of the Watershed Act, Public Law 566, the only real objection to the proposal came from the Department of the Army. We cannot help but believe that their position was dictated by bureaucratic ambition rather than a real desire to accomplish the objectives of the legislation. Their opposition to 11 of the 13 watershed projects submitted by the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 566, which was made known at the May 7 hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, appears to be a continuation of this same type of bureaucratic approach which has characterized the Army's attitude toward upstream watershed protection and flood-prevention projects for many years.

The official voting delegates representing the member State Farm Bureaus approved at our last annual meeting the following resolution:

"Both downstream dams and upstream watershed-protection measures are needed to minimize flood damages and provide water for beneficial use. * * * The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act recognizes the concept that the watershed, as well as the river, must be considered in any plan to combat erosion and floods and minimize the effects of drought. We recommend an equitable distribution of appropriated funds between upstream and downstream protection and control measures."

It is our feeling that land and water conservation on the small watersheds of America are one and the same thing and that they must be dealt with as one problem. Appropriate consideration of the development of wise and conservative use of both soil and water in a small watershed area necessitates analysis of such use on a unified, integrated basis, as provided in Public Law 566. At some point a line must be drawn between the responsibilities for this type of work which is assigned to local organizations with the help of the Department of Agriculture and the flood-control responsibilities of the Department of the Army. We believe that the approach to this division of responsibilities as spelled out in Public Law 566 is as practical a solution to this problem as has been suggested to date.

We are extremely pleased with the way local organizations and States have reacted to the possibilities of watershed protection programs under provisions of Public Law 566. No program of this general nature has been more popular in recent years than that authorized under this act. In the past 18 months about 800 watershed protection and flood-prevention programs have been initiated and are now in some stage of planning. Of this number approximately 480 local organizations have applied for assistance from the Department of Agriculture. Over 300 more applications are presently pending before State agencies. Numerous other project proposals will soon be submitted to State agencies for initial approval. The governor of each State has appointed State agencies to review and approve project applications. The legislatures of 21 States have enacted 40 pieces of legislation in less than 18 months to implement this program. Twenty-five national organizations have become interested in this program and have formed the National Watershed Congress to actively promote local action in upstream watershed protection programs. Despite this interest no projects have as yet been approved for construction.

At the hearings before your committee on May 7 the Department of the Army objected to 11 of 13 watershed plans. The major reasons for their opposition to these projects are reviewed below:

1. They professed great concern about the alleged differences in cost-sharing by local organizations on different projects. Apparently they considered only the cash contribution to the construction of structures and failed to take into account the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way to the local organizations, the cost of contracting for the improvements, cost of operation and maintenance, and the cost to local people for the installation of soil and water conservation measures on the land. On the 13 watershed projects in question local contributions to structures amounted to 29 percent and the average local contribution amounted to 55 percent of the total cost. The contribution of local groups on these 13 projects appears to us to be completely within the intent of Public Law 566. In fact, we wonder why the Army should bring this point into the discussion when one of their recent reports indicated that out of more than $3 billion of flood-control works built by their organization, the non-Federal contribution was less than 6 percent.

2. The Army claims that the cost-sharing policy under Public Law 566 is preventing them from requiring the same local contribution on Army projects. It appears that they tried to make the point that they are attempting to bring their cost-sharing policy on flood-control projects in line with the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture. We understand that they have issued a directive to require cost sharing on small projects to be comparable with those planned under Public Law 566. This apparently applies only to reservoirs of less than 5,000 acre-feet capacity. In the past, the Army has built less than a dozen reservoirs of this size and now that Public Law 566 is operative and the authority is given to the Department of Agriculture for such small structures, we question why the Army should be considering projects of this small size. Their new so-called cost-sharing policy has no relationship to their large multimillion dollar dams where no local or State contributions are required.

3. They express concern relative to adequate provision for operation and maintenance of the dams built by local organizations under this legislation. Public Law 566 provides that the operation and maintenance of these projects are the responsibility of the local organization. Apparently the Army is of the opinion that local organizations cannot be entrusted either to build or operate and maintain small dams. Local organizations throughout the country have built and maintained thousands of small dams during the past. These dams have been built and maintained at far less cost than if the same structures had been built by the Federal Government.

4. The Army suggests that there is need for further checks on the economic justification on the proposed watershed projects. This proposal appears to be designed to cast a cloud of suspicion on the combined judgment of the local organizations and Department of Agriculture as to whether the proposed improvements for the watershed would pay off. We feel that this is just another way of saying that only the Army is qualified to do watershed protection and flood-prevention work in the upper reaches of the Nation's watershed.

5. They claim that assistance was given on drainage without authority under Public Law 566. The conference committee report on this legislation states:

"The conference agreed to the change made by the Senate in the form and punctuation of the definition of 'works of improvement' to make it clear that the definition includes drainage projects and that it may be an undertaking either for flood prevention or the agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and the disposal of water."

It appears to us that this language is exceptionally clear and that Public Law 566 contains adequate authority for drainage. It is difficult to visualize why the Army would support such an argument unless it was to confuse the issue.

6. The Army claims that the design of the dams in some of the proposed projects involves risks of failure. Again this argument appears to be designed to cast a reflection on the qualifications of the Department of Agriculture engineers to design and build small structures. The record to December 31, 1955, shows that the Soil Conservation Service has built 338 floodwater-retarding structures. These are the same general type of structures contained in the 13 watershed plans being considered by the committee. In addition, Soil Conservation Service technicians have designed and supervised the construction of more than 13,000 small irrigation reservoirs and more than 700,000 farm ponds. We know for a fact that their structures have withstood terrific abuse in many intensive storms without failure. Engineers employed by both the Army and Department of Agriculture are trained in the same colleges and universities. We see no reason why there should be any differences in engineers of the two organizations as to their ability to design and construct small dams.

Many other objections to the proposed watershed projects were raised by the Army at this hearing. It is our opinion that their bureaucratic ambitions were again employed to frustrate and dim the hopes and desires of thousands of local organizations who have seen for the first time an opportunity to conduct their own watershed programs with technical assistance from the Department of Agriculture without being subjected to Federal domination and control of local resources.

As an organization we do not endorse individual projects. However, it is our feeling that the 13 projects in question are well within the authority prescribed under Public Law 566, and we trust that your committee will consider these 13 watershed-improvement-project proposals on this basis.

Sincerely yours,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

Golden Anniversary of a Golden Investment in Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a most timely editorial entitled "Golden Anniversary," appearing in the April 3 issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune, explaining the true and wholesome nature of the wonderful work being done by our boys clubs throughout the country.

The editorial follows:

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

What we believe to be an unfortunate impression could have been gained from an article carried recently in a national publication, Reader's Digest, which had to do with the boys' club movement.

From it one would gather that boys' clubs are the refuges of hoodlums, slum area conversion centers, and recreation bivouacs only for the underprivileged child. It tossed some brickbats in the direction of South Boston and Charlestown, unwittingly perhaps, as it intended to show the effectiveness of the boys' club movement in areas of particular need.

True, the boys' club did originate in areas of heavily concentrated population. Clubs did and still do take kids in the "tough sections" off the street corners and pavements, drawing them to supervised programs in good environment.

This sort of endeavor is basic. No doubt it has an effect upon the good juvenile records in South Boston and Charlestown, although residents of those communities point to the fact that decency and happy family living abound there in far greater quantity than indicated in the article's allusion to squalor and broken homes.

While the boys' club objective remains the same, to provide something wholesome for youngsters to do in leisure time, its philosophy has broadened. It would be most fallacious to believe that boys' clubs intend to serve only those lads from families in the lowest income level, or to feel that it is limited to problem boys.

Indeed, the movement has matured, as we see it, so that youngsters from all the economic levels are brought together. Communities which never before recognized their obligations to the future in providing an outlet for youthful energies are taking great satisfaction in the establishment of boys' clubs.

The street corner problem is pretty much the same in every city or town. If the boy has no place to spend nonschool hours except the soft drink parlor, pool room, or sidewalk he's apt to think up mischief. His association can be with bad companions. The combination, in this era of high speed automobiles and free spending, can be damaging indeed.

Even though he may not be poor, in the sense of family income, a lad can be underprivileged in other ways if he is denied the care and understanding of parents, or the opportunity to express himself as an individual.

This the modern boys' club does, and it does it well through good leadership for youngsters from all strata of society. This mixing process has a beneficial effect. Boys from modest environment learn they can place themselves on equal footing with youths more favorably endowed. The latter learn to absorb the knocks which go with competitive sports, group games, and learning the arts and crafts.

It is a misconception to consider the boys' club an after-the-fact rehabilitation center. Its function, primarily, it to prevent delinquency before it can happen by doing something for the vulnerable boy. This is the investment a community makes when it builds and supports a boys' club.

Awareness of the philosophy underlying the movement is timely in view of the Golden Anniversary of Boys' Club in America being observed this week. Massachusetts, which has pioneered in so many avenues of education, can point to Fall River as the site of the first club. Now, there are 400,000 boy members in 435 boys' clubs throughout the Nation.

Waltham is very much in the forefront by virtue of its million-dollar youth center, constructed at much lower figure as two dollars were made to do the work of three on a self-help plan. This week you can see those contributed dollars translated into character development dividends by visiting the boys' club.

Lay That Proxy Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Faith and Freedom of May 1956:

LAY THAT PROXY DOWN
(By Morrie Ryskind)

Slowly but surely, the American egghead—that curious creature who cries "Onward" as he retreats backward—is leading us to his utopia: the dark ages. He asks but one thing of any proposal: that it shall have been tried again and again and again—and have failed utterly each time. That sanctifies it for him and he adopts it as part of his creed. Like the mystics, he believes because it is impossible.

Further, he will claim for his quack remedy that it has never been tried before and is a dynamic—he used to say revolutionary, but that word isn't as popular as it was, and he knows his semantics.

And it is no use to point out to him that his notions have been tried all the way from Neanderthal man to Joseph Stalin. Your true egghead is not one to be earthbound by facts: indeed, it is his lofty contempt for facts that makes him an egghead.

Thus, when the egghead demands a cheapening of the currency and the fixing of prices of everything from agricultural products to wages, you waste your breath when your refer to the edict of Diocletian. He will remind you that the edict was issued in the fourth century and that, since the rule of the well-intentioned Roman Emperor, the human race has come a long way.

We now have as part of our heritage the wisdom of Keynes, F. D. R., Truman, Hubert Humphrey, and Wayne Morse, to say nothing of the atomic bomb, television, and the AFL–CIO merger. This time, the egghead is certain, he will succeed.

PRAYING IN THE FRONT PEW

Until recent years, the egghead avoided, if he did not eschew, the church. But there has been of late, if not a genuine religious revival, at least a back-to-the-church movement. And the egghead is there, too—whether he has been genuinely converted or is merely looking for fresh fields in which to establish his doctrine of uniformity.

You will find him occupying the front pews of the kirk and the synagogue, praying loudly that the rest of mankind be recast in his image. For he is certain that the eggheads are the chosen people and that the covenant Yahweh made was with the Americans for Democratic Action.

THE ADA DESCENDS

True enough, he has revised the covenant and incorporated into it some sheerly political additions thoughtfully provided by Bishop Oxnam, Edward Murrow, and Joseph Rauh. This is known as progress, and any thought of adhering to the truths of Moses and Jesus and omitting the newer revelations is known as going back to the religion of the horse-and-buggy era.

The Almighty, it appears, progresses with the rest of us: He used Moses to give us His laws; he sent His Son to redeem a world that had forgotten the sacred commandments; and today, with the universe again in chaos and confusion, He sends us the ADA. Will you not believe? Then, alas, you will not be saved. And the least you can do, since you are an unbeliever, is to get out of the church or the synagogue whose Holy Word you deny.

WHAT ARE YOUR POLITICS?

The egghead, in short, has not only taken to going to church, but he has taken the church over. You and I, reserving for God the things that are His, go to the temple for a quiet communion with the Lord, for a little soul searching, perhaps for the confessional; we think of the man in the next pew not as a Republican or a Democrat, but as a fellow communicant.

Not so the egghead: he wants to commit you politically. He demands part of the reverence we reserved for the Lord, and he has taken over Caesar's function, too, and made it part of the services. We must give the egghead our votes and our tithes. According to the Gospel as interpreted by Walter Reuther and George Meany, every carpenter and automobile worker must think and vote alike; why not every Protestant, every Catholic, every Jew?

Thus, it is we see the liberal Catholic weekly, America, refusing to run an article it had accepted from Russell Kirk because he is a contributor to National Review, whose conservative point of view America rejects. Mind you, they don't object to his article, but he has appeared in the forbidden pages of their own carefully made-up index.

Thus we see the lay committee of the National Council of Churches of Christ forced to dissolve when it protested against the stand of the liberal clergy who began issuing political statements in the name of 34 million Protestants. Thus we see a score of representatives of Jewish organizations—some of them religious, some fraternal—meeting in Washington and pretending to speak for all Jewry on political matters.

TESTING FOR HERESY

The egghead demands not only, obviously, the right to speak, but the right to silence the rest of us. If you don't go along with America you are presumably not a good Catholic. If you don't go along with the general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ, you are not a good Protestant. If the views of the Jews who met in Washington are not yours, you are not a good Jew.

Hasn't the word been uttered?

So something new has been added to religion. And, of course, it isn't news; it's nothing but the old test for heresy. And, if the egghead has his way, the inquisition will follow. Not, to be sure, torture on the rack, but excommunication from the church and exile from the society of decent folk. Unable to present our ADA cards, you and I will have to do our worshipping at home.

I have before me a pamphlet, for example, that attacks the McCarran-Walter immigration law Now, I happen to think the law is a good one. Maybe you don't and cer-

tainly any group of citizens has a right to attack it.

WHO'S ON THE FENCE?

But notice the names of the organizations sponsoring the pamphlet, which is called The Fense: the American Jewish Committee, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, Board on Peace and Social Concern of the Friends, Church Peace Union, Commission of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, Council of the American Baptist Convention, United Church Women of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, National Council of Jewish Women, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church. Oh, yes; and the National Farmers Union—religion not stated.

ACTING IN WHOSE NAME?

Now, everyone of the individuals in these organizations has, as I said, a perfect right to assail the act—as an individual. Or even as a group united in something called, say, the Committee To Repeal the McCarran-Walter Act. But the bland use of the names of the churches, with the patently intended inference that every Jew, Presbyterian, Quaker, Congregationalist, Methodist, Baptist, et al., backs repeal is a palpable untruth, and people who pretend to revere the Ten Commandments ought not to break one of them by bringing false testimony.

There is another commandment, too, that they may have forgotten: against taking the name of the Lord in vain. If ever a commandment was broken, it is by the people who put out the pamphlet.

The McCarran Act may be good or it may be bad, but it is not a religious issue with God on the side of the pamphleteers, and Satan on the other side. I submit that the Congress that passed the act was not made up of infidels: the Jews, Catholics, and Protestants who voted for the bill were as God-fearing as any of the pamphleteers.

Of one thing, I am sure: the Congress was composed of better Americans than the self-anointed pamphleteers: they voted not as Catholics, Protestants, Jews, but as Americans, thinking not only of what was good for the immigrant, but what was good for America—which they had sworn to preserve. Or is that, too, heretical?

TORQUEMADA TIPTOES IN

Perhaps it is. And if this pamphlet succeeds, we may look forward to other pronouncements from the pulpit: it will turn out that the Bricker amendment is, by implication at least, anti-Semitic, and that Jesus warned us to beware of balancing the budget.

Against the day when the new Torquemada comes, I have already made my preparations. I may confess and be converted outwardly, but secretly I shall go down to the cellar, where I can read the Old Testament as my ancestors did. And—if the secrecy of the ballot still remains—I may even, on election day, vote for a conservative. If I can find one, that is.

Helicopters Rise to Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the progress of this age is due, in large part, to the inventive genius and courage of industrial pioneers of the free world. Typical of this, is the use of helicopters as a means of swift, safe, and speedy travel in many congested parts of the world and in many places where terrain and topography uniquely require such mode of travel. The future of "vertical whirlybirds" will not be dependent upon governmental subsidies, military coddling, or other artificial aids if the bold, courageous, and attainable plans of forward looking helicopter operators come to fruition, as set forth in the following report of the meeting of the International Air Transport Association held at San Remo, Italy, and which report appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 11, 1956, under the byline of Richard P. Cooks, staff reporter. The article is as follows:

SAN REMO, ITALY.—A perilous corkscrew road winds between cliff and chasm from Nice, France, to this picturesque seaport resort town looking out on the Ligurian Sea.

Helicopter builders and flyers from a dozen nations traveled by bus over this precipitous route a few days ago to meet here and map the whirlybird's commercial future. For many, the road seemed symbolic of the twists and turns ahead before pay-and-fly 'copter travel really gets off the ground.

Interestingly enough, and possibly portentous of things to come, helicopters soon will be flying over this craggy Riveria route, cutting the 2½-hour bus trip to just 20 minutes. The ubiquitous Aristotle Onassis, shipping fleet magnate and a dweller in the nearby principality of Monaco, let it be quietly known that he is arranging to buy up to four 12-passenger Sikorsky-built 'copters for regular Riviera runs. Cost of the S–58's: About $280,000 apiece.

SKY HIGHWAYS

At the San Remo conclave, called by the International Air Transport Association, manufacturers unveiled plans for bigger, swifter and safer helicopters. Traffic specialists talked of complex travel patterns, a sort of invisible highway system in the sky to take care of 'copters flying metropolitan routes. And conferees agreed that noise was one of the whirlybird's big handicaps for regular city operating.

The conference also spotlighted important differences between the civilian buyers of helicopters and the people who make them. On one hand, the operators of helicopter lines urged manufacturers to start building roomier, long-range commercial craft and held out the prospect of a multi-million-dollar market for them. Manufacturers, on the other hand, adopted a go-slow attitude, hesitant about zooming ahead on commercial output while helicopter travel still is in the infancy stage.

Until now, commercial helicopters have been single-engine craft and have been adaptations of military machines. Whirlybird enthusiasts say two or more engines are needed for safety in commercial use. They're urging plane manufacturers to bring out a multiengine 'copter that can be operated more cheaply than present types.

BUS-LIKE SERVICE

Robert L. Cummings, Jr., president of New York Airways, told the conferees here there's a market in the United States today for two hundred 25-passenger 'copters for short-haul service. He said his line, which last year toted nearly 25,000 passengers by helicopter in the New York metropolitan area, would operate planes on a bus-like schedule and do away with present reservation procedures.

Mr. Cummings urged manufacturers to rely less on Government orders for helicopters and develop the potentially greater commercial market. He figured the 25-passenger planes he called for would cost about $500,000 apiece and thus would represent something over $100 million in initial new plane orders. On top of that, he noted, there would be another $30 million for manufacturers in making needed spare parts.

Helicopter travel, though hampered by high seat-mile costs and limited schedules, has been on the upswing. New York Airways, for one, hauled only 8,758 fare-paying passengers in 1954, its first full year of operation. Last year, the pay load nearly tripled to 24,569. Within 10 years, predicted T. M. Sullivian, chief of aviation planning for the Port of New York Authority, a million riders a year will be whirlybirding to and from Manhattan.

LONDON TO PARIS

United States lines are not the only ones growing and planning to branch out. British European Airways, which sent eight men to the San Remo session, is casting about for a huge helicopter able to carry 40 or 50 passengers. It wants to use the plane for direct hops from the heart of London to the foot of Paris' Eiffel Tower. It's about to start testing a medium-sized, twin-engine whirlybird but doesn't expect to get the giant-size craft for 3 or 4 years.

New craft designs accented the shift from piston power plants for helicopters to turbine engines. The lighter turbines would make planes more economical to operate and would permit the use of more engines on each plane, thus giving it added safety features.

Igor I. Sikorsky, pioneer plane designer and engineering manager of Sikorsky Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., disclosed plans to use turbines in a twin-motored S–56, a 30-passenger whirlybird expected to be ready for commercial use in 3 to 4 years.

G. S. Hislop, chief helicopter designer for Fairey Aviation Co. of Middlesex, England, reported that a huge 50-passenger Rotodyne is expected to fly early next year and be ready for the market by 1960. Compressed gases will whirl its rotor tips for vertical ascent, then conventional propellers will take over for forward speed.

High costs of travel by helicopter dominated discussions at closed-door meetings. New York Airways' Mr. Cummings estimates a modern 25-passenger craft should be able to operate at a cost of 15 cents to 20 cents per seat mile for hauls of 50 miles or less in metropolitan areas. That would put helicopters in a competitive range with taxis, which now charge 25 cents a mile in New York.

But that cost figure for helicopters is far less than is now prevalent. Mr. Onassis' new S–58's, for example, are expected to have a direct cost of between 20 cents and 30 cents a seat mile. This means the operator's breakeven point, with overhead included, would be at least 50 cents, quite costly when compared to conventional airplane fare which averages about 5.25 cents a passenger mile.

"Convenience and service, not seat mile cost, will make the helicopter successful," argued Wing Commander R. Brie of British European Airways. Says another 'copter backer "A tired executive doesn't mind an extra $10 at the end of a $175 plane trip if he can get to his hotel an hour sooner."

With larger, longer-range helicopters, the seat mile cost (which declines with distance) is expected to run between 5 cents and 7 cents a mile. This, of course, would allow fares in line with rates charged on fixed wing planes. Sabena officials figure, for example, that an intercity helicopter fare for trips up to 250 miles would be approximately the regular plane fare, plus the cost of a bus or taxi to and from the outlying airport.

Report to Provost Thomas V. Garvey, of Queens College, Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., on Visit to Air University by Irving P. Schwartz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report made by Irving P. Schwartz, the assistant public relations counselor of Queens College in Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., to Provost Thomas V. Garvey, of Queens College, on his recent visit to Headquarters, Air Force ROTC, and the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama.

Mr. Schwartz is keenly interested in increasing the cadet enrollment in the Queens College detachment of the Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps, and I believe that his account of the visit, and his conclusions and recommendations will be of interest to all those concerned about our Air Force ROTC program.

The report follows:

Since September of 1955 the department of air science and the department of public relations of Queens College have been formally engaged in a public relations project with the goal of increasing cadet enrollment in the Queens College detachment of the Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps. As part of the project, an invitation was extended by the Air Force ROTC officials of Queens College and Headquarters Air Force ROTC officials at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, to the Public Relations Counselor of Queens, Dr. Henry S. Miller and the Assistant Public Relations Counselor, Irving P. Schwartz, for a visit to Headquarters Air Force ROTC and Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base. I made the visit to Maxwell together with Maj. Walter G. Lang, USAF, commandants of cadets, 1st Lt. Robert D. Hartwig, USAF, information services officer, both of the Queens Air Force ROTC detachment, and Prof. Charles Haywood of the department of music, from April 26 through April 29, 1956, for the following reasons:

1. To discuss ways and means, with Air Force ROTC officials, of increasing cadet enrollment not only at Queens College but at other colleges which have Air Force ROTC detachments. The enrollment has declined at many liberal arts institutions.

2. To acquire additional knowledge of the Air Force ROTC and Air University programs in order to help us to better understand the excellent work of the United States Air Force educational program.

MEETING WITH GENERAL DEICHELMANN

The group from Queens College had the pleasure of meeting with Maj. Gen. Matthew K. Deichelmann, USAF, Commandant of Headquarters Air Force ROTC. General Deichelmann gave us a complete background and briefing as regards the reasons for the reduced enrollment in Air Force ROTC at many colleges. He made the following points:

1. There is a flying requirement for cadets who enter the advanced corps. There are students who are physically and mentally unable to meet that requirement, and therefore cannot be commissioned as officers in the Air Force.

2. There has been a reduction in the draft quota for college students, and as a result, students are not entering the Air Force ROTC program.

3. There just seems to be a general lack of interest in flying.

4. There seems to be a lack of prestige as regards the military field. The civilian population does not seem to have a high regard for the military. This is one of the main reasons that even the Air Force ROTC graduates do not make a career of the Air Force—that is to say, they seem to fear the lack of prestige which the military has in the opinion of many civilians.

5. There is the need for the civilians to be correctly educated about the military. This, of course, calls for increased public relations. However, there is also a need for the civilians and officers to be further orientated about the excellent educational opportunities in the Air Force such as the various colleges located at Air University.

MEETING WITH COLONEL WHEELER

The Queens College delegation met with Col. Ansel J. Wheeler, United States Air Force, liaison group chief for this area. Colonel Wheeler stated that enrollment was increasing in science and engineering colleges, although there was somewhat of a decline in liberal arts colleges. He commended us for our public relations-Air Force ROTC project at Queens College. I suggested to Colonel Wheeler that other colleges establish public relations-Air Force ROTC projects similar to the project at Queens College. As a move in that direction, I suggested to Colonel Wheeler that local, regional and national college public relations organizations be orientated about the Air Force ROTC program. To my knowledge, this has never been done in a formal manner. Certainly, in my opinion, cadet enrollment can be increased if the public relations programs of the colleges as regards Air Force ROTC are geared toward doing everything possible to help the Air Force ROTC detachments in the colleges.

I told Colonel Wheeler that I would approach some of the public relations officials in the college field with the idea of an Air Force ROTC orientation session, and that I would report to Colonel Wheeler about my findings.

MEETING WITH CAPTAIN JOHNSON

Captain Lewis T. Johnson, United States Air Force, information services officer of Headquarters Air Force ROTC, actually made most of the arrangements for our trip to Maxwell. He was kind enough to tour the base with us, introduce us to all of the officials, and generally to see that we were made comfortable during our stay at Maxwell. However, Lieutenant Hartwig and I had a most enlightening conference with Captain Johnson about public relations and its relationship to the Air Force ROTC program. He made some excellent suggestions about improving our public relations program, thereby possibly leading to an increase in cadet enrollment. Some of the suggestions were:

1. The principals of the various high schools should be invited to the college for an orientation session on Air Force ROTC. Inviting the principals to the college for dinner, and then briefing them about the Air Force ROTC, should do a good deal toward helping to acquire more students for the Air Force ROTC. At the present time, there is somewhat of a lack of cooperation on the part of high-school principals in this area as regards Air Force ROTC. Perhaps, a better term would be that they are indifferent. An orientation program, according to Captain Johnson, would go a long way toward changing the attitudes of many principals.

2. The efforts in the New York area on the part of colleges in visiting the high schools should be coordinated. Captain Johnson said that it is useless to have each college send its cadets to the various high schools when one college can send representatives to speak for the Air Force ROTC at all colleges. In that way, each college would have an equal share of high schools to visit, and there would be no duplication of efforts.

3. The high-school principals should be invited to attend the formal reviews of the Air Force ROTC detachment.

4. Cadets should visit the high schools from which they graduated so that they can speak to students about the Air Force ROTC.

5. The crack Pershing rifle team of the Air Force ROTC should perform for some of the high schools.

VISIT TO COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

The Air Force has an excellent educational program for its officers. Unfortunately, many civilians do not realize the importance of this program nor are many aware that this program exists. The Queens College delegation was very fortunate in being able to visit the Air Command and Staff College, one of the aspects of the educational establishment and an integral part of Air University.

The Air Command and Staff College is the largest resident school for the advanced education of Air Force officers. Its two principal schools are the Command and Staff School and the Squadron Officer School. The Command and Staff School is the intermediate course in the progressive system of officer education provided by Air University and the Squadron Officer School is the first. The college provides an academic instructor course and two weapons courses. There is also a language laboratory for allied officers and a reading laboratory for all of its students. We were given a demonstration of the methods used in the language laboratory.

As the Air Force center for education and development of doctrine in command and staff subjects, the mission of the Air Command and Staff College is to conduct courses to prepare officers for command and staff duties, to prepare staff studies as required by the United States Air Force Headquarters, with the assistance of field agencies to write doctrinal manuals on air command and staff organization, procedures and techniques, to prepare correspondence courses paralleling the two general duty courses and to give instruction in special subjects as part of the general courses.

The mission of the command and staff school is to improve the professional qualifications and abilities of selected Air Force majors and lieutenant colonels to execute the command and staff tasks required in implementing air strategy and missions of the Air Force and to contribute to the development of air doctrine, strategy and tactics.

Major Lang, of Queens College, was selected for command and staff school and will start the nine-month course at Maxwell in September.

The Squadron Officer School is the first step in an officer's advanced military education. It prepares selected officers for the command of squadrons and for the performance of staff duties usually assigned squadron-grade officers.

Other aspects of the Air Command and Staff College include the academic instructor course for teachers in the Military Establishment, weapons courses and the language and reading laboratories. Lt. Col. Howard A. Mitchell, USAF, professor of air science at Queens College and Lieutenant Hartwig will attend the academic instructor course in the summer of 1956.

The entire establishment at Air University and the educational opportunities offered to officers in the United States Air Force cer-

tainly left a deep and lasting impression on us all.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. I must begin by stating that I have received no indication, as a result of my trip to Maxwell, that the Air Force ROTC detachment at Queens College will close in the near future. To the contrary, with all of the efforts being made at Headquarters Air Force ROTC and at Queens College, I am very optimistic about the detachment's future on our campus. I can only see an increase in enrollment as a result of our efforts.

2. The present public relations-Air Force ROTC project at Queens College should by all means be continued. The project has been highly successful. We have received a good deal of newspaper coverage and have also been successful with television coverage. The community is now becoming cognizant of the Air Force ROTC and its importance in our entire Defense Establishment. I cannot give enough praise to the Air Force ROTC officers at Queens College who have worked very closely with the public-relations office of the college in our project. The Information Services officer, Lieutenant Hartwig, has spent many hours, much of them during evenings and weekends, working with me in planning our public-relations program. With this type of cooperation, we cannot help but be successful.

3. By all means, the high-school principals should be invited to the Queens College campus for an orientation session on Air Force ROTC. I believe that a joint invitation should be extended by the provost and the Department of Air Science. I suggest that the provost sanction such a meeting.

4. If there is an opportunity to do so, I suggest that the provost and other members of the faculty visit Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base. In my opinion, there is no better way of learning about the Air Force ROTC and the other educational aspects of the Air Force than from such a visit.

Respectfully submitted.

IRVING P. SCHWARTZ.

MAY 1, 1956.

Appointment of a New Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the major differences between the Eisenhower administration and the preceding administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman lies in the philosophy of the relationship between Federal and local government and between Government and private enterprise in the field of developing our power and other natural resources.

In each of the annual Economic Reports of the Eisenhower administration much effort has been devoted to spelling out the belief of the Eisenhower administration that a balanced partnership between Federal Government, local governments, and private enterprise in the development of our power and other natural resources is the best way to get the greatest and cheapest abundance of these necessities for our society. There is plenty of room for honest argument as to just where the balance should be struck, but there is no room for argument which refuses to recognize that the issue is one of balance and not one of one side being for cheap abundant power and the other being against cheap abundant power. As a matter of fact, there is not just two sides to the question. There are many sides. Some believe that the balance proposed by the Eisenhower administration still unduly weighs the responsibility of the Federal Government at the expense of private enterprise. My own personal view is that the Eisenhower administration is still weighing too heavily the Federal Government at the expense of both local government and private enterprise.

Mr. Leland Olds, testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the President's 1955 Economic Report, complained that there was no attention paid to the problem of getting cheap adequate power for our people in the report. In questioning Mr. Olds on his views, I made the following suggestions for his comment: That he, Mr. Olds, was what is known as a public-power advocate. Mr. Olds admitted that he was. I suggested then that his complaint with the President's report was not that no attention was devoted to the problem of getting more cheap power for our people, but rather that the President had not suggested the Federal Government develop plans for moving further into the field directly. The President's report gave emphasis to plans which required more private initiative and which had a better balance between Federal Government, local government, and private participation. The objectives of Mr. Olds, the Eisenhower administration, and people holding views similar to mine, is to get as much cheap power for our people as we can. The issue is not centered on differences in motives, but rather in differences as to how we best attain these desired objectives.

However, the public-power advocates and others who are advocating the philosophy of greater Federal governmental participation in the areas of the development of our natural resources will not accept this statement of the question. I think it is fair to say, generally speaking, these people advocate greater Federal governmental participation in almost all areas of economic and social development in our society. They are opposed not only to a greater participation of State and local governments in all areas of social and economic development, but also a greater participation of private enterprise in these areas. Theirs is not just a holding action; they want the Federal Government to assume more responsibility.

The Americans for Democratic Action have been the public spokesmen of this philosophy and are directing the strategy of public debate on it. Although this is a relatively small group of citizens, in its ranks are individuals influential in the thought-molding professions of our society. They consist of traditional politicians, teachers, professors, authors, newspaper reporters, columnists, book reviewers, book publishers, and other persons in the administrative work of these professions. Accordingly, the strategy they develop on the public discussion of a political issue becomes important.

As I have stated, this group refused to accept the issue for discussion as being one of how we attain the fine objectives we all agree upon. Instead, this group decided to pose the issue as one of motives and opposite objectives. They are for cheap adequate power; the other side is for the opposite. They are for good; their opponents are for bad.

So the issue has been presented to the people by them under the huckster slogan "giveaway." The term "giveaway" implies insidious, improper motives. It has been applied by this group to every step taken by the Eisenhower administration where it has tried to effect a different balance, a balance away from the amount of present Federal governmental participation in economic developments in our society.

These spokesmen of ADA have not been content with merely implying improper motives; in many instances they have made frontal attacks on the motives of all persons connected with a particular issue where the importance of the Federal Government in a matter was being diminished. The Dixon-Yates controversy affecting the TVA as it did is a classic example of the methods employed. The strategy was a series of hit and run attacks. The public today has forgotten many of the charges made as detailed charges. They only remember, as those knowing public psychology planned they remember, there was something unsavory alleged. One of the first charges was that Bobby Jones, a personal friend of President Eisenhower, was financially interested in the Dixon-Yates proposals and therefore * * *. This charge was disproved almost immediately, but those who know public relations media and public psychology knew the refutation would never attain the prominence of the original charge. In the Dixon-Yates matter, one attack after another on the motives of the persons involved was made, refuted, and dropped, only to be picked up after a reasonable period of time and referred to vaguely and collectively to persuade the public that something unsavory was connected with the matter.

The basic issues involved in the Dixon-Yates matter were never honestly posed to the public or discussed by the ADA group although there was much area for honest public discussion.

So it has been with one giveaway after another, including the tideland oil question. Not once has this crowd of intellectuals honestly posed the questions so the American public could give consideration to the real and sometimes difficult issues involved. Furthermore through the power they possess in their thought-molding professions they have been rather successful in poisoning the air throughout the country on matters that can and should be the subject of honest and searching debate.

Now we come to one of the purposes behind such campaigns. The Secretary of the Interior has resigned. This governmental department makes a great deal of policy in regard to issues of

power and natural resource development. This department, under Secretary McKay, has been conscientiously following the philosophy of President Eisenhower in this area in spite of all attacks. It is most important to the ADA to have a Secretary of the Interior in this administration who is not a person of courage and strong convictions. The smear campaign can hurt a strong and able man, but it cannot make him change his course. The smear campaign can make a weak man—a man who doesn't study or know his subject—temporize and modify his views. Particularly, as men have learned, if he does modify his views he receives, through the same power these people exercise in the thought molding fields, great praise as a humanitarian. He is no longer an anti-intellectual, an ante-diluvian.

So the campaign has been on for some time to keep the Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence Davis, an honest, hard-working, and knowledgeable man, from being appointed by the President to the Secretaryship. The campaign against Davis I feel is pointed toward a few people in the administration who have been known in the past to have been influenced by these campaigns, either because they have been taken in by the cleverness of them, or because they feel that the public in general have been taken in by them.

An article entitled "Republican 'Give-aways': the Charges and the Facts" appearing in Harper's magazine, May 1956, illustrates the techniques employed.

This article cloaks itself—not too cleverly either—in the guise of being an objective and intellectual examination of the issues involved in the approach our society should adopt in the development of our natural resources. An alert, thoughtful person can see the dishonesty without even having to refer to outside materials. The fact that it was printed and headlined in Harper's magazine assist in taking the unalert intellectual unawares. I am curious as to why the editors of Harper's participated in this attempt at public deception on this important public issue.

I am setting forth a résumé of the background of Clarence Davis, the person the ADA is seeking to keep out of the Secretaryship of the Interior. I want to point out an interesting fact. Nebraska has long had a system of State ownership of power. Clarence Davis has had a great deal to do with the development of this system. So it can be seen his record is not really that of leaning primarily toward private enterprise in the balance of Federal Government, local government, and private enterprise. If anything it is one leaning toward State and local government. But either private enterprise or local government is anathema to those who want to enlarge the Federal Government. Much as I believe the emphasis should be more on private enterprise, I have no great fear of State or local operation except for the inherent inefficiency of the personnel system it brings, because our local and State governments are still close enough to the people to be watched. I do fear the concentration of economic power in Washington, D. C., or in Wall Street; it makes no difference. I greatly fear the concentration of both economic and political power wherever it be. A totalitarian state is nothing more than a state where economic and political power rests in the same hands. This result can be achieved by the economic groups taking over the political groups as in fascism or nazism or it can be achieved by the political groups taking over the economic groups as in communism. Or it can be a catalysis where the Military Establishment takes over both and coordinates and controls them.

One thing alone will keep a republic a republic and a people of a society free and that is honest public debate which means respect for the wisdom and motives of one's opponents and of the people of the society who listen. Clarence Davis is a public servant whose entire career bespeaks honesty, integrity coupled with great ability and great courage. He would make a splendid Secretary of the Interior.

CLARENCE A. DAVIS

Mr. Davis was born at Beaver City, Nebr., November 21, 1892, the son of Thomas M. and Nannie Galvin Davis. In 1916 he married Florence Wells, of Schuyler, Nebr. They have 1 son, Thomas M. Davis II, and 3 grandsons.

Education: Attended public schools of Beaver City, Nebr. (population 1,200), graduating in 1910. He attended Nebraska Wesleyan University, 1910–13 (A. B., 1913), taking the 4 years' work in 3, and had many college activities; baseball team, track team, tennis team, debating team, class orator, etc., and graduated from Harvard Law School (LL. B., 1916).

Legal biography: He practiced in Omaha, Nebr., from 1916 to 1917, with the firm of Baldrige and De Bord. He removed to Holdrege, Nebr., in 1917 and was elected attorney general in 1918.

Attorney General of Nebraska, 1910–23; counsel to Nebraska in interstate water litigation and in preparation of Nebraska-Colorado Interstate Compact regarding the South Platte River, 1923; member of commission compiling Nebraska statutes, 1922; member Uniform Laws Commission, 1922–25; general practice in Holdrege, Nebr., 1923–36; general practice in Lincoln, Nebr., 1936–53; member of law firm of Davis, Healey, Davies & Wilson; general counsel to Western Public Service Co., 1925–41; general counsel to Consumers Public Power District, 1941–53; counsel to Missouri Valley Development Association; lecturer on administrative law, University of Nebraska, 1943; trustee, Nebraska Wesleyan University, 1923–27.

Member of the Lincoln, Nebr., the Nebraska State, and the American Bar Associations, and a member and vice president of the Federal Bar Association; member of advisory board of editors, American Bar Association Journal, 1948–52; president, Nebraska State Bar Association, 1951; member of house of delegates, American Bar Association; member of the General Resolutions Committee of the American Bar Association, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953; has been on the council of the sections of municipal law, public utilities, and an adviser-member of the committee sponsoring the Administrative Procedure Act; member, committee on Lawyers' Reference Service of American Bar Association, 1951–52; chairman of the Missouri Valley regional meeting of the American Bar Association in Omaha, 1953; member of National Conference of Bar Association Presidents, and a member of its council, 1951–53; and presently a member of the committee of the American Bar Association on Civil Service and a member of the Federal Bar Association Committee on the same subject.

He has been a director of the American Judicature Society since 1951; is a member of the Institute of Judicial Administration and a member of the American Law Institute.

He is a member of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, the National Reclamation Association, the American Public Power Association, and a member of its legislative committee in 1952.

Other affiliations and activities: He is a member of the Episcopal Church, Scottish Rite (K. C. C. H.), Masons, Shrine, Pi Kappa Delta, Order of Coif, Lawyers Club (New York), University and Country Clubs (Lincoln, Nebr.).

The AAUP and Academic Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader of May 21, 1956:

THE AAUP AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY—SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM FAILS TO GRIP BASIC ISSUES

(By Sidney Hook, former council member, AAUP)

The long-awaited report by a special committee of the American Association of University Professors on academic freedom and national security has now been released. It was accepted by the council of the AAUP and adopted at its annual meeting in St. Louis. (Whether it represents the point of view of the membership is another question.) I refer to this report as "long-awaited" because it is the first that has been made on the subject of Communist Party teachers in colleges and universities since the issue was raised 7 years ago at the University of Washington. Cases have been piling up with no action taken by the AAUP. Not even investigations were launched. Finally, in the fall of 1955, a special committee was appointed to bring in a comprehensive report on all the cases to date in which the issue of communism was directly or indirectly involved and to formulate general principles to guide action with respect to them.

Of the 18 institutions reported on, only 2 were visited by a committee. This would normally be extraordinary, because hitherto in the investigation of run-of-the-mill academic-freedom cases the reports of the investigating committee of the AAUP have been exemplary in every respect. They commanded great moral authority, and university administrations were very sensitive to their findings. The report of the special committee, on the other hand, has been severely criticized because the committee did not visit all the institutions it censured, conducted itself like a kangaroo court, and based its findings on "facts of public knowledge" even though these admittedly did not represent all the facts.

However, there are two reasons why these criticisms are not very significant. First, the principles enunciated by the special committee made visits or detailed investigations in most cases unnecessary. Secondly, the censures were based primarily on the failure of administrations to follow certain procedural principles. Even if different and more sensible principles had been expressed in the report, it is clear that some of the

censured institutions deserved condemnation for violating canons of proper procedure.

My concern in this article is with the principles of the report, the grounds given for the AAUP's attitude toward employment of Communist Party teachers, the knowledgeability of the committee, and the pertinence and validity of its observations and recommendations on the issue before it. I approached this report with no hostility and, indeed, with some sympathetic interest. Dr. Ralph F. Fuchs, AAUP general secretary, had written me a few days before the report was printed: "Although the committee's approach probably differs from yours in some respects, I believe its conclusions do not differ substantially in practical effect from yours regarding the matters covered."

It may well be that the recommendations in particular cases may not be very different from what my own would have been, but I am convinced that the practical effect of the enunciation of the special committee's principles will be gravely damaging to the AAUP and, more important, to the cause of academic freedom.

The basic weakness—it would not be too strong to say the basic evasion—of the report is apparent in its very title: "Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security." The problem of communism and Communist teachers in colleges and universities has little or nothing to do with national security. It has everything to do with the question of professional ethics and professional integrity. At no time was the number of Communists in colleges sufficiently high to warrant the slightest concern that they would undermine our national security. Today, there are no, or hardly any, Communist Party teachers active on American campuses. In none of the cases considered by the special committee were individuals charged with weakening or even working against the security of the country. On the contrary, they were usually charged with lack of professional integrity, with undermining not our national security but the principles of academic freedom.

These charges, first formulated at the University of Washington, set the pattern elsewhere. They were the charges which the special committee should have considered. After all, John Dewey, first president of the AAUP, and Arthur Lovejoy, its first secretary, made it very clear that the group was founded not merely to defend the narrow professional interests of college teachers, important as they were, but to develop and uphold the highest standards of academic integrity. And it was fundamentally on this ground that both of them were opposed to tenure for members of the Communist Party or any other group organized under similar disciplines for unprofessional purposes.

It was the business of the special committee to assess these charges against members of the Communist Party thoroughly and honestly in the light of the ideals of professional ethics which the AAUP always stressed. They did nothing of the sort. They made no study of Communist Party activities in the colleges. They made no study of Communist Party directives to its members to abuse their professional trust. They cited no literature on the question. They met none of the arguments showing why supervision and observation of the behavior of Communist Party teachers in the classroom was morally undesirable and pedagogically impractical. They contented themselves with the pious statement that the academic community has a duty to defend itself from subversion of the educational process. But they did not even ask whether, as a first commonsensical measure of defense, those who were under explicit instructions to subvert the educational process should not be regarded as prima facie (not automatically) unfit for their posts. After all, academic freedom and commonsense are not irreconcilable. When physicians, lawyers, or any other professional group set up standards to defend the integrity of their profession against those who would undermine it, membership in any organization which gives instructions to proceed dishonorably or to subvert standards of decent practice is of immediate concern to the character committee or committee on professional ethics. Are teachers to be less concerned with the honor and integrity of their profession? Why, then, the red herring about national security?

Even as concerns national security, the special committee evinces an extraordinary naiveté which reflects its ignorance of the Communist Party and its ways. It has one paragraph on military security which states bravely with the admission that the committee accepts unhesitatingly the application of safeguards, where secret research is going on, against misuse of classified information important for military security. It makes the reasonable request that these safeguards should extend only to individuals who have access to such information. It then adds: "In no degree do they (the safeguards) justify the proscription of individuals because of their beliefs and associations, unless these persons were knowingly participants in criminal acts or conspiracies, in either the past or present." If this means what it implies—the report is not a model of clarity or precision—then members of the Communist Party as such cannot be proscribed or barred even from work on restricted projects no matter how important to the security of the Nation. They must first be caught acting as good Communists do in such situations. No one who has the slightest acquaintance with the enormous documentary evidence of the role of Communist parties as fifth columnists and agents of Soviet subversion could hold such an absurd position.

This is not the first time that a committee of the AAUP has betrayed either ignorance of, or indifference to, the nature of communism and the Communist Party. As late as 1948, Prof. George Shannon, reporting for the Commitee on Academic Freedom, wrote that "the evidence that the Communist Party in the United States is subservient to the dictates of international communism, which means the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is not conclusive (Bulletin, spring 1948, p. 123). One wonders what Mr. Shannon, who is at present editor of the Bulletin, would regard as conclusive.

Ignorance about communism, however, is not the decisive feature of the report, but rather a disregard of the standards of professional integrity. So that there may be no doubt that the instructions given to Communist Party teachers do violate the rudiments of professional ethics, I cite several lines from the official instructions:

"Party and YCL (Young Communist League) fractions set up within classes and departments must supplement and combat by means of discussions, brochures, etc. bourgeois omissions and distortions in the regular curriculum. * * * Marxist-Leninist analysis must be injected into every class.

"Communist teachers must take advantage of their positions, without exposing themselves, to give their students to the best of their ability working-class (i. e., Communist) education. * * *

"Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure and at the same time conduct struggles around the school in a truly Bolshevik manner." (The Communist, May 1937.)

Although often criticized for giving these instructions to its teachers, to this day the Communist Party has not withdrawn them or qualified them in any way.

The retort usually made—that accepting these instructions is one thing, while carrying them out is another—is quite specious. One might as well say that a boxer who has indicated his willingness to throw his fight, or a basketball player who has promised not to score, is not morally culpable until it can be established that he has actually carried out his instructions. The rules governing examination procedures in most colleges indicate clearly that evidence of intent to commit dishonest acts is a ground for disciplinary action. Membership in the Communist Party, which issues specific instructions to act dishonestly, is certainly prima facie evidence of intent warranting at the very least close inquiry and professional indictment. But not according to the AAUP. The very ethical principles which teachers expect their students to follow, they cast aside in assaying the professional misconduct of their colleagues.

The notion that members of the Communist Party can be detected by their classroom practices is mistaken, and I have detailed the reasons at length elsewhere. Some professors say that, if members of the Communist Party carry out their instructions, they are thereby establishing their incompetence and can be dismissed on grounds of incompetence rather than betrayal of professional trust. But has anyone ever heard of a professor losing his job on grounds of incompetence? Harold Taylor, president of Sarah Lawrence, who believes that members of the Communist Party have a right to teach on the same terms as any other teachers, has frankly admitted that "once a man has received tenure, the tenure rules and the academic policies of the university community are usually strong enough to sustain him in his post indefinitely, no matter what level of achievement he may subsequently reach as a teacher or thinker." (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July 1955, p. 79.)

The nonprofessional reader may be startled by this, since it seems to put the college teacher in a highly privileged position. Nonetheless, there are good and sufficient professional reasons for this state of affairs, the chief of which is the difficulty of formulating objective criteria of performance. Academic freedom would be imperiled were teachers to be dismissed on vague grounds of incompetence. This further reinforces the conclusion that the nub of the whole matter is one of professional honor and integrity. Once a teacher has won his spurs, neither supervision nor snooping can detect whether or not, if he is a member of the Communist Party, he is carrying out its instructions. His primary offense lies in his voluntary act of membership in an organization which gives him such instructions, and, although this should not be an automatic ground for dismissal, it should constitute a presumption of unfitness. Mutatis mutandis, the same principle should be applied to members of any group bound by a similar discipline and under similar instructions.

As if the failure of the AAUP special committee to come to grips with the basic issues were not bad enough, it goes on to advocate a policy which seemingly suggests that a college is actually failing in its educational duty unless members of the Communist Party are teaching on the campus:

"To maintain a healthy state of thought and opinion in this country, it is desirable for adherents of communism, like those of other forms of revolutionary thought, to present their views, especially in colleges and universities, so that they may be checked by open discussion. How else are Americans to know the nature of the ideological currents in their world? If representatives of com-

munism from abroad were to be employed under an exchange program in American institutions of higher learning, as has been proposed, the unwisdom of the present academic policy would quickly become evident." (Bulletin of the AAUP, spring 1956, p. 199.)

Now the above reference to the unwisdom of the present academic policy, in the light of the context, can only be to the policy of barring Communist teachers. The committee cannot mean that there is a policy of barring people who hold Communist views from speaking on the campus, for there is no such policy. Dr. Herbert Phillips, dismissed from the University of Washington as a member of the Communist Party, presented his case on almost every major campus of the country and admitted that he could not accept all the invitations he received. Not only are Communists permitted to speak before student groups on campuses; they are often invited to speak before classes as open representatives of their views. Although some adverse publicity sometimes results, this does not occur much more often today than in the years before the quest for national security began. The special committee is certainly aware of all this—or should be. (Objections are usually raised to convicted Communists appearing as speakers, but that is another question.)

What shall we say, then, of the implied proposal of the special committee? Simply this: The notion that, in order to learn objectively about communism, it is necessary to hire members of the Communist Party to teach it is just as absurd as the notion that, to give an objective report about Communist activities in the press, it is necessary to hire members of the Communist Party as reporters. If we do not need to employ racists in order to study objectively the claims of racism, Fascists to study fascism, or bankrupts to study the laws of bankruptcy, then surely it is not necessary to employ Communists to study the doctrines and conspiratorial practices of communism.

The odd thing about the position of the AAUP on this question is that it has never permitted its membership to discuss the issue fairly in the pages of its Bulletin or to hear it debated by competent representatives of both sides before a national meeting. It has loaded the pages of the Bulletin with only one position. It has refused point-blank to invite any speaker known to differ with the official position. It is not too late to conduct a fair debate around the question of professional responsibility and ethics. Is there any reason why the American Association of University Professors should not adopt as its own the statement of the New School for Social Research:

"The New School knows that no man can teach well, nor should he be permitted to teach at all, unless he is prepared 'to follow the truth of scholarship wherever it may lead.' No inquiry is ever made as to whether a lecturer's private views are conservative, liberal, or radical; orthodox or agnostic; views of the aristocrat or commoner. Jealously safeguarding this precious principle, the New School stoutly affirms that a member of any political party or group which asserts the right to dictate in matters of science or scientific opinion is not free to teach the truth and thereby is disqualified as a teacher.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Rice Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at New Orleans, La., on May 12, 1956, at the 57th annual meeting of the Rice Millers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER OF LOUISIANA, AT NEW ORLEANS, LA., ON MAY 12, 1956, AT THE 57TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to be present here with you today. It is a privilege, because I can always be sure when I am with this group that I will come away from your meeting having learned a great deal; it is a pleasure to be with you because I count so many of you among my personal friends. Those of you whom I do not know personally, I hope to meet and chat with informally some time in the near future. I invite all of you to visit me should you come to Washington.

May I say that I am very much pleased to be away from Washington, if only for a few short hours, to discuss with you a subject in which we all have a great and abiding interest—rice.

I am not going to glorify rice today; the good Lord and you folks who grow, mill, and market rice have already done that. On the other hand, I am not going to gloss over the problems our rice industry faces this year, and probably in the year to come. Instead, I want to talk to you straight from the shoulder.

Just a little more than 5 months ago I had the opportunity of visiting throughout the Louisiana Rice Belt. As a matter of fact, during last fall I visited almost every agricultural belt in our country, talking with farmers, and getting their views in an effort to help draft a farm program which would halt the drastic decline in farm income. Net farm income in 1951 was $14.8 billion and as of the last quarter of 1955, it had fallen to $10.3 billion or a net decline of $4.5 billion over the last 4 years. Falling farm income has become an infectious disease, one which is gnawing away at the economic health of our entire Nation. Farm income has fallen even as corporate and labor income have continued to reach record highs—this in spite of the fact that agriculture is basic—that it is the single most important segment of our entire economy.

To a very large extent, the hearings I held, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—hearings which drew farm opinion from every major agricultural region of this fertile country—were the basis of the President's farm message of January 9. They provided the raw material from which Congress drafted, approved, and sent to the White House a farm bill which the President promptly vetoed.

As you are well aware, among the provisions of this bill was a two-price plan for rice, a program which you, the rice millers, and other segments of the rice industry suggested and helped us draft. It was aimed at three specific objectives: First, to make available to the American consumer an abundant supply of rice at reasonable prices; second, to increase the income of rice farmers and protect them against further drastic cutbacks in acreage; and, third, to restore the American rice industry to its traditional competitive position in world markets.

The two-price plan for rice was your industry's idea; it had its genesis at the grassroots of the American rice-producing States. It was, I believe, a sound, forward-looking approach—a new look in agriculture. It has been vetoed, but the fight is not yet over.

As a matter of fact, the fight has only begun. Just the day before yesterday, the Senate Agriculture Committe reported a new farm bill, one which contains a soil bank. But, even more important, it contains provisions which are designed to return economic vigor to the American rice industry.

One of the new rice provisions empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to institute a 2-year trial of a 2-price plan for rice before 1959. The Secretary could declare that the 2-price program would go into effect in 1957, to run through 1958; he could, in the alternative, choose 1958 as the initial year, and operate the 2-price plan over the years 1958 and 1959.

In the meantime, rice acreage for 1957 and 1958 would be frozen at present levels; this freeze would affect not only the national rice acreage allotment, but the State allotments as well. No State would have to suffer an acreage reduction over the next 2 years.

There is also one other little gadget in the new bill, one which was in the measure President Eisenhower vetoed, and one which I think is a must. That provision specifies that no rice-producing State's 1956 acreage allotment would be less than 85 percent of its 1955 allotment.

Of course, there are still three big hurdles for us to jump. First, the Senate must pass our committee's bill; second, we must preserve in conference our amendments, particularly those affecting rice, such as the minimum rice acreage and optional two-price plan provisions. Third, the President of the United States must sign the bill.

Perhaps I am an optimist, but I think that if the President will just sit down and read the bill himself—if he will just give it a little more independent thought than he gave the first farm bill, he will sign the measure into law.

Several weeks ago I took time off from my regular work on the Senate Appropriations and Agriculture Committees to talk a little commonsense to the Secretary of Agriculture and to President Eisenhower.

I told them this:

I said it was unfair, unwise, and plain bullheaded for them to come to Congress with a straight soil-bank bill and expect us to approve it as submitted, with nothing else in the way of relief for the rank and file farmer. I told them I thought it was unconscionable for them to expect the Congress to become a rubberstmap. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am more than willing to meet the administration halfway in an effort to bolster farm income now, immediately, this year. But I am going to insist upon one overriding objective. I want to see all American farmers treated as equally as we can. I want to see that no area, no commodity, no one group of farmers, gets the cream while the rest get whatever happens to be left over.

Therefore, I want to assure you that before I cast my vote on final passage of a soil-bank bill, I am going to do my utmost to see that it contains the two-price plan and minimum rice-acreage provisions voted by the Senate Agriculture Committee. I want to see all commodities given a square deal.

I announced this position several weeks ago. Subsequently, some of my Republican colleagues came to me and said: "Senator, what are you trying to do? We do not know what you mean about treating commodities equally. Did the President not treat them equally, even after he vetoed the bill?"

My answer to that was "No—emphatically no."

Let me tell you why I think President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill was a political veto, that it was directed not at the merits or demerits of the bill, as it purported to be, but, rather, was aimed first and foremost at capturing votes in the November elections.

I have never undertaken to speak harshly of President Eisenhower before. On the other hand, I think that you, as vital members of the American rice industry and the American agricultural economy—I believe that each of our citizens, everywhere—should be familiar with the President's veto message, what it meant, and what it accomplished. I think it should be understood that the veto message was a sham, a collection of platitudes, generalities, inconsistencies, and misstatements of fact. The message demonstrates that the President of the United States neither studied nor understood the bill he vetoed.

Let me briefly review some of the reasons the President gave for vetoing the farm bill. Let us see how these so-called reasons measure up with the facts, and with actions subsequently announced by the President.

First, President Eisenhower said that the farm bill's 1-year, 1-shot, emergency 90 percent of parity price supports for the basics would have increased agricultural production.

The bill would not have increased production; you know it, I know it, and President Eisenhower should know it. The Senate bill reinstated 90 percent of parity price supports for 1 year, 1956. Acreage allotments for 1956 had been promulgated, distributed, and placed in effect as of the time the bill was passed. Many of these allotted acres had been planted at that time. Our bill provided for no increase in acreage; it provided only that on basic crops produced from allotted acres, farmers would receive price support of 90 percent of parity, for 1 year only. There was no possible way for the farm bill, the bill vetoed by the President, to have increased production of the basic commodities.

Of course, Secretary Benson has theorized that if price supports are increased, if commodity prices are raised, then farmers will pour the fertilizer to their land. He has said 90 percent of parity price supports will inspire farmers to coax maximum production from each acre they are permitted to plant. This may sound good to an arm-chair, ivory-tower farm expert, but let us look at it from the point of view of the dirt farmer.

Put yourself in a typical farmer's shoes. Imagine that your acreage allotment for rice is 100 acres. You know that you are going to have to wring from that 100 acres enough income to pay your fixed operating costs, to buy your food, to clothe your children, to meet your mortgage payments. If you must produce 2,300 hundredweights of 90 percent of parity rice to break even, then if price supports are reduced 15 percent, you will coax 15 percent more production from your 100 allotted acres. You will do your best to produce 2,645 hundredweights of 75 percent of parity rice. This is more than just human nature, it is practical business sense. When Ford or General Motors or Chrysler find themselves with a surplus of automobiles, they don't cut prices; no indeed, they cut back on production. Ladies and gentlemen, the whole Benson philosophy is fallacious; it has dragged American agriculture to the brink of ruin. If General Motors has found that price cutting is no solution to overproduction, then the American farmer is certainly in the same boat. Here is one time when I agree that what is good enough for General Motors should be good enough for the farmer.

Not only has the American farmer found that price cutting—income cutting—is no way to increase farm profits, but the President of the United States seems to be convinced, as well, for he has thrown the Benson sliding scale right out the White House window.

You will recall that in vetoing the farm bill, President Eisenhower said that the conference farm bill was a step backward from, and I quote, "the sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954." I do not concede that the 1954 Agricultural Act is either sound or forward looking; however, if President Eisenhower thinks it is, he should establish price-support levels which are consistent with his convictions. Having declared that the only way to solve our farm ills is to move ahead under the sliding scale—since he has stated that the new farm bill had to be vetoed because it contained rigid price supports—it is inconceivable that, in almost the same breath, President Eisenhower would abandon the flexible price-support program.

But that is precisely what he did. President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill because it reinstated rigid price supports for 1 year, yet, in that same message he announced that the Secretary of Agriculture would place in effect his own system of rigid price supports for 1956.

How, you may ask, did he manage to do this since the 1954 flexible price-support law specifies that as surpluses increase, support levels must fall?

In almost every law, particularly one as complicated and complex as the agricultural support program, there is at least one loophole. The President and Secretary Benson found this loophole and lost no time scooting through it, like mice after cheese—or like politicians after votes. That loophole in the Farm Act now on the books provides, in effect, that whenever any commodity important to the national welfare is not bringing the price it should under the sliding scale, then the Secretary can fix a new support price. Of course, this is what the Secretary of Agriculture and President Eisenhower did. I wonder, however, how Mr. Benson must have felt when his boss told him to do so; I wonder, because only 2 years ago the Secretary was making speeches to the effect that the six basics were receiving preferential price-support treatment. He even had his Department print up a little booklet stating that only about 25 percent of our total farm income is derived from the basic commodities. Suddenly, however, Mr. Benson has seen the light; he has discovered that this 25 percent has such a far-reaching effect upon the national economy that he must invoke authority contained in one of the sliding-scale loopholes in order to raise support levels. It evidently took a Presidential order to force Mr. Benson to recognize something you and I have known for a long, long time—that the six basic commodities are, indeed, basic to our farm economy.

Acting under this emergency authority, the President had Secretary Benson institute his own program of rigid price supports. In lieu of 1-year, rigid legislative price supports, the President decreed 1-year, rigid, lop-sided administrative price supports. He supported cotton at rigid 82½ percent of parity; wheat at rigid 84 percent of parity, peanuts at rigid 86 percent of parity, tobacco at rigid 90 percent of parity, and rice at rigid 82.7 percent of parity.

Here is the interesting part, however. Corn, the sixth basic, gets a little different treatment. Corn eats high on the hog. Corn gets not just a single rigid price support, not just a two-price program, but corn gets a rigid, three-price program for 1956.

Under the support schedule announced by the President in his veto message, corn in the noncommercial corn area will be supported at about 64.6 percent of parity.

Corn in the commercial corn area will be supported at two levels. First, for those corn farmers who comply with their acreage allotments, support will be available at 86.2 percent of parity. However, for producers who choose to not comply, and who decide to overplant their allotments, price support will still be available at 72 percent of parity.

Compare this with rice, where producers must content themselves with support at 82.7 percent, provided they comply with acreage allotments. If they do not comply, then they are penalized. Rice farmers who overplant their allotments do not receive price support on production derived from lands over and above their allotted acres. In addition, they are penalized 50 percent of the parity price for each hundredweight so produced. Corn farmers in the commercial belt, however, get price support at 86.2 percent of parity if they remain within their allotted acres. They can also get support at 72 percent of parity on all the corn they desire to produce, from all the land they desire to plant. They are eligible for this support level with no controls, no quotas, no allotments, no marketing penalties, no nothing.

For the first time in the history of our farm program, noncompliance corn in the commercial area is to be eligible for price support. Why? Is acreage planted to corn going to hit an all-time low? It is not. Quite the contrary is true.

In testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, during an executive session on the farm bill, Department of Agriculture experts predicted that corn farmers in the commercial corn belt would probably plant 56 million acres this year. This compares with a national acreage allotment of 43 million acres. Boiled down, this means corn farmers are expected to overplant their acreage allotments by at least one-third.

Let us consider another inconsistency in the veto message. President Eisenhower said he veoted the farm bill because it would have supported feed grains at 85 percent of parity. Yet, as a result of his veto, feed grains are now supported at 70 percent of parity. This 15 percent drop in feed grain supports will not reduce production. The conference bill, on the other hand, would have cut production. Under our bill, if a feed grain producer desired the 85 percent of parity price support, he would have been required to reduce his base acreage by 15 percent and, in addition, put the equivalent of 15 percent of his base acreage into the soil bank. Now, however, feed grain supports are set at 70 percent of parity on unlimited production. The sky is the limit on this year's production of corn and feed grains, with price support available nevertheless.

I am convinced that the present corn and feed grain support programs will increase the production of both; feed grain and corn prices will be kept low.

Who will this program benefit?

The Government? Of course not; we will end up this year with corn and feed grains coming out of our ears.

The feed grain producers? I do not believe so, because they are going to have to work off their surplus sometime in some way.

The feeders? Of course, they will benefit. They will be able to buy feed at cheap prices.

Do the commercial area corn producers benefit? Certainly. They can flip coins with the Government and be assured they will always win—86.2 percent of parity on allotted acres, or 72 percent on all-out production.

The President's farm program, as announced in his veto message, creates an agricultural "elite"; corn stands out alone; it receives treatment head and shoulders above that given the other producers. The feeders, too, get a bonanza. They are assured of cheap feed, the market is assured of an eventual oversupply of meat, and the Government is assured of having to undertake another costly meat purchase program.

I have never been one to engage in political prognosticating, but I have a hunch that the President's farm program—a program which is designed to benefit principally the corn producers and the cattle feeders—was hatched in the fertile minds of the Washington lobbyists for one national farm organization—the only major farm organization which sought a veto of the farm bill—the only farm organization for which the welcome mat is always out at the White House and Mr. Benson's office.

This national organization, it should be noted, draws almost one-half of its total membership from 12 farm States—all of which are corn States, and all of which are cattle feeding States. The President's farm program is a support program by corn, for corn and of corn. Everybody else gets a "sop."

Despite this sorry picture, the President of the United States has piously announced that he does not believe in playing politics with the welfare of our farmers. Well, let us look a bit deeper into the President's veto message and see who is playing politics with what.

The President stated in his veto message that the two-price plans for wheat and rice would bring hardship upon our consumers and would injure our foreign relations.

Would the rice program have injured the consumer? It most emphatically would not. You, as millers, would have bought rough rice at the market price. Before you milled the rice, you would have purchased from the Government a marketing certificate equal to the difference between what you paid on the market and 90 percent of parity. No miller would have had more than 90 percent of parity invested in the rice he milled.

Of course, the President might say that 90 percent of parity raises consumer prices. But, if he does, what happens to his often-expressed objective of farmers obtaining 100 percent of parity in the market place? How does he square his veto message with the objective of the soil bank, which is, as I understand it, to create artificial shortages, raise prices, and increase farm income to as near parity as possible? Parity is parity, whether it be achieved by way of price supports, in the market place, or through the soil bank. It is unbelievable that the President vetoed the two-price plan for rice because it might have cost consumers 10 percent less than his avowed objective of 100 percent of market place parity. This does not make good sense, but then, neither does the President's veto message.

Would a two-price plan hurt our foreign relations? Well, it might hurt some feelings in a few Far Eastern countries, but it would also bring us some friends, particularly in Japan, the Philippines and Indonesia, to name only three. It would certainly improve the competitive position of American rice.

Since 1953, the Department of Agriculture and the administration have been preaching that farm commodity prices must fall before American agriculture can once again compete in world markets. Yet, when we attempt to make our farm exports competitive without further bankrupting our farmers, we find the administration saying "No."

I think it is high time we began to put our own welfare first, to ignore the extremely sensitive feelings of our foreign competitors—feelings which become sensitive only when we cut off our gifts or seek to compete on equal terms in world markets. It is time for rice, cotton, wheat, and other farm commodities for which there is export demand to compete on equal terms with foreign products. We must permit American rice to be sold where we can find buyers.

You know and I know that the State Department does not like this idea. Not long ago I discussed the problem of foreign rice sales with a gentleman in the Department of State. He was most emphatically opposed to our selling rice to Japan, to the Philippines, and other deficit areas on the basis of the best price getting the business. He said that the Department preferred placing the rice we shipped abroad, so that we would not injure the feelings of a few neutralist countries. The administration, of course, prefers to sell rice under Public Law 480 so they can use local currency proceeds for economic aid. This is one means of bypassing Congress.

If the alternative to having a few injured international feelings is the creation of a huge, centralized, Government selling agency—if we must buy foreign friendships by slashing our domestic agriculture to the bone and bleeding our farmers white—if the basic theory of competitive selling is to be abandoned in favor of an all-powerful program of foreign sales, handled by Federal bureaucrats—then I think a two-price plan for rice is necessary for another reason. We need it to bring commonsense and free enterprise back into our Government operations.

Recently, national news magazines quote Prime Minister Nehru of India as stating that he liked to deal with the Russians because they had something to sell, not to give away. He said the Russians "drove a hard bargain."

Let us, then, begin to do the same. Why should we not obtain some of this same friendship and respect by selling rice instead of giving it away. If the neutralist nations like to deal on a business basis, let us deal with them as businessmen. Let us turn off the spigot which has poured billions of dollars of American tax money into their treasuries. Let us abandon the philosophy which has funneled our rice production into warehouses because selling it abroad might make somebody mad.

I have had my fill of this administration preaching the virtues of increased competition, only to find that when the Congress takes steps to make farm products competitive, the administration has its veto stamp ready for immediate use.

I have taken up much of your time, but before I conclude, I want to mention the soil bank. The soil bank, you will recall, is something the President said he desired very much. Of course, he vetoed a bill that had the Eisenhower soil bank in it, but he still wants a soil bank this year.

The President has said that quick action on a soil bank will permit him to increase farm income by a half-billion dollars this year, by paying farmers in 1956 for soil bank participation in 1957. This, ladies and gentlemen, is poppycock. Soil bank advance payments will not increase farm income—they will only increase farm debt. The entire purpose of the soil bank is to pay a farmer who does not plant his land about the same net amount he would have earned had he put that land into production instead of the soil bank. The soil bank theory is not complicated. Under it, production will be cut; artificial shortages will eventually be created; prices will rise; surpluses will be reduced, and farm income will increase. Let no one be fooled, however; farmers could, generally speaking, obtain just as much income from planting their land as putting it in the soil bank. Therefore, when the President of the United States speaks of increasing farm income by soil bank payments, he is talking through his hat.

Paying farmers in advance this year for soil bank participation next year will not help raise income; it is simply another form of Government loan, because any advance a farmer might receive in 1956 will be deducted from his 1957 earnings.

Let me tell you this, and I hope somebody sends Ike a copy of this speech:

The entire program announced by the President in his veto message was a political farm program, designed to benefit, first and foremost, a favored few, principally the producers of corn. The President's plea for an advance-payment soil bank was an outright admission that the Chief Executive neither understood nor appreciated the purpose or operation of the soil bank program.

Within a very few days, the President will have on his desk a new farm bill, one which is aimed at strengthening our sagging farm economy, and restoring to our farm price programs the concept of equal treatment for all farm commodities.

I hope it will contain the rice acreage freeze, and, in addition, the optional two-price plan for rice. I am going to do everything in my power to see that these provisions stay in the bill. I am also going to leave no stone unturned to see that the bill finally approved by the Congress provides for a similar freeze on cotton acreage at the State level.

I am going to continue my fight to eliminate at least the major portion of the favored treatment accorded corn under the President's administrative support plan. I want to see feed grain producers given a fair program, one which is workable, and one which will not further aggravate our surplus of these commodities. Corn produced in the noncommercial corn area, such as the corn grown here in Louisiana, should be given a little fairer treatment.

We have tried to achieve these objectives in the Senate version of the bill. It is not my personal idea of perfection, particularly with respect to its corn and feed grain provisions, but it is a fair compromise. As such, it should be acceptable to the President—provided, of course, he is desirous of helping our farmers.

I want to serve notice on the President, on his Secretatry of Agriculture, and on anyone else who may be pressing for some kind of pay-in-advance soil bank that I am not going to support any such scheme. The pay-in-advance proposal is an attempt to use soil-bank payments as political propaganda, to turn the soil bank into an installment-plan vote-buying device.

I hope that as I wage this battle, I am going to have the support of the rice industry; I hope that as I continue to fight for increased rice exports, you, the millers, are going to be at my side, as you have been in the past.

I worked long, long hours on the farm bill that was vetoed by the President; I have done the same on the new bill. I have done my level best to keep our farm program out of politics and to keep politics out of the farm program. I want you to know that I shall continue to do so in the future.

We are faced with a serious crisis in agriculture. Our farmers are in precarious economic health. You, as millers, know that if our farm economy is permitted to deteriorate further, the end result will be chaos for you, for the national economy, for the Nation as a whole. I feel very deeply that the very roots of our American way of life are found on our farms. We must keep these roots strong and healthy we must shield them from the blight of partisan politics—we must guard them against economic stagnation—we must make them immune to the dry rot of unrestricted "bigness."

Thank you for inviting me to speak here today.

Observance of Armed Forces Week and National Broadcasting Co.'s Wide, Wide World Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the week from May 14 to 20 marks this country's observance of Armed Forces Week. I want to call the attention of the Senate to an outstanding tribute paid to our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen on Sunday, May 13, by the National Broadcasting Co.'s Wide, Wide World television program.

Conceived on the theme of power for peace, this program inaugurated Armed Forces Week, and enabled some 35 million viewers from coast to coast to observe nationwide demonstrations by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some further observations of mine about this program and Armed Forces Week which I believe are timely.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

Using some 83 television cameras, the largest number ever assembled for one program, Wide, Wide World established the dedicated theme of Armed Forces Week when Dave Garroway, the narrator, said:

"There's nothing free about freedom. We don't inherit it as we would a building and just move in and live. It has to be bought and cherished and maintained. Each of us can add to the strength of the Nation—morally, economically, politically, and militarily. And out of this strength will come power—out of this power will come peace."

In presenting the various services, Wide, Wide World first introduced the Chiefs of Staff and Commandants of all our Armed Forces at the Pentagon. They, in turn, explained to the viewers the role played by each service in the defense of this country and as a deterrent to war, later presenting their commanders in the field in live demonstrations of "power for peace."

Through the eyes of television on last Sunday afternoon, the viewers of this Nation were able to see an Army demonstration from Fort Benning, Ga., an infantry-tank-artillery demonstration team in action, showing modern techniques and weapons used by today's Army and also, an airborne

assault where the viewer was present with live cameras in the plane as the paratroopers prepared to jump and actually took part in the jump as one of the men carried a portable signal corps television camera with him in a graphic exhibition of combat television.

The Navy's participation included a special run by the U. S. S. *Albacore* off Long Island with live cameras above and below decks, a visit to the aircraft carrier *Essex* off San Diego as a parade of Navy jets were brought up from below decks and launched into the air.

At Quantico, Va., the Marine Corps portrayed its newest assault methods of vertical envelopment, as helicopter assault units flew over simulated beach defense areas and seized vital points of land with concentrated firepower.

The Wide Wide World cameras again went into action at San Diego, this time showing the Coast Guard's watch on sea and shore to protect the lives and the property of our countrymen. Here the viewers participated in an air-sea rescue mission.

The pentagon of power needed to keep our country strong and free was completed from Eglin Field, Fla., where the Air Force paraded before this great television audience the plane designed to give this country the superior global airpower on which the security of the free world depends. The Air Force also showed how planes are tested under Arctic conditions.

To complete this American story of "power for peace," the live television cameras allowed the millions of viewers to pay their first visit to the Combat Operations Center of the Continental Defense Command in Colorado Springs. This dedicated defense mission portrayal was climaxed with a training mission in which an unidentified plane was intercepted at sea and downed by rocket power.

This week marks the seventh year that we have celebrated Armed Forces Day and appropriately enough through the live television cameras of NBC's Wide Wide World, millions of Americans were able to participate in this salute to the men and women of our Armed Forces. These men and women and their comrades in arms stationed all over the world are America's visible strength.

Together they make up the ultimate all-American team in maintaining power for peace.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to Rumanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

May 10 was, in brighter years, the most hallowed national holiday to Rumanians. May 10 is Rumanian Independence Day, the anniversary of Rumania's uniting her provinces into one nation and declaring her independence.

May 10 is no holiday on the Communist calendar. There were no celebrations, no ceremonies, no reminders of this revered holiday. But no communistic rule will ever stamp out the heritage and meaning of this independence day.

Rumanian Independence Day is being perpetuated in the hearts of freedom-loving Rumanians now living under the Communist yoke. It is to them another inspiration to sustain them to the day of liberation. A people who has known freedom cannot forever be kept in bondage with chains no matter how strong, or with a police state no matter how ruthless.

Americans of Rumanian descent continue to keep alive the spark of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. May 10 was marked in the United States by traditional ceremonies and celebrations as were held in Rumania before the Communist aggressor subjected this gallant nation. It was an inspiration to hear an outstanding Rumanian-American, the Reverend Father Eugene Lazar, pastor of the Rumanian Orthodox Church, Gary, Ind., deliver the opening prayer as the United States Senate convened on May 10. Its text is as follows:

"O Heavenly King, spirit of truth, who art present everywhere, treasure of blessings, and bountiful giver of life: Come Thou and abide among us, as we pray that unto our God-fearing President, and the Members of this House, and all civil authorities, and our Armed Forces, Thou wilt grant a peaceful life, health, salvation, and conquest over the enemies of these United States of America.

"O Almighty God, our help and refuge, fountain of wisdom and tower of strength, who knoweth that we can do nothing without Thy guidance, direct us to divine wisdom and power, that we may accomplish whatever task we may undertake, faithfully and diligently, as we beseech Thee, O Master, to remember those who live in oppression and fear, in countries behind the Iron Curtain, as they seek the same freedoms Thou hast bestowed upon us so generously, who are judged and condemned to prison and exile and bitter slavery, and who have need of Thy mercy.

"As as Thou desirest, O Lord, that all people be free, we ask that Thou especially remember the God-fearing people of the Kingdom of Rumania, on this memorable day, and as in the past they found and enjoyed the gift of freedom, assist them to find the same road to recovery, to liberation, and to freedom from injustice and the yoke of tyranny, and that Thy blessings be upon them as upon us in this hour.

"This we ask in the name of the Risen Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen."

John Lord O'Brian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Hon. Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, at a meeting in Buffalo of the Bar Association of Erie County, N. Y., in honor of the Honorable John Lord O'Brian, a very distinguished citizen of New York, and a very great American.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SIMON E. SOBELOFF, SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT A MEETING OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK STATE, HONORING JOHN LORD O'BRIAN, BUFFALO, N. Y., MAY 11, 1956

It is not necessary to point out the appropriateness of having this meeting in Buffalo, but even while acknowledging your special interest in Mr. O'Brian because he had the good taste to be born here, I nevertheless claim him on behalf of all good men everywhere. In a lifetime of exemplary conduct and by the wide range of his interests and the heroic proportions of his public services he has impressed himself upon the minds and hearts of people throughout the Nation.

In every generation there are a few leaders of unusual distinction, but several generations have appreciated Mr. O'Brian's leadership. It is a leadership that has embraced many worthwhile professional, civic, educational and religious interests. We are grateful because it has been given and continues to be given with selfless devotion and with a wise and lofty comprehension of the crucial problems that confront us today.

I shall speak of only a few aspects of this personality whom we regard with such affection and esteem.

As this is a gathering of lawyers, it is in order to speak first of Mr. O'Brian the lawyer. The mention of no name excites greater respect. In him our profession's loftiest ideals are exemplified.

Wonderful legends cluster about Mr. O'Brian as a trial lawyer. He is a great technician in the law. Planning and precision are a passion with him, but no advocate is more flexible than he in meeting the vicissitudes, or alertly embracing the opportunities, which present themselves at the trial table.

All who have observed Mr. O'Brian know what power he derives from the measured use of language. His briefs and oral arguments completely avoid the sensational and the flamboyant, just as they shun the trite and banal. In him this is more than an aspect of his style and competency as a lawyer. It inheres in his very character and discipline in life. Where another might be tempted to declaim his contentions with bombastic superlatives and excessive emphasis, he would be content to recite the facts as lucidly as possible, and add simply, "it might therefore appear that" thus and so. He prefers to leave it to his hearer or reader to recognize and apply for himself the inevitability of the suggested conclusion.

If there is anything in the idea that practicioners of an art may learn from the mode of a master, I venture to commend this bright example to you, my professional colleagues. In every court where he has ever appeared (including that which is at the summit of our judicial system), Mr. O'Brian enjoys a well merited reputation for cold understatement in his contentions and meticulous accuracy in his facts. This has notable practical advantages. Seldom does a judge interrupt to challenge his recital of the record. Rarely, too, is there dispute as to the relevance of the case he cites.

Likewise even in private conversation he has no need for strong language as a verbal crutch to give emphasis to what he has to say. An admiring coworker, who is, of course, a witness of the highest credibility, vouches that by actual count he has heard Mr. O'Brian say only two "damns" and three "hells" in the course of an association that stretches over a long span of years. Those who work with him know that when Mr. O'Brian listens to a suggestion and quietly observes, "I wonder", he means what someone else might mean by declaring more bluntly, "That doesn't seem to make sense." When a point has been made and elaborated, and he comments, "May we pass that?" it is the O'Brian equivalent of what another man might express less elegantly: "That's just

plain foolishness!" I am told that in conference with Mr. O'Brian he habitually avoids directly rejecting anyone's point of view, and he never blows up, but that he is an acknowledged master in gently casting a chill.

Never engaging in personalities, he doesn't fritter away time allowed for argument by resorting to useless circumlocutions. When an adversary had perpetrated a flagrantly rambling, discursive, and incoherent speech, Mr. O'Brian began his reply with devastating directness and simplicity. "Perhaps," he said, "this court would like me to tell them what this case is about," and proceeded to do just that, to the immense relief and enlightenment of the men on the bench.

Moderation in speech is indeed his characteristic mark. On the day Robert Lincoln O'Brien died, our O'Brian was in the elevator when a fellow passenger remarked, "too bad about John Lord O'Brian; he'll be missed." The living—the indestructible—O'Brian said not a word to the speaker, but turning to a companion with complete calm and objectivity, and with a merry glint in his eye, dryly observed, "This fellow is frequently confused."

Mr. O'Brian is timeless. For a number of years he was one of the magnificent trio at the pinnacle of the Supreme Court bar. The other two were John W. Davis and William D. Mitchell, who, like Mr. O'Brian, had once occupied high office in the Department of Justice. Now that Mr. Davis and Mr. Mitchell are no longer with us, Mr. O'Brian is the acknowledged dean of the appellate lawyers of this country, vigorous in health, his mind shining, and the peer of the best in the profession, regardless of age. Only last evening, before flying to Buffalo, my private FBI reports, he took the deposition of a key witness in a major railroad reorganization.

So much for O'Brian, the lawyer, although I am conscious that what I have said is hopelessly inadequate.

The term "liberal" has been subjected to so many strange uses and abuses that I do not know whether Mr. O'Brian would acknowledge the label. It is well known, however, that his preoccupation with the freedom of the individual is nothing new. It is not a dilettante interest indulged as an intriguing exercise in legal scholarship. He has fought on the barricades. Almost 40 years ago, in the First World War, when hysteria swept over the land, Mr. O'Brian, as head of the War Emergency Division of the Department of Justice, held vast power over the liberty of aliens and citizens. With rocklike firmness, he stood for a lawful administration of the laws, opposed the internment of persons without at least some evidence of guilt, and insisted that mere suspicion should not be sufficient to invoke the exercise of this necessary but drastic power. He did much to allay apprehension, to discourage unreasonable war emotions, and to prevent unnecessary discrimination and hardship to the law abiding and loyal.

When later, under a new Attorney General these policies were radically changed and wholesale and indiscriminate raids resulted, Mr. O'Brian left the Government. He did not leave, however, without first preparing a memorandum which is a distillate of the wisdom gained in dealing with the complex problems of protecting the national security without impairing personal freedom. This has been a source of strength to those in Government who seek under admittedly difficult conditions to perform their duty according to constitutional standards of fair play.

Only a free nation is called on to face the dilemma which existed when Mr. O'Brian was in the Department of Justice and which likewise presses upon us today. In an autocracy, whether of the Fascist, Nazi, or Communist variety, there are no questions about protecting individual freedom. The only aim of officials is the security of their regime. Their thinking is not complicated by any need to consider the rights of the individual citizen. He, in fact, has no rights against the Government, and any act or thought of which those in power disapprove is ruthlessly suppressed. This is accomplished by intimidation or, if need be, by the sudden disappearance of the dissenter or potential dissenter.

But in a land of freedom there arises an inescapable problem: How to protect the Nation against enemies from without and from within, and still not to work injustice or destroy freedom of the individual.

One difficulty is that so many people tend to line up with one extreme position or another. Either they blind themselves to the workings of traitors, denying the plain evidence that danger exists; or they fall into a panic, lose all balance and perspective, and tolerate no disagreement with their own opinions. Such division and distrust, suppression and confusion, is exactly what the enemy would like to spread among us, for it weakens us and serves his purpose.

It is important not to drift into this attitude toward those with whom we happen to disagree. In a democracy it is vital not to discourage the free exercise of the freedoms, because that is the source of our strength.

Sanity and safety are not to be found at either extreme. On the one hand we must not be soft-headed in dealing with treason; and on the other, we must discipline ourselves to respect the rights of those who honestly differ with us, and to accord fair treatment and due process even to those of whose bad faith we are convinced. In defending democracy against its enemies we must remember that democracy itself implies opportunity for the interplay of diversities of opinion, of cultures, of ideals, and that the utmost tolerance should never be denied to sincere thoughts or proposals merely because they are unpopular. In our proper and necessary job of exposing and prosecuting Communists, we must avoid destroying the liberty we are fighting to protect.

National security and the preservation of individual rights—these two—can and must be achieved together. The goal is to survive as a nation, as a nation of free men. We cannot hope to have freedom if a foreign tyranny overwhelms us; and it is equally certain that we shall not have freedom if we destroy it ourselves. If in our pursuit of evildoers we ourselves should pull down the edifice of freedom, wherein would be our triumph?

The problem of the preservation of freedom has been the constant concern of John Lord OBrian. There is not time, nor is it necessary, to do more than refer to Mr. O'Brian's latest work on "National Security and Individual Freedom." I merely point out that it springs from a lifetime of patriotic devotion and embodies convictions developed by deep and sound thought, refined in the fire of active experience, and molded by intimate contact with the pressures and stresses of war and the dislocations that follow in its wake.

Again and again in recent years Mr. O'Brian has been cited by learned and patriotic institutions for his tireless and fruitful dedication to the cause of the freedom of man. It is gratifying to point out that this recognition came early and has continued with accelerated force. He is the holder of the Presidential Medal for Merit from our country, has been decorated by foreign governments, was awarded the Chancellor's Medal by his alma mater, your University of Buffalo, and was honored by innumerable legal and other societies.

There is no need to recount to you Mr. O'Brian's continuing and expanding civic activity in this community between the two wars—including a fling in politics which, however it turned out, fortunately left him free when the Nation again wanted him. Like Cincinnatus of old, who was called from his plow in a time of his country's need, Mr. O'Brian was recalled from his law practice here in Erie County to organize and to head the War Production Board's legal staff. He made only one condition—that he should be free to choose his lawyers without interference and solely according to professional merit and fitness. They say that when Mr. O'Brian asked Mr. William Knudson if he consented to these terms, he answered in Danish accent but in good American spirit and idiom, "It's a deal, Judge."

There is a story, perhaps apocryphal, yet vouched for by a reliable source, about a legal adviser serving another agency. When this man was asked by the agency head if there was power to do a certain thing he coined a masterly formula: "It depends," he gravely said, "on what answer you want. There are 3 possible opinions—1, is that can do it; 2, is that you cannot do it; and 3, if you prefer, I can fudge it. Which of these do you wish?" There was nothing of that sort in the O'Brian shop at the War Production Board.

The legal staff Mr. O'Brian welded together has long ago passed from Government service into private practice, but it survives in the enduring memory of many as a monument to Mr. O'Brian's work in the Second World War. Each member of the group is to this day his devoted friend. When he undertook to raise $3 million to save the Harvard Divinity School, these former associates showed their affection for him by raising a half million dollars to establish a John Lord O'Brian chair at the divinity school.

Those of you who have been privileged for so many years to know Mr. O'Brian and to work with him here could not have been surprised by his role in the rejuvenation of the divinity school. He has been, as you, his neighbors, of course know, chancellor of this diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church. But his interest is not merely sectarian. His devotion to religion is but another facet of his deep and abiding solicitude for humanity.

One of the basic doctrines which our Nation's Founding Fathers sought to embody in our fundamental law is the separation of church and state. For more than 16 decades we have been ever admonished to insist on that separation. This is necessary, according to the American idea, to protect the State from domination by the church and, as wise religionists recognize, it is no less needed to save religious organizations from being made soon or late subservient tools of the state.

The lessons of history which led to the writing of the first amendment were plain. Too often in European lands had church and state been merged to a greater or lesser degree, to the detriment of the true purpose of both. These foreign examples had been followed in some of the American colonies, too, with unhappy results to both religious and secular interests. The complete divorcement of church and state, decreed in our Constitution, therefore marks a notable advance in human affairs. There are few who regret it.

Yet this proper insistence must carry with it important obligations. If government is to attain its highest purpose it needs a moral orientation. It must not be assumed that we are driven to choose between equally intolerable alternatives: one, a church that declares dogma and establishes policy for the government; and the other, a government that controls for its own political ends the religious concerns of the people, ruled solely by power objectives and unqualified by the humanizing doctrines taught by ethics and fostered by religion.

There can be a moral orientation without breaching the wall of separation between church and state or implying any government commitment in respect to religious doctrine or dogma. The principles of human conduct which are the precepts of religion can play a significant role in the establishment of a just order in our public as well as private life. It is still true that "where there is no vision, the people perish."

The harmony between our religious ideals and those of democracy has often been pointed out. We recognize that the foundation of democracy is moral even as its structure is political. The political theory expressed in Jefferson's phrase about the unalienable rights of man and what the religionist calls the dignity of the human personality are one and the same thing. Stripped of formal features, is it not the underlying objective of government to restrain the strong from aggression against the weak; to prevent violence, exploitation and fraud, to establish a modicum of decency and fairness in the relationships among individual men, and among groups and collectives of human beings? These are certainly also the goals of religion.

True democracy does not merely count heads. It is enlightened by certain ethical principles. These put a curb upon the strongest majority in dealing with the sanctities of life, which may not be abridged or taken from the weakest or poorest individual.

While religious creed should not impose itself upon government or in turn be dominated by government, our guest of honor has taught by word and deed that a vital interpretation of religion demands a concern with the way our Government operates in our daily lives. The things we do in private business and under the sanction of Government, and what our Government does in managing our relations with other peoples, all present moral problems. Democracy accepts as fundamental the religious doctrine that righteousness exalteth a nation. And so, while church and state are rightly kept separate, there need be, there must be, no separation between religion's ethics and the life of the people. Our Bill of Rights is not only a legal document, it is also the embodiment of the highest religious teachings as to the nature of man and the ethical basis of human conduct.

That Mr. O'Brian's teachings in the field of law and government are akin to these views as to the role of religion in our public life, was fittingly indicated by the award made him by the National Conference of Christians and Jews last February.

In much of what John Lord O'Brian has done and lived there can be found, like a golden thread running through a majestic tapestry, this tolerance for the thoughts and the beliefs of others. Perhaps here is the key to what some think is the paradox of the man, and others a real insight into his greatness.

Here is prudence, good humor, a passion for justice, charm and warmth, and unspoiled, modest simplicity. Emerson said, "Nothing is more simple than greatness. Indeed to be simple is to be great."

Here, if you please, is a quiet man, but one of high purpose and rare capacity. He commands the affection and esteem of industrialists and labor leaders, tough agnostics and devout divines, pedantic scholars and the most down-to-earth practical men. They agree on nothing, save in their regard for him.

Seldom has any lawyer attained comparable professional eminence and at the same time won such great love in his community and Nation. It was my sad privilege to preside at the memorial meeting of the bar in the Supreme Court for Mr. Justice Jackson, who, like our guest, also spent much of his youth in western New York. Mr. O'Brian revealed his own philisophy when he said in his address on that occasion: "He (Jackson) exemplified the old truth that the greatest happiness is derived from a life filled with responsibilities."

May I conclude this modest tribute to a good citizen and a cultured gentleman by recalling a text from ancient Hebrew literature. In the "Aphorisms of the Fathers," it is declared, "There are three crowns: one is the crown of Torah, or Learning; another is the crown of the Priesthood, or Spiritual Dedication; the third is the crown of Kingship, which is Governmental Authority; but excelling them all is the crown of a Good Name." Though written long centuries ago, these words could not be more fitly applied to anyone than to John Lord O'Brian.

Amendments to the Employee Relations Section of the Postal Manual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made last night by President Leo George and Legislative Director E. C. Hallbeck, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, about recent amendments to the employee relations section of the Postal Manual released by Post Office Department Officials under date of April 25.

Mr. President, these Post Office Department amendments are dictatorship in its most vicious form, and must and will be withdrawn.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 16.—Top officials of the largest Government union lashed out at the Post Office Department today with a charge that "wholesale revision of postal regulations has been deliberately timed this week to intimidate, mislead, coerce, discredit, and censor union members and union activities at the very height of efforts in Congress to obtain minimum bargaining rights and recognition for Federal workers."

President Leo George, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks (AFL-CIO), said amendments to the employee relations section of the Postal Manual, just circulated, are "an insult to the dignity of organized postal workers everywhere and a flagrant violation of their rights."

"This is union-busting on a grand-slam scale," he added.

The revised regulations dealing with union membership, the right to petition Congress, time off, distribution of literature, and canvassing for new union members were circulated today over the signature of Deputy Postmaster General Maurice H. Stans under date of April 25. Mr. George pointed out the revisions were received at a moment when over 300 union delegates from every corner of the Nation are in Washington on their own time to testify before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the Johnston-Rhodes bill to formalize Federal union recognition by the Government.

Mr. George, whose union consists of 115,000 postal clerks, was joined in his attack on the Post Office Department by the union's national legislative director, E. C. Hallbeck, who listed four specific areas in which Federal officials "apparently are out to cripple legal union activities both openly and by indirection.

The list follows, together with Mr. George's and Mr. Hallbeck's joint comment:

1. Revisions emphasize in sections 741.1 and 741.2 that while there is no law providing for recognition of representatives of unions, there shall be no denial or interference with employees' rights to petition Congress or individual Members. A special subsection adds, however, that "petitions and proposals may be presented to the official in charge of an installation by either an employee or an employee organization representative."

"Here is a thinly veiled effort," said George and Hallbeck, "to insinuate that the Post Office Department really doesn't have to treat with unions and that members would be well-advised to go through postal channels in petitioning Congress. Such a suggestion is misleading and intimidating."

2. Revisions of section 741.3, subsection .32, state that "time for attendance of employees at meetings in which management does not have a part or has not scheduled will be charged to annual leave or leave without pay."

"This means," the union leaders said, "that unless a meeting is literally scheduled by management a postal worker can be financially penalized for even taking up a local grievance with management. The section considers meetings scheuled by management as working time but not otherwise. These regulations lend themselves to all kinds of coercion."

3. Revisions of section 741.4 require that union literature for distribution or posting within work areas may not be critical of any agency, individual or activity of the Federal Government and first must receive prior approval both of content and method of distribution or posting from the postal official in charge, and may only then be posted or circulated on off-work time.

"This is outright censorship," said the George-Hallbeck statement. "It comes with singular arrogance from the Post Office Department which does not hesitate to use its free mailing privileges constantly to circularize postal employees in outrageously blatant propaganda efforts. Only a few days ago, the Post Office Department used a fancy blue-tinted folder printed and circulated at the taxpayers' expense in an attempt to draw postal employees into the postal rate increase controversy. This Government-subsidized pamphlet was not only deliberately deceptive in trying to persuade readers that postal employee organizations favor higher postal rates but also implied that improved working conditions were somehow tied to the increase. Actually, no major postal organization has taken a position either for or against the rate increase. The Post Office obviously believes in free speech only for itself and then abuses its own license."

4. Revision of section 741.5 puts a ban on canvassing or solicitation of organization membership or collection of dues. The same section also bans the use of penalty envelopes (free postage) in mailing union election ballots.

"The point here is," said the George-Hallbeck statement, "that the post office is tilting at windmills in an apparent effort to discredit unions by banning nonexistent abuses. The fact is that in its 50-year history, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks has never wanted or sought the privilege of using penalty envelopes and would not accept such a privilege even if it were granted. Membership canvassing and dues collections under the conditions mentioned, while never officially sanctioned, have, of course, taken place over the years in many installations

without damage to the postal service. A ban at this late date can only be considered as further evidence of the Post Office Department's antiunion determination to flex its muscles over the most trivial procedural details."

"It is this sort of penny-ante sharpshooting under the current administration," Mr. George added, "which has reduced morale of post-office employees to its lowest ebb in decades—to a point even where many installations can't find people willing to fill clerical jobs.

"It casts significant light on why and how our union delegates, meeting here in Washington this week, adopted resolutions so critical of the Post Office Department in areas widely ranging from seniority abuses, deterioration of working conditions and inhuman speed-ups to violations of promotion rights, sick leave, and censorship of activity and ideas.

"Our special conference unanimously approved a bill of particulars condemning the Post Office Department for its oppressive, unwise, and illegal actions and actions destructive of sound personnel-management relationships.

"We look now to Congress for redress and ultimately to the people who as patrons of the post office service are the ones whose interests are in the long run most vitally affected."

Moving Our Surpluses Into Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an address by Mr. Francis C. Daniels, general sales manager of the Commodity Stabilization Service. Mr. Daniels' address was given before the annual meeting of the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss., on May 8. The Delta Council is one of the foremost agricultural organizations of the Midsouth. Mr. Daniels' statement was of particular interest to the Delta Council membership, so vitally concerned with the recapture of our export market for agriculture, but it is of equal significance to all of us, for this is a matter of prime importance to our entire Nation.

The address follows:

MOVING OUR SURPLUSES INTO USE

(Remarks by Francis C. Daniels, General Sales Manager, Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, U. S. Department of Agriculture, at the 21st annual meeting of the Delta Council, Cleveland, Miss., May 8, 1956)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be with you today. For you folks, on the other hand, my appearance here must seem more in the nature of a novelty, for I am sure that in all the 21 years that the Delta Council has been holding these annual meetings it has never before found occasion to invite a Government sales manager to take part in the program. The reason for this, of course, is that never in all those 21 years has there been such a person in the Department of Agriculture for the council to invite.

For this reason, too, with your kind indulgence, I am going to spend a part of my talk today telling about the new kind of job the Department has given me to do. I'll get to cotton before I am through—I promise you that—but first I think it is important that all of us see clearly the setting in which the Department's expanded sales efforts for all commodities, including cotton, have to take place.

The office of the General Sales Manager was established in the United States Department of Agriculture in July of last year for the purpose of strengthening, coordinating, and expanding sales efforts directed toward moving commodities out of the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation (more commonly known to all of you as CCC) and into useful consumption. This strengthened sales action gave recognition to the fact that a surplus-commodity situation was going to be with us for a long time unless we took more aggressive steps than had been taken to do something about it.

Technically, my responsibilities include the formulation and direction of policies and programs for expanding sales of CCC's surplus commodity holdings. In this capacity I serve on the immediate staff of the Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, and through the Administrator I consult and advise with the CCC Board of Directors on the policies and sales programs for which we may be seeking approval or to which the Board has already given approval. In the main, though, my job—as you might surmise from my title—is to direct and expand sales.

Our sales staff, quite in contrast to the size of the CCC inventory, is surprisingly small. There's a good reason for this. Just as the CCC Board of Directors depends on the Commodity Stabilization Service for the actual operation of its price-support programs, so we work closely with the operating Divisions and area Commodity Offices of CSS in moving into consumption any price-support commodities acquired by CCC that are surplus to national reserve needs.

We also work closely with the Department's Foreign Agricultural Service and the agricultural attachés stationed throughout the world. We try to keep these attachés fully advised of our sales programs as we develop them as well as of progress under them once they are put into operation. The agricultural attachés, in turn, keep us informed of developments in foreign markets, of sales methods in the countries to which they are assigned, and of foreign reactions to our sales or to the prices at which we make them.

But we work most closely of all with American buyers and sellers—the people who trade either here or abroad in the commodities we have to offer. Legislation requires that we work through regular channels of trade insofar as practicable, rather than deal directly—in the matter of export sales, for example—with foreign governments, but we do this from preference as well as from law, for it is the only course that really builds soundly for the future. Our governmental sales efforts are temporary, designed to meet a situation that won't last long if we do our job effectively; but a healthy and growing foreign trade carried out through private dealings is something we believe to be a vital part of our national economy, and we can't have this kind of foreign trade unless we continually strive to develop it. We want future as well as present markets for our surplus-farm commodities, and we realize as you do that the promotion of healthy, continuing markets abroad in the years ahead depends on mutual confidence created now and at every possible occasion between United States businessmen and foreign businessmen continually working with one another on a strictly commercial basis.

The same general idea applies to our domestic sales. Our governmental purpose is to expand sales, not to supplant them, and so we must be continually on guard to see that our sales do not interfere with the normal commercial trading in commodities that is the foundation of our economic system. This means dealing honestly and openly with all potential buyers. We will be very scrupulous in this respect. We keep the list of commodities we have for sale well advertised so that all who may be interested in them may know about them, and we report regularly to the trade and general public on how sales are progressing. We are glad to send to anyone interested the CCC Monthly Sales List, which gives the list of commodities available for sale during the current month and the basis on which they are available. In fact, we issue reports regularly, not only on our sales but also on our transfers to other agencies or governments, our barter transactions, and our donations. We feel that private as well as public confidence is built up between buyers and sellers by this public reporting of what is going on.

And, of course, we also feel a real sense of achievement when we are able to report that we no longer have a given commodity available for sale or donation. It may surprise many of you to know that in the course of the last year we removed from the list of available commodities, because our stocks were depleted, such items as cottonseed oil, of which we once had more than a billion pounds in the CCC inventory; cottonseed cake and meal; linseed oil; broken rice (although we expect to have more of this later as we mill our takeover from the 1955 crop); soybeans; flaxseed; dry whey; and a number of varieties of dry edible beans and of hay and pasture seeds.

Just a week ago we removed butter from the list of commodities available for foreign donation because our committed CCC stocks were down to zero in late March, and in late April—in the flush butter production season—totaled only 6 million pounds. At their peak in July 1954, CCC butter holdings reached 466 million pounds. During the past two marketing season, through aggressive action, including a well-planned and vigorous foreign and domestic donation program, we have been able to move considerably more butter into food uses than we have been required to buy under the price-support program for dairy products. In the marketing year just ended—April 1955-April 1956—useful outlets were found for approximately 415 million pounds of butter, whereas price-support purchases amounted to less than half this amount, 178 million pounds.

It will also surprise most of you, I think, to learn that CCC's showcase of commodities available for sale isn't nearly as extensive as most people think. In saying this I do not mean to minimize the seriousness of the surplus situation we are currently dealing with. Our surpluses in some commodities, particularly cotton and wheat, are tremendous—and I'll have more to say about cotton in a moment—but if you add to these two commodities rice, cheese, tobacco, and possibly corn, you will have covered all the really burdensome surplus items in the CCC inventory.

I say possibly corn because even though we have a large CCC inventory of corn—currently more than 700 million bushels—and may take over another sizable quantity from 1955-crop corn now under CCC loan, the total of corn by itself is not alarming when you bear in mind that our annual consumption of corn is more than 3 billion bushels.

As regards wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco the sales problem is a tremendous one. All of these items are potent world export trade commodities; and the unfortunate part of the present situation is that we aren't the only country faced with surpluses of these commodities. They are in abundant supply throughout the world, and to a great extent consumer demand for each of them is inelastic. As a result, world supplies have reached a point where under present consumption conditions an increase in United States exports is likely to displace

trade rather than increase it; and there comes a time when such displacement, however strong the justification for it, creates serious international economic and diplomatic problems.

The Department has assured friendly nations that we are not going to disrupt their economies, which we have been helping to build up since the war, by dumping our surpluses. We have also made clear to them, however, that the time is at hand when we must try to move our surplus commodities at prices competitive with those of other sellers in the world market. We will first of all try to sell for cash, but in areas where cash is not available we will supplement these efforts through barter for strategic and other storable materials we are interested in. Further, we will attempt to increase consumption in many friendly areas through sales under Public Law 480, which provides for acceptance of local currencies in payment for surplus commodities when the sales are over and above the area's normal commercial trade in these commodities.

These alternative approaches to increased exports of our surplus commodities have been made possible through new legislation—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—which gives us greater flexibility in our selling approach to varied and different problems and situations. Trade for dollars is our normal way of doing business, and we will continue to try to do business that way, but the authority to make sales for foreign currency is a most useful one when we have potential customers in nations that do not have foreign exchange adequate to meet their import requirements. In a like manner, barter helps under certain conditions. In addition to giving us strategical and critical or other materials we need in exchange for commodities we have in surplus, it helps to reduce our storage problem because the items we get in exchange are both less bulky and less perishable.

We depart from commercial practice, of course, when we donate agricultural commodities, but this method of reducing our surplus can be an effective means of stimulating consumption in a way that also stimulates an opening for future increases in commercial trade. Voluntary United States relief agencies have done a good job of meeting humanitarian needs through distributing our food surpluses without a measurable disruption of normal commercial trade. In all cases recipients are selected on the basis of a need they cannot fulfill themselves. Dairy products—I have already mentioned the large donations of butter—have moved most effectively in this way. To the extent that this free distribution contributes to economic recovery in the recipient countries, then we are entitled to hope for expanding future trade.

I'd like to say just a word about the general program for sales on credit that we announced early in February. The program was developed as a result of ideas we got from banking groups and members of the export trade. Heretofore, CCC has never sold on credit; it has always insisted on "cash on the barrelhead" as soon as it delivers its commodities to the purchaser. But with credit so increasingly important in modern selling, and in keeping with our determination to use and develop more and better merchandising techniques, we have laid the groundwork for a new credit approach.

The basic idea is this: Instead of requiring cash upon delivery of CCC commodities, CCC is allowing up to 3 years time for payment provided it has assurance from a United States bank that payment of the principal plus interest will be made by the end of the credit period. This bank assurance may be in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit from the bank, such as is now required of the purchaser on a cash sales; an endorsement on a note executed by any party to the sales transaction, including the foreign importer; or some other recognized form of bank assurance.

It is expected that even though the credits are extended only to United States exporters, maximum benefits from the credit will be passed on to the foreign importer. In fact, the extent to which the benefits are passed on by the United States exporters will be considered by CCC in approving the credit transactions. CCC hopes to benefit by the reduction in storage costs that will result from the earlier reduction in its inventories that should be made possible by the credit sales.

I know you are anxious to have me discuss the CCC program for selling cotton and how this program fits into our overall sales program. I am sure that I don't have to tell you folks who know cotton that each commodity has its own particular marketing problems. And I'm sure, too, that you would agree that the problems incident to cotton export marketing are about the toughest any commodity has had to face in recent years. The reasons are many and altogether understandable, and I need not take time to go into them here.

The cotton export program as announced is an aggressive sales program on a competitive bid basis, the first ever used for Government sales of cotton. Our aim is a return to our historic commercial share of the world cotton market. It is not a dumping program. We do hope, however, that it will serve to curb any further expansion of cotton production in other countries at our expense—an expansion that has been taking place under the price-umbrella afforded by our domestic price support program. As President Eisenhower expressed it: "The United States cannot be satisfied with a position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodities."

In our first sales announcement under the new export sales policy for cotton we offered for export on a competitive bid basis a million bales of CCC cotton stocks of all grades having a staple length of fifteen-sixteenths inch or shorter. Within 2 months the entire million bales had been sold, and at prices that held firm throughout the sale. There was no depressing of prices on either foreign or domestic cotton markets. In fact, as you know, domestic market prices even strengthened a little during the sale.

On February 28 of this year we announced the second step in the new sales program. We announced that sales would be made each 2 weeks, on a competitive bid basis, of all qualities of upland cotton in the CCC inventory without regard to staple length. Under the provisions of the program the cotton purchased cannot be exported before the beginning of the new marketing year for cotton, which is next August 1. Just about 3 weeks ago—on April 17—we announced that that first offers under the new program would be received on April 24, and just last week we announced acceptances under these bids. These acceptances totaled only 10,487 bales, but that was not surprising in that both the seller and the numerous potential buyers need a little time to determine the most practical sales levels. Even though the number of bales sold was small, the large number of bids received was decidedly encouraging.

Since we are just at the beginning of this new and broadened sales effort on CCC-owned cotton, it is not possible to evaluate it as yet. I won't attempt even a guess as to what the eventual results will show. I do feel, however, as I am sure you do, that this matter of recapturing our historic export markets for cotton is going to be a long and difficult task. We can't be as aggressive as we would like to be about it, either at home or abroad. Abroad we must consider diplomatic as well as trade relationships, and here at home we must recognize that producers and others in the cotton trade have cotton to market too, and that they have priority on sales, particularly during their regular marketing seasons. We certainly won't aggressively merchandise Government cotton if it means depriving the producer of an equivalent amount of his normal market. There would be no net gain in that for anyone. Our CCC sales operations are going to be carried out with their companion price-support operations always in mind. Our stocks of agricultural commodities are acquired as a result of price-support operations, and to undo or impair these price-support operations by subsequent price-depressing sales would be to throw away with one hand any gains we had made with the other.

Also I feel—and I think you folks must, too—that the Government's strong sales role in this international play for world cotton markets is temporary. If king cotton's traditional role in the world of fibers is going to be maintained, it is going to be done mainly by folks such as you. The Government can lend a strong hand at times, as we are doing now, but in the continuing year-to-year go-round the eventual victory is going to be decided by the drive and stamina that only private initiative and private incentive can bring to the battle. We can help you regain your historic markets, but it will be up to you to keep them.

With the increasing competition from synthetics on the one hand, and the increasing yields in recent years on the other, the net result is a tremendous inventory in Government stocks. The national carryover of old-crop cotton as of next August 1 is currently estimated to total more than 14½ million bales, and that's a lot of cotton to be carrying on top of the new crop that will be available at that time.

There will always be honest differences of opinion regarding the details of any Government program, but there is one point upon which I feel sure we can all agree:

We know how to raise cotton and we know how to store cotton. Now we must get busy and get out and develop sales for our cotton.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you here today. I thank you for your kindness in asking me to come.

Wage and Hour Act Extended Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, relating to Wage and Hour Act extended coverage.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE AND HOUR ACT EXTENDED COVERAGE

George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, today expressed the interest and concern of the

members of the federation in the wage and hour law extended coverage now being considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and directed the following wire message to the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee now considering the legislation.

The complete text of the telegram follows:

"In lieu of personal appearance before your committee which is now holding hearings on numerous bills extending wage and hour coverage to include additional retail establishments, we request that this message be read into the record of the public hearings and made a permanent part of the hearings.

"As Members of Congress well know, the federation membership is comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men, all voting members, numbering approximately 100,000, which membership is located in all the 48 States.

"Small individually owned retail establishments are facing a struggle to exist due to the inroads of large corporate interests operating in the retail field. They are also plagued with increased taxation from local, State, and National levels, which adds further to their inability to maintain their establishments.

"The truth of the matter is, as we review the situation from actual experience of owning and operating independent establishments, that any independent businessman owning and operating his own retail establishment must, as a first requisite, have the loyalty and good will of his employees. Otherwise he will speed his own destruction. It is our belief from close contacts with small independent business establishments that the successfully operated businesses have no need for Government intenvention through regulations insofar as employer-employee relations are concerned, be they financial or harmonious working conditions within the establishment.

"We would urge your committee in its present study of wage and hour extended coverage to make a thorough survey of the administration of the present law to see that undue hardships are not created through improper interpretations at the local level and that when the rule is applied at the local level it should apply to all in an area in a particular business, and all such businesses should be so notified, and before any interpretation is placed as to whether a certain line of business comes under the wage and hour act there should be a commonsense approach to what constitutes interstate business, in the full sense of the word.

"We thank you for your cooperation and again request that this message be read into and made a permanent part of the public hearings before your committee.

"GEORGE J. BURGER,
"Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C."

Fielding L. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include two editorials eulogizing the late Fielding L. Wright, former Governor of Mississippi. One editorial is from the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss., and the other from the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss., of May 6, 1956]

FIELDING L. WRIGHT

The "good gray Governor" is dead; the State, and the Delta in particular, mourn his passing with shock at its suddenness. Fielding L. Wright was a stalwart statesman who stood by his convictions and who not infrequently stuck his neck out for them.

Never a flamboyant politician, he lent a special dignity to the position he held in Delta leadership and to the post he served so well as Governor of our State. We could not always agree with him but there could never be any rancor in our disagreements.

He tried earnestly to solve the most trying problems of our age, and he never compromised a principle in doing so. He was as conservative as a grey flannel suit but he projected his calm personality in such a way that he won both confidence and affection from his fellow men.

We shall miss Fielding Wright.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of May 8, 1956]

FIELDING L. WRIGHT

The death of Fielding L. Wright, scarcely before reaching the age of 61, removes a Southern statesman who had a long record of faithful legislative and gubernatorial service in Mississipi and whose leadership on behalf of States' rights and against the imposition of force bills upon the South will be long remembered.

In 1948, as vice-presidential nominee of the States' Rights Party, he loaned himself valiantly, after the soul-searching which tore the breasts of so many lifelong, dedicated Democrats, to the cause of protest against the Democratic Party's strife-stirring platform. It was not thought the electoral votes the party might receive in the South would in themselves make the difference between Republican and Democratic victory, because the Republican victory was taken for granted.

In Louisiana, 1 of 4 States this ticket carried, the States' Rights Party became the Democratic Party, and received 204,000 votes to the 136,000 the Truman-Barkley ticket (which finally, in generosity and fairness, got a place on the ballot) mustered. In 1952 the vote for Eisenhower fell 38,000 short of the vote for Stevenson.

The recent death of Senator Barkley, the opposite number of Governor Wright on what in 1948 were the only tickets seriously considered in the South; and now, so soon after the death of Governor Wright himself, accent in memory those stirring, stormy, troubled times—times whose resolution remains seemingly still far away.

More Glory for CAP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was recently pleased to meet and chat with Civil Air Patrol Pilot Jan Wood, a physical-education instructor at Birmingham High School, Reseda, Calif., who is on sabbatical leave for 1 year on a 30,000-mile trip around the world. On long distance over water she will go by boat and the plane will be taken aboard ship, as was done from New York to Europe. At the present time she is visiting in Turkey, Greece, and Italy, and during the summer months her mother and father will visit with her in Europe. After that she will entertain the CAP cadets from California who worked with her in preparing for her journey.

The occasion was reminiscent of the anxious moments spent in preparing for my own round-the-world flight of not too long ago.

CAP can be proud of men and women volunteers such as Miss Wood who contribute so much in time, efforts, and private funds in serving their country and promoting and maintaining national interest in aviation.

CAP's official publication, Contact, recently published an interesting résumé of her journey. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to offer the article for publication in the RECORD in its entirety. The article follows:

CALIFORNIA ROUND-THE-WORLD FLYER VISITS CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

WASHINGTON.—California CAP member Jan Wood visited national headquarters in the Nation's Capital and made final plans before starting on the next leg of her 30,000-mile trip around the world.

The 34-year-old Los Angeles high-school teacher left California recently in her Cessna 170, a single-engine, four-passenger plane, with her sole traveling companion, Cindy, a 3-year-old police dog. Miss Wood made stops at Phoenix, El Paso, Dallas, Atlanta, and Norfolk prior to landing here.

The physical education instructor is training officer of the Van Nuys Group 25, California Wing of Civil Air Patrol. She has been recommended for promotion to the grade of captain in the CAP.

MEETS GENERAL AGEE

Shortly after her arrival here Miss Wood met with Maj. Gen. Walter R. Agee, United States Air Force, CAP's national commander, and members of CAP's National Capital wing. The national commander praised the pioneer spirit of Miss Wood as she revealed her travel plans to him. The general lauded the trip as an unofficial goodwill mission for the Civil Air Patrol and a praiseworthy event for light aircraft.

The CAP commander, wishing her every success, told the Californian that he would look forward to receiving reports of her progress on the tour. He pointed out that she may have the opportunity to meet many of the American Civil Air Patrol cadets who will go abroad this summer to participate in the annual international cadet exchange.

Miss Wood told General Agee of plans for what she termed her private cadet exchange program. During the summer vacation period, she said, two 16-year-old Van Nuys CAP cadets, Lt. Barbara Martin, commander of Van Nuys Squadron No. 2, and Cadet Sgt. Connie Beneke, will join her for a tour of the Scandinavian countries. This plan evoked additional praise from the general.

MEETS REPRESENTATIVE MACK

Later the aviatrix met Representative PETER F. MACK, JR., Democrat, of Illinois, a licensed commercial pilot and World War II Navy pilot. Currently, the Congressman holds the rank of lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve and is qualified to fly all types of aircraft, ranging from single-engined planes to jets. Representative MACK himself flew around the world alone in a single-engined plane.

During a whirlwind tour of the Nation's Capital, with the assistance of Maj. Ray Martin, PIO of the National Capital Wing,

Miss Wood appeared on several radio and TV programs and was featured in press stories.

Miss Wood's Cessna 170 will be crated in New York and shipped overseas to Rotterdam, Holland, where she will pick it up late in March and fly around Europe in short 100- and 200-mile hops, landing and seeing the countryside via bicycle.

Later in the fall, Miss Wood will meet her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jess Wood, of Pasadena, Calif., for a month's tour around Europe. Then she will nose the Cessna along the Mediterranean toward Turkey and India.

SKIING IN ALPS

After a taste of skiing in the Alps and skin diving in the Mediterranean, Miss Wood plans a try at wild game hunting in Borneo. Her itinerary places her among the islands near Java and New Guinea sometime in December as she flies her way toward Australia.

Once again her plane will be temporarily grounded aboard ship as it is sent to Santiago, Chile. When Miss Wood and her Cessna are reunited in South America, she will proceed up the coast across the Caribbean and to Florida. She plans to complete the globe circling tour by landing in Van Nuys, Calif., sometime in March 1957.

A CAP emblem will be displayed on Miss Wood's Cessna during most of her flight.

Segregation Is a Wooden Leg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Manufacturers' Record of May 1956 published an editorial entitled "Segregation Is a Wooden Leg." The editorial deals in a most realistic manner with one of the great problems facing the South today. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEGREGATION IS A WOODEN LEG

If there is an editor in the South—or elsewhere, for that matter—who hasn't written an editorial on the segregation issue he enjoys a rare distinction. For, in our opinion, segregation today is one of the most overworked topics receiving attention of the free press.

Both on editorial pages and in news columns the issue is being subjected to an overdose of coverage in news media throughout the Nation. This excessive coverage in itself now constitutes a major barrier to easing of tensions and intelligent study of the problem.

Overemphasis by the press plays directly into the hands of the extremist on both sides. It makes heroines of propagandists and heroes of reactionary politicians. Neither contribute to progress.

The South today is somewhat comparable to a robust young man who wears a wooden leg as a result of a childhood accident. Except for this one handicap, the young man is of sound mind and limb, capable of leading a perfectly normal life.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that this young man, with proper therapy, can ultimately overcome his handicap completely and become a superior citizen. The speed of his recovery hinges on the effectiveness of the therapy.

Now it is well established that in the treatment of such cases the psychological conditioning is just as important as the physical conditioning. We go out of our way to be considerate of people who have suffered such physical infirmities.

It is considered exceedingly bad taste to call attention to an artificial limb, a withered arm, or even a mole on the cheek. It would be unthinkable to expose a patient to public ridicule.

Yet today the Nation is carelessly gossiping about every aspect of the South's wooden leg, regardless of the effect on the patient. The critics are sitting around discussing the length, weight, shape, and finish of the artificial limb. Some are even speculating as to whether it might be infested with termites.

In fact, the leg is getting so much attention that the rest of the young man is being virtually ignored. The fact that the South is pacing the Nation in many fields of industrial, scientific, and civic progress is being lost in the increasing barrage of segregation news.

This is about as reasonable as writing a biography of Franklin Roosevelt and describing his polio affliction in great detail while failing to mention his other activities. It is like identifying Winston Churchill as "a fat man who lives in England."

Recently we have seen a classic example of overemphasis of the South's segregation problem by nationally syndicated columnist Sylvia Porter. In a Charlotte datelined column she suggested that racial difficulties will materially reduce industrial development in the region.

We happen to have the facts on the development of the South. And they do not support Miss Porter's view to the slightest degree.

The major factors in the industrial development of the South are markets, materials, and manpower. Many other factors such as transportation, utility services, water, and taxes are more important in site selection.

Since Miss Porter's column appeared we have queried several dozen top developers and plant location experts, and they have told us most emphatically that the segregation issue seldom comes up for even a brief discussion. R. M. Cooper, director of the South Carolina Development Board for many years says "we have never had an inquiry which even referred to the matter."

Miss Porter's column started a lot of rumors, but as yet we have not been able to find a single confirmed case of a plant location project deferred or adversely affected by the possibility of segregation difficulties.

Moreover, it is clear that plant location activity in the South today is at an all time high. This was borne out in facts and figures in the 1956 Blue Book of Southern Progress released last month.

And key southern developers are highly optimistic about the future. They are confident that the region's many attractions for industry will continue to promote expansion in the years ahead.

As H. V. Allen, Jr., director of the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board puts it, "We believe the purchasing power of an expanding southern market, the availability of major physical resources including water, and the productiveness and enthusiasm of southern manpower are too firmly fixed in the minds of industrialists to allow the controversy on segregation to interfere with the continued industrial growth of the area."

This does not mean, of course, that southern industrial development cannot be adversely affected. But it is clear that if plant location factors are viewed in proper perspective the South will continue to enjoy a favorable competitive position.

We think it is in the interest both of the Nation and of the region to have more discussion of southern progress and to have less careless talk about the wooden leg. H. M. C.

Life's Saving Salt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 18, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Sunday Star of May 13 there was published a very interesting article entitled "Life's Saving Salt," written by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. As Senators know, Dr. Harris publishes a column in the Star each Sunday under the title "Spires of the Spirit." On this particular occasion he dealt with the life and conduct in the Senate of our late great friend, Senator Alben W. Barkley.

Because I believe every Senator who has not read the article will enjoy reading it, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate)

LIFE'S SAVING SALT

Long ago a truism became proverbial. It is the assertion that humor is the saving salt sprinkled upon life's vicissitudes. Humor saves from many things. It will save one from magnifying a speck into a specter. It is a magic restorer of perspectives. It will keep one from taking himself too seriously. Humor is a vent to prevent one under heavy strain and pressure from going all to pieces. A laugh will often pierce dark clouds of antagonism like a sudden shaft of light. Humor may break through in some subtle and clever turn of a phrase. A pun often transforms frowns to smiles. A joke may change straight-set lips, the prelude to angry biting words, to loud guffaws which may alter the climate of a conference as if refreshing windows had been thrown wide open.

The Nation mourns the loss of one of its best-loved leaders who exemplified in rich degree the saving salt of humor. Whatever the situation, Alben W. Barkley dealt in smiles and laughter. The funny side of things convulsed him and he was a past master in picturing for others what amused him. No statesman faced with greater solemnity and seriousness the thorny national and international problems of our troubled times as he served in posts of vast importance. No one was more conscious that the decisions he was helping to make in these crucial days involved the very survival of the United States as a free Nation. Yet, Senator Barkley never hung his harp of humor on weeping-willow trees. Facing the worst he could still laugh and make others laugh. He loved stories shot through with merriment which were mirrors to reflect some contemporary human foibles.

It was truly said at his funeral service in Washington, in the presence of the President and Vice President and a brilliant galaxy of public servants: "With unbowed head and unimbittered heart, he met life's losses gallantly and yet found fun in living and reveled in laughter." The address he was delivering to a multitude of smile-wreathed students when death instantly ended his earthly career, bubbled with humor. It could be said of the Nation's only "Veep" as was said of another: "He went laughing up to God." It might well be asked as somebody did when Artemus Ward, who constantly dealt in smiles, fared forth into the

heavenlies: "Is he gone to a land of no laughter, who made mirth for us all?"

Long after the last human eyes looked on Lincoln, there is still heard across the years the laughter in his Cabinet meetings during the War Between the States. There were some high officials in those White House conferences whose faces were sullen and shocked at the hilarity as the man that was to save the Union told yet another story. Lincoln declared: "With the fearful strain that is on me night and day, if I did not laugh I should die." A study of our greatest leaders seems to confirm the dictum of Coleridge: "No mind is thoroughly well organized that is deficient in the sense of humor." In that respect man is but a child of nature although it is only man who really laughs. But it has been ordained that always close to weeping is laughter. The universe is serious enough but its surface everywhere ripples with gaiety. It seems always ready for a laugh.

Of course, all laughter is not wholesome. There is laughter which jeers and hisses, stings and ridicules. The Good Book warns that there is the laughter of fools which is like the crackling of thorns under the pot. Like thorns, that sort of perverted laughter can tear and lacerate human spirits. There is a world of difference between laughing at people and laughing with people. Dr. Powell Davies, one of the Capital's outstanding preachers, does not exaggerate the matter when, in scanning the wide fields of history and literature, and impressed with the preservative power of the salt of humor, he declares: "Laughter is an integral part of life—a very important part. It is a shaping force in human affairs—it can influence events—it can mold character. It is interwoven with everything else—one of the basics of experience—an indissoluble part of human life."

An ancient proverb as old as King Solomon sums up this 20th-century statement in one sentence which has survived the destruction of the famed temple: "A merry heart doeth good like medicine." But one greater than Solomon, whose glad eyes saw in common flowers a wardrobe surpassing that of the most royal adornment, kept His irrepressible joy even when the next step brought Him to the Cross. Theology has too often labeled Christ as the Man of Sorrows, but the sorrows He bore were not His own. How have so many missed the gladness of Jesus at the Galilee springtime, His rapture at the song of the birds and the beauty of the flowers, His amused joy at children dancing in the market place, His humorous reply to the long-faced religious leaders, who asked reprovingly why He and His followers were so gleeful? All this is as much a revelation of religion as His most solemn words concerning sin and sorrow in death. His parables take merrymaking as their natural background. Pity it is that across childhood's indelible record is written: "Jesus wept." It is perfectly evident that that entry was made because it was so exceptional. To be sure the New Testament never says Jesus laughed. The truth is He laughed so frequently it was not worth calling attention to. Always with Jesus, with many a twinkle in His eye and humor in His speech, the atmosphere was joyous and jubilant. That was characteristic to the very last as He prayed that the joy which had always permeated His own heart might abound in the hearts of those dear to him. He was now leaving. In a lovely English cathedral dedicated to the Master of Men who met every situation with the salt of humor is hung a prayer. Who can doubt if that One in sandaled feet should enter this house of prayer bearing His name, He would be likely, with a smile, to read the petition approvingly even before He made his way to the high altar. And here is the cathedral prayer:

Give me a mind that is not bored,
That does not whimper, whine, or sigh,
Don't let me worry overmuch
About the fussy thing called I.
Give me a sense of humor, Lord,
Give me the grace to see a joke,
To get some happiness in life,
And pass it on to other folk.

A Hot Meal for Older People Who Need It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an interesting suggestion has been made in a letter I have recently received from Theda L. Waterman, executive director of the Central Agency for Chronically Ill of Milwaukee, Wis. The Central Agency for Chronically Ill is a Red Feather service receiving support from the annual Community Chest campaign in Milwaukee County. Miss Waterman, formerly coordinator of health services at the Tuberculosis Institute of Chicago, Ill., has been director of the Public Health Nursing Association, of Woonsocket, R. I. Miss Waterman's suggestion will be of interest to all who are concerned with better care of our older people. Her letter follows:

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,
New House Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I know you are extremely interested in the development of adequate facilities for the aged.

During the present controversy of farm legislation and surplus foods, I have thought again of a project which from time to time I have suggested to other people.

Briefly, it would be a project of one hot meal a day sold at cost to the ambulatory aged who are living in rooming houses where there are inadequate cooking facilities—such a project to be similar to the school-lunch program and like this program to use some of the surplus foods. The meals might be served at schools or in settlement houses at noon when the older people could go to the central place. We all know that many of these oldsters, because of their inability to shop and the lack of cooking and refrigeration equipment, live on sweet rolls and coffee with the result that their health is impaired. Such a program as I visualize it would be attractive to them not only because they could have a well-cooked meal at cost, but they would have the social life associated with eating in a group.

I realize that there would be many problems to be ironed out, but I think such a plan has possibilities and could be developed.

Personally, I would like to see an experiment made.

Very sincerely,
THEDA L. WATERMAN,
Executive Director.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed farm program bill (soil bank), and adopted conference report on Federal employees claims.

Senate committee approved Agriculture and State, Justice, Judiciary appropriations bills.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7582–7594

Bills Introduced: 16 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3878–S. 3893. Page 7583

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. J. Res. 261, to make transfers of available supplies and equipment to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., with amendments (S. Rept. 2018);

H. R. 8904, to amend certain laws relating to grade of certain personnel of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement (S. Rept. 2019);

S. 1637, to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made, with amendments (S. Rept. 2020);

S. 1961, conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, with amendment (S. Rept. 2021);

S. Res. 250, authorizing printing of a pamphlet entitled "Laws Controlling Illicit Narcotics Traffic" as a Senate document, with amendments (S. Rept. 2022); and

H. R. 11177, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration, with amendments (S. Rept. 2023). Page 7583

Military Dependents' Medical Care: Senate insisted on its amendments to H. R. 9429, to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, agreed to hold conference thereon, and appointed as conferees Senators Russell, Byrd, Johnson (Texas), Saltonstall, and Bridges. Page 7593

Committee Assignments: Senator Douglas was excused from further service on Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and was assigned to Committee on Finance; and

Senator Long was excused from further service on Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and was assigned to Committee on Foreign Relations. Page 7582

D. C. Transit: Senate disagreed to House amendment to S. 3073, the D. C. transit bill, asked for conference with House and appointed as conferees Senators McNamara, Morse, Bible, Beall, and Case of New Jersey. Pages 7611–7613

State, Justice, and Judiciary Appropriations: Committee on Appropriations was authorized until midnight Monday, May 21, to report H. R. 10721, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary and related agencies. Page 7583

Farm Program: Senate passed, with amendments, H. R. 10875, Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank), after taking the following additional actions on amendments:

Adopted: By 49 yeas to 31 nays, Young amendment authorizing CCC to sell annually 100 million bushels of feed wheat; modified Aiken amendment providing transitional parity for basic commodities frozen during 1957; Mundt amendment excepting from prohibition against production on Government lands of price-support crops in surplus supply where such production is necessary to maintain satisfactory wildlife populations; O'Mahoney amendment providing penalty in certain cases for increasing livestock production on grazing land set aside for soil bank; by 73 yeas to 14 nays, modified Holland amendment to remove feed grains outside commercial area from soil-bank payments but setting price supports therefor at 76 percent of parity this year and the same next year if commercial area corn is supported, and setting price supports this year for corn grown outside commercial area at 82½ percent of level for commercial area corn (after rejecting Daniel amendment as a substitute therefor); Anderson amendment respecting acreage allotments for cotton, as amended by adoption of Stennis amendment thereto providing that in application of national acreage allotment for cotton, no State shall lose more than 1 percent of its acreage; and Byrd amendment exempting from penalty, producers of wheat for use on own farms; and

Appendix

For Human Betterment—Address by Hon. A. Boyd Campbell, President, United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable Boyd Campbell, outgoing President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was made during their annual convention on April 30, 1956. It is a thought-provoking address and I commend it to the House:

Three hundred sixty-six days and one hundred twenty thousand miles ago we were in this room together.

Since then, I have been across the length and breadth of our national landscape.

From Albany to Austin, from Poland Springs to Pasadena, and from Wichita to Williamsburg, I have met wonderful people, so many thousands of wonderful people.

It has been a thrilling experience. No American could emerge from it without becoming a better American, or without acquiring a more perceptive knowledge of the real strength of our country and of the character, the spirit, and the purpose of our people.

As never before, I have realized the deep reservoir of good will which attaches to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—this great federation of chambers of commerce and trade associations, with its underlying membership of more than 1,700,000 business men and women.

If you had shared the salt—as I have shared the salt—with those who implement the national chamber's purposes and vitalize its policies—you would have gained—as I have gained—a new respect for the validity of our purposes and the integrity of our policies.

To you and to a great host of others like you, I express the sincere thanks and the most cordial appreciation of the board of directors, the officers, and the staff—and for myself—the gratitude of my heart for your beautiful courtesies and your boundless cooperation.

In 124 communities, I have visited with you and talked to you—singly and in groups.

More importantly, you have talked to me. You have talked about the current issues and public questions that affect the well-being of our beloved country.

By you, I mean Mr. and Mrs. Average American—God-fearing, home-loving, tax-paying, community builders.

Wherever I have met you, north or south, east or west, there was a striking similarity in your thinking.

You spoke the same language. The accents may have varied, but the meaning did not.

Because your words were far more eloquent, and because your thoughts were far more signficant than any that I could possibly assemble, I shall tell you what you said.

And so, I appear today as a reporter.

First of all, you talked about business—as it was, and as you thought, or hoped, it would be.

Last summer and fall, you looked forward to the turn of the year in anticipation that 1955—by national standards—would prove to be our finest business year—and it was.

In planning for 1956, you were hopeful and confident. Now, here we are, with one-third of the year behind us, and most of our economic forecasters believe that 1956—on balance—will be a better year than 1955.

You frequently raised the question about the continuance of good business.

You recognized your own responsibilities for a stable and expanding economy, and you were making plans accordingly. You also recognized that higher levels of business would depend, in large degree, on wise tax policies and sound fiscal policies of Government.

While you did not spell it out in so many words, I am convinced that you share my opinion that our high level of prosperity is an almost perfect tribute to the working of a free economy.

Furthermore, I think you will agree that there was never a more appropriate time to appraise the quality and scope of our economic stewardship.

This appraisal should be a continuing process, and I firmly believe it is becoming so—not only to the advancement of our dynamic system of enterprise, but also to the betterment of all mankind.

You were concerned—and very genuinely so—about the plight of your friends, the farmers, your fellow businessmen in agriculture. You were troubled because agriculture was not sharing in the prevailing prosperity.

You felt that the farm problem had been vastly complicated because politics had become so interwoven with it.

If I am reporting your opinions correctly, you are convinced that the problem may get worse before it gets better.

You know, however, that the economic softness of agriculture cannot continue indefinitely without becoming a hazard to our national welfare.

You have not claimed to know all the answers, but this you do know: any real answer to the farm problem must be based upon economic principles rather than political considerations.

There exists among the men of agriculture a tremendous fund of good sense, good judgment, good will, patriotism, and economic understanding.

When we add these priceless qualities to a high faith in the long-range future of farming, there will emerge a real solution to the farm problem—if—and this is a big if—political eager beavers will take a vacation.

Then—taxes. Everywhere I went, you talked about taxes.

What did you say about taxes?

Surely you would not expect me to quote your exact language in this company.

In essence, however, you said: "Taxes are too high."

Maybe you've always said taxes were too high. I've never heard you say taxes were too low—or even just right.

A system of taxation that puts a premium on tax angles rather than upon good management, undermines your confidence in its equity, and without equity, no system of taxation is tolerable or enforceable.

I could drop the subject of taxes right there, but I would be closing on a negative note. The fact is that your thinking leaned very definitely toward the positive.

You were worried not only about the tax burden itself, but about what our tax structure does to initiative, to venture capital, and to opportunity.

And that means that you are for a system of taxation that inspires initiative, magnetizes venture capital, and broadens opportunity.

You are thinking about tomorrow, and what it holds for young people. There is nothing negative about that.

You expressed strong opinions about Government in business. First, last, and always, you are against the competition of Government in economic areas where private capital is able and anxious to do the job.

Instead of amplifying your opinions, however, I shall condense them into one emphatic, unequivocal statement:

You said: "Let Government get out of business."

Repeatedly, you brought up the topic of social security. You approved the principle, but you were amazed at its complexity and alarmed at its implications.

Because the social-security program is full of heart appeal, it is also full of political allure. You recognized its attractions for the articulate and plausible—sometimes uninformed—and sometimes unprincipled office seekers who attempt to buy votes with your money by constantly raising the social security ante.

Your deep concern was indicated by the number of times you posed the question: "How far can we go?"

Can we contain the program at its present levels and supplement it by private plans, or will we be led—insidiously but pleasantly—along a primrose path toward a security mirage until we reach the point of no return?

Is it conceivable that the great humanitarian concept of providing basic security for our senior citizens and for widows and orphans could become an economic albatross about the neck of our body politic?

Now this leads us directly to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. What did you say about those recommendations?

Not enough. Not nearly enough.

True, 99.44 percent of you were for the recommendations of the Hoover Commission—which we usually call the Hoover report—just to simplify the reference.

While you were emphatic and highly articulate on the subject of taxes, the same emphasis did not carry through on the Hoover report.

This is paradoxical because the adoption of the report would provide the tax relief which you so earnestly seek.

Likewise, it would accomplish your vigorous demand that the Federal Government remove itself from competition with private business.

Not only does the Hoover report provide the means of bringing these long-sought objectives into reality, it proposes the modernization of our National Government, which is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

This magnificient audit of Government, produced by the best talent in America, after a prodigious amount of study, however highly respected, is not self-enacting.

To get its recommendations translated into law will require the full force of your informed, united, and sustained effort. It will take leg work, head work, and heart work.

I do not share the opinion of those who feel that this is not the time to press this matter. It is too important to delay—under any consideration.

And now—the labor merger.

We are confronted with the accomplished fact of a union between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, comprising a membership of about 15 million.

In many groups, in many States, I have sat in on conversations in which you attempted to appraise the impact of the merger on industry—on politics—and on the public weal.

If I have correctly gaged your thinking, you look upon the labor merger as a possible menace—and as a possible promise.

Labor's objectives, in many respects, run counter to our own. Labor tends to the idea of more government in our economic system—more concentration of power in Washington.

We have been working in exactly the opposite direction. We believe that one of freedom's greatest safeguards lies in the dispersal of authority, and we will never surrender that conviction.

Labor's vast power has been concentrated—and if I may interpolate a suggestion in at this point, I would recommend that while you are in your capital city, you have a look at the magnificent new buildings the unions have recently constructed—and those they are now constructing. There are some 15 in all.

Those buildings are solid evidence of labor's growing strength and of its entrenchment in Washington to present its views to government under the constitutional right of petition.

You have expressed no quarrel with that. You only hope that as labor comes into a realization of its great size and strength, it will be as zealous in policing itself for the general well-being as it has been zealous in pressing its economic demands.

You believe that the American public's awareness of the potential danger in bigness—big government, big business or big labor—is a safeguard to the abuse of such power.

You have hailed the high-principled statements of Mr. George Meany—President of the AFL-CIO. He has said—with emphasis—that as labor grows bigger and bigger, that it must discharge its responsibility to the community as a whole in a manner that will bring credit to the union movement.

Mr. Meany will have your great good wishes if he moves against the intolerable evils in the secondary boycott—that malignancy in the body of our economic-social system.

If Mr. Meany mobilizes his power and influence to clean up terrorism and racketeering in unprincipled unions, he will not only enhance the stature of American labor, he will perform a service of incalculable value to our country.

And then, you spun the globe:

You have been intrigued, amazed—and if I am not mistaken—somewhat amused at at the fantastic Russian spectacle—the so-called new look.

The ghost of Stalin has been hailed before the court of his successors and charged with every crime in the book.

No one is easier to convict than a ghost, and so, the present masters of the Kremlin, serving in the triple capacity of prosecutor, judge, and jury, have convicted "good old Joe." He is solely responsible, so they say, for the lies, deceit, duplicity, and murder and all the other sins against society—upon which the Soviet regime was built.

Among the many grotesque contradictions in this situation is that the same old gang is ruling Russia—minus Stalin. It is the same old gang with a brand new look.

They are playing that new look for everything it is worth—and let's face it—they are getting away with it in too many corners of the world.

Day after day we are deluged with stories of the back-slapping and baby-kissing tours of Russia's ruling clique. Synthetic goodwill is simply oozing from their pores.

But—as its present masters parade across the world behind their masks of benignity—you have not forgotten the real character of the Russian apparatus.

No, you have not been fooled. You have not been enticed by the song of the Russian Lorelei—because in that direction lies disaster.

There is nothing you would welcome more than a true change of heart in the rulers of the Kremlin,-because deep down inside each of you is a love of peace—and the hope that it may eventually prevail throughout the world.

You cannot envision, however, such a change among the men who were part and parcel of the great Russian blood-lettings.

You are committed to the principle of St. John the Divine, that men should be judged by their works—and so you are in favor of keeping America's defense impregnable while we watch and wait for more convincing evidence of the Soviet's regeneration.

When Russia has reversed all the entries of double dealing—

When she has released the thousands of slave laborers and war prisoners who are being held in captivity in violation of law and human decency—

When she has freed her satelite nations and done everything possible to expirate her crimes against civilization—

When she has repudiated her diabolical purpose to rule the world—then perhaps it will be time to take her new look seriously.

How about your views on education?

There was never a time in our history when education was so important to our national vigor, to our very survival, as it is today. The ideological and physical conflicts which embroil the world will be resolved in the realm of the mind and spirit.

You know this. You have come into a new realization of the value of education, and you have a sense of compulsion to do something about it—just what, you are not too sure.

The towering problems of teacher shortages, of tremendou s manpower demands, particularly in the fields of science and engineering and always the problems of finance, do not lend themselves to easy solutions.

Always, in talking about education there arose the subject of Federal aid.

And what is your attitude about Federal aid?

You want no part of it, and you understand clearly why.

You understand that just as livestock lose weight on a long trip to market, so does your tax dollar lose weight on a round trip to Washington.

But that is not your main objection to Federal aid for education. Your objection goes much deeper than that.

You believe in the dispersal of power, particularly with respect to education. You know that if and when local and State authorities surrender their responsibilities for the support and control of our schools, freedom will have lost one of its mightiest citadels.

The Founding Fathers allocated only 17 powers to the Federal Government. The responsibility for education was not one of them. That responsibility was left to the individual States and the people. The architects of our Constitution believed in a government close to the people and in the philosophy of maximum self-determination.

You are familiar with the recent exhaustive studies of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which it was found that not a single State in this Union was unable to finance its educational responsibilities.

The White House Conference confirmed this finding, although in the much discussed report of the conference, this significant fact has not had the emphasis that it deserves.

If I might be permitted to add a footnote to my interpretation of your attitude toward Federal aid to education, it would be this:

The increasing demand for Federal aid has its genesis in the failure of the States to meet educational needs. It can well be that there has been too much emphasis on States' rights and not enough on States' responsibilities.

If the States do not proceed at once—now—to close the gap between what is and what ought to be in education, we will have Federal aid. Children cannot wait, and the national welfare is involved.

Finally, the election year—the year in which a legion of candidates are advancing their personal and party claims to public office.

Among them are those who seek election to the most powerful position in the world—the Presidency of the United States.

This leap-year could be a stimulating and inspiring proposition, a reexamination of governmental practices, a reappraisal of political and economic policies and a reassessment of social accountability. In short—it could be a workshop on citizenship.

But, you say, that such is not the case. You seem to feel that our political campaigns all too frequently take the form of a promising match.

You believe our democratic concepts would be reinforced if we had more leadership and less followship.

You want the kind of leadership that makes us think—instead of followship that tells us what it thinks we want to hear.

We have often wondered—you and I—just what would happen if a politicial Daniel should come to judgment. What would happen if this man, possessed of the God-given power to "make interpretations and dissolve doubts," should announce for public office?

Suppose that he should promise nothing but the equivalent of the Churchillian promise of blood, sweat, and tears.

Would he be heeded—or hung in effigy?

Suppose he should be elected, and suppose that upon some momentous issue with tremendous public appeal, he should say—as did Senator Lamar of my own State—many years ago—"Today I must be true or false."

And then suppose that he took a position for integrity instead of expediency.

Would he be returned—or retired?

You are looking for men like that in public office because—here in Amercia—is the desire of the people to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God.

And now—I close the book on my report.

I conclude, as I began, by saying that no one could emerge from my experience of the past 12 months without becoming a better American.

Whenever I have been abroad, and the hour for returning finally arrives, my thoughts turn to these magnificent lines of Henry Van Dyke:

"Oh, it's home again, and home again,
America for me!
I want a ship that's westward bound to
plough the rolling sea
To the blessed land of room enough be-
yond the ocean bars
Where the air is full of sunlight and the
flag is full of stars."

Here in America—the air is full of sunlight—and the flag is full of stars.

I have never been so proud to be an American.

Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 19, we celebrate a day heavily charged with overtones as to the future of our Nation, Armed Forces Day. The numerous displays of our strength and publicity concerning how our defense effort works, should go a long way toward increasing public understanding of our defense program.

Armed Forces Day is particularly timely this year because it follows so closely on the heels of the passage of the Defense Department appropriation bill here in the House. There were several aspects in the consideration of that measure which deserve the attention of everyone concerned with the future of our Nation.

If there ever was a subject that ought to be completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical, our national defense effort is it. Yet there has been in recent months a good deal of headline-grabbing and wild charges with political overtones, centering around the President's policies with respect to the development of our medium and heavy bomber force.

Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that we cannot permit our Defense Department, and particularly our Stategic Air Force, to become second best. But this is a matter for the experts. What the Russians are really doing, and how our total defense organization compares with them, is something that only our military and intelligence experts can balance out for us. And so far as I am concerned, there is not a man in this country better qualified to do this than President Eisenhower himself. The President rightly cautioned against letting ourselves be misled by what he characterized the "numbers racket" in this field.

The House Appropriations Committee concurred with the President when they made their report on the Defense Department budget. Because these men have been studying this whole situation with minute care, their judgment is doubly significant at a time when our defense preparations are under partisan political attack from snipers who, unlike the members of this committee, have no responsibility for study and determination of what is an adequate and proper figure to fix for our national defense.

Let me quote a few lines from the committee report:

The committee, after extensive hearings * * * feels that, barring unforeseen developments, the amount appropriated is generally adequate to fully implement our projected military requirements for the fiscal year and will enable the Department to continue to give the country an increasingly strong and well-balanced force. The 1957 military budget, perhaps more so than any previous budget in our history, reflects changes and improvements in methods of warfare which we have been forced to develop in an attempt to retain superiority over any possible aggressor.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it necessary to remind the Members of this body that the vote on final passage of the defense budget was 377–0. This smashing victory represents a well-deserved vote of confidence from both sides of the aisle in our defense leaders and their work. It is to be hoped that from now on we will have a lot more cooperation with and trust in our military experts and a lot less partisan pettiness and wild charges.

As we celebrate Armed Forces Day let us remember these things and continue to work to keep our defenses strong. We must never forget that our Armed Forces represents a powerful force for world peace, because they are the greatest deterrent to possible aggression.

I hope that public understanding of our national defense program will be increased by Saturday's activities and that the world will more and more come to see in our strong defenses not a threat to the world, but an affirmation of America's peaceful aspirations.

Problems of a Small Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 Mrs. Robert F. Baxter, of Lumpkin, Ga., wrote a letter to the Letters to the Editor column of the Atlanta Journal.

Mrs. Baxter, living on Lilac Hill Farm, is naturally interested in the farmers' viewpoint, and has ably presented that viewpoint in her letter.

In the last paragraph of her letter she pays a well deserved compliment to her Representative in the United States Congress from the Third Georgia District, Hon. E. L. FORRESTER. He is an able, competent and highly respected Member of the United States House of Representatives, and is a tireless and effective worker not only for his agricultural constituents, but for the welfare of the entire Nation. I join Mrs. Baxter in the wish that we may have more brave men of the caliber of Congressman FORRESTER.

Under unanimous consent I attach herewith the above mentioned letter of Mrs. Baxter:

LILAC HILL FARM,
Lumpkin, Ga., April 26, 1956.

The EDITORS,
Atlanta Journal,
Atlanta, Ga.:

I did not need to read completely through the letter captioned "Could Farmers be a Little Bit Greedy" in yesterday's letters column to know there would be no signature. Yes "Mr. (or Mrs.) Name Withheld," if expecting to get a decent return for the crops we grow to enable us to have the necessities and a few of the pleasures of life is being "a little bit greedy" I suppose 98 percent or more of America's farmers are greedy. Most of the people who express their learned opinions on how much the farmers are making know very little about the situation. If they checked the price farmers must pay for their seeds, fertilizers, equipment, averaged with the years it rained too much or didn't rain at all and learned how much "take-home pay" the farmer really gets, there would be less criticism and more sympathy. But few farmers want sympathy. They merely want to be left alone and not be the subject of a political tempest in a tremendous teapot. Evidently there is a widespread misconception of the word "parity" (even though your paper has done a vital public service by repeatedly explaining it in detail) and I feel sure if our small friend can read, his dictionary will explain to him his error in using the phrase "90 percent loan" indiscriminately.

Farming is a hard and, in the case of small farmers, often a financially unrewarding one. Your obvious question then—why do we farm? First, because both my husband and I grew up on farms and we love it. We find a change of pace and constant challenge in wresting our livelihood from the soil. We gave up a promising career and financial security of the city almost 4 years ago, and came home to the farm as the third generation of my family to till this soil. We are making a success of it and we will continue to do so if the selfish people, who believe the stories constantly making the rounds of how much profit farmers make and how little work they do. We aren't starving and you aren't likely to hear of any farmer willing to use the hands God gave him, starving. But few farmers are making a decent margin of profit in comparison to the other industries.

So, in behalf of all our farmers, won't you look at the problem not only from the side section of your pocketbook from which you must pay a higher price for the produce you buy than a few years back but also from the farmers' angle of getting the same or perhaps a little more for his produce as a few years back but who also must pay the same prices for things his farm will not produce. We are not a down-trodden, ignorant class of people as many of the tired old jokes would have you believe. We are as intelligent and well read and enlightened as any other class of people as a whole. We are far too smart to be yelled or ridiculed into submitting uncomplainingly to an intolerable situation not of our own making. Why should there be any necessity for the phrases "country bumpkins" or "city slickers" for the same God made us all and we are almost all engaged in seeking to insure a measure of health and happiness for ourselves and our families. If we do not work together and help each other we have missed the entire concept of life in a free nation.

When people speak so freely of the Government aid to farmers, I wonder if they have stopped to examine the aid, either directly or indirectly, given to their particular industry or profession.

Our Nation's economy would fall overnight if all the fields were idle, but many, many other industries could cause the same effect if they ceased. But you rarely read of a farmer suggesting that an automobile dealer or an insurance broker or similar endeavor lowering their prices because we realize, perhaps better than most, that although we do

not enjoy paying high prices for their products, that the cost of producing the product or service would make such a step prohibitive.

Are farmers, then, being unreasonable for wishing that someone who has no political ax to grind or fear in their hearts that some class might make a penny more than they, examine the farm situation earnestly and prayerfully and come up with a workable solution? We realize it is a tremendous problem, and it will take someone far wiser than we to solve it. We wish with all our hearts we had more brave men of the caliber of our Third District Representative, the Honorable E. L. FORRESTER, who has fought so long and tirelessly for a workable solution fair to both the farmer and consumer.

Sincerely,

FRANCES NEWMAN BAXTER.
Mrs. Robert F. Baxter.

Katyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the Associated Press carried a dispatch from Warsaw, Poland, stating that the present Communist Government proposes to launch an investigation to determine the facts as to whether the Soviet Government massacred thousands of Polish military officers and civic leaders in the Katyn forest at the beginning of World War II.

On May 3, Polish Constitution Day, I filed a resolution asking the Congress to request the State Department to forward the reports, findings and evidence recorded by the select committee which investigated the Katyn massacre in the 82d Congress. If the Polish Communist Government is serious in exposing the international crimes of Joe Stalin the testimony of 220 sworn witnesses taken in America, England, and Europe during the Katyn committee hearings should be of great value to inform the world again about the Kremlin crimes.

The following resolution presented by Vincent A. Basinski, of the Polish Army Veterans' Association, was adopted unanimously at their meeting held in Gary, Ind., in September of last year:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PUBLIC COMMEMORATION OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Assembled on this 18th day of September 1955, in Gary, Ind., at the Polish Home, 1600 Pennsylvania Street, to commemorate the first public protest in America against the savage acts of genocide that were, and are being perpetrated by the Soviet Union against the Polish Nation, as exemplified by the unprecedented in history, and most bestial mass murder of 15,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, Kozielsk, Starobielsk and Ostashkov areas by the Russian secret police, we, the representatives of various veterans', civic and fraternal organizations, unanimously resolve to bring before the forum of public opinion certain facts and grievances that came into being during the 6 years of our endeavors to bring justice and Christian morality into international affairs, to wit:

1. We assure the martyred, persecuted and enslaved Polish Nation, that we will not cease in our attempt to bring the perpetrators of the Katyn massacre to the bar of justice either at the General Assembly of the United Nations, or the inernational tribunal, or a special judicial body competent to render at least an advisory opinion.

2. We cannot agree with, nor can we condon in silence the position taken by a State Department's functionary, Mr. Thruston B. Morton, who in a letter to Representative RAY J. MADDEN, dated May 14, 1953, and cloaked in fine and empty legal terminology, revealed impotent expediency of the State Department and its unwillingness to bring the Katyn findings of the select committee for a discussion in the United Nation General Assembly. We strongly feel that the principle of elementary justice and decency was pushed aside in fear of offending the Kremlin tyrants with innocent Polish blood on their hands, when said State Department's functionary advised the select committee of the 82d Congress not to press resolution 63 which demanded that the Katyn mass murder be brought at least for discussion before the United Nations General Assembly.

3. Again, we express our most sincere thanks and grätitude to Representative RAY J. MADDEN from the First Indiana District, who took the Katyn matter into his heart, delivered several addresses before the House of Representatives, published several Katyn resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then became chairman of the select committee to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. In this work, Representative RAY J. MADDEN has shown statesmanlike wisdom and courage rarely to be found in our diplomatic personnel.

4. We wish to highly commend the work of the chairman of the First Katyn Observance Committee, Mr. Vincent A. Basinski, whose untiring efforts resulted in the Katyn commemorations on September 18, 1949, in Gary, Ind.; on May 6, 1951, in South Bend, Ind., and today's meeting in Gary, as well as several resolutions passed through his inspiring work at conventions, meetings, and observances of the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc.

5. We pledge our civic endeavors toward the end that the Katyn massacre perpetrators be brought to justice, other acts of genocide revealed and prevented on the face of the earth, thus making this world a safer and more orderly place in which to live—in peace and justice, and under the eternal precepts of Christian ethics.

Committee of resolutions:

JOSEPH WIEWIORA, *Chairman.*
ZYGMUNT STARKO, *Cochairman.*
W. WAWRZYNIAK, *Secretary.*

Passed and unanimously approved by all participants of the third solemn commemoration of the Katyn massacre.

Presiding officers:

T. S. KUBIAK, *Chairman.*
SOPHIE DORSCH, *Secretary.*

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, Monday, May 14, 1956:

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH

After still another close and thorough checkup there is a further report on the health of President Eisenhower. It is detailed and precise. What is most important is that it is completely favorable.

We have occasion to congratulate the President upon his fine recovery. We also congratulate ourselves upon the restored health of our Chief Executive. We are happy for him, for his family and for the Nation.

This whole matter of the President's illness has been handled in an unusual way. Never before in our history has the public been so completely and carefully informed of the character of a President's illness and every step in his recovery. Since we know the sort of person he is we cannot believe that the President has had any feeling of chagrin or resentment over this continuous personal and even intimate publicity. He has obviously felt that his fellow countrymen had a right to be concerned over his health and that they had also a right to be fully informed. We appreciate his generosity and applaud his good judgment.

This latest complete report on his condition should go far to take the issue of the President's health out of the current presidential campaign. This should be a good thing, not merely because unpleasant and even morbid personalities can be avoided. It will make it possible to concentrate closer attention on what are and ought to be the real and big issues.

The voters are being asked to judge an administration and its accomplishments. They will be voting, if indirectly, on such questions as foreign aid, national defense, farm policy, fiscal responsibility, and administrative integrity. It is right that their attention should be focused on such questions and not diverted by something that is now most happily, no longer an issue.

It is also fortunate that this favorable report on the President's health should come out at this time because of its undoubted impact on the whole field of foreign affairs. President Eisenhower has become a very real symbol of a troubled world's search for peace. He occupies an unusual position in the esteem of other peoples. His word carries weight, not merely because of the great country for which he speaks, but because the sense of his own integrity has been translated into terms that people all over the world seem to understand.

At the time of the President's initial illness there was a veritable torrent of messages from every part of the earth. They expressed a deep concern over the well-being of a trusted friend. With his steady recovery there has been also a worldwide feeling of thankfulness and relief. The President's health is an international concern.

So we are glad to get this good report. We wish the President many more years of a happy and useful life.

Eugene J. Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Members of the House of the passing of Eugene J. Butler, an eminent Catholic gentleman and layman, who was known to so many of us

as the executive director of the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Probably no layman within our memory has accomplished more on behalf of his church and his country than has Mr. Butler, for he was devoted in his service to both. The greatest tribute that I can pay to his memory is to include in the extension of my remarks, the eulogy that was delivered at his funeral this morning by His Excellency, Right Rev. Emmett M. Walsh, bishop of the diocese of Youngstown, Ohio:

TEXT OF SERMON OF BISHOP WALSH

REQUIEM—EUGENE J. BUTLER

Your Excellencies, and so forth, Brethren in the Lord:

"Lord, Thou didst deliver to me 5 talents, behold I have gained other 5 over and above. His Lord said to him, "Well done, good and faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord" (Matthew 25: 20–21).

Our hearts are sad today in the presence of death, the death of one whom we have loved in life for his wholesome Christian manhood and his warn personality rich in wisdom as well as charm, endowed with a genuis for understanding and generous friendship animated by Christian charity.

Not the least of his virtues was the fortitude with which he walked for months with full knowledge of his true condition of health, down into the valley "in the midst of the shadows of death." His most intimate friends heard no word of complaint. He was always "fine" when they inquired. His work went on day by day, his mind was keen, his interest and effectiveness seemed never to diminish, until the end was almost at hand. "I am now in the hands of God, and I need the prayers of my friends." These were his words as he took to his bed for the long and weary weeks of suffering he bore so patiently and humbly in union with the sufferings of his crucified Lord.

His faith and confidence were in Christ Jesus our Lord, "in whom the hope of a happy resurrection has shone upon us," according to the words of the preface of the Mass of Requiem, "so that those whom the certain fate of dying renders sad, may be consoled by the promise of future immortality. For with regard to thy faithful, O Lord, life is changed, not taken away, and the house of this earthly habitation being destroyed, an eternal dwelling in heaven is obtained."

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing Eugene J. Butler in life understand his courage to live with confidence and, with unperturbed mind, carry on his work as the shadows deepened and the house of his earthly habitation was falling in ruins around him. For he was a man of living faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in all the truths He revealed with divine authority and in His promises of eternal life. We can remember occasions when life challenged Mr. Butler's faith and he would, with calm and steady eyes and smiling countenance give the Catholic answer by word or deed. A loyal soldier of Jesus Christ in full health, shirking none of life's responsibilities, he was in failing health faithful and true to the end.

He loved God and had an abounding charity for his fellow men. He was a devoted son of Holy Church. The church's voice was ever to him the voice of Jesus Christ teaching. The church's ministrations were to him, as to every true Catholic, the saving ministrations of Jesus Christ our eternal High Priest. We who knew him and loved him in life have the consoling hope that he now knows and enjoys the good things that God has prepared for them that love Him.

Yet we must remember the words of St. Paul, "But to me it is a very small thing to be judged by you or by man's day. But neither do I judge my own self. For I am not conscious to myself of anything. Yet am I not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord" (I Corinthians 4: 3, 4).

So let us remember those other words of Holy Scripture, "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins" (2 Maccabees 13: 46). Let all of us who knew Eugene Butler as a friend, all who esteemed and loved him in life, remember him often before the altar of God and pray that God grant him eternal rest and peace and let perpetual light shine upon him.

But on this sad occasion, I must have more to say, because Mr. Butler was more than an exemplary Catholic. He was a servant of the church distinguished by his singular devotion to her cause, no less than by the high degree of excellence of the service he rendered. He was an able lawyer with a unique genius for discerning the church's true interests in the fields of legislation and public policy. He had expert knowledge of the legislative process as well as of administrative and judicial procedures, and profound respect for these American institutions.

With these gifts and accomplishments he was utterly dedicated to the service of the church. His personal integrity, engaging personality, and innate honesty, as well as his realistic understanding of the problems of men in public life, gave him ready access to all with whom he had to deal, when he came to discuss the church's interests or her position on public questions. They knew he came to make no deals and to ask nothing that would compromise the public welfare or the individual conscience. He came to present the church as she really is, to give a forthright explanation of the church's God-given rights and her legitimate interests, as for instance, in education and in social legislation, social welfare policies, public morality, the protection of the morals of our youth, and the preservation of our Christian traditions and sound religious values in law and public policy.

In a very true sense, Mr. Butler was an ambassador of good will and understanding and often seemed to have a special "grace of office" to serve God and His holy church and at the same time contribute to our country's welfare. His prestige with official Washington over a period of almost 3 decades was remarkable. In his humility he would say that his prestige was that of the bishops, whom he represented. The truth, however, was that he was jealous of the honor of the church. He had a profound sense of responsibility to represent the church truly and well and he dedicated his life and his talents without reservation to the church's cause. The quality of his service enhanced the prestige of the church and her influence for good in our land.

As a legal adviser to the bishops, Mr. Butler enjoyed their utmost confidence through the years. When decisions were in the making he could be relied upon for a realistic appraisal of all the elements involved, a competent presentation of the law and the facts that were pertinent, and prudent counsel as to the appropriate course of action. His advice was objective and wise, and characteristically was always presented as the advice of the legal department, with full credit to his associates for their contribution.

I am sure the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops of the United States would have me pay tribute to his memory in their name. They have known through the years the invaluable service that he rendered them in the discharge of their responsibilities for the welfare of the church. They have always appreciated his splendid Catholic manhood, his clear and sound Catholic mind illumined by faith, his high professional competence, his wise counsel, his zeal for the welfare of the church, and his profound spirit of dedication to her service. They honored him with their complete confidence. They held him in esteem, which deepened through the years. With his passing into eternity they are conscious of a deep sense of loss, and all over our country archbishops and bishops are offering holy mass for his eternal repose. They would have me say these words of sympathy and consolation with Mr. Butler's family.

Here, we have united with the archbishop in offering the holy sacrifice of the mass for the repose of the soul of our departed brother. In the spirit of prayer it is not hard for us to imagine him rendering an account of his use of the talents given him by his Lord. Nor is it hard to imagine our Lord saying to him, "Well done, good and faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many * * * enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

For this happy reward he labored in life, and we, his friends, devoutly pray.

Why No More Helicopter Subsidy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith for the RECORD, an editorial published in the San Francisco Examiner on May 1 concerning the need for helicopter service for the San Franciso International Airport—one of the largest airports in the United States. I include with it a copy of a speech made by James S. Ricklefs, president of Rick Helicopters, Inc., of San Francisco. These articles point out the necessity for a review by the Civil Aeronautics Board and Civil Air Administration of our present airport facility programs in view of the forthcoming development of jet liners and the possible further removal of metropolitan airports from nearby downtown areas. Our highways are crowded every hour of the day and frequently more time is lost in transportation to and from airports than is consumed in actual flight. The use of the helicopter may conceivably be the answer to this problem. I submit these articles so that they may be reviewed by the members of the CAB and CAA and appropriate committees of Congress:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of May 1, 1956]

TRUTH, JUSTICE, PUBLIC SERVICE

Every major airline serving San Francisco has now placed orders for jets or turboprops or both. The near advent of these high speed planes makes more necessary than ever a helicopter passenger service radiating from San Francisco International Airport to all principal cities of the Bay region.

The turboprop will shave 28 minutes off the Los Angeles-San Francisco flight time, doing the run in 1 hour and 7 minutes. But if the flight is completed at a morning or evening rush hour, as many of them are, a traveler bound for Berkeley will need another hour and seven minutes by car to get there. A helicopter could do it in less than 15 minutes.

The pure jet will knock 3 hours off the New York-San Francisco flight time, making it in 5 hours. After that swift journey, a crowded airport bus on a crowded freeway will seem a horse and buggy to the traveler. A helicopter could deposit him downtown in 7 minutes.

Three cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles—now have such 'copter service. Every large metropolitan area needs it, for it is the one way to outwit surface congestion.

Thus far, however, the Civil Aeronautics Board and Post Office Department have refused to grant mail subsidies for helicopter operations in additional cities. Without subsidy the service is not possible.

Such cities as Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland have the same interest in this matter as San Francisco. We suggest our Bay area officials and Congressmen take the lead in forming these cities into a bloc that can make itself heard before the CAB and Postmaster General.

WHY NO MORE HELICOPTER SUBSIDY?

(Speech by James S. Ricklefs, president, Rick Helicopters, Inc., San Francisco International Airport, San Francisco, Calif., for presentation at the 12th annual forum of the American Helicopter Society, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 2, 3, 4, 1956)

SUMMARY

In the light of the billions of dollars spent by the Federal Government to subsidize various segments of the American economy and in the light of the past subsidies given to the transportation industry to foster its development in its early infancy, this paper seeks to prove that the Civil Aeronautics Board should reexamine its present policy of granting a limited subsidy on an experimental basis to the helicopter transport industry. When the current relatively large subsidy payments to the local service air carriers are considered along with the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue the development of air transportation, the author believes that it is in the interest of public welfare; the interest of national defense; and the interest of consistent national transportation policy that we justly ask the question—Why no more helicopter subsidy?

INTRODUCTION

According to Webster's dictionary, subsidy is defined in several ways, two of which are particularly applicable for present purposes. The first definition states that subsidy is: "Any gift of money or property made by one person to another by way of financial aid." The second definition and one which is often overlooked, calls subsidy "A grant of funds or property from a government * * * to a private person or company to assist in the establishment or support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public."

Unfortunately a subsidy is in many instances considered to be merely a handout, as implied in the first of the definitions, even though the grantor is the Federal, State, or local government. In a larger sense, all Government expenditures are of the nature of subsidies, for directly or indirectly they are meant to serve, and indeed they exist for the very purpose of, public welfare. This fact only too frequently escapes notice. This oversight on the part of many people is doubtless responsible for the derogatory connotation that may attach itself to the term, even though we dwell in the midst of subsidies, direct or indirect.

It is the object of this speech to analyze objectively and, where possible, quantitatively, the factors which have had an impact on more obvious types of subsidies in the United States in order to determine the relative position and magnitude of the subsidy paid to the aviation industry, and especially to helicopter service.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

We are surrounded by subsidies in various forms. There are farm subsidies which have taken the form of parity payments, and in the early days of our Nation, homestead land grants to encourage the development of new farmlands. During the dismal decade of the 1930's, farmers were given direct cash payments for reduction of output, by virtue of which the crop producers obtained a larger return than sole dependence on market prices could give. A different purpose was served by the subsidies granted to the farmers during World War II. In this case, the objective was to hold down consumer prices by compensating food producers for a rollback in their selling prices to a level below that prevailing in the open market. The subsidy was paid the farmers and benefited the public, which was protected against high prices.

Here then are three ways in which farmers have been subsidized; the subsidies have shared the common purpose of furthering public welfare. The homestead grants opened new sources of food supply; the output reduction payments contributed to market stability and redistribution of income; and rollback subsidies gave lower prices to consumers. The difficulty in reaching any definite amount one can set as the subsidy to the agriculture industry via these three methods can be appreciated by examining the huge list of legislation in past history which has provided these subsidies. By using the limited definition of the "Current Expenses for Aids and Special Services" in the annual Federal budget, such Government expenditures for agriculture in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, have totaled $3,773,000,000.[1] This figure does not even include the losses incurred under the Commodity Credit Corporation's price support program of over $1 billion.

The tariff, of course, is another form of subsidy, although it is commonly thought of as a protector of the American standard of living, and it benefits many industries and agriculture in this country, but costs consumers many millions. Included in these tariffs are all the infant industries which, through tariff protection, are shielded against competition from foreign exports. Most notable example of this is the sugar tariff during the 1930's, which cost consumers on the average of $273,632,755 a year.[2] The reasons for these huge figures become clear when it is realized that domestic producers of sugar refine only about 20 percent of the consumption, thus raising the price of all imported sugar by the amount of the tariff. It was estimated by the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941 that at that time it was fair to place the approximate amount of the tariff subsidy for all products at a conservative figure of $1 billion a year.[3]

Labor, too, has been subsidized in various ways. During the early part of the New Deal administration, the work relief programs of the Works Progress Administration and the Public Works Administration, and the tree-planting activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps were all forms of temporary subsidies, granted to keep our economy from bogging down. These subsidization policies were followed by others of a more permanent character such as social security benefits and low-cost public housing. Again looking at the Federal budget account for "Current Expenses for Aid and Special Services," Government expenditure for labor in the years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, was $1,435,000,000.[4] These social security benefits including unemployment insurance and old-age pensions can be justified on the grounds of assuring the industrial working population of a more regular and somewhat augmented participation in the national real income produced annually.

Footnotes at end of speech.

During the same 6-year period, according to the same source, the Federal Government made payments to the veterans of the United States Armed Forces of over $32 billion, most of which was spent immediately and fell directly into the cash registers of business.

Figure 1 illustrates the relative position and magnitude of the various types of direct and indirect subsidies, as defined earlier, paid by the Federal Government in the fiscal year of 1955. These figures are designed to represent conservative estimates compiled by the House Committee on Agriculture and other governmental agencies. The majority of subsidies illustrated in the exhibit are mostly of the indirect type, since the Government is seldom frank about calling a subsidy by its true name. Of particular interest and significance is the small spectrum at the far right in the exhibit. This minute column represents the tiny $2 million subsidy paid in 1955 for helicopter service.

If time and the listener's patience permitted, a list of subsidy recipients could be expanded. However, since we are considering the aviation industry and helicopters, let us note first how the transportation industry as a whole has been subsidized and then turn our attention to helicopters.

TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES

Promotional activities and financial aids by the Federal Government for the development of transportation facilities have a long history which dates back to the early periods of constructing canals, harbors, roads, and railways in this country. State and local agencies have likewise participated widely in fostering improved means of transportation to meet their expanding needs and to enhance their agricultural, commercial, and industrial opportunities.

While George Washington was President, subsidies for canals and roads were voted by Congress and later the Pony Express was also supported by this means. From 1850 until 1871, railroads were granted land in the great undeveloped regions of the West and Midwest, to aid in opening up that territory for settlement. By 1930 total land grants to the railroads by Federal and State agencies aggregated 176,030,259 acres, at a total value of approximately $422 million.[5] In addition, cash contribution and stock and bond subscriptions came to nearly $200 million. As a result of the increased value of the lands donated, in 1950 the total value of all aids received by the class I railroads was $1,070 million, representing about 4 percent of the investment in this class of railroad.[6] This figure compares with a subsidy of close to 85 percent in the case of waterways. Although the railroads under present conditions do not receive financial help from the Government, it has been shown that they did receive considerable aid in and during their period of infancy with the help of strong political pressure groups in Congress.

Shipping over our inland waterways has received and is receiving subsidies in large amounts. Although these activities date back more than 160 years to 1790, it is significant that the great bulk of the aggregate expenditures has occurred in comparatively recent years—over three-fourths since 1920 and more than 60 percent since 1930. Findings of a Government agency investigating the subject indicate that in the 160 years, total waterway expenditures for river and harbor improvements amounted to nearly $4 billion. Unlike the railroad land grants, there are no offsets to this subsidy, and the users of the waterways (except for the Panama Canal) pay nothing for their privilege. Since the Army Corps of Engineers maintains some 190 harbors, 400 locks and dams, and 27,000 miles of improved channels, it can be seen why the annual subsidies spent in keeping the waterway system in operation are substantial.[7]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Subsidies for ocean shipping are of a different nature and now have the distinction of being called by their true name in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Prior to that year, ship operators had been subsidized by authority granted the Postmaster General to make grants-in-aids to ocean shipping, without requiring the transportation of a single pound of mail. From 1847 to 1936 such subsidies amount to over $55 million.[8] Since 1936, the Federal Maritime Board is authorized and directed, when requested by a steamship operator, to make up any disadvantage which an American-flag company might suffer in competition with foreign operators. Since the latter are frequently able to offer lower rates because of lower construction and operating costs of their vessels, our shipping would be at a disadvantage without the subsidies granted. In the 6 prewar years 1936–42, the total net operating subsidy (after certain repayments) was $17 million. In the 7 postwar years 1947–54 (after the program had been suspended and renewed) the comparable figure was $203 million. Currently, prospective subsidies are running between $65 million and $70 million a year.[9]

Under the same legislative act, the Government may contribute, as a construction differential subsidy, the difference between the cost of building vessels in American and in foreign yards. This contribution is nominally limited to a third of total cost. But where there is convincing evidence that American yards cannot compete on this basis, it may be raised to half. And where a ship is designed to include features that increase its potential usefulness for national defense, the fraction may be even higher. The liner *United States* was built at a cost of $76,800,000. Of this $43,900,000 was put up by the Government as a subsidy and only $32,900,000 by United States Lines.[10] This subsidy payment alone was more than the entire domestic aviation industry received during 1955.

Commercial highway users, namely trucks and buses, have been and are being subsidized to the extent that the registration fees, toll charges, and fuel or special taxes paid to the governments providing the roads and highways do not cover the share of maintenance costs assignable to the commercial vehicle operators. According to a public-aid study made 3 years ago, these costs amounted to $45 billion from 1921 to 1950.[11] Much of the use made of highway facilities is by private automobiles and military traffic, a circumstance which complicates the problem of determining what portion of the highway costs should be borne by truckers and bus operators.

AIR TRANSPORTATION AID

Turning now to air transportation, we find that governmental aid has taken four forms: airways, airports, and other navigational facilities have been furnished; aeronautical research and development have been carried on; taxation concessions have been given; and airmail payments have been made far in excess of what could be reasonably considered as compensation for mail service alone.

Since 1926, the Federal Government has furnished the domestic airlines with various airway aids, such as intermediate landing fields, lights, radio markers, weather reports, communication facilities, and recently, instrument landing systems and radar controls. These aids have been supplied at no cost to the users, which include private and military flyers as well as commercial pilots. Airports have been constructed and maintained by both the Federal and local governments, with only a portion of the costs assignable to the scheduled airlines covered by landing fees and other payments. During the 1930's alone, various Government agencies spent $704 million building or improving 3,029 airports, exclusive of military airports on which was spent another $400 million.[12] In the fiscal year 1955, this subsidy is currently costing the Federal Government around $90 million annually.[13]

Aeronautical research is conducted for the benefit of aviation in general and not for commercial air transport alone. While this class of user undoubtedly derives great value from the activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which carries on this research, it is impossible to measure the amount of these benefits in terms of dollars and cents.

Taxation concessions to air transportation fihave been granted by many States but not by the Federal Government. Gasoline used by aircraft is either declared tax exempt or a partial or total tax refund is given the purchasers in several States having an aviation fuel tax. In some instances a third form of concession is given through taxing aircraft gasoline at a lower rate than that applying to other motor fuels.

Last, but by no means least, our airlines have been subsidized through payments made by the Post Office Department. The air carriers have occupied a unique position in the field of transportation, since they are the only type which, by act of Congress, were set up in business largely by mail pay. This policy is almost entirely confined to our country although foreign airlines have received other forms of aid from their respective governments. These forms include government investment of capital, direct cash payments, provision of flying equipment and ground facilities, taxation exemptions, and training of personnel at government expense.

Aid to air transportation through mail pay had its origin some 30 years ago, when these payments were more than 80 percent of total airline revenues. Thus the Federal Government, once again, chose to subsidize an infant industry which was vital to sound national transportation policy. It should be noted that not once was the early airline industry placed in an experimental stage in order to improve its cost structure or competitive position. Rather it grew rapidly, regardless of high operating costs, at the expense of the Government. Through fiscal year 1954 the airline industry had received over $300 million in mail-pay subsidies alone.[14] Therefore, it is easy to conclude that during most of the past 30 years, mail-pay subsidies have been the lifeblood of the air-transport industry.

A glimpse of the present airline-subsidy picture may be seen in figure 2. This figure illustrates the comparative subsidy as a percent of total mail pay for the fiscal year 1955. It is significant to note that 94 percent of the mail pay received by the local service carriers is a subsidy. This compares with 86.5 percent for helicopters, and 57 percent for the average of the entire industry. A slightly different comparison is shown in figure 3. In this figure the actual dollar amounts of mail pay for the different classes of domestic air-carrier groups are separated into two groups—service pay and subsidy. This new plan of separation went into effect late in 1951 and gives a much clearer picture to airline subsidies. Thus it may be seen in this exhibit that the local service carriers (groups 3–6) receive the majority of subsidy payments. For comparative purposes, the helicopter lines are more nearly like these feeder or local service carriers than domestic trunk carriers with respect to two important operating ratios, percentage of scheduled miles completed, and average daily utilization of revenue-producing aircraft. Furthermore, both of these types of carriers conduct a short-haul, common-carrier service and have a great deal of the same characteristics and problems. The first local local-service airline was certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1946 to provide, on a regional basis, air service among the smaller communities and to link these small communities with major terminals. The local-service carriers have grown very rapidly since 1946 despite high operating costs, and currently are receiving a subsidy of over $23 million annually.[15]. In comparison, the first helicopter service authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board was certificated in 1947. Only 2 more such helicopter services have been authorized and all 3 are on an experimental basis at the present time, receiving less than $3 million annually.[16]

The major reason for this limitation being placed on the growth of the helicopter industry is the high operating costs in comparison to other forms of transportation. Yet the Honorable Oswald Ryan, former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, stated in a speech before the National Aeronautics Association in late 1954 the following comments concerning the operating costs of the local-service carriers:

"Now the problem of accomplishing lower operating costs * * * is a difficult one in times like the present. But operating expense is only one aspect of the local-service problem, although it is an important one. The other aspect is the necessity for obtaining greater revenues, and it is my own opinion that the most important problem in the local-service picture is the enlargement of the carriers' revenues. I doubt very much if we may expect, under present conditions, any very great improvement in costs, but there is plenty of room for development of more revenues, and this means more traffic from the communities they serve." [17]

It would seem that this statement should also be applied to the helicopter services. Why should one type of air carrier be exempt from the importance of maintaining a low-cost structure and receive a tremendous subsidy payment, while a similar type of carrier is penalized for incurring relatively high operating costs and operated on an experimental basis still receiving a very small subsidy?

Similarly in January of this year, Mr. Raymond Sawyer, Executive Director of the Civil Aeronautics Board, stated in a speech before the eighth annual convention of the Helicopter Association of America regarding future CAB policy concerning helicopter subsidy:

"When American industry has met that challenge, and we have a multiengine, economic, 35- to 50-place helicopter, which has a reasonable chance of operating commercially without Government subsidy. * * * I am certain you will find the Civil Aeronautics Board not only willing but anxious to join with you in doing its part to further the new dimension of air transportation." [18]

In the light of past subsidy payments to the transportation industry, what would have been the effect of such a policy upon the growth and development of the American maritime and aviation industries in their period of infancy? Why must the helicopter industry be placed in an experimental category until it finds a helicopter which can operate commercially without Government subsidy? Sound national transportation policy, as well as national defense, requires that the helicopter industry be allowed to expand now, and become an aggressive and progressive industry.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 gave the Civil Aeronautics Board the authority to determine and prescribe the rates of compensation to be paid the carriers. In setting the rates the Board was directed to take into consideration "* * * the need of each such air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical,

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense." [19]

If the helicopter was not a vehicle of such potential and value in the civil defense, disaster, and transportation service, then it would not be deserving of Government support, but such is not the case. As a past example of subsidy that paid tremendous dividends in both money and life, let's recall to mind the civilian pilot training program started by far-thinking and courageous men in the 1930's over much economic objection. The value of having trained pilots when war broke out could not be measured in dollars. How much it shortened the war; how many lives it saved, can only be a guess. In the event of national disaster the helicopter will be one of the few remaining links in transportation and communication. Should we wait until this day to start building and metropolitan helicopter fleets, the maintenance facilities, the trained personnel, the heliports, the routes and the navigational aids? Should we be penny-wise and pound-foolish?

In conclusion, having considered the billions of dollars spent by the Federal Government to subsidize various segments of the American economy, having considered the past subsidies given to the transportation industry to foster its development in its early infancy, having considered the relatively large subsidy payments made to the local service air carriers, and having considered the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue the development of air transportation, I believe that it is in the interest of public welfare; the interest of national defense; and the interest of consistent national transportation policy that we justly ask the question, Why no more helicopter subsidy?

---

[1] House Committee on Agriculture, Government Subsidy Historical Review (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 3, 1954), p. 4.

[2] Temporary National Economic Committee, Industrial Concentration and Tariffs Monograph No. 10 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1941), p. 10.

[3] Ibid, p. 83.

[4] House Committee on Agriculture, op. cit., p. 2.

[5] National Economic and Social Planning Association, Public Aids To Transportation (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1940), p. 3.

[6] Burton N. Behling, Subsidies to Transportation (Washington: The Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, August 1950), p. 55.

[7] Ibid, p. 56.

[8] Report of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, November 1947), p. 12.

[9] House Committee on Agriculture, op. cit., p. 4.

[10] New York Times, November 14, 1953, p. 52.

[11] Burton N. Behling, op. cit., p. 27.

[12] House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Airport Subsidies—79th Congress, 1st session, H. R. 3170 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1945), p. 22.

[13] House Committee on Agriculture, op. cit., p. 3.

[14] House Committee on Agriculture, op. cit., p. 4.

[15] Civil Aeronautics Board, Administrative Separation of Total Mail Payments to United States Air Carriers (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, September 1953), appendix 5.

[16] Ibid, appendix 5.

[17] Oswald Ryan, An Address Before the Greater St. Louis Chapter of the National Aeronautic Association, October 21, 1954, p. 3.

[18] Raymond Sawyer, The Promise of Helicopter Transportation—An Address Before the Eighth Annual Convention of the Helicopter Association of America, January 24, 1956, p. 10.

[19] Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, 52 Stat. 998, sec. 406 (b).

Declaration of Convictions by Citizens of Prince Edward County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Prince Edward County, Va., faced with the gravest crisis ever faced by the people of that county, have made their decision, a decision with which I am in entire accord and one that I am proud of.

As a result of the decision of the so-called Supreme Court of the United States of America on May 17, 1954, the school system of our State was wrecked; the rights of our people mutilated; and the sovereignty of our State desecrated. Somewhere along the line, it become necessary to meet the issue head-on. This the people and officials of Prince Edward County have done. They have drawn the line. They have gone about the matter in a calm, deliberate, and Christian manner. It remains to be seen whether the officials of this State and the other people in the State have the intestinal fortitude, the will to preserve our way of life, and the ability to analyze the situation so as to preserve the rights of our people and the sovereignty of our State by standing four-square behind the citizens of Prince Edward County.

I hereby call on all people of this great country of ours, who believe in the freedom of the individual, who believe in the dignity of the individual, and who believe that the government is a servant of the people, to take time enough to thoroughly understand the situation confronting the people of the South and to search their hearts and souls in an endeavor to realize fully the seriousness of our problem and to make up their minds whether or not they desire the individuals and the States to be taken over and molded into creatures following the political philosophy of an arrogant, despotic Supreme Court of the United States of America which no longer represents an arm of the Federal Government that one can look upon with pride and a feeling of security, but rather one that we must look upon with alarm and shame.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith a copy of the affirmation signed by over 4,000 citizens of Prince Edward County, a copy of resolutions passed by the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, and a copy of the declaration of convictions adopted on May 3, 1956, by the citizens of Prince Edward County, Va., in a mass meeting assembled at Farmville, Va., which are as follows:

AFFIRMATION

We, the undersigned citizens of Prince Edward County, Va., hereby affirm our conviction that the separation of the races in the public schools of this county is absolutely necessary and do affirm that we prefer to abandon public schools and educate our children in some other way if that be necessary to preserve separation of the races in the schools of this county.

We pledge our support of the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County in their firm maintenance of this policy.

NOTE.—This affirmation has been signed by 4,216 citizens over 21 years of age in the county which is 1,000 more than the total qualified registered voters.

RESOLUTIONS

At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County held at the courthouse thereof, on the 3d day of May 1956, at which meeting all members of the board were present, the following resolutions were adopted unanimously:

I

Be it resolved by the board of supervisors, That we do hereby express to the people of Prince Edward County our gratitude that they have made known to this board so clearly their views upon the grave problems with which we are confronted with respect to our schools. The support of our people makes the burden of our responsibilities lighter and the course of our future action clearer. We trust the people of the county will continue to make known to us their views as we go forward to meet our problems together.

II

Be it resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County as the elected representatives of the people of Prince Edward County, do hereby declare it to be the policy and intention of said board in accordance with the will of the people of said county that no tax levy shall be made upon the said people nor public revenue derived from local taxes shall be appropriated for the operation and maintenance of public schools in said county wherein white and colored children are taught together under any plan or arrangement whatsoever.

III

Be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, That the Governor of Virginia, the superintendent of public instruction, and the State Board of Education are hereby requested to pay any State revenue to the School Board of Prince Edward County in support of public schools in accordance with the policy adopted by the board of supervisors of said county for the payment of local revenue to said school board.

IV

Be it further resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, That the "Affirmation" signed by citizens and school patrons of the county is hereby received and directed to be filed with records of the board and it is further resolved that the "Statement of Convictions and Purposes" adopted by the citizens of this county present at this meeting (being approximately 250 in number) be received by the board and it is directed that the same be filed with the records of the board.

And the clerk of this board is directed to prepare copies of the affirmation with a statement attached thereto showing the number of the citizens whose names are signed thereto together with copies of the "Statement of Convictions and Purposes" and that one copy of each be transmitted to

the School Board of Prince Edward County, the Governor of Virginia, the superintendent of public instruction, the attorney general of Virginia, the State Board of Education, Representative J. H. Daniel and Senator J. D. Hagood, together with a copy of this resolution, and of the resolution this day adopted stating the policy and intention of this board with respect to the levy of taxes and appropriation of local revenue for school purposes.

V

Be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, That the Governor be and he is hereby respectfully requested not to call a special session of the Legislature of Virginia for the purpose of presenting any legislative plan which would require, permit, or authorize under the laws of Virginia the teaching of white and Negro children together in the public schools of Prince Edward County.

HORACE ADAMS,
Clerk of the Board.

DECLARATION OF CONVICTIONS

(Adopted May 3, 1956, by citizens of Prince Edward County, Va.)

The power of the Federal courts being once again invoked against the administrative officers of our public schools for the purpose of causing children of the white and Negro race to be taught together therein, we the people of Prince Edward County, Va., deem it appropriate that we should make known to all men our convictions and our purposes.

We first affirm our deep and abiding loyalty and devotion to our country and its institutions. We acknowledge the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land and the bulwark of our liberties, ever subject to the sovereign powers reserved by it to the States and to the people. We know that the liberties of all Americans of all races rests upon the Constitution and the division of powers ordained therein. We deem it the obligation of free men to preserve the powers reserved under the Constitution to the States and to the people and to preserve the constitutional separation of the powers of government in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches separately.

We believe that the educational, social, and cultural welfare and growth of both the white and Negro races is best served by separation of the races in the public schools.

We believe the tranquillity, harmony, progress, and advancement of the Negro and the white races, who must live together in Virginia and in Prince Edward County, is absolutely dependent upon the mutual good will and mutual respect of each race for the other.

We believe that a policy which undertakes to force the association of one race with the other against the will of either, by court decree under threat of fine or imprisonment, is destructive of mutual good will and respect, breeds resentment and animosities, and is injurious to the true interests of both races.

EDUCATION PARENTS' DUTY

We believe that the molding of the minds and characters of our children is the sacred duty and the priceless natural right and obligation of parents.

Freedom of decision with respect to these considerations touching as they do the most intimate relations of the people of our community and the most cherished natural rights and duties of parenthood is absolutely essential to the maintenance, operation, management, and control of our public schools. We conceive this freedom to be among the sacred rights "retained by the people" under the ninth amendment of the Federal Constitution.

Among the reserved rights and powers of the States guaranteed to the State of Virginia under the 10th amendment, is the power to maintain racially separate public schools. We do not perceive that the exercise of this power has ever been prohibited to the States by any provision of the Federal Constitution. We believe that this power can be prohibited to the States only by the States themselves. To concede the right of a Federal court to withdraw this power from the individual States is to concede that all rights and powers of the States and of the people are enjoyed at the sufferance of the judiciary and that the guaranties of the liberties of the people are no longer fixed in the Constitution itself.

We do not intend to speak disrespectfully. The gravity of the issues requires that we speak plainly. By its decision of May 17, 1954, and subsequent decisions the Supreme Court of the United States has flagrantly exceeded its lawful and intended authority, trespassed upon the rights of the people and dangerously encroached upon the reserved rights of the States.

Holding these convictions, it is not possible for us to submit the children of Prince Edward County to conditions which we most deeply and conscientiously believe to be pernicious. Nor can we as the heirs of liberty, purchased at so great a sacrifice by those who have gone before, submit to this judicial breaking of the constitutional chains forged to restrain tyranny for all generations of Americans. We, therefore, pledge ourselves firmly to use every honorable legal and constitutional means at our command to oppose this assault upon the Constitution and upon the liberties of our people.

PROHIBIT FUNDS

Therefore, if courts refuse to recognize these most fundamental, intimate, and sacred rights and the profound necessity that they be respected, then we proclaim our resort to that first American tenet of liberty—that men should not be taxed against their will and without their consent for a purpose to which they are deeply and conscientiously opposed. We ask our board of supervisors as our legislative representatives to proceed at the appropriate time to enact and adopt whatever ordinances and resolutions may be required to prohibit the levying of any tax or the appropriation of any funds for the operation of racially mixed schools within Prince Edward County to the end that all public schools of the county may be closed upon the entry of a court order requiring the mixing of the races in any school of this county.

We further call upon our school board to make known to the district court the determination of the people of Prince Edward County here expressed. The issues are too profound and the consequences to our people too grave to leave any doubt of the impossibility of our compliance or of the resolute mind of our people. An order to mix the races in our schools can only result in the destruction of the opportunity for a public education for all children of this county.

MONTH-TO-MONTH BASIS

We also call upon the Governor of Virginia and all officials of the Commonwealth in control thereof to pay State revenue to Prince Edward County for school purposes in accordance with the policy adopted by the board of supervisors for the payment of local funds for school purposes, thus and thereby giving effect to the interposition resolution of the General Assembly of Virginia, adopted on February 1, 1956, fixing the policy of this Commonwealth, "to take all appropriate measures, honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us, to resist this illegal encroachment upon our sovereign power."

It is with the most profound regret that we have been forced to set this course. The history of the people of Prince Edward County demonstrates their love and appreciation of the value of educational opportunity. We act with no animus toward any man or body of men. We do not act in oppression of the Negro people of this county. We propose, in every way that we can, to preserve every proper constitutional right of all the people of Prince Edward County. However deeply convinced as we are of the wrongness and imprudence of intimate racial integration, we cannot and will not place merely supposed rights, newly created by judicial mandate, above the conscience of our people and above rights and powers, which for generations have been exercised honorably and constitutionally by the people of our county.

It is our earnest hope that other counties and the Commonwealth of Virginia will repudiate the spurious allurements of expediency and stratagem in order that Virginia may stand as she has always stood, dedicated to the protection of the rights of a free people against tyranny from any quarter. If we fail in this solemn obligation now our rights will be extinguished one by one.

West Virginia Honors a Statesman—Remarks of Hon. Robert C. Byrd Before the West Virginia Society Honoring the Memory of the Late Senator Harley M. Kilgore

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to have included the following tribute to the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore of West Virginia delivered by my colleague the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD before the West Virginia society on the occasion of their paying tribute in absentia to a great statesman:

My fellow West Virginians:

"Near a shady wall a rose once grew,
Budded and blossomed in God's free light,
Watered and fed by the morning dew,
Shedding its sweetness day and night.

"As it grew and blossomed fair and tall,
Slowly rising to loftier height,
It came to a crevice in the wall,
Through which there shone a beam of light.

"Onward it crept with added strength,
With never a thought of fear or pride.
It followed the light through the crevice's length
And unfolded itself on the other side.

"The light, the dew, the broadening view
Were found the same as they were before;
And it lost itself in beauties new,
Breathing its frangrance more and more.

"Shall claim of death cause us to grieve,
And make our courage faint or fall?
Nay! Let us faith and hope receive;
The rose still grows beyond the wall.

"Scattering fragrance far and wide,
Just as it did in days of yore,
Just as it did on the other side,
Just as it will for evermore."

Tonight we honor the life and memory of one of West Virginia's greatest men. The late Hon. Harley M. Kilgore was born in Harrison County and reared in Marion Coun-

ty. He was a graduate of the West Virginia University law school, and he moved to Beckley in 1915 and established a law practice. There he married Lois Lilly. He served in the United States Army during and after the First World War. He was elected Judge of the Criminal Court in Raleigh County, and he served 8 years in this office until he was elected to the United States Senate in 1940. Senator Kilgore served with distinction in the United States Senate, and he became known, respected, and loved, not only by his fellow Americans but also by the people of many nations.

The scriptures say, "A man that hath friends must show himself friendly." Harley Kilgore had a multitude of friends. Someone has said, "There can be no true greatness without humility." Harley Kilgore possessed this virtue. In him the elements of love and humility and kindness and brilliance were so mixed that it truly can be said: Here was a man. "When comes such another?"

He was the kind of man Emerson had in mind when he wrote:

"Not gold, but only men, can make
A nation great and strong,
Men, who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.

"Brave men who work when other men sleep,
Who dare while others fly,
They build a nation's pillars deep,
And lift them to the sky."

I am told that Benjamin Franklin's favorite scriptural quotation was a passage from Proverbs: "Sees thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings." Harley Kilgore was diligent in his business, and he walked with kings and presidents and the great men of the earth; yet, he never lost the common touch, and perhaps it was this that so endeared him to the people of our own State. They thought of him as a true son of the mountains; one who had breathed the fresh air of liberty one who had traced the greatness of his Creator in the stars of West Virginia heavens; one who had known the pain and sweat of honest toil; one who had experienced the joys, the sorrows and the sufferings that crowd the common way of life.

It is not the privilege of every man to build for himself a great shaft of granite or to engrave his name upon a plate of bronze, but it is within the power of each of us to so live as to plant an everblooming flower within the bosom of all whom we meet. Harley Kilgore so lived, and the fragrance of the flower of his life will never cease to shed itself within the lives of those who knew him. It was Tennyson who said, "I am a part of all that I have met." Each of us is a part of Harley Kilgore.

He seemed to be dedicated to the task of serving others, and this could well have been the secret of his greatness.

" 'How far away is the temple of fame?'
Said a youth at the dawn of the day;
He toiled and dreamed of a deathless name,
And the hours went by, and the evening came,
Leaving him feeble, and old, and lame,
To plod on his cheerless way.

" 'How far away is the tmple of good?'
Said a youth at the dawn of the day;
And he strove in the spirit of brotherhood
To help and succor as best he could,
The poor and unfortunate multitude,
In their hard and dreary way.

"He was careless alike of praise and blame,
But after his work was done,
An angel of glory from heaven came,
And wrote on high his immortal name,
To proclaim this truth that the temple of fame,
And the temple of good are one.

"For this is the lesson that history
Has taught since the world began;
That those whose memories never die,
But shine like stars in the human sky,
And brighter grow as the years roll by,
Are men who live for man."

Several months ago the West Virginia Society decided to honor Senator Harley M. Kilgore as West Virginia's most outstanding, most noteworthy, most derserving son of the year, and so it was planned to present him with a token of appreciation and esteem upon this occasion. But the Creator and Giver of life altered these plans, and so this evening we pay tribute to one who is no longer with us but the memory of whom will always live in our hearts. His companion is with us, and so we have chosen to present to her that which we had intended to give to him. With Mrs. Kilgore here tonight are her son and daughter and Senator Kilgore's sister. We are happy that all of them could be present.

As I prepare to present the plaque to Mrs. Kilgore, may I say to this audience that Senator Kilgore was my neighbor. Raleigh County was our home. I had an opportunity to observe his life, and mine has been enriched thereby.

"The roses red upon my neighbor's vine
Are owned by him, but they are also mine.
His was the cost, and his the labor too,
But mine, as well as his, the Joy—their loveliness to view.

"They bloom for me, and are for me as fair
As for the man who gives them all his care.
Thus I am rich because a good man grew
A rose-clad vine for all his neighbors' view.

"I know from this that others plant for me,
That what they own, my joy may also be.
So why be selfish, when so much that's fine,
Was grown for me upon Harley Kilgore's vine."

Mrs. Kilgore, we were proud of your husband, and we are proud of you and your family. I know that I speak the thoughts of every person present. On behalf of the West Virginia Society, I present you with this plaque as a token of the love and the pride possessed by all West Virginians whose hearts have been warmed and made glad by the services of your illustrious husband. May you cherish it forever, and may it not only recall to your memory the many good things he did for all of us but also may it constantly remind you of the way we feel toward West Virginia's great statesman and great son.

The Desert Game Range, Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the announcement made recently that the United States Air Force is giving careful study to the possibility of expanding its gunnery ranges in southern Nevada has aroused great interest on the part of the citizens of my State. The reason for this that one proposal under consideration by the Air Force would involve taking over 680,000 more acres from the desert game range, a large portion of which is already being used by the same agency.

While in Nevada recently, I met with Frank C. Craighead, Jr., refuge manager of the Desert Game Range, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, who is well acquainted with the area now under study by the Air Force, and who in response to my request sent me a letter which well summarizes the values which may be impaired if the Air Force decides that this area should be acquired and its request is approved. Because Dr. Craighead's letter so well describes the problem and values involved, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert it at this point:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
DESERT GAME RANGE, P. O. BOX 432,
Las Vegas, Nev., April 20, 1956.

Hon. CLIFF YOUNG,
Representative at Large, House of Representatives, 421 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: In the course of our conversation of April 3 you asked if I would briefly summarize for you the biological and recreational values of the Desert Game Range. As you know I feel that the people and particularly the sportsmen of Nevada should be made fully cognizant of these values in view of the pending Air Force withdrawals.

From the biological standpoint the Desert Game Range has three vital functions:

1. It serves as a refuge or haven for preserving and protecting a rare, possibly vanishing species, the Nelson bighorn mountain sheep, along with a relatively untouched segment of its desert environment.

The Desert Game Range was set aside by Executive order primarily for the preservation and protection of the Nelson bighorn mountain sheep. To date it has admirably served this purpose for the sheep have increased from an estimated 300 to an estimated population of several thousand. The majority of these animals are to be found in the Sheep Mountains of the Desert Game Range. It is this entire mountain range and sheep habitat that the Air Force now wishes to take over. It currently supports the single largest concentration of Nelson bighorn in existence.

2. It serves as a population reservoir for restocking nearby mountain ranges and for providing transplants to repopulate former habitat in the Southwest.

The sheep of the Desert Game Range have now more or less reached the carrying capacity of the area and are slowly moving out to repopulate adjacent mountain ranges. We are just attaining one of the primary goals for which the refuge was established.

We have underway a major trapping and marking program. Each year a certain number of these trapped bighorns will be transplanted to former or to low density sheep habitat in Nevada and neighboring States. The Desert Game Range will be the nucleus for obtaining the animals needed to repopulate former mountain sheep habitat. It is in fact the only area with a sufficient population to do this.

3. It provides an exceedingly important study area for research relative to the ecology of this splendid game animal. Comparatively little is known about the desert bighorn and conditions now existing on the Desert Game Range offer an unusual and possibly the only opportunity to systematically gather the biological data that is essential to the proper management of this animal throughout its range. The needed information cannot be gathered in small relatively restricted areas or in areas of low sheep population.

The Nelson bighorn sheep found in the Sheep Mountains of the Desert Game Range

are a self-contained, self-sufficient population living in a relatively untouched wilderness-type habitat. This is a rare condition among populations of many species of big game animals today. A great deal will be lost if this opportunity for a field research study is abandoned. It cannot be carried out in an area where Air Force restrictions are imposed. We have learned this the hard way in regard to the Pintwater Range, now within an Air Force restricted area.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service together with the Nevada Fish and Game Commission and other cooperating agencies has initiated a 3- to 5-year field study relative to the management of the Nelson bighorn sheep. The Fish and Wildlife Service alone plans to put two two-man teams working on this full time. We feel that the optimum point of population recovery has been attained and that now is the time to concentrate on gathering this important management data on the desert bighorn. The value of this information to future Nevada sportsmen and conservationists can hardly be overestimated. It will play an important part in developing a unique and well-rounded outdoor recreational program for this rapidly growing part of the country. The day is not far in the future when the mention of the desert bighorn sheep will be immediately associated with Las Vegas and the Desert Game Range just as elk or wapiti are now associated in the public eye with Jackson Hole and Yellowstone Park.

We anticipate, in fact have recommended annual controlled sheep hunts in the Sheep Mountains of the Desert Game Range. We have now reached a point where the scientific management based on an active field research program the available trophy hunting in the refuge as well as in adjacent repopulated areas should steadily increase. In connection with these hunts much practical biological data can and will be gathered. Many Nevada sportsmen have been anxiously awaiting this time and through their interest and support have contributed to its attainment.

From the standpoint of outdoor recreation the entire desert game range has tremendous untapped resources. I believe its value can be better appreciated if I comment first on this resource in a general way.

One of the major and ultimate aims of much of our wildlife, timber, land, and water conservation programs is to provide a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities and facilities for the American people. This may take the form of hunting, fishing, picnicking, camping, rock hunting, hiking, riding, or the purely esthetic appeal of a day spent outdoors close to the land, the water, or the beauties and mysteries of nature and of life itself. Many of these values, though great, are intangibles and have fared poorly in the past when pitted against monetary values or military needs. Such recreational values, however, are with better understanding becoming more and more recognized as the principal resource of many areas.

The system of wildlife refuges contributes materially to this type of recreation in both a direct and an indirect way. They preserve and protect many forms of our renewable resources. Because of its large size the desert-game range is providing and can continue to furnish a considerable and varied opportunity for outdoor recreation.

Outdoor recreation is an American heritage. It is the natural followup to the pioneer experience of the explorers, trappers, prospectors, cattlemen, homesteaders, and others who built our country. This pioneer experience has had a profound influence in shaping the destiny of our people. It developed the qualities of courage and enterprise that was necessary to the tremendous undertaking. If the character of our people is to continue in the mold of the past, fostered largely by the pioneer life in early America, it is essential that we preserve this outdoor heritage.

Nevadans who have prospected in the upper reaches of the Sheep Mountain canyons, who have hiked or ridden beneath the towering yellow pines, in not one but in numerous "hidden forests," who have stalked and watched a band of majestic wild rams among the junipers and pinon pines, or out on the rocky ledges where they are so much at home, well realize what loss of this area will mean to Nevada citizens as well as to the millions of tourists, many of them outdoorsmen. In 1955 alone, Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife Service personnel estimated from records that the area embraced by the desert-game range had a total use of over 150,000 visitor days. This is only a beginning.

Throughout the country, resources for outdoor recreation are decreasing, although our population is rapidly increasing. Urban communities in many areas now face a serious shortage of outdoor recreational areas and facilities. This is not yet the case in southern Nevada, but a permanent loss of potential recreational lands combined with an unusual population and industrial growth could readily bring this about. The inseparable biological and recreational values of the nearby Sheep Mountains of the desert-game range are essential to the health and welfare of an expanding Las Vegas community. Nevadans are indeed fortunate that this large area is now being held and managed for them by the Federal Government with a realistic knowledge of its present and future value to our citizens.

Little would be gained, and much would be irrevocably lost should this unique bit of desert land be turned over to the Air Force as a bombing range and restricted area.

I appreciate your interest in getting the facts on both sides of this controversial issue. I know that you will consider the values I have mentioned before committing yourself to either side of the question and that your stand will be taken only after a weighing of the values in regard to alternatives and to the overall welfare of our citizens. I hope that the Air Force's arguments for withdrawal can be made public.

I hope that the information I have given you will prove helpful. If I can be of further aid, please do not hesitate to call on my services.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. CRAIGHEAD, Jr.,
Refuge Manager, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Desert Game Range.

Statement by George McLain, President, National Institute of Social Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. George McLain, president, National Institute of Social Welfare:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MCLAIN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL WELFARE, MAY 18, 1956

To the Honorable Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George McLain. I am appearing before you in the capacity of President of the National Institute of Social Welfare with offices located at 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and with western headquarters located at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

As a citizen of these United States and as the representative for a quarter of a million members of old age pension and social welfare organizations in this country, I wish to raise my voice in protest against certain distinct inconsistencies in the attitude of our Government.

We, the inarticulate countrymen of yours, find it very difficult to understand your benevolent and extravagant concern for the peoples of the world while at the same time allowing misery and want to exist among some 16 million needy Americans comprising those on social security public assistance, direct relief, unemployed, migratory workers and low-salaried heads of large families.

President Eisenhower and his aides are asking that Congress appropriate $4,300,000,000 for economic and military aid to foreign countries. This means a further tightening of the belts of the American people with a resultant lower standard of living.

The sacrifices that we Americans have been called upon make for other countries since World War I under the guise of national security is almost too fantastic to believe. Had our foreign giveaways been used, instead, for improvements in our own country such as modern highways, dams, sanitation, medical research, health institutions and hospitals, public housing, and schools, it would have assured the American people of a prosperous way of life that the people of all the world, instead of fighting each other, would have been too busy trying to copy us.

We spend billions of dollars each year directly and indirectly trying to impress every other human being on earth with our superior form of government, our universal prosperity. Our international byword seems to have changed from "land of plenty for all" to "land of plenty for all and then some." These people in foreign nations are supposed to think that such is the result of our form of government.

But, I ask you, what is the good of spending all of these billions of dollars when the salfsame foreign people can pick up their newspaper most any day and read where some poor soul in this country has died of malnutrition or starvation?

There is a great nationwide resentment, gentlemen, over our Government being so lavish to foreign countries while neglecting the plight of our needy here at home.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to increase foreign aid and keep it flowing for years to come.

He proposes spending $4,300,000,000 next year for foreign aid—of this huge amount $2,500,000,000 would be for direct military support, and $1,800,000,000 in economic and technical aid for the nations lined up with the United States.

Sometime back, a couple of Russian leaders by the name of Khrushchev and Bulganin made a visit to India. They made a tour of the country and were well received. In their speeches they blasted the United States and made a lot of promises on what the Soviet Union could do for India.

According to our newspapers at that time, our State Department fell apart like a dollar watch. The very fact that Khrushchev and Bulganin were cheered and applauded along their way in India by crowds of people seemed to react on our State Department, headed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, like a hot poker.

Now, it's not as if we have been neglecting India while helping all of the other nations friendly to us. Far to the contrary, we have during the past years appropriated and contributed more than $324 million for

economic aid to India on top of which in 1951 we gave them a loan of $190 million worth of wheat and approximately $21,500,000,000 worth of United States surplus food.

Therefore, it's hard to understand why our State Department will ask Congress for an additional $60 million in United States aid to India and carry on as if the world would come to an end if India did not get this money, all because two Communist leaders smiled at India.

After all, if the vocal promises of these two men can upset all of the aid to India that the American taxpayers have sweated and slaved to produce, then I say something is wrong with the way our State Department is spending our money abroad, and Congress should do something about it before they appropriate the billions now being asked for by President Eisenhower.

I am sure that President Eisenhower and his aides would not be so insistent that you gentlemen appropriate these billions of dollars for foreign aid if he didn't think that the Nation could well afford this expenditure.

But, I ask you—is aid good or bad? Can we afford it, or can't we?

I have heard all too many lawmakers declare on one hand "That aid to needy Americans costs too much money"; "That we don't have enough money to take care of needy Americans such as the old, blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children"; and "That economic aid to needy Americans is apt to destroy their self-reliance, and that if they are (grudgingly) given such aid, they should first have to take the pauper's oath."

Later from the same lawmakers we hear of plans for giving vast sums of money to the governments of foreign countries with no strings attached—so they won't think we're giving it grudgingly—"after all we must let them maintain their self-respect and realize that Uncle Sam is just a great, big, generous fellow who wants to see that none of the peoples of the world suffer deprivation."

Here you have the paradoxical attitudes which seem to be the basis for the domestic aid policy and the foreign aid policy of our Government.

Why?

Is it because our lawmakers think a hungry child in the Far East or Europe is more worthy of care than a hungry child in the United States?

Is it because our lawmakers feel that their fellow Americans haven't the same pride, the same heart, the same soul as their foreign brothers that the "make 'em beg for what they get" policy is imposed on needy Americans, and the "don't be insulted, we just want to help" theory is applied to foreign recipients of our aid?

Why, then, the harsh "means test" for needy Americans, and exuberant generosity in the foreign aid department?

To illustrate my point, I'd like to direct your attention briefly to testimony given by Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and opposed every single, solitary humane proposal which came before that committee to help liberalize the Federal Social Security Act and give additional help to the needy aged, the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children of this country.

Folsom told the committee we couldn't afford to lower the age for women beneficiaries to 62, as provided in H. R. 7225.

Folsom said we couldn't afford to make payments available to workers who become disabled at age 50 and over, also provided for in H. R. 7225.

Folsom said we couldn't afford to give $10 a month surplus food stamps to the millions of American needy on public assistance, an amendment authored by Senator KERR and other Members of the Senate.

Folsom said we couldn't afford a small increase for those on public assistance as offered in an amendment authored by Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, and many other Members of the Senate.

Secretary Folsom said that passage of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' amendment to allow the needy aged to earn $50 a month would "* * * tend to give the old-age assistance program some of the qualities of a pension." He therefore opposed it.

For the Eisenhower administration to say we can afford such exorbitant sums for foreign economic aid, while vigorously opposing much needed economic aid for needy Americans on the grounds that we can't afford it, is hypocrisy in its worst form.

It is not our policy to be against foreign aid. To the contrary, we feel that people of the United States should be proud and happy to share part of their wealth and abundance with needy people of the world—if and when the needs of their fellow Americans have been met fully.

It's a poor father indeed who buys steaks for his hungry neighbors while throwing crumbs and scraps to his own children.

Such a father could expect contempt in the place of love and respect from his children, as well as from his neighbors. It's a universally accepted code that love, understanding, and charity begin at home.

Thank you.

Promote Milk Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, milk production exceeded consumption in the United States in 1955 by approximately 4,600,000,000 pounds, or almost 4 percent of the total production. These 4,600,000,000 pounds of milk were manufactured into butter, cheese, and powdered milk, and as such made up a large part of the dairy purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Every effort must be made to increase consumption of manufactured dairy products. More effort must also be made to increase the consumption of fluid milk. The fluid milk marketing areas have increased their production far in excess of fluid milk demands for class I milk. This has resulted in dumping large amounts of milk from the Federal and State order areas into competition with areas of our Nation producing manufactured dairy products. This depresses the cheese, butter, and powdered milk market. More fluid milk can and must be moved into consumption.

Today I wish to compliment a group for their help in promoting milk consumption. In 1955 the major manufacturers of the chocolate ingredients used in cholocate milk and chocolate milk drinks formed the Chocolate Milk Research Foundation. Its specific aims are to inform the public of the healthful and nutritious values of chocolate milk; to study its markets; to encourage its use; and to aid in the alleviation of the national milk surplus through increased uses of chocolate milk.

Chocolate milk can play a major role in moving fluid milk into consumption. Scientific research has demonstrated that chocolate milk is a decided stimulant to total milk sales and consumption. Whenever chocolate milk is available—in stores, restaurants, home delivery—total milk use increases. It has been definitely proved that consumers do not purchase chocolate milk as a substitute for their usual white milk ration, but rather as an addition.

An extensive series of studies was conducted at the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois by the National Dairy Council for the Chocolate Ingredient Manufacturers on the per capita milk consumption of families, students, and factory workers in nearby medium sized cities. It was found that families which had regular deliveries of chocolate milk used an average of 21.72 percent more milk than those families which used only white milk.

A similar test was made at a university dining hall. For a 4-week control period only white milk was served; during the next control period both white and chocolate milk were offered. Results showed that during the final period, when students were offered the choice, total milk consumption jumped 12.7 percent.

A careful check of milk-vending machines in four factories indicated that 16.6 percent less milk was sold when chocolate milk was withdrawn from the dispensers. Interviews with factory workers indicated that more than half of the chocolate-milk drinkers would change to nonmilk beverages if chocolate milk were not available.

According to the surveys made, children and teen-agers comprise the largest group of milk drinkers in the United States today and the purpose of the special school milk program, with an appropriation of $75 million, is to make more milk available to a greater number of children and at the same time alleviate the national milk surplus which otherwise is converted into byproducts and stored in our Government warehouses. Chocolate milk can play an important role in this program.

Regulations of the Department of Agriculture, governing the operation of the special school milk program, provide for the reimbursement of whole milk, including flavored whole milk, meeting applicable State standards of butterfat content and sanitation. In schools serving chocolate milk, along with white, dairymen are pledged to deliver chocolate milk which meets the State's butterfat standard.

In one large city in Ohio—Toledo—vending machines for both white and chocolate milk were installed in the schools. Milk sales increased over 100 percent. Where children were offered a choice, the consumption of both white and chocolate milk went up. And children, who ordinarily were not milk drinkers, consumed large amounts of energy-giving chocolate milk, thereby increasing the total milk sales. And the more milk sold, white or chocolate, the

larger the subsidy to the schools as provided by the school milk program.

In other words, schools which serve chocolate milk along with white increase milk consumption, improve the health of their children, enlarge their school milk budget, cut down on taxes spent buying up surplus milk, make the farmers happier and keep the cows contented.

The United States Must Import Products From Other Countries if We Are To Export Our Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Chamber will recall that on April 27, 1956, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks published a list of approximately 700 items, approved by our Government, which may now be shipped to any Soviet bloc country without license or restriction.

Carefully tucked away in this list of what Mr. Weeks described as a roster of peaceful goods were three products—watches, watch movements, and watch parts. And I am sure that many of my colleagues must have opened their eyes in astonishment when they saw this portion of the list. It represents a very curious postscript on a very important trade action which our Government took nearly 2 years ago.

In July of 1954, President Eisenhower, on the advice of the Office of Defense Mobilization and many of his Cabinet officers, adopted a decision to increase our tariffs on Swiss watches by nearly 50 percent.

Watches, as you no doubt realize, are the chief commodity in Switzerland's trade with the United States, and the sales of watches enable Switzerland to buy between 150 and 190 millions of dollars of American goods each year.

For instance, my own State of Louisiana shipped more than $2 million worth of rice, cotton, furs, and chemicals to Switzerland during 1954. The States of the South and the Southwest sold more than $40 million worth of their products to Switzerland in the same year. American cotton, fruit, tobacco, and vegetables alone amounted to more than $22 million of sales to Switzerland.

Because of the present situation of mounting agricultural surpluses and falling farmer incomes, farmers in Louisiana and everywhere else in the United States have become increasingly interested in preserving and improving every opportunity to export American cotton, wheat, rice, corn and other products. They know how important is the role of two-way foreign trade in helping to enrich and stabilize the agricultural economy of our country.

When the President's decision to restrict watch trade with the Swiss was announced, these farmers knew that, by raising barriers to Swiss watch trade with us, our Government was quite probably shrinking the market for American farm products in Switzerland.

But the farmers of America loyally restrained their immediate criticism and protest over President Eisenhower's action on Swiss watches. Why? Because they were told by nearly every important officer in the President's official entourage that the restrictive action on Swiss sales to the United States was undertaken only as a vital measure to protect an American industry whose product had been declared essential to defense by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

I have now checked back over that famous watch report made by the Office of Defense Mobilization. And I have found that among the most strident and partisan advocates of protection for the American watch industry, and restrictions on Swiss imports, were our Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sinclair Weeks, and his Department of Commerce representatives.

In one portion of this report, even after the Department of Defense had expressed serious doubt that the American watch companies represented unique or irreplaceable portions of our defense production, the Department of Commerce countered by finding still further reasons to favor the American companies' claim that they were "essential to defense".

The Department of Commerce reported to the ODM that the defense effort during World War II was hampered by serious shortages of watches for nurses, miners and railroad workers. It urged that on this basis the American companies be protected from competition so that they could produce at least 3 million watches a year.

For anyone who can read, it was clear that the Department of Commerce was arguing in 1954 that watches and watch movements are strategic goods needed by any country to wage war.

To say the least it is utterly amusing, therefore, to find the same Department of Commerce asserting in 1956 that watches and watch movements belong on a roster of "peaceful goods", which may be exported to the Soviet bloc countries without restriction.

If watches were needed to help us conduct war in 1941–1945, why should they not be helpful for the Soviet to conduct war tomorrow?

Are there no nurses, no miners, no railroad workers in Russia? I think the answer to this ridiculous inconsistency and confusion in our policy is that Mr. Sinclair Weeks must have changed his mind since 1954. Or perhaps he did not really believe that watches were necessary to conduct war in 1954, and was acting to favor the many influential protectionists who were bringing enormous pressure to bear on our Government at that time.

In 1956, it is highly conceivable that the same people who wanted him to shut off Swiss watch trade with the United States, were now urging him to permit them to resume trade with the Soviet bloc countries. After all there has been an alarming drop of hundreds of millions of dollars in the value of American products sold to these countries, and there must have been an accompanying loss of profit for many American exporters.

I see no reason to raise any objections to American shipments of watches and watch movements to foreign countries. However, I see sufficient reason to urge that Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks immediately take action to rectify the absurd inconsistency and contradictions of his Department and his policies.

It is obvious that watches cannot be, at one and the same time, both peaceful goods and essential to the conduct of war.

If they are peaceful goods then it is incumbent upon the Secretary of Commerce to announce that he has withdrawn his decisions and recommendations to the ODM in 1954. I think the facts of the situation require that the Secretary take this action, and I can assure him that a clarification which will clear away the confusion over the defense essentiality of watches will be hailed by all friends of trade, both in the United States and in the democratic world.

To persist in stubbornly maintaining the defense essentiality of watches, after his action of April 27, will only lay Secretary of Commerce Weeks open to criticism both from trade interests in the United States and from our democratic partners.

Roundup on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Barnet Nover, chief, Denver Post Washington bureau, who has had several years experience on the Hill. He has pointed out the activities of Members in Congress in an excellent article which appeared in the Denver Post recently. The article is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—One of the things that astonishes and distresses many visitors to the Senate and House galleries in the Capitol here is the amazingly small number of Members normally in attendance at sessions of either body.

There are 96 Members of the Senate; 435 Members of the House. But except during a rollcall or in the closing stages of a debate on some issue of major importance it is rare to find even half or even a quarter of the total membership in their seats.

What many visitors fail to realize is that attendance at sessions represents only a small and, except on occasion, by no means the most important of the duties of a Member of Congress. Most of his work, like the bulk of an iceberg, is not visible to the naked eye.

Consider, for instance, the committee labors of one Member of the House—Repre-

sentative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, who represents Colorado's western slope district.

ASPINALL is the second-ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which deals with legislation of tremendous importance to the western third of the Nation.

Because of his seniority, he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation whose membership is precisely the same as that of the full committee. He is also a member of the Subcommittees on Mines and Mining, Territorial and Insular Affairs, Public Lands, Indians Affairs.

In addition he is a member of the House Veterans' Committee and 2 of its subcommittees, 1 of them being the Subcommittee on Veterans Insurance of which he is chairman.

This makes a total of nine committees and subcommittees.

When we take into account that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation alone had 111 bills referred to it and up to now has actively considered and passed on 36 of these (some after very prolonged hearings) we begin to get an idea of the vast amount of committee work a chairman is called upon to perform.

In the case of one measure of particular concern to ASPINALL's own district and his home State of Colorado and of vital concern to the neighboring States of Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico as well—the upper Colorado Storage project—20 separate meetings were held before the bill was finally reported out.

It was then ASPINALL's task (jointly with Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, the committee chairman) to manage the bill on the floor of the House where, after a 3-day debate, it was approved by the smashing majority of 120.

There has been a lot of loose talk of obvious political inspiration to the effect that the 84th is a "do nothing" Congress.

So far as reclamation is concerned, nothing could be further from the truth.

Not even in what westerners now look back on as the golden era of reclamation has so much been done in this field as the present Congress has already done and the story of its full contribution is not yet complete.

Up to now, and the session is only in midterm, bills authorizing reclamation projects with an estimated overall cost of $1,053,269,000 have been enacted into law. This includes the $760 million upper Colorado project, the $225 million Trinity project (California), the $27,669,000 Ventura project (California) and the $40,600,000 Washita project (Oklahoma).

In addition reclamation legislation approved by the House Interior Committee but still awaiting final action either by the House or the Senate or both calls for authorizations totaling another $225 million, including the $157 million authorization for Fryingpan-Arkansas.

Still awaiting final action by the full House committee but approved by the subcommittee on reclamation and irrigation are two other bills, one of them authorizing the high Hells Canyon project, which would involve a total cost of $414,500,000.

It has been estimated that since the beginning of the 84th Congress, the reclamation subcommittee has met for a total of 151 hours, not including the time spent on the road or in viewing projects in the field.

But vastly important as its labors have been, the reclamation subcommittee has only occupied Aspinall part of the time. He has taken an active part in the work of the other subcommittees and of his major committees, of which he is a member, as well as serving as regional whip for the Democratic floor leader and carrying out other congressional duties.

Anybody who says that the life of a Congressman is a sinecure doesn't know what he's talking about.

Sources of Energy for Electric Generation in the Two Decades Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of an address delivered before the American Mining Congress in Cincinnati on May 7, 1956, by Mr. Philip Sporn, president of American Gas & Electric Co.

I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress, inasmuch as this highly enlightening analysis of our fuel resources and supplies can serve as a guide for numerous decisions that we shall be called upon to make from time to time as growing population and rising standards of living bring about constant increases in our energy requirements.

As a leader in an industry indispensable in peace and war, Mr. Sporn has based his address on a careful study of projected electric power needs and on our precious reserves of nuclear and fossil fuels and on the availability of water supplies.

Read closely, if you will, Mr. Sporn's remarks regarding the need for handling with care our depleting supplies of natural gas, his frank presentation of the limitation to which the products of crude petroleum will be able to participate in the electric-power program, and his complete picture of America's increasing dependency upon the coal industry. I feel that these remarks by Mr. Sporn are important to this Congress and will be of increasing value in future sessions.

The address follows:

SOURCES OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC GENERATION IN THE TWO DECADES AHEAD

(Address by Philip Sporn)

In order to arrive at a reasonably reliable projection of sources of energy for the somewhat distant future, it is necessary first to make a good estimate of total energy requirements for the period in question. Such an estimate in turn depends upon the view taken of overall anticipated economic development.

I begin, therefore, with certain conclusions about the level of economic activity which I believe is to be expected in the United States during the next two decades, the period I have elected to examine. A number of factors impress me as especially relevant in arriving at these conclusions. We are experiencing a population boom which gives every indication of continuing for some time to come. We have achieved a high level of material welfare with a relatively steady but increasing trend over the past several decades. We have good reason to hope that trend will continue. The very fact that we are engaged in a worldwide struggle between the free and the Communist world that seems destined to go on for a long time to come makes it essential that we maintain and increase our economic strength.

We must be economically strong in order to support an adequate system of armament; we must also produce enough goods and services to take care of the peacetime requirements of our growing population at ever higher standards of welfare; we need to produce enough in addition to help strengthen our allies and potential allies who are less fortunately situated than we are.

Now, among other things, what all this means is that our energy requirements will have to increase very substantially year by year. Ours is a technically advanced economy, which is another way of saying that it is a high-energy economy. This view of our present situation and future needs sets the base for a quantitative projection of how much energy we will have to make available in the future.

ENERGY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE NEXT TWO DECADES

Today the United States fulfills its energy requirements by bituminous and anthracite coal, oil, natural gas, and waterpower. Total current use represents 1,480 million tons of bituminous coal equivalent annually. Recent predictions about the country's requirements 20 years hence place the figure at approximately 2,750 million tons of bituminous coal equivalent annually. The distribution of this future supply among coal, oil, and so on, is in itself a very complicated problem. Study of the subject, taking into account the availability of various classes of fuel and the prices at which they will be available, is among the most important resource problems that warrant attention. But the question of sources of energy for overall requirements of the long-term future is hardly a manageable subject for an occasion of this kind. I want to address myself to more limited questions: energy requirements for electric power and the sources of such energy. Even such a subject may seem overly ambitious. But, if as I have done, we consider not the remote future but only the next two decades, I think it possible to make reasonably reliable projections.

A look 20 years ahead is commended by a number of considerations:

Two decades are definitely within the range of interest of almost all people now engaged on the problem.

The trend in availability of competitive fuels for this period can be gaged with reasonable accuracy.

The effect of atomic energy in particular can be gaged for this period; for whether one is inclined to be optimistic or pessimistic in his outlook about nuclear power, the chances are that an examination of the problems involved in developing competitive atomic plants in the next 20 years will yield projections that lie within a relatively narrow range.

Finally, the next two decades may witness a focusing of worldwide forces affecting us, which may be the most critical that will confront this country for perhaps several hundred years ahead. Energy policies will play an important role in the working out of these forces. This is particularly true from the standpoint that if any action needs to be taken looking toward a change in policy or the projection of a new program to make new sources of energy available there is not very much time to lose, if effective help is to be obtained prior to the critical conjuncture of turning points in our history of the next several decades which may affect us for centuries.

We begin with total generation by utilities in the United States of nearly 550 billion kilowatt-hours in 1955. Using the techniques that we are accustomed to apply in projecting growth in my own company, which, of course, take into account our expectations concerning the national economy, I believe the corresponding figure for 1975 will be close to 2,000 billion kilowatt-hours. A reasonable breakdown of this load would show the several classes of use, as follows:

Projected total electric-power generation by electric utilities in the United States in 1975

Class of consumer:	Billions of kilowatt-hours
Residential	545
Commercial	250
Industrial	900
Miscellaneous	55
Total consumption	1,750
Losses	250
Total utility generation	2,000

Residential consumption is estimated on the basis of 54.5 million customers in 1975 with an average annual consumption per customer of 10,000 kilowatt-hours, as compared with 44.5 million customers today and slightly over 2,750 kilowatt-hours' average use. Industrial consumption results from an estimate of 245 for the FRB Index of Industrial Production in 1975 and industrial consumption of 3,675 million kilowatt-hours per point of the index, or 900 billion kilowatt-hours. (It excludes generation for self-use, which we estimate at about 250 billion kilowatt-hours.) Commercial and miscellaneous consumption represent extrapolations of present trends related to projected growth in population and income. The important figure here is the 900 billion kilowatt-hours for industry.

The estimate of 245 for the FRB Index of Industrial Production for 1975 requires explantation. It is nearly twice the 1953 figure of 134, but I do not regard it as overly optimistic. In the same period, 1953–75, the number of production workers in the country, which in 1953 was close to 14 million, is expected to increase to nearly 17 million. Taking account of the fairly well-established trend in working time, man-hours worked may be expected to rise in the same interval by a much smaller amount—my estimate is a modest 8 percent. Obviously, then, the bulk of this large increase in the FRB index has to come about as a result of the continuation of the rising long-term trend in the output of the average worker.

The measure of this is seen in the nearly trebling of large power sales per point of FRB index which I have assumed. And the nub of the increase is that the 1975 worker, with fewer hours an the job than his counterpart in 1953, will be much more productive and that the increased productivity will require tremendously more electric energy per hour of work. The 1953 figure of 9 kilowatt-hours per man-hour will in my opinion be nearly 19 kilowatt-hours per man-hour by 1975.

With industrial energy requirements of 900 billion kilowatt-hours and the residential, commercial, and other use of power that we believe are clearly in the offing, you end up with the total energy requirement of 2,000 billion kilowatt-hours.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THE HYDRO PORTION

The installed hydroelectric generating capacity in the United States in 1955 was not quite 25 million kilowatts or approximately 21 percent of a total generating capacity for the utilities of 114,550,000 kilowatts. But the percentage of hydro power in the total of electric energy is on a declining trend; hydro is bound to play a consistently diminishing role as our economy expands and the expansion in total power requirements continues to exceed the growth potential of our hydro reserves. By 1975 the Department of the Interior expects that 14 million kilowatts of hydro will have been added to the existing 25 million kilowatts of hydro installations. The Federal Power Commission estimates as much as 30 million kilowatts of additional hydro between now and 1975, or a total of 55 million kilowatts by that date.

My own projections make me think that we shall have about 48 million kilowatts installed hydro by 1975 and total capacity of all kinds of 382 million kilowatts. This would mean that two decades from now slightly over one-eighth will be hydro and that this capacity will account for 250 billion kilowatt-hours, or one-eighth of all generation. The balance, or 1,750 billion kilowatt-hours, will be thermally generated. Solar, tidal, and wind energy in the United States can be disregarded for the period in question. Despite the attempted revival of Passamaquoddy and the growing interest in solar energy, it does not look as if such sources will count for much between now and 1975.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THERMONUCLEARLY

The balance of 1,750 billion kilowatt hours to be generated by thermal power will either employ nuclear or fossil fuels. I would like to give you my estimates for nuclear fuel and then, having determined how much will have to be supplied by fossil fuels, go on to estimates of the respective parts that will be supplied by oil, gas, and coal.

The large experimental nuclear power projects which are now well beyond the early planning stage total altogether about 1 million kilowatts. These reactors are either owned outright by the Atomic Energy Commission or are being installed under the reactor demonstration program of the Commission, or in some cases are to be owned and paid for entirely by private companies without governmental aid.

This is a substantial program. A million kilowatts is a sizable amount of capacity from any point of view. Nevertheless, the effect of nuclear fuel and its impact on the energy picture of 1975 in the United States, although not insignificant, is likely to be relatively small. One of the important things to remember is that, while all the promising types of reactors are being undertaken on a large developmental scale, we should not be surprised by a period of slowdown between the completion of each of the prototypes and the inception of addittional reactors of similar species. Each experimental reactor must be built and operated to obtain the first test results and operational verifications of engineering projections. These reactors will then have to undergo a phase of further experimentation and development before the design and construction of more advanced additional projects in the same family is decided upon or before wholly new types evolve.

A substantial period of technical development and adaptation precedes the perfection of major scientific discoveries. We are now witnessing this process in the development of nuclear powerplants. In view of the formidable technical-economic obstacles to be overcome, progress in making economically competitive nuclear installations is not going to be as dramatic as has generally been assumed. I am confident that the obstacles will be overcome and nuclear power costs will be reduced to competitive levels, but only after some years of painstaking engineering development and experience with a wide variety of large experimental operating units.

Hence, I do not believe that the total installed nuclear generating capacity by 1975 will reach a level much above 20 million kilowatts in the United States. This will then represent some 5.2 percent of the total generating capacity at that time, but, owing to the higher load factor that is likely to be available to the nuclear plants, this capacity should account for approximately 150 billion kilowatt-hours, or 7.5 percent of the total 1975 utility generated energy. Of course, if the fossil fuels should for any reason fail to meet the requirements adequately, nuclear plants will be installed more rapidly. On the other hand, there is the possibility that even the estimate of 20 million kilowatts in atomic plants by 1975 may be too optimistic, because the time that it will take to solve some of the technical and economic problems may be greater than any of us now realize. Some notion of the time span which may be involved in the development of competitive nuclear power may be obtained from the recent estimates of Admiral Rickover with regard to the Shippingport plant scheduled for operation next year. Admirical Rickover has estimated that the cost of power from the operation of the first core in the Shippingport reactor will be some 52 mills per kilowatt-hour. The second core, he estimates, should produce power at 39 mills per kilowatt-hour, and the third core, which may be ready for operation in 10 years, may reduce the cost of power to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is still well above a realistically competitive cost level.

While there can certainly be differences of judgment with respect to the speed with which competitive atomic power will take its place in our economy, the estimates presented herein represent I believe a reasonably well founded judgment of the probable order of magnitude of atomic energy that will be produced in the United States in 1975.

I would not want to leave the impression that Admiral Rickover's account of what is to be expected on costs from our first commercial-sized experimental power reactor illustrates anything more than the point that the first prototype of any reactor will represent the first step in a relatively long progression of steps from higher to lower costs. I say this because even now I think we know how to build reactors which will produce power at a cost reasonably close to that which the Shippingport reactor will not approach until 10 years after initial operation; the reason, of course, that we are that confident today is because of all the experimental work which has gone on in the last 10 years.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THERMAL PORTION: FOSSIL FUELS

The picture with regard to the fossil fuels it seems to me is susceptible of fairly accurate analysis. Let us start with natural gas.

Gas

In 1955 natural gas supplied some 96 billion kilowatt-hours, or 17.5 percent of the total electric energy, and 22 percent of the thermally generated energy of the United States. The figures, going back to 1950, of percentage of thermal energy generated with natural gas are:

Portion of total electric utility thermal electric energy generated by gas

Year:	Percentage
1950	19.1
1951	20.9
1952	23.3
1953	23.6
1954	25.7
1955	22.0

The conditions which have resulted in the continual rise, until reversed in 1955, in the proportion of total electric energy generation accounted for by natural gas in the past two decades, and particularly since the end of World War II, are not likely to prevail over the next 2 decades. The rapid extension of the gas pipeline networks is nearing the completion and the emphasis now is being directed to gas-storage facilities in order to avoid the need for selling large quantities offpeak at extremely low prices. The very rapid rise in gas demand for premium uses at higher prices has made such storage attractive and has stimulated construction of more storage facilities.

The rapid expansion of demand has, in turn, intensified the upward pressure on gas prices in recent years. The same process is likely to continue and exert increasing

pressure on natural gas reserves. This pressure is reversing the price advantage that natural gas has enjoyed over alternative fuels until now.

As demand expands and strains natural gas reserves and as prices rise, it will become less economical to burn offpeak gas under boilers. Available supplies are likely to be assigned to those electric utilities located close to the sources of gas supply and to an even greater extent to those special high-value uses in which natural gas is especially suitable and in which for one reason or another price is not the important factor.

Appraisals of the role of natural gas in supplying 1975 energy requirements vary considerably in large part because of uncertainty as to recoverable reserves. Some of the leading estimates of the total marketed production two decades hence, are:

Projected marketed production of natural gas in the United States in 1975

Authority:	Trillion cubic-feet
AGA	22
Department of Interior	19
Wallace E. Pratt	15
Paley Commission	15.2

Adopting from this range of figures 19 trillian cubic feet as a likely estimate for marketed production, it is possible to make a fairly reliable estimate of the amount of power that will be generated with natural gas. The maintenance of natural gas' present share of the electric utility generating market would imply the consumption of about 3 trillion cubic feet or almost 16 percent of all gas production in 1975; compared to 1955 when use for power accounted for only about 12 percent of total marketed production. An expansion of this magnitude in the utility market does not appear feasible when reviewed against the expected expansion in demand for the higher value uses and estimates of ultimate reserves. My own judgment is that gas for utility generation in 1975 will be approximately 1.7 trillion cubic feet, which will represent expansion of close to 50 percent in gas consumption by electric utilities. (Mr. Pratt has ventured a somewhat higher estimate of 2.4 trillion cubic feet.) With the B. t. u. figure at 1,050 per cubic foot and an average performance of 9,000 B. t. u. per kilowatt-hour, this represents 200 billion kilowatt-hours or 10 percent of total 1975 generation.

Oil

In 1955 oil accounted for 36 billion kilowatt-hours, or 6.68 percent of the total generation and 8.3 percent of thermal generation. The figures going back to 1950 are as follows:

Portion of total electric utility thermal electric energy generated by oil

Year:	Percentage
1950	10.2
1951	7.7
1952	7.4
1953	8.7
1954	6.67
1955	8.3

As in the case of natural gas, projections of petroleums's role in the energy economy in 1975 are highly dependent upon estimates of total recoverable reserves. While these vary over a considerable range, nevertheless leading estimates of total oil use in 1975 are quite close to one another:

Estimated total oil use in the United States in 1975

Authority:	Billions of barrels
Bureau of Mines	5.0
Wallace E. Pratt	4.9
Paley Commission	5.0

As in the case of natural gas, oil is being diverted to higher value uses, such as motive power, for which economic or convenient substitutes are not available. There has been a rapid growth in demand for the lighter petroleum fractions which is expected to continue. This shift in the composition of petroleum demand has led to changes in the petroleum refining process to diminish the portion of the barrel of oil which remains as residual oil, the oil used for power generation; even residual oil itself is finding higher value uses in the making of petroleum coke, asphalt, and other materials. In the international sphere the United States may expect to meet increasing competition for the world's petroleum resources so that imports are less likely to be available in the necessary quantities at favorable prices for utility generation. Western Europe is straining its coal reserves and looking toward oil to fill the gap in its energy supply. Accentuating this, growth in the underdeveloped countries of the world is likely to result in a very rapid rise in their petroleum demand.

These factors will increase the competitive pressures on world petroleum markets.

It appears unlikely that, in the face of the anticipated expansion in demand for the lighter fuel oils in their many specialized uses, the prospective diminution of our petroleum reserves and the rising prices likely to result from the growing demand and rising costs of petroleum exploration and development, the quantity of petroleum burned under utility boilers could expand the almost 300 percent necessary to maintain its present share of the market.

Based upon the accepted conversion figures, my own estimate of use of oil for power production is 143 million barrels, a 90-percent expansion over 1955 consumption. (Here again Mr. Pratt believes a somewhat higher figure—182.5 million barrels—is justified.) My estimate of a 90-percent expansion over 1955 would mean oil-fired power production equivalent to over 91 billion kilowatt-hours or roughly 5 percent of the total.

Coal

In this country we are extremely fortunate in our coal reserves. To arrive at the portion of the electric energy to be generated by coal we are, therefore, able to simply subtract the percentages of the total requirements that will be supplied by hydro, nuclear fuel, gas, and oil. It will be recalled that these are 12.5 percent, 7.5 percent, 10 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. Thus the total amount to be taken care of by coal is 65 percent, or 1,300 billion kilowatt-hours. Again using an average performance of 9,000 British thermal units and assuming coal at 12,000 British thermal units average heat content, this results in a 1975 coal utilization of 488 million tons.

In a previous study that I made of this subject, I had come to the conclusion that the amount of coal, based upon a similar assumption of the proportions to be supplied by nuclear energy, was 463 million tons. This lower figure resulted from using a conversion ratio to go from B. t. u. to tons of coal on the basis of 13,100 B. t. u. per pound as against the 12,000 utilized here. However, the latter figure is the more realistic for average utility coal.

I have a few remaining observations. I am confident that our industrial system will be able to provide the country with the additional 275 million kilowatts of capacity that will have to be built by 1975. I have equal confidence that we can make the fuel available to the extent required by the new capacity. As to that, the most important observation is that the role of coal will with the years become increasingly prominent.

This country is in an especially favored position in that we have the necessary coal reserves.

Parenthetically, the favorable situation of the United States in respect to coal must be contrasted with the situation of many areas abroad in which fossil fuels are even now available only at high cost or where the areas are rapidly approaching such a condition. In such areas the rate at which nuclear powerplants will be built to supplement and even replace plants using fossil fuel is likely to occur more rapidly than in this country. The present British program is a good illustration of the point. And I think it is also very probable that our interest in strengthening our friends abroad in relation to their energy program will be a stimulant to our own experimental work on nuclear reactors and that our manufacturers are likely to play an important part in supplying equipment for reactors abroad under conditions that make their work in that field more attractive economically at an earlier date than in the United States where the situation with regard to coal and coal reserves is so favorable.

But coal in the ground is not available until it is mined; in that process there will be required vast increases in capital facilities and, therefore, in capital expenditures and considerable development in all phases of coal mining: technological, management, and operational. It is true that there is on the horizon a young, vigorous, and serious competitor in the form of nuclear fuel but, considering the opportunities that are presented to coal and to the coal industry, I will not believe that the effect of the impending challenge of nuclear fuel will be anything but a stimulant to the industry—to its owners, managers, technicians, and to the people engaged in the actual mining. In responding to that challenge all of them will enhance their own welfare. That is important but, what is more important, they will make an immeasureable contribution to the welfare and safety of the people of the United States, and indeed of the whole Western World.

Corridors for Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, recently Hon. J. Aubrey Simmons, member of the Canadian House of Commons from the Yukon Territory, proposed that accessways be granted by the United States through southeastern Alaska to afford passages to the sea for the Yukon Territory and northern British Columbia. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include here an editorial which appeared in the May 9, 1956, issue of the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

A CORRIDOR FOR CANADA TO SEA THROUGH ALASKA SEEMS SOUND

According to Associated Press reports, Canada is thinking about asking the United States for one or more corridors across the Alaska Panhandle to the Pacific Ocean.

The Panhandle is the 550-mile strip which cuts off the Yukon and northern British Columbia from the sea. Canadian interests maintain that this "fence" is a basic factor in limiting mineral and hydroelectric development in an area of great potential.

The world's last experience with a territorial corridor (in the Danzig area) was unsuccessful. In that instance, however, the arrangement was forcibly imposed on hostile Germans and Poles following a war. The proposal for Canadian corridors, as advanced by J. A. Simmons, Liberal member of the Canadian Parliament for the Yukon, seems reasonable and practical. As Alaska's congressional Delegate, E. L. Bartlett, has said: "Alaska and Canada have a great community

of interest and it would be very foolish if we did not take steps to see how we might use our resources to the advantage of both Territories."

Such an arrangement between this country and Canada—emphasizing good relations that have existed since the "54–40 or fight" dispute over the Northwest boundaries in 1846—would set a good example for the world. It would follow in the long pattern of peace and friendship as presently evidenced by joint development of a radar defense warning system. Under this program, incidentally, American military establishments and troops are stationed on Canadian soil.

Before the United States surrenders—or trades—any Territory, there must, of course, be a great deal of thought and discussion. But if the United States and Canada haven't had any trouble along the world's longest border, why should they have it over one or more remote corridors used for industrial transit purposes?

Actual transfer of territory might not be necessary. A long term lease, an easement, or a like arrangement might serve just as well. In any case, it should be a simple matter to work out a way for Canada to have easy access to the Pacific through the Alaska Panhandle.

Farm Prices and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been invited to an interesting and revealing editorial in the May 19 issue of America, National Catholic Weekly Review.

Father James L. Vizzard, S. J., is assistant to the executive director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. It is evident from reading his editorial that he is well posted on the family-farm problem and that he is a militant fighter in the effort to maintain a strong American agriculture, particularly among those whom we classify as family farmers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms, it gives me pleasure to place Father Vizzard's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FARM PRICES AND POLITICS

Farm problems these days are in the center of the political stage. Not even the most confirmed Manhattan canyon dweller can deny that they belong right there. The stark facts of the farmers' plight have fought their way through the welter of statistics, claim and counterclaim, and finally have begun to get the attention they deserve.

The 1955 net profits of industrial manufacturers increased 32 percent above 1954 (New York Times survey, April 29, 1956), but net farm income dropped 10.6 percent (26 percent since 1952). A significant footnote can be added to this comparison: manufacturers using agricultural raw material boosted their net profit 15 percent on food products and 91 percent on fibers and fabrics. Farmers who in 1952 were getting 51 cents of the consumers' retail food dollar now get 38 cents. In 1 year, 1954 to 1955, the average net profit on Iowa farms declined more than 50 percent when the hog market fell to the lowest point in 15 years.

It does not take too much imagination to translate such statistics into terms of personal hardships, family crises and sheer desperation. In a few months these have driven over 150,000 Midwest farmers to repudiate their own farm organizations and join the newly founded, politically potent protest group, the National Farmers Organization.

In the face of these facts it is not surprising that politicians are ungracefully falling all over one another in a stampede to prove that they and their party are the true friend of the farmer and have always been concerned with his problems. In this struggle for farm votes the infighting between the two parties has been bitter and at times vicious.

PUTTING PARTY BEFORE PEOPLE

Congressional maneuvering on the farm legislation at the moment is shifting too fast and too unpredictably to allow any competent forecast on what kind of bill will finally pass Congress and escape another Presidential veto. One thing, however, seems clear. Farmers will not necessarily get what is good for them and the country. They'll get what political strategists calculate will hold or shift votes.

This is nothing new in an election year; but even in that context it's not very often that the vtial interests of so many are subordinated to political considerations. Farmers and the rest of us have a right to be bewildered and resentful.

Neither party has much reason to be proud of its part in the tug of war for farm votes. Senate Democrats can hardly refute the charge that with malice aforethought they loaded the recently vetoed bill up to the President's breaking point and left him little choice but to reject it. In the past few weeks the party leaders in the House have picked up the pieces and, as this is being written, have started putting them together again—this time, however, carefully calculating the absolute limit Mr. Eisenhower will accept.

But the President and Secretary Benson do not come off unscathed. For too long they refused to acknowledge the seriousness of the farmers' problems and to take the appropriate steps within the authority already theirs. What has particularly infuriated farmers has been Mr. Benson's brand of economic couéism: his insistence day after day that everything was getting better when things were patently going from bad to worse. Farmers interpreted this attitude as a blindness to facts or a lack of sympathy for their problems, or both.

Nor do the farmers feel that any longer they have reason to grant grudging admiration to the Secretary's well-publicized devotion to principle. The rather sad spectacle of his checking his principles at the door and circulating through the Senate to make deals with susceptible cotton, corn, and wheat interests badly shook that myth. There was little left of it when the highly acclaimed "moral" stand of the President on the veto was nullified by the accompanying maneuver of jacking up the support prices on key commodities in an obvious move to buy back some votes. The "to-the-rear-march" order could hardly be interpreted as a courageous stand on principle.

RETURN TO BRANNAN PLAN

It is probably too much to expect in an election year that even the critical problems of millions of citizens should get objective nonpolitical consideration and action. What such action would turn out to be is hard to figure. But this writer has a hunch that if Secretary Benson had not done such a thorough job of burying the Brannan plan under heaps of Madison Avenue scorn, some of his party might like to try now to resurrect it, dress it in a new script, and present it to the farmers and the country as a sound Republican program. That might start a new battle of words, like the current one over the origin of the soil-bank idea. But a lot of Democrats would go along with that approach. After all it was first proposed by a Democratic administration. The current administration has given it an unpublicized trial in wool, and we haven't heard any cries of distress over that. It's not likely that we will either, with Secretary Benson supporting wool at a "rigid" 106 percent of parity.

Remarks by Adlai E. Stevenson at The Dalles, Oreg., Tuesday, May 15, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I would like to insert these remarks made by Adlai Stevenson at The Dalles, Oreg., on May 15. This seems to be a very fine statement of the stake American people have in the fullest development of our great natural resources such as Hells Canyon:

In recent weeks I have been doing a good deal of traveling up and down the Columbia River. This great valley, from Astoria back here to the business end of the river, has many memories for me.

I recall traveling through this area in 1947, when I went up to Mount St. Helens and Spirit Lake with a young Oregon journalist who has since become familiar to all of you and to all the rest of America—a fellow by the name of DICK NEUBERGER.

When I look at the Columbia River I am always reminded of the description by the late J. D. Ross, Bonneville's first Administrator. He called it "a coal mine that will never thin out and an oil well that will never run dry."

And coming back here to The Dalles today I am also reminded of an interesting and, I think, highly significant bit of local political history.

Eight years ago you had a big political rally here. And I suspect that a good many of you turned out to listen to a vigorous young fellow who was engaged in a hot contest for Oregon's nominating votes at the Republican convention. The fight was on for The Dalles Dam then, and the Republican candidate was careful to take note of it—but not until after he had completed the nationalwide radio broadcast that originated here that day. With the microphone to the outside safely dead, he returned to the rostrum to promise the local audience that he would come back as President to dedicate The Dalles Dam.

Well, Thomas Dewey didn't get back to The Dalles. But Harry Truman got back to the White House in 1948, and because he did, this great dam got started and is now in its final stages.

As I understand it, you won't complete the mammoth project until after next January. And I find great comfort in this. As Mr. Truman remarked not long ago, we Democrats are getting pretty tired of having Republicans dedicate the dams we built.

There has been enough construction money in the pipeline to keep the Republican

claim jumpers busy at the dedication ceremonies recently, but what they say on those occasions has little relationship to what they do, and their real record on river developments being written in the appropriations bills—where the administration is willing to make the taxpayers' money available for what it calls partnership deals, but isn't willing to make it available for public projects that would serve the total public interest.

Now, there is nothing wrong with the partnership idea in theory. But there has been a great deal wrong with it the way the Republicans have practiced it.

More often than not it has been an excuse for putting off the construction of needed public power facilities—or, worse still, for developing them to only a fraction of their capacity and thus wasting the great potential that belongs to all the people.

A good example is provided by the next big Oregon project in the planned series that has already done so much to transform the Pacific Northwest. The need for, and the feasibility of, the John Day Dam has long since been established. John Day will even top The Dalles when it is built—with a total capacity of 1½ millon kilowatts, and a vast potential in flood control and navigation.

The Army engineers estimated that they could use $1,450,000 for planning John Day if construction is to begin as scheduled in 1957. But the Eisenhower budget included only $500,000 for this purpose—and it is easy to see how that budget cut translates into delay in getting this great project into service.

But the same administration that couldn't spare money for planning John Day as a public facility put in a health request for funds to start it as a partnership deal with the private utilities. A total of $10 million was requested for John Day, Green Peter, and Bruces Eddy if the private utilities were cut in on the deal—but only $600,000 if they weren't.

This is the proposition WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER call "an indefensible attempt to force a shotgun marriage with the private-power companies onto the people of Pacific Northwest."

But perhaps the best example of "partnership" in action is to be found at Hells Canyon.

There the Eisenhower administration has turned over to a private utility the last great dam site on the North American Continent—a dam site that is the keystone to the program to develop the whole of the Columbia Basin. "Partnership" in this case means three small dams to be built by the Idaho Power Co.—which takes its name from your neighboring State but sends its profits back to its owners in New England. Federal development would mean a single high dam that would triple the hydroelectric output and at the same time provide additional irrigation, flood control, downstream power production, and protection for wildlife. And it would do something else, too—it would provide power at far lower cost to the farmers, manufacturers, and homeowners of the area.

Now let me make it clear that I have no objection at all to letting a private company develop a power site if the public interest will not suffer. For example, if the only feasible use of that particular water resource is for power alone and if not comprehensive basinwide plan is involved, then there is no reason why the project should not be privately developed. But if private development means inadequate development, then it's wrong.

I cannot think of a place where private development is more wrong than at Hells Canyon.

The Idaho Power Co. plan at Hells Canyon will waste as much power as Bonneville produces. It will waste it in a region whose growth will be stunted by anything less than full realization of its waterpower potential. It will prevent forever full development of the Columbia River Basin. It will throw a roadblock in the way of the development of the economy of the entire Northwest.

On the other hand, High Hells Canyon built by the Federal Government means resuming the full development of the entire Columbia River Basin. It means the maximum development of the economy of the Northwest.

High Hells Canyon means cheap phosphate fertilizer for the farmers.

It means cheap power in the farmhouse, in the factory, and in city homes.

It means life-giving irrigation for arid lands—new farms that people can settle on and live on and prosper on.

It means more power at Bonneville, the Dalles, John Day, McNary, as well as dams on the Snake.

It means flood control. It means new industry, new homes, new towns, a new expanding economy in the Great Northwest. High Hells Canyon is, as your Senator Wayne Morse has called it, "the indispensable dam."

Awhile back the Secretary of the Interior, testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, referred to High Hells Canyon as a "white elephant."

Well, 20 years ago other Republicans from the dinosaur age referred to Grand Coulee as a "white elephant," in precisely that language. But today Grand Coulee is the greatest power-producing project anywhere on this planet. And it has spread its bounty over millions of acres—has made the desert bloom, the factories arise, the cities grow, the farms light up. When Grand Coulee was proposed, a private power company wanted to dam the Columbia with little dams, and waste forever the power of the High River. A Republican Congressman said there wasn't any sense in building Grand Coulee because "there was on one in the Grand Coulee area to sell power to except rattlesnakes, coyotes, and rabbits. Everybody knows that. There is no market for power in the Northwest." And the hucksters of the private power lobby of that day used all the arguments we hear today. They said Grand Coulee was too expensive, an unfair burden on the United States Treasury. But today Grand Coulee is $65 million ahead of schedule in paying back the United States Treasury's investment in the future of the Northwest. They said Grand Coulee was a wild dream, fit only for woolly-headed professors; but today it is one of the wonders of the world. They said Grand Coulee would come to nothing; but it powered the Hanford Atomic Energy Plant that helped to save the Western world. They said Grand Coulee was socialistic; but if that is so, today thousands of veterans who have settled on land it made fertile are socialists; and so are thousands of farmers who are getting low-cost public power kilowatts from the Bonneville system to lighten their labors and brighten their lives, to lift their water and light their homes. And so are the men and women who work in the industries created by its power, the industries that wouldn't be here if the Federal Government hadn't had the vision to see that if only we used what God had given us there could be something more out here than coyotes and rattlesnakes.

A fine power site is a magnificent asset bestowed upon the people. We must not waste it. And I hope I can be of some use to you and your Congressmen, Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, in bringing this project to full realization.

Hells Canyon is more than a damsite. It is also, as Senator MORSE has suggested, a symbol. It is a symbol of the clear-cut difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties in this election year.

I want to stop this erosion of our resources by the Eisenhower administration.

And I want to get on with the full development of our resources for the benefit of the people all over this great country.

For, although I am in Oregon today, I am speaking to the country as well. We cannot afford any longer to waste our national inheritance. This issue means a great deal to us alive today. But it will mean much more to our children. We are shaping a Federal conservation policy—or a Federal waste policy—today that will mold our children's lives. Theodore Roosevelt said: "Of all the questions which can come before this Nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us."

I believe that. I think we all believe that. I especially believe it because I have seen the arid wastelands in the old world, those dry valleys and stone creek beds where once great civilizations flourished by the Tigris and Euphrates but where today is nothing but wasteland. The rivers were there—God put them there—but men neglected them and their forests and soil. The rivers are here today—and we know what to do with them. The question is: Will we do it? Have we the vision and the courage? I think we have. The people have last say on this question. And I think, if we can get the truth about this issue across to them, they will take back for themselves what the power lobby wants. And Iva and Bonneville and Grand Coulee will become not reminders of a past long dead but guideposts along the highroad to the future. And high Hells Canyon dam will become reality, not a dream. The Pacific Northwest can have a great future. That future lies in making the best use of what God has placed here. This is to say that your future, and your children's future, lies with you.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine statement on foreign aid, delivered by Mr. George J. Burger before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID

(Statement by George J. Burger before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 10, 1956)

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are

committed by their majority vote. No officer or group of officers is permitted to speak or act officially for the federation until our entire membership has been polled.

Our members were polled through mandate No. 216 (official publication of the federation) on the question: "Are you for or against maintaining foreign aid as a permanent feature of our Nation's foreign policy?"

It is to be noted on the mandate the instruction is given to the members: "Before voting—See arguments for and against."

The argument for:

"In the political cold war, foreign aid almost certainly saved Western Europe from communism. Europe doesn't need more aid, is now expected to help the United States in aiding Asia. Stout defense of United States at Bandung last year is proof that mutual assistance helps can work there, too. Militarily, the United States, with annual expense of a few billion, has made possible creation of allied forces equal to nine times our ground forces, twice the number of air squadrons, equivalent of our naval forces. Economically, aid has helped sustain the United States economy. Over three-fourths of funds have been spent in the United States. More, in 1954, rise in exports helped float the United States economy through the recession."

The argument against:

"Since July 1, 1945, United States taxpayers have ponied up about $69 billion for foreign aid. While the program was temporary at first, it is now on a permanent basis. Meanwhile our Nation has gotten the highest deficit of any country in the world. Those who espouse aid forget that you can't finance or buy friendship. Consider, in Korea the United States bore almost 90 percent of the burden. Where were our European allies? Now the switch is to Asia. But India, an Asian country which has taken foreign aid, is flirting with Communist China. Indonesia which would get aid, has indulged in ventures sure to wreck its economy. Question here is just who is kidding whom?" (Oral insertion No. 1.)

The result of this poll, as it appears in Mandate No. 217 shows 16 percent for continuance of foreign aid, 80 percent against, and 4 no vote.

As a matter of record, I request the privilege of having made a part of the permanent record of this hearing, mandate bulletins Nos. 216 and 217 as they refer to our action on the foreign aid program.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, as these expressions come from what can properly be termed the "grass roots" of our Nation, we believe it should be of importance for the committee and the Congress in shaping future action on this major subject.

To substantiate this statement, the Governor of Utah wrote me under date of December 13, 1955, and I quote:

"I think the people as a whole would be against foreign aid if they were given an objective picture of the entire foreign-aid program. Even as matters stand, what with all the Government's propaganda in favor of foreign-aid, I think a good segment of our people are opposed to this giveaway scheme."

It has been reliably reporaed, as late as April 26, over one-half of the present Federal public debt can be traced directly to involvement in foreign wars and the extension of aid to foreign governments and peoples.

It is also reported that the worst feature of our foreign aid programs is the fact that during periods of deficit financing, we have put the American taxpayers deeper in debt by borrowing money for the foreign aid programs. This has cost another $18 billion plus and the interest on the interest of this borrowed money added more than $8 billion to the total of the foreign aid programs since the end of World War I.

It is to be noted in a recent report appearing in the New York Times of April 21, it says: "NATO costs so far set at $312 billion," and further quoting from the Times: "Seven-year bill for United States alone is $252 billion. Thirteen other lands contributed the balance."

Again, it is to be noted as reported in the Press, April 27, and I quote: "Lag in United States orders pinches Belgium—her industrial leaders fear adverse impact of drop in contracts for NATO."

In my executive position with the federation, and in my travels throughout the Nation meeting with the average independent businessman, the question is put to me time and again: "When is Congress going to call a halt to the giveaway program before it wrecks the economic structure of our Nation and breaks the backs of its people?" Mr. Chairman, this is an actual, truthful statement presented to me time and again nationwide. I answer: "The question must be answered by the Congress of the United States."

I think it can be said that the public at large is well aware of the fact of the constant inspired, alarming statements used by the various administrations as to the peril we face unless this foreign aid of all descriptions continues. It is my belief that the public now believes that most of these statements are merely smokescreens in an attempt to justify the continuance of this giveaway program.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to keep this statement as short as possible and, at the same time, present to the Committee what could be called: "Mr. Citizen speaks."

The argument is now being used for the continuance of foreign aid to combat reported, alleged aid from the Soviet Government. It's beyond me to understand how that Government could make good or deliver foreign aid in the same capacity as our own Government has done—where, on the other hand, it is a matter of public record that the Soviet Government has yet to make its adjustments on the lend-lease arrangement our Government so graciously extended during the critical days of World War II. It is my belief, judging on performances, that any pledge made by the Soviet Government can be looked upon as merely piecrust, and in substantiation of this belief, it was reported in the press under date of January 27, 1956: "MARTIN suspects a Russian trap—fears aid race may lure United States into bankruptcy." It would be our opinion there is real food for thought in this expression by such an outstanding Member of Congress as the Honorable JOSEPH P. MARTIN.

Just recently, to my surprise—and it happened within the past 60 days, I found that an American citizen returning from the Middle East after a year or two stay, remarked: "If you want to see some evidence of appreciation of our foreign-aid program, look at what is stamped on the currency of that country, 'Yankee go home'."

I wonder how many other recipients of aid from this Government share the same lack of appreciation—all at the expense of American taxpayers. From authoritative reports we are receiving it is a safe conclusion that this must be happening, either directly or indirectly, in the case of many other recipients of our foreign-aid program.

It is interesting to note in the international section of the New York Times of Wednesday, January 4, 1956, it said: "Booming Europe forced to slow industrial gain—struggle to keep prosperity from inducing inflation believed won in 1955." So there is justification for the Congress to "stop, look, and listen" before continuing this obviously unneeded foreign-aid program.

It would appear to small business generally that the continuance of such extensive foreign-aid program may be a smokescreen to further the best interests of international business corporations—all at the expense of the American taxpayers and small business of this Nation—and in line with this reasoning we are quoting herewith an editorial appearing in a Scripps-Howard newspaper under date of May 4, 1956, titled "Murky Billions":

"If Congress doesn't appropriate a dime this year for foreign aid—military and economic—the Government will start the fiscal year July 1 with $6.6 billion of old appropriations still not spent. If the President's request for $4.9 billion more is granted, the foreign-aid program would start the fiscal year with $11.5 billion in unexpended funds.

"Much of this is for military equipment—stuff that requires in Pentagon Jargon a long lead time between order and delivery. Granted even that, $11.5 billion is a lot of money to have kicking around in reserved and unreserved funds.

"This is another compelling reason why Congress which has let this program grow like Topsy for several years, will be failing its responsibilities if it doesn't start a thorough study of the aid program and an unbiased reappraisal of future needs."

In conclusion, solely in the interest and welfare of our own Nation, and in behalf of the people we represent, independent business and professional men, nationwide, we say: "The time for Congress to close Uncle Sam's international gift shop is now."

The Refugee Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Refugee Relief Act represents a wise and generous act of the American people in line with our finest traditions. As the provisions of the act approach termination, however, it becomes clear that not only its extension but also a more flexible readjustment of quotas within it are urgently needed if the original intent of Congress in enacting this fine legislation is to be served. As evidence of the great public support for these proposals, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point two letters received from the Oregon Council of Churches, a group that speaks for many church people and of which we in Oregon are very proud:

OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Portland, Oreg., April 24, 1956.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: It is my hope that it would be possible for you to take some definite action in persuading Congress to change quotas in the Refugee Act, in order to reopen immigration from some areas such as Greece and China, which have been closed because the assurances more than fill the quota. At the same time, Austria and Germany are lagging far behind in the number of refugees seeking to enter the United States.

It seems to me that rather than hold up refugees from such distressed areas as Greece, we should attempt to open up the flow again by reducing quotas in those areas where the people do not appear anxious to emigrate.

At the present time, I am sending through an assurance for the son of Greek parents, who is a refugee in Greece, a boy of 17, in spite of the fact that Church World Service has told us not to send any more assurances

for Greece because the Greek quota is filled. It is distressing to tell these partents of a 17-year-old boy that he cannot come into the United States, while several thousand possible assurances would be made available if the quotas were lowered for Germany and Austria.

The same holds true with those who are still seeking to bring refugees over from Hong Kong and are unable to do so because the small quota for Chinese refugees has been filled.

Whatever you can do and do speedily, I know would be most appreciated, not only by our Council of Churches, but by the many who are most anxious to do what they can to ease the distress of the refugees.

Sincerely,

MARK A. TALNEY,
Executive Director.

OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
CHURCH WORLD SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Hood River, Oreg., April 16, 1956.

DEAR MRS GREEN: The Church World Service Committee of the Oregon Council of Churches urges you to do all possible to insure the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953, to December 31, 1957.

Such an extension would enable us to secure more assurances of employment for refugees, the time being an important factor since assurances must be on file 6 months in advance of the act's expiration.

Sincerely yours,

REV. SUMNER WALTERS,
Chairman, C. W. S. Committee Oregon Council of Churches.

The committee: Rev. Donald L. Helseth, Corvallis; Dr. S. Raynor Smith, Eugene; Rev. John Ediger, Beaverton; Dr. Walfred Erickson, Portland; Rev. C. Stanley Knott, Portland; Dr. Julian J. Keiser, Salem.

The 1956 Convention of the National Coal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement advising of the 39th annual convention of the National Coal Association to be held in Washington between June 12 and 14.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1956 CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

In recent years Washington has become an increasingly popular meeting place for religious, patriotic, and business organizations. Among the most important affairs on this year's schedule is the 39th annual convention of the National Coal Association, to be held at the Shoreham Hotel June 12–14. I commend it to your attention.

The National Coal Association, as spokesman for an industry vital to the Nation's health, wealth, progress, and security, has come to be relied upon in numerous ways by Members of Congress. It represents producing companies from more than half of the States of the Union. Each Senator and Representative knows that the association is ready to assist whenever information on coal—for that matter, on all sources of energy—is needed. When a committee of Congress is charged with an assignment requiring knowledge of the coal industry's views, the association can be counted upon to give effective expression on behalf of coal producers. I daresay that most of us on both sides of the Capitol in the past have never hesitated to call upon the association for facts and figures. We shall look to the association for even greater cooperation in the years ahead, inasmuch as Congress must of necessity keep abreast of developments in overall energy supplies, requirements, and reserves.

The convention will present forums of interest to all of us. The advance program, which arrived at my office today, lists addresses by men of prominence on such subjects as coal and the atom, coal and chemistry, coal and electricity, coal and business, coal and steel, coal and exports.

Except for perhaps a very few new Members of the legislative body, all of us are acquainted with the Honorable Tom Pickett, former Member of the House, who is executive vice president of the association. We also have numerous friends among the membership, and we look forward to their arrival for the convention and business meetings next month.

State Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the May 16, 1956, issue of the Denver Post entitled "State Water Rights Must Be Reaffirmed." I believe the editorial simply and effectively states the absolute necessity for legislation such as proposed in my western water rights bill, S. 863.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE WATER RIGHTS MUST BE REAFFIRMED

So far as the 17 Western States are concerned, there is no more important legislation before Congress than the Barrett bill (S. 863). This measure which was introduced by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, is designed to settle and, in effect, quiet title to the water rights of water users in these States against claims that the United States owns virtually all the water in all the rivers and streams of the West.

The Barrett bill would (1) prohibit any Federal interference with the exercise of existing water rights which have been granted by the Western States, and (2) require that water rights for any Federal programs or projects shall be acquired "in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, and use or distribution of such water."

"This legislation," Hatfield Chilson, of Loveland, attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board, told the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at the recent hearing, "merely places the Federal Government on a parity with other water users. If it wants to use water, it comes in and gets it with the same priority and by the same method that an individual or a citizen of the State would obtain his water right." That, we had assumed, has always been the rule. But the Supreme Court found otherwise.

"The position of the State of Colorado," Chilson said, "is that the State of Colorado, since it was admitted to the Union, is the owner and has full control over the waters and the water use in the State of Colorado. (That is in the State constitution which was accepted by Congress.) We do not recognize that the Federal Government has any rights in the body of water or water use in Colorado except such as they have acquired under the doctrine of appropriation, which is the official water doctrine of the State of Colorado.

"The basic issue involved is very simple. The question is, does the Federal Government own and thereby control all of the unappropriated waters in the Western States; and secondly, does the Federal Government by virtue of withdrawals and reservations of Government land thereby have a water right which was vested at the time of the withdrawal?"

The theory or philosophy of Federal control of western waters, of which J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, seems to be the principal proponent, is:

1. When the lands which now compose the Western States were ceded to the United States, the United States became the owner of the lands and waters and the rights to use of that water.

2. While Congress has the power to give waters and the use thereof to the States, it has not done so and the title to unappropriated water remains in the United States.

3. Any water right initiated by a water user after the date of Federal withdrawal of public lands from settlement is subject to any future uses of water which the Federal Government chooses to make in connection with the withdrawn lands.

The construction placed by the Department of Justice on the United States Supreme Court in the Pelton (Oreg.) case has alarmed Western States. The time has come when Congress should say, in unmistakable words, that adjudication of water rights is exclusively a State matter, and that all claimants—Government or individual—are on the same footing. It can do that by passing the Barrett bill.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD comments on capital punishment from a symposium conducted by the Nation magazine of New York City.

I think it is significant that such well-known public officials as Gov. Walter J. Kohler, of Wisconsin, and Gov. Joe Foss, of South Dakota, have taken a strong and positive public position against capital punishment, inasmuch as they do not regard capital punishment as an effective deterrent to major crime.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From a symposium in the Nation, New York]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: PRO AND CON

(Governors, judges, prosecutors, wardens, chaplains oppose death penalty while few defend it; say it does not deter crime, leaves no chance to correct mistakes, does not benefit criminal or kin of his victim; it is based on anger and ignores value of human life.

(Governors, State attorneys general, prison wardens, and chaplains, as well as the general public have written many letters—the great majority of them supporting the Nation's stand against capital punishment. Here is a sampling:)

I have never favored capital punishment and 6 years as governor of a State which does not impose the death penalty has merely served to reinforce that conviction.

The murderer more often than not is one of the best prospects for parole. In most instances the crime for which he was sentenced was his first serious offense—a single violent act committed under extreme provocation which it is unlikely would ever be repeated.

Here in Wisconsin all murderers who are sentenced to life terms are eventually paroled, and experience has shown that they generally establish outstanding records and ultimately are pardoned.

WALTER J. KOHLER,
Governor of Wisconsin.

I have now been in law enforcement for some 12 years. I have grave doubts as to the efficacy of capital punishment. I think that it could well promote violence rather than deter it.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Attorney General of California.

I have been mildly opposed to capital punishment, but the brutal bombing of 44 airborne travelers has convinced me that capital punishment should be continued.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Governor of Colorado.

It is punishment as a concept at which we should take a fresh look. Actually the process of taking such a fresh look is well underway, for we find in the Federal prison system and in California a rather full range of penological institutions from the fortress to the open farm.

This whole development is bringing into existence effective methods of rehabilitation. In the institutions that follow this philosophy the repeater rate has gone way down.

With the growth of this new kind of penology the death penalty is likely to wither away naturally, but this is no reason to relax the direct attack on it.

CURTIS BOK,
Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, Pa.

What motivates legislatures in reversing the trend toward abolition of the death penalty? In my judgment it is a response to insistent pressure. Brutal and sensational crimes like the Lindbergh kidnaping case create an atmosphere of passion and prejudice. Legislatures, in adding another to the list of capital crimes, reacted like parents punishing a child in anger.

Those who advocate the death penalty insist that it is a deterrent. The evidence available is not convincing.

DON EASTVOLD,
Attorney General of Washington.

In a century in which barbarism has returned in so great a part of the world, in gas chambers and slave labor camps, I think that we people of the English-speaking world are becoming a bit precieuse in our consideration for the lives of hardened criminals.

I do not ask myself why these fiends should die, but why should they live.

JO M. FERGUSON,
Attorney General of Kentucky.

Let me point out four ways in which life imprisonment would be superior to the death penalty.

1. It gives the State a chance to rectify any mistake it may make.

2. It gives the criminal a chance to atone. When the father of one family kills the father of any other family, we take the life of the remaining one, with the result that we have 2 dead parents and 2 orphaned families.

3. Life imprisonment gives a criminal a chance to repent and reform.

4. By showing a reverent reluctance to take even the life of a convicted murderer, the State could do more to affirm the sanctity of all life than by a thousand laws.

DAVID RHYS WILLIAMS,
Minister, First Unitarian Church, Rochester, N. Y.

I have always been opposed to capital punishment as I do not believe it is effective in crime prevention. I, too, value human life very highly, and I believe the entire matter of capital punishment should be reviewed by the legislatures of those States which have laws permitting the death penalty.

JOE FOSS,
Governor of South Dakota.

In the 1937 session of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, a bill was introduced to abolish capital punishment. I voted against a motion to recommit it and then for its passage. It was defeated; but when reconsidered later in the session I voted for it again. This time it passed but was buried in Senate committee. My views have not changed since.

HERBERT B. COHEN,
Attorney General of Pennsylvania.

Capital punishment has a very detrimental effect on the morale and general well-being of prison inmates, as well as upon the rehabilitative program of the institution.

I certainly favor the abolition of capital punishment. I question whether man can legislate away its responsibility under the sixth commandment, which reads: "Thou shalt not kill."

J. E. OVERLADE,
Warden, Indiana State Prison, Michigan City, Ind.

I am highly in favor of capital punishment for certain crimes. In North Carolina, the death penalty is the punishment for first-degree murder, first-degree burglary, rape, and arson. However, our statutes have been amended and now the jury may, in its discretion, recommend life imprisonment in every instance.

WILLIAM B. RODMAN, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General, North Carolina.

I believe the State has lost its right to take a life. In our courts there have been too many deals, too many fixes, very little uniformity in applying the law.

Just this summer I accompanied a man to the chair, a pathetic case, and we fought to the end. His partner, the actual accomplice, was given the opportunity to plead guilty to second-degree murder and thereby get a life sentence. This to me is a farce. * * *

Basically the State has the right to take a life, but to exercise this right it must exercise perfect consistency. Since deviation is so obvious, capital punishment should be abolished.

Nothing is more inhuman than an execution. I believe that all judges, prosecutors, even jurors if possible, should be made to witness an execution, then they might think much more sincerely and seriously before giving the death penalty.

It is far greater punishment to make a man serve a life sentence (25-year minimum) than to snuff out his life.

J. W. REYNOLDS,
Catholic Chaplain, Connecticut State Prison, Wethersfield, Conn.

The death penalty is an expression of society's own sadism and cruelty.

The periodic expression of these attitudes through the dramatic and well-publicized ritual of executing a criminal reinforces, encourages and caters to psychopathic tendencies, particularly among impressionable youth.

ISIDORE ZIFERSTEIN, M. D.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

My opposition to capital punishment is based on the fact that it is not filling its purpose. It does not seem to be a deterrent.

E. R. CALLISTER,
Attorney General of Utah.

Amendments to the Slot Machine Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Department of Justice, I introduced on May 16, 1956, H. R. 11256, a bill to amend section 3 of the Slot Machine Act. The letter from the Attorney General to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, requesting introduction of the bill, and giving the reasons for the request, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1956.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Experience acquired by the Department of Justice in the administration and enforcement of the act of January 2, 1951, commonly known as the Slot Machine Act, coupled with the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Five Gambling Devices* (346 U. S. 441 (1953)), indicates a need for some major revisions of the act both in form and in substance. Accordingly, the attached draft legislation is submitted for your consideration and introduction in the House of Representatives.

Section 3 of the Slot Machine Act now requires every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices to register with the Attorney General upon entering such business and to reregister annually thereafter. It also requires such persons to file monthly reports with the Attorney General, indicating in such reports an inventory and record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices. The section further requires that the component parts of gambling devices shall be separately marked and numbered if sold or shipped in unassembled form.

In providing for the registration and filing of required information, the section directs that information be supplied as to business places "in such district," and sales and deliveries "in the district." The quoted lan-

guage was inadvertently retained in the legislation after the Congress had decided to substitute the Attorney General for the then Collector of Internal Revenue as the official with whom the required information was to be filed. However, two of the Justices of the Supreme Court, in the case above cited, found the section void and unenforceable because of the vagueness and the uncertainty of the quoted language. The bill would eliminate this language.

In the same case, three of the five justices constituting the majority of the court held that the registration and report provisions of the act, insofar as they undertook to regulate purely intrastate transactions which do not directly affect interstate commerce, went beyond the commerce power of Congress. As proposed to be amended, the language "every person manufacturing, repairing or reconditioning any gambling device who buys or receives such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or who sells, ships, or delivers in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers knowing it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, any gambling device, and every other person who buys or receive any gambling device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or who sells, ships, or delivers in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers knowing it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, any gambling device, shall register" will clarify the matter by making quite clear who must register, and will effectuate the view expressed in the case that only those whose activities directly affect interstate commerce should be required to do so.

Another major change which the bill will accomplish will be to eliminate the present filing requirements. Rather, persons subject to the registration provision of the act will be required to maintain inventories of essential information. These inventories will reflect not only sales and transfers in intrastate commerce, or in interstate or foreign commerce, but also the acquisition, possession, ownership, or custody of gambling devices. The registrants will also be required to maintain records of the numbers placed on their devices in accordance with the amended section 3. This bill also takes a more realistic view of the difficulties involved in the numbering process than does existing law and does not require small component parts to be separately numbered.

Two other major changes include (1) provision for the inspection of the required records by personnel of the FBI and (2) an immunity provision applicable to those who maintain records in compliance with the act. With respect to the FBI inspection the bill will authorize Federal district courts to compel the production of requested records. Finally, the bill continues and clarifies the provision of the present law which declares it unlawful to sell, deliver, or ship any unmarked or unnumbered gambling device or to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver or ship any gambling device without complying with the registration requirements. It differs from and enlarges the present prohibitions in that it would make it unlawful for a person to possess any gambling devices if, being required to do so, such person has failed to register or to maintain the required records. This will permit enforcement personnel to pursue forfeiture processes without waiting for a sale or delivery in an appropriate case.

The Department of Justice is of the view that this legislation will materially strengthen and clarify the Slot Machine Act and will be of genuine help in the enforcement and the administration of that law. Its prompt introduction and enactment are urged.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

Search for Ideas To Slow Arms Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Malvina Lindsay, the well-known columnist for the Washington Post and Times Herald, devoted her column on May 17, 1956, to a discussion of the Senate Disarmament Committee hearing recently held in Boston, Mass. Her article was entitled "Search for Ideas To Slow Arms Race," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEARCH FOR IDEAS TO SLOW ARMS RACE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

To professional cynics the current efforts to get citizens to do some thinking about disarmament may seem futile, even ridiculous. The subject is supposed to be too vague and complex for anyone but experts to consider. It is also associated with failure—with all the unsuccessful disarmament conferences of history.

But some inroads on this what's-the-use attitude are being made through the regional hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Control and Reduction of Armaments. These are at least bringing some concrete aspects of the problem to the attention of grassroots leaders of opinion, including both those who attend the hearings and those who are challenged to present ideas at them.

The subcommittee has not, despite some predictions, functioned as a forum for a procession of zealots to expound grandiose, Utopian schemes. Rather, under the chairmanship of HUBERT HUMPHREY, it has been assembling the most practical regional thinking on the subject. This was particularly true of the hearing last month in Cambridge, Mass., where professors from half a dozen colleges and also some leading citizens gave the results of their studies of armament problems.

One blunt warning to come out was that time was breathing down the necks of those working for President Eisenhower's aerial inspection plan. If this is to be effective, said Walter J. Levison, assistant director of the Boston University physics research laboratory, it "must be in operation before intercontinental ballistics missiles are included in the Soviet inventory of weapons." The site for building such a missile might be detected, but the weapon when once completed could be hidden.

A proposal that Senator JOHN O. PASTORE of the subcommittee called "the best suggestion I have heard," came from Charles D. Coryell, professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It was that this country should be trying an open sky inspection system on an experimental basis with a friendly neighbor, as England or Belgium, in order to test the efficacy and also to develop personnel for carrying it out. The proposal would be strengthened if there was proof it would work, said Professor Coryell.

The need to relate arms control to other phases of foreign policy was stressed by witnesses. "We should aid the constructive aspirations of other peoples," said Max Millikan, director of the Center for International Studies at MIT. We should also in any disarmament policy, he pointed out, try to reverse the warlike impression of Americans that exists in some Asian and African nations.

"Our posture on disarmament has vital importance for our relations with the rest of the world," Professor Millikan reminded. He pointed out there was a "very major psychological difference between doing the same thing in one case under the appearance of pressure as a response to somebody else, and doing it as something for which you are taking the initiative."

Much of the testimony got around to the need of a strengthened United Nations to provide international machinery for arms control. Donald C. Stone, president of Springfield College, who has had wide experience in international agencies, testified he was "under no illusions as to the ease with which you could bring about the strengthening of the United Nations * * * but unless our objective is in that direction, unless we take all possible steps, I think the sincerity of what we are engaged in can be questioned."

Despite some pessimism of witnesses as to the short-range prospects of arms reduction, there was general agreement that efforts in this field must be vigorously continued. Even the least optimistic witness, Walter W. Rostow, professor of economics at MIT, an authority on Soviet and Chinese Communist societies (who saw little hope for disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union for the next 10 years but thought long-range prospects better through a probable change in Soviet society), declared "we should proceed with vigor and imagination" in arm-control efforts.

One reason for this, he said, was that he might be wrong in his estimates. Another was that a mood of pessimism on the part of this country would not be regarded as proper by either the American people or those of the free world. Still another was that as the dialog with the Soviet continued men gradually would "begin to see the dimensions of it and to have some common feeling as to how it might be solved if the policy makers in Moscow some day let it be solved."

The Holland Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Friday, May 18, entitled "The Holland Plan." It is designed to alleviate the shortage of engineers and scientists, and refers to H. R. 11200:

THE HOLLAND PLAN

As almost everyone knows by now, one of the gravest problems facing this country is the shortage of engineers, scientists and technicians in this atomic age.

Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of Radio Corporation of America, bluntly and plainly describes our situation this way:

"It is extremely disturbing to learn that Soviet Russia is already turning out engineers at a greater rate than we do.

"It comes as a shock to be told that if the present trend continues, the land of communism will, within a decade or sooner, outstrip the United States across the technological board.

"In the struggle between freedom and communism now underway, this is a situation that we cannot afford to view complacently."

Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, Allegheny County's freshman Congressman, has come up with this bold plan:

1. Grant 30 engineering scholarships each year to outstanding high-school graduates in each of the 435 congressional districts.

2. Offer engineering-school graduates economic and professional incentives to devote 3 years to teaching science and mathematics in high schools.

3. Give supplementary salary grants to engineering colleges to enable them to hold teachers.

When fully underway, the program would cost the Federal Government about $183 million a year, Mr. HOLLAND estimates. But, he said, "it is apparent that private individuals and industry have not, cannot and should not be expected to solve this problem. It is a national problem."

Mr. HOLLAND wisely included in his bill a provision specifically blocking Federal control of an institution joining the program.

Whether Mr. HOLLAND's proposal is the right answer to this worry remains to be seen. For one thing, 30 scholarships from each of the 435 congressional districts may be too many.

There are many debatable provisions of the bill. And that is just what should take place—debate. Bring it out in the open so that the Nation can start to catch up.

Industry, labor, engineering-school deans, defense leaders, almost everyone admits the problem. It would be more than foolish to "wait and see" once the Communists far outdo us in technological advances—and they are on the way.

Mr. HOLLAND deserves thanks for his contribution. Now Congress should consider and act.

Alaska Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a letter recently written to the President by the Reverend N. C. Middaugh, of Moose Pass, Alaska, in which a resolution passed by the 1955 session of the Alaska mission conference of the Methodist Church was forwarded to the White House having to do with the economic and social development of Alaska:

THE CHURCH OF THE TRAIL,
MOOSE PASS METHODIST CHURCH,
Moose Pass, Alaska, May 15, 1956.

Re Alaska colonialism.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the 1955 session of the Alaska mission conference of the Methodist Church the following resolution was passed as a portion of section II of the action projects of the report of the conference committee on social and economic relations:

"Section II, paragraph 4, colonialism:

"We believe that the best interests of all of the citizens of the United States, including those resident in the Territories, can be served only as the right of self-determination is assured and made secure for those peoples resident in the Territories.

"We therefore respectfully request the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and the Members of the Congress of the United States to take all proper measures as will guarantee and protect the exercise of the rights and privileges of self-determination to the people of the Territory of Alaska, to the end that—

"(a) Overexploitation of the Alaskan fisheries to the advantage of absentee industries, eventually resulting in the destruction and loss of this important industry, shall cease immediately.

"(b) There shall be an effective land-development program administered to the advantage of those people living in Alaska.

"(c) There shall be ample protection against the abuses by lobbies conducted on behalf of absentee enterprises.

"(d) An adequate judicial system shall be established and administered.

"Respectfully submitted,

"NORMAN MIDDAUGH.
"Chairman.
"Mr. ROSS KINNAMAN.
"Mr. GEORGE B. MCMILLAN.
"Mrs. JOHN ARGETSINGER.
"Mrs. JOSEPH ENGEL.
"WILLIAM FOSTER.
"NELSON MOYER."

Please bear in mind that the above request was a unanimous vote of the conference, which is a representative body of Alaskan Methodists.

Would you please correspond with us as to your plan for action regarding the above request. We would like a report on this matter in time for the 1956 conference meeting in Fairbanks on June 12.

Respectfully yours,
The Reverend N. C. MIDDAUGH,
Chairman.

Opposition Views on OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the minority views on H. R. 5550, the bill authorizing United States membership in OTC, should be of interest to the Members of the House. These minority views will be found in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill (H. Rept. No. 2007, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). A summary of these minority views follows:

(1) OTC is designed to implement the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Therefore, enactment of this bill will be interpreted inevitably as constituting congressional endorsement of GATT although the provisions of GATT itself have never been submitted to the Congress for approval.

(2) GATT is dedicated officially to the primary objective of substantial reduction of tariffs and enactment of this bill will commit the United States to the furtherance of this objective even though the Congress itself has not given its approval to any reduction in United States tariffs beyond the limited authority delegated to the President under existing law. This official dedication of GATT is of grave significance to the textile, chemical, and many other industries already hard hit by tariff reductions.

(3) OTC will create a permanent international bureaucracy susceptible to use as a powerful propaganda agency directed against the essential protection of United States industry, agriculture, and labor and to opening our domestic market to the low-cost producers of the world.

(4) Authorization of United States membership in OTC will result in an almost complete transfer by the Congress to an international organization of its constitutional authority over United States foreign-commerce policy. There is serious doubt of the constitutionality of such a delegation.

(5) Several of the substantive provisions of GATT conflict directly with established principles of United States law, particularly with regard to quotas on imports of agricultural commodities designed to implement our domestic price-support program.

(6) As a member of OTC, the United States will have but one vote. Thus, the United States, having the largest single proportion of world trade of any member nation and required to make the largest single contribution to the expenses of OTC, will be on a voting par with the other 34 member nations and will be bound by their majority decision.

(7) The agreement on OTC declares the intention of the contracting parties to seek a specialized-agency status within the United Nations. Achievement of such a status can only result in our tariff policy being further subordinated to considerations of international politics rather than to considerations of domestic economic interest.

(8) OTC contains no mechanism, by hearing or otherwise, for the direct presentation of the views of United States industry, agriculture, and labor in the formulation of recommendations vitally affecting their interest.

(9) Finally, the amendments adopted by the committee make no substantive improvement in the defects inherent in OTC–GATT.

Michigan Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is Michigan Week—the time of year when the residents of the Wolverine State pause to ponder the benefits and pleasures they have derived from Michigan.

We in Michigan have so much for which to be grateful and proud. Our State is world famous for the contributions it has made to mechanical progress and nationally famous for its social advancements. Our city of Detroit is largely responsible for the 56 million motor vehicles on our Nation's highways; our laws protecting the workingman and his family have been an inspiration and challenge to other States with large working forces.

Each year, thousands of Americans travel many miles to visit our vast woodlands and glacier-formed lakes. Our fishing and outdoor sports facilities are unsurpassed.

In addition to the privileges offered to the visitor, Michigan is rightly proud of the opportunities it has afforded its own citizens. Michigan is most famous for its manufacturing; 10,000 factories give us the highest national income average derived from manufacturing. The No. 1 industry is, of course, the automobile. In addition, countless allied and subordinate businesses supply the auto industry with necessary parts and services.

We are a great agricultural area as well as an industrial giant. Our State is the foremost producer of such foodstuffs as celery, cherries, strawberries, navy beans, and cantaloups, to mention just a few. Previously, I touched on a phase of our natural resources in connection with outdoor sports. However, the quality of our other resources are well known.

We have the largest deposit of native copper in the world, the largest forest acreage in the country, and one of the largest iron-ore producing regions in the world.

We in Michigan are inclined occasionally to look back with pride at our many achievements; however, we are primarily a forward-looking people. Our State has had a glorious past, but anticipates an even greater future. The St. Lawrence seaway will radically change the complexion of Michigan as inland ports are opened to world commerce. The completion of the new bridge uniting our two peninsulas will allow our citizens to become even better acquainted with each other. Automation, if pursued in a sensible and just fashion, with an adjusted workweek, will provide our working force more leisure without a decrease in pay.

Michigan in the past has been called the hub of the arsenal of democracy. She will not be found wanting in the future.

More About Autos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the RECORD letters from new-car purchasers. These letters substantiated my testimony before congressional committees that new cars are being dumped on the market that are not fit for use and certainly are not being delivered in the condition in which new cars should be delivered.

I have in mind what one of our colleagues said by way of answer.

Unfortunately, he made it appear that my criticism was directed against the employees of the automobile manufacturers, whereas it was directed against the manufacturers and their mass-production methods which ignore the safety factors as well as the convenience of the consumer.

All the pride in the world of an employee in his craft must be subordinated to the demonds of the assembly-line foreman who insists on speed at the expense of quality.

Further proof of the correctness of my views is found in the following comment which appears in the June 1956 issue of Motor Trend on page 74, under the heading "From the Rear Seat." It reads as follows:

The new-car manufacturers tell us that their quality control departments are supposed to see to it that each and every one of their cars is assembled with the most possible care. They say that those minor errors which periodically occur will soon be caught and corrected by the diligence of the people in this department. If that's true, what in the world has happened to the quality of our present-day cars? Is it to be expected that rattles are a normal occurrence even after a short 1,000 miles or so?

What excuse is there for screwdriver marks on metal trim? Upholstery that's not properly fitted? Trim pieces that don't aline? Rough edges on bumpers? Sloppy and orange-peel paint? Mottled chrome?

In cases where this gets by the manufacturer we're told that the dealer should take care of it before delivering the car to the customer. But is it the dealer's responsibility? Or the person's who builds the car?

We're not crying "They don't build them like they used to," but we certainly like to see them built, and not so hastily thrown together. How about it, Detroit?

Abraham Lincoln—Postmaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 17, 18, and 19 the Illinois chapter of the National Association of Postmasters held their 47th annual convention at Springfield, Ill. It was probably the largest attendance in the history of the association. Included in the printed program was a brief article on Abraham Lincoln—Postmaster, compiled by William E. McElroy, the postmaster at Springfield.

It is a highly interesting article with definite historical value, and I believe it might be very appropriately included in the Appendix of the RECORD that it might have wider circulation. Accordingly I request that it be included.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—POSTMASTER

(Compiled by Postmaster William E. McElroy)

Abraham Lincoln was appointed postmaster of New Salem on May 7, 1833, succeeding Samuel Hill. His explanation of his obtaining the position under President Jackson when he was "an avowed Clay man" was that the office was too insignificant to make his politics an objection.

According to one story, Lincoln's appointment was the result of a petition circulated by the New Salem women. Irked at the treatment accorded them by Hill, who neglected the distribution of mail while he sold liquor to the men, they petitioned the Post Office Department for his removal. It is not known whether Lincoln solicited the appointment or whether it came to him without effort on his part. Upon appointment, Mr. Lincoln, like other postmasters, was required to furnish bond of $500. Nelson Alley and Alexander Trent were his bondsmen.

New Salem was on a mail route which ran from Springfield through Sangamo Town, Athens, New Salem, Havana, Lewistown, Jackson Grove, Canton, and Knox Courthouse (Knoxville) to Warren Courthouse (Monmouth), a distance of about 125 miles. The mail was scheduled to leave Springfield on Saturday at 4 a. m. and to arrive at Monmouth Courthouse on Monday at 8 p. m. On the return trip it left Monmouth Courthouse at 6 a. m. on Tuesday and arrived in Springfield at 10 p. m. on Thursday if on time. It was carried on horseback by Harvey L. Ross, whose father, Ossian Ross, of Havana, held the contract for the route. After the stage line was established it carried the mail.

By 1834 central Illinois was pretty well covered by mail routes. Besides the New Salem route, six others ran from Springfield to various places. One went to Vandalia; another to St. Louis via Jacksonville, Carrollton, and Alton; a third to St. Louis via Carlinville and Edwardsville; a fourth to Peoria (where it joined another going to Ottawa and Chicago); a fifth to Terre Haute; and the sixth to Beardstown and Quincy.

Postal rates varied with the distance traversed and the number of pages in a letter. A single sheet cost 6 cents for the first 30 miles; 10 cents for 30 to 80 miles; 12½ cents for 80 to 150 miles; 18¾ cents for 150 to 400 miles. Two sheets cost twice as much, 3 sheets 3 times as much, and so on. Neither stamps or envelopes were used. Stamps were introduced by the Post Office Department in 1847, but did not come into general use until 1855.

Letters were simply folded and sealed and the postage charge was written in the upper right-hand corner on the outside. Postage was paid by the person receiving the letter.

The high rates on letters elicited numerous complaints. To conserve space, people frequently covered a sheet, then turned it sidewise and wrote across what they had already written, sometimes following this by writing obliquely across the page. Postmasters had difficulty in determining the number of sheets in a folded and sealed letter; and if the receiver questioned the rate charged he could open the letter in the postmaster's presence and have the error, if any, corrected.

As postmaster, Lincoln was exempt from militia and jury duties, was permitted to send and receive personal letters free, and to receive one newspaper daily without charge. The law provided, however, that "If any person shall frank any letter or letters, other than those written by himself, or by his order, on the business of the office, he shall, on conviction thereof, pay a fine of $10." A letter of September 17, 1835, from Mathew S. Marsh to George M. Marsh, his brother, throws light on Lincoln's conduct of his office. "The postmaster (Mr. Lincoln," wrote Marsh, "is very careless about leaving his office open and unlocked during the day—half the time I go in and get my papers, etc., without anyone being there as was the case yesterday. The letter was only marked 25 and even if he had been there and known it was double, he would not have charged me any more—luckily he is a very clever fellow and a particular friend of mine. If he is there when I carry this to the office—I will get him to 'frank' it * * *." Lincoln was there, and did frank it, thereby making himself liable to a $10 fine; for on the outside of the letter, in Lincoln's hand is written, "Free, A. Lincoln P. M. New Salem, Ill., Sept. 22."

A note from Lincoln to George Spears also reveals his indifference to postal regulations. "At your request," wrote Lincoln, "I send you a receipt for the postage on your paper. I am somewhat surprised at your request. I will however comply with it. The

law requires newspaper postage to be paid in advance and now that I have waited a full year you choose to wound my feelings by insinuating that unless you get a receipt I will probably make you pay for it again."

According to Harvey Ross, Lincoln kept his receipts in an old blue sock, which he hid in a wooden chest beneath the counter.

Lincoln gave general satisfaction in his administration of the office. He was always anxious to please and accommodate. When he thought that someone was especially anxious to receive a letter, he would walk several miles, if necessary, to deliver it. It is recalled that "Mr. Lincoln used to tell me that when he had a call to go to the country to survey a piece of land, he placed inside his hat all the letters belonging to people in the neighborhood and distributed them along the way." The practice of carrying papers and letters in his hat became a habit with him.

As Postmaster, Lincoln could read all the newspapers that came to New Salem. At this time he formed the habit of newspapers reading, which he continued through life, and through which, in part, he learned to interpret public opinion. His position also enabled him to become acquainted with almost every settler in that part of the country and made more formidable his subsequent candidates for the legislature.

Financially, the job was not much help to him. His remuneration depended upon the receipts of his office, which were small. More than a year after the New Salem office was discontinued, and after he had moved to Springfield, he turned over the balance of his receipts to William Carpenter, the Springfield postmaster. Carpenter's account book contains the following entry under date of June 14, 1837: "For cash recd of A. Lincoln late P. M. New Salem $248.63."

It is not known how long this sum had been accumulating; but if it represented the receipts of the office for a year, Lincoln's commissions for that year would have totaled about $75 or $80. If it represented the total receipts of the office for the 3 years of Lincoln's tenure, his commissions amounted to $25 or $30 a year.

An act of Congress of March 3, 1825, provided that postmasters should receive per quarter 30 percent of the receipts up to $100. Then, on any sum over and above the first $100 and not exceeding $400, 25 percent; on sums over the first $400 but not exceeding $2,400, 8 percent. They also kept 50 percent of the receipts from newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets, while there was allowed "To postmasters whose compensation shall not exceed $500 in 1 quarter, 2 cents for every free letter delivered out of the office, excepting such as are for the postmaster himself."

The Sangamo Journal of April 9, 1834, published the receipts of some of the Illinois post offices for 1833. The Jacksonville office took in $956. T. at at Springfield received $681. The Chicago post office received $369; that at Beardstown, $187, Peoria, $136; Pekin, $178; Vandalia, $426. On the New Salem route, the Havana office took in $54; Knoxville, $36; Lewistown, $130. No figures are given for the New Salem office, but in comparison with these figures, the estimate of $25 or $30 a year as Lincoln's remuneration seems more likely to be correct.

The position of postmaster was not confining, and Lincoln supplemented his commissions by doing all sorts of odd jobs, such as splitting rails, helping at the mill, harvesting, and tending store for Hill.

In the latter part of 1833 he secured employment as a deputy to John Calhoun, the county surveyor. Calhoun was one of the most prominent Jacksonian politicians in the county and Herndon says that Lincoln probably obtained the job through the recommendation of some Democrat. Knowing Calhoun's political affiliation, Lincoln hesitated to accept the job at first, but upon being assured that it would entail no political commitment, he agreed to take it.

Lincoln served as postmaster just 3 years from May 7, 1833, until May 30, 1836, when the office was removed to Petersburg. There is no question but that Lincoln's experiences as postmaster at New Salem, in his early formative years, played a definite part in shaping the destines of this great man.

Remarks by State Controller Robert C. Kirkwood Before Spring Convention, Irrigation Districts Association of California, Fresno, Calif., May 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the attention of my colleagues to an address delivered recently by the Honorable Robert C. Kirkwood, controller of the State of California, before the spring convention of the Irrigation Districts Association of California.

I believe that this address is outstanding in pointing out the enormity of the California water problem, and the urgent necessity of joint Federal, State, and local action.

The address follows:

Today I am appearing before you for the last time as a member of the water project authority. While I am asking your indulgence to listen to what in a sense is my swan song, still the matters which I wish to discuss with you today are subjects in which my interest will continue because of my responsibilities as the chief fiscal officer of the State. What I want to discuss with you are the problems of financing water projects.

These problems are tied in closely to the overall fiscal problems of your State government. On the one hand stands the probability that part of the financing will be done through the issuance of bonds. Whether they be revenue bonds or general obligations bonds, their issuance in any considerable quantity will affect the interest costs and related problems involved in the issuance of other bonds by, your State government. On the other hand, you and I know that a district which lacks water is a sick district, and sickness soon spreads into adjoining areas. We cannot afford to see that kind of sickness come into any part of California. It would directly affect the revenues of your State government as well as other aspects of our economy.

As State controller, therefore, I expect to continue to be concerned with water problems.

Today I wish to discuss two main aspects of the financing of water projects. First, the extent of financing through the Federal Government, and second, the extent of financing by your State Government. I will not attempt to touch onthe problems of financing by local districts—a field with which you are much more familiar than I.

Federal assistance takes two primary forms, that which is nonreimbursable and that which is reimbursable.

The nonreimbursable programs are those for flood control, salinity repulsion, navigation, and so on. During the 50 years that these programs have been in existence, California has received some $400 million of Federal funds, approximately half of which has been spent in the area south of the Tehachapis. There seems to be little controversy about the desirability of seeking Federal funds under these programs.

More controversy surrounds the reimbursable programs of the Bureau of Reclamation. If we include a portion of the cost of the Hoover Dam, which has been of tremendous benefit to southern California, California has received more than $1 billion of reclamation funds. Again, more than half of this sum has benefited southern California.

Without these tremendous expenditures of Federal funds, we must all admit that California's economy would be lagging far behind today's level.

We have not always been happy with the conditions imposed on the expenditure of reclamation funds. I am one of those who feel that when an area has within its own boundaries an adequate supply of a natural resource, it is best to develop that resource locally. As far as water is concerned, this is our situation—at least in northern California. Yet because of the financing aspects of the problem, the situation is the same today as it was some 20 years ago when we invited the Federal Government into the Central Valley project picture.

In plain words, we cannot afford to move the Federal Government out of that picture and to handle the entire problem on our own.

As a member of the Water Project Authority and earlier, as a member of the Joint Legislative Committee on Water Problems, I have explored the possibility of State purchase of the Central Valley project. I have participated in many discussions with representatives of the Federal Government. It is my considered judgment that State purchase of the Central Valley project is out of the question and would in fact be unwise.

I say this for two reasons: First, if we finance the purchase through revenue bonds, we cannot provide water and power to the citizens of California as cheaply as they are provided under Federal programs. Second, we would have to divert funds which are badly needed to finance new units of the State water plan.

To those of you who resist Federal financing and fear Federal control, I would suggest as an alternative proposal that not only should the State government of California get its feet wet in meeting our water problems, but that we should plunge in with a real program of construction.

It seems to me California must choose during the coming year between dedicating a possible $200 million to a statewide plan for water development or tossing that money—and the future of the State—into a pork barrel.

The 1957 session of the legislature looms as the most important in terms of water policy that has ever confronted the State of California. We now stand at a crossroad, where our decisions for right or wrong will affect California's future for generations.

Our great need today, as I said a moment ago, is to add units to the overall plan for developing our water resources, and our most urgent water problem is financing. We are fortunate in having available some $120 million of funds which the State has received from the depletion of a natural asset, our tidelands oil.

These funds are not the equivalent of ordinary tax revenues. They should be plowed back into the development of our other natural resources.

I have urged in the past and urge again that the $75-million rainy-day fund should also be spent on projects which are long range in scope and which will benefit the entire State.

A combination of the rainy-day fund and the tidelands revenues would mean that the State could make available a sum conceivably exceeding $200 million and not heretofore specifically earmarked for other purposes.

When funds as large as these are on hand, however, there is a temptation to dip into the pork barrel. But to plunder revenues from our own natural resources or to dissipate reserves is not in the best interest of the State.

In the long run, it is not even in the best interest of those who may receive a temporary windfall for some pet project.

As far as water is concerned, 1957 is California's "year of opportunity." For the first time in her history the State will have a department of water resources prepared and able to assume responsibility for State construction of water projects.

It is imperative that all parts of the State stand together to agree upon a constructive program, before our tremendous opportunity is lost through the manipulation of selfish interests.

The time is now.

We have, on the one hand, areas presently favored with a natural resource, oil, from which large sums of money are currently being derived. These same areas now recognize the necessity for making certain of the availability in the future of another natural resource, water.

We have on the other hand the counties of origin, where memories of devastating floods are still fresh in everyone's mind, and where there is a willingness to see surplus waters transported to other parts of the State, provided flood control and water development projects with some local benefits are undertaken at once.

In between stand areas such as the central and coastal valleys. Here the immediate need for water is so great that these areas will help to secure the rights of their neighbors to the North and to the South, provided there is wholehearted cooperation in rushing water to their parching lands.

The major obstacle that stands in the way of dedication of $200 million to the State water plan is that southern California, the source of the great bulk of these funds, must have definite, enforceable commitments that water will be available to it when needed.

This certainly can be done without jeopardizing the rights or the future of the counties of origin. There is water enough to go around—for the future needs of the areas of origin and the areas south of the Tehachapi, and for the present needs of our great central and coastal valleys.

The longer we delay financing our water development, the more we will have to concentrate the sources from which financing is drawn, and the more difficult we will make our task. Long-term obligations and high, fixed interest rates—as you in the irrigation districts know—can become intolerable burdens.

Therefore, except for those funds quite properly earmarked for beach and park development, we should commit ourselves to expend on water development in the future all sums derived from tidelands oil or from power and water developed from projects constructed. Thus, we will be able to hold bond financing to a minimum and reduce the burden of long-term obligations and high interest rates.

With the program of State construction thus made feasible we can seek our full share of funds under established Federal programs without fear of Federal domination of our water picture.

If we are to do the job that must be done, we must make available not only the funds which I have suggested for use at the State level. By making these available, it is true that we will build up our voice and our bargaining position at the conference table. But we must also take advantage of all Federal programs—both nonreimbursable and reimbursable—if we are to keep our financial situation sound and stable.

This sort of thinking will benefit every part and every citizen of the State and will provide the best use and highest purpose for the rainy-day and tidelands funds.

I am confident that if all of the water users of the State realize the great opportunities which now are open to them, they will demand the proper use of this money for the water development of the State.

Let us not choose selfishly or shortsightedly. We have much to lose, for such an opportunity will not pass our way again.

Niagara River Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed S. 1823, a bill introduced by me and 16 other Members of the Senate, for the public development of the great power potential at Niagara Falls. For the people of New York State it was a most significant victory. It was also a vote of considerable significance for the entire Nation. The Christian Science Monitor, in its issue of Thursday, May 17, called it "a major and perhaps historic victory" for the cause of public power.

I ask unanimous consent that this article describing the significance of the Senate vote on Niagara, written by Mr. Richard L. Strout, the veteran correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, and one of the most astute observers in the National Capital, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE BACKS PUBLIC POWER

(By Richard L. Strout)

Public power has won a major and, perhaps, historic victory in the Senate. It came when the so-called "preference clause" was reaffirmed as the basis for disposing of the huge hydroelectric power resources at Niagara Falls.

The "preference clause" requires that municipalities, cooperatives, and other public bodies be given preference over private utilities in the purchase of power created by the State.

The famous "preference clause" was first written into Federal law in the Reclamation Act of 1906 in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, conservation advocate. It has been a battleground for public versus private arguments for 50 years.

Clarence A. Davis, Acting Secretary of the Interior, on January 21, 1954, charged that ambiguity exists in the variations of so-called preference caluses written into power acts by Congress over the half century. While not attacking the preference clause frontally as "socialistic," as many critics have, Mr. Davis displayed lack of sympathy for the feature and indicated that it interfered with businesslike arrangements with private utilities.

FAVORITISM CHARGED

This led Girard Davidson, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior under President Truman, to charge, May 10, 1955, before a House subcommittee that the Eisenhower administration is supporting the private utility campaign to delete from this country's power policy the provision which grants a preference to public bodies and cooperatives to purchase the power generated at Government dams.

The great Canadian-United States Niagara power development will be the biggest in the East. It will cost $405 million on the American side.

The Senate division was on a clearcut partisan basis, Democrats backing public handling of the power along with the preference clause, a majority of Republicans opposing.

The vote was 48 to 39, an unexpectedly large majority. The party lineup was Democrats for—40, against 6. Republicans for—8, against 33. The matter now goes to the House.

Indicating the importance of the measure, two campaigning Democrats Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, flew back to vote for the bill and then flew away again.

There are indications that the power issue will be important in some voting areas in the election.

BATTLE OVER CLAUSE

The real Senate battle over the bill of veteran Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, for the development of the Niagara power project turned primarily on the specific inclusion of the preference clause, and only secondarily on whether power development and management should be undertaken by a public authority—the proposed State power authority—rather than by private utilities. Both the preference clause and the public authority won.

New York State Republicans, led by former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Senator IRVING M. IVES, Republican, of New York, favored the State authority over private utilities, even though the former has been denounced as socialism by more conservative groups. Mr. Dewey so testified 3 years ago.

On the other hand, Messrs. Dewey and IVES were against the inclusion of the preference clause. Senator IVES read to the Senate a telegram from Mr. Dewey expressing unalterable opposition to the clause.

Significantly, there was no attempt on the Senate floor to introduce an amendment striking out the preference provision, which goes back to Theodore Roosevelt and which recently has been increasingly brought into doubt by the Interior Department under former Secretary Douglas McKay and Acting Secretary Clarence A. Davis.

BOND SALE PLANNED

The New York State agency plans to finance power development under the 1950 treaty with Canada by public bonds. It will be second in size only to Grand Coulee Dam in Washington, with ultimate capacity of 9 billion kilowatts.

New England stands to benefit, particularly any municipal or public power authorities that may come forward under the preference clause.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, bluntly charged Republicans with being against State development of power and with using the preference clause only as an excuse.

In testimony in 1954, Mr. Davis agreed that "there are profound philosophical differences as to the proper role of the Federal Government in the economy of the electric industry."

BRANDED "RADICAL"

Mr Davis appeared then as solicitor of the Interior Department. He is now acting Department head with the resignation of Secretary McKay to go to Oregon to battle Senator MORSE for the Senate seat, where hydroelectric power is the dominant issue.

The public, after half a century, is largely unfamiliar with the preference clause battle which once helped to bring the name "radical" to Teddy Roosevelt.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl seemed to advocate a retreat from the preference clause in a statement March

9, 1955, regarding the Department's Southwestern Power Administration policy.

"The present policy of the Department," Mr. Aandahl said, "is that the construction of multipurpose dams by the Government makes a valuable contribution to specific areas. He added that that should be "the limit of Federal participation," inferentially barring the further operation of the preference clause to local public agencies.

Soviet World Domination Goal Hasn't Swerved an Inch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1956:

SOVIET WORLD DOMINATION GOAL HASN'T SWERVED AN INCH

(By William Philip Simms)

Faces may change inside the Kremlin, and so may Soviet tactics, but Moscow's goal of world domination has not swerved an inch since the Red dance of death began back in 1917.

Because that is so; because the goal is more shrewdly camouflaged than in the past, and because Russia is militarily more capable than ever of carrying it out, the United States and the rest of the West are in graver peril at this moment than at any time since the Bolshevik revolution.

The notion that Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov & Co. have suddenly got religion and are now somehow different from what they were when they were Stalin's hatchetmen will be rank poison if swallowed by the American people. When a real change comes to Moscow, we won't have to guess at it. The whole world will know it.

As long as Russia holds on to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and her other conquests; as long as she refuses to accept any kind of mutually cheatproof arms limitation plan; as long as she continues to conspire with Communist nationals in every country in the world to overthrow their own governments, she clearly has not change one iota.

So long as the U. S. S. R. hides everything she does behind an Iron Curtain, and everything she thinks behind gobbledygook, she cannot be trusted. Deceit, lying, and double-crossing have been among her chief instruments of national policy from the outset.

BASIC COMMIE POLICY LAID DOWN BY TROTSKY

Basic Communist policy was laid down by Leon Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk in 1918. It was: Not peace, not war, but keep the free world in a constant state of eruption until strife-weary peoples everywhere fall into Russia's clutches out of sheer desperation.

But the jack-booted Germans refused to stop the war on any such arrangement as that. Instead, they mashed Russia's face into the mud and tore the country apart. Whereupon Lenin wrote his famous postscript to the Trotsky ukase. Peace, he said, would have to be accepted but only to give the Reds time in which to stage a decisive comeback. "The proletariat of the world," he added, "will come to our assistance. Then we will lay the bourgeoisie and the imperialists low."

The biggest irony of the present moment is that Trotsky's brains were bashed in because he held that Stalin was not a true follower of Lenin. For now come Khrushchev, Molotov, and other Stalinites to say, in effect, that Trotsky and the vast horde of liquidated Trotskyites were right all the time.

Which means, if it means anything at all, that Khrushchev and his comrades haven't the slightest intention of abandoning the Lenin-Trotsky concept of not war, not peace, but world domination through international conspiracy. How, in the circumstances, any informed person can believe that recent events in Moscow are a hopeful sign, is beyond this observer's ken.

Khrushchev, et al., do not say Stalin was wrong insofar as he sought to promote world revolution. On the contrary, they denounce him for butchering better Bolsheviks than he and falling down on his real job, which was plotting the downfall of free nations.

MOSCOW SPECTACULAR ANOTHER RED ZIGZAG

It would seem, therefore, that the most that can be said for the latest Moscow spectacular is that it is just another different, but typical, Communist zigzag.

More powerful than ever before and better organized everywhere for international sabotage and boring from within, there is considerable evidence that Khrushchev and his fellow conspirators now believe they can achieve their goal without actual war—that is, without a war in which Russia herself would be directly or legally involved.

All around the globe—in Western and Southern Europe, in Asia, Africa, and the Americas, and in all the strategic islands of the seas, their agents are turning every national difficulty to Moscow's advantage.

Moscow is not entirely without reason in feeling cocky. Under the terms of the Russo-German truce of 1918, Russia lost one-quarter of her population and arable land, one-third of her factories, three-fourths of her coal production and her railway system. Today, just 38 years after, approximately two-thirds of the total world population are either Reds, pinks, fellow travelers or sympathetic neutrals. Small wonder that Khrushchev now openly boasts of our certain victory over the other third.

REDS THINK THEIR A-BOMB COUNTERBALANCES OURS

European intelligence reports reveal that Khrushchev and his coconspirators believe that Soviet atomic bombs now fully counterbalance ours. From that, they conclude that they have little to fear from an atomic war because both sides realize that such a war might well prove fatal to both. That being so, conventional armies and weapons may now be said to have come back into their own.

This makes Khrushchev's present drive for conventional arms reduction especially interesting. One reason for it, of course, is its propaganda value but most likely there are others more important still. By a sort of package deal, Russia might hope to obtain some kind of ban on atomic weapons which would leave the way open for her to hold on to hers without the allies being able to catch her at it. Secondly—and perhaps the most important—any further reduction of the already skeletonized forces of Western Europe would leave that whole area at the mercy of the powerful fifth columns everywhere rampant.

SOME NATIONS FEAR RED COUP FROM WITHIN

Some of Western Europe's key countries—which, at the same time, are key countries in NATO—already live in fear of a Red coup from within. In them are enormous Communist populations, trained and disciplined in the use of conventional weapons, sabotage and violence. The Spanish civil war revealed how easily these could be secretly aided by Moscow. Thus, what happened to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and other countries taken over by the Communists, could also happen there.

Until we can eliminate all guesswork, and until some of the things enumerated above actually offer proof that there has been a genuine change of heart as well as of faces in the Kremlin, for us to enter into any bargain with it as the result of wishful thinking would be the deepest folly.

Meantime, 10 years and $50 billion worth of trying ought to have convinced us that true friendship cannot be bought.

In my humble opinion, the greatest possible service we can do for our own people, for our allies, for the cause of world peace and mankind in general is to make the United States itself as nearly invincible as humanly possible. If we do that, and are as just as we are powerful, loyal friends, of their own accord, will gladly rally round us. We won't have to go, moneybags in hand, seeking them.

Our Great Historic Sites, Buildings, and Objects Are Compelling Ways of Realizing the Worthy Quality of Our Past Attainments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the rate of destruction of notable buildings in this country in the last two decades either by fire, demolition, or alteration is so dangerously high that thoughtful citizens are becoming deeply alarmed lest we be largely despoiled of the landmarks, sites, and notable objects which identify the historic achievements of the people of this Nation. Recently Prof. James Grote Van Derpool, president of the Society of Architectural Historians, wrote me in support of 2 bills I have sponsored, H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, saying that:

The inspiration to be derived from the great lessons of the past are of immense significance in guiding present and future generations toward similarly worthy standards and attainments. It seems somewhat futile to be deeply concerned about our future if we have little comprehension of our past. Certainly our great historic sites, buildings, and objects are compelling ways of realizing the worthy quality of our past attainments.

My 2 bills were designed to assure the completion of work begun under President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935 to prepare a national list of sites, buildings, and objects which are declared a part of the national treasure and are thus designated for careful consideration. Such lists are carefully developed and maintained by all the great nations of Europe.

Following the enactment of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935—Forty-ninth United States Statutes at Large, page 666—the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior began making a nationwide survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects for the purpose of determining which of them are of outstanding national historical importance in the history of this country. The information collected has

proven to be of basic importance to the Service and has been utilized in preparing data for Presidential proclamations, national historic sites designation orders, departmental reports on proposed legislation, replies to senatorial and congressional inquiries, and answers to private and semipublic requests regarding preservation of nationally important historic buildings and sites.

The data thus provided has also been essential to the Service in assisting the Department of the Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Division of Territories in their historic sites and buildings program. The data has also been found useful in advising the President regarding problems relating to the preservation of important historic sites and buildings.

When this important survey was approximately 50 percent complete, it was interrupted by World War II in 1941. I have been advised that under the Mission 66 program for the improvement of the natinal parks and the work of the National Park Service, it is expected that funds will be available to resume the important work of the historic sites survey and that if the necessary funds are appropriated, the Service will resume this activity during the next fiscal year. I understand that in making their survey, the National Park Service staff studies not only buildings in private or semipublic ownership, but also makes studies of those owned or controlled by the Federal Government.

Early in the 1st session of the 84th Congress I began to campaign for the preservation of the historic Civil Service Building at 7th and F Streets NW., in Washington, D. C., and later protested the plan to survey some 31 other historic buildings across the country, such as the fine old customhouse in Charleston, S. C., preparatory to razing them. I am happy, therefore, to commend the Honorable Franklyn G. Floete, Administrator, General Services Administration, and the Honorable Conrad I. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, for establishing review procedures which will prevent the thoughtless razing of historic buildings. I am very happy to include here for the information of my colleagues some of the many fine letters I have received in support of my measures as well as a letter from Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Director of the National Park Service, confirming the review procedures which should have the support of everyone concerned with the cultural status of our Nation:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: A recent verbal inquiry from your staff requested detailed information relating to the procedures referred to in our letter of April 16 for the review of old Federal structures scheduled for demolition under provisions of the act of August 27, 1935.

We are glad to advise you that on April 20 by mutual agreement between this office and the General Services Administration, there were established regular procedures for the referral, review, and evaluation of such old Federal structures. The steps in these procedures are as follows:

1. General Services Administration will notify the National Park Service of the proposed demolition of an existing Federal building at the time that General Services Administration determines to include the structure as a project in the lease-purchase program for the replacement of obsolete public buildings. The notification to the Service will be a memorandum form, which will give the name of the building, its location, and its date of construction; a separate memorandum to be forwarded on each project.

2. The Service, upon receipt of the memorandum of notification, will examine the project file in the GSA Washington office; and if necessary, borrow pertinent documents, maps, and photographs for study.

3. After preliminary study, if the Service finds no apparent historical value or architectural merit in the property, GSA will be notified to this effect. If definite historical value is believed to exist and field investigation is required, GSA will also be notified and provided with a statement of the probable time required for the report and determination as to the national historical significance of the structure.

4. The Service will provide GSA with a written determination on the historical significance or architectural merit of the structure within a feasible time and certainly within the 90-day review period prescribed in the act of August 27, 1935.

We are gratified with the fine spirit of cooperation shown by the officials of the GSA and feel certain that the established procedures will provide an adequate safeguard for the evaluation and preservation of old Federal structures.

Sincerely yours,
HILLORY A. TOLSON,
Acting Director.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for your recent referral of S. J. Res. 156, to provide for the preservation of the historic customhouse in Charleston, S. C.

We are pleased to learn of your interest and that of Senator JOHNSTON in preserving the old customhouse at Charleston through some appropriate means. The whole question of the preservation of old Federal structures, which have national historical associations, is currently be discussed with the General Services Administration. We are at present exploring procedures for the referral, review and evaluation of any of such structures under the provisions of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended (63 Stat. 380, 40 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 304a–2), which provides that the Administrator of General Services shall refer to the Secretary of the Interior for determination as to the national historical significance of any old Federal buildings scheduled for demolition. Officials of the General Services Administration have been very cooperative, and we believe that the review procedures being established will prevent the thoughtless razing of any structure of national significance and will also provide an opportunity for effecting arrangements for the preservation of such structures.

We appreciate your interest in bringing S. J. Res. 156 to our attention, but, in advance of a report by the Secretary of the Interior on this legislation, we are not in a position to state our views upon it.

Sincerely yours,
CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director.

MARCH 14, 1956.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman, Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ENGLE: I strongly favor the passage of two bills that are now pending in the House of Representatives, No. 7975 and No. 7976, making an appropriation to the Park Service for a survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects owned by the Federal Government, and a second appropriation for a survey of historic and other sites, buildings and objects not owned by the Federal Government.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my nephew the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, Congressman from Philadelphia, and am asking his support of these bills. I am also sending a copy of this letter to the headquarters office of the National Trust in Washington.

With regard, I am
Sincerely yours,
EDWIN O. LEWIS,
Chairman, Advisory Commission, Independence National Historical Park.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Trenton, April 25, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thanks very much for your letter of April 23, 1956, regarding H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976. I believe these are definitely good bills covering a field which has been long neglected. You may certainly count on all my support.

With warmest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH E. MCLEAN,
Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
DIVISION OF PARKS AND MEMORIALS,
Springfield, March 9, 1956.

Mr. FREDERICK, L. RATH,
Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RATH: I wish to extend the support of this office for the two bills, H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976 which were recently introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey.

The first bill will provide for a much-needed survey of national park properties which should permit them to be more efficiently restored and maintained.

H. R. 7976 should be passed so that the incomplete nationwide survey of historic properties can be brought to a conclusion. It is certainly a worthy and needed project.

May I say that both bills provide for surveys of a type which we are now undertaking in the State of Illinois. We have found that such surveys permit us to develop our present properties and also to guide us while in the acquisition of properties which are not yet in public hands. The same sort of activity should certainly be going on throughout the Nation. I hope that the National Trust can be an effective instrument in relaying the wishes of this office to Congress.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD S. HAGEN,
Historical Consultant.

SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS,
April 4, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In reply to your good letter of March 26 requesting a statement in support of bill H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, I am more than happy to do so as follows:

On behalf of the Society of Architectural Historians I would like to offer warm commendation for the objectives expressed in the two bills designated as H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, as introduced into the House of Representatives on January 3 by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON.

These two bills represent logical first steps toward the preservation of significant historic sites, buildings, and objects in this country, whether already owned by the Federal Government or in other hands.

Calling for an appropriation to finance a systematic survey and evaluation of these two classes of historic holdings, for the first time, will allow our Nation to have a clear picture of what constitutes an important part of the heritage of the American people. Such a survey undertaken by the admirably trained and historically aware staff of the National Park Service, should prove an immensely useful guide as to exactly what is of genuine significance to us and hence worthy of zealous preservation. From an administrative point of view such inventories should prove of immediate usefulness to the concerned members of the Government and private bodies responsible for the custodianship of such works.

At long last, this country will be joining the ranks of the great nations of Europe who have long maintained so-called national lists of sites, buildings, and objects which are declared a part of the national treasure and are thus designated for careful preservation.

The rate of destruction of notable buildings in this country, in the last two decades either by fire, demolition, or alteration is so dangerously high that thoughtful citizens are alarmed lest we be largely despoiled of the landmarks, sites, and notable objects which identify the historic achievements of the people of this Nation. The inspiration to be derived from the great lessons of the past are of immense significance in guiding present and future generations toward similarly worthy standards and attainments. It seems somewhat futile to be deeply concerned about our future if we have little comprehension of our past. Certainly our great historic sites, buildings, and objects are compelling ways of realizing the worthy quality of our past attainments.

Very sincerely,
Prof. JAMES GROTE VAN DERPOOL,
President.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I was very glad to receive your letter of May 9, 1956, which I read to the members of the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting held on May 9 and 10, 1956. We share your feeling of satisfaction that the General Services Administration has changed its mind about the need to raze the old Patent Office Building here and the old customhouse in Charleston, S. C. The preservation of our historic and architectural monuments remains, however, a matter of continuous vigilance, and we are grateful that you consider this a matter to which you can lend your support.

The allocation of funds for mural paintings and sculpture in new public buildings is an important item of our current studies in the Commission. The preparation of such legislation involves the agreement and cooperation of the General Services Administration and the Bureau of the Budget, where the matter now stands. Until it can be cleared through these two agencies, there is nothing that can be done at the present time about such legislation, but we are hopeful of securing a report and draft of such legislation from the General Services Administration in the near future.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID E. FINLEY,
Director.

COMMITTEE ON PRESERVATION
OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS,
Chicago, Ill., April 17, 1596.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Representative from New Jersey, the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Mr. Albert Simons, of Charleston, a member of our committee, has been good enough to send me a clipping from the Charleston Evening Post, April 6, 1956, with the welcome news that any thought of razing the old customhouse there has been abandoned and that the General Services Administration will seek to preserve it.

Our Committee also notes mention of your having added your voice to protests against the proposed demolition and also that you have drafted bills aimed at preserving national landmarks having "exceptional value of commemorating or illustrating the History of the United States." Such structures so often possess architectural significance also, that the American Institute of Architects finds double cause for applauding and supporting your cause. We would be very interested indeed to know what progress has been made toward your objective and especially how we could bring the institute's national prestige to bear in support.

We have over 100 preservation officers through the country who are conducting a national inventory of significant buildings and who, as much as is possible, help in the preservation of them. Perhaps you know Mr. Seymour Williams, 385 Central Avenue, Rahway, N. J., and would be interested in talking things over with him. He is a veteran in preservation and one of our most zealous cooperators.

Also, you might wish to communicate with Albert Simons, 17 Broad Street, Charleston 3, S. C., who has led our fight to save the threatened Patent Office in Washington, so far successfully.

Please accept our thanks for your interest and effective support.

Sincerely yours,
EARL H. REED,
FAIA Chairman.

THE HENRY FRANCIS DU PONT
WINTERTHUR MUSEUM,
Winterthur, Del., March 21, 1956.

Mr. FREDERICK L. RATH, Jr.,
Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: I note with great interest the two bills now before Congress: H. R. 7975 and H. R. 797. Without question, the two projects outlined in these bills are of tremendous interest to the Nation as a whole. It seems a great shame that any nation, and especially one as rich as ours, has been unwilling or unable to afford the comparatively small amount of money necessary to complete a survey of its historic buildings and monuments.

Each year these monuments mean more and more to the American people. I foresee their becoming a most important part in the overall American educational system in the comparatively near future; that is to say, if any of them remain. The first step toward saving them is to learn the important ones through such surveys as outlined in H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976.

I wholeheartedly hope—as does every member of this institution—that these two bills may be passed.

Yours very truly,
CHARLES F. MONTGOMERY.

MISSOURI HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
St. Louis, Mo., March 23, 1956.

Mr. FREDERICK L. RATH, Jr.,
Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RATH: I have just had the opportunity to examine your fall-winter 1955 issue of Historic Preservation with your enclosure regarding House bills H. R. 7975 and 7976. Both provide an opportunity for completing the increasingly needed list of historic properties administered by the National Park Service, and the remaining sites of national interest which still survive.

Here at the historical society we constantly use, for reference purposes, the material assembled under the Historic America Building Survey Act. It is greatly to be desired that this project be completed.

Sincerely,
CHARLES VAN RAVENSWAAY,
Director.

CITY ART MUSEUM OF ST. LOUIS,
St. Louis, Mo., March 2, 1956.

Mr. FRED L. RATH, Jr.,
Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: Recently I received a copy of the two bills H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976 relating to the facilitation of historic preservation in the United States. Needless to say I hope these will be passed since the survey for which they would provide would be most helpful in the appraisal and eventual realization of many preservation projects commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

The National Park Service, under whose aegis such projects come would be greatly aided in their efforts by such a survey since at the present time the development of historic sites and the preservation of buildings and objects owned by the United States lack the benefit of any organized plan for the implementation of these many and disparate undertakings.

In our own region for instance I am sure that the great Jefferson National Expansion Memorial would benefit through such a survey, whereas at present it is having to undergo a painfully slow reactivation after almost 20 years of stagnation because of the late war.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES NAGEL,
Director.

Brooklyn's Oldest Synagogue Celebrates 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn's oldest synagogue, known as Baith Israel Anshei Emes, is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence. Founded in 1856 by 12 Jews of Dutch and Bavarian origin, this congregation was the first attempt to organize Jewish religious and communal life in Brooklyn. Today, the Borough of Brooklyn contains the largest Jewish community in the world, numbering about 1 million people of the Jewish faith.

Of particular interest is the fact during the early years of its existence it

was aided by Christian neighbors when a group of bigoted know nothings tried to stop the congregation from conducting religious worship. Today, we find that Christian people are again aiding this congregation through financial contributions for the purpose of establishing this old synagogue as a shrine in Brooklyn for posterity. What better example of brotherhood and interfaith understanding can we have?

A century ago when this congregation was established, Brooklyn was primarily farmland. The members of the congregation, their children and their grandchildren grew up with Brooklyn and helped to make it what it is today. They have played a vital role in the growth of community life, which today encompasses some 3 million souls of all faiths.

On the occasion of a century of uninterrupted existence, I extend my sincerest good wishes to the congregation and its entire membership. May it continue to bring forth the finest in Jewish life in the future as it has done so well in the past.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert two articles which describe the history of Brooklyn's oldest synagogue and its impact on the community. The articles, written by Oscar Hertz, president of the congregation, and by its spiritual leader Rabbi Israel Goldfarb, were published in the April 1956 issue of the Jewish Forum. They are as follows:

CENTENNIAL OF BAITH ISRAEL ANSHEI EMES

(By Oscar Hertz, president)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Oscar Hertz, a prominent attorney, is active in Brooklyn's religious and communal affairs.)

BROOKLYN'S OLDEST SYNAGOGUE: A SHRINE

In 1943, Brooklyn's first and oldest synagogue was fraught with peril. Congregation Baith Israel Anshei Emes, founded in 1856, was haunted by one pervasive reality—the threat of closing its doors as a house of worship.

The two imposing synagogue buildings located at Kane and Court Streets were on the verge of crumbling because of lack of repair. A shift in the Jewish population had considerably reduced its membership. Our country was at war with Germany and approximately 200 of the congregation's young men were in the armed services.

Everything looked bleak. The board of trustees was utterly discouraged. To gather courage to carry on, our conversation centered around the common struggles of our congregation's pioneers. But as the weeks rolled on, the financial crisis became worse.

"The Jews are a people of history and time," wrote the historian, Rufus Learsi. Our members, guided by this philosophy, decided to hold on as long as possible, hoping and praying that time would bring the miracle of keeping our synagogue open for posterity.

The miracle did happen. In our midst appeared a stranger who made inquiry for a place of worship. A mild-mannered individual, with a kindly looking face, introduced himself to the members as Herman Belth.

Rabbi Israel Goldfarb, spiritual leader of our congregation, warmly welcomed Mr. Belth. Members of the congregation made him feel at home. As time elapsed, he was attracted more and more by the awe-inspiring synagogue. He loved its lofty simplicity of design. He was struck by the majestic beauty of the buildings. Its high columns, stained-glass windows, and choir loft gave one a feeling of peace and religious contentment, despite the crumbling plaster and cracked walls.

Mr. Belth, a partner in the brokerage firm of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner, & Beane, learned of the financial distress of the congregation. He felt the importance of maintaining the Jewish religion and preserving the synagogue for prayer. He recommended the establishment of a building fund, of course, pledging his own assistance. "Our support at this crucial period must be expanded to the utmost," pleaded Mr. Belth.

The members were permeated with Mr. Belth's spirit and enthusiasm. We all worked hard to raise funds. Mr. Belth brought in many thousands of dollars. This enabled the synagogue immediately to make some necessary repairs.

In 1948, I noticed that the moneys contributed were not sufficient to meet many of the obligations. Somewhat discouraged, I wrote a letter to Rabbi Goldfarb informing him that, despite Mr. Belth's and members' herculean efforts, the synagogue was still financially in distress.

This letter was shown Mr. Belth. While the Rabbi and Mr. Belth were in conversation at the latter's home, Mrs. Belth handed an envelope to her husband. It was from a Christian friend. It contained $2,000 for the synagogue. This brought new temporary life and hope to the rabbi and the congregation.

Thirteen years have passed since Mr. Belth has come into the life of the congregation. During this period he, with the aid of his friends (some of them the most outstanding Christian folks in the political and financial fields in the world) contributed approximately $100,000. With this money the synagogue was remodeled and redecorated. Singlehanded, Mr. Belth lifted the congregation from its plight in 1943 to one of the foremost synagogues in Brooklyn today.

Congregation Baith Israel Anshei Emes is now celebrating its 100th anniversary. On May 13, 1956, the centennial celebration will culminate at a dinner to be held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The proceeds will go into a building endowment fund. Mr. Belth has undertaken the chairmanship of this fund for the sole purpose of raising an initial sum of $250,000 to insure the perpetuation of the synagogue as a shrine for posterity.

No longer does this synagogue belong to the members of the congregation as such. It rather belongs to all Jewry. As the first and oldest synagogue in the largest Jewish community in the world; it rightfully has its place as a shrine dedicated to Jewish life.

At first, minyan services were held in homes. When, on January 22, 1856, they met in the home of Mr. B. Rose on Myrtle Avenue, the minyan became Baith Israel (House of Israel) and Morris Ehrlich was elected president; Marcus Bass, vice president; J. A. Jonas, treasurer; Nehemiah Hoffheimer, secretary, and Tagol Samter, Michael Prince, and Joshua Mendes, trustees.

A temporary synagogue was fitted out at 155 Atlantic Street (now Atlantic Avenue). The ritual was usually chanted by laymen, except on Passover and autumnal festivals, when a regular cantor, chazzan, was brought from New York.

But all did not go smoothly. In that area where the congregation met, and where George Washington planned the amphibious withdrawal that saved his army, where freedom won in the Battle of Long Island, the pious Jews found themselves pursued by the old wolf pack of bigotry.

The know-nothings, a bigoted and anti-intellectual group of the time, blasted away at the establishment of the synagogue. But they hadn't counted on the force of faith. The little congregation was supported in its struggles by local Christians—Roman Catholics and Protestant. Following the implications of their faith, which holds that God is not the special property of any tribe or race, and that all men should worship Him as brothers, sincere Christians stood by the pious Jews in verbal debates and fistfights. Some were arrested for assault and battery. Against the active religious conviction of Jew and Christian, the opposition of the know-nothings splintered apart. The congregation then and there began its tradition of Jewish-Christian cooperation.

A building erected on the corner of State Street and Boerum Place was the second home of the congregation, when Solomon Furst became president; Marcus Bass, vice president; T. Samar, treasurer; Julius Corn, secretary; and H. Mautner, M. Lowenthal and M. Cohen, trustees.

The cornerstone was laid on January 12, 1862, by Moses Lowenthal, who subsequently became president of the congregation. The large gathering at the ceremonies included city officials and Christian clergymen. Officiating were Rabbi Raphall Isaacs and S. M. Aaron, both of New York.

Members of the congregation marched with their scrolls from the temporary quarters on Atlantic Street to their new spiritual home—the "Boerum Shul." Here Baith Israel spent more than 40 decisive years, years filled with pathos, humor, and progress.

While the new synagogue was located near a stable of race horses, members of the congregation did not complain. But the thoroughbreds, apparently, did. Race-horse handlers complained about that "loud praying from the synagogue disturbing the horses." Any requests, however, to stop praying must have been met with a polite nay (neigh?), for the members continued praying and the congregation continued exerting a wider influence in the growing community. Waves of immigrants were sweeping into the country.

The early minutes of the congregation were in English, next in German, then in Yiddish, the last indicating an influx from Poland, Russia, and other areas of Eastern Europe. Before the turn of the century, they were again written in English, and have been ever since.

As the Jewish population in Brooklyn grew from 100 to 1 million, groups split off from the mother synagogue and from one another and formed new synagogues, so that today a number of Jewish institutions in the borough can trace their lineage back to the first congregation.

After the turn of the century the congregation declined; by 1904 it had dwindled down to about 30. One reason was population movement with people spreading farther out into Brooklyn, leaving old neighborhoods to decay. For some years the congregation had been without a rabbi. The trustees and officers took the dilemma by the horns and the congregation was moved to its present location on Kane Street (then Harrison Street) near Court Street.

In June 1905 Rabbi Israel Goldfarb became the spiritual leader of the congregation. In autumn of that year he made a powerful plea for the establishment of a Talmud Torah (daily Hebrew school). With the initiative of Mr. Sonnenstrahl and Mr. Salit, the school was organized. It opened its doors on November 26, 1905, with 90 pupils, who came to 4 sessions weekly to learn Hebrew, the prayer book, translation of the Bible, Rashi, Jewish music, Jewish history, and religion. The instruction in Sunday school was thorough and the Talmud Torah provided added learning which broadened and deepened the students' knowledge of their religious and cultural past.

The congregation's new home was originally built in 1846 as a Dutch Reformed Church. It was temporarily remodeled, and the pulpit of the old Boerum shul was removed to the new synagogue, which was dedicated on Washington's birthday, 1905. In March 1908 it merged with Talmud Torah Anshei Emes (of Degraw Street). The Scrolls of the Law were brought in carriages, and

President Isaac Tuck presided over the joyous celebration. Thus the congregation became Baith Israel Anshei Emes.

Down through the years the women of the congregation played an important role. It was the congregation's first women's society, formed in 1868 as the Daughters of Israel Benefit Society, that gave some of its money for the Kane Street building. A permanent sisterhood was formed in 1908 with Mrs. L. Summer as president.

The synagogue was completely remodeled in 1911 and again in 1929. The 1920's were golden years for the congregation. Eight hundred active members contributed to the life of the synagogue, and the Sunday school thronged with 500 children.

But trouble was ahead. A ticker tape told of ever-sickening prices. The congregation, decimated, weathered the depression, serving its members and standing for the principles of traditional Judaism. Faithfully it taught the young and buried the dead in its cemetery. Then came the war, the sacrifices, the lives of sons laid down on the battlefields.

But there was nothing it could do about population shifts in the Borough of Brooklyn. The immediate area became increasingly Roman Catholic, surrounded by business establishments. The Jewish population scattered and shifted, leaving the mother synagogue more and more alone. Yet the congregation still has its faithful members, holding services every day for some of the Jewish businessmen of the area.

Sometimes when there aren't enough present for a legal service, the local police station (Butler Street precinct) is called up. The Irish desk lieutenant politely obliges by sending the needed number of patrolmen who had just finished their tour of duty, to fill out the congregation's morning or evening minyan.

Incidents like these are typical of the Jewish-Christian cooperation that has been distinctive of the congregation's history. On December 16, 1955, it honored the members of the bench and bar in recognition of their outstanding contribution to the growth and development of the largest Jewish community in America. On February 5, 1956, the congregation held a public celebration to commemorate its centennial. Both successful events were held in the synagogue.

The dinner celebration, to be held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on May 13, 1956, will begin a new milestone in the history of the congregation. Now it has been decided that the synagogue be made into a shrine. Nothing could be more fitting. Brooklyn has been called the "Borough of Churches." But with a thriving Jewish community of more than a million persons, it is also a borough of Synagogues.

The "mother synagogue" today stands as a symbol of the finest in Jewish life and of the finest of cooperation with other faiths. We are linked in unity, supported by an unswerving faith in the power of religious belief. In the past we have contributed generously to the spiritual life of our community. As a shrine, an additional growing contribution will be made toward building Brooklyn as the Borough of Brotherhood.

BAITH ISRAEL ANSHEI EMES

(By Israel Goldfarb, rabbi)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Goldfarb has just completed his 50th year as spiritual leader of congregation Baith Israel Anshei Emes, which is celebrating its centennial. He is recognized as one of the outstanding members of the Rabbinate.)

SPIRITUAL IMPACT ON COMMUNITY LIFE

Looking at the sprawling Jewish community of Brooklyn with its estimated population of more than 1 million souls, one would hardly believe that this, the largest single Jewish community in the world, has grown up and developed within the short span of only 100 years. To trace the beginnings of this remarkable community and its unprecedented growth, one must turn to the annals of Congregation Baith Israel Anshei Emes, the mother synagogue of Brooklyn, now celebrating its 100th anniversary.

It is not known exactly when or how Jews first came to live in Brooklyn. It is most probable that individual Jews settled on Long Island as early as the Dutch period. Their number was apparently too small to form a community. It is a matter of tradition that, during the holy days, they attended the congregations in New York, the more pious among them rowing over on Fridays to spend the Sabbath with their brethren on Manhattan Island.

It was not until January 22, 1856, when 12 serious minded Jews of Dutch and Bavarian descent, symbolically reminiscent of the original 12 tribes of Israel, met at the home of Mr. B. Ross on Myrtle Avenue in the city of Brooklyn for the purpose of incorporation of a congregation and synagogue for divine service. This meeting marked the birth of the first Jewish house of worship and the first attempt at organized Jewish life in Brooklyn.

Little did this small group dream that the tiny acorn which they then planted in the virgin soil of Brooklyn would someday grow up into a mighty oak. If these pioneer Jews were to return today, how surprised would they be to find that the quiet and peaceful Brooklyn countryside of a century ago has grown and developed (in great measure through the efforts of its Jewish population) into a great center of industry and commerce, religion, education, art, and culture. With what just pride would they gaze upon Brooklyn's large network of synagogues and religious schools of every description, of philanthropic, educational, and social institutions that are teeming with Jewish life and activity.

II

During the first years of its existence, Congregation Baith Israel, as the new organization was named, held its religious services in a temporary, improvised synagogue at 155 Atlantic Street (now Atlantic Avenue). It was not until January 12, 1862, when the cornerstone for Brooklyn's first synagogue was laid on the corner of Boerum Place and State Street, a few blocks from Boro Hall. It was a happy day when on August 31 of the same year the new synagogue was dedicated in the presence of a large gathering, including distinguished rabbis from New York, city officials and Christian clergymen.

In the decades that followed, Congregation Baith Israel was the center of Jewish activities in Brooklyn's growing community. Within its sacred walls, hundreds of men and women have found spiritual comfort and religious exultation. Within its classrooms, many hundreds of Jewish children have received their spiritual nourishment and their first knowledge of our people's history and faith.

The first years of the congregation's existence were not, however, without their hardships and struggles, disappointments and serious setbacks. Early in its history, the congregation was torn by internal ideological strife when a number of its members sought to introduce the reform ritual into its religious services. It happened during the period when the reform movement was very strong under the aggressive leadership of men like Rabbis Isaac M. Wise, Max Lilienthal, David Einhorn, Samuel Adler, and Samuel Hirsch. This movement, a product of Germany, had made rapid strides over the length and breadth of the country. Under such strain, Baith Israel, which had been pursuing a strict course of consistent and uncompromising orthodoxy since its inception, had quite a task before it in trying to keep itself from being swept by the powerful currents of the reform movement into the labyrinth of the new cult.

To all demands for changes in the ritual, the Congregation remained stubbornly unyielding. Accordingly, in 1861, the discontented advocates of reform seceded from the congregation and organized a new society under the name of Beth Elohim, the first reform temple of Brooklyn, now situated at Eighth Avenue and Garfield Place.

In 1869 a splinter of this new congregation broke away from Beth Elohim and organized Temple Israel at the corner of Bedford and Lafayette Avenues, but which later merged with Temple Beth Elohim of Williamsburg under the name of Union Temple, now at Prospect Park Plaza and Eastern Parkway.

III

For the next 40 years the congregation continued without interruption, serving the spiritual needs of the growing Jewish population in the downtown area of Brooklyn with rare zeal and devotion.

During these years wave after wave of new Jewish immigrants began to arrive from lands of persecution and poverty. With the influx of these newcomers the completion of Brooklyn Bridge, the improvement of transit facilities, the consolidation of the city of Brooklyn with New York, and the opening up of many new and attractive residential sections in this great borough, the Jewish community grew and prospered beyond all expectations. New synagogues, temples, and chevras appeared, new Sunday schools, Talmud Torahs, and Yeshivas came into being. New philanthropic, social, and cultural institutions sprang up everywhere. Brooklyn today may truly be said to be the largest single Jewish community in all the world.

In 1905 the congregation acquired its present building at Kane and Court Streets. The high archceilinged interior, with its finely wrought columns, its artistic, dignified interior decorations, its choir loft, balconies, and its decorative stained-glass windows combine to give this old building an atmosphere of dignity and holiness.

In 1908 an amalgamation was effected between Baith Israel and the neighboring Congregation Talmud Torah Anshei Emes. The congregation then adopted the name Baith Israel Anshei Emes. This merger helped to increase the membership and to secure for the synagogue its position as an active and growing congregation.

In the 1920's the synagogue was at its peak. It enjoyed a membership of more than 800 persons and a religious school of 500 children taught by a staff of 25 teachers. Unfortunately, the two world wars changed this rosy picture. The character of the neighborhood changed. The Jewish population in the vicinity of the synagogue began rapidly to decrease, resulting in a sharp decline in the congregation's membership, and a serious falling off in synagogue and school attendance.

Yet, despite this serious setback, the congregation carried on its sacred work with rare devotion and sacrifice, never for a moment lowering its high standards of communal responsibility. Its Ner Tamid was never dimmed during the entire century. The solemn voices in prayer never failed to be heard in its synagogue thrice daily. The cheerful voices of children at study ever re-echoed within its classrooms without interruption.

In the two world wars the congregation was alert to its duties and responsibilities. Over 600 of our young men responded patriotically to the call of our country's Armed Forces. Many thousands of dollars were raised for the relief of our brethren in the war-stricken countries and for the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish homeland.

Here at home, the congregation was alert and active in every movement that worked

for the good and welfare of the Jewish as well as the non-Jewish community.

IV

We are now entering a new milestone in the congregation's history, as its first century ends. We are now reconsecrating ourselves to greater efforts on behalf of our synagogue and the high ideals for which it stands.

In the past decade, in particular, the congregation has been blessed with an alert and far-sighted leadership. High in this leadership stands Mr. Herman Belth, through whose generosity and influence the synagogue was refurbished and redecorated at a cost close to $50,000. Largely also to Mr. Belth's initiative, the congregation has now embarked on an ambitious plan to raise an endowment fund of $250,000, toward which he has already contributed $25,000. Among the other leaders of whom we are very proud are Oscar Hertz, our youthful president, and his senior brother Jacob of the law firm of Hertz and Hertz, who are imbued with a fine Jewish ideology and with a self-sacrificing spirit.

There are many others, both men and women, in our congregation's leadership who are worthy of honorable mention for their dedicated zeal in the work of this century-old synagogue, but whose names I must regretfully omit due to lack of space. Suffice it to say that with such men and women at the helm of Baith Israel Anshei Emes, the congregation cannot fail.

It was my privilege and joy to have served the spiritual needs of this historic synagogue for over half a century. I am happy to have been able to serve it with all the talent and strength that the good Lord has granted me.

My only prayer now is that the synagogue to which I have dedicated a lifetime of service may continue in the years ahead as a spiritual blessing to those coming after us, and that Congregation Baith Israel Anshei Emes may stand out as a beacon light, as a sacred shrine dedicated to the lofty ideals of emeth, din, and shalom—truth, justice, and peace.

Need for Strengthening United States Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to speak to the Arnold Air Society at the University of Wisconsin in Madison on Saturday night last, on the subject of the necessity for strengthening United States air power. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES STRENGTHENING UNITED STATES AIR MUSCLE—SAYS ANY MORE UNDERESTIMATING OF RED STRENGTH COULD BE "SUICIDAL"—URGES MORE UNITED STATES REENLISTMENT INDUCEMENTS.

It is a privilege to be your guest tonight. You will have an even greater privilege—of serving in the United States Air Force.

Today, we pay tribute to you and all other patriots who defend America.

KREMLIN RESPECTS UNITED STATES MUSCLE

We pay tribute by the great Armed Forces Day parade which we have been privileged to witness. We pay tribute by our words of sincere praise for America's sentinels.

But most important of all, we pay tribute in action—by vowing to take constructive steps—to put still more "muscle" into the United States Air Force, into the crucial guided missile program, and into all other essential military arms. Why? So as to assure America's invincibility and to deter global war.

The Soviet Union, despite showy signs to the contrary, is still unfortunately bent on world conquest. The Kremlin still respects "muscle" on its opponents arms; not flabby fat, not apathy, not empty bragging on any American's part, but strong, well-trained, defensive, "muscle."

We don't get muscle without exercise, without training, without self dedication.

That is what you of the Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps have been learning, and it is what all Americans must relearn. In this dangerous Jet-Atomic Age, softness of mind or body can be suicide. We must be strong, vigilant.

A GREAT AMERICAN—"HAP" ARNOLD

As you so well know, the Arnold Air Society perpetuates in honor of the immortal name of "Hap" Arnold, one of the greatest, strongest airmen of all times.

He was an air officer who learned to fly from the Wright brothers, who picked up from Billy Mitchell's dying hands the torch of a dynamic Air Force. He carried the torch aloft into the "wild blue yonder" with the winged squadrons which played so magnificent a role in winning World War II.

In but a few years, we had built the insignificant airpower that we had before 1941—into the most powerful air force in the world—an armada of 2½ million men and 75,000 planes. That was an "impossible job," but it was done.

And it was done under the command of your namesake, Gen. Hap Arnold.

As he said, "The difficult, we do easily. The impossible takes a little longer."

This time, thank goodness, we recognized our potential enemy much sooner. And after a postwar relapse, we wisely began steps to rebuild our shrunken airpower.

THE NEED FOR SPLIT-SECOND REACTION

We are all aware that with the growth of flight radius and the rise in air speed—better than 1,400 miles per hour—we shall not again have much warning of actual outbreak of hostilities.

That is why our air strength is built into an instantaneous machine which must start without delay.

Our superb SAC, or Strategic Air Command, is poised, as you know, to go off at the flash of a signal.

Ready are the long range and medium bombers. Ready are the atomic-H-bombs. Ready are the skilled air crews. Waiting for a signal—we hope will never have to be flashed from headquarters; a signal that a potential enemy has actually started hostilities.

Then SAC stings back with fatal destructive power.

Our U. S. A. has never begun a war. And it does not intend to.

But it is ready with an all-powerful threat of awesome retaliation which our potential enemies fear.

Besides this retaliation, we have the defense of our far-flung Navy, with its own airpower afloat on the big flat tops.

And our Army and Marine Corps are dispersed startegically to block attack upon the free world.

Similarly and most important, our missiles and interceptors are set up to defend our continental United States.

THE COMPONENTS OF AIR MIGHT

As you are so well aware, airpower includes, of course, the aircraft, and their weapons, and the men who fly and service them.

Airpower also means the indispensable bases—at home and abroad—from which the aircraft are launched on their missions.

And back of the bases and aircraft is the vast complicated industrial organization of human skills and of raw materials.

Through a kind of magic formula, there emerges the intricate airplanes, with automatic fire control systems, atomic-H-bombs and rockets.

And back of this production is the long research and development process. It conceives, designs, builds and tests all the things which go into their super-modern airplanes.

Air power also includes civil aviation which furnishes ready additional sources of planes, skills and fields.

"Air power," to quote Arnold again, "will always be the business of every American citizen."

MADISON JUST HOURS, SOON MINUTES AWAY FROM MOSCOW

In this shrunken world, it is now possible to fly from Moscow to Madison, or Madison to Moscow in a jet bomber in less than 9 hours; and from or to Siberia in less than 5 hours.

Soon, the long-range rocket will again shrink bomb transportation time between these spots and only to a matter of minutes.

These facts have utterly changed our concept of international relations. Gone—as dead as the dodo or the dinosaur—is the obsolete concept of isolation.

AIR POWER BACKS UP UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY

Technically speaking, General Arnold defined air power this way. He said:

"Air power includes a nation's ability to deliver cargo, people, destructive missiles and war-making potential through the air to a desired destination to accomplish a desired purpose."

American air power is not an offensive threat to anyone. But it is ready to back up our American Foreign Service and our economic and technical aid group in their front-line responsibility of strengthening our relations with other governments and with other people.

Here, at home in our domestic affairs we have put away our "six shooters." We face no major threat to domestic tranquility. But, out in the cold international scene in this world where Korea was attacked and split asunder, where Vietnam was assaulted and divided, where fires rage in North Africa and potentially again in the Middle East, we face a grim challenge from international communism.

We are still so threatened with brutal Red disregard of right, honor and security; we are faced with so serious a threat of potential death and destruction of ourselves and of all that is dear to us, that we must keep up our guard. That means an attitude of vigilance. And it means appropriations for vigilance. False economy would not make sense. A second best air force is no good. Underestimating our enemy could be a catastrophe, perhaps sheer suicide.

We must maintain our air power supreme and ready to retaliate with efficiency at all times.

AIRPOWER IS PEACE POWER

We must and shall only use it to defend the peace of the world.

And so our airpower is, in reality, peace power.

Our statesmen—inside and outside NATO—must continue to be able to negotiate from positions of strength; from positions, not only of moral strength, but also of physical military strength, so as to assure respect for our statements, and to back them up, if need be.

SOVIET DISARMAMENT THUS FAR A SHAM

Unilateral disarmament would be the height of stupidity on our part, and that is why our alert President will never risk it. The Reds, for all their propaganda fanfare of reduction of conventional ground and sea forces, have not reduced by one iota, their all-out preparations in the crucial air arm—by piloted and pilotless aircraft.

They are putting away their obsolete "bean shooters," so they can step up their production of superdeadly missiles and H-bombs.

I do not mean that the recent ferment inside the top echelons of the Kremlin is without any meaning save as propaganda.

Obviously, there is a reappraisal going on, and a new phase of the struggle for power inside the Kremlin.

But while the Soviets so obviously continue to seek to conquer the world, their sham and showy efforts of so-called disarmament—their sirupy words of friendship—must not lull us to sleep.

IS KHRUSHCHEVISM ANY BETTER THAN STALINISM?

Joe Stalin is dead. Stalinism, as such, may be dead or dying.

But the Reds can "tell it to the Marines," or to the Army or the Air Force, if they think we naively believe that Khrushchevism is innocent or harmless.

Therefore, 365 days a year, we will continue to combat Red subversion at home and abroad.

And we will do so with the marvelous aid of the men with the honored, winged emblem, and with their hard-working ground crews.

They are called not simply to carry weapons of death, but, as well, the sinews of life.

INSPIRING EXAMPLES OF PEACEFUL AIRPOWER

Illustrations of peaceful use of airpower abound. There was the unforgettable Berlin airlift which fed and saved the liberty-loving Germans of West Berlin, who had been blockaded by the ruthless Communists.

There was the Moslem airlift to Mecca, which was appreciated as a friendly act to overcome a transportation problem encountered by devout pilgrims.

There has been the "Kinderlift" when Berlin children have been brought out by air for a few weeks' vacation and recreation in Western Germany.

And the Air Force has cooperated with her sister services on land and sea in a long series of disaster relief and rescue operations. These have covered flood relief in England, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, and Pakistan, and earthquake relief in Greece and Turkey.

WE ARE PROUD OF OUR OVERSEAS FORCES

And that brings us to this point.

We can indeed be proud of the behavior and the accomplishments of our men stationed throughout the world.

Our American airmen, our sailors and ground forces have recognized the delicate nature of our overseas position—being stationed in other sovereign peoples' territory.

Of course, every once in a while, you hear some criticism of the conduct of some GI in a foreign land. But I say to you that there has never been a people whose overseas boys have behaved more admirably, more thoughtfully, more generously than have the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad. Despite the occasional, isolated incidents and mishaps, we have a right to hold our head high over the general conduct of our boys overseas. And we can thank the top command of our services, as well as the officers down the line, and the GI's themselves, for that inspiring record.

Even before the United States of America dispatches a fighter or bomber wing to a foreign base, the ground must have been prepared—in spirit and in letter—money must have been spent there first. Runways, shops, and hangars must have been built. Barracks and hospitals, chapels and commissaries—in fact the living needs the size of an American town must have been provided—for our own men.

And our airmen abroad are genuine ambassadors of good will, who are representative of all that is fine in American life. Although the United States Air Force is a new service, it has a record of devotion to duty and of accomplishment which makes it worthy of representing America abroad, along with our Army, Navy, and Foreign Service.

SOVIETS MAKING SPECTACULAR AIR PROGRESS

Now, what about our airmen's equipment? Are we losing the competitive race with the Reds?

As we are all aware, the newspapers, radio and television have recently been full of conflicting testimony of both sides of this crucial question: "Are we now still ahead of the Soviet Union in air power, or are the Reds already ahead of us?"

Gen. Curtiss LeMay has given the very disturbing but factual testimony that only 78 B–52 bombers have been produced, of which only 31 were accepted. On the other hand, it is estimated that the Reds have approximately 100 intercontinental jet bombers, which are equivalent to our B–52's.

While it is agreed that we are thus behind the Soviet Union in the long-range bomber, it is universally agreed that we are far ahead in medium range jet bombers—our B–47's. These medium bombers require, however, overseas bases, or refueling in air.

And there have been other comparisons—many of them disturbing comparisons—as regards our own versus Soviet production, in interceptor planes and in other categories of aircraft and missiles.

It is not my intention at the present time to try to evaluate the conflicting testimony—the defense of our supremacy by Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Admiral Radford, on one hand, or assertions by some Senators and others to the contrary.

The Soviets have, by everyone's opinion, made spectacular progress. And the very fact that there is now such strong dispute—the very fact that there is controversy as to who is ahead, the very fact that many people believe that by 1960, the Soviet Union may surpass us in many crucial respects—these facts make it absolutely necessary that we constantly re-evaluate the adequacy of our own forces, and that we appropriate every dime necessary for our survival.

DECISIVE BATTLES WOULD BE FOUGHT IN AIR

President Eisenhower has, of course, rightfully stressed that we cannot look exclusively at any one weapon and ignore other weapons and forces.

At the same time, it is quite clear that if World War III ever comes, (and we pray God that it will not come) the decisive battles will be fought in the air. And in the air, the decisive weapon may be pilotless aircraft, the guided missile and the intercontinental ballistic missile.

THREE CONDITIONS WE MUST NOT TOLERATE

Under these circumstances, it would be absolutely folly to allow certain conditions to continue:

1. It would be absolute folly to fail to take steps to widen our inadequate reservoir of scientists, engineers and technicians.

2. It would be absolutely folly to continue to allow conditions to exist which discourage our most skilled technicians in the Air Force and in other services from reenlisting.

Our country is each year losing literally billions of dollars in trained manpower, as our experienced airmen and as our mechanics quit in droves when their enlistment period is up. These men would be glad to continue to serve, if we gave them the minimal encouragement in adequate salary and benefits—for themselves and for their families.

3. It would be absolute folly to permit needless duplication of effort and confusion among the services in the guided missile or any similar advanced weapon field.

It is one thing to have a spirit of healthy competition; it is another thing to have each service "stepping over the other services' feet," retracing perhaps, the same steps which the other service may long since have gone through, and failing to benefit from the other services' latest research and findings.

I hope that recent Pentagon changes will at long last bring smooth coordination and teamwork. The air will be the crucial battlefield.

And I hope there will be universal recognition among our people of this and other "facts of life" in today's danger-strewn world.

NIKES AT MILWAUKEE, JETS IN NORTHERN MICHIGAN

A year ago, last November, steps were begun to surround Milwaukee with Nike sites. Milwaukee is, of course, our State's greatest manufacturing center and therefore, the most likely target in the State.

In northern Michigan, one of the greatest interceptor fields in all the world is now being built, with the idea that if the Russian bombers come, they can first be intercepted by Air Force fighters.

If the Russian bombers should get past the fighters and the guided Nikes, then it is goodbye Milwaukee and vast adjacent areas. Most of Wisconsin would be on the firing line in the next war, if hostilities should break out.

SAC, TAC, CADC

Fortunately, in the Strategic Air Command, we have the ability to destroy an enemy's war-making capacity and his will to fight.

In the Tactical Air Command, we have a a highly mobile light bomber and fighter bomber force that can destroy enemy troop concentrations and lines of communication and can employ atomic weapons.

In the Continental Air Defense Command, we have a constantly increasing capability to detect, intercept, and destroy invading bomber aircraft before they reach our vital target centers.

Behind the radar network, our manned interceptors, such as those here at Truax Field, are ready for instance action against an aggressor.

THE GREAT VALUE OF TRUAX FIELD

Truax, as we all know, is an immensely important base and is rapidly expanding. There exists, however, a requirement for 523 family housing units, and construction of these has already been approved. The feasibilty of extending the runways is under study. The Air Force expects Truax Field to be a permanent-type base for a long time to come.

General Mitchell Field, at Milwaukee, has an Air Reserve fighter bomber wing. Also an Air National Guard fighter interceptor wing. More space and equipment are needed. The Air Force has an approved construction program to provide during the next 2 years adequate facilities for the Air Reserve unit.

The field's location near the concentration of reservists in Milwaukee helps assure the permanence of this field.

As I'm sure you are aware, a new base is being constructed in an area generally to the south of Kansasville. Acquisition of land has begun and construction should start this summer. It should be completed in about a year and a half. At that time, about 150 officers, 1,225 airmen, and 250 civilians will be assigned to the base. The estimated annual base payroll will be about

$5 million. Additional expenditures for base services, supplies, utilities, etc., are estimated to run up toward $1½ million per year. The location of this base in Racine and Kenosha Counties will result in tremendous financial benefits for that area and for the whole State. And the jets to be stationed at the base will provide protection of immeasurable value to the State of Wisconsin and the Nation as a whole.

Of course, we might have hoped that it would not be necessary to disturb the tranquil scene of our countrysides with roaring military jets. But we would far rather suffer such little inconvenience and disturbance as arises than risk national extinction.

CONCLUSION

The overall United States Air Force numbers more than 930,000 uniformed personnel, employs about 300,000 civilian employees with over 800,000 dependents. This represents a potent influence in our domestic life—and an influence for good.

Whether or not you make the Air Force your life-long career, as General Arnold made it his, you will find positions of importance and responsibility in the years that lie ahead. Chosen men like yourself are educated to be leaders and, whether in the Air Force or in civilian life, you have the opportunity to be leaders who understand and appreciate air power.

Wisconsin is proud of you and wishes you well.

As the Air Force says—

"In space so vast
It ends where no one knows,
Our giant birds seem gnats
As distance grows.
We measure flight
In miles and speed and men
And quality of craft—
But mostly men."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address by Judge Irving R. Kaufman at an Americanism Seminar Sponsored by the Minnesota American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently one of America's distinguished jurists, the Honorable Irving R. Kaufman, judge of the United States district court in the State of New York, addressed an Americanism seminar sponsored by the Minnesota American Legion in the city of St. Paul, Minn. Judge Kaufman used as his theme the Bill of Rights and commented extensively upon the historical background relating to the fifth amendment and the recent abuse and misuse of that amendment by the Communists.

Judge Kaufman said:

Democracy can be preserved only by democratic methods. When we stifle honest criticism and when we ostracize the dissenter, we are not practicing democracy, but are adding fuel to the Communist fire.

The editorial in the St. Paul Dispatch on April 17, 1956, summarized Judge Kaufman's address in these words:

True Americanism includes living up to our principles of liberty under law and making democracy work for minorities and dissenters as well as for majority groups. The Legion's seminar has been a constructive force in this direction.

It was Judge Kaufman who presided at the espionage trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. Judge Kaufman is known as one of the great legal minds of our time. He is a strong defender of freedom and is an effective anti-Communist. His dedication to liberty and his abhorrence of any form of tyranny is well known.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of the April 17 St. Paul Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the news story from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 15 entitled "United States Must Guard Liberties, Judge Says," be printed at this point in my remarks; also the editorial from the Chicago Daily News of April 26, and the lead article in the Minnesota Legionnaire of Wednesday, April 18, along with the news item of the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 15.

These editorials and news stories bring to our attention the importance of Judge Kaufman's address and the courage and brilliance of his remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch of April 17, 1956]

JUDGE KAUFMAN ON POSITIVE AMERICANISM

Positive Americanism requires a good deal more than mere denunciation of communism, as Judge Irving R. Kaufman of New York emphasized in his American Legion address here Saturday.

Appearing before the Legion's annual Americanism seminar, the judge who presided at the espionage trials of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg pointed out that it is not always easy or popular to stand up for basic American principles of freedom.

It is an irony of human nature that periods of emotional superpatriotism tend to develop support for restrictions on personal liberty not countenanced by the United States Constitution. In such times the defenders of traditional constitutional safeguards may find themselves assailed as unpatriotic, or as Communist sympathizers.

"Democracy can be preserved only by democratic methods," Judge Kaufman said. "When we stifle honest criticism and when we ostracize the dissenter, we are not practicing democracy, but are adding fuel to the Communist fire."

Judge Kaufman's defense of the fifth amendment illustrated his warning against impatience with democratic processes. The fifth amendment has been used by Communists for their own protection, but this does not alter the fact that this safeguard against forced self-incrimination "is fundamental to our idea of justice," he stated. When borers attack an apple tree, the judge commented, "you eliminate the borer—you don't chop down the tree."

Another point made by the jurist was that at times the Communists pay lip service to certain good causes and ideals. Then honest citizens who stand up and defend these same principles are sometimes "branded as Communists or fellow travelers." This, said Judge Kaufman, "is playing right into the hands of the Communists both here and abroad."

True Americanism includes living up to our principles of liberty under law and making democracy work for minorities and dissenters as well as for majority groups. The Legion's seminar has been a constructive force in this direction.

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 15, 1956]

UNITED STATES MUST GUARD LIBERTIES, JUDGE SAYS

Soviet Russia's efforts to "co-exist capitalism to death" must be met by renewed vigilance over American liberties, Judge Irving R. Kaufman said in St. Paul Saturday night.

The New York Federal jurist, presiding judge at the espionage trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, said in a speech prepared for a Minnesota American Legion seminar this country can beat the Communists at their own game if it honestly portrays its way of life to the world.

The new Red line, he said, clearly means Russia "will aim a barrage of Communist propaganda and espionage at freedom-loving countries the like of which we have never seen," and try to "coexist capitalism to death."

Thus it is essential that the entire world be made aware of our success story, Kaufman said.

But, he added, Americans must guard against striking "blindly at all who espouse an honest and decent cause merely because the Communists are also paying it lip service."

"Democracy," he said, "is based on a calculated risk, a belief that free men exercising a free choice out of various competing ideas will exercise the widest choice possible."

By smothering honest criticism "when we ostracize the well meaning dissenter, we are not practicing democracy but are adding fuel to the Communist fire," he said.

He cautioned against weakening the fifth amendment, preserving the right against self-incrimination, although he acknowledged there is "justifiable frustration among Americans because the Communists have been invoking this privilege consistently."

Americans who want to abolish the amendment because Communists have abused it, he said fall into the Red trap by endangering the same liberties the Communists want to destroy.

He said the Nation must maintain a continuing vigil on two fronts, against Red subversion and against the danger of labeling as Communists all who disagree with the majority.

This is complicated by the fact that Communists "often parade in false dress as advocates of liberal causes," he said, adding.

"We cannot let certain worthwhile causes become Communist property. We cannot permit a worthy movement to be defeated merely because a few Communists are attempting to infiltrate it."

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 26, 1956]

GUARDING LIBERTIES

United States Judge Irving R. Kaufman, of New York, will be remembered as the judge who sentenced Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the convicted spies. He thereby became the target of a worldwide campaign of abuse, sparked and fed by the Communists.

As one thus singled out for persecution, it is interesting to hear Judge Kaufman's views on the subject of Communist causes. It has not clouded his thinking, as evidenced by his remarks to an American Legion audience in St. Paul the other day.

He noted that Communists "often will be heard hypocritically in defense of certain of our precious liberties—but these liberties do not become any less precious because Communists have temporarily decided to pay them lip service.

"Yet, all too often, others who then speak out in favor of these same vital rights are branded as Communists, or fellow travelers, for some believe in the old saying that: 'Where there is smoke, there is fire.' I urge you, the next time you hear that familiar theme, don't rush blindly with an ax at the smoke thus created—you may chop a fire fighter instead of a fire."

[From the Minnesota Legionnaire of April 18, 1956]

JUDGE KAUFMAN WARNS THAT DEMOCRACY CAN ONLY BE PRESERVED BY DEMOCRATIC METHODS—SEMINAR STRESSES POSITIVE ASPECTS OF AMERICANISM

(Condensed text of Judge Kaufman's address.)

Continued vigilance against Communist subversion while "equal vigil is maintained to insure that not all who disagree with the majority, politically or economically, are labeled Communist" was urged by United States District Court Judge Irving R. Kaufman, of New York City, in a banquet address at the department's second annual Americanism Seminar in St. Paul Saturday.

Judge Kaufman, presiding judge at the trial of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg who were convicted of espionage for revealing atomic secrets to a foreign government, declared that democracy can be preserved only by democratic methods—"slow and plodding though they be."

Warning that "when we stifle honest criticism and when we ostracize the well-meaning dissenter, we are not practicing democracy, but are adding fuel to the Communist fire," he emphasized that an "important basic concept of our democracy is that only when people are given free access to all different competing viewpoints can they recognize the truth and thus choose wisely."

Judge Kaufman was the principal speaker at the banquent, concluding event of the 1-day seminar. Speakers at the afternoon session included Department Commander Dan Foley, Wayne Murphy, national research director of the American Legion, Hennepin County Sheriff Ed Ryan, and National Committeeman Carl Lundgren. The afternoon program included a dramatic and revealing skit on Communist tactics presented by the University of Minnesota theater. Miss Gasperlin, of St. Cloud Cathedral High School, gave the prepared talk she gave as a finalist in the department oratorical contest.

Emphasis was placed on the positive aspects of Americanism and how the various programs of the American Legion can be utilized as a potent force in the battle against communism and all forms of subversion. Although stressing the positive approach, the various speakers warned against relaxing our vigilance against the ever-increasing Communist menace.

Wayne Murphy, one of the Legion's leading authorities on subversion and counter-subversion, pointed out that the basic aims of the American Legion have not changed since 1919 and emphasized that "teamwork is our greatest asset."

Although warning that "we can't win this kind of warfare by remaining silent," Murphy declared "we don't need any vigilantes."

Sheriff Ryan, stressing the importance of combating bigotry at home, also warned against the vigilante method, and urged that anyone having information about suspected Communists turn that information over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Murphy called the Legion's Americanism program a two-fold program consisting of the positive or educational phase and the actual fight against subversion. In discussing counter-subversive activity, he said it "requires mental and moral courage that many people are unwilling to demonstrate." He sees the chief problem of counter-subversive activity as getting people on the local level aware of a definite responsibility to advance both phases of the Americanism program.

Judge Kaufman, meanwhile, pointed out that "democracy is based on a calculated risk—a belief that free men exercising a free choice out of various competing ideas will exercise the widest choice possible—America's history over the past 175 years has justified continued faith in that belief."

Emphasizing that the fifth amendment of the Constitution is "fundamental to our idea of justice, to our belief in man's inherent dignity, and to our tradition that a man is innocent until proven guilty," he warned against weakening the strength of the fifth amendment even though there is a "justifiable frustration among Americans because the Communists have been invoking this privilege consistently."

He declared that when Americans react by summarily condemning the whole doctrine of the fifth amendment and urge its abolition "we fall into the Communist trap by endangering the very liberties they seek to destroy."

Stating that, "the best way to sell democracy is to show that it works," Judge Kaufman declared that failure to speak up for the rights of the honest dissenter is not only a failure "to live up to that heritage of freedom which our ancestors fought to preserve, but we also lose another battle of words and ideals we are waging with Moscow."

The Federal jurist concluded by warning that, "we must never become so completely consumed with this ever-present Communist threat that our thinking is motivated by what we hate rather than by our love of the American way. Unfortunately, some of us have begun to hate each other—particularly when we are in disagreement over some fundamental issue. It was a condition that led a contemporary philosopher to warn that, "If we permit our hatred of Russia to replace our love of the American dream as the motivation of our lives, we will have accorded Communism the greatest tribute to which any dogma may aspire, the power to dictate the thinking of its enemies."

Highlights of the afternoon session was the skit presented by University of Minnesota dramatic club members under the direcction of Dr. Arthur Ballet. It graphically demonstrated how Communists infiltrate an organization and take over a meeting without well-meaning members even knowing what has happened. It stressed the importance of being ever alert to these undermining tactics and demonstrated how doing things in the democratic way is the best safeguard against the Communist threat.

Featured players were William Phelps, Neil Hofland, James Stapleton, Thomas Quigley John Blue, Jerry Rumley, Jerry Ness, Janis Benson, Philip Benson, and Kallista Mavroulis. The script was written by Phillip Gelb, of KUOM, the University radio station.

C. B. Howard, special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was also scheduled to speak at the afternoon session, but was unable to appear.

[From the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of April 15, 1956]

NEW YORK JUDGE SPEAKS HERE—FIFTH AMENDMENT DEFENDED

A prominent New York jurist Saturday cautioned against any weakening of the fifth amendment despite its use as a refuge by Reds.

Judge Irving R. Kaufman, the United States district court judge who presided over the trial of atom spies Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, said Americans who want to abolish the amendment fall into a Communist trap "by endangering the very liberties the Communists seek to destroy."

Speaking at an Americanism seminar sponsored in St. Paul by the Minnesota American Legion, Judge Kaufman said the idea that a man should not be compelled to bear witness against himself "has been fundamental to our idea of justice in the courts, to our belief in man's inherent dignity and to our tradition that a man is innocent until proven guilty."

Casting out that doctrine and labeling as Communists all who want to retain the privileges of the fifth amendment "is playing into the Communists' hands," he said.

"All the Communists need to do is take refuge behind the very civil rights which we know they are pledged to destroy and then others, fearful of being labeled subversive, will shun the term 'civil rights' as a Communist label," he added.

Democracy can be preserved only by democratic methods—"slow and plodding though they be," he said.

INFILTRATION DANGER

Warning against Communist infiltration, he said:

"If a few Communists try to infiltrate your organization, don't abandon ship and hand them the organization as a gift. Fight back and clear them from your group."

The United States can beat the Communists at their own game if it honestly portrays its way of life to the world, he said. The new Communist line means that Russia "will aim a barrage of propaganda and espionage at freedom-loving countries the likes of which we have never seen. They will try to coexist capitalism to death."

Thus it is essential the entire world be told the American success story, he added, and that freedomwise "we practice what we preach."

The seminar was held at the Hotel St. Paul.

Low-Cost Electric Power Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "People's Electric Systems Must Work Together for Abundant, Low-Cost Power," written by Clyde T. Ellis, and published in Public Power magazine for May 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE'S ELECTRIC SYSTEMS MUST WORK TOGETHER FOR ABUNDANT, LOW-COST POWER

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

Today, 20 years after the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, not only the farmers' rural electric systems, but many of the municipally-owned systems as well, are in trouble.

They are in trouble first, because in most of the country no good method has been found for tying together for maximum efficiency those consumer-owned electric systems better known as municipals, power districts and cooperatives. They are in trouble secondly, because the so-called private-power companies, having themselves achieved the efficiencies of integration by fair means and foul, are now pouring fabulous sums into propaganda, lobbying, and public relations campaigns to convince the American people that their monopolies typify the American way and that the consumer-owned systems do not.

All of them realize more and more that the cooperative position is vulnerable and insecure, but perhaps few know that there are certain interests who would like to eliminate entirely the REA cooperatives. To most cooperative members, the Hoover Commission report is something vague and remote. They do not see that those who support the Hoover

Commission reports are by and large the same interests who didn't want REA brought into existence in the first place, and who now see in the cooperatives a challenge to the monopolistic utilities.

Too few cooperative members see any relationship between public power and REA cooperatives. They don't know that the two types of projects have a lot in common, including a common opposition, and that this opposition is relentless and resourceful.

Only through the development of plentiful supplies of low cost public power could REA cooperatives be given loans to take electricity to hundreds of thousands of rural homes in the post-war period.

The only hope of electric cooperatives to survive lies in eternal vigilance and unity. Those who would restroy public power would destroy the REA cooperatives and vice versa. It will take a unified defense to win the struggle against the common enemy.

Outstanding Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the horizons are limitless for the young people of today, and many of them recognize it. It is a pleasure to call to the attention of this House the record of a young man of my district who has won not only 1 scholarship but 3, and who, in addition to superior achievements in scholarship, is a good musician, a good speaker, and a good athlete. Keith A. Wallace, a senior at Elba Central School, has just been awarded a $4,000 Bell Foundation scholarship to Antioch College, as a result of his eminence in his studies, which averaged over 90 percent. The foundation is affiliated with the Bell Aircraft Corp. in Buffalo.

Keith expects to become a research chemist, a field in which his talents will assuredly be needed. At a time such as this, when we are faced with a shortage of trained scientists, the opportunities for advanced study which industry is making available to young people are to be commended, as are the young people who rise to those opportunities. Keith has already brought honor to himself, his parents, and his school, and will undoubtedly bring further honor to science and his country, as a result of this developing program of partnership between industry and education.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following account of this young man's attainments, from the Batavia Daily News of May 19, 1956:

SENIOR AT ELBA CENTRAL SCHOOL WINNER OF $4,000 SCHOLARSHIP

Keith A. Wallace, 17, a senior at Elba Central School, is the 1956 winner of the $4,000 Bell Foundation Scholarship to Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. The foundation is affiliated with the Bell Aircraft Corp. in Buffalo.

Keith, who ranks third in the senior class with an average over 90 percent, is also the recipient of two other scholarships. He was awarded a $1,400 State scholarship and a $400-a-year scholarship to Hobart College in Geneva. He will accept the Bell Foundation grant. He plans to major in chemistry with hopes of becoming a research chemist.

Besides attaining high scholastic honors, Keith is also in the Elba Central School band, the National Honor Society, and he took part in the school play. He was winner of the school speaking contest this year and placed second in the county competition. He was a member of the football team and enjoys playing chess.

His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Chester A. Wallace of the Transit Road, Elba. Mr. Wallace is employed as a toll collector at the Batavia Interchange of the State Thruway.

Post Office Department Tries Union Busting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, recent directives of the Postmaster General that have been issued and sent to the major post offices of the Nation for posting appear to be followups on his declarations of the past 2 years that any form of collective bargaining or unionism in the postal service under his administration must be his kind of unionism or suffer the consequences.

Worse than that is the denial to any postal worker the right to express or convey to his Representative or Senator any grievance or complaint without first submitting it to the Department. This order savors very much of real "slave labor."

In addition to the recent directives issued, the Department has served notice that rules and regulations of bygone days will now be dusted off, or better yet, may we say, resurrected and rigidly enforced.

I submit that the new directives enumerated below and the strict enforcement of age-old directives surely do not in any manner display friendly relationship but to the contrary only express and lay the groundwork for a declaration of dictatorship upon each of the postal unions and their officers.

As to myself, I want no part of this type of Government administration and take this means to express my deep resentment and opposition.

Following are a couple of the latest directives that have been broadcast by the Department and clearly make known to the employees its hostile attitude:

Issue 57 of the Postal Manual, dated March 28, 1956. Section 744.442, captioned "Engaging in Campaigns for Changes in the Service," reads as follows:

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Postal Bulletin for Thursday, April 19, 1956, reads:

"ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

"While on duty employees of the postal service may not participate in any contest sponsored by private concerns, associations, or other private organizations, nor accept any prizes from such concerns, associations, or organizations, unless participation is approved specifically by the Department.

"Office of the Deputy Postmaster General."

A Time for Stocktaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I introduced an amendment to the mutual-security program which is designed to do exactly what this editorial of May 9, 1956, from the Galesburg Register-Mail, of Galesburg, Ill., suggests; namely, appoint a commission of not more than five members whose duty it would be to study the program and submit to the President their recommendations.

A TIME FOR STOCKTAKING

The idea is growing in important quarters that a thoroughgoing review of this country's foreign-aid program is much in order. It makes much sense, since we have not had one since 1947.

President Eisenhower favors review by a high-level commission free of partisan leanings. Chairman WALTER GEORGE, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, earlier had advocated a similar study and his suggestion gained the evident approval of the members of his committee.

A full study of foreign aid, preferably by an independent group not directly affiliated with Government, would seem to serve significant purpose.

First of all, even assuming that those in the administration who now prepare foreign-aid proposals are exercising utmost care, they are too close to the matter to see it with any detachment.

The program requires the dispassionate look of the outsider.

Back in 1947, when the Marshall plan was just shaping up, the Nation got such a study.

One group, nonofficial, considered aid from the viewpoint of our capabilities. Another, under then Representative Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, examined it from the standpoint of the actual needs of our foreign friends.

From that time on we have been advancing foreign assistance, either economic or military, virtually without interruption. The emphasis has shifted from Europe to Asia and from economic to military, but the program has gone on.

It is no reflection on those who annually frame new aid plans to suggest that a certain haphazard, unsystematic element may have crept into a program that is now nearly 10 years old.

We need to be sure that in 1956, as in 1947, we are spending our billions wisely in terms of both foreign needs and our own ability to bear the load.

We need to be sure, too, that if the program is going to go on and on it will do so

because of clearly understood purpose associated with high Government policy.

Fears have increased over the years that the program is running to some extent on sheer momentum.

Some will say that a review of foreign aid would be designed simply to afford excuse for cutting it down.

It is known, for instance, that Senator GEORGE is in political difficulty in his native Georgia from former Gov. Herman Talmadge, a rival who is shooting at foreign-aid giveaways.

We can acknowledge that reexaminations of foreign aid often are urged by its opponents (which GEORGE never has been). But we cannot for that reason say that an impartial, highminded study of the question is either unnecessary or unwise.

Foreign aid is no sacred cow.

If it is necessary to the safety of this Nation and its friends, there is no doubt it will go on. Still, it is completely reasonable to seek an independent check upon it.

So long as that review is managed by able and honorable men, we need not fear that it could be used successfully by the program's enemies to destroy indirectly what they could not kill by open measures.

Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, this past week this Nation along with the Armed Forces observed its seventh annual Armed Forces Day.

Citizens throughout the entire United States watched parades and witnessed demonstrations of the Air Force, Army, and the Navy.

Unlike the military demonstrations put on in the Soviet Union and witnessed by the chosen few of Moscow, the seat and source of power for world communism, Armed Forces Day in the United States was witnessed and observed by all people throughout the length and breadth of this country. The fact that all of our citizens participated in honoring the military services and the contribution that they are performing in the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world is a vivid illustration of the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy. For, it is the American people who control the destinies of our Nation. It is our citizenry who are our source of power.

They, unlike the average citizen of the Soviet Union, are not barred from our airbases and our military installations. Here our citizens are invited to come on to our military bases to see at firsthand the products of defense that they are paying for.

One of the many speakers during the celebration activities for Armed Forces Day was Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

Speaking at Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex., before a gathering of residents of the community and military personnel of the base, General White stressed the benefits to be derived from cooperative civic-military relationships. He stressed the fine community relations that exist between military personnel of Sheppard Air Force Base and the community of Wichita Falls.

As you may know, Sheppard Air Force Base makes a valuable contribution in providing the necessary technically trained personnel to operate complex Air Force equipment. The support provided by Wichita Falls to the airmen and officers at Sheppard in the long run helps to create the hard core of skilled manpower within the Air Force.

Now this is a very important matter. For as we all know, this Nation cannot hope ever to match the Communist Soviet military forces man for man. Airpower, however, does give us the opportunity to match Soviet Russia in striking power.

It therefore behooves us to make certain that our airpower has the properly qualified manpower necessary to sustain an effective and efficient Air Force.

The Air Force needs picked men carefully trained. It must be backed up by an organization of mechanics, supply, and administrative personnel carefully selected and extensively trained. They, along with our air crew members, represent a valuable investment to this country.

But, it is no secret that the Air Force, like its sister services, is having difficulties in retaining its qualified and trained personnel. In the case of the Air Force, a shortage of technical skills places it in a vicious circle and as General White pointed out "when an experienced mechanic leaves the service he must be replaced."

Much can be done to remedy this trouble and to increase the attractiveness of a career in the military service. General White cites the need not only for a pay raise—which will more nearly equal the compensation of equivalent civilian positions—but of adequate housing, proper medical care for dependents, and other benefits.

Armed Forces Day is a day set aside to honor the men and women of the military service. It is up to the American people and this Congress to do everything that can be done to keep these fine people.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD General White's address:

On my way to Wichita Falls, I enjoyed sightseeing from my plane. As I watched the unfolding of this vast and wealthy land of rolling plains and rugged mountains, I could easily understand why Texans are so proud.

This is the land of superlatives—biggest in size, greatest producer of oil, cotton, and livestock.

Everything is done in a big way down here. Maybe this is the reason that while military leaders speaking elsewhere are getting away with just one Armed Forces Day speech, here in Texas, I have got to give two.

Normally, I feel that speechmaking is one of the least attractive of my duties. Here in Texas, though, I will make an exception. First, this gives me a chance to spend 2 days in Texas, a favorite Air Force State. Furthermore, it would take many more than two speeches for me to express by appreciation for the outstanding community support that the Air Force receives here and all over Texas.

I am especially happy to see you here at the Sheppard Air Force Base Officers' Club. This luncheon gathering of civilians and military demonstrates the close relationship that exists between this Air Force installation and the city of Wichita Falls.

At any base, this sort of mutual support and friendly relationship is important. At bases where, for instance, our vital fighting units are located, the better civic-military relationship, the better the fighting quality of our combat units. We have found that those bases that enjoy wholehearted reception and support by their surrounding civilian communities are those bases best and most efficiently accomplishing their missions.

For example, at bomber bases where the nearby rents and the cost of living have been held down to rates airmen can afford, our crews have not been forced to live far away from their airplanes. In an emergency they could get into the air much faster than they could if forced by high prices to live far from their bases.

Another example—the reenlistment rate of our airmen is higher at bases located in friendly and hospitable communities. Naturally, the more trained airmen that reenlist, the higher our combat effectiveness. More on this later.

Here at Sheppard Air Force Base the fine community relations are valuable in a very special way. This base is the largest in the Nation for the training of aviation mechanics. In addition, other schools are located at Sheppard. The young men in training here are, for the most part, relatively new in the service.

Up until the time they arrive here, life in the service for most of them has been a hectic round of basic training, classification and so on.

Here at Sheppard, they settle down to study and learn to do a very important job. Here is probably their first chance to stand back, look at life in the Air Force, and decide whether or not this life is for them.

The welcome and hospitality you offer them help to convince these young airmen that a military career is a respected profession. Your actions can influence these men toward an honorable career for public service.

I mention all this to affirm the significance of the relationship between the military services and the communities they serve and protect. In no other nation is this relationship so important.

In yet another way, community relations are important here. Students from many allied countries are sometimes fortunate enough to attend schools at Sheppard Air Force Base. I am pleased to learn of your warm hospitality to these foreign students. Just as the strength of our land is built upon the union of the States, the strength of the free world is built on free world alliances. You will be happy to know that in many allied nations, your sons and daughters are receiving the same kind of wonderful treatment. In its own way, this reciprocal hospitality speaks the words of true friendship more sincerely than treaties.

Today marks Armed Forces Day in America. All across the United States, ceremonies similar to the fine parade here this morning, and to this luncheon, have been taking place during the last 2 or 3 days.

From Fort Benning, Ga., to Fort Lewis, Wash., Americans are being welcomed into Army Posts to see the Army's marvelous new equipment of land warfare.

From Norfolk, Va., to San Diego, Calif., American men, women, and children are eagerly climbing all over our naval warships and seeing the latest weapons of seapower.

And at Air Force bases from Maine to California, and especially in Texas, where there are so many airbases, our citizens are examining the latest and most modern aircraft and weapons which combine to form American air strength.

It is interesting to contrast Armed Forces Day here and its equivalent in Russia—whether it be the annual May Day show of Communist armed strength or the Red Air Force Day.

In both countries the armed forces show takes place within and over the source of power.

In Russia, the show takes place only at Moscow, for the Kremlin is the source of power.

In the United States citizens all across the Nation see parades and witness demonstrations by the various services. Here it is our people who control the destinies of our Nation, and our people who are our source of power. This is a vivid illustration of the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy.

There are other contrasts.

In the Soviet Union the average citizen is barred from the airbases and other military installations.

Red fighting equipment belongs to and is jealously guarded by the Government. The people have no business examining military equipment.

Here our citizens are invited to come onto our military bases to see at firsthand the products of defense that they are paying for. It is their business.

In Moscow, the countless troops that march through Red Square and the airplanes that thunder overhead are products of authority and oppression, as well as a symbol—a kind of fist that is shaken at the world as a reminder of the Communist aim to dominate the globe.

In our land, the military strength on display is a source of pride. Our strength is power for peace and freedom.

We in America are well aware of these differences, and they make us prize our liberty even more. This is the reason we are willing to devote some 10 percent of our gross national product to defense of our freedom.

These dollars, almost 40 billion of them a year, are buying for us the biggest bargain in history. Consider, for example, what just one day of a modern, global war would cost this Nation. Just a few dozen thermonuclear bombs on the United States could go a long way toward wiping out our material wealth. Cities that have been abuilding for generations could be flattened, as if stepped on by a giant foot. Damage and loss would be immeasurable—we do not even have the figures to describe it in dollars.

Even more tragic would be the loss of American lives. If we were hit by nuclear weapons, our deaths would be counted by the millions. The tragic personal loss would touch us all.

If this ever happened, we would take little comfort in knowing that, at the same time, the attacker was suffering even greater loss. Regardless of how decisively we defeated the attacker, we could never claim to win—if by winning we mean coming out ahead.

Horrible as such a war would be, however, I hope that all Americans still value liberty and freedom highly enough to accept that kind of a fight for freedom, if the choice is forced upon us.

In fact, our determination to stay free can be instrumental in preventing our being forced to fight for freedom. If we keep strong, and, much more important, if our strength is backed by evidence that we prize freedom more than life and wealth, the chances are good that we can save both our lives and our liberty.

Look at the record of the past 10 years. Nineteen fifty-six marks what has been called A Decade of Security Through Global Air Power. During these years our country has remained safe, even though a potential aggressor has developed and built a powerful air force and is stockpiling nuclear bombs, the most powerful instruments of warfare.

Throughout this period, the Red rulers have been well aware of the United States capability to retaliate to any attack with decisive and devastating blows.

Obviously, this ability of the United States frustrated Communist aims of world domination. For this reason, the Reds have begun to abandon traditional forms of military strength and have chosen two new courses of action, both designed for ultimate attainment of Communist goals.

First, they have taken on the task of building up their airpower. Their all-out drive for military production sacrifices even the human needs of their people. The haste with which they are proceeding is significant. I would imagine that their goal is Red air strength great enough to be able to attack us so effectively that we would find it impossible to retaliate with significant force.

Second, and concurrently, during the period in which they lack the capability of attacking us decisively, they have been forced into other, more devious avenues leading to Communist goals.

Thus we see the smiles and jokes, the proffered aid to underdeveloped nations, and the time-consuming stalling on disarmament and other questions of international importance.

Militarily speaking, we cannot let the changing expression on the Communist face affect our defense planning. Although I am quite hopeful that eventually the Communists will change, I do not think it will be soon.

For this reason we must continue to work hard on what has been termed "the long pull" in defense. For 10, 50 years, or longer, our best chances for security lie in the system we have found to be effective during this last decade. This means we must remain so strong that no aggressor will risk attacking us, regardless of how burning his ambitions or how dishonorable his methods.

To keep strong enough so that in 1966 we can celebrate a second decade of security will require great efforts on our part. It also means that we must solve some major problems.

Each of the services faces difficulties in maintaining effective strength. You who are interested in airpower have undoubtedly been following the current Air Force questions dealing with bombers, bases, and missiles. There are also other problems which are the primary concern of other services.

There is one concern, however, that is common to all three arms. It is a problem that assumes special meaning here, since this base is primarily a large training establishment. In these days of supersonic airplanes and miraculous electronics, it brings us up short to realize that our main difficulty is an old-fashioned one, a shortage of men.

Consider how this affects the Air Force.

Although, as I said, the problem is old-fashioned, the kinds of men we need are products of a new age, the jet age. We can get thousands of untrained, basic airmen. This is no solution. The difficulty is in getting the skilled technicians, or in keeping our skilled airmen once we have trained them from basics.

A shortage of technical skills places us in a vicious circle. When an experienced mechanic leaves the service, he must be replaced. To replace him, we must train an unskilled airman. To train unskilled airmen requires a skilled technical teacher. We must, in effect, pull a good man out of a combat organization and use him as a teacher in a training organization, like the one here. This, in turn, creates the need or another technician in the combat unit, and so on. Thus the most serious result of the shortage of skilled men is reduced combat capability.

Another serious result is the increased cost of operating your Air Force. Our training bills are tremendous, and again, if our training job were not so big, much of the money now used for training could be used to increase our combat power.

The immediate remedy for this trouble is to increase the attractiveness of a career of military service. Last year our Government granted a pay raise to servicemen. Immediately reenlistments started to rise. Unfortunately, the greatest rise was among those men whose military specialties were not critical. Although the pay raise helped, it was not large enough to induce enough jet engine mechanics, hydraulic experts, and electronic specialists to stay in.

What we need is a pay raise that, added to other service benefits, will more nearly equal the compensation of equivalent civilian positions. As part of this compensation, we must be able to offer adequate housing, proper medical care for dependents, and other benefits.

It has been pointed out many times that the cost of these remedies would be far smaller than the amount we are now paying in turnover and training costs.

But even if the remedies cost more, we still would get a bargain. If all the services could man their full forces with properly trained and experienced men, the Nation's effective defense potential would be multiplied.

I think it is appropriate on this Armed Forces Day here in Wichita Falls, Tex.—home of one of our largest training bases—that I leave these thoughts with you. This is the day set aside to honor the men and women of the Armed Forces. We must do everything we can to hang on to these wonderful people. Here in Wichita Falls, you are already contributing to this cause by helping to make our people feel they are doing a worthwhile job. I hope you will be just as enthusiastically behind any measures designed to keep these people on their jobs.

The strength we need to deter war lies first, last, and always in our people. It is up to all of us to insure that a shortage of trained people does not turn out to be the Achilles' heel of our defense.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following resolution adopted by the program board of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, Wednesday, May 9, 1956:

Whereas both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have said that it is now time to develop the economic and political potentiality of NATO; and

Whereas most of our NATO allies have for some months been pressing such action; and

Whereas it is of cardinal importance that the moral power of the democratic West unite effectively behind some responsible effort to explore how best to preserve and advance the right and practice of self-government throughout the world; and

Whereas the statement of our Secretary of State in New York City, April 23, indicates a forward-looking attitude toward world affairs, away from war and nuclear menace toward a more orderly way of international life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the program board of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, having previously urged the immediate passage of Senate Concurrent Resolu-

tion 12 which is a resolution for calling an Atlantic Exploratory Convention of citizen delegates from the principal Western democracies, we do hereby convey to the Secretary of State of the United States our approval of his statement that this Nation is willing to join with other NATO countries in an exploration of ways and means to develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in ways more than military; and we commend the purpose to strengthen the economic and cultural forces of these nations; and we pray that unified action, if achieved, may extend to the benefit of all peoples everywhere.

Maritime Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today is that outstanding occasion which, unfortunately, occurs but once a year. It is Maritime Day.

I have just returned from a luncheon given by the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore. While there, I had the great privilege of introducing the guest of honor, our friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Of course, in looking about for an outstanding authority on maritime matters, it was only natural that the Propeller Club would give serious consideration to requesting the Senator from Massachusetts to deliver the Maritime Day address. During that time he did me, the Port of Baltimore Propeller Club, and the State of Maryland the great honor of delivering one of the finest Maritime Day addresses I have ever been privileged to hear. Accordingly, and for the purpose of sharing his remarks with the Members of the Senate and the people generally, I send to the desk a copy of his speech, with a request for unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARITIME DAY LUNCHEON, PROPELLER CLUB OF BALTIMORE, MAY 22

Since I certainly don't want to sail into any port, especially Baltimore, under false colors, I think I should say right here and now that you fellows are competitors, strong competitors, of ours in Boston. This rivalry is one of the painful yet stimulating facts of Atlantic port life, and I want you to know that we recognize it as such.

Despite our rivalry, however—and it's a healthy one fundamentally—you in Baltimore and we in Boston have an equal and vital interest in maritime affairs as a whole. It is therefore essential that, as Baltimoreans and Bostonians, but even more importantly as Americans, we do everything within our power to see to it that a dynamic and progressive national maritime policy is maintained and implemented with commonsense, vigor, and foresight. Although we all recognize it, I think we can never overemphasize the dual importance of our merchant marine and our maritime industries to a healthy American economy and to our national defense.

Nearly 100 years of trial and error, marked in great part by the failure to recognize this dual importance of our merchant marine, failed to provide America with a stable maritime policy until Congress drafted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act is agreed to be a fundamental piece of maritime legislation, for it establishes a workable basis for maintaining a strong American merchant marine as a private enterprise venture, and at the same time strengthening the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as an essential arm of our national security and as an indispensable auxiliary of our armed services in event of national emergency.

In time of peace, reliable shipping service at reasonable rates requires that the United States carry a substantial part of its waterborne foreign commerce in American-flag vessels. During periods of economic depression, such as all nations have known in their history, the seafaring people have tended to give priority to their own commerce and their fleets have been instruments of national policy and trade promotion. But even in times of peace and prosperity such as we enjoy today, it is clear that if the strength of our American merchant marine is reduced or, indeed, if we were ever to be without it, foreign maritime powers would be in a position—which they are ever ready and eager to occupy—of carrying our goods at times and from ports of their own choosing and at whatever prices the American traffic could be forced to bear. Needless to say, those prices would be boosted sky high. We could not argue, since we could not compete.

Of even greater consequence, however, is the vital role of the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as instruments of national defense and security. Regardless of ordinary economic considerations, the maintenance of a vigorous merchant marine, available for service as a military auxiliary, simply must be regarded as a necessary cost of national defense to the extent that an adequate merchant fleet and shipbuilding industry cannot, in the light of crippling foreign competition, be self-supporting.

The Congress is repeatedly reminded of these facts by those of us who, by reason of the maritime States from which we come, have a great awareness and knowledge of United States maritime history, policy, and requirements. Fortunately, through the vigorous and unflagging efforts, on a wholly bipartisan basis, of such Senators, among others, as your JOHN BUTLER, Washington's WARREN MAGNUSON, Maine's FREDERICK PAYNE, and this occasionally seagoing Yankee now speaking, the Senate has been regularly persuaded that certain legislation just had to be placed at the top of the Senate's must list of legislation to be enacted. We have not achieved all that we hope to, all that we should—but we refuse to give up the ship!

Most recently, through the spirited bipartisan effort to which I have referred, we were able to record in the Senate a defense of the Cargo Preference Act, the 50–50 law, which we believe in so wholeheartedly and which we feel must be maintained. The very existence of a United States-flag fleet is our only protection against the kind of situation as that in which foreign maritime powers would be enabled, without such cargo preference restrictions, to take arbitrary and costly action where our American cargoes are concerned. Public Law 664, the Cargo Preference Act, is one of those pieces of legislation which prevents such foreign monopoly and yet at the same time fairly provides our friends from abroad with an opportunity to participate in the interest of healthier world trade. Previously, on nine such occasions since 1948, Congress has written this 50–50 provision into various aid programs. Now the Cargo Preference Act has made it unnecessary to repeat that procedure. It has become a part of our general law.

In another area of merchant marine interest and activity, it is pleasing to report that with the approval of Public Law 415 of this Congress, the Secretary of Commerce has been authorized to maintain the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., on a permanent basis.

In a word, we are strengthening the sinews of our merchant marine for the purpose of attracting the best of our young men to the merchant marine and encouraging them to remain in it as career officers.

These actions are typical of the maritime legislation for which we are determined to fight hard in every session of every Congress, and yet these are but a part of a larger effort, a wider program, that must be given effect continuingly if the American merchant marine is, economically and in the national interest, to achieve the goals it seeks.

I have had occasion from time to time to list six specific suggestions as to how our maritime problem may be seen clearly and implemented successfully. The suggestions are these:

1. A full cooperation among the Maritime Board, the shipping industry, and Government based upon confidence and mutual understanding.

2. The prompt determination of reliable indices for construction and operating participation by the Government.

3. The institution and maintenance of an orderly replacement program by appropriate planning and legislation.

4. The common-sense gearing of our maritime policy equally to defense and to peacetime needs.

5. The initiation of a vigorous and comprehensive program of public information and enlightenment.

6. The effective administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, together with a periodic review of that act to see how it may be better implemented from time to time in order that its purposes may be more effectively achieved.

It has always seemed to me very necessary that our citizens realize that the beneficiaries of a strong national maritime policy are not solely the shipowners and operators or those who man the vessels. The beneficiaries of such a policy are all the people of all the States, for every single region in this country contributes to and shares in the benefits which flow from the construction, the maintenance, and the operation of our merchant fleet in time of peace and in time of war.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee, I have worked hard for years to try to help overcome the feast or famine practices that have characterized us in maritime affairs over the years. In time of peace we have, characteristically, been foolishly content to wallow in the trough of the maritime wave. Then hurriedly and apprehensively in time of emergency we have built, at tremendous expense and with no little risk, to achieve a crest of production adequate to those emergency needs.

We hear much these days, particularly as regards airpower and the new era of guided missiles, of research and development, the work of our scientists in private laboratories and in Government installations designed for one purpose: the more rapid and effective improvement of weapons, ships and aircraft. We have had it dramatized spectacularly for men who go down to the sea in ships by the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus*. This same emphasis upon research and development must be applied to America's merchant marine, to the conception, designing, and building of newer, better, more efficient and more economical commercial vessels and gear.

During World War II, Mrs. Saltonstall was invited to christen the first LST built in the shipyard at Hingham, Mass. That yard was barely a year old and had been created almost from scratch on the Massa-

chusetts shoreline. Just as Mrs. Saltonstall was about to break the bottle on the vessel's bow, the superintendent of the yard said to her, "This ship will go down the ways at a speed of 16 knots and it will never move as fast as that again." That statement often makes me think of the advances that have been made in marine design and engineering in the last decade and of the grim significance of that progress in today's world.

Finally, may I say that, if we intend to keep an effective merchant marine afloat, it is inescapable that our merchant marine will have to be helped financially to compete with foreign-flag vessels. Therefore, a program of Government participation seems to be the only answer to our dilemma. Only through such Government participation can American shipowners maintain up-to-date, high-speed vessels which they can operate on a competitive basis with foreign-flag fleets.

For the same reasons we must continue with the construction subsidy program, which enables American shipyards to retain that vital core of shipyard labor without which we could not build vessels in time of war. A New Englander certainly doesn't spend money he doesn't have to spend. Nevertheless he paints his barn regularly. This is an expenditure, but it is a long-term economy. It is exactly in that sense that we must look upon expenditures where our national security and the merchant marine are concerned.

Let me conclude with these words of President Eisenhower's: "We were caught flat footed in both World Wars because we relied too much upon foriegn owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country.

"America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supplies for either peace or war will be safe.

"I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade."

These are sentiments of a far sighted and clear-thinking leader with which we all agree and toward the realization of which we are determined to work everlastingly hard together.

Quality of Bank Assets in Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the matter of public debt, private debt, and inflation are all subjects of deep interest to every thinking American.

James N. Land, vice president of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., of Pittsburgh, delivered a very able address on May 3, 1956, in Atlantic City, at the 62d annual convention of the PBA.

This address should be widely read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bank assets consist largely of borrowers' obligations to pay. The quality of such assets, therefore, turns on the ability of borrowers to keep their promises.

Many times in the past, in periods of prosperity, borrowers and lenders alike have become overoptimistic regarding the amount of debt that could be serviced and paid, and there have been many painful days of reckoning.

Will Rogers, once when he was asked what caused depressions, is reported to have replied, "Well, every now and then we have to stop and pay up."

Is history getting ready to repeat itself again, or has the creation of debt this time been sufficiently restrained that no new day of reckoning is to be expected?

The largest single borrower whose obligations are held by banks is, of course, the United States Government. The Federal debt, as we all know, is a huge one. It has not, however, increased markedly in total amount in the last 10 years, and relative to the size of the economy it has declined considerably. At the end of 1946 it was about 1¼ times gross national product for that year; now it is only about 70 percent of the current annual rate of gross national product.

There can be no doubt of the continuing ability of the United States Government to meet its obligations in dollars. The money it requires for payments of principal must, of course, come largely from the sale of new obligations, as must also the funds for financing deficits when they unfortunately occur. The Federal Reserve, while possessing a large degree of independence, recognizes the necessity of maintaining conditions in the money market which will enable the Treasury to carry out its necessary financing. This was demonstrated anew last November in the assistance which the Federal Reserve then rendered to a Treasury refunding. It is unthinkable that the Federal Reserve should set itself up over and beyond the general Government to such an extent as to cause the Treasury to default.

The sole question regarding the quality of United States Government obligations is not whether they will be paid but whether the dollars in which they are paid will have the same or a diminished purchasing power. Prosperity is a threat to the quality of such obligations only if its sets in motion a chain of circumstances which leads to inflation. Regardless of its effect on quality, however, it does tend to reduce the quantity of Government obligations in the hands of banks. For instance, during 1955, the pressure to obtain funds for loans caused commercial banks to dispose of about $7 billion of United States Government securities. This substitution of risk assets for riskless caused some lessening in the average quality of bank portfolios.

Private debtors and State and local governments cannot have the same degree of assurance as the Federal Government in obtaining money with which to meet their obligations under any and all circumstances.

An unfortunate result of a long period of prosperity is that it creates a deceptive appearance of strength for many marginal enterprises. Also many lenders become lulled into a false sense of security as prosperous conditions continue on and on without serious reversal. There is a strong temptation to be content with reduced margins of safety, as for instance in the relationship of current assets to current liabilities on the part of borrowers, whereas past experience would indicate that the reverse would be the part of wisdom. For instance, after an extended period of prosperity perhaps we should regard a current ratio to 2¼ to 1 as being no better than 1¾ to 1 following a period of liquidation when things had been put to the test. And perhaps we should have a similar viewpoint in regard to the relationship of earnings to charges.

Hindsight has proved that in the past the quality of lending tends to deteriorate in long periods of prosperity. By way of example, I shall cite some figures from a study of the National Bureau of Economic Research of a sample of urban mortgage loans made in the 1920's by life insurance companies, commercial banks, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. In the case of residential loans, 21 percent in volume of the loans made in 1925–29 eventually went into default as compared with only 8 percent of the loans of this character made in 1920–24. The corresponding percentages for loans on business properties were 37 percent for 1925–29 and 14 percent for 1920–24. These striking divergencies can only partly explained by the fact that the earlier loans had more time to be paid down or paid off before trouble hit.

In suggesting that there may be a margin of borrowers whose ability to pay debts is less strong than it should be, I am not implying a serious deterioration of position on the part of most business enterprises.

In the corporate field at least, the view that there has not been a general deterioration seems supported by the overall facts regarding corporate debt. These facts have been obscured somewhat by increased use of the lease-back device, which creates obligations that do not appear on the balance sheet. Nevertheless, it seems fairly clear that, if we leave out accrued taxes offset by short-term United States Government obligations owned, the rise in the debt of nonfinancial corporations during the last 15 years has not been as great proportionately as the growth in either corporate profits or the general economy during the same period. It is true that this is partly because the debt rose relatively little during the war years, but even if we deal only with the present decade we find little evidence of any markedly disproportionate growth in corporate debt.

When we turn to unincorporated enterprises, we find that their debt has been increasing at a somewhat faster rate than corporate debt, not only over the span of the last 15 years but also during the present decade. This suggests that there may be a greater segment of borrowers of marginal strength among unincorporated businesses than among corporations.

While State and local governmental debt has increased substantially since the war and particularly during the last 3 years, it is nevertheless considerably smaller now in relation to gross national product than it was in 1940 and 1941. Such debt does not seem likely to be a primary or initiating cause of trouble in the economy. The problems of State and local governments relate more to raising new money for such things as schools and roads than to paying the obligations they have already incurred.

I now come to a class of debt which is of great importance, from the standpoint both of bank portfolios and the general economy, and that is the debt of individuals, consisting primarily of consumer debt and residential mortgages. And here we find a class of debt that has been rising not only more rapidly than the general economy but also more rapidly than the specific economic factors which generate most of the debt, namely, (1) consumer purchases of automobiles, household appliances and equipment, and other durable goods, and (2) residential construction.

We are frequently assured by apologists for the debt that while it cannot go on rising at recent rates its present level is not too "high" in relation to some standard or other and therefore is no cause for worry. Frequently such contentions are based on the assumed continued high level of income or on the greater margin of income which is available now for so-called discretionary spending.

Such thinking misses a very important point. Income should not be thought of as something that comes into being without regard to what is happening in the area of debt creation and payment. If one grants that the debt cannot continue rising at recent rates, he should ask himself what ef-

fect the slackening will have on the amount of income that is being generated.

Things which are sold to consumers on an installment-payment basis, whether they be automobiles or houses or household equipment or other goods, pump money into the income stream a long while in advance of taking an equal amount of money out of it. The money injected into the income stream consists largely of wages and salaries paid to the persons who make, transport, and sell the things destined for consumer installment purchase, and, to a lesser extent, it consists of dividends and interest paid from the business earnings generated by these processes. The money taken out of the income stream consists of downpayments and installment payments by the ultimate purchasers.

To illustrate, take what happens in connection with an automobile. The workmen who make the automobile and the materials entering into its manufacture will have received their wages probably before the automobile even reaches the ultimate buyer and in any event long before he has finished paying for it. The same will largely be true of salaries of supervisory and executive personnel. Also investors in the concerns involved will usually have received their reward in the form of dividends and interest well before the ultimate buyer has finished his payments.

In the economy as a whole at any given time the making, transporting, and marketing of a multitude of new things destined for consumer installment purchase will be tending to enlarge the income stream and the installment paying for a multitude of things previously sold will be tending to reduce it. The net effect will depend on which element is dominant, and this is likely to be reflected in increases or decreases in the total amount of debt outstanding.

Any increase in either the dollar volume of installment-debt financing or the period of time over which installments are to be paid provides a stimulus to the economy by widening the gap between money income created and money income used up, but it can be demonstrated mathematically that, in the absence of new changes, the effect of such a "shot in the arm" lasts no longer than the term of the new debt brought into existence at the time of the change and is of diminishing importance before the end of that period.

To illustrate, assume that for some years a particular type of personal debt has been coming into existence at the rate of $100 million a month at the beginning of each month and has uniformly been payable over 20 months. This would mean that a total of $100 million would be paid each month and the total debt outstanding at the end of any month would be $950 million. This would represent the unpaid residue of debt created over 20 months, consisting of $95 million for the most recent month, $90 million for the month before that, and so on. Now assume that at the beginning of a particular month new debt starts coming into existence at the rate of $120 million a month and the period over which the new debt is required to be paid is lengthened to 30 months. The changed rates of debt creation and debt payment would cause the outstanding debt to rise gradually from $950 million to $1,740 million at the end of 30 months, at which point it would become stationary. Debt payment and debt creation would then be in balance, and, in the absence of new changes, the transitional stimulus to the economy would be at an end. If new changes should occur but should be in the direction of a reduced volume of borrowing or more rapid rates of repayment then not only would the stimulus be gone but instead there would be a drag operating against the economy.

I am aware that the money injected into the income stream by the processes I have been describing is not new or additional money unless it is borrowed from banks and that it does not go out of existence when repaid unless it is repaid to banks. This, however, is frequently the case. And even when the money used consists of nonbank funds previously in existence, its employment in financing installment-buying transforms it from the status of capital in certain hands into income flowing into other hands. It becomes capital again when repaid to the lenders and does not automatically reenter the income stream.

The dollar volume of consumer purchases of durable goods was only about one-fourth larger in 1955 than in 1950, but the amount of consumer goods installment-debt outstanding at the end of 1955 was nearly double the amount outstanding at the end of 1950. Similarly, mortgage debt on nonfarm 1-to-4 family residence was almost twice as large at the end of 1955 as at the end of 1950, although the dollar volume of residential construction was only about 60 percent greater during the 5 years ended with 1955 than during the 5 years ended with 1950.

In the year 1955 alone consumer installment debt went up nearly 25 percent and mortgage debt on nonfarm 1-to-4 family residences rose 17 percent.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland has computed that, if installment debt and disposable income were each to continue increasing at approximately the average percentage rate of the past 4 years, installment debt by 1965 would be over three times as large in relation to disposable income as at the end of 1955, and in 1965 would require more than one-third of disposable income for its servicing.

The recent rates of increase in consumer and residential debt are obviously unsustainable; they simply cannot continue indefinitely. The arithmetic of debt-payment schedules, if nothing else, will inevitably reduce the gap between debt creation and debt payment.

I will venture the opinion that at least half of the rise in personal income in 1955 originated in or was supported by unsustainable increases in personal debt.

Income which originates in a growth of debt that cannot be kept up is unreliable income. One wishes that as it circulates through the economy it could be made to bear a label reading somewhat as follows: "This income originated in an unsustainable source. Don't count on its being repeated." Such a label would afford a better appreciation of economic realities. For example, the automobile worker who is receiving large wages in a period in which automobile installment debt is climbing rapidly can perhaps understand that his income may be reduced if such debt levels off, but people who at second-, third-, or fourth-hand receive income created by his spending are usually not aware of the element of undependability in it. If they were warned of this undependability, they might order their affairs differently.

We talk much about the automatic stabilizers that have been built into our economy in the last quarter-century and I do not think they should be minimized. But I also think that before we accept the philosophy that we are in a completely new era we should take a good, hard look at the possibility that personal debt will prove to be an automatic unstabilizer.

If trouble does develop in the area of personal debt, I think the repercussions will be felt not so much in the form of defaults on personal debt as in a reduced volume of consumer purchases, particularly of durable goods. Most people, I believe, will keep up their debt payments even in a period of declining income. Both by inclination and to keep their records clear, they will reduce their purchases of new goods before they default on their outstanding obligations. They can do this all the more readily because a high but reducible standard of living and a large stock of durable goods already on hand make more wants postponable than ever before.

If trouble originating in the area of personal debt causes a reduced volume of consumer purchases, the effects will be felt most severely by business concerns of marginal strength, particularly in the durable goods field. All of which reemphasizes the importance of not relaxing standards in making loans to business enterprises.

I do not intend to imply that I expect a period of liquidation comparable to the early 1930's, because the contrary is the case. But I do suggest that in our lending it would be well to take in account the posibility of a setback within the next few years of more severity than any readjustment that has occurred since the war. One does not have to be a bear on the future of this country to believe that such a setback is possible. If it were just a matter of material resources and human capabilities and desires, we could dismiss the possibility of a downturn; we have everything of that sort that we need to keep our economy expanding continuously. But we must remember that these fundamental factors have almost always been favorable to economic expansion, and yet we have never been able in the past to proceed without interruption. To my way of thinking, these interruptions have occurred primarily because what I call the financial statement of things has been allowed to get out of kilter with the physical and human potentialities of the economy, requiring us every now and then, as Will Rogers said, "to stop and pay up."

If we adhere to conservative standards of lending and investing we may not only serve own own direct interests in avoiding trouble in our own portfolios but also contribute to the public welfare by mitigating those distortions in the financial system which produce economic dislocations. By throwing our weight against inflation now, we may be helping to avoid deflation later on and perhaps still later a renewed push toward inflation which might originate in governmental deficits incurred during the deflation. In other words, we may be doing our part in facilitating orderly and constructive economic progress.

Remarks of W. P. Kennedy, President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Mr. W. P. Kennedy, addressed the State meeting of the Minnesota Association of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary Lodges in Minneapolis, Minn., on May 5, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kennedy's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF W. P. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN, BEFORE THE STATE MEETING OF THE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN AND LADIES AUXILIARY LODGES, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MAY 5, 1956

Someone rightfully said, "Government is our Business." The business of Government is, or should be, the concern of all. The problem that faces us, and particularly so in this important political year, is, how and what can we do, to exercise our rights in taking care of our business—the Government?

The best and really the only effective and successful way to do the job is through our individual political efforts by qualifying and voting in all elections.

Of course, we can do the job more efficiently, after we have qualified through registering, wherever required, by pooling our political efforts with those of others, in groups and through such groups in political parties.

The members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen have, through 73 years learned the great values of successfully doing things collectively.

Our collective endeavors have really been our salvation, as workers, striving to improve our wages, working conditions and ways of living. We would have failed miserably as individuals. It was that working together, pulling together and all standing as one that did more to do the job than all else.

Through those years we have also learned that pooling our political efforts can be tremendously effective in nominating and electing public officials who served the people—all of the people, not a certain group or small clique of specially favored persons.

We have also learned that when we failed to pool our political efforts, we lost. We lost more than the election contest. We lost gains difficult to recover. A good example of such losses was in the vote complacency in 1946, which brought forth that terribly bad 80th Congress in 1947, with its infamous Taft-Hartley Act and uneven and unfair tax laws. In other instances we have watched national administrations almost forget the workers and the farmers in their eagerness to serve that small clique, who appeared to be their heaviest campaign contributors.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and its ladies auxiliary, a labor organization of serious minded American workers in the United States and Canada, will continue its age-old custom of being nonpartisan in all elections. That is the only reasonable course we can take in fairness to all concerned. Those most concerned in such actions are the members of the brotherhood, who are usually quite active in all political parties, except the Communist Party. We do not have any known Communists. We do not want any. They would find our membership hard and difficult to get along with.

The democratic procedures within the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen do not provide fertile ground for Communists or other totalitarian minded individuals. That is good for us. That's the way we want it. It's the way we are going to keep it.

We have developed a good habit of looking over the political issues that are of vital interest to the workers, to the farmers and to the people generally. We scan the records of those in office, along with information and attitudes of those seeking office. From such information we make our decisions on who to support and who to oppose. We support or oppose the candidates regardless of their political party. It's the only way we can do—in our search for justice and political freedom.

The elections this year—are of grave political importance—in Minnesota—in the Nation—and in the world-at-large. The election of a President, a Vice President and the Members of Congress presents a great challenge and a great opportunity to every member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and ladies auxiliary in the United States, in lending their assistance in building this Nation's future program and policies for a freer and more democratic society at home and throughout the world.

In a world endangered by Communistic influence abroad and with economic uncertainty and political confusion at home, the stakes in the primaries and in the general elections this year are enormous. We, the citizens of this great country have a most important task before us. We should insist that the major political parties nominate their most qualified candidates and include planks in their platforms on the important domestic and foreign issues before the American people.

We, in the labor unions, in the farm organizations, and in the civic groups, must do our part in presenting the issues clearly and understandingly to the people.

We can wholeheartedly support the American Heritage Foundation in its nationwide campaign to have citizens to qualify and to vote in the primaries and in the general elections.

We must overcome the complacencies of the past. We must all qualify and vote. It's the wise thing to do. It's the only way we can assure ourselves of holding our economic and social gains of the past two decades. It's our only chance to go forward to the better ways of living—we cannot stand still—we either move forward or backward—and who among us wants to go back to those demoralizing days of the 1930's. People throughout the world, who love liberty and want its freedoms preserved are anxiously watching and waiting the results of our primaries and elections. We must not fail them. We must not fail ourselves. There is so much depending on what we do in America this year.

The office of the Chief Executive of the United States is a most important one. On the shoulders of our next President will rest the responsibility for the general welfare and the preparedness of our 166 millions of people and there will be millions and millions of people in the critical areas of the world who will look hopefully to America for guidance.

The next 4 critical and difficult years will require a lot of hard and vigorous work. As much as we may desire to do so, there just isn't any plausible way of successfully delegating the important and essential duties of our Chief Executive. We cannot accept the idea that our national administration can be liberal in its foreign policies and at the same time serve the most decadent reactionaries at home.

We want and we need a President who will serve all of the people, not just a privileged few—one who believes that our great natural resources belong to—and should be used for—all of the people, instead of being given away for exploitation by selected groups or individuals for personal gain. Our next President should be a person who believes that what is good for the workers, the farmers, the housekeepers, and the small-business people, is also good for America.

We regard the office of the Vice President as one of importance—not to be offered as a consolation prize. Events of the past months make us more than ever conscious of the importance of an office, whose occupant is only a heartbeat away from that of the Chief Executive.

We deplore a political expediency whereby a liberal is counterbalanced with a conservative as a candidate for Vice President, or vice versa. The succession in office makes both the President and the Vice President equally important. The people should so regard it—even if the politicians have no regard for the desires of the people.

While we discuss the importance of national officials, we must not overlook the national officials to be elected from the several States. Along with the President and Vice President, there will be 33 United States Senators and the entire House of Representatives, 435—a delegation from each State.

Our great State of Minnesota has its important and impressive quota to be nominated and elected this year. The nine Representatives in Congress are up for the consideration of the voters this year. Of those 9 there are 5 who have been outstanding in their services to the people of our State and of our Nation. It might be well to call the roll—for they do deserve special mention.

Here in Minneapolis we have a fine liberal in ROY W. WIER in the Third District, now serving his fourth term. Across the river from St. Paul, there is another fine liberal, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY in the Fourth District, also serving his fourth term. Over from Grove City in the Sixth District we have an outstanding farmer, who is equaling his city colleagues' record—FRED MARSHALL, serving his fourth term. Representing the northern part of the State from Chisholm is another fighter for the rights of the people, JOHN A. BLATNIK in the Eighth District, serving his fifth term—and in the northwestern Ninth District, we have a newcomer in national politics, Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, serving her first term. And really doing a good job. It's wonderful—those 5 good Congressmen—the only thing we need to do is to return them to the Congress along with 4 others who will serve the people's interests as these 5 are now doing.

The election of liberals as President, Vice President, and as Senators would be ineffectual without a majority in the House of Representatives. That is why it is so important to increase the number of liberals in the House of Representatives from Minnesota.

That outstanding liberal in the Senate of the United States, our good friend and fellow citizen HUBERT H. HUMPHREY needs more help in Washington next year. One of the best ways to give that help is to elect more Congressmen like WIER, MCCARTHY, MARSHALL, BLATNIK, and COYA KNUTSON.

There is a definite trend toward the nomination and election of candidates who will serve all of the people.

The Congress will be called upon to consider fair and equitable tax law revision, labor relations, social security, national health, railroad retirement, aid to schools, federal housing and workable farm supports—all of those subjects are extremely vital to members of the Brotherhood and the Auxiliary and the workers in all other avocations.

We do have a big task ahead of us—we must do our part to make sure that our most important business—the business of our Government is carried on in a forthright manner to promote the general welfare—to provide adequately for the national defense and to adjust the inequalities which developed when we failed to do our part of the job.

The task ahead of us will not be so very difficult—if each individual will do his or her share by voting in all elections—and pool their voting collectively with that of others seeking the same goals. It is really a simple matter and doesn't take very much time.

The most important phase of it—is voting for the candidates who serve your interests, regardless of their party affiliations. There's no reason why we cannot use the same good judgment used by the big industrialists and the financiers of Wall Street—they vote for

candidates who serve their interests. When we become aware of the great value of that vote of ours—we will vote for labor's endorsed candidates. Public officials elected with the support of labor unions have always served the public interest—that is always to our interest.

Our labor unions were put at an unfair disadvantage by our enemies who controlled the 80th Congress and passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the veto of the President. That act among other antilabor provisions amended section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act, by putting labor unions in with national banks and corporations organized under the authority of Congress.

To overcome the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley law we organized the Trainmen's Political Education League. The league provides facility whereby the members, employees and friends of the brotherhood can legally carry on needed nonpartisan political activities in support of favorable candidates for public office.

TPEL affords you and your friends the opportunity to effectively take an active part in the selecting of capable public officials who will be friendly to your interests.

tI is the best way you can help keep your Government working for all of the people. We must ever be alert to the fact that a TPEL contribution is needed from each of you and from each member of your lodge. Our friendly candidates need financial support. We can give that needed support through TPEL. A membership card is issued to all making a contribution of $1 or more.

Brother Lester J. Covey, State Legislative Representative, is State chairman for TPEL. He has membership cards. He will accept your contributions.

We do have a vital interest in the issues that should be discussed and considered in the campaign this year.

Will the power companies be given the franchise to sell the publicly created power from the Niagara Falls development—or will we follow that splendid example set by the Canadians in the Ontario Public Power Authority. The Canadians give the people full advantage of public power. We, in the United States should do likewise.

The national administration takes an entirely different view—in the Hells Canyon project, where every effort is made to give away that great natural resource to a power company with its limitations to develop the full potentiality.

Another good example of the administration's attempt to destroy the progress made in public power, flood control, and conservation is in the support given the ill-fated venture of the Dixon-Yates in the power field in the Tennessee Valley Authority territory. Another one is the efforts to dispose of the public grazing and timber lands—much of which are in national parks and national preserves. We must take care or we will be seeing national scandals that will make the Teapot Dome-Fall-Doheny scandals of the early twenties look like pink tea parties in comparison.

It is time to check vote complacency and join in the campaign to have all qualify and vote—and to become familiar with the issues—the real issues before the people of our great Nation. We, in the labor unions do have a vital interest in the issues that should be sizzling hot topics of the campaign this year.

America is full of traditionally liberal, militant people—people who love the good life of freedom and abundance for all. We are yet too close to the early pioneering frontiersmen to have developed the conservative ways and attitudes of the continentals. The majority of us still believe the rights of the individual are and should be superior. We believe in democratic government, free enterprise, with the dignity and importance of human rights, freedoms, and needs over all else.

We want to conserve, at any cost, our invaluable heritage of time-tested customs and institutions in the forward march to economic, social and political security.

We can never hope to obtain the goal where we will reach economic, social and political perfection. The struggle for survival goes on and it must be continued by us and by our children and their children. The present and the future, like that of the past, must depend upon the people, who are more conscious than the others, that our democratic way of life is not a label, nor a name, but that it consists of social, economic and political ideals, which must be protected—fought for—in order to be kept alive and growing for us and for our posterity. Such people have always been more alert and sensitive to the forces which create injustices. Such people are the liberals, who have held high the torches of our cherished ideals.

Thomas Jefferson recognized the forces of liberalism and reaction when he wrote, "Men by their very constitutions are naturally divided into two parties, those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish, and consider them as the most wise depository of the public interest."

Our political party alinements are not so well defined as in the quotation from Jefferson. We have liberals and reactionaries in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. That is why we, as a labor union, must remain nonpartisan—supporting liberals where we find them in both parties. In that way we attempt to meet the challenges of our time by courageously joining with those who believe the people to be the best depositary of the public interest.

As a voter in Minnesota, I don't see how I can turn in any direction but to the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party.

In Gov. Orville Freeman, we have a liberal as described by Thomas Jefferson, who serves well the interests of all people in the State. He is doing a good job and his administration is following the pattern set by his illustrious predecessor, Floyd B. Olson.

The State of Minnesota needs Orville Freeman and with him a workable majority in the legislature.

It will be wise to follow the endorsement of the Minnesota State Legislative Board. Lester Covey will keep you fully and correctly informed on the candidates for State offices endorsed by the legislative board.

The uneasy restlessness of the people since January 1953 seems to show less and less confidence in President Eisenhower and the Republican Party. Despite all of the favorable publicity in the newspapers and magazines, on the television and over the radio, there's definite trend in the opposite direction.

The 30 Republican Governors in 1953 have dwindled to 21, with the Democrats increasing their number from 18 to 27. Five hundred and five State legislators have been added to the Democratic column in the same period. Hundreds of Republican strongholds in counties and cities in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, the New England States and in other sections of the country have turned Democratic—all of this indicates the people's resentment against the administration's failure to provide for the general welfare. It is evident that what is good for General Motors is not good for and is not wanted by the people.

The Minnesota Legislative Boards of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary have the obligations of directing the course of our members should take in the primary and general elections. The officers and members of the boards must not fail in pushing forward our collective political efforts to where all will be registered and all will vote in the primary election, September 11 and in the general election November 6. 1956 is an important political year. You can make it one for yourselves and for the people. May God grant you the wisdom to do so.

Legislation From the Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Tuesday, May 15, 1956, entitled "Legislation From the Bench," which is worthy of the consideration of all Members of Congress, as well as citizens generally in this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATION FROM THE BENCH

Senators BRIDGES and MCCARTHY are offering a bill providing that no act of Congress dealing with sedition, subversion, or communism shall be construed as taking away the concurrent jurisdiction of the States in these fields. This legislation is in answer to recent decisions of the Supreme Court, holding that the Federal Government preempted jurisdiction over such matters and that the States may not take action as long as the Government has laws under which it may act.

The growing tendency of the Supreme Court to kill off State laws in wholesale lots and to center all authority in the Government was pointed out in a speech the other day by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, who called upon Congress to stop the Court's process of reducing the States to "the status of provinces, completely under Federal law."

In order to accomplish this purpose, Mr. BYRD and 11 other Senators have introduced bills whose general effect is to inform the Supreme Court that when Congress intends a Federal law to invalidate all State laws in the same field it will plainly say so, and that otherwise the Court is to presume no such intention.

Among other recent decisions, the Supreme Court upheld the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in invalidating the conviction of Steve Nelson, a leading Communist, under the State sedition law. It also ruled that resort to the fifth amendment was not sufficient cause for firing a New York City schoolteacher, although State law existed as authority for doing so.

Senator BYRD noted a similar intrusion of the Court in denying States the right to exercise ordinary police power in maintaining peace and order in labor disputes. The Court granted a writ of certiorari to the United Automobile Workers in a case involving union goon tactics amounting to civil insurrection, which the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board had sought to bring under control.

This string of decisions and court decrees started in March, when the Supreme Court, upholding the immunity law of 1954 in the case of a Communist named William Ludwig Ullmann, asserted the doctrine that Congress could bind the State courts. Ullmann contended that, although the Fed-

eral immunity law compelled him to testify on Government order or go to jail, he was in nowise protected from subsequent prosecution in the State courts, based on the testimony he gave under a pledge of Federal immunity. Therefore, he argued, the immunity law abridged the fifth amendment, which guarantees that no witness may be compelled to testify against himself.

The Supreme Court met the issue by saying that, inasmuch as the immunity law was related to the national security, it placed a restriction on the exercise of State power in the interest of a more effective exercise of conceded Federal power. As we asked at the time: Who conceded it? Certainly not the States. And the legislative history of the immunity law showed that Congress itself admitted doubt that it had the constitutional power to bind the States.

Senator BYRD says that, given the course upon which it has embarked, there is no telling where, if anywhere, the Supreme Court will be willing to stop. On the same premises that it has already adopted, it could proceed to rule that no State can enact labor legislation or exercise the taxing power in areas in which the Federal Government also happens to operate. In fact, according to the prevailing philosophy of preemption, the Supreme Court would deny the States any powers in any fields for which the Federal Government has spoken a claim, however faintly, through congressional action.

The 9th and 10th amendments, reserving rights to the States and the people, would inevitably become nullities under the application of this doctrine. We think that Congress is right in deciding that it is past time to call a halt to the Court's disposition to legislate from the bench in the interest of a vast extension of Federal power. To do so is not to negate the power of Congress, for it is clearly established that Federal law prevails when State law is in conflict. But that is not the issue. The issue is to preserve the concurrent jurisdiction of the States, as well as their integrity as voluntary partners who gave their consent to Federal union.

Twentieth Anniversary of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the May 1956 issue of Public Power, the official publication of the American Public Power Association, contains four articles recognizing the 20th anniversary of our REA program. These articles report on the past, present, and future of the REA program, as we pass the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Act, which was signed on May 20, 1936, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of these articles, which was written by Mr. Claude R. Wickard, who was for many years the able and devoted REA Administrator. He speaks a wise word of warning in his article entitled "Enemies of Public Power Also Would Destroy Electric Cooperatives."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENEMIES OF PUBLIC POWER ALSO WOULD DESTROY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

(By Claude R. Wickard)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Longest term as REA Administrator during the agency's first two decades was served by Claude R. Wickard. Mr. Wickard rose through various positions in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to Secretary of Agriculture in 1940. After resigning as Secretary of Agriculture in 1945, he became REA Administrator, serving until 1953. He now lives on his Indiana farm.)

This is being written on a cold and snowy February night in an Indiana farm home, made comfortable, modern, and convenient through REA electric service.

I was awakened this morning by an electric clock radio, and I heard the latest news before I arose. I washed and shaved with a plentiful supply of hot and cold water available through an automatic electric water pressure system and an automatic electric water heater. The whole house was a comfortable 72° because of an electrically controlled heating system.

My breakfast: grapefruit was taken from an electric refrigerator. The milk which had been pasteurized in an electric home pasteurizer also came from the refrigerator. Bacon and eggs were cooked on an electric range. The coffee was made in an automatic electric percolator and the toast in an electric toaster. The garbage was placed in an electric disposal and the dishes were washed by an automatic electric dishwasher.

My wife placed the soiled cloths and linens in the automatic washer and later transferred them to the electric dryer before smoothing them with the electric iron. She cleaned the rugs with an electric vacuum sweeper.

The noon meal came from foods which had been preserved in the electric refrigerator. The evening meal was prepared entirely from foods taken from the deep freeze and the refrigerator. Even before I sat down to the evening meal, I had received up to the minute news, weather and market reports over the radio.

I took time out from writing this article after dinner to watch Purdue, my alma mater, beat Michigan 72 to 63 in a Big Ten basketball game. Because of the blizzard, many were prevented from attending the game, but I saw it clearly and comfortably in my own home through that electrical annihilator of space—television.

With the exception of the radio, none of these electrical devices were in this house 20 years ago. There was no power to operate such electrical devices. Yet there was a high line along the State highway just 1 mile away. Some of my neighbors and I had tried in vain to get the power company officials to serve us on terms we could afford. These officials said that the company was not interested in serving farmers because farmers would not use enough electricity to make service profitable.

REA CHANGED FARM LIFE

It was only after the creation of REA that the power company became interested in serving us. We refused to negotiate with these people who suddenly had become interested in giving us service after years of disinterest. We would wait a little longer perhaps to get electric service, but we thought we would get better and cheaper service through our own cooperative. In 2 years we were getting REA electric service.

We are now using it for over 20 different purposes in farm production. At the risk of omitting some, I shall try to name them: automatic water pumps, making water available in automatic fountains in all buildings and fields; heaters for automatic water fountains; lighting of barns and barn lots; elevators for grains and feeds; feed mixer; air compressor for tire inflation; power drills; saw and planer; automatic hog house heater; hog house air circulator; poultry house lights; chicken brooder; pig brooders; milking machine; milk cooler; milkhouse water heater; milking house ventilator; emery wheel; sickle sharpener; welder; chicken fountain heater; refrigerator for serum and vaccines; and crop dryer.

Electric service has modernized farm living and it has helped to revolutionize farm production. Millions of rural families are deeply indebted to Franklin Roosevelt, George Norris, Sam Rayburn and others who had the vision of REA and the courage to fight off the opposition.

Those of us who now derive so much benefit from REA must have vision and courage if we are not to lose the full benefit of REA or even all of REA.

To obtain the full advantage of electric service on the farm, the service must be reliable and it must be low in cost. Reliable and low cost service means new uses and greater usage. The additional use means that the lines, transformers and other facilities must have greater capacity. The increased use of electricity around the farmsteads means more dependence on the service. This means that the proper maintenance of REA facilities is essential. The cost of REA service can be influenced by proper maintenance which will insure increased use.

Reliability, capacity and cost are interdependent. The board of directors and the managers will have to have vision and courage if this interdependence is properly used to gain full advantage of REA service.

My own REA cooperative is a good example of how it is possible to give good service through proper maintenance and increased capacity. It is most reassuring to know that other cooperative crews would rush to our aid if a bad storm hit our lines.

We members could and would make our voices heard if our management was not alert and efficient. Yes, we can effectively control the affairs of our cooperatives in the interests of good service and low cost.

My cooperative, like the majority of REA cooperatives, does not generate its own electricity. It, therefore, has only limited control over the reliability and cost of the service it extends its members. For instance, most of the lengthy interruptions of my service are due to the failure of the supplier's system rather than the cooperative. The cooperative management can only beg that improvements be made to avoid these outages, which are far too frequent and too lengthy. The power company failures have an unfortunate habit of coming at milking time.

The cooperatives in the State are in constant negotiation with the power suppliers over location of substations and wholesale rate contracts. One of the principal suppliers of REA power in the State has asked the State utility commission for approval of a rate increase, much of which was based on erroneous claims. The power company did not include an increase to REA cooperatives in its petition, apparently because it did not want to disturb the most influential of its customers. When the utility commission granted a part of the increase requested, it then included the REA cooperatives on the ground that rates could not be discriminatory.

The cooperatives learned the truth of what they had often been told—that the long-term contracts always sought by the power companies are no guaranty against rate increases.

There is considerable variation in the attitude of the cooperatives toward their suppliers. Some seem to feel that the only strategy they can adopt is to stay on the friendliest terms with the power companies. Others are openly resentful of the arbitrary

and even arrogant tactics of the power company officials.

All of them realize more and more that the cooperative position is vulnerable and insecure, but perhaps few know that there are certain interests who would like to eliminate entirely the REA cooperatives. To most cooperative members the Hoover Commission report is something vague and remote. They do not see that those who support the Hoover Commission reports are by and large the same interests who didn't want REA brought into existence in the first place, and who now see in the cooperatives a challenge to the monopolistic utilities.

Too few cooperative members see any relationship between public power and REA cooperatives. They don't know that the two types of projects have a lot in common, including a common opposition, and that this opposition is relentless and resourceful.

Only through the development of plentiful supplies of low-cost public power could REA cooperatives be given loans to take electricity to hundreds of thousands of rural homes in the postwar period.

The only hope of electric cooperatives to survive lies in eternal vigilance and unity. Those who would destroy public power would destroy the REA cooperatives and vice versa. It will take a unified defense to win the struggle against the common enemy.

A Government-Subsidized Scholarship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the shortage of teachers, scientists, nurses, and social workers is a national problem to which I have frequently invited the Senate's attention. I have just received a letter from Mr. Harold Pluimer, principal of the public schools in Renville, Minn. He proposes a Government scholarship program for members of the top 10 percent of every senior class. It is a sound and constructive proposal.

I commend him for his concern with this serious problem and for his imaginative proposal. I have long supported a Federal scholarship program and endorse in general the suggestions of Mr. Pluimer. This type of Federal aid to education is urgently needed and could be expanded by cooperative efforts of States and local political subdivisions. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Renville, Minn., May 14, 1556.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Please permit me to take some of your valuable time to very briefly propose a partial answer to the very acute problem of the shortage of professional personnel. Particularly I am referring to teachers, scientists, nurses, and social workers.

This may possibly be classified as a variation of Federal aid to education but I am sure the many public and congressional objections to the Federal-aid program would not apply to the suggested plan.

Approximately 1¼ million seniors will be graduating from our high schools this spring. I would like to recommend a Government subsidized scholarship program for the members of the top 10 percent of every senior class. Certainly this segment of the school population, in the interest of our national welfare, should attend college. Offhand the cost would appear staggering—but an analysis of the proposal would reveal it to be possibly one of the best investments our Government ever made. Let us assume a $100 scholarship for 100,000 students needing financial assistance. The cost per year would be approximately $10 million—the cost of one B–52 bomber.

The implications of such a program are staggering, and it is difficult to conceive valid objections to such a venture.

I sincerely believe that a program of education assistance would be as valuable to the defense of our country as the strategic material that is so often emphasized.

Your careful study of this proposal is requested.

Sincerely yours.

HAROLD PLUIMER,
Principal.

The Bully Among Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Bully Among Us," which appeared in the Concord Daily Monitor, Friday, May 18, 1956, which I feel warrants the attention of the Members of Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BULLY AMONG US

The Russians have announced they are going to reduce their armed forces numerically by 1,200,000. They will still have in excess of 10 million or 11 million men under arms, even if their announcement is genuine, a fact the world has no way of determining.

Because the Russian word is worthless the free world can do little more than ignore the Russian announcement as other than political propaganda and continue perfection of its own armed defenses. In doing so the free world must say to the Communists that only if it agrees to joint inspection of defenses in all their aspects will it recognize any honest desire on the part of the Communists to reduce armaments for the purpose of helping to preserve world peace.

In short, Russia has not in this new statement provided genuine proof of honorable intentions as respects the peoples of this earth. It is, instead, seeking a cheap advantage. It wants the rest of the world to drop its guard against Communist aggression. It wants to soften up the free world, partly by dividing it. And the chances that it will succeed in part are very, very good.

The burden of armaments upon the free peoples is great. The will of many of the free peoples to fight to preserve their freedom is not all it might be. The full implications which lie in the development of atomic power are not generally realizable short of an atomic war. The political stability of many of the free governments is nil. Unity in the free world is a fiction.

It is the nature of freedom that each person and each nation shall be itself. The common danger from communism is not enough to overcome this trait which is both an asset and liability of free men. So free men will interpret the Russian announcement in any variety of ways, and pursue any variety of consequential actions and attitudes.

Within the free world there is a seeking of the attainment of ideals. In the Communist world there is only a seeking of the attainment of power. Man's nature is always temporarily on the side of the power seekers. Their objective is less abstract than that of the idealists, and more realizable because of man's innate weaknesses. Force can produce power. Freedom does not always produce freedom, but more often a license which sometimes degenerates into force.

The goal of the free world is the harder one to achieve. Its achievement rests upon faith, and the works which faith alone can produce, yet no man is completely a man of faith. Contrariwise, no man is completely devoid of faith, not even the most avid disciple of force. Without effort, however, it is easier for man to be selfish and cynical and hypocritical than to let his faith dominate his actions and reactions.

So it is that the advantage often seems to be with the unscrupulous, as it does at this moment in international affairs. This very fact illustrates the great part faith plays in our destiny. Only if we have faith do we refuse to yield our idealistic goals despite the enticements of those who have accepted the wicked way because the weakness of the appeal of power has submerged the faith they, too, might have had.

Often in the struggle toward the goal of justice and peace upon this earth obstacles which appear devoid of solution test our faith. Often we are compelled to proceed without knowledge as to whether the course we persist in or adopt will or can produce desirable results. We feel our way, and now and then, we are rewarded, our faith is renewed, and we have the courage to keep trying.

The world has been in a long interval of such trying, without respite. It is tired. It is tempted to relax its efforts. It is quarrelsome. Yet a calmer second thought reveals that progress there has been, not universal, but nevertheless impressive. The world has become amazingly small and intimate, and this very fact is one reason we sense what seem to be so many irritants. Its nations and people are like a complete family of relatives all living in the same house at last. No wonder there is confusion as we try to work out compatible arrangements for such close association.

International Trade Union Activity: A Vehicle for Greater World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "International Trade Union Activity: A Vehicle for Greater World Security," by Solomon Barkin, director of

research, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, in the Labor Law Journal, December 1955:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION ACTIVITY: A VEHICLE FOR GREATER WORLD SECURITY

(By Solomon Barkin)

In a world in which opposing sides are oriented around totalitarian Communist regimes, on the one hand, and a group of democratic countries, sensitive to the popular demands for rising living standards and world peace on the other, international free trade-union activity plays a vital role in strengthening the position of the non-Communist world. It is creating a popular loyalty to and a belief in the progressive programs of the non-Communist states. In itself, it constitutes a weapon with which to hold off and combat the Communist threat. It is an organization which seeks to assure the realization of the basic objectives of the free world.

The active part which the trade-union movement has played, and can continue to play, in the establishment of world security as understood by the non-Communist world has been moderately appreciated by professionals in our foreign service. But the great mass of Americans does not yet begin to comprehend the direct, vital position it has already occupied, and the part it can in the future play, in containing the flood of communism, even destroying its grasp within its own areas, and building stronger democratic institutions.

The free trade-union movement is particularly well suited by its history, activities, and knowledge, its intense hatred of and opposition to Communist principles, and its devotion to progressive democracy to serve in the present battle. In fact, no other group is as well adapted for this undertaking. In this offensive, it enjoys the advantage of not only creating support for a non-Communist, progressive economic-social program, but also of assuring stricter adherence to it by the nations themselves and threatening the very hold of the Communist totalitarian powers over their own repressed peoples. Above all else, it knows that ultimate victory will be effected not by military means but by the demonstration of rising standards of living, full employment, political democracy and respect for human rights in the free world. These gains will ultimately force relaxation of totalitarian controls and reductions in military expenditures in the Communist states—the preludes to more sweeping accommodations to democratic human concepts. With flourishing trade-union movements the world over, the era of coexistence can become one of conversion of totalitarianism to democracy.

THREE WEAPONS OF SECURITY

1. Adequate self-defense: World security, in the eyes of the non-Communist world, embraces three basic guiding principles. First, freedom from outside attack or a military power adequate to assure this objective. This end has to be promoted not by one nation, but by all, for all associated nations and independent countries. This strength is necessary as a deterrent to military attack.

2. Economic and political improvement: The second principle for world security for a democratic non-Communist world is dedication to the improvement of the economic and political positions of its people. The western, and many Asiatic, non-Communist powers are pursuing this goal. The Communist countries have been too devoted to the construction of capital-goods industries and military might to give consideration to this objective. The rewards for the non-Communist countries which have embarked on this program are an affirmative devotion by their peoples to their cause and a diminishing following for the Communist parties in their midst. The price Russia is paying for its program is its constricted economic development which does not keep abreast of its growth in population.

3. Political freedom and self-determination: The third principle of the free world's program for security is the right of people of each nation to determine their own form of government and economy. We have respected those maintained by other nations. The United States has objected to and refused to recognize conversion through military might. We have never accepted the submergence of the Balkan states. The Congress of the United States recently declared that "peoples who have been subjected to the rapacity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they live; and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter." President Eisenhower declared at the summit conference that "the American people feel strongly that certain peoples of Eastern Europe have not yet been given this pledge of our United Nations war-time agreement." Free elections for the Germans were assigned number-one priority in the allied programs.

The battle among systems and programs must be waged through the hearts and minds of men, by means of deeds and economic accomplishments and not by political and military might.

No principle comes closer to the dedication of the free trade unionist who proclaims the right of all peoples to full national freedom and self-government, and dedicates himself to champian the cause of human freedom, oppose and combat totalitarianism and oppression in any form and supports all working people deprived of their rights as workers and human beings by oppressive regimes.

This determination to fight for freedom and ecoonmic and political progress, to support defense and to advance the cause of economic well-being through unified action of workers constitutes a formidable assistance to the non-Communist world. The Interntional Conferedation of Free Trade Unions, at its May conference in Vienna, numbered delegates from 56 countries representing more than 50 million workers from all continents and all regions, races, religions, and colors. Associated with the confederation are the International Trade Secretariats which add an additional 3 million organized workers in nations without affiliated national centers. They included men high in the echelons of their country's leadership. Some were allied and others in opposition to incumbent governments. But all were united in support of the above priciples.

ICFTU: A EIGHTER FOR HUMAN FREEDOM

The international free trade union movement not only has a common cause with the democratic nations, but it is composed of organizations led by persons tried in the battle for human freedom. Their lives have been dedicated to this purpose. And in this fight with Communist totalitarianism and subversion, they are among the best qualified and most learned in the arts of combat with them. Their faith and qualifications for the challenge have been repeatedly tested. They know the difference between the men who exploit the fight for freedom to impose their own totalitarian organizations and those who are truly advancing human rights, well-being and freedom.

Steeped in the hope that Allied-Soviet war cooperation would usher in a new day, the British and French trade unions and the CIO, together with the Russians, formed the World Federation of Trade Unions in 1945. The effort to build a single world movement based on the assumption of a contained Communist labor front was set back in 1946 with the death of Sidney Hillman and the withdrawal of Sir Walter Citrine, the British unionist. The increasing domination of the federation by Communist officialdom caused increasing dissention. Concurrently, the American Federation of Labor maintained its own international operations designed to counteract Communist activity and to help strengthen the newly rising free unions in the defeated countries. The WFTU finally collapsed with the split between the East and West on the Marshall plan. The International Trade Secretariats had never joined and remained independent, jealousy protecting themselves from domination by Communists. With the help of the American Federation of Labor, the free unions withdrew in December 1949, and formed the present International Confederation of Trade Unions, selecting J. H. Oldenbroek of the Netherlands, a fighting anti-Communist and secretary of the International Federation of Transport Workers, as its general secretary. It now enjoys the support of the free trade unions throughout the world. No longer predominantly a European organization, it draws its support, leadership and following from all corners of the world.

Lonely Man and Lonely Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lonely Man and Lonely Philosophy," written by Jim Lewis, and published in University of Miami's fine newspaper, the Miami Hurricane, of April 27, 1956.

The editorial describes the difference in the thinking between those who live under a free government and those who live under a dictatorship or a Communist form of government. I think the editorial is splendidly written; it tells an impressive story, and I commend it highly to the attention of Members of Congress and the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONELY MAN AND LONELY PHILOSOPHY

(By Jim Lewis)

It was sunset. Outside, the western sky was slashed and bleeding, but the cafeteria was cheery with a suppertime peace. Dishes clanked, people laughed quickly and the public-address system covered it all with soft music. And I had supper with a Communist.

"You are weak," the Communist said, "and Lenin despises you. You call yourself a liberal, but in reality you are only a weakling. You are afraid to make up your mind, you vacillate, you think one thing today and another tomorrow."

He glared at me through his glasses and bolted some mashed potatoes. He drank some milk. He was kind of a young Communist, and he didn't like coffee.

"Certainty has never been strength," I suggested. "Because you have a belief doesn't mean that you have the truth."

"How do you know?" he shouted. "You've never tried our way, you don't know anything about it and can't make a judgment."

I'd never, never tried suicide, either. But it didn't seem worth mentioning.

His eyes got a religious glow, and he continued: "We have decision. We have a truth to carry. You have nothing; no guts, no insides, no strength. Lenin despised you, your kind, the phony intellectual. We despise you."

He was editorializing. He wasn't a party member, probably not even a fellow traveler. And I don't think he despised me. Lenin, maybe; but Lenin was a lonely, bitter man with iron instead of a soul. My friend was only lonely.

The Communists, the believers in any true cause, feel they have strength because they have a discipline to follow. They feel, it seems to me, that because they are part of a movement, they are secure; that they do not have to rely on personal weakness, that they need not exercise the dreadful freedom of decision.

And they are strong, as the brick is strong in the wall. Or as an ant in the sand hill is strong.

But I have never really thought of that as a strength. After freshman semantics, none of us are brave enough to say "Strength is—" or attempt to delineate a meaning.

But if I were on the spot, I think I would admit that strength to me has always meant the ability to stand alone, to make decisions, to exist through choice. A man who is strong will go his own way.

"You are weak," my friend had said, "because you change your mind." Decisions once made should be happily forgotten; changing your mind brings you once again to the abyss of choice, the insecurity of being an individual.

"You're afraid of being," I said.

"You're intellectually soft," he told me.

We went out together. The sky was green and shadows were soaking softly into everything. A blonde Chi-O went past, her hair the color of ashwood in the fading light. I watched her pass; my friend studied the lake.

Communism and the West will never meet or agree. Their social philosophies are more remote than their economy. Our ancestors followed the sunset, and went alone, and made their choices; communism, although originaly a Western economic theory, answered a dire need in the Slavic breast, a need to be safe. The West is a civilization of nomads; the East, of farmers.

My friend went away, walking quickly across the darkening campus, his arms full of books and fear. Around him the university buildings thrust their stone geometries against the sky with a breathless ease, as casual and free as the philosophy that made them.

My friend looked as if he were lonely. He always will be.

Soviet Spy Network in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Evening Star, Monday, May 21, 1956, entitled "Soviet Spy Network in America," written by Constantine Brown, which I feel is worthy of the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET SPY NETWORK IN AMERICA—TESTIMONY OF FORMER RED AGENTS SEEN AS VINDICATION OF MCCARTHY

(By Constantine Brown)

A sensational story of 2 years ago, widely publicized in the press and on television, was the Army-McCarthy hearing which eventually ended in condemnation of the Wisconsin Senator by the Senate.

The basis for that spectacular row between an investigating committee and the Army Department, headed by Secretary Stevens, was the accusation by Senator MCCARTHY and his staff that the Army was coddling Communists who had imbedded themselves at Fort Monmouth.

The Army said it started the investigation because MCCARTHY had used "undue influence" to get a commission for one of his staffers, David Schine. At the same time, it insisted that there had been no espionage at Fort Monmouth and that only a routine error had been made in the promotion of Major Peress.

Last Thursday the testimony under oath of a former Soviet employee of the Soviet Signal Corps Research Institute in Moscow was read into the record of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, and then made public. For security reasons the witness did not appear in public hearing and his evidence was given under the assumed name of "Andriyeve." When he fled from the U. S. S. R. and how he reached this country are also kept secret.

The testimony bore out entirely the accusation of Senator McCarthy that there had been large-scale espionage at Fort Monmouth since 1944 when Mr. Andriyeve first joined his outfit. One of his functions was to examine a series of documents in foreign language, 90 percent of which were of American origin and 10 percent of British and French origin.

When asked by Committee Counsel Robert Morris whether they had originated at Fort Monmouth or the Signal Corps, the reply was: "One batch emanated from Fort Monmouth and the other from RCA. I could not tell you exactly which RCA laboratories because I don't remember."

When Mr. Morris asked for an approximation of the quantities of documents examined and translated by the witness over a period of a year the reply was "thousands."

The Army Department was queried by reporters soon after the end of Thursday's hearings. Its spokesman pointed out that during the war we exchanged military information with the U. S. S. R.; hence it would have been natural that the Soviet Signal Corps Research Institute should have in its possession data about our then novel radar and other such things.

But in his sworn testimony Andriyeve stated: "The documents came from the Sepetsotdel (secret police section) and had to do with high power, supersonic frequency and ultra-high frequency tubes that are used for radar. Some of them would be photocopies or photostats that evidently came in originally from the United States; others were enlargements, blowups from microfilms which got into the Soviet Union from America and were developed and enlarged at some local Soviet level. The vast majority of them had classification marks such as 'secret', 'top secret' or only 'confidential.'"

When asked how he thought they came into possession of his agency the answer was: "The only thing I can tell you is that when we would tell the secret-police officer in what you may call a facetious way 'Where did you steal them' he would say 'Shut up; it is none of your business. Your business is to try to find out how to use them. It is our business how to get them.'"

Insofar as Andriyeve could tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the flow of documents continued through 1945 after he had been transferred from the Signal Corps Research Institute to the manufacture of radar parts.

It is, of course, accurate that we did give the U. S. S. R. some technical information of minor importance. The Pentagon's official policy was to keep away from the Russians our major technical inventions and know-how. This was, however, a policy which the Soviet agents in this country knew how to counteract. What they could not obtain officially they got through ideological stooges who had sensitive positions in the Government.

The revelations of the former Soviet official will change nothing, of course, in MCCARTHY's status as a censured Senator. The Republicans in the Senate feel that they cannot afford to raise the question that he was censured too hastily and that there was some real foundation for the accusation of Communist infiltration at Fort Monmouth because they would go counter to the wishes of the executive branch of the party. The Democrats have no reason to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for an opponent whose activities cost them some seats in the 1952 election.

Bureau of Reclamation—Hydroelectric Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer, Bureau of Reclamation, together with a list of hydroelectric powerplants constructed, under construction, and authorized to be constructed by the Bureau.

The letter and list follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1956.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EVINS: As requested in your letter dated April 26, 1956, the following information is being furnished:

1. In reply to your first question a tabulation of hydroelectric plants under the administration of the Bureau of Reclamation is attached.

2. The total existing hydroelectric nameplate capacity is 4,962,550 kilowatts. The total nameplate capacity under construction by the Bureau is 470,750 kilowatts and the Bureau is authorized to construct an additional 1,884,400 kilowatts giving a combined total of hydroelectric power capacity authorized and under construction of 2,355,150 kilowatts.

3. There is also attached a pamphlet entitled "Repayment Histories and Payout Schedules, 1952," which gives the latest comprehensive data on Bureau of Reclamation contracts that are available in this office. It would take several months' work to bring this up to date and since you require this information at the earliest possible date, this Office feels that the attached pamphlet will in all probability meet your requirements.

Exclusive of the Missouri River Basin project which is authorized jointly to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers, the beneficiaries of Reclamation projects in general repay over 90 percent

of all projects construction costs. The balance of construction costs is either allocated to other services such as flood control and navigation or to special programs such as the water conservation and utilization program or to writeoffs and adjustments. All these are authorized by specific acts of Congress. You, of course, are aware that power and municipal and industrial water allocations bear interest. Incidentally, these interest-bearing features pay out their own allocations and assist in the repayment of irrigation costs as well. In terms of overall ratios, irrigation repays about 60 percent of its total cost with power and municipal and industrial water paying out the remaining 40 percent of the costs allocated to irrigation.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, hydroelectric powerplants, Dec. 31, 1955

A. CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

State	Project	Name of plant	Calendar year of initial operation	Nameplate capacity		Number and nameplate capacity of generators	
				Existing (kilowatts)	Ultimate (kilowatts)	Existing (kilowatts)	Ultimate (kilowatts)
1. Alaska	Eklutna	Eklutna	1955	30,000	30,000	2, 15,000	2, 15,000.
2. ....do	....do	Little Eklutna [1]	1955	2,000	2,000	2, 1,000	2, 1,000.
3. Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon	Hoover [2]	1936	1,249,800	1,354,300	14, 82,500; 1, 40,000; 2, 2,400; 1, 50,000.	14, 82,500; 1, 40,000; 2, 2,400; 1, 50,000; 1, 104,500.
4. ....do	Parker-Davis	Davis	1951	225,000	225,000	5, 45,000	5, 45,000.
5. ....do	....do	Parker	1942	120,000	120,000	4, 30,000	4, 40,000.
6. California	Central Valley	Folsom	1955	162,000	162,000	3, 54,000	3, 54,000.
7. ....do	....do	Keswick	1949	75,000	75,000	3, 25,000	3, 25,000.
8. ....do	....do	Nimbus	1955	13,500	13,500	2, 6,750	2, 6,750.
9. ....do	....do	Shasta	1944	379,000	379,000	5, 75,000; 2, 2,000	5, 75,000; 2, 2,000.
10. ....do	Yuma	Siphon Drop	1926	1,600	1,600	2, 800	2, 800.
11. Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson	Estes	1950	45,000	45,000	3, 15,000	3, 15,000.
12. ....do	....do	Flatiron	1954	71,500	71,500	2, 31,500; 1, 8,500	2, 31,500; 1, 8,500.
13. ....do	....do	Green Mountain	1943	21,600	21,600	2, 10,800	2, 10,800.
14. ....do	....do	Marys Lake	1951	8,100	8,100	1, 8,100	1, 8,100.
15. ....do	....do	Polehill	1954	33,250	33,250	1, 33,250	1, 33,250.
16. ....do	Grand Valley	Grand Valley [3]	1932	3,000	3,000	2, 1,500	2, 1,500.
17. Idaho	Boise	Anderson Ranch	1950	27,000	40,500	2, 13,500	3, 13,500.
18. ....do	....do	Black Canyon	1925	8,000	8,000	2, 4,000	2, 4,000.
19. ....do	....do	Boise Diversion	1912	1,500	1,500	3, 500	3, 500.
20. ....do	Minidoka	Minidoka	1909	13,400	13,400	1, 5,000; 1, 2,400; 5, 1,200	1, 5,000; 1, 2,400; 5, 1,200.
21. Montana	Missouri River Basin	Canyon Ferry	1953	50,000	50,000	3, 16,667	3, 17,667.
22. ....do	Hungry Horse	Hungry Horse	1952	285,000	285,000	4, 71,250	4, 71,250.
23. New Mexico	Rio Grande	Elephant Butte	1940	24,300	24,300	3, 8,100	3, 8,100.
24. South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Angostura	1951	1,200	1,200	1, 1,200	1, 1,200.
25. Washington	Columbia Basin	Grand Coulee	1941	1,974,000	1,974,000	18, 108,000; 3, 10,000	18, 108,000; 3, 10,000.
26. Wyoming	Kendrick	Alcova	1955	36,000	36,000	2, 18,000	2, 18,000.
27. ....do	....do	Seminoe	1939	32,400	32,400	3, 10,800	3, 10,800.
28. ....do	Missouri River Basin	Boysen	1952	15,000	15,000	2, 7,500	2, 7,500.
29. ....do	....do	Kortes	1950	36,000	36,000	3, 12,000	3, 12,000.
30. ....do	North Platte	Guernsey	1927	4,800	4,800	2, 2,400	2, 2,400.
31. ....do	....do	Lingle	1919	1,400	1,400	2, 400; 2, 300	2, 400; 2, 300.
32. ....do	Riverton	Pilot Butte	1925	1,600	1,600	2, 800	2, 800.
33. ....do	Shoshone	Heart Mountain	1948	5,000	5,000	1, 5,000	1, 5,000.
34. ....do	....do	Shoshone	1922	5,600	5,600	1, 4,000; 2, 800	1, 4,000; 2, 800.
Subtotal A				4,962,550	5,080,550		

B. CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY OTHERS—POWER MARKETED BY USBR

1. Montana	Fort Peck (USCE)	Fort Peck	1943	85,000	165,000	2, 35,000; 1, 15,000	2, 35,000; 2, 40,000; 1, 15,000.
2. South Dakota	Missouri River Basin (USCE)	Fort Randall	1954	280,000	320,000	7, 40,000	8, 40,000.
3. Texas	Falcon Dam (IBWC)	Falcon	1954	31,500	31,500	3, 10,500	3, 10,500.
Subtotal B				396,500	516,500		

C. UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

1. Idaho	Palisades	Palisades	1956	0	114,000	0	4, 28,500.
2. Montana	Missouri River Basin	Yellowtail	1961	0	200,000	0	4, 50,000.
3. Utah	Provo River Basin	Deer Creek	1957	0	5,000	0	2, 2,500.
4. Washington	Yakima-Kennewick	Chandler	1956	0	12,000	0	2, 6,000.
5. ....do	Yakima-Roza	Roza	1958	0	11,250	0	2, 5,625.
6. Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Glendo	1958	0	24,000	0	2, 12,000.
Subtotal C				0	366,250		

D. UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS—POWER TO BE MARKETED BY USBR

1. North Dakota	Missouri River Basin (USCE)	Garrison	1955	0	400,000	0	5, 80,000.
2. South Dakota	....do	Gavins Point	1956	0	100,000	0	3, 33,333.
3. ....do	....do	Oahe	1961	0	425,000	0	5, 85,000.
Subtotal D				0	925,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, hydroelectric powerplants, Dec. 31, 1955—Continued

E. AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

State	Project	Name of plant	Calendar year of initial operation	Nameplate capacity		Number and nameplate capacity of generators	
				Existing (kilowatts)	Ultimate (kilowatts)	Existing (kilowatts)	Ultimate (kilowatts)
1. California	Central Valley	Lewiston	1962	0	2,000	0	1, 2,000.
2. ....do	....do	Matheson	1962	0	75,000	0	3, 25,000.
3. ....do	....do	Tower House	1961	0	66,000	0	3, 22,000.
4. ....do	....do	Trinity	1961	0	90,000	0	4, 22,500.
5. Colorado	Collbran	Upper Molina	1960	0	8,400	0	1, 8,400.
6. ....do	....do	Lower Molina	1961	0	4,600	0	1, 4,600.
7. ....do	Colorado-Big Thompson	Big Thompson	1959	0	4,500	0	1, 4,500.
8. Idaho	Minidoka	American Falls	1961	0	30,000	0	3, 10,000.
9. Montana	Missouri River Basin	Absaroka	1969	0	50,000	0	3, 16,667.
10. ....do	....do	Kenil	1969	0	1,600	0	2, 800.
11. ....do	....do	Little Porcupine	1969	0	18,000	0	3, 6,000.
12. ....do	....do	Lyon	1962	0	24,000	0	3, 8,000.
13. ....do	....do	Moorhead	1969	0	8,000	0	2, 4,000.
14. ....do	....do	Portage	1964	0	20,000	0	2, 10,000.
15. ....do	....do	Tiber	1958	0	2,000	0	3, 667.
16. Nebraska	....do	Lillian	1965	0	4,400	0	2, 2,200.
17. Oregon	Talent	Green Springs	----	0	16,000	0	2, 8,000.
18. South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Pony Hills	1965	0	180,000	0	4, 45,000.
19. Utah	Weber Basin	Gateway	1958	0	4,000	0	2, 2,000.
20. ....do	....do	Wanship	1958	0	1,400	0	1, 1,400.
21. Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Bald Ridge	1963	0	23,000	0	3, 7,667.
22. ....do	....do	Fremont Canyon	1960	0	48,000	0	2, 24,000.
23. ....do	....do	Hunter Mountain	1963	0	14,400	0	2, 7,200.
24. ....do	....do	Sheridan	1963	0	25,000	0	2, 12,500.
25. ....do	....do	Sunlight	1963	0	14,900	0	2, 7,450.
26. ....do	....do	Thief Creek	1964	0	125,200	0	3, 41,734.
Subtotal E				0	860,400		

F. AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY OTHERS—POWER TO BE MARKETED BY USBR

1. California	Central Valley (USCE)	Iron Canyon	----	0	54,000	0	3, 18,000.
2. South Dakota	Missouri River Basin (USCE)	Big Bend	----	0	120,000	0	6, 20,000.
Subtotal F			----	0	174,000		
Total			----	5,359,050	7,922,700		

[1] Acquired from city of Anchorage for operation with Eklutna project, fiscal year 1955.
[2] Powerplant units operated by power allottees under agency contract.
[3] Leased to Public Service Company of Colorado for operation.

USCE = United States Corps of Engineers.
IBWC = International Boundary and Water Commission.

Sukarno and the Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Post of May 22, 1956, by Mr. Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann's usual penetrating analysis and evaluation of President Sukarno's impressive and sobering speech before the Congress last week raises very basic points which requires the serious thought and consideration of us all.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

SUKARNO AND THE REVOLUTION

Dr. Sukarno, the President of the Indonesian Republic, who was in Washington last week, came at a time when the administration, and even some Members of Congress, are reappraising American policy in Asia. We know that we have been working up a blind alley. In fact, the invitation to Dr. Sukarno was meant to mark a new approach to the neutralism of the newly independent nations.

Yet it must be said that to listen carefully to what Dr. Sukarno said to Congress, and to what was implied in what he said, was a sobering experience. For though he had come as the head of the Indonesian Republic, he spoke with great zeal and fervor as an apostle of the revolution which is rising against Western power and influence all the way across Asia and Africa. We are, it was quite evident as he spoke, only in the first phase of the reappraisal which the tides of history are compelling us to make.

More specifically, what is going on in Washington today is an effort to correct errors in our policy which are quite recent which were the consequences of the Korean war. Before 1950 we did not take the view that all nations ought to join a military coalition of which we are the leaders, that neutralism or not joining our alliances was morally wrong and unfriendly to American vital interests, that with grudging exceptions joining our military alliances was the passport to economic aid.

In the Marshall plan, which was launched before the Korean war, economic aid was given ahead of military aid. The NATO military alliance had not yet been conceived when the Marshall plan went into effect. It was the Korean war that compelled us to rearm ourselves in Western Europe and led to the militarization of our foreign policy in Asia.

We are now engaged in trying to persuade Congress to agree to some demilitarization of our policy.

Dr. Sukarno made it quite plain how necessary is the demilitarization of our relations with newly independent countries like Indonesia. But there was a lot more to his address than that, and all of it dispelled any notion that with a few changes of emphasis in our foreign aid policy, all will be well. In the welcoming addresses and in his responses much was said about George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. But the analogy cannot be carried very far. For the revolution of which Dr. Sukarno is so brilliant a leader and spokesman has a depth and scope and energy which are without precedent.

The revolution is not only anticolonial in the sense that it is a rebellion against foreign rulers. Dr. Sukarno went beyond that to raise the question—not explicitly but by intimation—whether the revolutionary movement means to stop short of the expulsion of all Western power and influence from Africa, South Asia, and the South Pacific. What gives this revolution its fierce and enormous energy is the determination at long last to undo the human consequences of three centuries of the white man's domination, and at the same time to overcome the economic and technological backwardness of the former colonial lands. Dr. Sukarno made it plain that if this four-dimensional revolution can be carried out by democratic means he would prefer it, but that the revolution will have to be carried out, if necessary, by totalitarian means.

The revolution which Dr. Sukarno was proclaiming is running from Morocco to Tunis through the Middle East, to Aden, to Ceylon, to Singapore, to Indonesia, probably to Formosa and Japan. The Western nations, among whom we belong, are on the defensive throughout this vast area, and all the key positions remaining to them are under attack. One has the feeling that the Western nations are fighting rearguard actions, the French in North Africa, the British in the Middle East, we in Formosa and beyond.

We must begin to ask ourselves questions to which we cannot expect to find quick and certain answers. A new relationship between the emancipated East and the democratic West will have to be found. Where shall we look for the end of the thread by which we can find our way through the labyrinth?

In 1950 the answer to that question was plainer than it is today. We should have looked to India to be the mediator. Is it now too late for this? Is the damage done by our crudely militaristic policies irreparable in the sense that opportunities which once existed are now foreclosed?

Let us hope that nothing is irreparable.

Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with a bumper crop of 372 million bushels of soybeans produced in 1955, now selling around $3 a bushel, so far above parity that it hardly can be computed, is the best proof that supply and demand gives the farmer greater profit than can be brought to him by support prices and we are not plagued by any surpluses.

I would like to point out Illinois leads all States, producing 77 million bushels and the total crop of 372 million which brought the farmers about $1 billion.

Research scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture through the years by plant breeding have developed 16 new varieties—all producing 20 percent more oil and 10 percent more beans that the varieties they have replaced.

At this time when we have billions of bushels of surplus wheat, corn, and other products which are depressing farm prices, may I point out that this huge soybean crop is selling far above price supports and we not plagued with any surplus. One of the reasons is that the research scientists have found many new industrial outlets for this farm crop in addition to feed and food uses.

Today, soybeans provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine and 54 percent of all vegetable shortenings.

Marketing research has opened outlets for 221 million pounds of soybeans annually for use as drying oil products, for acids, special resins, in printing inks and paper, textile sizing and automobile tire cord sizing. In plastics alone including linoleums, tile and like products it is estimated 200 million pounds of soybean oil are used annually. Markets in industry are steadily being expanded which help to keep the demands for the farmers' soybeans strong in our domestic market.

From July last year to February this year, 55 million bushels of soybeans were exported—40 percent more than a year before.

By finding new markets for this farm product, research has again proven that the small amount of money our committee appropriates for finding new uses for farm products is paying tremendous dividends to agriculture and the economy of the Nation.

Tax Scandals Under the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 3 editorials, 1 from the Chicago Tribune, 1 from a recent issue of a Pittsburgh newspaper, and 1 from the Tampa Morning Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 15, 1956]

RANKING RACKETEER OF THE BUREAUCRACY

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who demonstrated during the Truman administration that he has a remarkable ability for getting onto the trail of shady business, has lost none of his talent. He has just notified the Senate that the fourth highest paid employee on the Federal payroll is a gambler and racetrack operator whose deportation is sought as an alien illegally in the United States, and against whose racetrack the Government has filed claims for $2½ million in unpaid taxes.

This adornment of the Washington welfare state, William G. Lias, has been retained by the Government at a salary of $35,000 a year to manage the Wheeling Downs racetrack at Wheeling, W. Va. The horse park went into receivership. The Government then turned around and hired its operator, who had run up the big tax arrearage, in order to protect its equity. When WILLIAMS inquired who was responsible, the Treasury Department pointed to the Justice Department, and the Justice Department, in turn, pointed to the Federal court that appointed receivers for the track.

WILLIAMS asserted that Lias started bootlegging in 1941 and branched out as an operator of slot machines and the numbers game before he turned to racetrack management. In his present elevated status as a public servant, his pay exceeds that of any Member of Congress, any Cabinet member, and the top officials of any Government agency. He is drawing $100 a day even while appearing in court to answer charges of being an undesirable alien, subject to deportation to Greece.

Senator WILLIAMS said that Lias' wife had been installed at the track as another Federal employee on racetrack duty, and that the assistant track manager under the Federal receivership had been George Lewis, of San Anselmo, Calif., who was under a 1-year sentence to prison for evading $1 million in income tax when he was hired. Lewis lost his appeal and is now serving his term at Terminal Island Prison in California.

The Delaware Senator is a Republican, and these strange goings on occur under a Republican administration, pledged to clean up the Truman mess in Washington. Evidently that promise did not extend to the outlying provinces. Mr. WILLIAMS continues to call his shots as he did so ably during the Truman regime, when, as a one-man investigation, he exposed more corruption and fraud than most of the delegated investigatory agencies were able to discover.

The Senator is now in his second term, with 2 years to run. We should think it a calamity if the Nation were to lose the services of so useful a man. But, if political misfortune ever overtakes Senator WILLIAMS we would be glad to have him on our staff. He has all of the attributes of a great reporter who could be trusted to uncover more than his quota of scoops.

[From a recent Pittsburgh (Pa.) newspaper]

WHY FAVORS FOR LIAS?

Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who keeps a sharp watch over tax matters, is justly indignant over the Federal Government's two-faced dealings with William G. (Big Bill) Lias, former owner of the Wheeling Downs racetrack.

The Justice Department has classed Lias as one of the Nation's prominent racketeers. Although the Government has a $2½ million tax lien against this one-time king of the Wheeling rackets and the Justice Department is trying to deport him as an undesirable alien, he is now employed by the Government to manage the Wheeling Downs track at a salary of $35,000 a year. And that, Senator WILLIAMS has pointed out, makes Lias the fourth highest paid employee on the Federal payroll.

The track which Lias formerly owned is now under a Federal receivership. Federal Judge Harry E. Watkins appointed a Wheeling attorney as track receiver and, subsequently, approved the attorney's selection of Lias as track manager. Thus Lias became, in effect, a Federal employee. So did his wife, who is on the same payroll, and George Lewis, a convicted income-tax evader who was named assistant track manager.

This means that Lias is put in a position of trust to protect a $2½ million tax lien against himself. It is a little like assigning a wolf to shepherd a flock he is known to have raided.

Are Lias and an income-tax evader the only people who could be found to manage a racetrack in Federal receivership? Senator WILLIAMS should push his charges until the people responsible for this obvious impropriety are held accountable.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of May 12, 1956]

HOW ABOUT IT, MR. BROWNELL?

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, made a name for himself digging up tax scandals under the Truman administration. After Eisenhower took office the digging became harder but the Senator kept at it. Now he seems to have uncovered something suspicious in the vicinity of the Wheeling Downs (West Virginia) race track.

This track is owned by William G. Lias. The Federal Government has reason to know Mr. Lias quite well. It has (1) classified him as a "top racketeer," (2) filed $2,500,000 in claims for unpaid taxes against him, and (3) is attempting to deport him as an undesirable alien.

As a result of the Government's tax claims, the Lias race track was placed in receivership by order of Federal court. It is, therefore, in effect being operated by and for the Government.

But who is being paid $35,000 a year to manage it? None other than William G. Lias, the same man the Government is trying to deport.

Lias, said Senator WILLIAMS, regards himself as a Government employee. As such he would be "about the fourth highest paid employee on the Federal payroll" (only the President, Vice President and Speaker of the House receive more).

If the Williams charges are true, Attorney General Brownell owes Congress and the peo-

ple an explanation. There must be honest, law-abiding citizens willing and able to manage the race track at $35,000 a year. Why, then, give the job to a man the Department of Justice contends is neither?

Western Self-Interest and Israeli Self-Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the magazine Commentary. This article should be of interest to Congress and to the American public because of the revealing light that it casts on the problem of peace in the Near East which is a vital American national interest:

WESTERN SELF-INTEREST AND ISRAELI SELF-DEFENSE—THEY COINCIDE

(By Hal Lehrman)

"If Israel is dissuaded from using the life force of their race to ward off the Egyptians until the Egyptians have learned to use the Russian weapons with which they have been supplied and the Egyptians then attack, it will become not only a matter of prudence but a measure of honor to make sure that they are not the losers by waiting."—Sir Winston Churchill

In the 2 months just past, the threat of Middle Eastern war has taken up fixed residence on the world's front pages. All the wisdom of the world's statesmen has made no measurable progress in allaying the crisis. In Washington, and to some extent still in London and Paris, policy remains muddled by the obsessive belief that Arab reasonableness can be obtained by gift, entreaty, and gentle admonition. In the United Nations, nobody is even looking for solutions any more; the best to be hoped for—if East and West can compromise their differences—is some wordy and complicated stratagem which will have the dubious advantage of "gaining time." And in the Middle East itself the record shows a perilous decline of the Western position.

Britain's ignominious ejection from Jordan has begun. Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia have held semipublic deliberations on ways and means of speeding British departure and winning over Jordan to their side. Jordan has concerted with Syria on mutual military aid along their Israeli borders. Remote Yemen has been drawn into Egypt's system of military alliances with Syria and Saudi Arabia. The Cairo radio, not content with the trouble it has helped to make in North Africa, has begun to foment revolt as far away as Zanzibar. There is a brisk traffic of Soviet satellite instructors bound for Egypt to teach, and of Egyptian military teams bound for Eastern Europe to learn, the operation and maintenance of the complicated weapons obtained by Cairo at bargain prices from Prague.

The West, quite clearly, is simply marching along, without a studied policy for the Arab-Israel dispute—or for the latter threat of Arab-Soviet friendship and loss of the Middle East. In both areas, however, the interest of the free world, and the national interest of the United States, are dangerously involved. The search for an effective policy is therefore obligatory, however futile the previous efforts have been.

At this writing it is possible, by straining, to derive comfort from indications that western capitals are beginning dimly to recognize the desirability of enabling Israel, for her hard cash, to purchase some weapons similar in quality to the new Egyptian arms. An elementary justification for this step would be Israel's obvious need to be able to defend herself. More important, it would dampen the Arabs' intoxication with their own increasing strength. The Egyptians are acutely aware of Israeli prowess in the field. If Cairo knows that the Israelis have obtained the means for counterattack, it will not dare provoke an all-out war. Left-handedly, the State Department has intimated that it has "no objection" to sale of arms to Israel by the "traditional" suppliers of Middle Eastern arms, Britain and France.

The latter powers are described with some reason, as considering this a hypocritical—and futile—ruse to divert Arab resentment from the United States. Nevertheless, there are some signs that narrow cracks may be developing in that western wall which, except for clearance of some French jet planes and a miscellany of auxiliary items, has so far prevented Israel from acquiring the arms capable of confronting Egypt's Soviet equipment.

But it will take more than a thin trickle of modern weapons to keep Gamal Abdel Nasser's junta prudent, or give Israel the security to which she feels entitled in view of declared Arab hostility. Moreover, even full achivement of an arms balance can only have a negative value. It can dissuade the Arabs from making war—but it cannot compel them to make peace. Israel will still be confronted by the enervating drain of maximum preparedness. The West will still be harassed by Arab intransigence on all fronts, and Arab willingness to accommodate the Soviets will almost certainly grow, to the greater jeopardy of the entire Middle East.

In a previous article in these pages (March) this writer examined—and noted the flaws in—the possible lines of action usually envisaged in any tough policy of political and economic sanctions which the West might adopt toward the Arabs. However, in some quarters familiar with the Arab mind it is felt that another means of bringing the Arabs to their senses lies close at hand.

Every non-Arab military observer in the Middle East—and every candid Arab observer as well—knows that the Arabs are actually more afraid of the Israeli soldiers, man for man, than they are of the whole might and power of West and East combined. They do not expect to have to fight the remote Americans, British, or Russians. But they know that a test of battle with the Israelis next door is a very real possibility. They have undergone such tests before, and they remember the results ruefully. Even now, with all their newly acquired massive armor, they are very respectful of their Zionist neighbor's military ability.

Not until the Arabs have grown considerably more proficient in the use of this equipment, and confident that they can propel it across the border in one massive knockout blow without the smallest chance of reprisal, will they cease regarding Israel as a holy terror. Meanwhile certain military experts—and even a section of sober Israeli opinion—are beginning to reflect on the possibilities of exploiting this military inferiority complex to deflate an Arab political arrogance which, unless checked, will end by knocking the last props out from under the western position in the Middle East—and by ruining the Arabs as well, to the sole profit of the Kremlin.

The idea of playing on Arab respect for Israeli fighting skill to call the Arab diplomatic bluff against the West has not yet recommended itself to the West's own diplomats. There are many precedents for such diplomatic failure to see the obvious when the conclusions from the obvious require daring action. When the Nazis marched into the Rhineland, they could have been marched right out again if the British and French had called their bluff—without a shot fired. When the Russians began gobbling up eastern Europe in violation of World War II commitments, they could have been induced to disgorge if the British and Americans had called their bluff. (President Truman, later, called it in Iran with complete success and not an ounce of powder burned.)

Such bluffs are not challenged because the risks are too large; it takes imagination to perceive that the risks of allowing the bluff to stand, as evident in the examples above, are even larger. So runs the argument of certain qualified observers, in Israel and elsewhere. In the present case, western policymakers still cling to the notion that the Arabs can be wheedled, bribed, and maneuvered into loyalty. Perhaps the French, fed up with Egyptian backbiting, might support a stern western policy. But the French, with most of their effectives already involved elsewhere, are the weakest of the Big Three. Though the British are now disenchanted with Nasser and reportedly itching to deal sternly with him, they are so wedded to dependence on Arab friendship that they might, in exchange for the smallest bone, begin believing all over again in a policy of concessions. It is the State Department, above all, that remains hopeful that such a policy will succeed—and the State Department sets the direction of western diplomacy in today's Middle East.

The State Department view recoils from any suggestion of a showdown with the Arabs. It persists in seeking to placate them so as not to "provoke" them into further collaboration with the Soviets. It rests on the assumption—negated by all previous experience with the Arabs—that they appreciate the generosity implicit in concessions and will not despise those who offer them. American diplomacy has not yet discovered that appeasing the Arabs in order to keep them out of Moscow's clutches will only make the Arabs more demanding—and more dependent on Moscow as the lever for the next turn of the screw on the West. Western willingness to finance Egypt's high dam at Aswan, for instance, has merely increased Arab enthusiasm for the Soviets, whose vague offer to help with the dam is credited with having forced the West's hand. In recent declarations, Premier Nasser has excelled himself in cockiness, and made no effort to hide his intention of working the Soviet bogey to the limit. Such cockiness is the direct result of the bowing and scraping by Western spokesmen in his anteroom.

Critics of western policy hold that the way to stop losing the Middle East is to choke off the game of diplomatic blackmail which the Arabs are playing. And there are observers with no stake in the fate of Israel, except insofar as it involves that of the West, too, who see in Israeli military superiority an effective diplomatic instrument by which to bring the Arabs to terms.

If the Arabs are not brought to terms—these same observers feel—the Arabs' own folly will eventually make them, as well as the Israelis, victims of the Soviets. Israel's existence—at least as a free society—would be snuffed out by the sovietization of the Arab world. At a certain point on the road to Middle-Eastern ruin, therefore, Israel will be compelled for the sake of sheer survival to throw off western inhibitions and devise an independent policy of her own. That policy may include an attempt by Israel alone to call the Arab bluff.

How could the West wisely exploit the real and persisting Arab fear of Israeli battle superiority? Will a tactic that exploits that fear necessarily lead to war?

It suits Nasser's propaganda to assert that Israel has no reason for alarm over Egypt's armament because Israel is protected by the Anglo-Franco-American guaranty of 1950. The implication is that the West, and in particular the United States, shields the Zionist state. The fact is that the tripartite declaration, though woolly as to implementation, guarantees all existing Arab-Israeli frontiers, including the Arab sides of them. Egypt's saber rattling, her small adventures along the Gaza strip, the incursions of the fedayeen suicide squads, the Syrian attacks on Israeli fishermen, the brandishing of fists by Jordan's Arab Legion—all this is done on the assumption that, should the enraged Israelis venture on full-scale retaliation, the West would rush forward, under the tripartite guaranty, and stop them. Israel would emerge with nothing gained except the stigma of aggressor. It is under the umbrella of the tripartite declaration, which Nasser and his friends profess to despise, that the Arabs have been able to embark with impunity on a massive arms program, to reject negotiation, and to proclaim that there can be no peace with Israel until she has accepted impossible terms.

Under this umbrella, too, Egypt has been able to bait the West and woo the Russians, secure in the assurance that Egypt's front with Israel cannot erupt because the West itself—absurd though it now may seem—is guarantor of a peace that the Arabs themselves refuse to recognize. As long as Egypt has only the confused and anxious West to worry about, she can flirt with Moscow as boldly as she likes.

But what if Nasser should suddenly find himself faced by a single-minded—and unhampered—Israel? How much leisure would he retain to plan new diplomatic maneuvers? Suppose that, on any morning during the next weeks, and wearing appropriate pokerfaces, the Ambassadors of France, Britain, and the United States in Cairo were to convene before the Egyptian Premier's desk and hold discourse with him somewhat as follows:

"In 1950 our governments announced they would apply sanctions against any aggression on frontiers and armistice lines around Israel. The purpose of this guaranty was to protect all parties and facilitate negotiations between Israel and the Arab States with a view to transforming the armistices into peace treaties. We are now compelled to note that this purpose has failed.

"We do not blame you—or Israel. We simply observe that there is no peace, and that our guaranty has not achieved the purpose for which we undertook it 6 years ago. Therefore, Mr. Prime Minister, as of 5 a. m. next Sunday, we are annulling the guaranty. We leave you and the Israelis to settle your differences between you—without hindrance from outside. How you settle them, or do not settle them, is not our affair. We merely invite your attention, with the friendliest of motives, to the fact that your policy of nonnegotiation with Israel may have unhappy consequences. When one party to a dispute persists in maintaining a state of belligerency, it runs the risk that the other party may eventually turn belligerent, too. Mr. Prime Minister, we bid you good day. * * *"

The advocates of such a move concede that it is daring. How could the mid-20th century countenance such ruthless 19th century diplomacy? And wouldn't a vacuum be created into which the Russians could enter? Foreseeing these disconcerting questions, the advocates of a western policy based on Israel's fighting strength propose 2 further steps, 1 prior to the proposed colloquy with Nasser, 1 afterward.

The first step would be to expose the U. N.'s inability to obtain peace. (U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammerskjold's "success" in obtaining an Israeli-Egyptian ceasefire last month merely eased a current irritation temporarily; it brought no relief for the basic malady—absence of peace—which can flare up in fresh outbreaks any time.) Let a tripartite resolution at once be presented to the Security Council calling for direct Arab-Israeli general negotiations within a brief time limit. Unless the Soviets are prepared to lose all the advantages so far gained in Arab affections, they will veto this move. (A similar move in the General Assembly would be similarly defeated by the combined efforts of the Soviet and Arab blocs.) The U. N. thus having tried once again and failed, the three guarantor powers could then visit Nasser.

Immediately after withdrawal of the envoys from the Premier's presence, a joint note from Washington, London, and Paris could be sped to Moscow containing notification of the Tripartite Declaration's annulment, with the following addendum:

"We consider the Arab-Israeli dissension to be purely a local dispute. The locality is situated in an area where our three governments and their nationals possess clear and established interests. Nevertheless, we will not intervene in settlement of the local dispute—and we are confident that no other government will intervene. Any such intervention will be regarded by us as a hostile act. * * *"

Would Moscow pick up this challenge? It can be argued that the Soviets would not need to. They could seize the opportunity to meddle (and improve their standing with the Arabs) simply by pouring more arms into Alexandria—a "commercial transtion" against which the West could legitimately take no exception. True. But there is a saturation point for a backward country like Egypt beyond which extra planes and tanks simply cannot be absorbed. A deluge of arms would not affect the Arab-Israeli issues right now—so long as the Israelis already had an adequate supply of the same types of weapons. It takes skilled personnel to handle such arms, and time to learn how. The Egyptians lack the know-how, and the Israelis, by speedily moving to call their bluff, would not give them the time.

But what if Soviet and satellite "volunteers" were ready to man Egypt's new weapons? Wouldn't that mean Egyptian willingness to fight—and, eventually, war with the West? In the light of the grim Western notice against a "hostile act," it certainly would—which makes it extremely unlikely that Moscow would permit such "volunteering." For the Soviets to defy the West under these circumstances, one would have to assume that they were ready and eager for war. If so, would they let the West pick the time? Or the place? Every adventure the Soviets have undertaken to date indicates that they pick the time and place. If they were seeking world war III, would they start it in the Middle East, where, of all conceivable theaters of action, they are most at disadvantage for bases and communication lines? Wouln't they, instead, seize West Berlin, or strike at Vietnam, South Korea, or any other point to which the Communist empire had easier access than to the Levant? And wouldn't they select a moment designed to give them the benefit of maximum surprise?

It makes no sense to suppose that the Soviets will sacrifice all this for the relatively minor advantage of stirring the Arab-Israeli pot. Nor can the West be charged with provocation if it serves notice that Soviet meddling would be a casus belli. The three Western powers have at least as much right to protect their interests in the Middle East as the Soviets have, say, in Eastern Europe. Any attempt from Moscow to replace the tripartite guaranty by one of its own would be as impertinent, and provocative, as a Western attempt to inaugurate and supervise free elections in Bulgaria or Rumania. As a matter of fact, Moscow in mid-April actually denounced all projects to intervene in the Israeli-Arab issue. Thus the Soviets' stated position, whatever it may be worth, suggests that, if anything, they would have to endorse the West's annulment of the tripartite guaranty as consistent with the ban on all intervention from outside. Assuming, then, that the West stands firm in its resolve to isolate the Arab-Israeli argument, the Russians can be confidently relied on to keep clear.

What would Israel do? For the first time, she would argue her case with and against the Arabs on its merits and with full use of her bargaining power, unhampered by the prospect of Western restraint, discriminations, or sanctions.

She would, according to the advocates of such a showdown policy, remind Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon that each had pledged, in the armistices of 1949, to proceed with her from temporary armistice to permanent peace treaty, not to permanent belligerency. She would certainly invite them, one more time in a long series of such invitations, to sit, negotiate, and make peace with her. If her invitation were again spurned, she would demand at least that hostile acts by the armistice signatories, in particular Egypt, should cease. She would insist that the blockades at Suez and Eylat be lifted as intolerable restrictions. Otherwise, Israel would serve notice, she would be compelled to draw the logical consequences from Cairo's assertions that Egypt was still at war with her. Israel would move to defend the armistice to which Egypt had agreed. Any continued or new violation of that armistice by Egypt would itself be aggression, and would justify full Israeli countermeasures.

What would Egypt do? She would not attack, the spokesman for this line of action argue. On the contrary, there would be an even chance, according to them, that Nasser would attempt to grope his way to the conference table; faced suddenly by an actual showdown with an adversary whose proven superiority he knows, and against whom he has lost all protections from abroad, he would have eloquent reasons to seek the surer protections of a peace treaty. Could he do so without committing political suicide? It would risk. But if he is as strong and popular inside Egypt as he claims to be, he should be able—by energetic propaganda and resolute police precautions—to accomplish the somersault convincingly. His biggest obstacle would be the hotheaded younger elements in the army—but even they are not unaware of Israeli prowess. Should the domestic perils of agreement to treat with Israel seem too formidable to Nasser, he would still have the choice of gradual retreat on the blockade and on other specific acts of belligerency. Such retreat could be covered by a noisy brandishing of arms to save face at home. Israel would certainly not mind the words as long as the deeds were satisfactory.

But, obviously, if no such satisfaction were given, then Israel would be compelled to move. Otherwise it would be her bluff that would be called. And obviously, her move would have to be larger than the usual punitive raid with limited attack and quick withdrawal. The move would have to be of sufficient size to force Egypt's compliance with her own pledges. This could very easily become the spark to a full-scale Arab-Israeli war—and this is where the spokesmen of independent Israeli action have to face up to the full consequences of the line they propose. No competent military observer doubts that Israel would win such a war, but there is more than that to it.

Nobody is more aware than the advocates, Israeli and non-Israeli, of this course of action that to contemplate war as a last resort to bring about an Arab-Israeli settlement sounds shocking and brutal. It is not

the kind of proposal customarily made by enlightened people—certainly not in this era. But it must be understood that the advocates of a showdown with Egypt believe the alternative to it may be considerably more dreadful. If the Arabs continue their unrestricted arming against Israel and their diplomatic blackmail of the West, sooner or later the question will cease to be one of war or peace but simply of the date and dimension of the inevitable war. The later the decision, the weaker the Israelis (which also means the West) vis-a-vis the Arabs and the bloodier the ultimate struggle. The longer the present trend is permitted, the stronger the Soviets will grow in the Middle East, and the wider the boundaries of the eventual conflict.

But should Israel let herself be put in the position of fighting the West's battles singlehanded? No responsible Israeli statesman has suggested that Israel be used in such a manner. Yet few sectors of Israeli opinion would find the idea unacceptable. To most Israelis, pulling the West's chestnuts from the fire would seem only incidental. Israel and the West have an identical degree of interest in ending the present Arab-Soviet threats. The proposed line of action, it is felt, would afford Israel release from an actual pressure and a prospective disaster that have already become nearly intolerable for her citizens to contemplate.

Two months ago—it is further argued—it might have been objected that Britain would never consent to drastic anti-Arab action. But Britain has gone a long way since Jordan gave Sir John Bagot Glubb his walking papers. The British are fighting mad at Egypt for having largely instigated that move, and for other anti-imperialist acts on her part. They have been reported even ready to employ their troops in Jordan in the event of a further major effort to destroy British influence there. This is a spectacular toughening of attitude for a government which only a year ago talked itself into giving away the Suez Canal. The British, it is said in Israel and elsewhere, have not yet taken the full cure for that tropical disease of which the most sinister symptom is confidence in the pledge of Arab leaders, they still, for example, have illusions about Iraqi fidelity. But at this precise moment in their reeducation, it is quite possible that they would cooperate in a plan to cut Nasser down to size by cancellation of the Tripartite Declaration.

The French, too, have suffered some rude revelations. Only last November a highly placed Frenchman in Cairo advised me ponderously that France "is in effect an Islamic power because of our great holdings in Moslem North Africa; we must therefore have an independent, and most careful, policy toward other Islamic powers such as Egypt." Today the French are so aroused about Algeria and so furious over Egyptian meddling in Moslem North Africa that they are inclined to be much less careful in treating with Nasser. And it is argued that, even if they and the British recoiled from annulling the guaranty outright, the United States could bring about the same result by withdrawing of her own accord; with the major partner gone, the Tripartite Declaration would lapse. If in a subsequent confrontation between Israel and the Arabs the United States remained aloof, it is most improbable that either Britain or France would choose to intervene unilaterally.

The only really valid objection anticipated by proponents of the idea of a direct Arab-Israeli settlement is a simple but effective one. It is not, they feel, going to happen, because the United States—or at least the Eisenhower administration and the present State Department—will not permit it to happen.

Who would have dreamed the day would come, as it now has, when the British would be cocking a fist at the Arabs—and raging at the Americans, of all people, for seeming to play a devious game on the Arab side. Shades of Ernest Bevin and Harry Truman. Washington has become the bizarre champion of Arab sensibilities, while London, classic and indefatigable wooer of Arabs, has at last had its eyes opened to the hopelessness of it all.

The cumulative evidence that appeasement of the Arabs has only fanned their ardor for Moscow has not induced the State Department to change its course. There are risks in any policy of showdown with Nasser. These are the only risks the Department apparently can visualize. A blind departmental eye is turned toward the greater risks that other observers foresee in a policy that avoids any crisis with the Arabs, which would then lead inevitably to greater disaster. It is easier to sit in a bus careening downhill out of control than to crawl through the window and jump.

The State Department at this moment does not even dare "offend" the Arabs to the extent of selling Israel a single airplane. Cancellation of the Tripartite Declaration is thus most unlikely under present circumstances. Nevertheless, discussion of such a move here serves to illuminate, as if by a lightning flash, the fact that Western policy today pinions Israel's arms behind her back while the Cairo junta, fed with Soviet weapons, looks forward to the time when it will be able to obliterate Israel at a blow.

The leaders of Israel—let there be no doubt about this—would have great moral and practical scruples against launching on an independent course that risks war, and they are, moreover, anxious not to forfeit the world's good opinion. Yet the largest evil which can befall any community is its annihilation—and survival is a moral value, too. If a stage is reached where the distance between Israel and destruction becomes even narrower than at present, diplomatic and other considerations will become secondary to the well nigh supreme one of survival. The Arabs make no secret of their intentions. As recently as last month the official Cairo newspaper Al Goumhouriya advised Secretary Hammarskjold that peace was impossible until Israel ceased to exist.

Should the safeguarding of her life and freedom force Israel to call the Arab bluff on her own, what would be the gravest obstacle to victory? The might and majesty of the Arab armies? Hardly—if the war came before Egypt could bring the full force of her new armaments to bear. The major impediment would be the sanctions which the powers might impose on Israel as an "aggressor." Total censure, economic penalties, paralyzing blockade are all conceivable. These could drive Israel back to her point of take-off and despoil her of any advantage gained from battle. Armed intervention might even be employed, with sufficient speed to halt and repulse the Israeli forces before the issue could be decided in the field. In the clash, Israel would emerge sapped spiritually and physically, with her ultimate security more jeopardized than ever, and her moral credit gone.

The prospect is more than sobering to the Israelis, and also to their friends. If some Israelis can contemplate it as possible, if not imminent, it is only because the inaction of the West, with the State Department giving the cues, is allowing their country to drift into a most desperate situation. The simple truth is that Israel cannot accept a position of inferior strength in the face of neighbors sworn to her destruction. Until the threat of being reduced to such a position is eliminated, counsels of desperation (which seem less desperate than their alternative) will receive more and more of a hearing from Israelis.

Meanwhile it is all-important—and here I speak for myself and my own assessment of the situation—that Israel's cause be better presented to the American public than it has been so far. The Israelis—all the Arab propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding—have not shown themselves adept at public relations. More important, neither have the several American organizations and the numerous American friends of Israel working energetically to present her case. Otherwise, the dangerous impression might not have arisen that it is the Israelis, and not the Arabs, who are the chronic aggressors—and that aid to Israel would hurt American interests in the Middle East.

Two things need to be brought home to American public opinion by friends of democracy in the Middle East. First, Washington's negative behavior toward Israel (as distinguished from Washington's pious declarations) is strengthening the Arabs militarily and encouraging them to believe that they may launch an all-out blitz—and get away with it—just as soon as they feel confident enough of a crushing superiority in arms and alliances. Second, the one way to salvage the Western position in the Middle East—and avoid loss of the area to the Soviet—is to reverse the present State Department policy of Arab appeasement.

Western diplomatic timidity toward Nasser and his allies will only encourage them further into the Soviet embrace. Advocates of Israel's security must lift themselves out of their rut of special pleading and shopworn slogans: These can no longer convince or persuade. Nor are they pertinent. Aid to Israel is not the paramount point. It is aid to the United States that matters now. The State Department, in effect, is telling Americans that the Arabs must be placated or else the United States is threatened. Let Americans be told instead that the State Department's present policy of appeasement will only destroy American security in the Middle East.

This is the truth: That only a resolute confrontation of the Arabs will help America. One vital element of such a confrontation is American support of Israel's right to security and peace. Not for Israel's sake, but for America's.

TVA Repayments Into Treasury Exceed Statutory Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been regarded for many years—by those who are fair-minded—as one of the most efficiently operated Government agencies in our entire Federal system.

This great agency which has contributed so much to our national-defense effort has diligently been repaying into the Federal Treasury the investment in its power operations.

Today, TVA is far ahead of its regular payment schedule and we can only conclude that this has been brought about by efficient management and operation.

Through 1957, a total of $261,500,000 will have been repaid into the Federal Treasury by TVA. The following table of repayments show accurately the annual revenues and other payments paid by TVA into the Federal Treasury.

The schedule of payments follows:

Payments made by TVA into the United States Treasury as repayment of investment in its power program

Fiscal year	Payment	Total payment
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	50,000,000	127,500,000
1956 (estimated)	59,000,000	186,500,000
1957 (proposed)	75,000,000	261,500,000
Repaid into Treasury prior to enactment of statutory requirements prior to 1948		24,000,000
Total payments through 1957		285,000,000

Foreign Giveaway Program: An Alice in Wonderland Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, soon to come before the House will be legislation to authorize continuation of our foreign WPA extravaganza, a giveaway scheme we were once led to believe was to be a temporary and emergency program.

In this regard, I call attention to the current Small Business column, sponsored by the National Federation of Independent Business, which appears in weekly newspapers throughout the country. The column, written by the federation's president, C. Wilson Harder, is as follows:

Many veteran Washington observers feel greatest improvement needed in Government is return to old-fashioned intellectual morality.

People look to Government for an example of morality. Along the Potomac today there are those Government experts who decry expansion of consumer installment credit on grounds it is immoral for people to spend beyond their means.

Yet Government itself furnishes the example. For instance, increased use of tubeless auto tires is making inroads into inner-tube use. Government collects tax on inner tubes. To offset this loss, serious consideration is being given to a tax to replace inner-tube tax. Little thought is being given to cutting expenses accordingly.

It is interesting to note Coleman Andrews, recently retired income-tax head, is now stumping for repeal of that tax, largely on ground it leads to governmental excesses.

The administration beats drums for multi-billion dollar highway program. Ways and means of raising taxes for program are discussed. But as yet, there is no guaranty such extra taxes would go into roads.

For example, in 8 years, 1947 through 1954, Federal Government collected almost $13 billion in special automotive excises from highway users, but has spent bare $4 billion on roads. Where has other $9 billion gone? An interesting speculation.

Part has probably gone to defense against communism. Yet, paradoxically, part has undoubtedly gone to help communism.

For some officials in the International Cooperation Administration, huge giveaway operation descended from Marshall plan, cannot seem to recognize a Communist when they see one.

In recent 60-day period ICA shelled out over $9 million in American tax money to Communist Yugoslavia in hides, cotton, coal, ocean transportation, and even road-building equipment.

This fellow Boz, alias Tito, is even more wondrous than the wonderful Wizard of Oz. In fact, like Stalin, born something else, he, too, works under an alias.

The late Stalin probably only rates as a bigger Communist than Tito because with so many more millions of Russians than there are Yugoslavs, Stalin could liquidate more than Tito can. There is no difference here between the quality of murder; the only difference is in quantity.

Yet this Nation's giveaway agency, now under complete State Department control, hands out money hand over fist to build up Yugoslavia. It almost appears there is a design to prove that a Communist state can be successful. Thus world has spectacle of a government making angry noises at those who call themselves Russian Communists, smothering with kindness those who call themselves Yugoslavian Communists.

To complete Alice in Wonderland situation, Government is going to give a huge amount of rubber tires to Formosa, just in case Chiang Chinese might be useful some day to help kill off Communist Chinese.

But no American company can bid on this business. It has been reserved for Italian makers. A weird situation.

Many Notable Dignitaries From Foreign Countries Have Visited the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years many heads of state, important personages and foreign dignitaries from many lands have visited the TVA. Foreign visitors to our country, as well as our own citizens, have come to look upon TVA as a superior example of government at work in the field of resource development and conservation of national resources. Certainly the TVA is a symbol of success of what a great government can do to protect lives and property, advance commerce, industry, and agriculture through cooperative endeavor between the people of a great region and the Federal Government. Because of this achievement and success TVA has become a great national and international asset. It is an international symbol of American engineering achievement—and TVA is visited annually by many notable visitors.

Among the distinguished dignitaries visiting TVA the following are included:

Prince Albert of Liege, Belgium, November 1955.

Prime Minister U. Nu, of Burma, July 1955.

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, of India, May 1954.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enroco Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, Ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

Petition for Separate Pension Program for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition received from my congressional district on May 14, 1956, and bearing the signatures of 33 of my constituents. The petition urges the immediate enactment of a special pension program for World War I veterans. I am glad to bring this petition to the attention of the Congress. The petition follows:

PETITION FOR SEPARATE PENSION PROGRAM FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

This petition is addressed by the undersigned to the President and Congress of the United States, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for World War I veterans and their widows and orphans. We submit that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history and in line with established American traditions.

Steve Burks, Cecil Burks, Martin V. Hunter, Onida Martin, Herman Martin, Laura Hinter, Brison Hinter, Gladys Toney, Mr. Phil Hunter, Mrs. Ruby Hunter, Herbert O. Gordon, Seth, W. Va.; James C. Johnson, Charleston, W. Va.; Roland Loy, Everett H. Toney, Mrs. Inize Jones, Oscar M. Workman, Russell E. Brown, Seth, W. Va.; Roy Maynor, Comfort, W. Va.; S. J. Shelton, Mrs. Carril Porter, M. M. Morgan, Arnold E. Curry, Siglent A. Mason, Ruth E. Morrison, Harriet L. Mason, Gloria Jean Cunningham, Frank Adams, Billie Martin, Ebose Warren, Dallas C. Mullins, Seth, W. Va.; Homer Michael, Comfort, W. Va.; J. W. Dolin, Mr. and Mrs. Oshel Skeens, Seth, W. Va.

Film Furor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, back in December 1954 a consent decree was signed by Eastman Kodak Co. and the Department of Justice which permits other color-processing companies to develop the color film manufactured by Eastman Kodak.

For many years Eastman dominated the color film processing industry, and thousands upon thousands of amateur photographers were used to the old system of purchasing the film and paying for the processing at the same time. The exposed film was automatically sent to Eastman and then returned to the customer directly.

Upon the new competitive system the customer pays the purchase price of the film at his dealer's and then when the film has been exposed he brings it back and pays the processing charges. At the moment Eastman still handles such processing because the other developers have not yet been able to get into operation. However, it is expected that Pavelle Color, Inc., of New York City, one of the leading independent color photofinishers, which has launched a tremendous expansion program, will be set up and operating by this summer. By next month this corporation will be starting Kodacolor operations, and they will be able to handle Kodachrome shortly afterward.

Naturally, in changing from a monopolistic system to a competitive one there is a period of adjustment which results in certain inconveniences and confusion. Customers now find themselves faced with this state of affairs, and have been outspoken in their dissatisfaction. However, it is the consensus of opinion that once these competitors get underway the consumer will reap many advantages. A recent article in Business Week, May 12 issue, gives the true picture of this situation, and the benefits the customers may expect to realize. That article follows:

FILM FUROR: EFFORTS TO MAKE COLOR-FILM PROCESSING COMPETITIVE HAVE STIRRED UP CONSUMER UNREST; NO COMPETITION SO FAR

Justice Department sowed the seeds of competition in the color-film processing industry a little less than a year and a half ago when it got Eastman Kodak Co. to agree to let other companies develop the film it manufactures (Business Week, Dec. 25, 1954, p. 24). But they have been slow in taking root. Right now the thing that seems to be growing fastest is consumer dissatisfaction and confusion.

The transition: There are a couple of reasons for this state of affairs. One of the big ones is the efficient marketing system that Eastman developed for the sale and processing of its color film. This system is on the way out as a result of the consent decree reached between Eastman and the Government in December 1954. But consumers haven't adjusted yet to the new order of things—and many see no reason for the change anyway.

The system was abandoned to give other companies a crack at the $100 million annual business of developing color films for amateur photographers. But, although a number of new processors are jumping into the field nationally—such as Pavelle Color, Inc., Pathecolor, Inc., and Technicolor, Inc.—none of them has had time to get set up to do any processing. New processors see this fact as the underlying cause of current difficulties.

One-price system: Eastman was able to maintain its dominance in the color-film processing field by selling its Kodachrome and Kodacolor film—which constitute 90 percent of the color-film market—for a price that included processing costs. Under the consent decree, the company agreed to give up its exclusive processing rights on these two types of film. This meant setting 2 prices—1 for the film itself, and another for processing charges. And it agreed to turn over its technical know-how on processing the film to any comers who might want to get into the business.

The two-price policy on Eastman color film gives the customer and the dealer from whom he buys it a chance to decide whether Eastman or some other processor shall develop it. The policy went into effect for Kodachrome 35-millimeter still transparencies last October, for Kodacolor prints last December. And this month Eastman will begin shipping to its dealers new packages of Kodachrome 8-millimeter and 16-millimeter amateur movie film for sale at a price that doesn't include processing charges.

Consumer dissatisfaction: But a lot of the millions of amateur photographers who use Eastman's color film don't like the new setup. They found the old one more convenient. That's because when they bought film and paid for the processing at the same time, they got a little mailing pouch for sending the exposed film back to Eastman for development. Then the processed film came back to them directly.

Now the customer only pays the purchase price of the film when he picks it up at his dealer. After he has shot a roll, he has to bring it back and pay the processing charges. For now, the dealer will send the film to Eastman—since no other processor is ready to handle it yet. And then the customer has to make another trip back to his dealer for his processed film.

Price boost: Users of Kodachrome transparencies have been squawking plenty about the new system. They found the mailing setup a lot easier. Not only that, under the two-price system they've been paying an extra 10 cents over the single price. Eastman says the increase is due to the additional handling involved.

Confusion: The company anticipates new compliants will start rolling in soon when home movies fans find they can't use the mail pouch any more. Many of them don't realize there's been a change and will mail the film directly to Eastman anyway. A lot of Kodachrome users have been doing this. In such cases, Eastman processes the film and sends it on to a dealer in the owner's vicinity. Then the company writes to the customer, telling him where his film has been sent and asking him to use a dealer in the future. The letter also explains that under the consent decree the company can no longer service the customer directly.

Eastman says it knew a lot of these problems would crop up. It says it proposed to the Justice Department that instead of getting two prices for its film, it be allowed to sell film both ways—with or without processing costs included in the price. This way, it contends, the consumer would still have the choice of having the film processed by some other company. Yet, for those who wanted it, the old system would remain intact. It isn't saying "I told you so" publicly, but Eastman clearly sees the present complaints and confusion as a vindication of its position.

How Justice feels: Justice Department, smarting under the implication that its consent decree is responsible for consumer dissatisfaction and higher prices, points out that injecting competition into a monopolistic situation necessarily involves a period of readjustment. And it feels Eastman is adding to the trouble by going further than it has to under the decree.

Most of the consumer unrest stems from doing away with the mail pouch. But Antitrust Chief Stanley Barnes says Eastman didn't have to do this. "They want to have their cake and eat it too, which is perfectly all right as an attitude for a business to take," says Barnes, "but we didn't force them to adopt that policy." According to Barnes, Eastman could continue to use a mail pouch by selling it separately from the cost of the film.

Eastman counters that while the decree does not specifically outlaw the mail pouch system, it does enjoin any sort of tie-in between buying the film and paying for the processing. And the company thinks this makes the use of a mail pouch impractical.

Independents' position: Independent processors feel that the fact that they are not ready for business lies at the heart of the current trouble. They say that when they are ready—and when competition does in fact exist in color film processing—consumers will begin to reap a few advantages.

At the time the consent decree was signed, firms could develop Kodachrome or Kodacolor film. But immediately after it was signed, several companies announced their intention of entering the field on a national scale, began to make plans for setting up shop. Pathecolor was organized, for example, and started construction of a $1-million processing lab in Bayonne, N. J. It began to lay plans for a national marketing system (BW, July 30, 1955, p. 50).

Time element: Dates for changing over from the one-price system to two prices by Eastman were set, according to the type of film, in the consent decree. These extended from 10 months to a year and a half from December 1954. But, actually, this did not give the independents enough time to get their plans ready to process film. For one thing, the diagrams for the processing equipment, as well as some of the equipment itself, had to come from Eastman. And not until late last year did Eastman have to come across with the diagrams or offers to sell equipment.

Some of the new processors feel that more time should have been allowed for them to get set up. But Justice Department wanted to alter the one-price system as soon as possible. It realized a period would follow when no competition was ready, but it also felt that until Eastman changed its methods there would be no business for the new companies anyway.

The independents admit that the consumer has been inconvenienced to some extent, though some think there's been some exaggeration. But they are sure once they get into business, the inconveniences will disappear.

Advantages seen: James L. Wolcott, president of Pathecolor, says: "When the new companies get underway this summer, present inconveniences will be replaced by definite advantages to the consumer." And Si Pavelle, vice president of Pavelle, feels the same way.

Pathecolor will be ready to handle transparencies and Kodacolor next month and the movie film by midsummer. Pavelle will take transparencies and Kodacolor about the same time. Both companies will provide mailing pouches for customers who want them, in addition to working through the regular camera store and drugstore outlets.

Some of the independent processors think Eastman could have avoided some of the confusion that has marked the transition period.

As they see it, for example, pushing up the date for the changeover in handling movie film from July to May will cause a new rash of customer complaints. It means an added month or so when customers have to take their film to a dealer for the privilege of choosing their own processor when the only company ready to do the processing is Eastman.

Eastman retorts that it is sending out new movie film packages under the two-price system this month because the old film is being sold out. And, after all, the company says, it's just doing what the Justice Department asked it to do, only faster.

Modification feared: What the independents really are afraid of is that all the consumer unrest and confusion may make it appear that the consent decree is unworkable. Some of them speculate privately that a case is being built up to justify modification of the decree. Drastic modifications might wash their investments down the drain. But Justice Department says it hasn't heard anything about such a move.

One change the independents definitely would not like to see would be permission for Eastman to sell film under both the single-price and two-price systems. Since film sold under each system would come in different packages (one would contain a mailing pouch), they point out there would be no way to control the availability of the two packages. And they frankly feel they couldn't buck both Eastman's long-established reputation and customer's tendency to go on buying film in the old way.

Supreme Court Decisions Put States On the Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of May 19, 1956:

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS PUT STATES ON THE SPOT

State officials and others who are concerned about the encroachments of the Federal Government in matters which have hitherto been the affair of the States and local communities are alarmed by the implications of recent decisions by the Supreme Court. Following up its decision outlawing segregation in public schools, the Court, in the Steve Nelson case, seems to take the view that the 48 States may not pass laws dealing with internal subversion or punish those convicted under such statutes. In the Slochower case the Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, denied the right of the State of New York arbitrarily to bar from public office persons who take refuge behind the fifth amendment.

The irony of the Slochower decision is that the New York City Charter containing the provision which the Court has upset was passed in 1938, following the Seabury investigation of corruption in New York City a few years earlier. Since the adoption of section 903 as part of the New York Charter, public officials who refuse to waive immunity in the course of such investigations do so on pain of losing their jobs. We are not aware that this requirement has been regarded over the past quarter century as an outrageous denial of personal liberty as long as it applied to politicians or bureaucrats. But when a fifth amendment professor runs afoul of this provision the heavens fall and the country is astounded by another Supreme Court decision restricting the right of a State to decide for itself what kind of people to retain in its school system.

As is often true of Supreme Court decisions, the dissenters in the Slochower case seem to make better sense than the majority. Justice John Harlan, for example, pointed out that the teacher in question was not necessarily suspected of guilt because he had availed himself of the fifth amendment when asked concerning past Communist Party membership. The question in Justice Harlan's view was not whether there was an inference of guilt but "whether a State violates due process when it makes a claim of privilege grounds for discharge." The justice added that "a State may justifiably consider that teachers who refuse to answer questions concerning their official conduct are no longer qualified for public-school teaching on the ground that their refusal to answer jeopardizes the confidence that the public should have in its school system."

Plainly, the implications of these recent decisions go beyond the qualifications of schoolteachers. The issue is rapidly becoming whether or not any field remains which the States may safely regard as their legitimate concern. If New York may not establish its own qualifications for the employment of public officials, including schoolteachers, what becomes of the right of some seventeen States to curtail the excesses of labor leaders by right-to-work laws? And if the effort to deal with subversion and treason is to be the monopoly of the Federal Government, what chance will there be to combat the Communist conspiracy without an enormous and possibly dangerous enlargement of Federal police activity?

A bill has already been presented in the House of Representatives providing that State laws shall not be nullified by the existence of a Federal statute unless the Federal law specifically so provides or unless the two laws are completely inconsistent. Up to now, this proposed statute has received little attention, but the trend of recent High Court decisions will certainly stimulate new interest in it among the now alerted States.

Loring M. Black

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was with extreme regret that I learned of the sudden and untimely demise of our very good friend, the Honorable Loring M. Black. He served in this House with distinction and honor to himself, the Borough of Brooklyn, and the city and State of New York, as well as the Nation, for 12 years.

Although it was not my privilege to serve with him in the House, it was my good fortune to have known him for many years and to have been able to call him my friend.

He was able, to the point of brilliance. His advice was sound and much sought after. He will be grievously missed, not only by his good and dear wife, but by all his many friends.

The Life of J. Melville Broughton Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator J. Melville Broughton lived a very manly and magnificent life, and during his long and useful public career he made many grand contributions to the welfare of his State and Nation.

A few days ago a beautiful building on the campus of State College in Raleigh, N. C., was dedicated to the memory of this great and good man. On that occasion Mr. Clyde A. Dillon delivered an appropriate and beautiful speech in which he paid a tribute to our late beloved friend, Senator J. Melville Broughton, and I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Dillon's speech to the end that the Members of Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have an opportunity to read this elegant address by one of the leading businessmen and beloved churchmen of the city of Raleigh in which Senator Broughton made his home:

THE LIFE OF J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON CONTINUES

We are here this morning on the campus of a great university, and we are in a building well designed for the teaching of technical subjects—so badly needed in this country; and this building that we occupy bears the name of a great statesman. At this moment we should look up to heaven and thank God for the life of J. Melville Broughton.

Before speaking in particular about the Broughton Mechanical Engineering Building, it seems most appropriate to pay tribute to the man that will be perpetuated through future years because this building is named and dedicated in his memory. From the life of this man whose passing is marked by durable light, let us reverently gather at least a few of the incidents likely to make known the incentives of his great soul, especially for the education and inspiration of posterity, as well as for our good here today.

Mr. Broughton had the good fortune of beginning his illustrious life with a family name of distinction; but, howsoever great a man's heritage may be, he is responsible for living his own life and making his particular name of greatness, and of eternal value to human society and the glory of his Creator. It is said that Emerson peeped into every cradle—looking for a new prophet. Every happy parent of a new son also looks into the cradle with fond dreams of how great a man could be produced from that "little bundle of possibilities." That child's particular heredity may mean an eye for beauty unseen by others, an ear for unheard melodies, a stronger tendency toward God and right, and a new spark of creative genius. A child's heredity may even reach back across generations, and pick up some lost trait or gift, and therefore remake an age. And, chiefly, there is our heredity from God, which dignifies our dust and makes us a "little lower than the angels."

J. Melville Broughton, my friends, while inheriting the rich treasure of a good family name, knew from the beginning that he had his own life to live and was responsible for meeting life's challenges and hardships with high resolve, definite purpose to live for

others as well as for self, and should dedicate himself to such a task, with courage to be at his best in all efforts, regardless of conflict and opposition.

Someone has said that the way to success in life is as plain as the way to market—if one selects a business or profession that he likes, and works at it all the time with devoted enthusiasm and unceasing patience. Along that highway of living, the traveler who knows the rules of the road and who is true to life, continues all the time to display kindness and courtesy to all people, and he seasons all his efforts with an abiding sense of humor—seeing something funny in his successes and even in his failures. And, too, he is ever mindful of life's greatest requirement, which is faith—faith in self, in his fellow men, and in his God.

We could scarcely think of a man who has exercised all of these high requirements and qualities more completely than did Mr. Broughton. He made use of these things with such grace and poise that he appeared to be perfectly natural and undisturbed at all times. These things were basic characteristics of his life, without which he would not have dared to live. Such practice in his life gave him a winsoneness of personality that caused people to fall in love with him; and the better he was known the more he was loved.

Thus we can understand how undisturbed he was in meeting all the difficult as well as the ordinary tasks of life. He conducted even the most strenuous political campaigns with the greatest of confidence and composure. If he had political enemies who used unfair tactics against him, he seemed not to be annoyed; without malice nor anger he maintained his steady course toward victory—with wonderful poise and peace of mind. I know Melville Broughton was a real and true winner in life, and was never a conceited boaster of victories won. He deserves to be remembered as a great statesman, for he measured up to the high standard of true statesmanship in every respect.

Again Melville Broughton truly recognized the big place that his charming and gifted wife had in helping him to be the winner and the man of distinction that he was. She shared high honors with him as he served at his best in the highest places of State and Nation. And together they made home life sweet and wholesome for themselves and for their four children. The influence of that entire family is, indeed, a rich heritage for our State and country. State Supreme Court Justice Emery B. Denny, in a well-written article on J. Melville Broughton, which appears in a book written concerning papers and addresses of Mr. Broughton, has this fine thing to say about his good wife: "Mrs. Broughton," he said, "is one of the most attractive and charming women ever to grace the executive mansion as first lady. Through the years she has been a tremendous asset, as well as an inspiration, to her husband."

Without going into every detail on Mr. Broughton's accomplishments, we simply name a few of his steps upward on the ladder of success, the most of which are pretty well known already by all of you. He was graduated early from high school in Raleigh, and then from Wake Forest College; he rendered good service as high-school principal and as a reporter of the Winston-Salem Journal; he studied law both at Wake Forest and Harvard University; he served with distinction as State senator in two sessions of our State legislature; and he won in the race for Governor of North Carolina by the largest majority of votes ever given a gubernatorial candidate in our State, in which office he served for 4 years, during which administration many great achievements were won for the people of our State because of his wise leadership, in spite of the fact that much of this period our country was engaged in war. Finally, as you well know, Mr. Broughton ended his life's career while serving so well as United States Senator in Washington, where he mingled with many of the greatest men of America and of the world—and yet "he never lost the common touch."

It is very significant that throughout Mr. Broughton's busy life, in Raleigh and in our Nation's Capital, he was continuously engaged in teaching a Sunday School class, after having served many years as Superintendent of the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Raleigh. Thus we see that he not only did not lose the common touch with men, but more significantly he never lost touch with God. Really and truly, Mr. Broughton was what we often refer to as an all-round man. So much so, that he could well be regarded as one answer to J. G. Holland's prayer:

"God, give us men—
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

And now, with all these facts before us about the man, how appropriately State College is naming this magnificent building the Broughton Mechanical Engineering Building. I want to congratulate the College, and especially the Engineering Department, for so honoring this good man, and friend of us all.

Mr. Broughton was deeply concerned while Governor of North Carolina in the development of the engineering program of State College, as well as being interested deeply in improving the industrial training in all of its branches here in our State.

We find this paragraph in the Sunday's News and Observer of April 8: "The $800,000 building which houses the offices, laboratories, and classrooms of the State College Department of Mechanical Engineering, was named in memory of the former Governor and former United States Senator, the late J. Melville Broughton. Governor Broughton was the first president of the Engineering Foundation at State College and was active in the support of the College's School of Engineering."

Right here we should like to emphasize the great need for industrial development in North Carolina, so as to raise the standard of living for all our people, and at the same time make possible the manufacture of products in our State, and make it unnecessary to send our raw materials out of the State for manufacture. Such a course would increase the income for the State, not only to individuals but the needed revenue for the State. In this progress we know that our own present Governor Luther H. Hodges is most vitally interested, for on many occasions he has expressed this concern. He would also agree with us as we declare that accomplishment would greatly aid in keeping our good men within the bounds of our commonwealth. Is it not an alarming situation that North Carolina, according to Governor Hodges, is losing too many of its well qualified men to other States for more lucrative jobs, simply because we are not developing industry to the extent that we could keep them here?

Such achievement, I venture to say, is not only possible, but with our ever-increasing consciousness of such need, and with emphasis added to emphasis concerning the need and the possibility, we shall in the near future realize a big advance along all these lines. And even those who have had dreams of such reality and have passed on shall not have dreamed in vain.

This magnificent Broughton Mechanical Engineering Building gives us new hope for such accomplishment. Will you please visualize in these figures something of the immensity of this building? It has 52,419 square feet of floor area and a volume of 749,505 cubic feet. It is inspiring to think of what may be produced within these walls. The building contains such fundamental basic laboratories as aerodynamics for the determination of air forces on airplane model parts, an aircraft structures laboratory for fundamental studies of heat transfer, heating and air-conditioning, refrigeration, steam generation, power generation, instrument analysis and development for measurement of all kinds, the study and examination of fuels, lubricants, and the examination of stresses in machine parts which cannot ordinarily be determined by calculation.

We are, indeed, proud of the rapid progress that State College is making, and especially of its progress in the engineering department. And we are proud of the fact that great men, with great minds, are continuously concerned in making State College just the place where the best young men of our State and country will seek to be trained for the best possible service in the best possible industries—which industries, we earnestly trust, will be provided very soon right here in our State. And, very probably, these students as they learn here in this and other buildings, will be the men who will plan and develop greater industries than our great forefathers ever dreamed would be developed in our midst.

And again, my friends, we look back to Governor Broughton with thanks, for his keen vision and his endeavors to make North Carolina great in industry; and we look to his radiant face today—if perchance he is looking this way—and gain new inspiration for the tasks ahead, as we behold that face which expresses sincere appreciation for what State College has done, and is doing, in his memory and his immortal name.

John Ruskin's lines on the subject, Builders, seem so very appropriate for the conclusion of my remarks here today that I want to use them now:

"When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone.
Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men wrought substance of them,
See! This our fathers did for us."

Porter on Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the top political analysts in the country is Phil Porter, the Sunday and feature editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

His rise to national prominence in political reporting is based upon a lifetime of achievement. He was valedictorian of his high-school class after winning six letters in football, baseball, and swimming. Spare time, he worked as a high-school correspondent for the Plain Dealer.

At Ohio State University, he was a leader in his class, won honors in campus politics, and was awarded a cup as the most campus-active student in the Big Ten. Summertimes were spent as a police reporter for the Plain Dealer.

Following his college days, Phil Porter embarked upon a 35-year career with the Plain Dealer where he has worked at every desk, covered every kind of story on the Ohio scene, and reported eight national political conventions.

During World War II, Phil Porter served as an Air Force colonel in north Africa, Europe, and England, and on the staff of General Spaatz.

Phil Porter's brilliant interpretation of politicians and political activities is unexcelled. Phil Porter was one of the first to predict the nomination and election of General Eisenhower which he did in October 1951. Today, Phil Porter has a new prognostication which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 12, 1956. I commend it to your attention.

PORTER ON PRIMARY

(By Philip W. Porter)

Tuesday's pjrimary election proved little, except that mighty few people in this land of the free are interested in voting. No amount of money, effort, or preaching will get them out, unless there's a red hot fight between sharp personalities, and usually not even then.

The greatest misinformation still exists in the minds of many who are interested; they still don't understand, after 40 years of primaries, that you can't vote for Republicans and Democrats in the same primary, that there are really two separate elections held on the same day in the same voting booths. And failure to vote won't stop people from griping about their officials, even though they had no part in May in choosing those who finally run against each other in November.

The only mildly significant event of Tuesday was the semifinal death rattle of the Lausche presidential boom. I say semifinal because it will not officially expire until the Governor's name is presented to the Democratic convention in August along with a lot of other also-rans. But with Lausche unable to get the votes of the entire delegation from his home State, and four delegates in there actively pitching against him, he'll look like a mighty poor "favorite son."

ODDS TOO GREAT

Unlike some other newspapermen, I've never taken the Lausche boom seriously because of its essential contradictions. Frankie would first have to be nominated by the Democrats before he could get the votes of any of those Republicans who have viewed him so favorably in the past. And how he could even be considered as a serious contender with the labor unions, the remnants of the New Deal (ADA) and his hometown political organization against him, I could never quite figure. Now, with four Ohio delegates against him, that just about does it.

I may be unduly suspicious of human nature, but it has seemed to me all along that the Lausche presidential pitch was just so much advertising for his Senate campaign, and to get him better known nationally, so that if he should lose the Senate seat, he'd be in a position to command a good "front" job in business. I concede that he has made considerable hay outside Ohio among people who hadn't even heard of him (particularly the so-called independents), by his unorthodox tactics and personality, but they'll never get a chance to ballot on him.

The old pros around the State, both Democratic and Republican, have for some time taken with a grain of salt the standard Lausche denunciation of bosses, which consisted mainly of a slug at a so-called boss who has nothing much left to boss (Ray T. Miller), while the majority of other county bosses throughout Ohio were on Lausche's ticket as delegates.

STAFF WORK SPOTTY

If Lausche had had better staff work by his supporters in Cleveland, he might not have lost any delegates here. But they failed to get petitions properly signed in a couple of cases, which is inexcusable in political organization work. If you knew the inside, however, you were not surprised, for the Lausche-ites here have never been really organized. They were loosely hung together—anti-Miller, to be sure, but never a real organization themselves. And I've always suspected that the Governor avoided a precinct-control fight with Miller because (1) his crowd probably could not have got the candidates properly accredited and (2) Miller was more valuable to him as a live whipping boy than a defeated chairman.

Anyway, the Lausche boom as of today is as dead as Methusaleh, despite his sudden national publicity and the most favorable press around Ohio that any governor has had in the last generation, if not before. If the State House corresopndents had worked him over from the beginning as they worked over Harry L. Davis, Martin L. Davey, and John W. Bricker, the history of the last 12 years might have been somewhat different. But they have been charmed by him, just as ordinary voters have, and little truly biting and analytical stuff has been dug up about the inadequacies of the Ohio road and mental-health situations.

O'NEILL'S THE MAN

In nominating Billy O'Neill for Governor, the Republicans chose a man who is odds-on to win, to make a splendid administrator (something we've not had in Columbus in ages) and who can go much farther in public life as he ages.

Bob Krupansky is an able, though young and green, candidate for county prosecutor. He has a chance to win, if he plots his own course and doesn't let some of his new-found friends get the idea they own him. But in a Democratic county against an opponent named Corrigan, it will be tough.

And now, citizens of our great State and county who didn't vote, you can go back to griping about taxes and incompetent public officials.

View of Truck Body & Equipment Association, Inc., Concerning the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement containing the views of Truck Body & Equipment Association, Inc., relative to the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

The statement, addressed to Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, chairman, Senate Finance Committee, under date of May 18, 1956, follows:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We would like to submit herewith for the record this written statement in lieu of a personal appearance before your committee applicable to title II containing the revenue raising features of H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

The Truck Body & Equipment Association, Inc. is a national trade association representative of truck body manufacturers, special truck equipment manufacturers, distributors of these products, and others related to this industry such as suppliers of component parts that go into truck body construction and truck operation.

Our membership includes firms located in all sections of the United States. The industry is recognized as one vital to our national economy, and based on established standards these firms are considered small business, the backbone of our American economic system.

The Truck Body & Equipment Association appreciates and supports the general objectives and necessity of a Federal highway program as proposed in H. R. 10660, especially the features of the highway construction portion of the measure incorporated as title I. Likewise, the provisions of title II, incorporating the revenue-raising features of H. R. 10660 with the following exceptions:

1. Exemption from the revenue-raising features of the bill should be provided for trucks and bodies purchased for use in relatively confined areas, on urban streets and roads within city limits and adjacent suburbs, within limited populated sections in which regions practically all of the truck bodies and truck equipment manufactured by members of the industry represented by the Truck Body & Equipment Association are sold and used. The proposed highway program must be defined as pertaining to roads and highways in rural areas for traffic and hauling on a long-distance-over-the-road-intercity basis. We urge and recommend that such trucks and bodies as described above be treated as nonhighway users and be relieved of the payment of further taxes.

2. Trucks and truck bodies not used for product delivery, for the hauling of revenue cargo, or operated for profit should be excluded from the revenue-raising features of the bill. Example: Trucks and bodies used by utility companies and the vocational trades.

3. We urge and recommend an amendment to the bill exempting from any form of taxation, including highway-use taxes, manufacturers' excise tax, etc., motor vehicles operated over private roads and purchased and used for nonhighway operations.

4. An increase in Federal excise tax rates as proposed in the bill may well have an adverse effect on truck body production because there would be a pronounced tendency on the part of prospective purchasers to reuse an old truck body when buying a new chassis in view of the additional cost involved for a new body, the manufacturer passing on to the purchaser the full amount of the Federal excise tax involved to recover the same which he was obliged to pay.

We respectfully request serious and favorable consideration of the foregoing recommendations with respect to H. R. 10660.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR H. NUESSE,
Executive Manager.

A Sound Fiscal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it has been particularly encouraging to notice recently the strong interest on the part of

the American people in a sound fiscal program. A poll taken by me this year in Nevada indicated that my constituents by a vote of 68.8 percent to 19.1 percent preferred having any surplus in the budget this year applied to reducing the national debt before being utilized to make possible a badly needed tax reduction.

One of the fiscal problems in devising a sound taxing system is to be sure that taxes do not impose an excessive and discriminatory burden on small businesses and farms. I recently received from Emery Graunke, an experienced accountant and tax consultant in my State, a very challenging and informative letter in which he points up some of the difficulties being encountered today by those who have small farms and are starting out in business. In continuing our quest for an ever better tax system, I think it might be well worth while for the Members of the House to consider the very sound suggestions that come from this well-qualified man.

Pertinent excerpts from this letter are as follows:

Doing a considerable amount of tax work as a tax consultant, I have been very interested in the articles written by the former Internal Revenue Commissioner, T. Coleman Andrews. There are certain fundamental points that he has discussed in which I agree with him wholeheartedly. I think his suggestion for a Hoover-type commission to study the entire tax field is excellent.

I fully realize that the Government, of course, must have a source of revenue and that people today expect more and more services from their Government; however, I believe that the American public has reached the point of somewhat rebelling against the present excessive high rate imposed by the income-tax law. Fundamentally, the income tax is a self-imposed assessment of taxes, and, due to the continued existing high rate, people are searching for every loophole possible and stretching claims for deductions to the point where they often are not honest and the self-assessing principle is deteriorating.

In my tax practice I deal with the average so-called small-business men as well as wage earners, and I have come to the conclusion that the present income-tax laws make it almost impossible for a young man to enter into business or farming on borrowed capital for the reason that he has to make enough money in order to repay the borrowed capital. In the process of making money he then becomes liable for exorbitant income-tax assessment, with the result that after he has made his payments on the loan, paid his income tax, there is seldom enough left for his livelihood. This in turn keeps stifling the small-business man, with the result that the trend in business and farming today is toward the elimination of the small-business man entirely and being replaced by large concerns or ranching operators. I sincerely feel that it is not a healthy condition. I also feel that the excessive rates of taxation in the higher brackets kill all incentive to expand, and it is this incentive to expand and grow that has made America the greatest industrial nation of the world.

In small towns it is surprising the number of businesses, such as service stations, retail stores, etc., that net approximately $5,000 a year. Recently a client of mine had borrowed $10,000 to buy a service station. Due to the existing tight-money market, the longest term loan he could obtain was a 5-year loan, which meant he had to repay the loan at a rate of $2,000 a year plus the interest. His net income was $5,000. Naturally, the repayment of the loan had to be paid out of his net income, as only the interest is deductible as an expense. Therefore, after making the payment of $2,000, he had approximately $3,000 left of his $5,000 profit. His income tax on the $5,000 profit was approximately $540. Taking that from the $3,000 that he had left after making his loan payment, there remained $2,460, which he found to be inadequate to support his family. I think this is a clear example of the devastating effect of the income-tax laws.

I feel that there should be some allowance for a tax deduction of loan-principal repayments. It is important to remember that the small neighborhood grocer, the corner druggist, the service-station operator, etc., make up the bulk of the real small-business men in this country and are very important to its economy. They are the people who really need tax relief in the form of deduction for repayment of borrowed capital.

The above are just some ideas I have had in my mind regarding taxation, and I feel that I can speak from experience because of having some 400 tax clients, most of whom are in the small-business category or in the small ranching field.

Drawing for Homestead Units on the Minidoka Reclamation Project's North Side Pumping Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart at drawing for homestead units on the Minidoka reclamation project's north side pumping division, May 12, 1956:

It is a real pleasure for me to be here today and to take part in the drawing for homestead farm units on the Minidoka Project's North Side Pumping Division.

Irrigation and homesteading fit together like hand and glove. The western United States owes much of its tremendous, dynamic growth to irrigated agriculture and to the intrepid homesteaders who developed the raw land into productive farms.

The veterans whose names are drawn here today are indeed fortunate for they will have an opportunity to become integral parts of this region's basic economy.

This opportunity is the great prize that will be won by some of you here at the drawing today. But in order to capitalize this opportunity, each of the lucky winners will have to work, and work hard. As veterans, I am sure all the winners will know that success is not handed to them on a silver platter. It will have to be earned.

I have more than a passing interest in the North Side Pumping Division. Back in the summer of 1949, joint hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Public Lands and a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H. R. 5506. This was a bill to authorize the Palisades Dam and the North Side Pumping Division. It was my privilege, as a Member of Congress from Montana, to sit as a member of the House group and to participate in those hearings.

There was much discussion during the week-long sessions about how much the development of the North Side Pumping Division and the Palisades project meant to this area and to our country. Authorization of these projects was supported by a number of eminent representatives in the immediate area and by Idaho's able congressional delegation.

I am sure I don't have to remind you of the important efforts of Congressman HAMER BUDGE and Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK in this respect. Both of these highly esteemed gentlemen have worked hard and successfully in behalf of this project. When the first $150,000 to start this work was appropriated for fiscal year 1953 I know it was a dream of many years come true for you and for your elected representatives in Washington.

Now that I'm out here and have seen for myself how the North Side work is progressing and how it has added to the overall economic health of the area—I realize even more that the many witnesses from this area who appeared at the hearings and urged the projects were indeed foresighted men.

I understand that excellent progress is being made on the Palisades project, too, and that the first storage and power generation will take place this coming October.

The basic purpose behind the establishment of Federal reclamation was to develop the arid lands on the 17 Western States while simultaneously settling as many farm families on the lands as was economically feasible. The North Side pumping division certainly meets these criteria. In 1953, 72 farm units were entered, 85 units in 1954, and 94 in 1955. There are 194 scheduled to be entered in 1956, and 225 in 1957. This means more than 77,000 acres of productive land from what once was barren, arid desert. Incidentally, the 194 units being drawn for today is the largest such land drawing to be held this year in the whole United States.

There are more farm units being made available for homestead entry than many persons realize, for homesteading generally is thought of only in connection with the old wild West and the Oklahoma race for newly opened lands. Yet, a total of 2,159 units including 183,125 acres has been made available for homesteading since the close of World War II. In 1956, 232 farm units will be opened for entry in Western States. These units, here on the North Side, the Kennewick division of the Yakima project in Washington, and the Gila project in Arizona, will include some 26,297 acres.

In addition, 166 farm units, encompassing over 15,000 acres, will be sold from federally owned lands on the Columbia Basin project in Washington and the Eden project in Wyoming. Throughout the 17 Western States there are over 7 million acres of land receiving full or supplemental water supplies from facilities constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. This is the equivalent of more than 125,000 family-size farm units and 125,000 suburban units. In addition, about 100,000 family-sized farm units will be created by projects now under construction or authorized for construction.

The gross value of crop production from all Federal reclamation projects in the 17 Western States in 1954 was over $865 million and the cumulative value of crops produced since 1906 is now over $10 billion. Federal tax revenues since 1916 from reclamation areas which can be considered attributable to the Federal reclamation developments total over $3 billion, far more than the total cost of all Bureau of Reclamation constructed projects. The total income to reclamation project farmers and farm labor over the years since 1906 is almost $7 billion and the aggregate income to urban areas tied into reclamation projects is in the neighborhood of $10 billion.

The beneficial effects of reclamation development may be likened to rippling water in a pond. Starting from a small localized area, the ripple spreads in ever-widening circles to cover the entire pond. A person has only to visit such thriving cities as Twin Falls, Jerome, and Rupert to see what the development of the North Side pumping division means to this area. It is not particularly difficult to recognize the ever-widening circles of economic values.

The chance to be a part of and share in all of these basic, essential facets of the local community, the State of Idaho, and the Nation—that is the lot of the lucky veterans whose names are drawn today. A chance to work hard and put down roots in an orderly, expanding community, founded on firm, dependable, irrigated agriculture.

But when putting down roots, both in the literal and in the figurative sense, one must consider at all times the availability of an adequate and continuing supply of water. Water is basic to all life. Without it neither plants nor animals nor human beings can survive. Properly supplied with it, all living things can complete their normal, productive life cycles.

I noted in a Geological Survey report published in 1954 that your State, Idaho, was 1 of 3 States in the Nation, the others being Rhode Island and Mississippi, that reported no shortage of public water. You were, indeed, fortunate that year, but I know it was not always thus. From my ranching experience in your neighbor State of Montana I have learned, as I am sure you have learned, that water supplies and the weather that regulates them are anything but constant.

Water problems have been with the West for more than a century. It was in 1847 that pioneer Mormon settlers in the Salt Lake Valley, not too far from where we are meeting today, started diverting water from nearby canyon streams. Though it isn't commonly known, the first diversion wasn't for irrigation at all. It was to soften up the ground so these ambitious farmers could plow it for planting. But before long, they had water running down the ditches between growing plants. They even managed to harvest a crop which was planted in the late weeks of that first hot summer.

From that meager beginning has grown an irrigated farmland empire that now counts more than 26 million acres in the 17 Western States.

However, great as this progress has been, the time has cowe for us to own up to the fact that across the Nation we have been rapidly approaching a water crisis. From the housewife in Washington, D. C., to the sugar-beet farmers right here in Magic Valley this crisis is assuming more and more definite proportions. There are many reasons for this. Most important among them, perhaps, is the unprecedented and to a certain extent unanticipated, increase in our population. There are now nearly 165 million people in this country and the experts predict we shall have passed the 221 million population mark by 1975. With more and more people depending on a single resource it isn't difficult to see that something must be done to alleviate the pressure by conservation, development, and wise use.

Irrigation is a major consumer of water. The present average daily consumption of 120 billion gallons is double the amount used in any other category. By 1975 it is expected that irrigation will still retain first position with an average daily demand of 170 billion gallons. Thanks to evaporation and transpiration there is a considerable amount of water returned to the atmosphere. An undetermined amount percolates through the soil and replenishes ground-water supplies. Usable return flows range from 20 to 60 percent.

When you add the requirements of irrigation to the other use categories, the total daily demand at present is slightly more than 250 billion gallons. By 1975 the total daily requirements for public, industrial, steam electric power, and irrigation water supply will amount to approximately 450 billion gallons. Our requirements will be neary double what they are today. And these are conservative estimates.

The administration has taken positive steps toward the solution of the water problem. One of the first steps in this direction was taken more than 2 years ago when President Eisenhower appointed an Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy.

When he created the committee, President Eisenhower had this to say:

"If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil, or which can be extracted from the oceans. It is my desire that this administration furnish effective and resourceful leadership in establishing national policies and improving the administrative organization needed to conserve and best utilize the full potential of our water resources.

"Policies have been modified repeatedly to reflect changing needs and priorities. Unfortunately, we have often relied on piecemeal or stopgap measures * * * policies * * * have been inconsistent. Accordingly, it is both fitting and necessary for us to undertake a comprehensive review looking toward modernization of Federal policies and programs."

The committee completed its report late last year and in January of this year the President transmitted it to Congress with a request for prompt consideration.

The first problem the advisory committee recognized was that our store of basic physical facts was inadequate, or that they were ignored. The committee recommended that the basic data program be strengthened. It proposed that within the next 5 years the amount of funds allocated at present be doubled to carry out an expansion of all phases of the basic data program in cooperation with States and local units. It was proposed that a minimum of 5 percent of the allocated funds be spent on evaluation of data. In addition, the committee urged that funds be appropriated on a uniform scale from year to year.

The committee emphasized that there is no national water problem. It said there are instead a variety of water problems and they are unique in each region, State, and locality. As a result, there can be no overall plan for water resource development. Planning must be based on existing and projected conditions in each area. The organizational changes proposed by the committee would lessen bureaucratic control, and provide the local people a greater voice in determining how their resources would be developed.

The committee strongly believed that a sound water resources development plan required all interested groups to participate in the planning process from the start. Consequently it recommended that regional or river basin committees be established as the need arose. Each committee would have a nonvoting chairman appointed by the President. The Federal agencies having responsibility in the area would be represented on the committee and the governor of each affected State would appoint representatives.

These committees should be the principal medium through which planning activities of all participants would be coordinated. These committees would prepare and publish joint comprehensive water resources development plans, which would be revised from time to time as conditions in the region and in the Nation changed.

The committee has proposed that an Office of Coordinator of Water Resources be established in the Executive Office of the President.

The Coordinator would reconcile the inevitable interagency differences, and he would develop and establish uniform procedures for all agencies; he would cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers in evaluation of departmental requests for appropriations; he would work on the reconciliation of water resources policies with other Federal policies, and would prepare long-range programs of water resource developments consistent with other public works programs.

The advisory committee proposed that an impartial board of review be established to evaluate the economic and engineering feasibility of projects before submittal to the President. The board would be composed of three persons with competence in engineering, economics, or others with recognized abilities and judgment in the resources field. They should have had no connection with the planning of projects submitted for review, nor should they be involved in the subsequent construction of projects. Such a board would serve full-time and would be able to give due consideration to congressional policy and to criteria established by the Coordinator of Water Resources in evaluation of projects.

The committee has several proposals designed to clarify the complex situation regarding State water laws.

It recognizes that in many areas land is worthless without the water rights that go with it. The report states, "The principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted. Determinations as to disposition of water should recognize such rights."

The committee recommends that the Federal Government collaborate with States in a study to determine the relationships between the establishment of property rights to water and the economic and social development of the Nation. Such a study would clarify the rights of the respective parties and is a prerequisite to solving the current dilemma in this field.

The committee urges that the States solve these problems to their mutual satisfaction by means of interstate compacts. Agreements arrived at in this manner are considered preferable to the imposition of Federal legislation.

Most of the Western States have adopted a set of rather rigid priorities for the use of water, usually listed in the following order: Domestic uses, stock watering, irrigation, manufacturing or power generation. This pattern has evolved over time in response to local conditions. There are many parts of the country where these priorities come in different patterns.

The committee believes that each State can determine how water can be used to best advantage within its borders. It rejects the idea that the Federal Government can dictate priorities; however, it recommends that there be come flexibility with regard to priority of use in order to adjust to changing conditions.

Another of the committee recommendations deals with participation in costs. If there is to be a genuine partnership in the water resources development and partnership is the creed of the Eisenhower administration natural resources program—the State and local interests should be expected to assume a fair share of the costs along with their increased responsibilities. A major share of the project benefits accrue to particular individuals and to particular areas. The committee has recommended that the share of the costs to be borne by the beneficiaries should be proportionate to the benefits received.

By following the guidelines laid down by President Eisenhower's committee, I am confident the country as a whole will solve its water problems. Certainly many of the committee's recommendations are in evidence here on your own Minidoka project.

I admire the way you Idahoans manage your soil, water and other resources. I am interested, too, in the Federal Government's cooperating in the further development of the Snake River and its tributaries.

However, in planning any development, we must take into consideration multiple-use; that is, to return the maximum benefits to the greatest number of people. We must consider not only the storage of water for irrigation which is clearly one of the primary purposes in this area but also flood control and fish and wildlife values. Because it helps pay the bill, we must also consider maximum development of hydroelectric power resources.

Right now, there is a clear need for further upstream storage on the Snake River. I understand there is a record snow cover piled so deep in the mountains that there is danger of floods when the snowmelt starts, which should be very shortly. Yet, in several recent years, it has been necessary to pull the reclamation reservoirs down to a very low level to keep irrigation canals flowing.

Additional storage will permit cyclical operation of the entire network of reservoirs rather than on a year-to-year storage basis. With the exception of the few years of extreme drought, the level of reservoirs could be maintained at a fairly constant level if there is sufficient capacity to hold over storage from flood years to years of drought. This would enhance their value for all purposes, particularly for the fishermen and for the millions of recreation seekers who crowd into the upper Snake River watershed in Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks every summer.

At the same time, there are existing fishery and wildlife resources which must be preserved and enhanced where possible. That is why the Bureau of Reclamation is spending many thousands of dollars in a complete investigation of all storage possibilities before making a recommendation to the Department on how to proceed. Field offices of other agencies within the Department of the Interior are working closely with the Bureau of Reclamation in these investigations. When the report is received in Washington, it will again be closely scrutinized by all agencies and the Secretary of the Interior will undoubtedly have to make some decisions between conflicting interests.

You may rest assured that in making these decisions, the Department will be guided by a desire to effect the greatest multiple-use of the river's resources including both further stabilization of your irrigated land production and enhancement of upstream fish and wildlife benefits.

Speaking of irrigation and farmland, much has been written and more has been said regarding crop surpluses. A principal question these days is "Why should we develop additional irrigated farmlands in the face of current overproduction?" Generalizations are often misleading. They are not only misleading—they result in gross misinformation which indicts reclamation as a principal contributor to these surpluses.

First, I would like to call to your attention some of the overall considerations that have a bearing on the development of our agricultural resources. I have mentioned the population increase, but there are others.

It has been pointed out that more than 115 million acres are now occupied by cities, highways, airports, defense establishments, and for industrial use. Eighty million acres of this area was originally good farmland. It has also been pointed out that we are losing farmland to nonagricultural uses at a rate of more than 1 million acres per year despite any new acreage brought in by irrigation projects.

The trend in eating habits is a factor, too. If we consume an average of 156 pounds of red meat annually, which was the consumption in 1954, we will require some 35 million acres more land in 1962 than was used in 1953 to grow feed. It has been variously estimated by responsible officials in the Department of Agriculture that a balance will be reached between production and consumption within about 3 to 5 years.

Other significant trends are in evidence also. The increasing population of the West is consuming more and more of the farm production of the Western States. Only a few years ago cattle raised in the Great Basin were shipped eastward. Now the line of demarcation between the East and West bound movement of cattle is generally, I believe, at about the Continental Divide, but with some Texas cattle moving to the west coast.

The increase in per capita consumption of fruits and vegetables reflects a further change in our diet and eating habits. The irrigated West supplies a substantial part of the total requirement for these protective and health-giving foods, much of which is marketed during the late fall, winter, and early spring.

In this perspective, consider that many years elapse between the time a Federal reclamation project is first proposed and the time the lands are in full agricultural production. We must go through the extensive process of investigation, review of proposed reports by all interested State and Federal agencies, authorization by the Congress, the appropriation of funds for construction, the development of final plans and specifications, the construction of the physical facilities of the project, and finally the settlement of the land.

Even after the farmer is on the land, several years are required to extend the farm ditches to all parts of the farm and to level and to get into full production the total acreage served. On a large project this can involve a period of time varying from possibly 5 to 25 years. Projects or additions to projects which are proposed today will not come into full production for several years after we have attained a balance in overall production and consumption. Many of our projects supply supplemental water to an existing economy—that is, they assure water year after year to stabilize production.

The principal price support crops on which there is some production on reclamation projects are barley, corn, oats, wheat, rye, grain sorghum, cotton, dry and edible beans, flaxseed, rice and soybeans. The cereal grains are grown primarily for feed and to provide a balanced farming operation, including the rotation of crops for maintenance of soil structure and soil fertility.

Data obtained from the Department of Agriculture shows by States the 1954 production of each of these crops under the support program. The amount of production which is actually price supported varies from 5 to 50 percent. Using the percentage of production supported in each State, we have estimated the amount produced on reclamation projects which might be considered supported. The total production of each cereal crop on reclamation projects in 1954, as a percentage of United States production, varies from about one-sixth of 1 percent to about 7.5 percent. Thus, when you take into consideration the relatively small portion of each total crop which is price supported, it becomes clearly evident that support for reclamation project production is negligible and of little significance.

Many western irrigation projects are in close proximity to large public grazing areas. These cereal crops supplement the grazing lands and permit better utilization of the 700 million acres of western rangelands by providing a late fall, winter and spring feed supply. Grazing of many acres would not be economically feasible by reason of high transportation costs of livestock to and from grazing lands were it not for these irrigated feed base lands.

We hear a great deal about how wheat production on reclamation projects is in competition with midwestern wheat. Wheat produced on reclamation projects in 1954 was less than 2 percent, and the amount supported was less than 1 percent of the United States production of about 970 million bushels. This is hardly a major contribution to the problem of overproduction of wheat. Actually, instead of contributing to that problem, farming as practiced under irrigation tends to alleviate this problem.

Rice production on reclamation projects is less than 1 percent, and the production of soybeans amount to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our national production. Flaxseed under support which was produced on reclamation projects amounts to less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the United States production.

Of the 13.7 million bales of cotton produced in 1954, almost 17 percent was under the support program. Production on reclamation projects amounts to approximately 6.5 percent of the total production. The amount under support from reclamation projects is only 1.27 percent of the United States production.

Here we have a situation in which cotton can be produced under irrigation in competition with any other area in the country. In a free market, the irrigated areas probably could continue to produce profitably and many of the producers in nonirrigated areas would be forced to other alternatives. To criticize this production is to put a premium on inefficiency.

Dry and edible bean production in 1954 totaled 17 million bushels. Approximately one-third of the total is produced on reclamation projects. This is a western crop and a good crop, and we offer no apologies for producing it any more than anyone else should apologize for production of corn or wheat in the Midwest. However, only about 23.5 percent of the total 1954 bean production was price supported. This compared with 44 percent of wheat and almost 52 percent of rice production under the support program.

Thus, it appears rather evident that production of agricultural commodities on Federal reclamation projects does not contribute significantly to the overall farm surplus problem. In the light of forecasts of future needs, it is also clearly evident that we should proceed with all speed to develop and bring into production all of the potentially irrigable lands of the West.

As we go forward—in reclamation, in farming, and in the control, management, and use of our great natural resources—we must never lose sight of the fact that our greatest asset of all is a strong, upright, free citizenry. I mean the kind of citizenry envisioned by our forefathers when they wrote the Constitution with its limited powers of government. Such a citizenry can be developed not by bureaucratic control, but by encouraging the individual to use wisely his and his country's resources. The land is a great heritage. Its best development, use and control will come in the traditional American way—as a result of intelligent forces at work within rather than by arbitrary force imposed from without.

May I offer my advance congratulations to the veterans whose names will be drawn here today. I know they will carry on this tradition on the farm as they did so nobly on the battlefield.

Corps of Engineers—Hydroelectric Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to have included a letter from Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, together with a statement from the Corps of Engineers listing hydroelectric power projects operated under construction and in an active status, by the corps.

The list is substantial with an ultimate installed power capacity of 5,253,400 kilowatts, by the Corps of Engineers.

The letter and list follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1956.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: The attached data inclosure specifically covers the data requested in your letter of April 26 with reference to Corps of Engineers multiple-purpose projects with power. You will find the data arranged in the same order as listed in your letter.

It is a pleasure to be of assistance to you and it is hoped the data will supply the information you want. Should any further data be required, I wish you would let me hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers, for Civil Works.

DATA INCLOSURE

1. Twenty-five multiple purpose projects with power have been built and are now being operated by the Corps of Engineers. As of May 2, 1956, the installed generating capacity of these projects was 4,025,400 kilowatts, with 1,228,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity yet to be installed in four of these projects not yet completed.

2. List by basins and name and location of the above 25 projects:

Columbia River Basin: Albeni Falls, Idaho, Pend Oreille River; Bonneville, Oreg. and Wash., Columbia River; Chief Joseph, Wash., Columbia River; McNary, Oreg. and Wash., Columbia River.

Willamette River Basin: Detroit, Oreg., North Santiam River; Lookout Point, Oreg., Middle Fork River.

Missouri River Basin: Fort Peck, Mont., Missouri River; Fort Randall, S. Dak., Missouri River; Garrison, N. Dak., Missouri River.

Cumberland River Basin: Center Hill, Tenn., Caney Fork River; Dale Hollow, Tenn., Obey River; Wolf Creek, Ky., Cumberland River.

Roanoke River Basin: John H. Kerr, Va. and N. C., Roanoke River; Philpott, Va., Smith River.

Savannah River Basin: Clark Hill, Ga. and S. C., Savannah River.

Alabama-Coosa River Basin: Allatoona, Ga., Etowah River.

Ouachita River Basin: Blakely Mountain, Ark., Ouachita River; Narrows, Ark., Little Missouri River.

White River Basin: Bull Shoals, Ark. and Mo., White River; Norfolk, Ark., and Mo., North Fork River.

Red River Basin: Denison, Okla. and Tex., Red River.

Arkansas River Basin: Ft. Gibson, Okla., Grand (Neosho) River; Tenkiller Ferry, Okla., Illinois River.

Brazos River Basin: Whitney, Tex., Brazos River.

Great Lakes Basin: St. Marys River, Mich., St. Marys Falls.

3. List of Corps of Engineers multiple purpose projects with power authorized and planned for construction:

(a) Projects now under construction—Total, 14: Buford, Ga.; Cheatham, Tenn.; Cougar, Oreg.; Fort Gaines, Ala. and Ga.; Gavins Point, Nebr. and S. Dak.; Hartwell, Ga. and S. C.; Hills Creek, Oreg.; Ice Harbor, Wash; Jim Woodruff, Fla.; McGee Bend, Tex.; Oahe, N. Dak. and S. Dak.; Old Hickory, Tenn.; Table Rock, Ark. and Mo.; The Dalles, Oreg. and Wash.

(b) Other active projects in current budget—total, 3: Green Peter, Oreg.; John Day, Oreg. and Wash.; Lower Cumberland, Ky.

(c) Other active projects—total, 18: Beaver, Ark.; Belton, Tex.; Big Bend, S. Dak.; Booneville, Ky.; Carthage, Tenn.; Celina, Ky.; Dardanelle, Ark.; Eufaula, Okla.; Gathright and Falling Springs, Va.; Greers Ferry, Ark.; Jones Bluff, Ala.; Libby, Mont.; Little Goose, Wash.; Lower Granite, Wash.; Lower Monumental, Wash.; Millers Ferry, Ala.; Short Mountain, Okla.; Stockton, Mo.

Total, (a), (b), and (c), 35.

4. Total installed capacity of existing projects and of projects under construction:

(a) Existing projects: This installed capacity of existing projects as of May 2 was 4,025,400 kilowatts. Four of these projects have a total of 1,228,000 kilowatts of generating capacity scheduled to be installed between May 3 and June 1961, making the total installed capacity for these existing projects upon completion 5,253,400 kilowatts.

(b) Projects under construction: The total scheduled installed capacity of the 14 projects listed under 3 (a) above is 2,412,000 kilowatts.

A Salute to the Army Field Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, great bands and illustrious military musical organizations have been the good fortune of our country since the first humble fife-and-drum led our forefathers to battle and independence almost 200 years ago at Concord and Lexington. In the two centuries since 1776, our gallant sons and daughters have marched to the defense of our country behind stirring martial music that told the enemy with crashing drums and awesome chords to beware. America was in the fight to the end. Then, when the smoke of battle had cleared and the last hurrah was voiced, our great bands honored in stately music the returning heroes and those who did not return.

As we pause on May 30 to honor our hero dead in parades and appropriate ceremonies, who can deny the thrill of hearing The Stars and Stripes Forever in the distance and then our troops and veterans going by in ordered ranks? What heart can fail to respond to When Johnny Comes Marching Home? Who is so hardened that he can withhold tears when the trumpeter steps from the band and plays the clear, sweet notes of taps?

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay a special tribute to the United States Army Field Band. This organization, in both war and peace, at home and abroad, has always maintained the highest traditions of great music. The people of Clearfield, Pa., in the 20th Congressional District, had the recent good luck on April 9 to hear the Army Field Band in concert. Since Clearfield, Pa., is in my congressional district I wish to call attention to an editorial published in the Clearfield Progress April 12, 1956, which indicates the outstanding quality of the Army Field Band and certifies the values of this band not only to the Army but to the entire country:

A WORTHWHILE FRILL

Every time we hear the United States Army field band or music by some of its members and every time we meet and talk with Maj. Chester E. Whiting, director of the band, Clearfield's own Capt. Lewis Bierly, assistant director, and the enlisted members of the band, we are proud that we are an American. We're proud that our country and its Army can produce such a fine musical organization and proud of its personnel that represents us as our soldier-musicians.

Clearfielders have been extremely fortunate in having the opportunity to hear the band or, as was the case Monday night, a selected segment of the fine musical organization. The band was a featured attraction of the County Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1954 and last year came back to present, from a raft on the river, the "Clearfield Legend," an original musical composition written especially to glorify the Susquehanna and its influence on the area over the years. Monday night, a dozen or more members of the band returned to demonstrate, at a Rotary Club-sponsored dinner, that they were as versatile and talented as a small group as is the entire organization.

The major share of the credit for the pleasure Clearfielders have had in listening to the Army field band is due Russell A. Shaw, an old bandsman himself, a lover of good music and a personal friend of Major Whiting and Captain Bierly. Mr. Shaw deserves the community's thanks for the opportunity of hearing the band. Clearfielders themselves—those who have sponsored the band's appearances in the community—also can take a bow for being good hosts, the kind that make the band members and their leaders willing and anxious to come back.

As Mr. Shaw pointed out in his remarks at Monday night's Rotary dinner, the public relations or good will value of the Army Field Band in its occasional foreign tours is unsurpassed and far more productive than the millions of dollars this Nation pours down the drain in equipping foreign nations with armaments, economic aid, and the like. On the domestic scene, the band is providing all 48 States of the Nation, through its many tours, an opportunity to hear music the like of which towns such as Clearfield and its counterparts across the country would never otherwise have the opportunity to enjoy. It's somewhat comforting, also, to realize that out of a defense organization basically devoted to destruction can come a cultural organization such as the United States Army Field Band.

It may be that the Army Field Band might be classified as a Government "frill." However, it is one Government "frill" that we think is worth while and should be continued with adequate financial support. It is a "frill" that gives the taxpayer enjoyment for his money—and it's money well spent. It could be ill-spent if it weren't for the inspired leadership and the enthusiastic and talented personnel of the band that has been so apparent in its Clearfield appearances. As long as such leadership and enlisted personnel are available, the United States Army Field Band is one of the best investments of taxpayers' dollars this Nation can make, for they are truly ambassadors of good will at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, everytime we hear the United States Army Field Band or music by some of its members and everytime we meet and talk with Maj. Chester E. Whiting, director of the band, Clearfield's own Capt. Lewis Bierly, assistant director, and the enlisted members of the band, we are proud that we are Americans. We are proud that our country and its Army can produce such a fine musical organization and proud of its personnel that represents us as our soldier-musicians.

Clearfielders have been extremely fortunate in having the opportunity to hear the band or, as was the case Monday night, a selected segment of the fine musical organization. The band was a featured attraction of the county sesquicentennial celebration in 1954 and last year came back to present, from a raft on the river, the Clearfield Legend, an original musical composition written especially to glorify the Susquehanna and its influence on the area over the years. Monday night, a dozen or more members of the band returned to demonstrate, at a Rotary Club-sponsored dinner, that they were as versatile and talented as a small group as is the entire organization.

The major share of the credit for the pleasure Clearfielders have had in listening to the Army Field Band is due Russell A. Shaw, an old bandsman himself, a lover of good music and a personal friend of Major Whiting and Captain Bierly. Mr. Shaw deserves the community's thanks for the opportunity of hearing the band. Clearfielders themselves—those who have sponsored the band's appearance in the community—also can take a bow for being good hosts, the kind that make the band members and their leaders willing and anxious to come back.

As Mr. Shaw pointed out in his remarks at Monday night's Rotary dinner, the public-relations or good will value of the Army Field Band in its occasional foreign tours is unsurpassed and far more productive than the millions of dollars this Nation pours down the drain in equipping foreign nations with armaments, economic aid and the like. On the domestic scene, the band is providing all 48 States of the Nation, through its many tours, an opportunity to hear music the like of which towns such as Clearfield and its counterparts across the country would never otherwise have the opportunity to enjoy. It is somewhat comforting, also to realize that out of a defense organization basically devoted to destruction can come a cultural organization such as the United States Army Field Band.

It may be that the Army Field Band might be classified as a Government frill. However, it is one government frill with adequate financial support. It is a frill that gives the taxpayer enjoyment for his money—and it is money well spent. It could be ill-spent if it were not for the inspired leadership and the enthusiastic and talented personnel of the band that has been so apparent in its Clearfield appearances. As long as such leadership and enlisted personnel are available, the United States Field Band is one of the best investments of taxpayers' dollars this Nation can make for they are truly ambassadors of good will at home and abroad.

I submit that this editorial is a well deserved tribute to a fine musical organization and that any attempts to eliminate this band or others like it are tantamount to taking the breath out of spring. Through the fine cooperation extended to me by Captain Whiting I have been instrumental in securing the Army Field Band for delightful concerts in several communities in my congressional district. On each occasion it has never failed to live up to its reputation as one of the finest bands in the Nation. Therefore, I speak from experience when I join the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress in its well deserved tribute to the United States Army Field Band.

Supplying Education With the "Spirit of Religion"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech given by Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, as guest speaker at the opening meeting at the annual Veishea celebration of Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. The meeting was held in the Clyde Williams Stadium and was attended by approximately 10,000 people.

The speech follows:

President Hilton, I feel greatly honored in being invited to participate in this annual Veishea celebration, sponsored and presented by the students of Iowa State College. Your introduction is very complimentary and your welcome most generous.

It is indeed a great pleasure and privilege for me to return to my native State and be the guest speaker at one of America's outstanding institutions of higher learning. I am finding myself tempted to engage in a reminiscent mood for as I go up and down the courts of memory there are coming to my mind many of those boyhood experiences which I had in that little town of Alton where I was born.

Perhaps there are folks in this audience who were my fellow students at Grinnell College some 52 years ago when I was the shortstop on the varsity baseball team during my freshman and sophmore years before going to the University of Michigan and Princeton. I recall very distinctly being here in Ames when we played Iowa State College.

I am not going to continue in this sort of a reminiscent mood for there is no time for that. Furthermore, brevity has always been one of my specialties. Not long ago I was the guest speaker at a dinner meeting. The toastmaster, who has known me intimately throughout my entire ministry of 45 years in Washington, said, "I am quite sure the Chaplain's message will not be very long; it will only seem long." I like the observation made by Dr. Alexander Ruthven, who was for many years the distinguished president of my alma mater, the University of Michigan. He reminds us that an address or message need not be eternal in order to be immortal. I sincerely hope that my message will not seem long and I am quite sure that it will not be immortal.

Your chairman has informed me that this year's Veishea theme pertains to education and that the program committee has invited me to present a message that relates or ties together religion and education. This is an exceedingly broad subject and I shall not attempt to treat it in any academic or abstract fashion, a mission for which I have no qualifications. Recently a friend characterized a very scholarly and learned gentleman as being all abstract up there, referring to his head and all concrete down here, referring to his heart. I trust that what I shall say will be practical and helpful, stimulating not only your minds but stirring your hearts.

During this year, 1956, we are commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States, who will always be remembered as one of America's foremost educators, and statesmen. I shall never forget the last time I was privileged to hear that great man. That was 45 years ago when I was a senior student in Princeton Theological Seminary and also taking post-graduate work in the University for a masters degree in philosophy.

Late one afternoon he came to the seminary vesper service to address the young men who were preparing for the ministry. He began by saying: "Gentlemen, I have always regarded the illustrations that I use in my messages as the windows through which my listeners can see most clearly what I am trying to say." Then he related the experience of a student who many years ago went to a little town in Iowa to occupy the pulpit of the Presbyterian Church during his summer vacation. Woodrow Wilson didn't mention the name of the town but it may have been Ames. After a 2 days journey by train the student arrived on a Saturday and went straightway to the barber's shop for a haircut and shave. The barber, like most barbers, was very talkative and began to ask him all sorts of questions. "Stranger here?" "Yes from Princeton, N. J." "What are you going to do here?" "I am going to supply the Presbyterian Church." Quick as a flash the barber asked, "And with what?" He evidently thought the young man might be a Fuller Brush man who was going to supply the church and the janitor with mops, brooms, brushes, soap, wax, etc. In answer to the barber's very fundamental question, "And with what?", the student replied that he had come to supply the church with the gospel.

Now in speaking on this subject, "Religion and Education," let me be a little more specific and take as my theme, "Supplying education with the spirit of religion."

The cynic, who has been defined as the man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing, would have us believe that religion is merely a racket; something which people feel will bring certain economic,

social, and political advantages and material gains.

Then there are those who speak of religion as an opiate. This is the invective which Karl Marx and the Communists have hurled against religion, that it teaches people to be resigned to their sufferings and struggles, putting them to sleep and making them content with social conditions, as they are, instead of fighting against them.

Furthermore, there are some who think of religion as an emotional gust; a passing sentiment; an impulse which comes and goes; a fad or fashion of mere temporary interest.

There are still others who refer to religion as a kind of stimulant which it is well for a man to take when he feels pretty low and needs something to strengthen his morale as he faces a crisis and is in doubt concerning the outcome.

Over against these negative attitudes of the cynic and the Communists let us remind ourselves of one of the great affirmations made by Thomas Carlyle that religion is the chief fact in a man's life. Here is a statement that is becoming increasingly evident for as Sabatier, the French theologian and historian, said many years ago, "Man is incurably religious."

The editor of a popular magazine asked a friend to write an article on the subject of what he considered would be the next forward step in religion. In that article he set forth the thesis that the next forward step in religion would be a step backward. A statement of that kind may strike us at first as being hopelessly reactionary. Furthermore, it may seem very paradoxical for how can one go forward by going backward?

When we look at the root meaning of the word, "religion" we have no difficulty in seeing that this is the basic idea. There are two definitions of the word, "religion" each giving a different aspect of the same thing. Cicero preferred the meaning, "to think back; to think over again; to reflect on the meaning of life and to recollect divine things." St. Augustine defined religion as meaning "to rebind; to tie together that which unites man to God and his fellow men." One thought runs through both definitions, namely that religion is the tie that rebinds us to God.

Now, in speaking on this special subject of "supplying education with the spirit of religion," I want to go back and remind you of three factors or aspects which constitute the very alphabet of true religion. The first statement I wish to make is that the spirit of religion supplies not only education but the whole of life with a sense of reverence.

This aspect of religion may be rather difficult to define but it is easily recognized for it indicates a mental attitude and a heart attitude with which we are all familiar. Reverence is a word we find in both sacred and secular literature. It is that indwelling grace or sentiment which makes us conscious of the fact that certain things invoke not only our admiration but our adoration.

When we begin to think of whom we should revere we soon discover that reverence for God must transcend them all for here we have the basis and inspiration of all other reverences. When we eliminate reverence for God we are cutting the very root of reverence for our fellow man, for ourselves, for law and everything else.

Dr. Henry Churchill King, who was for many years the president of Oberlin College, wrote an inspiring book entitled, "The Moral and Religious Challenge of Our Times." In the very first sentence he states that he has come to believe that reverence for human personality is the ruling principle in ethics and religion. This is also the outstanding principle in the life of Albert Schweitzer.

Nowhere have I found a more beautiful reminder and expression of this sense of reverence for ourselves, which religion supplies us with, than in these words written to a friend, as a birthday wish, by the daughter of a brilliant professor in the University of Edinburgh. "That life for you may never lose its halo."

Religion supplies us not only with a sense of reverence but with the strongest and noblest kind of restraint when we are tempted to break faith with our higher and better self.

Voltaire must have understood this when he said, "If there were no God it would be necessary to invent one." This was his unique way of saying that the best proof of the fact of God is that we cannot do without him. It is related that one day Voltaire was entertaining in his home a company of friends. Presently their conversation turned to the subject of religion. As soon as they were about to give their reasons for not believing in God he ordered his servants to leave the room. On being asked his reason for so doing he replied he did not wish that he and his guests should have their throats cut. Voltaire knew very well that religion with its belief in God supplies man's character and conduct with the greatest sense of restraint.

Centuries ago the Prophet Isaiah exclaimed, "Where there is no vision, the people perish"—this is the more accurate translation: "Where there is no vision of God, the people cast off restraint." The old registrar at Oxford said to a young man who was a candidate for admission into the university, "Tell me about your belief in God." "But sir," was the reply, "I do not believe in any God." "What!" exclaimed the registrar, "You say you do not believe in God. Go out and find God by tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock or leave this university." That registrar likewise understood very clearly that belief in God affords man the greatest sense of restraint.

We hear a great deal of talk about freedom but freedom must always be coordinated with restraint and discipline for these are the supreme factors in social integration. I am thinking of a 10-year-old boy who was finding parental discipline very irksome. He said to his father, "When will I be old enough and big enough to do as I please?" The father was a very wise man for he gave the right answer when he said, "My boy, no one ever grows to be that old and that big." Surely one of the primary objectives of an education is to teach us this sense of restraint for it is absolutely essential to social unity. Our college students, who have the advantages of an education, are charged with the responsibility of maintaining and promoting it.

This brings us to the third thing that religion supplies education and all life with namely, a sense of responsibility. Here we have one of the great principles of religion for it tells us that we are human beings with a responsibility toward God and man. Nowhere is this more clearly taught than in the Bible. There are those who would have us believe that the early chapters of the Book of Genesis have been discredited long ago. I am confident, however, that they are of rich and rare value for our moral and spiritual culture for in those chapters we are reminded of this sense of responsibility. They teach us that the question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative. The indictment brought against Cain was that he defiantly declared he had no feeling of responsibility for life and welfare of his brother Abel.

In one of Hall Caine's novels there is a story of a schoolboy who was asked by his teacher, "Johnny, who is your neighbor?" His answer, "Please sir, the man who lives next door." Again the teacher asked, "And what is your duty toward your neighbor?" The boy replied, "Please sir, to keep my eye on him."

Several years ago two books appeared simultaneously. The one is entitled "Beyond Good and Evil," giving us the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche which is that of excessive individualism. It is a bold confession of the ruthless law of the survival of the fittest and tells us that it is all nonsense to talk of being responsible and giving ourselves for the sake of others. The other book entitled, "The Christian Ministry and the Social Order," places the emphasis upon the sense of responsibility, reminding us to seek an education in order that we may be better enabled to meet the needs of humanity and thus bring to fulfillment and fruition the ideals of democracy. George Eliot asks, "What are we here for if not to make life less difficult for one another?"

Now, before speaking of that which is of supreme importance, I wish to say by way of parenthesis, that one of the most encouraging and hopeful signs of our time is that of a new feeling of religious consciousness among our leaders in public life. It seems to me that there is sweeping across the vast areas of our national life a new wave of appreciation of the vitality and validity of the spirit of religion.

Since making the chaplaincy of the House of Representatives a full-time ministry, I have had a greater opportunity than ever before, through my daily association with the Members of Congress, to learn that the spirit of religion is being given as large a place among them as among any group of men and women. Our chosen Representatives are quite aware that national greatness cannot survive if we allow it to become eclipsed by a decline in spiritual idealism and that our national problems cannot be solved on a purely economic basis.

I believe that his new feeling of religious consciousness among our legislators is also becoming increasingly evident in the field of education. In the March issue of the Alumnus of the University of Michigan there is an interesting article entitled, "The Role of Religion on the Michigan Campus." Dr. Baldwin, the coordinator of religious affairs at the university, observes a rising spirit of religious acceptance among students. He indicates that there have been times when they were antagonistic or indifferent to religion but today they recognize its value. It is becoming more and more evident to them that science does not have all the answers and that in religion they may find secure principles for growth and self-realization.

What is true at Michigan is equally true in nearly all our universities and colleges for both the faculties and students understand, as never before, that the "Temple of Modern Civilization" cannot be built without religion. A college or university may be very expert and efficient in many kinds of learning and knowledge but these are not enough.

Let me conclude my message by being more specific and say that education and our whole life, in all its relationships must, above everything else, be supplied with the Spirit of Jesus Christ in whose character and conduct we have the incarnation of life's highest aims and loftiest aspirations.

Shortly after the First World War, Lloyd George said, "Now it is Christ or chaos." Among the most profound affirmations which Woodrow Wilson ever made we find these, "Civilization cannot be redeemed materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. The world must be saturated with the spirit of Jesus Christ."

When I was a student at Grinnell College and the University of Michigan, I had great

difficulty in knowing what studies to take for I didn't seem to have the slightest idea as to what kind of a career I ought to prepare for. Perhaps I was too much interested in athletics, especially baseball, hoping someday to make the big league.

I entered my senior year at Michigan fully intending to study law after receiving the degree of bachelor of arts. Three months before graduation I had a unique experience. One Sunday evening I was invited to attend a meeting in the YMCA building. About two hundred students were assembled there to hear Dr. Angell, the president of the university. His introductory words were these, "Young men, I have spoken to you on many occasions and on many subjects but there is one subject of supreme importance; namely, "Jesus Christ and our relationship to Him." He closed his message by saying, "O, what a great Christ we have." I went home that evening with those words ringing in my ears and shortly before midnight I dedicated my life to the Christian ministry.

In speaking about Jesus Christ and supplying our life and education with His spirit, I want to make three brief observations.

The first is that I wish to acknowledge very humbly and frankly that there is no one whose spirit so baffles and perplexes me. The New Testament narrative tells us that 1900 years ago God historically humanized Himself. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us."

Theologians have tried to draw the mystic line which separates the human Jesus from the Divine Christ. The old credal statement refers to Him as, "very God of very God, of one substance with God; very man of very man, of one substance with man." But, what is substance?

Dr. Joseph Fort Newton will always be remembered as one of America's outstanding preachers. He ministered for several years to a church in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and then was called to the City Temple in London where he had a most significant ministry. I heard him tell of a friend who asked Bertrand Russell two questions: "Do you fully understand Einstein's theory of relativity, and do you go with him all the way?" The great mathematician straightway replied, "I answer the first question in the negative and the second in the affirmative.

A student in the Divinity School of Harvard University of the class of 1913, wrote the following lines which have been set to music by Lowell Mason:

"I know not how that Bethlehem's Babe
could in the Godhead be. I only know the
Manger-Child has brought God's life to me."

Yes, this Christ baffles and perplexes me but even though my finite mind cannot understand His nature I am willing to accept Him and try and follow His spirit.

My second observation about Jesus Christ is that there is no one whose life and character and spirit so attract and allure me. We find it impossible to place Him in any human category for only once has the plant of humanity bloomed and blossomed into a perfect flower and that was the Rose of Sharon, the Lily of the Valley. In Him we have the realized ideal of humanity. He was always speaking the language of the heart which is the language of kindness and considerateness, of mercy and love. Is there any wonder that the multitudes were astonished at the gracious words which came from His lips?

Greek mythology tells us that when Iole was asked how she knew that Hercules was a god she replied, "Because I was satisfied with him the moment my eyes fell upon him. When I beheld Theseus and the other heroes, I desired that they might engage in a chariot race, or at least a foot race that I might see which of them was the doughtiest but when I beheld Hercules, he conquered when he walked or sat or whatever he did and so I knew that he was a god." Surely in a sense far more wonderful we become satisfied with Jesus Christ, the moment we behold the beauty of His character and spirit.

What a beautiful tribute of reverence and homage Charles Lamb paid to Him on that memorable day when he and a few friends were meeting in a coffee house in London. Presently their conversation turned toward the great men of the past. One said he would liked to have met and known Chaucer. Many other names were mentioned. Presently someone spoke of that name which is above every name. There was a moments pause and then Charles Lamb broke the silence by saying, "If William Shakespeare came into this room we would all stand up and do him reverence, but if Jesus Christ came here we would all kneel in worship."

The third and last observation I wish to make about Jesus Christ is that He is challenging us to belong to His Spiritual Kingdom and help Him build it upon this earth. Frederick of Prussia was greatly intent upon teaching his subjects, especially the youth and children, the lessons of patriotism. He would frequently visit the schools. One day he stood before a class of boys and girls, and holding up a stone, he asked them this question, "To what kingdom does this belong?" "To the mineral kingdom," was the prompt reply. Then he held up a leaf and asked the question, "To what kingdom does this belong?" "To the vegetable kingdom," was the ready response. Then with great pride he straightened himself up before those children and asked, "To what kingdom do I belong?" Immediately there came from the lips of a little girl in the rear of the room this answer, "Sir, you belong to the heavenly kingdom." It is said that Frederick of Prussia was moved to tears and replied that he wished all his subjects might belong to that kingdom.

That little girl has spoken a great truth. There is a kingdom greater than the mineral, the vegetable, the animal kingdom, and greater than all our civil kingdoms. When Francis G. Peabody addressed the students of Harvard University many years ago he urged them to cultivate "spiritual frontage" and to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. I believe that it is our great business to help build that kingdom and to give it that larger numerical and geographical expansion which is inherent in the very principles which it proclaims.

Several years ago Mrs. Paul Douglas, the wife of Senator DOUGLAS, was the Congresswoman at large from the State of Illinois. Her father, Lorado Taft, will always be remembered as one of America's foremost sculptors. One morning I said to Mrs. Douglas that I greatly admired her father and that I had recently come across a very significant exhortation which he gave in an address to a group of fellow sculptors. This is what he said, "What we sculptors need to do is to get back into our work the hint of eternity." Surely this is what we need to do in the greatest of all arts, the art of living. Let us go back and get into our education and life, with all its various vocations and avocations, the spirit of religion and the spirit of that eternal Christ whose name is above every name.

Richard Watson Gilder has written these lines which have always challenged and inspired me:

"If Jesus Christ is a man,
And only a man, I say
And to Him will I cleave alway.
And to Him will I cleave always.

"If Jesus Christ is a God
And the only God, I swear
I will follow Him through Heaven and hell
Through earth, the sea, and the air."

Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Altoona, Pa., Celebrates 103d Anniversary of the Junior Order, May 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1956, it was my privilege to address the 103d anniversary banquet of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, sponsored by the Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Altoona, Pa.

The address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 103D ANNIVERSARY BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE WARREN G. HARDING COUNCIL, NO. 372, JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 19, 1956

It is a privilege to be invited to deliver the principal address at this banquet commemorating the 103d anniversary of the Junior Order United American Mechanics.

One hundred and three years is a long time, but when you look back over the many accomplishments of the junior order in the field of Americanism it is only proper to say that the 103 years represent over a century of progress in the building of a better America.

It is an honor for me as a member of Pride of Mountain City Council, No. 472, to be asked to deliver the address on this occasion.

In choosing a subject, I have decided to talk to you of loyalty to one's country and an adequate national defense as twin weapons in the struggle against world comunism.

Before discussing the subject of my discourse, I wish to assure you that I have not changed my position as a strong supporter of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

There are many in Congress who share my views. Thus, I am confident that the effort being made to nullify the present law will not succeed.

Loyalty to our country is one of the virtues of every red-blooded citizen prompting him to utter the prayerful exclamation, "Thank God I am an American."

It is typical of men and women who belong to such a patriotic organization as the Junior Order United American Mechanics to Promote Love of Country, and in so doing warn of the existing dangers at home and abroad.

At the same time we must stress the importance of constant vigilance against those forces seeking to destroy the American way of life.

As a Nation, this year we are celebrating the 250th birthday anniversary of the immortal Benjamin Franklin.

An inventor, statesman, and diplomat, Franklin was well aware of the problems which a young Nation was about to face.

He was a firm believer in national preparedness, which is so strongly advocated by the Junior Order.

It is well to recall what Benjamin Franklin had to say on this subject.

Speaking of preparedness, Poor Richard, as he was known in printing circles, had this sage advice—and I quote:

"Let us beware," said Franklin, "of being lulled into a dangerous security; and of being weakened by internal contentions and

divisions; of neglect in military exercises and discipline, and in providing stores of arms and munitions of war; for the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be necessary to maintain it."

How right, Ben Franklin was—and is to this day.

Do we not all remember Pearl Harbor—and how difficult it was for us to get our war effort underway?

Today, we are in the atomic age—and time will work against us.

Preparedness, therefore, is a matter of top priority.

For years the Junior Order United American Mechanics has urged that greater attention should be given in our public schools to the teaching of American history—to let our children know exactly how hard-won were the liberties which we enjoy.

These youngsters should be made aware that they have an inheritance—that is priceless—and they should be training in their early days to be ready to take over that precious gift when they reach manhood and womanhood.

It was Franklin again who had these wise words to say in connection with our youth, and I quote:

"I think with you, that nothing is of more importance for the public welfare, than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue.

"Wise and good men are, in my opinion, the strength of the State far more than riches and arms."

Franklin was old and wise enough to know that if children are well trained in their heritage, they will be able to advance it through the arts and sciences and bring even greater glory to the Nation.

The Junior Order United American Mechanics is aware, too, of the evils of communism, and constantly has raised a loud voice about this menace to the welfare of our land.

With some other patriotic organizations, it was a voice in the wilderness because little heed was given until recent years, when communism reared its ugly head publicly by showing itself openly in parades and demonstrations.

The Junior Order had an answer for these public demonstrations and that answer was to emphasize the objectives of this patriotic group by urging greater love of country and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States.

The plea for an alert and educated citizenry must be heeded because it is the only solution to the problem of attacking and defeating subversive elements in our midst.

This positive expression of confidence in our way of life actually has caused public consternation in the ranks of the Communists—and, as a result, their public demonstrations have faded into obscurity.

But we are not fooled.

The Commies in this country have not disbanded—the threat of communism is still with us and at times becomes arrogant beyond belief.

Wasn't it Mr. Khrushchev who recently said, although he smiled while he said it, that "Communism would one day capture the imagination of the entire world"?

So we must be on guard.

We must continue to teach the American way of life as opposed to a life of slavery and degradation which communism brings.

We must make every American citizen awaken to his civic responsibility to combat this menace.

And we must urge our citizens to take full part in their own Government processes.

That is the message we have for our membership in commemoration of the 103d anniversary of the junior order.

Once more let us turn to wise and aged Ben Franklin, a man who was years ahead of his time in his thinking.

The words I quote now could have been uttered yesterday, since they fit so well into our international situation at this time.

Franklin had this to say on the question of world leadership—listen clearly as I quote:

"Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them—those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; 'tis a common observation here, that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own."

Truer words were never spoken in Franklin's day and can be uttered again today.

We are without a doubt the hope of the world if a way of life in which we believe is to be preserved for ourselves and extended to other people.

So we must be vigilant.

We must question those who would foist upon us ideas such as are found in UNESCO education pamphlets, which urge that we rescind our citizenship and join a world organization.

We must guard against those who feel we should sacrifice much of our sovereignty in order to allay the fear of other nations.

None of this need be done.

What we must continue to try to do is to give assistance to those who need it most.

In giving that assistance, we must tell them where it came from, and why we, as American citizens, are able to share our good fortune with others.

If this story can be gotten across in foreign lands, we have no doubt that in time, the people in Communist countries and their satellites will rise in their own wrath and destroy that system before it wholly destroys their precious countries.

Each nation cherishes its own way of life just as much as we do.

No one wants to be dominated by a power whose language and customs it cannot understand.

But there can be a common denominator, where respect for each other will be paramount, and where by an exchange of the necessities of life, we can actually turn swords into plowshares.

Instead of fearing an atomic explosion, we can benefit by the use of nuclear power for the good of all people.

We know that we are in a year in which much will be heard in the way of political propaganda as our two great parties in the United States strive for power.

And though we hear charges and countercharges, we are not alarmed.

When the chips are down, Americans will unite as no other people in the world.

Franklin knew that in his day.

For late in life he said:

"Do not believe the reports you hear of our internal divisions. We are, I believe, as much united as any people ever were, and as firmly."

Ladies and gentlemen, as we observe this 103d anniversary of the junior order, let us take to heart the words of Benjamin Franklin.

No matter what one hears, we are a united people working for a better place for each of us in which to live and rear our families in peace.

But we must keep our guard up.

For it is only by constant vigilance on the part of such organizations as the Junior Order that we as a nation can protect the American form of government and thus preserve our cherished legacy of liberty and freedom purchased with the blood of American patriots.

Therefore, let us resolve to continue our efforts to keep the United States strong and free and thus help to guarantee for our children—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which are their rightful heritage.

Congressman Brown Issues Eloquent Warning Against Court Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable PAUL BROWN is held in the highest esteem throughout South Carolina as well as Georgia. The following editorial from the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., recognizes the able address made by Mr. BROWN recently on the floor of this House:

CONGRESSMAN BROWN ISSUES ELOQUENT WARNING AGAINST COURT DICTATORSHIP

Americans who have long regarded Supreme Court decisions as final were shocked last week to read that the present tribunal has ordered reopened a case in which it awarded $90,000 to an accident victim.

This is the latest in a series of unusual—to risk the understatement of the decade—decisions by the Court headed by President Eisenhower's Chief Justice Warren.

How the Court has succeeded in piling conflict upon confusion was eloquently expounded in the United States House of Representatives by Representative PAUL BROWN of Georgia's 10th District.

"Is it any wonder," Representative BROWN demanded, "that editorials are being written which refer to the Supreme Court as a third House, when the rights guaranteed the States under the Constitution are being ignored; the authority of Congress is being disregarded; judicial precedent is being cast aside; and language is being written into the Constitution by means of judicial interpretation?

"Is it any wonder that the decisions of the Supreme Court bring uncertainty and confusion as a substitute for the peace and good order which earlier courts felt obligated to preserve?

"The Constitution of the United States has served us well for more than 160 years, the wisdom and foresight of its framers remain unequaled in history, and it is my belief that it is no less imperative that we adhere strictly to the principles of the constitutional government today."

Congressman BROWN referred not only to the school integration decision which 2 years ago last week made the date May 17 infamous, but to a more recent decision in which it was held that State antisubversive statutes are no good and others in which arbitrary sociological conclusions supplant or change the letter of basic law as set forth in the Constitution.

The Georgia leader sees this new concept of the Supreme Court striking at the very heart of judicial interpretation and constitutional government in America."

He warns that "if the Supreme Court is to be consistent, this new theory of ignoring the meaning of words when written will have equal application to all other provisions of the Constitution, as well as legislation passed by the Congress."

Unless there is a reversal of this trend, there is danger that this Nation will find itself subjected to the dictatorship of nine men with our liberties buried under a mass of decisions cut to fit expediencies of the day rather than the sturdy pattern of constitutional law.

Congressman BROWN has rendered his State and Nation a real service by spotlighting with unerring reason and unanswerable logic the growing menace to the liberties of a free people.

Nationalization of Property in Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Bolivia will be, as it has been for some years past, one of the chief beneficiaries of our Government's Mutual Aid program in South America.

Since Congress is currently considering this program for the coming fiscal year, I believe we should be extremely careful to see that the funds of the American taxpayers are used to help only those governments which respect and uphold international law.

Recently, several articles have appeared in the American press concerning Bolivia's nationalization policy. It seems that Bolivia is resorting to nationalization of property as an official government policy, thereby flagrantly disregarding its obligations to compensate United States and foreign stockholders when their properties in Bolivia are nationalized.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article on the subject by Mr. Edward Tomlinson, a veteran observer and corresponodent who has spent many years in Latin America. His article, which was published in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on April 28, 1956, reads as follows:

BOLIVIA LEARNS A LESSON IN TIN

(By Edward Tomlinson)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—President Victor Paz Estenssoro, of Bolivia, has just read off an important lesson in economics to nationalist politicians and leftist labor leaders in his own as well as in other countries of this hemisphere.

The Bolivian strongman, who took over the country by bloody revolution in 1952, expected to bring more gold, if not the golden age to the old Andean nation by confiscation of the giant tin industry. Four years and an empty treasury later, he admits that Government operation of the vast enterprise has been a failure.

President Paz not only declares, in effect, that nationalization of the mines has been financially disastrous, but that the mine laborers, chief supporters of his Government, are responsible for the fiasco. "They worked harder for the private owners," he says, "than they did for the Government."

LOAFED ON THE JOB

Few people ever work very hard for the Government in Latin America. Bolivian Government workers are some of the most efficient clock watchers in the world. It got them by political leaders insisting that the Government invade the field of private business enterprise.

Bolivian workers, of course, loafed on the job after the mines were nationalized. On the other hand, they didn't strike continually. They didn't carry on a consistent campaign of sabotage against the operators. They didn't organize riots and wreak vengeance upon foreign engineers and their helpless families, as they had been doing for years before the Government took over.

Even so, it is a little unfair to blame poor, illiterate Indians and cholos (half breeds) for the mistakes in policy and lack of technical and engineering ability of higher ups which brought misfortune to the country's number one enterprise. The workers listened to, and were pressured by these leaders into supporting the nationalization scheme.

The blame for what has happened rests squarely upon President Paz and his henchmen. He and they had preached confiscation for years. They embarked upon this latest Latin American economic misadventure in spite of the previous failure of nationalization and government operation of the oil industry.

Be it said to his credit, Dr. Paz tried to do something about the oil situation, although in a somewhat underhanded way. He has turned that industry back to private enterprise to operate, but not to those from whom it had been taken. Acknowledgment that nationalization of oil was a mistake did not include any thought of remuneration, or even open apology to those who originally spent millions to explore and discover that oil was there.

LEARNED LESSON

At any rate, in the closing weeks of his term of office, the Bolivian leader confesses he has learned that confiscation and nationalization of big private industry is a most unprofitable policy. His old companion in arms, Juan Lechin, big boss of the mine unions, has said nothing. It remains to be seen whether those who take office after Dr. Paz profit from his mistakes and his confession.

It also remains to be seen whether the nationalistic political and labor leaders in other Latin American republics learn anything from the Bolivian story. So far, little has been said about it in the Latin American press.

The Great Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an address made by Adlai E. Stevenson in New York on April 25, 1956:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

THE GREAT UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There can be no lasting freedom in America unless there is peace in the world. And there will be peace in the world only when we here in America prove that freedom means what we say it means.

We must show that freedom is the servant of the poor as well as the rich—for most of the world is poor; that it protects change—for most of the world is in revolution; that is it colorblind—for humanity knows no color lines.

We must prove that freedom contains that full measure of justice without which it could be freedom for the strong to oppress the weak.

I see freedom in the world today as the great life-giving river of which America is the source. It will be whatever we are, not more not less. So if we hope to make the principles of freedom meaningful in the world, we must first make sure they have mighty meaning for ourselves. We must—in our land, our own communities, and in our own hearts—live up to the values of individual freedom and individual right which are the basis of our American society.

Yet we must do this not just because it may exalt our leadership in the world, but, above all, for the sake of these values themselves—the values which give life and power to the great experiment in self-government to which we as a people have been so long committeed, and to which so many others in Asia and Africa now urgently aspire.

Our task is all the harder and the purity of our example all the more important because these people know little about these values of individual freedom and rights which lie at the root of free society and national independence. The achievement of equal rights for all American citizens is the great unfinished business before the United States.

This would be just as much the case had there been no Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools. That decision was simply an expression of our steady movement toward genuine equality for all before the law; it expressed in a new field the old principle that the American heritage of liberty and opportunity is not to be confined to men, women, and children of a single race, a single religion, or a single color.

Yet the Supreme Court decision requires social change in some areas of our country, and all social change creates massive problems of adjustment. The Supreme Court wisely left it to the district courts to determine the measures of good-faith progress.

There remains, however, the abiding responsibility of the executive branch of the Government to do its part in meeting this most fateful internal problem and the rising tensions that have followed in its train.

The Presidency is, above all, a place of moral leadership. Yet in these months of crucial importance no leadership has been provided. The immense prestige and influence of the Office has been withheld from those who honestly seek to carry out the law in gathering storm and against rising resistance.

Refusing to rise to this great moral and constitutional crisis, the administration has hardly even acknowledged its gravity. It is the sworn responsibility of the President of this Nation to carry out the law of the land.

And I would point out that this Office is the one office in the democracy, apart from the courts, where the man who fills it represents all the people. Those in the Congress bear particular responsibilities to the citizens of the States they represent, and on what is in some ways a regional problem their views are natually divided.

Not so of the Presidency. Where the Nation is divided, there is special demand on him to unite and lead the people toward the common goal.

As President, if that were my privilege, I would work ceaselessly and with a sense of crucial urgency—with public officials, private groups, and educators—to meet this challenge in our life as a Nation and this threat to our national reputation.

I would act in the knowledge that law and order is the Executive's responsibility; and I would and will act, too, I pray, in the conviction that to play politics with the Court's decision and the basis rights of citizens and human beings is wicked.

Hon. Loring M. Black

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened yesterday by the sudden passing of my good and old friend, Loring Black, and our former colleague

who served in the House from 1923 to 1935, as a Representative from Brooklyn.

Loring served with distinction in the House and was an active opponent of the prohibition law and its enforcement. He also sponsored much beneficial legislation on behalf of our veterans and was an early worker in the field of narcotics control. Loring was a gentle, kindly man, and I shall often recall the many pleasant hours I spent in his company. His was a friendship that I greatly treasured over the years, and I shall miss his keen sense of humor, his friendly visits and the many talks we had together. A gentle spirit has left us and we, his friends, are poorer for the loss, but we shall cherish his memory and hope that he now rests in peace.

Notice to Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee today voted out H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination, which was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, a member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. BYRON G. ROGERS.

This bill is identical to H. R. 11, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, except that the ROGERS' bill eliminates the preamble termed "Declaration of purpose and policy."

Application is now being made for a rule to bring to the floor of the House the aforesaid bill, H. R. 1840.

The texts of both bills follow:

H. R. 1840

A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination.

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13 (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however*, That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

H. R. 11

Declaration of purpose and policy

A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13 (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however*, That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

The Showdown on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, an informative article on foreign aid, written by Gould Lincoln, appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., on May 19. It dealt, in large degree, with a recent address by my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I hope that every Senator will find time to read this interesting article. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)
THE SHOWDOWN ON FOREIGN AID

As Congress approaches a showdown on foreign aid, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, veteran Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is emphasizing a basic and important reason for the continuance of nonmilitary aid to underdeveloped countries. It goes beyond the prevention of the spread of communism, although that still remains a primary objective.

Speaking recently to the New Jersey State Bar Association, Senator SMITH said:

"The nonmilitary foreign-assistance program must have a more human and more universal objective than merely the prevention of the spread of communism. Our primary nonmilitary objective should be as friendly partners to help fulfill the aspirations of the millions of people in the underdeveloped countries for freedom, independence, self-determination, and, of course, a higher standard of living."

The New Jersey Senator is firmly of the opinion that peoples of these underdeveloped countries, most of them in Asia and Africa, are eager to learn the know-how from America of real government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

He is convinced, too, that the peoples of these countries are eager to break away from the old imperialisms and colonialisms, and to be recognized as free and independent and without any form of external control. American aid, he insists, can be so given and administered as to convey the know-how of democratic self-government.

"If we can meet this objective," the Senator said, "the appeal of communism should disappear and should no longer be such a threat to our own future freedom and security.

"Stated in another way, our primary nonmilitary objective should be a human man-to-man contact with peoples who really wish to be free and who wish to know what brought freedom and liberty to the people of the United States."

Nonmilitary aid to these underdeveloped countries should also be designed particularly to improve the economic condition of their peoples, Senator SMITH believes. He warned that the gap between Western economic prosperity and that of two-thirds of the non-Communist world, which is underdeveloped, is steadily increasing. And, he added:

"Our own standards of living will advance only if we do our part in helping to advance standards of living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." He said, too, that if this country accepts the opportunity now offered to help make men free it will pursue the one course that can lead to an eventual and lasting peace.

The House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees are both engaged in whipping into shape the necessary legislation authorizing foreign aid for fiscal 1957. President Eisenhower has asked for a total of approximately $4.9 billion, of which $3 billion is for military aid, and $1.9 billion for economic relief and technical assistance.

Economic aid for most of the West European countries is out, as stated by the President in his foreign aid message to Congress last March. Rehabilitation in these countries has progressed enormously under the foreign-aid program since the close of the last war.

The importance of the nonmilitary foreign aid program has been greatly increased by reason of the Soviet Union's new drive to gain prestige and friends through economic assistance, especially in these underdeveloped countries.

Notwithstanding this fact, strenuous efforts are being made in Congress in this election year to chop the authorization of funds for economic aid, as well as funds for military aid. It's a shortsighted operation.

Furthermore, an important recommendation by the President that Congress declare a policy under which long-term commitments for economic projects in underdeveloped areas of the world may be made has been seriously under fire.

The President recognizes that one Congress cannot bind a future Congress, and that appropriations must be made each year for any project. But he feels that some assurance should be given that economic projects, undertaken in these underdeveloped countries, will be pursued to completion, though it be only a moral assurance.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, while refusing to accept the President's plan for a 10-year loan authority, went so far as to write into the bill a declaration that foreign aid should be continued as long as international communism remains a danger to the peace of the world and to security of the United States.

The foreign aid bill not only has to receive committee action, but also the action of the two Houses of Congress. Senator SMITH insists its passage is the most important immediate step Congress can take to assure a safe and more peaceful world.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*—
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*—
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*—
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*—
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*—
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*—
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*—
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The American Institute for Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a few short miles north of the thriving city of Glendale, Ariz., is located America's most unique and at the same time one of her most valuable schools. Founded by the late Gen. Barton Yount, the American Institute for Foreign Trade has in the few short years of its existence made itself felt on the economics of this country and Latin America. This institution trains young men and women to fit into the economic life of foreign countries at the executive level; and while the graduates are to be found around the globe, they have concentrated in the Latin American countries. In order that my colleagues may have a better understanding of this school, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article from the Arizonian, a weekly newspaper of Scottsdale, Ariz.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Scottsdale (Ariz.) Arizonian of May 11, 1956]

AND THEN THE WORLD—STORY OF A UNIQUE CENTER OF LEARNING

In round numbers—and much more literally than figuratively speaking—Phoenix, Ariz., is the world's training center for foreign trade. In all probability, more of the American-born men who become the business leaders of trade centers around the world in the next few years, wil have trained specifically for their foreign careers at the American Institute for Foreign Trade than in any one other school anywhere.

And, partly because the Institute is only 8 years old, and partly because its function is highly specialized as compared with the traditional ivy-clad alma mater, we have constantly to be reminded that this world-recognized and tremendously important fountainhead in foreign trade education is virtually a local institution: the American Institute For Foreign Trade is located at Thunderbird Field No. 1, a dozen miles west and north of Phoenix near Glendale. Actually, several members of the school's distinguished board of directors are residents of Paradise Valley.

In a few words, the school is primarily for college graduates who have decided to make a career of business in a foreign country and want specific, concentrated training in the language, customs, culture, attitudes and intricacies of foreign commerce in the country or part of the world of their choice. A 1-year course leads to the degree of Bachelor of Foreign Trade; the less usual 2-year course to the degree of Master of Foreign Trade. There are also short, intensive "Key Man" courses for groups of young executives, whose companies have selected them for foreign posts.

The rest of the short-version story is in terms of placement of AIFT graduates. "We train for executive positions, not clerkships or secondary jobs," says President Carl A. Sauer with pardonable pride, considering the results obtained. "Our students enter the Institute knowing where they are going and with completely businesslike attitudes; they graduate ready for key positions with the largest corporations."

FIVE HUNDRED IN KEY POSITIONS

Director of Placement Donald A. Johnson will be happy to show you the card-indexed result—2000 graduates, 500 of them currently in top foreign posts with American and international business concerns around the world. A few of the rest, of course, have returned home or never did "go out"—but most of the balance are currently on the payrolls of companies who want them to have preliminary service in the home office or the American sales force before being established in Latin America, South America, Europe, Asia or Africa. Soon there will be a thousand AIFT alumni in the Who's Who of world business.

CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED

Throughout the school year, and especially during the spring term, executives and personnel directors of some of the country's largest corporations visit the AIFT campus at Thunderbird and interview students preparatory to employing them for berths in foreign trade. Students are also furnished with the needs and requirements of firms everywhere, and carry on extensive correspondence with them in search of the one best opportunity. More than half the students in each class are hired before they have graduated. The rest go in search of their jobs, armed with a unique credential—a BFT from AIFT.

FOUNDED ON DREAM

Behind the record of quick and dramatic growth of a significant institution with implications of worldwide influence is a dream, of course—the dream of its late founder, Gen. Barton K. Yount, who believed international understanding could best be served by training at home to know and respect customs and attitudes abroad before attemping to live and work abroad. There was also a stroke of good fortune when the fledgling school acquired Thunderbird Field No. 1, wartime pilot training center, as a gift from the United States Government with all of the buildings and facilities of that famous plant. The third ingredient, hard work, has related principally to the difficulties of private financing through gifts and bequests—the institute has no Government support whatever beyond the original gift of land and buildings.

BIG FIRMS EMPLOY GRADS

A partial roster of companies employing AIFT graduates tells the story: Goodyear Tire & Rubber, Otis Elevator, Columbia Pictures Corp., Socony-Vacuum, Sinclair Oil, First National City Bank of New York, The Texas Co., Firestone Tire & Rubber, Time-Life International, Underwood Corp., Sperry-Rand, International General Electric Co., Gibson Refrigerator, Sherwin-Williams, Sears, Roebuck & Co., International Petroleum, Procter & Gamble, Carnation Co., General Shoe Co., Ralston-Purina, Union Carbide & Carbon.

That is the record—the sort of report that tells forward-looking businessmen what they want to know about an operation that merits their close attention and support. It is the business end of a business institute.

THE CAMPUS STORY

But the American Institute for Foreign Trade is also a college of sorts—it is coeducational, it has its social life, its problems in discipline, its unique methods in teaching—and the story of the institute, worth many times the words the Arizonian can accord it, would be by no means complete with out a little of the story of campus life at AIFT.

AT AIFT WIVES JOIN HUSBANDS IN PREPPING FOR THEIR NEW LIVES ABROAD

There have been 90 women who have been graduated from the American Institute for Foreign Trade. Of these, a third have married classmates.

But the fascinating and intensely practical coeducational aspect of AIFT is the number of married couples, some of them with one or more children, who spend a school year at the increasingly famous training center for young executives who are to have their business careers abroad.

In most cases the wives are not enrolled as students, but they are encouraged to take full courses in language and area studies to prepare themselves to start even with their husbands in the business of building a life in a strange land. These courses are without additional cost for wives—only food and lodging come extra if a male student has a wife with him. There is also provision for children; a nursery on the campus with full nursing and medical care are good examples of the practical, businesslike attitude of the school toward its students and the down-to-earth business they are about.

Wife-conditioning for the sometimes difficult adjustment ahead as the couple takes on an assignment in foreign trade is particularly important in the concern of the school, according to President Carl A. Sauer.

"The No. 1 cause of a man's broken career in this field is the wife who cannot or will not adjust to circumstances in living out of the country," he says. "The firms which have hired our graduates have noticed that the turnover rate on the job is significantly lower than the general turnover rate for foreign work, and this is attributed in large measure to the attitude with which the wives of our graduates accompany their husbands overseas."

Sauer reminds visitors that each student—and his wife, if he is married—definitely expects to spend, not a few years, but the balance of his active career in some foreign country. That makes it doubly fascinating to watch the language classes and area study groups in which wives are as intent on learning as are their husbands. Another natural and helpful result is that couples who intend to live in Latin America or the Argentine or wherever, tend to live and work together on compus and to become mighty good friends because of their common interest in the strange new world for which they are fitting themselves.

The campus and its buildings would do credit to any school, and there is no lack of informal recreation ranging from tennis and swimming to dances and parties. But discipline is a minor issue, for AIFT students are more mature and settled in their purpose than most undergraduates, and their concentrated, purposeful preparation for the job directly ahead is an earnest, demanding business.

Economic View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Economic View," by Harold B. Dorsey, which appeared in the May 21 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This article is well worth reading, and I commend it to my fellow Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC VIEW

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

CREDIT POLICY NOT CAUSING SLUMP IN AUTOS

Last week the president of General Motors Corp. reduced his forecast of 1956 automobile production by 15 percent and seemed to place much of the blame for lower automobile sales on the restrictive credit policies of the Federal Reserve Board. Certain facts suggest that he picked the wrong "whipping boy": the real culprit may be the automobile industry itself, and/or the fickle public.

Personal disposable income (after taxes) in the first quarter of this year showed a $16.1 billion (6.2 percent) increase over the first quarter of last year, but an analysis of personal expenditures shows that, either by choice or by necessity, this increase in purchasing power was channeled to uses other than the purchase of automobiles.

In the first place, it is difficult to see how there could be any quarrel with a $16 billion increase in personal purchasing power, whether or not one chooses to criticize credit policies. An increase of that size is one of the best annual gains on record. Nor do we see any reason to believe that credit policies had much influence on the public's use of this increased purchasing power.

It so happened that the public decided that it wanted to spend $4.3 billion (annual rate) more for food and beverages in the first quarter of this year than it did a year earlier. So 27 percent of the splendid increase in purchasing power was absorbed for these items.

Another $6.1 billion, or about 38 percent of the year-to-year increase in disposable income, was absorbed by higher expenditures for services. Since this latter item includes a theoretical "rental value of owner-occupied homes," it may be said that the figure partially reflects increased carrying charges on residential mortgages, as well as expenditures for transportation, amusement, utilities, and other service-type expenditures.

An additional $4 billion, or about 25 percent of the $16 billion year-to-year increase in purchasing power, had to go for higher installment debt repayments. Last year, when the automobile industry was conducting the aggressive sales campaign that caused installment debt to rise very sharply, it was difficult to focus attention on the facts: (1) that the installment debt had to be repaid; (2) that some of the buying of cars then represented the spending of future earning power; and (3) that the abnormally high sales were borrowing from future sales.

The $14 billion year-to-year increase for these three items combined, namely, expenditures for food, for services, and for installment debt repayments, thus absorbed in the first quarter 90 percent of the $16 billion increase in purchasing power. But the public also chose to increase its expenditures for nondurable goods other than food by $3.2 billion. So, by choice or necessity the public decided to channel all of the increase in purchasing power to purposes other than buying automobiles. As a result the amount of purchasing power remaining for making downpayments on automobiles and houses, and for adding to liquid savings, was at the annual rate of $17.8 billion in the first quarter of this year, which was actually $1.5 billion less than it was a year earlier.

But why blame it on credit policies? If these policies had been able to restrict the sharp expansion of installment debt last year, repayments of that debt would not have been absorbing such a large proportion of purchasing power this year. There would seem to be more validity for criticizing the fact that credit policies were not restrictive enough last year than there is in criticizing the restrictive policies that have been in effect this year.

As a matter of fact, new installment debt was being granted at the annual rate of $37.6 billion in the first quarter of this year, which is $2.5 billion higher than it was in the first quarter of last year. When this fact is considered in conjunction with the lower level of automobile sales, it would appear that the latter are dependent to a greater degree on installment financing this year than they were last year.

Furthermore, the seasonally adjusted annual rate at which new installment debt was being granted in the first quarter was still $3.3 billion in excess of the rate of repayment of such debt, indicating that the repayment requirements are still in a rising trend. These charges against purchasing power, at the annual rate of $34.3 billion in the first quarter, were absorbing about one-eighth of personal purchasing power.

These statistics strongly suggest that the real explanation for lower automobile sales this year is to be found in the facts that: (1) the industry's sales policies last year were too aggressive and thereby temporarily saturated the market; and (2) the fickle public decided it would rather spend a larger portion of its purchasing power for food and other nondurable goods, and for services.

[Billion dollars: Annual rate]

	1947–49 average	1953	1st quarter, 1955	2d quarter, 1955	3d quarter, 1955	4th quarter, 1955	1st quarter, 1956
Disposable personal income	$181.6	$250.4	$261.0	$267.1	$271.7	$276.0	$277.1
Expenditures for:							
Food and beverage	$56.0	$71.9	$74.0	$75.9	$77.5	$78.3	[1] $78.3
Services	$56.0	$81.8	$89.0	$90.2	$91.8	$93.6	$95.1
Installment debt repayment	$13.0	$26.8	$30.3	$31.2	$32.1	$33.4	$34.3
Subtotal	$125.0	$180.5	$193.3	$197.3	$201.4	$205.3	$207.7
Percent of disposable income	68.8	72.1	74.1	73.9	74.1	74.4	75.0
Balance of disposable income	$56.6	$69.9	$67.7	$69.8	$70.3	$70.7	$69.4
Expenditures for nondurables other than food and beverage	$40.2	$47.0	$48.4	$49.4	$49.5	$50.5	$51.6
Balance of disposable income	$16.4	$22.9	$19.3	$20.4	$20.8	$20.2	$17.8
Percent of disposable income	9.0	9.1	7.4	7.6	7.7	7.3	6.4
New installment debt granted	$15.4	$30.3	$35.1	$37.2	$38.5	$37.8	$37.6

[1] Partly estimated.

Friendship International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Capital's air traffic situation is becoming more critical every day, and there is general agreement that something should be done immediately to lessen the dangers which surround the overcrowded facilities at Washington National Airport. The major controversy in the matter is based on varying opinions as to the best remedy. Many of us who have studied the problem closely feel positive that the prompt use of Friendship International Airport is the only logical answer. There are others, however, who advocate that more than $50 million be spent to build a new airfield at Burke, Va., since they say the construction of such a facility would reportedly save about 15 minutes of ground-travel time for Washington passengers.

Several days ago, about 250 Washington-bound officials of the Civil Air Patrol—persons with a wide knowledge of airport facilities—were directed to land their planes at Friendship, because of the dangerous congestion at National Airport. They were then brought into this city via the Baltimore-Washington Expressway, and immediately reported that they found the trip shorter and easier than in most cities.

Among the numerous newspaper accounts which mentioned the incident was an editorial in the May 21, 1956, edition of the Baltimore News-Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAK FOR FRIENDSHIP

For a day, at least, Friendship Airport, stepchild of Washington officialdom, yesterday managed to punch a chink in the armor of Washington National Airport, fair-haired boy of these same officials.

Because of the dangerous congestion at Washington, 58 Air Force planes started flights into Friendship to bring Civil Air Patrol officials from all States to their annual meeting in Washington.

These officials, numbering about 250, were being transported from Friendship to Washington by bus without hitch and with little more expenditure of time than would have been entailed by use of Washington National port.

At the same time, about 1,000 Baltimore schoolteachers visited Friendship for Eastern Airlines' "Educators' Airlift" and thousands of other visitors viewed late-model Air Force and Navy planes on display there.

These events confirming the availability of Friendship for large-scale services, are provisionally gratifying, but they reflect only a temporary crisis at Washington. The CAP flights were just a crumb that fell from Washington's table.

The Baltimore area is not satisfied with such crumbs. It deserves and demands full

status as a regional airport for both Baltimore and Washington.

The brief new demonstration of Friendship's fine, ample facilities and its availability did, however, serve a purpose as a strong argument against the revived project to build a $50-million-plus supplemental Washington airport at Burke, Va.

Six members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate have suggested that while Burke is being built the overflow from Washington Airport should be diverted to Friendship.

To our mind the events of this week-end pile up evidence that the Burke project should not be built at all—that it would constitute an unjustifiable waste of the taxpayers' money, at least until the full potentialities of Friendship shall have been absorbed.

The Soil-Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, soil-bank provisions in the Agriculture bill passed Friday by the Senate have been the subject of many letters received from Oregon farmers in recent weeks. This past week there came to my desk a letter which spells out in detail how George S. Zimmerman, long a farmer in Yamhill County, plans to incorporate the soil-bank provisions into his farm plan. Mr. Zimmerman shows the true feeling of a conservationist. He is a man who believes that the acres he farms are lands placed in his trust to hand on to coming generations. Farms will be preserved from the heavy toll of erosion, noxious weeds, and soil depletion when tended by men dedicated to their stewardship of the soil.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zimmerman's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE S. ZIMMERMAN GRAIN CO., INC.,
Yamhill, Oreg., May 15, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is written to show you how a good soil bank will work on own farm to our advantage. My son-in-law and I operate a 620-acre farm in Yamhill County, which includes some leased acreage. We believe this farm to be pretty typical of the grain and stock farms found in this part of the Willamette Valley.

Like most of the valley farms we have Canadian thistle, morning glory, wild radish, and a little wild garlic. Part of this land needs additional drainage; the open ditches should be cleared out and their banks gently sloped. Soil needs additional liming.

We are definitely planning on a soil bank this year as you will see from the following steps already taken: Our 100-acre wheat allotment was voluntarily cut to 50 acres. Three acres have been put in permanent pasture. Forty-seven acres is at present in summer fallow with no crop this year. We are concentrating on the killing of Canadian thistle and other weeds, doing a thorough job because there is no crop on the land to interfere. We will also put in more tile and clean and slope open ditches properly, distributing surplus earth to best location. We will also lime this acreage and spread manure from livestock barns during next few weeks.

By systematically following this procedure on different fields for next 10 years, we can have a farm free from noxious weeds, with adequate drainage, well limed, giving us greater fertility.

This will be a better heritage for our children and grandchildren than money in the bank. Let us have some real action on the soil bank program immediately, so we may be adequately compensated for our efforts in preserving soil fertility for future generations. Please do not fail us.

Yours sincerely,
GEORGE S. ZIMMERMAN.

Wisconsin Honors Leo Crowley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a week ago there was honored in the capital of my State, Madison, a hometown boy who had truly made good—an outstanding son of the Badger State and a truly great American. I refer to the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, chairman of the boards of the Milwaukee Road, as well as of the Wisconsin Public Service Corp.

A most noteworthy group of leading Wisconsinites was on hand to pay tribute to Mr. Crowley, who has held a great many posts of distinction in our Government, as well as in private life.

Leo Crowley is not of my political party, but he is certainly of the breed of Wisconsinites of which all Americans and all the inhabitants of my State can well be proud.

I send to the desk the text of an article which was published in Thursday's issue of the Wisconsin State Journal describing the festivities in his honor. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORED AT DINNER, CROWLEY RECALLS FDR WARNING ON RUSS

(By Lew Roberts)

A few days before he died, Franklin D. Roosevelt advised against giving Russia any undue economic advantage, Leo T. Crowley said Wednesday night.

Crowley—the Madison boy who has sat in the halls of the mighty—was acclaimed at a testimonial dinner at Hotel Loraine here by 750 friends and business associates.

Crowley, chairman of the boards of the Milwaukee Road and the Wisconsin Public Service Corp., was accorded two standing ovations by an audience which included the justices of the Wisconsin Supreme Court and other leading officials of government and business.

Crowley's comments on foreign aid to Russia came after he was commended by the main speaker of the evening, Thomas E. Coleman, president of Madison-Kipp Corp., and a longtime leader in Wisconsin and national Republican circles.

The 67-year-old Crowley was in the limelight of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration as one of the most influential men in Washington for 13 years.

Coleman praised Crowley for his work in writing the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and for holding to his commitments as head of lend-lease operations during World War II that lend-lease not be extended after the war.

"We handled $45 billion in lend-lease funds and we committed ourselves that it was a war measure, not to be extended to the post-war period," Crowley said when he spoke after Coleman.

"The last Friday night before President Roosevelt died I asked him after a cabinet meeting about lend-lease," Crowley said. "I told him the war was coming to an end and we must be sure to cut it off."

Crowley quoted the late President as responding:

"That's right, Leo. I want to do that. We must carry out our commitments but we must not give Russia an undue economic advantage. I have yet to get the first compromise out of Stalin, and I've been insulted by him."

Coleman said that one of Crowley's most important contributions "was that he thought perfectly straight and acted in a straight line when there were so many people down there (Washington) who were confused."

Harry Stuhldreher, former University of Wisconsin football coach and now a United States Steel executive, set the tempo with the comment that "everything Leo's ever done has been done for somebody else." Stuhldreher was toastmaster for the dinner.

Oscar Rennebohm, former governor and a member of the university board of regents, said that Crowley has shown the qualities that Wisconsin "is spending millions to try to instill in our students."

J. P. Kiley, president of the Milwaukee Road, credited Crowley with revolutionizing operations of the railroad since he joined it in 1945.

"Leo will never let me do anything around Madison unless it's going to redound to Madison's benefit," Kiley said. "Not that I'd want to."

James R. Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, said he was speaking as chairman emeritus of the Wisconsin Public Service Commisison in reminding the audience of the saying that public office is a public trust.

"There is a new concept now—that corporate office is a public trust," Durfee said. "You, Leo, exemplify that new concept."

Lt. Gov. Warren P. Knowles called Crowley "one of our most illustrous native sons" and gave him temporary custody of a loving cup which will be in annual custody of the president of the Madison Transportation Club, sponsors of the banquet.

A memory book signed by the guests at the dinner was presented to Crowley by Vern S. Bell, president of Bell & Farrell, Inc., a club member.

Elmer Layden, Chicago transportation executive and Notre Dame four horseman, who spoke at the first annual meeting of the Madison Transportation Club 6 years ago, gave Crowley an honorary membership in the club.

The program was opened by M. Lee O'Brien, president of the club.

Coleman was applauded when he suggested removal of Federal estate taxes which amount to $850 million a year. He said this tax was strangling the small-business man in Ameirca, while the United States was supporting foreign economies to the tune of billions.

Conservation Award to Nelson Brothers, of Morrow County, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a clear pattern, I believe, is developing among America's leading farmers. They invariably seem to set an example for their neighbors in their adherence to the most progressive farm practices. They will not tolerate weeds, attacking them on every square foot of land, with a "massive retaliation" made possible by modern chemistry. Contour tillage, trashy fallow, seeded right-of-ways, scientific pasturage, crop rotation—these are terms one uses in describing a modern, progressive farm operation.

If we follow the modern farmer away from his acres we discover him using his time away from home participating in the community life—as master of the Grange, president of the Farm Bureau, chairman of the school board, or exalted ruler of the Elks.

Usually he has been to college and his wife, after winning prizes for her pickles at the county fair, may rush off to New York or Washington for a national AAUW convention.

I say these things, Mr. President, after reading the story written by Mrs. Tom Wilson, of Heppner, Oreg., reporting in the Pendleton East Oregonian of May 18, 1956, the award to the Nelson brothers, Alfred and Norman, of Lexington, Oreg., of the title "Conservation Men of the Year."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for the inclusion of Mrs. Wilson's report in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NELSON BROTHERS CHOSEN FOR CONSERVATION AWARD

(By Mrs. Tom Wilson)

HEPPNER. — Stubble mulching, sodded waterways, contour seeding, and grass rotations are among the conservation practices of Nelson brothers, which won for them the Morrow County "Conservation Men of the Year" award, announced Tuesday night at the Morrow County Wheatgrowers Association annual spring meeting.

Norman and Alfred H. Nelson, Jr., started stubble mulching on their 3,600-acre ranch 6 miles north of Lexington in 1934, and since 1948 have used only subsurface tillage with spikes to control their soil from wind and water erosion. An average of 1,600 acres is cropped yearly.

Firm believers in the benefit of grass rotations with wheat for improving soil structure, Nelson brothers have had as much as 400 acres in grass at one time and at present have 160 acres in grass. In 1950, they began nitrogen fertilizer application to augment soil fertility.

SEVERAL GRASSES USED

Grasses used in 20 acres of sodded waterways, seeded grass pastures and over 6 miles of field borders, ditches, and slopes are crested wheat, bulbous bluegrass, pubescent wheatgrass and sheep fescue. In addition they have seeded crested wheatgrass on about 2 miles of highway rights-of-way adjoining their property as a weed-control measure.

Listing the control of annual weeds as one of the biggest financial gains for wheatgrowers, Nelson brothers began working with the Morrow County agent, N. C. Anderson, on the program in 1948. Liquid spray has been applied yearly since the initiatory program of dusting with 2,4–D the first 2 years.

Early fall seeding when moisture permits is followed by the Nelsons who seed out field corners first and practice contour tillage with as much rough, trashy fallow as possible.

With their wheat operation Nelson brothers run 20 head of Herefords on over 200 acres of native grass and crested wheatgrass pastures and stubble. Registered bulls are used and a regular testing program followed. Farm buildings are in top shape and a complete ranch shop is maintained.

About one-third of the ranch is owned by Nelson Bros. and the remainder leased from their father, A. H. Nelson, Sr., who was born in Sweden and began operation of the ranch in 1913. Norman and Fred Nelson, who have worked on the ranch all their lives, began their partnership in the thirties and assumed full-time operation in 1946. They give credit to their father for his example in the practical and progressive care of the land. Nelson, Sr., was one of the sponsors of the Lexington Blow Control District of which Fred, Jr., is presently secretary. Mr. and Mrs. Nelson, Sr., retired in 1938 and now live at Oak Grove, Oreg.

ACTIVE IN WHEAT LEAGUE

Both brothers are active in farm organizations including the Oregon Wheat League, Morrow County Cattle Growers Association, Farm Bureau, and Lexington Grange, of which both are past masters. Norman Nelson is county agricultural and stabilization committee chairman, a member of the Wranglers Riding Club, and the Elks. Fred Nelson is a member of the Ione School Board, a 4–H leader, and member of the South Morrow County 4–H Council, and the Masons. Both attended Oregon State College.

In addition they are cooperators in the Heppner soil conservation district and expressed appreciation for assistance from both the district and the county extension service.

Mr. and Mrs. Norman Nelson have 2 children, Charles, 6, and Kristin, 4. Mr. and Mrs. Fred Nelson are the parents of 3, Kenneth, 12, Karen, 7, and Keith, 5.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, May 3, I was absent from the Senate because of illness. I had intended to make a statement to the Senate on that day, and I regret that I was unable to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

On this 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, lovers of freedom can feel new optimism that the chains binding Poland to the Communist tyranny will be broken in our time.

One cause for optimism is the debunking of Stalin by the Communist leadership of Russia. Does this mean that the slavemasters are aware of their monstrous crimes? Do they fear the wrath of the subjected peoples and seek to divert it to the dead leader? There is room for hope.

Another cause for optimism is the assertion by the Communist premier of Poland reecntly that there is to be more democracy in Poland, that the parliament there is going to be allowed more scope for debate and criticism. Here, again, there is room for hope.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was a splendid document, closely paralleling our own Constitution—then 2 years old. It is one of the tragedies of history that the brave Polish people have been able to live only a few years under their noble charter of liberty.

We in the free world hope and pray that freedom of the type embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791 will come again to the people of Poland.

With steadfast resolve on the part of liberty-loving Poles inside and outside of their beleaguered homeland, and with the unrelenting support of free peoples elsewhere, Poland can and will be restored to the ranks of a democracy.

Potential Hazard in Serving Liquor on Planes in Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on May 11, 1956, entitled "Follow the Leader to Tragedy?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLLOW THE LEADER TO TRAGEDY?

Again airplane pilots, stewards, and stewardesses have spoken out against the potential hazard implicit in serving liquor on planes in flight. Again 2 bills—1 in the Senate and 1 in the House—are pending which would forbid interstate advertising of liquor.

The flight personnel are talking about the bald risk of having themselves and their charges imprisoned thousands of feet above the ground with one or several drunken passengers. Senator LANGER and Representative SILER are talking about the national risk of continuing to expose youth and susceptible adults to the massed forces of modern advertising importuning them to start drinking or to drink more.

The public concern that eventually will compel the airlines to take liquor off their planes is part of the same public concern that eventually will bring about a policing of liquor advertising. The airlines and the liquor industry both feel that concern.

The airlines suggest that the stewards and stewardesses really are less interested in safety than they are in extra pay for doubling as barmaids. If so, then why do the pilots, who are not called upon to be bartenders, also protest?

The airlines argue that competition forces them to serve liquor to stay in business. Aside from the obvious question as to how, then, do the 3 major airlines which don't

serve liquor stay in business, 1 is compelled to ask: Must the other 7 play follow the leader with competition until somebody goes over the brink? Until, to quote the president of the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses Association, "we have some great liquor-caused plane tragedy"?

The Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a concurrent resolution passed by the California State Legislature in our community. We are proud to honor the new Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A great many of these fine Americans live and work in the community I represent in Congress. I want to join with many others in paying tribute to their daily achievements and their contribution to our wonderful America.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE LOS ANGELES TEMPLE OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

Whereas the people of the State of California have recently witnessed the completion and dedication of a beautiful and majestic edifice of worship and service—the Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and

Whereas this notable achievement will be an impressive reminder of the part played by the heroic Mormon people toward the exploration and colonization of California in the midyears of the 19th century; and

Whereas the first contribution came when the good ship *Brooklyn*, under command of Samuel Brannan, arrived at San Francisco, July 31, 1846, bringing 230 people, many of whom figured notably in the early history of the bay region; and

Whereas the second contribution was the Mormon Battalion, a body of 500 men enlisted at Council Bluffs, Iowa, as United States Infantry, under orders to explore and chart a highway for transcontinental traffic between Santa Fe and San Diego. This body of men served as military patrol at San Diego and Cajon Pass. In Los Angeles they built Fort Moore and assisted in raising the United States flag, July 4, 1847. This marked the beginning of California-United States history; and

Whereas the third contribution was the colonization of San Bernardino in 1851 by a group of 437 people who made their way from Utah in 150 wagons. They became the founders of that beautiful city; and

Whereas in the past 80 years approximately 150,000 of these intelligent and enterprising people have settled in California and have made notable contributions to the progress and prosperity of this State in business, finance, manufacture, agriculture and industry, as well as in the cultural fields of literature, music, entertainment and education; and

Whereas in this same period of time these devout and progressive people have erected more than 200 places of worship in the communities of California—chapels, recreation halls, auditoriums and welfare centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Legislature of the State of California convey to the officials and members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints the congratulations of the State of California upon the completion and dedication of the great temple in Los Angeles, and commend the church and its people upon the contributions made to the progress of the Commonwealth of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to President Daniel O. McKay at the general headquarters of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Los Angeles Temple of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, and to the Honorable Hugh C. Smith, 1021 Zelzah Avenue, Granada Hills.

Foreign Aid Is No Sacred Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current proposals for a complete reexamination of our foreign-aid program, I ask leave to call to the attention of the House a recent editorial in the Atlantic City Press entitled "Time for Stock Taking," which I think very well expresses the need for a complete review of the program. The editorial follows:

TIME FOR STOCKTAKING

The idea is growing in important quarters that a thoroughgoing review of this country's foreign-aid program is much in order. It makes much sense, since we have not had one since 1947.

President Eisenhower favors review by a high-level commission free of partisan leanings. Chairman WALTER GEORGE, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, earlier had advocated a similar study and his suggestion gained the evident approval of the members of his committee.

A full study of foreign aid, preferably by an independent group not directly affiliated with Government, would seem to serve significant purpose.

First of all, even assuming that those in the administration who now prepare foreign aid proposals are exercising utmost care, they are too close to the matter to see it with any detachment.

The program requires the dispassionate look of the outsider.

Back in 1947, when the Marshall plan was just shaping up, the Nation got such a study.

One group, nonofficial, considered aid from the viewpoint of our capabilities. Another, under then Representative Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, examined it from the standpoint of the actual needs of our foreign friends.

From that time on we have been advancing foreign assistance, either economic or military, virtually without interruption. The emphasis has shifted from Europe to Asia and from economic to military, but the program has gone on.

It is no reflection on those who annually frame new aid plans to suggest that a certain haphazard, unsystematic element may have crept into a program that is now nearly 10 years old.

We need to be sure that in 1956, as in 1947, we are spending our billions wisely in terms of both foreign needs and our own ability to bear the load.

We need to be sure, too, that if the program is going to go on and on it will do so because of clearly understood purpose associated with high Government policy.

Fears have increased over the years that the program is running to some extent on sheer momentum.

Some will say that a review of foreign aid would be designed simply to afford excuse for cutting it down.

It is known, for instance, that Senator GEORGE is in political difficulty in his native Georgia from former Gov. Herman Talmadge, a rival who is shooting at foreign aid giveaways.

We can acknowledge that reexaminations of foreign aid often are urged by its opponents (which GEORGE never has been). But we cannot for that reason say that an impartial, high-minded study of the question is either unnecessary or unwise.

Foreign aid is no sacred cow.

If it is necessary to the safety of this Nation and its friends, there is no doubt it will go on. Still, it is completely reasonable to seek an independent check upon it.

Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, just to prove the assistance which Vice President NIXON is giving to the President, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the following article by Andrew Tully, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

When it comes to social duties out in the blazing sun on the White House lawn, President Eisenhower can feel lucky he's got Dick and Pat Nixon in his official—and political—family.

The President and Mrs. Eisenhower gave their annual lawn party for several hundred disabled veterans yesterday afternoon and the Nixons saved the day. They did it merely by doing their job, while most of the other big shots shirked theirs.

At these outings, Ike and Mamie stand under a marquee outside the White House balcony and shake hands with the veterans as they file by. Then the vets disperse onto the south lawn where they are served ice cream, cakes and punch and, theoretically, are entertained by members of the Cabinet, military chieftains and the White House staff.

LONELY

But until the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon showed up, the vets were pretty lonely. Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, and Mrs. John Foster Dulles, wife of the Secretary of State, spread themselves thin chatting with the guests, but the other big names seemed to have urgent business among themselves. Generally under generous shade trees.

They were all genial enough, but they seldom ventured from their own little groups for more than a quick handshake.

But then the Nixons arrived and the veterans started to have some fun. While other official ladies stood prettily around the fringes, Pat Nixon grabbed a tray and started passing around punch.

TOAST

Several times she had a few sips from a cup herself to toast a wounded soldier or sailor. She posed for a dozen separate snapshots. She looked at pictures of wives and girl friends.

Meanwhile the Vice President seemed to be all over the place. He'd spend a couple of minutes with one group of servicemen, leave them laughing, then bust in, unannounced, on another covey. He traded statistics and historical facts with them on their home towns, quoted baseball batting averages and voted with the majority on climatic peculiarities of various sections of the world.

RECIPE

Once, chatting with Alexander Logan, of Kew Gardens, N. Y., the Vice President offered a recipe for chili. Joe Bulloch, an old-timer from the Old Soldiers' Home here via Anniston, Ala., told the Vice President the Republicans would win this fall "but jest by a hair." Mr. NIXON grinned a political grin and regretted that "I can't talk politics today."

The Nixons looked tired when the shindig finally broke up—tired and hot. After all, they'd worked pretty hard. But they'd done a swell job of turning a hot afternoon in the sun into a pretty good party.

The Importance of Small Business in Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the importance of small business in our national economy should be of continuing interest to all of us. Many definitions have been given of "small business," but my particular interest, for the moment, is directed to the millions of independently owned and operated small local enterprises found in every community throughout the land.

I am vitally interested in this subject because of my conviction that small, independent business is essential to our free enterprise economy. The Federal Government's function should be to provide a healthful climate wherein our people will be given incentive to take the risks which go with commercial ventures.

Many of us were appalled a few years ago when the Federal Government attempted to seize the steel industry. But it would be next to impossible for a grasping National Government to seize our millions of small enterprises. They are a bulwark in the people's defense against Government domination of free men and private property.

Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues recognize the big part played by small business in the growth of our country. Several proposals are now before the Congress which would provide varying degrees of tax relief to small corporations. It is my feeling that our present tax laws do not make sufficient allowances for the small unincorporated business operator to plow his profits back into his business. This is especially noticeable in the retail field.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, many small concerns can ill afford the heavy overhead expense made necessary by the numerous tax records required today. I am gratified to note that a study has been proposed to consider the impact of Federal taxes on individual taxpayers, small business, and the national economy.

I have asked a representative group of my small, independent business constituents to give me their views on these matters so that I may report more fully to the Congress the grassroots thinking on this important subject.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

At a mass meeting commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of the 3d day of May, held at the Polish Union Hall, 761 Fillmore Avenue in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the year 1956 marks the 165th year of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, which document was the most liberal and the most democratic constitution of its day; and

"Whereas the Republic of Poland has been deprived of her political independence and has suffered the loss of approximately one-half of her eastern territory and 13 million of her citizens having been unjustly and arbitrarily absorbed by the brutal action of the Soviet Union and contrary to international law; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union is at the present time in total and in complete domination of what remains of the Republic of Poland with her Red army and the puppet Red government; and

"Whereas these unfortunate events that followed the end of World War II were conceived and agreed upon at the now infamous conferences of the Big Three at Teheran and Yalta, from which it appears that because of the temporary political expediency, democratic principles were forgotten and solemn pledges of the Atlantic Charter were broken.

"Whereas the present western boundaries of Poland on the Oder and Nisse Rivers have been historically Polish territory through the ages; and

"Whereas the present leaders of the Soviet Union have allegedly repudiated some of the dastardly actions and crimes against humanity of their later leader Stalin, having branded him a murderer and a disgrace to the human race; and

"Whereas the Red Polish Ambassador in the United States, Romuald Spasowski, and his agents have been systematically pressuring Polish refugees who found sanctuary in this country to return behind the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas communism continues to threaten our own liberties in these great United States of America through infiltration into our schools, into our factories, into Government agencies, and various other institutions and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, as Americans dedicated to the freedom of all nations, we feel dutybound in the name of justice and equity to take a firm stand in defense and restoration of the just rights of our ally, the Republic of Poland; be it further

"Resolved, That we firmly believe that the decisions of the Teheran and Yalta Conferences concerning Poland and other nations, arrived at without their representation, be revoked and repudiated entirely; be it further

"Resolved, That we protest against any change in the present western boundaries of Poland as presently constituted, inasmuch as they have always been historically Polish; and the eastern boundaries as they existed on September 1, 1939, should be restored to Poland; be it further

"Resolved, That we petition our Government to remain alert and extremely vigilant to the assumed New Look of the present leaders of the Soviet Union until such time as they roll back the Iron Curtain and free the captive peoples of Poland and other enslaved nations, and until they admit and make amends for the massacre of the Polish officers and soldiers in Katyn Forest and the atrocities committed on our American soldiers in South Korea; repudiate the lie of germ warfare, desist from further aggression in the Near East and Asia, and return all prisoners now held in slave-labor camps; be it further

"Resolved, That we compliment and commend our State Department for the firm stand that was taken against the Red Polish Ambassador, Romuald Spasowski, relative to the coercion and pressure he has been exerting upon the Polish refugees who have found a sanctuary and haven in our beloved country; be it further

"Resolved, That we petition our Government to continue to eradicate communism from our land and our institutions, and that it continue to take all necessary steps for our defense that we remain prepared on land, on the sea, and in the air in order that we can properly defend our homes and our loved ones against any possible future aggression of the Soviet Union; be it further

"Resolved, That we, as loyal citizens of the United States of America, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and alegiance to our great and beloved country; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and to our Congressman, the Honorable Edmund P. Radwan; also to Hon. Herbert H. Lehman and Hon. Irving M. Ives, United States Senators."

Resolution committee: Chairman, Michael E. Zimmer, Judge, City Court of Buffalo; Chester Koval, Comptroller, City of Buffalo; Peter G. Zawadzlir, Councilman, City of Buffalo; Joseph S. Matala, Attorney at Law; Walt C. J. Jose, Attorney at Law; Rose Biedron, State Chairman of Polish Women's Alliance of America.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *May 6, 1956.*

America, Beacon of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the prize-winning essay of the America, Beacon of Hope contest, sponsored by the ladies auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States in the 21st annual national contest, written by Regina Parisen, aged 16, of 331 East 33d Street, New York, N. Y. This young lady, who attends the Immaculata High School, has written an outstanding message from and to the youth of our country. Miss Parisen's essay was winner in the city of New York area contest:

AMERICA, BEACON OF HOPE

As the immigrant boats pull into our harbor, a strange and wonderful sight greets their eyes, for there is a large statue of a woman holding a torch standing in the middle of the water. Why is it there? It is there to welcome these people and to make a promise. A promise that the men will get work, that there will be enough to eat, and that the children will grow up to be good Americans. Her name? She is the Statue of Liberty, and her promise is made to all men, regardless of race, color or creed.

The story of America has been told many times, by learned men and by eloquent orators. But, what about the ordinary American, the man who is never called upon to tell others what he thinks about his country, the mechanic, the bus driver or the storekeeper? No, he does not orate on America, he hasn't got the ability to speak, but he shows his feelings in a far better way. For he is the man that fights and perhaps, dies for his country. He is the man that makes America what she is, the land of the free.

And what about American youth, how do they feel about America? What does it mean to them? Well, I'll tell you, because I'm an American teen-ager. It means that we can go to our own church on Sunday, and no one will stop us or harm our family because we went. It means that we can go to school and receive an education and someday be the good Americans that we want to be. And we want to be the best Americans we can, and be able to tell others about our country too, not as a statesman or an orator, but as an American citizen.

We feel that the ideals of America should not be kept for Americans alone but are for all the world. For they are the ideals of freedom, democracy, and love. To all men belongs the gift of freedom, because that is the way God made us, to be free. Some people say that certain countries are not ready for freedom. How can this be, when we are born free, and are ready from birth to take our place in the ranks of equality and fraternity? It is democracy that makes us free men, for we rule ourselves and our laws are our own. Perhaps this is not the only course to freedom, but it is our way and we have followed it successfully for hundreds of years. We are not trying to force any country, against their will, to be a democracy. We are only anxious that they enjoy the same freedom that we do.

Most important of all is the ideal of love. For despite tyrants, dictators, and democracies, love rules the world. It is the force behind all charity and religion. It is the force that makes America the refuge for the homeless, the poor, and the oppressed. These people are seeking love, and we have love to offer. The inscription on the bottom of the Statue of Liberty cries out for these people, for these are our people and America is their land. Is it any wonder that Americans will so readily defend their country? They built her and she is theirs.

Ours is a land of brotherhood. An American knows that wherever he is, he has a mighty big country and a great many friends back home. An American in trouble is never alone, but has a lot of people helping him, because he's no stranger, he's one of us.

But what about the immigrants on those boats, are they one of us? They are. America is a land of immigrants, and they are as much a part of her as we are, for without them, there would be no America. Will they understand that? Perhaps not. Perhaps the older people will always be waiting for that knock on the door that brings sorrow and pain. It will never come, I know.

The future of this country depends not on the older people but on the youth. It is they who will forge the future of our land. Therefore, it is up to us to teach them how. They learn in our schools, and from our teachers, but most of all they learn from us; the American youth. How can we teach them? Just by showing them why we think that our country is the best in the world.

We'll take a young immigrant boy and call him Joey. Where is Joey from? It doesn't matter, he's here now. But how shall we begin? We can tell him about the history of our country or about her great men, but how can we explain the thing that makes men die for her, the strange thing that makes us love her so much? Will the history of our country tell Joey what it is that makes America the land of hope and dreams? No; because it's not something that historians can write about in books. Ours is not just a country, it's an idea. Let's try telling it this way.

You know, Joey, a man named Lincoln once said, "this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from this earth." And he was right. For as long as there is one American who lives, and loves, and can fight for his country, this Government shall not perish. America is not just a land, it's an idea and an idea not only in the minds of men but in every beat of their heart. Yes; Joey, as long as there is one oppressed man in whose heart the breath of freedom lives, then America lives on. If someday this land of ours should exist no longer, then know that Americanism has not died, but lives, and will live forever, in the hearts of all free men.

The Growing Narcotics Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as an outgrowth of my particular interest in the public health problem, it was my pleasure in the 83d Congress to introduce legislation dealing with apprehension and treatment of narcotics addicts in the District of Columbia. This legislation was subsequently passed by the Congress. It has, I believe, provided a solid framework upon which to build a system of control and eventual eradication of the foul menace of drug addiction.

In retrospect, it is apparent that the pioneer drug-addict law is lacking in several vital precepts. First, it does not provide for sufficient control over the individual once he is singled out for possible commitment as a drug addict, and the time lag between preliminary examination and commitment proceedings permits the addict suspect to drift away from this jurisdiction. Existing law does not provide for an interim detention order.

Second, enforcement officers are seriously handicapped by the strict Federal search-and-seizure rules under which they must operate in the District of Columbia. A suspected dope pusher's residence may not be searched at night except upon a warrant obtained by an affidavit from an officer who can swear that he has positive evidence narcotic drugs are located in the premises to be searched. While the probable-cause rule obtains for daytime searches, the nighttime positivity requirement operates as a serious handicap because practically all traffic in narcotic drugs occurs during the sunset to sunrise hours.

A third glaring weakness is to be found in the police officers' lack of authority to arrest on probable cause for misdemeanor violations under the Uniform Narcotic Act. A valid arrest for such violation may be made only when the officer has a warrant or when the violation is actually committed in his presence.

Similarly, neither Federal agents nor Metropolitan Police are authorized to make wiretaps, or to use wiretap information, in order to corroborate testimony or detect new evidence of narcotic law violations. Admittedly controversial, wiretapping is permitted in a number of States and, because the telephone plays an important role in the drug peddling business, use of the wiretap is highly desirable in illegal narcotics investigations. I am told that drug peddling has been virtually wiped out of Philadelphia because of two recent raids staged successfully by enforcement officers after they had gained the information they needed through wiretapping.

Yesterday I introduced an amendment, in which I am joined by a number of other interested Members of Congress, which broadens existing dangerous drug laws to include barbiturates and synthetics that are not presently covered. It also attempts to correct many apparent practical weaknesses in the existing statutes which are pointed out above.

I do not anticipate that there should be any substantial opposition to this bill, because all Members of Congress and all citizens who have the interest of our country at heart will want to do whatever is reasonable and necessary to stamp out the growing drug addiction problem in the Nation's Capital. One needs only to consider the fact that drug addiction is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation to comprehend the seriousness of this problem. Even more shocking is the fact that addiction has grown from a ratio of 1 addict to every 10,000 people, at the end of World War II, to about 1 to every 3,000 people in the United States at the present time, and about 13 percent of the addicts are minors less than 21 years of age.

Drug addiction is a contagious thing, with one addict spreading the habit to members of his family, friends, acquaintances, and associates. It should be treated as such. It is inevitable that this $500 million per year traffic will increase unless sharp measures are taken to remove the supplier and the user from society for appropriate treatment.

I would invite the attention of all my colleagues to the legislation I have introduced, which will provide more effective methods for dealing with this tremendous problem in one of the more troublesome narcotic drug centers of the United States, the Nation's Capital.

Preserve Our Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Boston Post entitled "Jap Textile Goods Peril Northeast Mills, Cause 20 Percent Cut in Employment."

This is an excellent article. It stresses in substance just what I have been stating to the House in past and recent remarks. It parallels some of the evidence, which I presented to the United States Tariff Commission in support of certain applications by Massachusetts industries for relief through the escape clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Reading this article, one can readily appreciate how serious the industrial situation created by very unsound and unwise provisions of pending trade treaties really is. One does not have to be a trained economist or even a member of the industries affected to realize how damaging these textile imports are to many industries, workers, and communities.

It is obvious that if this flood of imports continues or increases a great many more textile industries will be driven to the wall and forced to liquidate.

What kind of a program is it anyway, which as a national objective, chooses to increase prosperity overseas and at the same time cause distressing unemployment here in the United States?

Every reasonable American is willing to help foreign nations within our capacity and in every feasible way. But we should not be expected to render this aid in terms of billions of dollars and then in addition enter into agreements and create conditions which enable foreign imports to flood American markets and knock out American industries and throw thousands and thousands of American workers out of employment.

Viewing the operation of this law, one would wonder what the origin of it was, what motivation, sincere or otherwise, brought it forth, what brand of statesmanship permits its continuance with steadily aggravated damage and detriment to American industries and our own fellow citizens, who are employed in them.

Looking at this situation objectively, one could hardly be blamed for wondering whether we need economists, statesmen, or psychiatrists to furnish us with the explanations. But one thing is definite and certain—that unless relief efforts and remedies are soon vigorously sought and applied, there will be little, if anything, left of our American textile industry.

To make the situation even worse, we can take note of the sad fact that similar conditions are developing in many other industries in this country because of the operation of this law, and I can only express the hope that enlightened self-interest will soon prompt wise statesmanship to check this growing menace to the American economy.

Some may be absorbed with nuclear physics, quantum mechanics and the theory of relativity to such a degree that the handwriting on the wall may appear to them only as a dim mirage. It is much later for the textile industry and for the American economy in a very real sense than some people believe, and I hope and urge that action can and will be taken in the very near future to apply appropriate remedies, which will correct these intolerable conditions and put a stop to the unreasonable and growing flood of foreign imports, which are undermining and threatening to upset our economic balance, the stability of many established American industries and the employment of millions of worthy, faithful American workers.

The article referred to follows:

JAP TEXTILE GOODS PERIL NORTHEAST MILLS, CAUSE 20-PERCENT CUT IN EMPLOYMENT

Japanese textile imports flooding the American market have caused a 20-percent cutback in employment in New England mills, and further slashes are expected if the Federal Government does not act to halt the cheaply produced goods, it was disclosed yesterday.

In the past 3 weeks operations have been curtailed at a dozen mills by 3 New England firms employing nearly 12,000 workers.

Two major divisions of the Bates Manufacturing Co. in Maine have reduced their output. Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., has cut back productoin 20 percent at 3 mills in Fall River and 1 in North Adams.

A number of other textile manufacturers in the area have said that if the Government does not take prompt action, they will be forced to close down completely.

William F. Sullivan, secretary of the Northern Textile Association, warned that New England manufacturers cannot compete with firms in Japan, where textile wages are less than 15 cents an hour.

"Japanese imports are having a particularly severe impact on fine combed goods, notably ginghams and velveteens, which are produced in New England," Sullivan said. "Bad business conditions, which are causing curtailment in our New England mills, are likely to generate further unemployment.

"It is apparent that unemployment and more short time will develop unless the Federal Government adopts a firm policy against the excessive cutthroat competition from low-wage countries such as Japan."

Sullivan added that the situation is aggravated by the present United States policy of selling raw cotton at cut prices to foreign textile manufacturers.

Sullivan said that while the cotton industry is trying to fight back against cheaply produced cotton goods, reports have been received that the Japanese now are planning to move into the woolen and worsted fields.

If this competition should materialize, he said, it would weaken the textile situation further in this area.

Federal Aid To Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the Board of Education of the City of Stevens Point, Wis. The letter dated May 16, 1956, from the Board of Education of the City of Stevens Point was signed by each member of the Stevens Point school board. The letters follow:

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Stevens Point, Wis., May 16, 1956.

The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAIRD: We are writing you in regard to H. R. 7535, introduced by Representative KELLEY, and S. 2905, introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and 14 other Senators). These bills are designed to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities in financing public elementary and secondary school construction.

We oppose the Federal school aid as provided in these two bills for the following reasons:

1. State and local responsibility for schools is clearly established under the Federal Constitution and by the constitutions of the several States; it is deeply embedded in the American tradition.

2. American schools have made spectacular progress under State and local responsibility. Educational opportunities are now greater than ever before and greater than in any other country. School-building activity has established new records in each of the past 5 years. Each year more classrooms are being built than are needed to accommodate the increase in enrollment.

3. School needs can be seen and felt more clearly at the local level than in Washington. Action can be taken in communities and States. The Federal Government cannot give anything to the States unless it first takes it away from their citizens. There are no resources in the United States, no wealth or income which are not located within the borders of the 48 States and which are not subject to their taxing powers. Nor is there any restriction on State support of schools save the willingness of their residents to be taxed.

4. The Federal Government has taken on too many responsibilities, and its taxes and debt have become excessive. This would be made worse if new obligations were forced on the Federal Government. The States are in a better position to take care of school needs than is the debt-ridden Federal Government.

5. The trend of growing centralization is threatening to upset the balance of power between the Federal Government and the States. If continued it will destroy the Federal system, concentrate all power in Washington and turn the States into mere administrative subdivisions. If schools should be added to the responsibilities of the Federal Government, the balance of power would be irretrievably lost.

6. It is naive to expect that Federal control of the school system would not creep in and grow if Federal money were provided for school support. The effect of Federal aid would be to transfer the control of the schools from the communities to the professional bureaucracy.

Local school boards have long arranged for their own construction contracts and they bargain to save school funds. Under one of the proposed laws, even the wage rates paid in constructing local schools would be fixed under Federal law—or no Federal money would be granted. The Secretary of Labor would determine a prevailing wage rate and his decision would be final.

The Board of Education of Stevens Point, Wis., by unanimous decision is not in favor of these bills as proposed and we would respectfully ask that you vote against them.

Very truly yours,

Board of Education: T. G. Holthusen, President; A. E. Anderson, Vice President; Gordon Hanson; Leo Larsen; E. S. Hoppa; Francis Roman; Fred Klingbail; Dr. W. G. Wochinski; L. V. Courtney; M. E. Sorensen.

MAY 21, 1956.

Mr. T. G. HOLTHUSEN,
President, Board of Education,
Stevens Point, Wis.

DEAR MR. HOLTHUSEN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 16, 1956, signed by all members of the board of education of the city of Stevens Point. I appreciated very much receiving your very explicit views regarding H. R. 7535 introduced by Representative KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Two separate bills are before the Congress at the present time. The Kelley bill sponsored by the Democrats provides $400 million in direct grants to States for 4 years. Each State would receive the same amount, $11.30 per school-age child regardless of need, ability or present effort. The Eisenhower bill would provide for $250 million a year for 5 years giving more aid to those States with the least income per child and less aid to those States not making an effort in their own behalf, but paying some aid to each State. Regardless of whether the Congress takes the Kelley bill or the Eisenhower bill, the amount of money contained in each of these bills for direct grants is small when compared with the total school construction need of the entire country. Instead of putting this Federal aid out in dribbles, it should be used in those areas which have made the maximum effort to solve their own school problem but find it impossible to construct needed classrooms without Federal aid. Certainly the Eisenhower bill does an infinitely better job in meeting this need test than the Kelley bill. It is defective, however, in that it pays aid to States which have the ability to finance their own schools and to States which are not making the minimum effort in their own behalf. These two bills must be amended so that they will contain an adequate need requirement. Federal aid must be used where a State, because of inadequate resources, is unable to do the job.

It is wasteful for the Federal Government to give funds to all States, extracting tax money from the rich ones, deducting its administrative expenses and then returning it to the rich and the poor in the form of assistance. The Federal Government is justified in attempting to equalize the ability of States to meet their needs by serving as a medium whereby the richer States can contribute to the poorer States much as we apportion equalization aid to the various school districts in Wisconsin.

I certainly want to commend the Stevens Point Board of Education for making the very thorough study which was made of the Fedral aid to education proposals. Your letter to me of May 16 was evidence of the fact that this legislation had been very carefully and thoroughly considered by your school board. I further want you to know that your views have been and will continue to be given very careful and thorough consideration by me at all times.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

South Atlantic Region of the Propeller Club of the United States Recommends Early Construction of Cross-Florida Barge Canal

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the attention of the general public a resolution recently unanimously approved by the South Atlantic Region of the Propeller Club of the United States, in convention assembled. This resolution enthusiastically endorses the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and recommends the early appropriation of construction funds for this congressionally authorized project. In addition, the resolution sets out a great deal of valuable background information on this project. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas a project to construct a waterway across north Florida to connect the waterways of the gulf and the Atlantic is as old as the recorded history of Florida; and

Whereas the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was authorized by Public Law 675, 77th Congress, approved July 23, 1942, in these words:

"In order to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment, there is hereby authorized to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers a high-level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico in accordance with the plans set forth in the letter of the Chief of Engineers dated June 15, 1942"; and

Whereas the early completion of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal in providing the connecting link between the Intracoastal Waterway system of the Atlantic and the gulf will afford economic benefits to the Nation, the South-Atlantic region and the State of Florida; and

Whereas this project is the key to other navigational projects in the southeastern area, as indicated by the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War in 1945, in his justification of the project for deepening the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami to 12 feet, as follows:

"A protected waterway having at least a depth of 12 feet with widths ranging from 90 to 150 feet has been completed from Norfolk, Va., to Jacksonville, Fla. In Public Law 675, 77th Congress, approved July 23, 1942, Congress authorized a high level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico which will have minimum widths of 125 feet and a depth of 12 feet. Plans have been completed for the early post-war construction of this Cross-Florida Barge Canal which connects with the early postwar construction of this Crossviously referred to, the waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, which will constitute a principal feeder to these other sections, has been completed to a depth of 8 feet for a width of 100 feet. I am firmly convinced that there will be an ultimate requirement for a project of 12 feet depth and suitable width to accommodate commercial needs of the waterway from Miami to Jacksonville. This requirement may not exist in the immediate postwar period, but will certainly become necessary when the Cross-Florida Barge Canal has been constructed and placed in operation"; and

Whereas the project will afford increased recreational facilities as is indicated by the resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in his report to the Director of Civil Works Division of the Office of Chief of Engineers in 1946, as follows:

"The recreational opportunities afforded vacationists from all parts of the country by the waters adjacent to the Cross-Florida Canal route constitute a national asset of unquestionable magnitude. Provision of the Cross-Florida Canal will make the recreational waters of the gulf coast and Atlantic coast accessible to each other, thus extending the cruising range and stimulating the use of this kind of craft. Direct benefits will result from dedication of previously useless land to use for mooring, storage, servicing, repair, and boatbuilding. There will also be a definite saving in the cost of passing between the recreational waters of the Atlantic and gulf coasts of Florida and the adjoining States"; and

Whereas the benefits to national defense which will be derived from the completion of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal are stated by the resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in the same report, as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers has stated as his opinion that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost. During the actual conduct of hostilities, comparative means of placing essential supplies, in sufficient quantities, at the proper points, are measured, not in dollars, but in units of time, materials, and manpower against the available national reserves of these vital elements. The primary necessity for gaining the final military decision in war at the least possible cost in the lives of our nationals renders monetary yardsticks a secondary consideration. But there is, nevertheless, a definite value, apart from purely military considerations, in the avoidance of loss of ships and cargo through enemy action. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an annual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities"; and

Whereas it has been recently estimated that the insurance value of the avoidance of war losses due to enemy action referred to by the Chief of Engineers and projected into the year 1955 to be in the amount of $16,440,000 annually; and

Whereas in 1951 the Secretary of Defense reported to the President that—

"The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that 'a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. * * * Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to

move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Key route.'

"During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation"; and

Whereas Gen. Carl Spaatz has recently called public attention to the threat of the vast fleet of Russian submarines to the security of our Nation and the Washington Evening Star has recently written an editorial on the same subject; and

Whereas Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT has made a statement in the extension of his remarks recently in the House of Representatives calling attention to the editorial on April 20, pointing out that there is urgent need for this country making a more adequate defense against Soviet warfare, and stated that "our experience in World War II with a much smaller German submarine fleet shows that we should not delay any longer the beginning of construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. The canal would justify its construction costs many times from the savings which might be made against submarine-incurred shipping losses should we ever have another war": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Atlantic Region of the Propeller Club of the United States, at its sixth annual meeting in Jacksonville, Fla., April 26, 1956, recommend the early appropriation of construction funds for this congressionally authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as being economically desirable and urgently in the national interest; be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be sent to the Members of Congress representing the South Atlantic States, to members of appropriation congressional committees, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to the Governor of the State of Florida, and to such other parties as may be appropriate.

Cyprus Echoes Irish History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R. I., of May 12, 1956. The title of the editorial is "Cyprus Echoes Irish History," and I commend it to the attention of every Member of this House. In my opinion the article draws a particularly apt analogy between the fight for Irish independence 40 years ago and the present struggle faced by the Greek nation.

The editorial follows:

CYPRUS ECHOES IRISH HISTORY

As somebody has said, just change the names in Cyprus and you have Ireland all over again.

The British experience in trying to suppress the deep passions of political nationality in Ireland by force should have warned the Eden Government of the increasing difficulties it would have to face in making the same attempt in Cyprus. The pattern runs true to form—and to history.

The execution of the two Cypriot terrorists by the British (they were called "patriots" by the Greek primate in Athens) had a direct parallel in Ireland. The leaders of the 1916 Easter Rebellion in Dublin, members of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, an extremist minority, were executed by the British military for their uprising. The executed men included one severely wounded man who had to be helped to a chair to face his executioners.

The Easter Rebellion had at first shocked Irish public opinion as a rash and suicidal affair. Disavowals of complicity in it were speedy and vigorous. But when the rebel leaders were executed, national sentiment switched. Once the blood of the Irish was up in bitter anger against the executions, there was no turning back. Two years later, the patriotic Nationalist Party, Sinn Fein, swept the country in elections and set up a rump republic.

Because a handful of rebel leaders were executed and suffered martyrdom, the historic home rule issue died with them. After Easter week, the Irish would settle for nothing less than political independence.

The British campaign of repression in Cyprus is a familiar story in Ireland, and the responses of the Cypriots are the same. Reprisals have already started for the execution of the two Cypriots. It was basic policy with Michael Collins, the Irish guerrilla leader, to take lives for lives. When the British burned a house for sheltering rebels on the run, the guerrillas burned two British houses in Ireland. Like the Black-and-Tans in Ireland, the British troops in Cyprus rope off an area and search house by house for arms and rebels. As in Ireland, if the people refuse to give information about terrorists, collective punishment and fines are imposed upon the specified area.

The curfew is in effect in Cyprus as it was in Ireland. Fat rewards are his for the informer who comes forward to betray his countrymen; and, as in Ireland, his number immediately is up and the rebels concentrate upon shooting him. The frightening silence that at times settles over Cyprus is not the quiet of peace; it is freighted, as in Ireland, with sullen hatred. The British find, as in Ireland, that working against a civilian countryside loyal to the cause is like trying to pick up quicksilver. The tolling of the bell has a different meaning to the British from what it has to the Cypriots, as the British discovered in Ireland.

It is true that the British feel that in Cyprus their very existence is at stake because of the strategic importance of the island to the Middle East and its precious oil for British industrial and military life. But the Cypriots think like the Irish—they are reckless of all but their passion for freedom and independence from an outside power. The execution of the two will resolve doubts in the minds of the Cypriots and stir passion in the timid. The force of an aroused and uncompromising nationality is, like religion, extremely deep in human beings and, when aflame, can be suppressed only by a ruthlessness of which the Russian State is capable but which its own public opinion will not permit to the British Army in Cyprus.

Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here two letters from people who well express some of the arguments against the arbitrary acts of the Public Health Service in forcing the fluoridation of city water supplies upon our citizens. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that these letters be printed in the RECORD as I believe that this program of fluoridation presents a real menace to the health and rights of our people. No one should be forced to submit to this kind of medication against his will.

Immediately following the letters are some remarks of my own concerning the subject of fluoridation.

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 7, 1956.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon learning that Congress has been asked to appropriate almost three million dollars to the United States Public Health Service to combat dental disorders, it becomes clear to me that this money would be used for one purpose and that is propaganda. Fluoridation is always paid for by the cities which put it in, but this agency always sends a team out around the country to wine and dine the dentists, public officials and P-TA members. This costs money to be sure and the newspaper advertisements which are all layed out for the newspapers to use cost money too. The "kits" which this department has printed up for use by the American Dental Association and to send to Congressmen are also expensive.

Whenever a court case comes up it is someone from the USPHS who travels across the country to testify against local citizens who do not want to be mediated by public water supplies. In our case here it was Dr. Nicolas Leone, who told us that now fluoridation is considered even good for adults and especially good for women over 40. He did not say in what way.

Please, sir, would you be favorable to a joint congressional investigation by an impartial committee entirely free from promoters of fluoridation? A committee composed entirely of trained statisticians would prove in a hurry that the figures and charts put out by the USPHS are deceiving and deliberately falsified. The whole subject should be traced back to the beginning of the idea and I am sure some very interesting information would be brought out.

With a son in the service I resent the order by some Government agency that all naval and Army bases be fluoridated. Why? Are there so many little children under the age of 8 on any base?

This program stems from the World Health Organization in 1951 and although France, Switzerland, and other countries have held fluoridation to be dangerous, we are forced to submit to it. France has held it to be against individual freedom and is France to be more concerned with such freedom than the United States? We need your help to get to the bottom of this menace and I hope you will do what you can to get such an investigation started. Thanking you for whatever you can do, I am,

Yours very truly,
GLADYS ZUBE
(Mrs. Arnold G. Zube).

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *May 8, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURDICK: I am reliably informed that Congress has been asked to appropriate some millions of dollars to the Public Health Service to "combat dental disorders." It is strongly suspect that if such funds are made available they will be used in part or in full to disseminate propaganda in favor of fluoridation of public water supplies.

If it is deemed appropriate to grant the request, I urge the Congress to specifically stipulate that not one penny of it be used to beat the drums in favor of the strongly

suspect and highly controversial practice of fluoridation.

I am a graduate of the University of Washington and have taught chemistry for many years. The case against fluoridation is simple and logical. No doctor worthy of his profession would prescribe the same medication for an entire population regardless of whether the individuals were old or young, weak or strong, sick or well and I testify that fluorides in any amount constitute a medication. This is not to say that in some instances such poisonous substances as fluorides may not be beneficial. Strychnine may also be a useful medicine in some cases, but it is highly unscientific to prescribe either of these substances as a mass medication.

The second point against fluoridation is, that it is an invasion of civil rights. Never before in the history of this Nation has an adult been compelled, against his better judgement, to take any medication for the alleged prevention of a noncommunicable disorder. Fluoridation is an entering wedge. If water supplies can be medicated, then individually or in mass, citizens may be forced to take medications they do not need nor desire and they will therefore no longer be secure in their persons.

Fluorides are available in low cost, easy to take, tablet form for those who want and need them. Once water is fluoridated this salt cannot be removed by boiling or any simple means short of distillation, so everyone who drinks the water is being forced to take a medication.

I earnestly request that you read this letter to the Congress and have it, or some similar testimony, inserted in the RECORD.

Yours very truly,

CARL T. RICHARDSON.

Chemical treatment of drinking water is supposed to prevent the decay of teeth—that is what the experts say. This may or may not be true, but the advocates of fluoridation of water cannot say, at this time, what deleterious effects such chemicals have on the general health of the public. There is much evidence that they do have a noxious effect.

If a choice must be taken between sound teeth and life, then I submit that life should take precedence. Teeth can be artificially supplied, but life cannot—at least not yet. Any individual can struggle along with "store teeth" and still be able to conduct his business, profession, or calling with very slight impairment of his natural faculties, but if his life is ended prematurely it will not make much difference whether or not his teeth have been preserved.

Before we go too far with fluoridation the public should know what results the use of these chemicals have on the general health. A man can still be of some use in life with Sears, Roebuck teeth, but he will be considerably handicapped if his liver and other vital organs have been eaten up by chemicals.

Current Racial Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement on current racial tensions adopted by the Department of Christian Social Relations of the Protestant Council of the City of New York.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON CURRENT RACIAL TENSIONS ADOPTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS

Recent events have made all Americans aware of the racial tensions which have developed in our southland. Amid the outcries of extremists, the crisis demands clarity of thought and unusual courage, free from the divisive spirit of hate, vengeance, and demagogy. As Christians, we are committed to justice and equality, sought vigorously through reconciliation and accompanied by continual expressions of love and understanding. We commend those individuals and groups—white, Negroes, and biracial—which have resisted the demands of mob passion and blind emotionalism. Our admiration has been especially stirred by the remarkable display of good will and religious faith.

This is not the time for Christians of New York or other parts of the North to think of the race question or of specific matters of discrimination and segregation as problems peculiar to the South. We are conscious of our own shortcomings in New York City. While nondiscriminatory employment is well established, we have moved only gradually in the direction of nonsegregated housing and interracial churches. In the changing racial makeup of our metropolitan area we incessantly undergo difficult adjustments. We recognize our own shortcomings in this field. Nevertheless, we feel compelled to speak out emphatically and without qualification against the un-Christian practices that have divided society along lines of race or color.

Our churches have already made their voices heard on the sin of segregation. We voice again the sentiments of the National Council of Churches which, speaking through its general board in 1952, renounced the pattern of segregation based on race, color, and national origin as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the gospel of love and human brotherhood, and stated its forthright intention to work for a nonsegregated church and a nonsegregated society. The implementation of this goal must be the persistent aim of all our people, not only in the Southland but in our own neighborhoods as well. Accordingly, we suggest to our churches as an immediate step a program of prayer.

One of the encouraging aspects of this otherwise sorry picture is the response of people everywhere to the suggestion of prayer. We urge a sincere and earnest participation in the several periods of prayer already being arranged. These include observances during Holy Week, as designated by the Right Reverend Horace W. B. Donegan, bishop of the New York diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church; the prayer session scheduled for the evening of March 28 at Manhattan Center as originally proposed by the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.; and on May 17 the observance sponsored by the National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., and other groups.

We urge that these periods of prayer—those already arranged and those yet to be scheduled—be experiences of repentance, with emphasis upon our sense of contrition for the inadequacy of our living and of our failure to measure up to Christian principles in our relations with persons of other races. Let us pray that Christian people in all parts of our country will learn to work together, in due adherence to law, for the establishment of the standards given us in our Lord's teaching, concerning the equality and brotherhood which should prevail among God's children. Furthermore, we urge that these seasons of prayer be followed by concrete action, in order that what we speak with our lips, we may believe in our hearts and practice daily in our lives.

ORRIN G. JUDD,
Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, Protestant Council of the City of New York.

Some Observations on the Problem of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the preparation of a discussion of economic trends for the annual meeting of the Colorado Bankers Association on Monday, May 21, at Colorado Springs, Colo., I gathered what information I could, plus seeking the opinion of the best informed men in our Government on the subject and I was forced to tell the Colorado bankers that there appeared to be no general agreement as to what the immediate trend is, much less what the conditions would be next year. So I gave it as my personal opinion that there are at work in our economy both inflationary and deflationary factors but if the Federal Reserve Board did not yield to political pressure I felt that the inflationary forces could be controlled. If controlled, the natural and probable consequence would be that the gross national product for the current calendar year would be somewhat less than for the previous year, although, of course, our economy would be on a safer and sounder basis.

I also said that if inflationary forces were not controlled by self-controls imposed by bankers and businessmen generally, the current boom would be pushed to higher and higher levels but that in the natural course of events the resulting price inflation would eventually price so many consumers out of the market that a boom of that character would inevitably turn to deflation and once that turn had occured the psychological effect of a switch from business optimism to pessimism would undoubtedly accentuate the deflationary movement and perhaps in a serious degree, notwithstanding the very high level of Government expenditures now being contemplated for fiscal 1957.

It was, therefore, gratifying to me to have those views more or less sustained in the address delivered in Boston the same day I was speaking in Colorado Springs by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. And in asking permission to have inserted in the RECORD the full text of Dr. Burns' address I wish to emphasize the statement he made about the effect of inflation and especially his statement: "When an economy is poised on a very high plateau, as ours has been in recent months, the threat of inflation cannot

be very distant. The like, unhappily, is also true of the threat of recession."

In other words, in spite of what has sometimes been referred to as built-in devices against a future business cycle of boom and bust, it is still possible to have another experience of that character. Whether we do or not will depend in part, as Dr. Burns has pointed out, upon the exercise of Government controls, especially with respect to restraining or easing credit as the situation at the time may indicate. In that connection it is highly important for the Federal Reserve Board to maintain its independence. But even more important will be the willingness of businessmen and labor leaders to forego present opportunities for quick gains in behalf of a satisfactory level of enterprise generally on a sound and stable basis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

(Address by Arthur E. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, before the National Federation of Financial Analysts Societies, Boston, Mass., delivered May 21, 1956)

When you invited me several months ago to speak at this meeting, I sought protection under the umbrella of the title "Our Economy Today." But on looking through your program, I found that you will be reviewing with some care the current fortunes and prospects of our major industries. One of the general problems that you will be pondering in the course of this review is the future of the dollar, and it occurred to me that I might venture a few observations on this very large subject.

It is frequently said that we are living in an inflationary age, that the dollar is depreciating in value, and that it is likely to continue depreciating. The history of recent decades lends some support to this thesis. But it is well to keep in mind that the years from 1933 to 1939 were dominated by efforts to engineer a recovery of prices as well as of production, and that the broad movement of prices from 1939 to 1951 was dominated by war finance or its sequelae. Although the period is very brief, it seems desirable to give special attention to the course of events since 1952 if we wish to sense the forces that may be operating on the general price level in the years immediately ahead.

The past 4 or 5 years have witnessed an extraordinary economic expansion in our own country and Western Europe. People everywhere have been impatient with their standard of living and eager to improve it. Capital expenditures have been rising by leaps and bounds. Spending on armaments has added heavily to the surging demands for raw materials and labor. Unemployment has been low in practically every part of the Western World. Nevertheless, the average level of prices in consumer markets has risen little in most places, and it has been virtually stable in the United States. If there has been a tremendous upsurge of demand during the last few years, there likewise has been a tremendous expansion of supply. We must not overlook this fact.

Since 1952 the domestic level of consumer prices has moved within a range of about 1 percent. It rose eight-tenths of 1 percent between 1952 and 1953, rose another three-tenths of 1 percent between 1953 and 1954, then fell three-tenths of 1 percent between 1954 and 1955. In March the index of consumer prices was three-tenths of 1 percent higher than a year ago, but one-tenth of 1 percent lower than 2 years ago. These are diminutive movements. The essential fact is that the general price level in consumer markets has been quite steady.

We often hear that the steadiness of the consumer price level is largely the result of divergent trends in the prices of foods and other things, and that the price level of consumer goods would now be significantly higher if the prices of foodstuffs had not fallen. This is a dubious argument. For if the prices of foodstuffs had been higher than they actually were, people might well have spent more money on food and less money on other things, thus curbing the rise in the prices of goods other than foods.

But it is not necessary to engage in speculation on this point. The vital fact is that the prices of foods have not been alone in declining since 1952. Indeed, the general level of nearly every major category of commodity prices in consumer markets has moved downward. While the average of food prices was 3 percent lower in 1955 than in 1952, the average of apparel prices was 2 percent lower, the average of household appliance prices was 11 percent lower, the price average of furniture and bedding was 3 percent lower, and the price average of automobiles and related supplies was 6 percent lower.

When we take the commodities bought in consumer markets all together, it appears that a decline has occurred every year since 1952. In 1955 the average level of these prices was 3 percent below the level in 1952. This March the average level was six-tenths of one percent lower than a year ago.

The basic distinction in recent consumer prices is not between foods and other articles, but rather between commodities and services. While commodity prices have been declining, prices of services have been rising. The prices of some services—such as dwelling rents and medical fees—are still adjusting to the great inflation of the 1940's. These prices have been catching up, so to speak, to the broad price movement that occurred earlier. The prices of other services, such as work by domestic employees, barbers, and repair establishments, have been reflecting the upward trend of wages. When the rising trend of prices of consumer services is combined with the declining trend of prices of commodities, we get a virtually stable price level since 1952, as I've already noted.

I have been speaking of the consumer price level because that is the price level that figures in the thinking and lives of all Americans. What happens to that price level determines how much a typical family can buy with its dollars. What happens to that price level determines whether we can safely rely on the savings that we have accumulated in bank accounts, pension funds, life insurance policies, and Treasury savings bonds. By contrast, the movements of prices in wholesale markets are of direct concern to only a part of the population—those who are engaged in business dealings. However, wholesale prices are more sensitive to inflationary developments than are consumer prices, and it is therefore desirable to take notice of recent trends in wholesale markets.

Here, some substantial advances have occurred. The average level of prices of processed materials used in industry, including components, parts, and supplies, has risen steadily since 1952, and rather sharply since June of last year. The prices of finished goods purchased by business firms—that is, machinery and equipment—have behaved in similar fashion. Construction costs have likewise risen materially. These are the prices and markets that reflect the pressures of our great expansion in investment. Other price movements have been much tamer. Nevertheless, the average of all industrial prices, which rose gently in 1953 and 1954, began advancing rapidly around the middle of last year. The average of these prices is now 5 percent above the level of last June. It is the broad movement of industrial prices that has caused special concern and renewed fears of inflation.

However, it is well to observe that the wholesale prices that bear most closely on consumer markets are not depicted by an overall average of industrial prices. While the upward push of prices has been conspicuous at the wholesale level of consumer as well as producer goods, the fact is that since 1952 the prices of consumer durables have on the average risen less in wholesale markets than have the prices of producers' equipment. The prices of nondurables, exclusive of foods, have risen still less, while the prices of foods have declined.

In considering the general value of money in wholesale markets, we must take prices all together, regardless of the destination or character of the commodity. When we do that, we find only minor movements. The overall index of wholesale prices stood at 111.6 in 1952, which compares with a figure of 100 in 1947–49. The index dropped to 110.1 in 1953, then rose to 110.3 in 1954, and to 110.7 in 1955. Thus, the average level of wholesale prices in 1955 was about eight-tenths of 1 percent below the average in 1952. In the first 4 months of this year the index of wholesale prices reached 112.7, which is 2 percent above the level of the corresponding months last year, 3 percent above the level in the third quarter of 1954 when the economy resumed its advance after the 1953 recession, and only 1 percent above the level that prevailed during 1952.

The rough stability of the overall level of consumer and wholesale prices in recent years requires explanation. As I see it, four factors are largely responsible for what has happened. First, rising productivity and expansion of industrial facilities. Second, increasing business competition. Third, restraint on the part of many in advancing prices. Fourth, monetary and fiscal discipline on the part of Government.

Since the end of World War II business expenditures on new plant and equipment have been running at a very high level. Every year since 1951 these expenditures have exceeded $25 billion. Lsat year they reached $29 billion and this year they may amount to $35 billion or better. While these huge expenditures have put pressure on available resources and have served to raise the prices of metals, building supplies, and machinery, they have also resulted in a great expansion of industrial capacity and in widespread installation of modern and cost-reducing processes.

Back of these investment expenditures are huge outlays on research and development that have been steadily bearing fruit by increasing the amount of output that is obtained per unit of labor. In 1954 over 15,000 companies had research and development programs on which about 160,000 scientists and engineers were engaged. The numbers have grown since then. The more glamorous achievements of technology have recently been registered in electronics, jet and rocket flight, atomic energy and radioisotopes, metallurgy, plastics, and textile fibers. These achievements should not, however, obscure the fact that research and development activities have been expanding the variety of materials, products, or processes in virtually every branch of industry.

The drive to reduce costs is omnipresent. The processing stations of the factory are being integrated into continuous productive systems. Mechanization and systematic managerial planning have spread beyond the shop. They are already important features of office work and are almost as typical of the farm as of the factory. Indeed, very remarkable progress in reducing the amount of labor required per unit of production has recently occurred in agriculture, as a result of the spread and improvement of farm machinery, the increasing use of fertilizers, better varie-

ties of seeds, improved breeds of livestock, and other advances.

The upsurge of technology, managerial planning, and capital investment has not only served to increase industrial productivity in recent years, but it has pushed the advance in productivity well above the gains of earlier decades. Between 1950 and 1955 the output per manhour in the private sector of our economy rose at an average annual rate of about 3 percent per year, in contrast to an average of about 2 percent between 1910 and 1950. Dramatic reductions of labor requirements per unit of output have served to offset the influence on costs of the substantial increases in wages of recent years.

But if advancing productivity has helped to keep unit costs down, business competition has served to keep prices down. Apart from some of the hard-goods industries, there has been a broad shift of late from sellers' markets to buyers' markets. Indeed, much of our business investment and progress in productivity has been stimulated by the intense competition that has developed in industry. Customers are again being wooed. The art of salesmanship, which was dormant during the 1940's is again being practiced with vigor and ingenuity. The pace of competition has become especially keen in retail markets. New methods of distribution, symbolized by the discount house, supermarket, and suburban shopping center, have spread rapidly. Retail margins have generally narrowed and emphasis on volume of transactions has increased.

Many businesses have also been conservative in their pricing policies, that is to say, they have hesitated to pass on rising costs to their customers even when they could readily do so. Some businessmen have practiced restraint because they are aware of the dangers of inflation and feel a responsibility to do what they can to keep costs and prices from spiraling. Many others have taken a long view with regard to pricing in order to entrench themselves against competitive displacement when markets become weaker. The restraint of businessmen in advancing prices is often overlooked because it receives no publicity, in contrast to the notice that is taken of every upward revision in prices. Much the same is true of the behavior of workingmen. I do not like to contemplate what our present cost-price structure would be if every businessman, salaried official, wage earner, and trade-union leader sought aggressively to charge the full amount that current traffic would bear.

The private-economic policies that have helped to keep prices down have been powerfully reinforced by public policies. Through its tax and expenditure programs the Federal Government has been encouraging research, innovation, and investment. Vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws has reduced temptations to escape competition by rigging markets or entering into collusive arrangements. Most important of all, monetary and fiscal policies have sought to contain inflationary tendencies no less than recessionary developments. During a large part of the period since 1952 the banking system has been under pressure, sometimes mild and at others quite substantial, to restrain the expansion of credit. The creation of new money has been held in check. The management of the public debt has been coordinated with general credit policy. While the physical output of goods and services increased 11 percent between 1952 and the first quarter of 1956, the money supply—that is, the sum of demand deposits and currency in the hands of the public—rose only 8 percent. Meanwhile, the Federal budget has moved from a zone of substantial deficits to a modest current surplus.

As a result of both private and public policies, we have thus had during the past 4 or 5 years approximate stability in the value of the dollar in consumer markets. This achievement should make us hesitate about describing our times as an age of inflation. Surely, many of the forces that have recently kept the overall level of consumer prices stable can be counted on to operate in the years ahead.

The cumulative forces on the side of costs and supply are less commonly recognized than the cumulative forces on the side of demand. They are, however, no less vital. Thus, the sources of supply of metals and industrial hard goods are expanding both here and abroad. Research and development are proceeding on a wide front. Indeed, the pace is quickening, partly because markets are generally expected to grow, partly in response to the upward tendency of wages, and partly because of the need felt by progressive businessmen to match or surpass what their competitors may have to offer. This year $3 billion will probably be spent on research and development by private industry and the universities, and perhaps another $3 billion will be spent by the Federal Government, in contrast to a combined total of about $5 billion in 1953 and of about $3 billion in 1950. As I have already observed, the trend of industrial productivity has of late moved forward at an accelerated rate. The opportunities created by expanding markets, by advances in technology, by business innovations, and by improved management bid fair to extend this trend. The pressure of wages on prices will therefore continue to be counteracted by a progressive tendency to increase output per unit of labor.

Consumer markets are likely to remain intensely competitive. Even the prices of consumer services will not necessarily continue on their rising course. The process of "catching up" on the part of dwelling rents and other lagging items will probably be completed before long. Mechanization is likely to penetrate in increasing degree various of the manual services that have been exerting an upward push on the consumer price level. Although retail margins may not be reduced further or may even rise a little, it seems likely that marketing research will be stepped up materially and pave the way for lower unit costs of distribution for primary producers and manufacturers. With productivity rising, industrial capacity expanding, the abundance and variety of consumer articles increasing, and our international trade growing, we may expect competition for the consumer's dollar to be very keen in the years ahead.

The main uncertainties with regard to the future of the dollar are therefore, first, whether wages will tend to rise faster than industrial productivity, second, whether businessmen will give sufficient heed to the longer-range consequences of their pricing policies, third, whether the monetary and fiscal policies of Government will be sufficiently disciplined to keep in check such inflationary pressures as may from time to time develop. Experience since 1952, while favorable and encouraging on balance, is much too brief to be conclusive. It may be that our private or public policies will become reckless in later years. It may be that we will throw restraint to the winds. But it cannot be justly argued from the evidence so far available that a high-level economy is necessarily biased in an inflationary direction. It is a disservice both to truth and to social opportunity to describe our times as an age of inflation. We are living in an age that can be either one of inflation or of general price stability, depending on the courage and wisdom that private citizens and Government officials bring to their responsibilities.

What I find most promising in contemplating future prospects is the fact that economic literary is spreading rapidly. Knowledge of economic movements, and of their causes and consequences, is no longer confined to specialists. Nowadays, great numbers of ordinary citizens understand that inflation can wipe out their savings just as effectively as can prolonged unemployment. They understand that inflation creates hardships for many salaried workers as well as for those living on pensions or on income from fixed-interest securities. They know that inflation reduces a nation's ability to sell in foreign markets. They know that inflation distorts the calculation of depreciation costs and of profits and thereby threatens the solvency or growth of businesses on which they depend for their livelihood. They know that inflation is often the precursor of depression and unemployment. Most important of all, they know that inflation is not an act of God, and they believe that a mature people should be able to conduct their private and public affairs so as to avoid both deflation and inflation.

This growth of economic knowledge and understanding has played a large role in maintaining the value of our dollar in recent years. It can be counted on as a major force to promote general price stability in the future, and to do so in other nations as well as our own. The need for monetary discipline is now recognized practically everywhere, and nowhere more than in the countries of Europe that have suffered most from inflation in the past. Experience is also teaching the nations of the world that the effectiveness of traditional monetary restraints has been reduced as a result of growth in the economic scope of the public sector. Under modern conditions an exacting fiscal discipline and some funding of the public debt may well have to accompany monetary restraints when inflationary pressures mount.

I have allowed myself in the course of these remarks to dwell largely on longer-run tendencies and prospects rather than on current developments. However, before closing, I wish to add an observation or two on the immediate situation. I have already noted that the level of wholesale prices has been rising since last year. This advance—which has been especially pronounced in some broad categories of industrial prices—has given rise to renewed fears of inflation. The potential danger of the rise in wholesale prices that has occurred during the past 6 or 12 months should not be minimized. But I think it is also important to see the recent price movements in perspective.

Since 1952 economic activity has been proceeding at a very high level. At no time during these years has our economy been very far from a position of practically full employment, and during most of this period it has been quite close to it. The physical output of goods and services is currently running at a level that is about 11 percent larger than in 1952 and 5 percent larger than a year ago. Employment now is 6 percent higher than in 1952 and 4 percent above a year ago. Had I been told toward the end of 1951 what the movements of production and employment in our country would be like during the next 4 or 4½ years, and also told of the great boom that would develop in the economy of Western Europe, I seriously doubt whether I would have predicted the degree of stability that has characterized the overall level of consumer and wholesale prices in recent years. In the light of the history of prices during the past century and a half, and especially of their usual behavior during periods of vigorous economic activity, I would have envisaged higher indexes of prices than are currently being recorded. The remarkable thing even about the level of wholesale prices is that, despite the widespread and accumulating pressures of de-

When an economy is poised on a very high plateau, as ours has been in recent months, the threat of inflation cannot be very distant. The like, unhappily, is also true of the threat of recession. Aggregate economic activity is now proceeding at peak levels, but divergent movements are going on beneath

the surface. Capital expenditures on the part of business have been rising rapidly, and governmental spending as a whole has also been moving upward. Homebuilding and retail trade, on the other hand, have been somewhat sluggish. I have the impression that relations among prices deserve no less attention than the overall level of prices. Rather wide discrepancies have been occurring in price movements. They have resulted in a cost-price squeeze not only in agriculture, but also in homebuilding, the automobile trade, the farm equipment industry, and some branches of the textile and appliance industries. The present cost-price structure is in process of being tested in the Nation's markets. While it is true that retail prices tend to lag behind wholesale prices, it is not yet clear that the recent advances of industrial prices in wholesale markets will be passed on to the consumer in significant degree. Developments in prices, inventories, and retail trade will bear careful watching in coming weeks and months.

Minor movements of the price level or of general business activity are significant not of themselves, but because of what they may portend for the future. Mistakes in diagnosis are bound to occur at times, and our only real protection against them is vigilance and a willingness to face the consequences of new facts as they develop. Our attention and efforts must center equally on the avoidance of inflation and of depression. The importance of maintaining general price stability is now recognized as widely as the importance of maintaining a high and rising level of production and employment. The paramount lesson of the history of the past few years is that these goals of economic policy are broadly compatible. It is this lesson and its great promise for mankind that I have tried to emphasize this morning.

United States Membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of floor discussion on H. R. 5550, the bill which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The arguments, pro and con, are now familiar to us here in the House. There seems no need for me to repeat the arguments. Other distinguished Members have done this eloquently, both before the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of this House.

In this discussion on H. R. 5550 I believe it to be of utmost importance that we go behind the formal arguments used. Supporters of H. R. 5550 have put forth their arguments with a pronounced air of self-righteousness. They have consistently appealed to questions of high policy to gain support for the measure. They make an argument of national interest for it—as glibly as Elmer Gantry.

I do not doubt that there are some proponents of H. R. 5550 who sincerely believe that such propositions constitute reasonable supporting arguments for H. R. 5550 and what it represents.

Unfortunately, I feel it my duty to disenchant unselfish and honorably minded supporters of the measure. I cannot sit idly by and see them becoming innocent dupes to a form of naked opportunism which threatens economic security in major areas of this land.

To illustrate my point, I need only cite an incident which occurred recently in our Capitol. During the 44th annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce some of the more calculating OTC supporters appear to have attempted—and failed—in a complicated maneuver. In the opinion of many informed citizens, their effort was certainly not launched in the best interests of our constitutional system.

At that meeting the chamber delegates were presented with a policy statement on multilateral trade agreements which read as follows:

The chamber favors participation by the United States in international organizations which deal with international commitments for the relaxation of trade restrictions; provide mechanisms through which arrangements for trade negotiations would be facilitated, and serve as forums for the discussion of trade problems and the amicable adjustment of problems involving commercial rules and commitments mutually agreed upon by the members. Under no conditions, however, shall the United States surrender its sovereignty or submit to control or domination by any supranational organization.

As its proponents admitted after a flood of membership mail, this statement is tantamount to an endorsement of United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Once adopted it would surely be used in support of H. R. 5550. OTC supporters could then claim that American business was behind the bill, and that the chamber favored the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT. But it might also be taken to represent support of an ITO, and economic NATO, or almost any other combination under the sun. Fortunately, alert delegates preparing to go to the chamber's annual meeting detected this. The excellent letter from the Midland, Mich., chamber gave a strong alarm. Delegates realized that they were being railroaded into a position which was certainly not overwhelmingly of their own choosing and which did not express their own feelings. Ten speakers rose to oppose the proposal, and I am happy to report that the delegates voted 227 to 163 for the only opposition proposal—to submit the statement prepared under sponsorship of the Foreign Commerce Department Committee on multilateral trade agreements to a referendum of the whole membership. Now that members have been alerted to the real purpose behind this ill-contrived statement of policy, I feel sure it will be rejected by the chamber's members.

How was such a maneuver possible? In the case of the United States Chamber of Commerce, I think it is attributable largely to the man who chaired the chamber's foreign commerce department committee last year, Mr. John S. Coleman. It was Mr. Coleman who was instrumental in having the statement included in the chamber's proposal policy declarations. And I am certain that Mr. Coleman will play an even larger role in such matters in the forthcoming year as the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. There can be no mistake that he favors the participation of this Nation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Certainly this stratagem within the Chamber was conducted in a rather devious manner. But it is important to note that Mr. Coleman has more than one string for his bow. He is also chairman of the lobbying group called the Committee for a National Trade Policy. This committee was the spearhead of support for H. R. 5550 before the House Ways and Means Committee. If you will recall, Mr. Charles Taft, who represented the National Committee for a National Trade Policy, appealed to the national interest in advocating passage of the bill. For the most part this group consists of, and is financed by, men with extensive foreign business connections. The committee takes a holier-than-thou attitude on foreign trade, trys to smear opponents as self-seeking, and hides or obscures the financial stakes of its supporters.

Do similar considerations motivate the committee's chairman, Mr. Coleman? Just what kind of a man is he?

In this connection I would like to review some testimony given last year before the Senate's Committee on Finance at hearings on H. R. 1, the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I hasten to add that in addition to the other, shall we say, "public service" duties of Mr. Coleman, he is also president of the Burroughs Corp.—a manufacturer of business machines with far-flung overseas operations. And now I quote from the record of the Senate Finance Committee hearings on H. R. 1:

This company (Burroughs) manufactures adding machines and other business equipment in five locations in the United States and in the following foreign countries: Canada, 2 plants and 1 plant site; England, 1 plant; Brazil, 2 plants; France, 1 plant.

Marketing corporations exist in 20 countries. The corporate net profit in 1953 was $7,206,655 on sales of $162,035,781, of which over $2,068,978 represented dividends from foreign subsidiaries, or approximately $2,700,000 if taken before a loss of $608,143 which was sustained in remitting dividends from Brazil. This figure of $2,700,000 foreign profit does not include the company's Canadian business, the profit from which is lumped with the United States profit. Hence, even without including the nonsegregated Canadian profits, 37.5 percent of the company's earnings are coming from abroad. The investment in countries other than the United States and Canada is listed as approximately $8.5 million of a total corporate equity of some $70 million. Foreign contingent liabilities additionally are listed as $1,093,000 making the investors' foreign exposure around $9,600,000. (Accounting data is spelled out more fully in the annual report, audited by Price Waterhouse & Co.)

The company appears to have closed down one plant in this country and moved the production and jobs to Scotland.

The tax advantages to Burroughs of the president's proposals cannot be estimated from the data which the company publishes. With such a heavy foreign investment, it might be substantial. Nor is the extent

known to which Burroughs ships foreign-made equipment or parts to United States or other markets.

In the light of this report, is it any wonder that the president of the Burroughs Corp. should have supported H. R. 1 with all the means at his disposal?

Must we not acknowledge that his chairmanship of the chamber's foreign commerce department committee and his chairmanship in the committee for a national trade policy are moves which would give the Burroughs Corp. a public forum on foreign-trade matters? And does not this corporation make a large part of its profits through foreign trade? After all, have not both groups, the chamber and the committee been used to promote legislation which is in direct interest of the Burroughs Corp.? Have not they served admirably without establishing a direct connection between the corporation itself and so-called unselfish moves to support H. R. 5550? And would not it be asking too much of the committee on a national trade policy to reveal such information on its own initiative?

But let us move on to H. R. 5550, the legislation under consideration by the Congress. At its least, the passage of the bill would make more secure the program by means of which Mr. Coleman has expanded the interests and profits of his business abroad. Oddly enough, the Burroughs Corp. has not seen fit to outline for the Congress or its shareholders the plan and rationale behind its foreign operations. Its published financial reports do not give adequate data even on its Canadian profits, much less its plants for exporting its manufacturing facilities into areas where cheap foreign labor can cut American prices.

Fortunately for us, news reports on the activities of Mr. Coleman's company help to bring us up to date. Perhaps they also give us a further clue to the reasons why Mr. Coleman is able so nicely to mate idealism and calculated business deals, and why his company finds it convenient to obscure financial reports on its foreign operations.

Here is what Business Week had to report on the Burroughs Corp.:

Burroughs' new expansion into computers and similar machines is taxing its United States production and research facilities. The company's expansion of facilities hasn't been enough to accommodate both this new line and its old calculator and adding-machine business. That's why it has shifted all production of calculating machines to its plant at Strathleven, Scotland. This plant is now the sole source of Burroughs calculating machines, even for the United States market.

Meanwhile, Burroughs has wanted for years to round out its line by adding cash registers that could compete directly with the products of National Cash Register Co. Last fall, it found a way to do it without setting up an expensive United States manufacturing operation. Burroughs signed a contract as sole American distributor for Anker, a German firm that is making a line of machines for Burroughs roughly matching National Cash Register's line in the United States market.

On April 10, 1956, the Wall Street Journal suggested that a trend is evolving in the sales of business machines in this country:

According to the Government's import figures, the number of foreign-made typewriters brought into this country jumped to 15,673 in January 1956, from only 2,210 in January 1951. The dollar value of imported electric adding and calculating machines amounted to nearly $1 million in January 1956, compared with about one-fourth that total 5 years earlier.

These figures don't represent much in the multi-billion-dollar United States office equipment market. But many trade observers believe the steadily rising curve on the imports chart will continue to move skyward.

"I'm betting European typewriters and calculators will account for 25 percent of total sales in their respective lines by 1957," forecasts the sales vice president of one of the leading United States business machine manufacturers.

What do the moves of Mr. Coleman's Burroughs Corp. mean for the individual American? What are the consequences of the national trade policy which he advocates? The testimony last year before the Senate Finance Committee and the news reports I cited supply us with the answer.

Apparently it is the policy of the Burroughs Corp. to move production facilities existing in this country overseas and to acquire additional facilities there. The products manufactured overseas are then imported into this country. That makes lots of money for Burroughs.

In effect, Mr. Coleman and the Burroughs Corp. transfer American jobs to foreign lands where they are open to foreign low-paid labor. In addition, Burrough creates job opportunities overseas which might have been provided here. Moreover, Mr. Coleman's corporation spawns a foreign competition to our domestic products by exporting technical and managerial know-how developed in our own land—again, a foreign competition which is based on low-paid foreign labor.

Is Mr. Coleman content merely with endangering our native business machine industry in this manner? It appears he would make the migration of American industry to foreign lands even more profitable by lowering our slim measures of tariff protection, and binding us forever to it by an international cartel agreement GATT/OTC. I ask how we are to maintain our high level of employment and high wage rates if we continue in the direction that the Colemans of this Nation are taking us? Is this what our national chamber of commerce stands for? I for one, don't think so, and I don't think the chamber's members do either.

These, then, are the blatantly self-seeking consideration which lie hidden behind the high-sounding words which are used by Mr. Coleman and many of his colleagues who support our membership in GATT and the OTC. Once these facts are known, they will spread alarm throughout the Nation.

Yes; those of us who have consistently opposed H. R. 5550 and the foreign trade program which it represents can be called selfish in our own way. We seek to preserve the economic values of the Nation against the unlimited competition of foreign labor, just as Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln, and others of our forefathers did. We seek to preserve the high levels of employment and wages of this Nation, and to preserve the growth potentials of our own economy, particularly for our ever-burgeoning new industries. If these are selfish motives, then we plead guilty of them.

Address by Eugene Cook, Attorney General of Georgia, at Southern Regional Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, Old Point Comfort, Va., April 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Hon. Eugene Cook, attorney general of Georgia, at the southern regional conference, National Association of Attorneys General, at Old Point Comfort, Va., on April 23, 1956.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

The issue of Federal-State relations holds the key to our form of Government, and sets it apart from all other governments which heretofore have existed anywhere on earth for any appreciable length of time.

The Founding Fathers were impressed, from the hardships of experience, with the necessity for avoiding great concentrations of governmental power which would submerge the individual under the pretense of public benefit.

It was this realization which gave rise to our Federal-State political arrangement, whereby strength against outside aggression was to be achieved by a unity which would still reserve to State and local governments the powers of self-government over the multitude of rights and relations which governments had traditionally dealt with.

The first experience at unity. The Articles of Confederation, had proved a failure due to the inherent weakness of the Federal Government to cope with those phases of activity to which the powers of national, as distinguished from State, government, should normally extend. This had been particularly true with respect to the many retaliatory trade barriers which the States had erected at their respective borders—a practice which unfortunately has been largely responsible for the periodic and cyclic wars of Europe.

With this and other problems in mind, the Constitution was drafted, principally from the Virginia plan, which, among other things, conferred upon the Federal Government the power to regulate interstate commerce.

"In building a Nation out of diverse elements, the urgent need in the formative stages is to create a viable measure of union where unity is possible. The dangers of overcentralization may be foreseen and feared, but they do not materialize until later stages of national development,"[1] and hence it is only natural that the judicial decisions of our early Chief Justices, particular-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ly Marshall, would be prominently nationalistic in tenor.

However, the formative stages of our national development have long since passed, and I must regretfully report to you that the nationalistic tendency has gone so far today as to raise serious doubts as to the future preservation of our democratic way of life, which, like all others before it, must be forever vigilant to the tyranny and despotism which history teaches inevitably comes from overcentralization.

Our present dilemma has been accomplished principally by the Federal Supreme Court—recently described as having taken "the most consistently nationalistic position"[2] of all branches of the Federal Government.

This innovation, I believe, has been brought about primarily through two doctrines—the doctrine of Federal preemption, and the doctrine of substantive due process.

Preemption has its origin in our early constitutional history,[3] but due process necessarily must date from adoption of the 14th amendment.

Originally placed in the Constitution solely to preserve certain modes of procedure, particularly in criminal trials, the due-process clause was strictly limited in the Slaughterhouse cases,[4] with the disclaimer that the Court desired to become a "perpetual censor upon all State legislation"—the Court declaring that "the Federal equilibrium" had already been sufficiently upset by the results of the War Between the States and the Reconstruction.

It was not until 25 years later, in *Smyth* v. *Ames*[5] that the Court, composed in part of ex-corporation lawyers, gave notice of its intention to thenceforth review in detail the reasonableness of rates prescribed by State laws for public utilities, and in *Holden* v. *Hardy*[6] decided that same term, the doctrine of freedom of contract, was written into the Constitution.

These cases laid the way for the great volume of decisions striking down State laws which sought to deal with the economic problems wrought by industrialization and Mr. Adam Smith's division of labor,[7] and represented the first step in the imputation of a substantive content to the due-process clause. The paradoxical result of this philosophy is that it so disempowered the States to deal with these problems that, of necessity, the people turned to the Federal Government which has now regimented business to an extent which would petrify the corpses of the laissez faire judges who unwittingly brought it about.

The second step came in 1925, when in *Gitlow* v. *New York*, in treating a contention that the New York criminal anarchy statute violated the due-process clause of the 14th amendment in abridging the accused's freedom of speech, it was said for the first time:

"For present purposes we may and do assume that freedom of speech and of the press—which are protected by the 1st amendment from abridgement by Congress—are among the fundamental personal rights and liberties protected by the due process clause of the 14th amendment from impairment by the States."[8]

The course of history subsequent to this decision leaves little doubt as to the vast assumption of powers which the Federal courts have taken unto themselves, both over questions of personal and property rights.

This is not to say that the fundamental rights of liberty and property are not deserving of the most meticulous protection, but in the very scheme of our Government, it was the States, not the Federal Government, which were vested with the responsibility of vindication.

Footnotes at end of speech.

We have now reached the point where the due process and equal protection clauses have been, in effect, elevated to the status of a shorthand version of the first 8 amendments, and thereby made applicable to the States, although Marshall himself, the most outspoken nationalist up to the 20th century, early declared that the Bill of Rights was intended only as a limitation on Federal, and not State, power.

Also, the 5th amendment contains a due process clause identical to that of the 14th, and if due process embraces practically all the other Bill of Rights, as the Court has in effect held, the Founding Fathers were certainly given to redundancy in bothering with any but the 5th amendment.

In recklessly exceeding its powers and holding the individual citizen immune from any given State restraint, the Supreme Court undoubtedly considers itself as striking a blow for individual liberty, but the theory upon which our Government was based in the beginning, and which is responsible in large part for ts success, is that individual liberty will be best preserved in the long run by preserving the sovereign status of the States, as a buffer for all its individuals against encroachment upon their liberties by an omnipotent Federal Government, for in *Texas* v. *White*,[9] we were admonished that "it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States."

While the present dilemma is due mainly to the Supreme Court, the States themselves cannot disclaim all responsibility. In the Report of the Committee on Inter-Governmental Relations, it was concluded that one cause of increased Federal encroachment lies in the inability of the States, through overdetailed and restrictive State constitutions, to deal with problems requiring governmental intervention.[10] This has resulted in State and local pleas for Federal assistance and regulation in areas which should manifestly be dealt with only by the States.

One of the instances in which the Federal court's intervention into State authority has been most distasteful and burdensome is with regard to the review of criminal convictions in State courts. We have come to the point where in every criminal case attended with much publicity or interest, the normal procedure is to expect a succession of post-trial procedures by way of habeas corpus in Federal courts, in addition to direct review by the United States Supreme Court on certiorari.

Being composed of men having little or no trial experience, the Supreme Court is simply unable to understand that crafty criminal lawyers delight in holding back points for post-trial litigation in the event the jury verdict goes against them.

So acute has this problem become that the association has gone on record as favoring remedial legislation that would prohibit issuance of habeas corpus writs in Federal courts against State custody except in very limited circumstances.

The Supreme Court has also not hesitated to knock down on direct review any rules of procedure devised by the State courts as necessary expedients to securing justice and bringing criminal cases to a final disposition.

In *Williams* v. *Georgia* ((1955), 349 U. S. 375), it was held that the Georgia rule of practice prohibiting the challenging of a jury on grounds of racial discrimination after trial, would not be recognized. But upon being rebuked on remand by the Georgia Supreme Court (211 Ga. 763), the Supreme Court simply receded from its untenable position.

However, in *Reece* v. *Georgia* ((1955), 100 L. Ed. (advance, p. 109)), the Court declared as a denial of due process, the Georgia rule requiring a person held in jail on charges to challenge the grand jury before the return of the indictment, although this practice had been previously upheld for many, many years by the courts of 13 States and the United States Supreme Court itself—all this in spite of the fact that the demands of due process have always been tested to a large degree by the history and prevalence of the practice attacked.

In *Ullman* v. *United States* ((March 1956) 100 L. Ed. (advance, p. 361)), the Court held in sustaining the act of Congress granting immunity against the prosecution of witnesses in national security cases, that Congress, under the power to "provide for the national defense", has the power to override State penal laws by granting immunity from prosecution thereunder.

In *Rea* v. *United States* ((January 1956) 100 L. Ed. (Advance, p. 213)) it was held that a Federal district court could frustrate prosecutions in State courts by enjoining a Federal narcotics' agent from testifying as to evidence obtained as the result of an unlawful search and seizure, although such evidence was admissible in State court.

One of the most recent examples of the Supreme Court's dislike for State authority is *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* ((April 23, 1956) 100 L. Ed. (Advance, p. 415)), in which the sedition laws of 42 States were declared superseded by the Smith Act, on the basis of the latter's preemption, the decision resting upon decisions of the Court dealing with the interstate commerce which Congress had undertaken to regulate, rather than activities which both Congress and the States had sought to prohibit by passage of the sedition laws.

In *Slochower* v. *Board of Higher Education of the City of New York* ((April 9, 1956) 24 Law Week 4178, 100 L. Ed. (Advance, p. 449)), it was held that due process is denied a teacher by his discharge on the ground of his invoking the fifth amendment before a congressional committee. The Court apparently not only overlooked the fact that this was not a criminal prosecution, which the amendment was aimed to protect as distinguished from mere discharge from employment, but also the fact that the relevant part of the fifth amendment applied only against the Federal Government.

In the field of economic regulation, the court has not hesitated to strike down State regulation with equal vigor, when arrayed against the supposed intention of Congress to deal with the particular subject.

In Castle v. *Hays Freight Lines* ((1954) 348 U. S. 61), the States were held remediless to protect their highways by revoking the right of an interstate carrier to travel over same, as a penalty for repeated violations of State highway weight laws. It was determined that Congress had precluded such action by its comprehensive treatment of the subject in the Federal Motor Carrier Act.

Similarly in *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin* ((1954) 347 U. S. 672), it was held that an independent producer of natural gas who did not itself ship such gas in interstate commerce, but only sold it to others who did ship, was nevertheless subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, and that the producer was immune from regulation by the States. Under the theory of this case, an insignificent Georgia cotton farmer selling his cotton to a local gin which ships it by interstate commerce, could be subjected to a Federal control in degradation of State sovereignty.

In *Kern-Limerick, Inc.* v. *Scurlock* ((1954) 347 U. S. 110), the Navy Department was permitted to evade payment of State sales tax upon materials sold to contractors doing

Footnotes at end of speech.

construction work with the Navy, by upholding the authority of the Navy Department to enter into colorable agreements whereby the contractor was designated as a purchasing agent for the Navy. This decision necessarily will have a cumulative effect in that the less revenue a State collects, the more the people will have to depend upon Federal money to support public services, which results in a never-ending entanglement of Federal control.

However, when the shoe is on the other foot, the overreaching Federal courts have not hesitated to look through such legal procedures, for in the Virginia Parks case, *Department of Conservation and Development* v. *Tate* ((March 9, 1956) 24 L. W. 2483), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals invalidated a leasing arrangement by the State of a public park and went so far as to hold that it was incumbent upon the State to insert an express provision in the lease requiring the private lessee not to discriminate against Negroes.

Unquestionably, the doctrine of Federal preemption has received its most widespread application in judicial interpretation of the interstate commerce clause, although it has by no means been limited thereto. Within the realm of interstate commerce itself, the greatest application has been in the field of labor relations. One of the most glaring of these cases is *Amalgated Association of State Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* ((1951) 340 U. S. 383), where a State was held powerless to outlaw strikes in public utilities on the ground that the National Labor Relations Act precluded any such State action.

Garner v. *Teamsters' Chauffeurs Union* ((1953) 346 U. S. 485), held that the State court was without power under its labor law to prohibit picketing, the sole purpose of which was to coerce the employers into influencing its employees to join the union. Although the practice was considered an unfair labor practice under both State law and the National Labor Relations Act, the court held that Congress had preempted the field.

In *Weber* v. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc.* ((1955) 348 U. S. 468), the State court was held powerless to enjoin picketing for the purpose illegal under the State restraint of trade law. While the National Labor Relations Board had already determined the enjoined action not to be an unfair labor practice, under one section of the act, it was declared that the conduct involved was either an unfair labor practice, under the Federal act, or if not, was protected by that act (which has no relation to restraint of trade statutes). This case apparently modified the Giboney case, holding that a State could enjoin picketing conducted for a purpose deemed illegal under State public policy as expressed in the State antitrust law.

General Drivers, etc., Local No. 89 v. *American Tobacco Company* (348 U. S. 978). In a summary decision, the Supreme Court reversed the State court decision enjoining a clause in a labor contract requiring teamsters not to cross any picket line. State courts had held such a clause contrary to its public policy. The Supreme Court reversed on the preemption ground.

In *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* ((1955), 349 U. S. 435), the States were deprived of their historic authority over water rights to nonnavigable streams, when it was held that the State of Oregon could not require a State license of one who had already received a license to construct a power project from the Federal Power Commission.

West Virginia ex rel Dyer v. *Sims* ((1951), 341 U. S. 22), presented the spectacle of the Supreme Court refusing to recognize the right of a State supreme court to construe its State constitution. In this case, the Court overruled a State court decision holding West Virginia unauthorized to expend money under the State constitution for carrying out of an interstate compact relating to river pollution. In substance, the Supreme Court merely held the State court's interpretation of the State constitution to be wrong.

In *Brown* v. *Western Railway of Alabama* ((1949), 338 U. S. 294), it was announced that any litigant electing to sue on a federally created cause of action in State court (under the Federal Employer's Liability Act) was not required, like all other litigants, to comply with the pleading requirements of Georgia law as to sufficiency of the petition against demurrer—this in the face of the ancient rule that a litigant electing to sue in State court on a Federal cause of action takes the State judicial machinery as he finds it.

Mention need hardly be made of the cause celebre of them all, *Brown* v. *Board of Education* ((1954), 347 U. S. 483), in which the States, in reliance upon the Plessy case had established vast and expensive school systems on the basis of segregation, only to be told 50 years later that this basis was no longer sustained by "modern authority." In a fashion the States were defrauded by the Supreme Court.

In *Griffin, et al* v. *Illinois* ((April 23, 1956), 24 Law Week 4209), by a 5 to 4 decision, the Supreme Court held that where a State provides for appeals in criminal cases, due process is denied if State law does not afford indigent defendants a free copy of the trial transcript to effect his appeal. This case goes further than any due process case to emanate from the Supreme Court in a long time, and simply amounts to the Supreme Court drafting rules of criminal procedure for the States under guise of due process. As pointed out by Mr. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion, the effect of the decision is not to prohibit discrimination by the State, but rather to require that it discriminate by giving free to some that which others are required to pay for. If this case is extended to the limit of its logic, we will soon reach the point where a civil litigant can successfully claim as denial of due process the failure of the State to afford him a Phi Beta Kappa for legal representation, on the ground that his adversary, due to economic reasons, is able to employ more skilled and experienced counsel, than the former's financial condition would permit. If this is not the socialistic, paternalistic state, it is difficult to conceive of a situation that would be.

---

[1] Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1955), p. 11.
[2] Report, supra, p. 23 (1955).
[3] *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 6 L. Ed. 23, 70–73 (1824).
[4] 16 Wall. 36, 78, 82 (1873).
[5] 42 L. Ed. 819 (1898).
[6] 42 L. Ed. 780 (1898).
[7] Wealth of Nations.
[8] 268 U. S. 652, 666 (1925).
[9] 19 L. Ed. 227, 237 (1869).
[10] Supra, p. 37.

Growth for the Middle South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an address by Mr. David Rockefeller, executive vice president of the Chase-Manhattan Bank, New York, which was delivered before the annual meeting of the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss., on May 8. The Delta Council is one of the outstanding agricultural and civic-development organizations of the Midsouth. Mr. Rockefeller is one of the Nation's distinguished financial leaders, and we were honored to have him with us at the Delta Council meeting. His statements, devoted to the sweeping industrial development of the Midsouth and its tremendous potential for further development, are of significance, not only to the South but to the entire country:

GROWTH FOR THE MIDDLE SOUTH

(Address by David Rockefeller, executive vice president, the Chase-Manhattan Bank, at the Delta Council, Cleveland, Miss., May 8, 1956)

Ladies and gentlemen, when I was asked if I would come visit with you today, I was most happy to accept. Although I have been in the South many times, this is my first visit to Mississippi, and I am delighted to have the opportunity to see this beautiful area under such happy circumstances. I should add, however, that thanks to Bob Whitfield, who drove me over this morning, Mississippi is by no means a stranger to me, nor to any of us at the Chase-Manhattan Bank. As a matter of fact, Bob, who was a close friend and colleague at the bank for many years, has been trying to get me to come to Mississippi for some time—long before he retired and returned here to live. Mississippi has inspired in Bob a loyalty, devotion, and enthusiasm which could not but be highly contagious. Anyone who is associated with Bob comes to feel that he not only has enjoyed a deep breath of fresh Mississippi air but he is eager to come down and gain more. So here I am.

When I talked with Luther Wade, your president, about what I might say to you today, he suggested that I discuss the question of the industrialization of the Middle South and the impact that I thought it might have on the future development of our Nation. This seemed to me to be a very large order, and it is an assignment which I, as an outsider, did not feel particularly well qualified to handle. On the other hand, I am grateful for his suggestion for the stimulus of this talk with you has led me to dig more deeply into what has been happening here in the Middle South than I had ever had occasion to do before. As a result, I have not only gained a liberal education about a very fascinating and appealing part of our country but, in the end, I even concluded that there might be some merit to having someone who is not a native of the area convey to you his impressions, both as to the accomplishments to date and the potential for future development. My point of view may not be your own but at least it is fresh and, I hope, objective. At any rate, it is to this task that I should like to address myself this afternoon.

First, let me say that anyone who examines the economic record of the past two decades cannot help being impressed by the great progress you have made here in the Middle South. Perhaps the best measure of general well-being is the average income of all of the people of the region. Today the per capita income in this area is well over $1,000—$1,000 per year for every man, women, and child. This represents a very great gain from prewar days. Of course, prices are higher. But even after adjusting for higher prices, the average real income per person is more than double that of prewar. This is no mean achievement, by any standard. It is reflected in the many new homes that have been built, in the telephones and

electric appliances that grace those homes, in the tractors now on the farms, and in the autos that line the roads. As a matter of fact, prior to the war there was one car to every 10 persons here in the Middle South. Today there is 1 car to every 5 persons, and you now hold the somewhat dubious distinction of participating in the Nation's traffic jam.

The record you have achieved is one of substantial economic progress, both in absolute terms and in relation to the rest of the country. Such progress, of course, is never achieved without some change in way of life. The Middle South has recognized this fact, and it has been particularly aggressive in creating a favorable climate for new industry and in seeking new and better ways of doing things. You have gone to great lengths to provide tax incentives, to provide information and facilities, and to help in every way possible the difficult adjustment of a shift of labor away from your farms. The result is etched in the picture of your countryside, both industrial and agricultural. It is seen in the new plants that dot the landscape; in the tractors, flame cultivators and cotton pickers that work the fields; and in the far-ranging activities of organizations like your Delta Council. And buried in the statistics that summarize all this activity is the record of a quiet revolution. There has been a shift from an economy in which agriculture was the great dynamic force, to one in which industry and trade have become the dominant and moving elements.

As I have suggested, the Middle South has now taken a long stride forward in industrialization which has brought with it economic betterment. As a matter of fact, here in the Delta itself, you have abundant evidence of this process. Since 1950, I am told that $200 million has been invested in new and expanded production facilities in the Delta. You now have many nationally known companies active here—companies like International Paper, Commercial Solvents, Westinghouse, Spencer Chemical, and others of similar stature. Throughout the whole of the Middle South, the number of people employed in manufacturing has increased substantially, and the income that arises out of manufacturing is now greater than that from farming.

It is interesting and significant, too, to see the direction in which industry has been moving. A quarter century ago, the dominant manufacturing industries in the Middle South were textiles, clothing, lumber, furniture, and the like. These are all essential and important lines. But they also are lines that use less complicated types of machinery, and they are lines in which the productivity and the return to both capital and labor is relatively low, at least initially. In recent years, the greater part of the growth has been in industries such as the chemicals, oil and gas, aluminum, pulp and paper, and various equipment lines. These are all industries which use very large amounts of capital—industries in which the worker is given help by hundreds of inanimate slaves. The average cost of machinery and plant that is used by a chemical worker, for example, exceeds $25,000. It is little wonder, then, that the productivity of labor—that is the output per man per hour—is high in such industries, and that they contribute greatly to the welfare of workers and the whole community.

Although there is no doubt that the Middle South has made a strong start in becoming industrialized, one might well ask whether this trend is likely to continue, and, if it does, what the consequences are likely to be. My answer, in brief, would be that it seems to me highly probable that industry in the Middle South will continue to grow—perhaps even more rapidly than in the rest of the country. As it does, I believe that incomes within the area also should grow, and the gap with the rest of the country should be steadily narrowed. At the same time, however, it seems likely that the Middle South will remain a more diversified economy than most regions which are primarily industrial in character. You should be able to maintain a better balance here than in other areas between farming and industry and, in so doing, I should hope that you will retain a large portion of the charm of your countryside, which so impresses all who come here.

When we inquire why industry is growing as never before in this part of the country, we get a number of answers: but three stand out as being of particular importance. First, there are raw materials in the Middle South which are becoming of increasing significance to the country as a whole; second, you have a group of workers here who readily adapt themselves to the needs of modern industry; and finally, the steady advance in living standards has created within the area itself a larger market—one which can be served most effectively by greater local production.

I think you all know of examples that fit each of those cases: The expansion of the Shell chemical plant at Norco is based on locally produced raw materials; the move of the Alexander Smith Carpet Co. to Greenville was tied in no small part to the availability of a suitable working force; and the establishment of a Knox glass-bottle plant at Jackson is due to growth of the market in this region. It is difficult to say in every case which of these factors is the most important—very often more than one is involved. Nevertheless, I am inclined to feel that here in the Middle South your fortunate position with regard to raw materials is likely to play an increasingly decisive role in the period ahead.

On this score, the Middle South is much better off than many other areas within the Nation. Moreover, the materials you possess are ones which are becoming relatively more important with the passage of time. There was once a day when the chief basis for industrialization was the possession of coal and iron ore, largely for the making of steel. These were the raw materials that gave Britain her start, and which laid the foundation for the great industrial complex in the Pittsburgh-Chicago-Detroit triangle. Coal and iron ore are still important, and you are fortunate in possessing a regional center for converting them to steel in Alabama. But in recent years other materials have grown in relative significance—particularly chemicals and the lighter metals, like aluminum. Here in the Middle South you have in abundance many of the basic raw materials for chemicals—oil, gas, salt, potash and sulfur among them. And Arkansas possesses the Nation's largest deposits of bauxite, the source of aluminum. Couple these materials with efficient power and transportation, and it is little wonder that Reynolds, Kaiser, and the Aluminum Company of America all have been expanding in this area, or that 70 new or expanded chemical installations have been introduced into the Middle South in the past 5 years. Perhaps no other industry will develop so fast in the next decade as chemicals—particularly those derived from oil and gas. One of the South's own experts, Dr. F. J. Soday, of Chemstrand, has pointed out that already one-third of the Nation's chemical industry is located in the South as a whole, and that the proportion is expected to grow to no less than one-half a decade hence. Much of this grain will be right here in the Middle South.

There is still another element essential to production which is becoming increasingly scarce in many areas, but which you in the Delta are able to take for granted. I refer to water—a resource which industry needs more and more as it expands and becomes more complex. Scarcity of water has already become the No. 1 problem throughout large sections of the West and the Pacific coast. It has reached a point where it is curtailing industrial expansion, and it clearly will slow future development unless a cheap method of removing salt from sea water can be found. Yet I understand that twice as much water flows through the Delta each day by way of the Mississippi as is used by the entire Nation. I venture to say that your plentiful water supply will become a factor of increasing importance in drawing industry to the Middle South.

These then are your great assets for a further growth of industry—raw materials which are prized highly, ample water, good transportation and economical power. Nor must we forget that the Middle South, and indeed the South as a whole, is an area where a steady flow of new workers has become available to industry. Some of these are coming from farms where they can be spared, as a result of an increase in the use of machinery. Others are younger people who are taking jobs for the first time. Moreover, as you well know, many a small farmer has turned to farming on a part-time basis, while earning a good share of his income by work in a nearby factory. This is a trend which may well continue, particularly on farms which are not large enough to be efficient or to provide a good livelihood.

It is a fact that you have in this region almost all the essential ingredients for a further expansion of industry. Yet there are several roadblocks that exist, and it would be shortsighted to ignore them. It seems to me that the Middle South has two principal deficiencies which somehow must be made up: first, you lack adequate capital to develop fully the resources of the area; and secondly, it seems probable that you have a shortage of skilled managerial personnel—particularly men who have had the training and experience necessary to start up new industrial enterprises. I should like to look at each of these problems with you for a brief moment.

On the matter of capital the entire South has made outstanding progress in the past 15 years. This can be seen in the new houses, new appliances, new buildings, and equipment, all of which represent saving, much of it by your own people. Your progress is no less evident in the growing strength of your financial institutions. Here in the Middle South, for example, the assets of banks have increased more than fourfold since 1939—a rate of gain which is substantially greater than that for the Nation as a whole. Moreover, insurance companies and savings and loan associations have grown rapidly and now command assets which are 4 and 5 times those of prewar. Indeed, insurance companies throughout the entire South possess investments which exceed $18 billion in total.

These are all encouraging trends. But they are not fully adequate to meet the capital needs of the South. Your banks handle a good portion of the credit needs of the farmer and of those engaged in small industry and trade. Local banks also provide substantial sums of mortgage money, as do insurance companies and savings and loan associations. In addition, insurance companies in the South have helped supply local utilities and certain industrial companies with part of their capital requirements. In order to establish a modern industrial plant, however, huge amounts of equity capital are needed, as well as a large quantity of short-term money. To a considerable extent, these funds must still flow into the Middle South from other sections of the country, either through investment of retained earnings by large national companies or through loans and investments by major banks and insurance companies located in the financial centers of the Nation.

There is still some debate here in the South about this inflow of capital from other areas. It is sometimes objected that because interest and dividends go to investors in the North the South is paying a form of

tribute to that area. In my judgment, this type of thinking does not rest on solid grounds. The fact is that the growth of industry by means of capital from other regions has helped raise living standards throughout the whole South. Wages have been increased; storekeepers, doctors, and dentists have benefited; and even the farmer has commanded a better price for produce sold for local consumption as a result of the influx of capital. As a matter of fact, experience shows that any area, no matter where, with a fast developing industrial potential must be a net importer of capital. For many decades, in the 19th century the North was a net importer of capital from Great Britain and the Continent. Later the West was an importer, and today you in the South have become a sizable outlet for investment funds from other regions.

Newly established companies are normally energetic in training future management and technical personnel so that, for the most part, outsiders need only be brought in at this start. On this score, however, there is one further comment that might be worth making. You could undoubtedly hasten the time when you will be free of the need to import personnel by further attention to the technical training you provide in the South. Quite frankly, facilities for training engineers are particularly short here in the Middle South. I believe you have only 10 schools that offer any type of engineering degree, and today these graduate no more than 500 engineers a year. To a lesser extent, this is a national problem as well. As you perhaps know, the country as a whole has fallen behind Russia in the training of engineers—last year we graduated 23,000 as against 63,000 in the Soviet Union. Thus, anything you can do to improve engineering facilities and training will help the whole Nation as well as your own position.

And now I should like to say just a word about the key role which research is playing in industrial growth, both here and throughout the Nation. Outlays on research have grown enormously since prewar days—last year, for example, we spent almost $4 billion for industrial research, more than was spent during the entire decade from 1930 to 1940. When you study these research expenditures, one of the most interesting facts that emerges is the close relationship between the amount spent by a particular industry, and the rate of growth of that industry. The industries that are spending the most on research today are electrical equipment, chemicals, and aircraft industries. Even within those fields, it is the companies which are spending relatively more on research which are growing most rapidly. Indeed, it can be shown statistically that, on the average, companies which devote 3 percent to 4 percent of their sales dollar to research more than double their total sales in a decade.

Now these facts have significance for you in the Middle South in several ways. First, as I have already suggested, you are gaining the benefits of a research undertaken by large national companies which are operating in your area. These are the companies which are most active in developing new products and new ways of doing things. Some of them have research facilities located right here in the Middle South—Esso Standard Oil, Ethyl, and Lion Oil, for example. As a matter of fact, it has been estimated that at least half of the increase in per capita income in the South since prewar can be traced to the development, through research, of new products and new processes which utilize resources found plentifully in the South—oil, gas, and forest products among them.

By the same token, failure to spend money on research tends to have an adverse effect on the earnings of an industry. The textile industry, for example, has traditionally spent relatively little on research. This is particularly true in that segment which is concerned chiefly with cottons and woolens. Competing materials developed through research have made heavy inroads against the natural fibers in recent years. Yet cotton is one of your outstanding products. To improve the use of cotton as a material, I believe the cotton producers themselves will have to take responsibility for a certain amount of research pioneering. Already they have done this to some extent through the National Cotton Council, and I understand that the results to date have proved beneficial. I should think it decidedly in the interest of cotton producers to support this and similar research efforts. More than ever, we live in a day of research, and no group within our economy, no matter how important, can afford to rest content with the things as they are.

As I survey the future of the Middle South, I cannot help feeling that it is a highly promising one. True, agriculture which has long been a mainstay in your economic life, is in a period of transition. But, offsetting this, and helping in the adjustment, should be a continuing growth of industry and trade. Science has at last caught up with your resources, and many of them fit the needs of the mid-twentieth century particularly well. Progress thus seems assured—particularly if the Nation as a whole continues to grow. As time goes on, incomes here in the Middle South will rise, probably even faster than in the rest of the country. The growth in your own prosperity and strength will contribute to the stability of the country as a whole and, through it, to the peace of the world. If we have any lesson to learn from studying history and economics today, it is that the world is becoming more interdependent even as it become more nationalistic. We can thank God that this country stands together as one unit and that the minor differences we may have between one region and another do not prevent us from having unbounded faith and loyalty to our great Nation. It is a thrill for me as an American to be with you today to see the great things that are being done here in the South and to congratulate you on the bright future which is opening up in the years ahead.

Tomorrow's Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, May 22, my distinguished colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON] made the principal address before the Propeller Club dinner, Washington, D. C., on "Tomorrow's Merchant Fleet." Because this address was in honor of National Maritime Day, and because of the great importance of the subject involved, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S MERCHANT FLEET

(Address by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON before the Propeller Club dinner, Washing, D. C., May 22, 1956)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to be with you on National Maritime Day. It is the day Congress has set aside annually to pay tribute to, and reevaluate the progress, of our entire maritime industry. Throughout the day, in this country and abroad, our flag has been flying from all Government buildings in tribute to this great industry. American-flag ships, busy at their trade upon the oceans of the world, have dressed ship for this occasion.

We have gathered here tonight to do our small part and pay our small tribute. While doing so, every one of us should be reaffirming our pledge to do everything within our power to keep the merchant marine of the United States strong. To renew our efforts, during the coming year. To accomplish the tasks which will make the United States merchant marine the most efficient, the most modern, and the best-equipped merchant fleet in the entire world.

I wish that everyone could realize the importance of our merchant marine to them, as Americans, in time of peace as well as in time of emergency and war. Unfortunately, the industry is not of such a nature that it can show off its product. Unlike the air transport industry, it cannot present an impressing air show with echelon after echelon of new equipment passing overhead. Instead, we are limited to deep water areas to display our wares and thus limited in our personal contact with the general public. I am happy to say, however, that our ships are busy plying the trade routes of the world. The few that are resting in United States harbors tonight would be woefully inadequate to convey our message to the American people, and the importance of the health of our industry to them.

I might say here that I am informed on the average our dry cargo vessels spend 60 percent of their time in port and only 40 percent at sea. This condition is directly attributable to the unbelievable lack of progress during the past 50 years in the development of new cargo handling techniques and port facilities. I have mentioned only two of the many problems facing us today. The need for a better informed public as to the requirements of the merchant marine and its value to them. The need for more research and development to devise methods and equipment to improve our antiquated and inefficient cargo handling methods.

Tomorrow's merchant fleet is my topic. It would give me the greatest pleasure to be able to tell you that tomorrow's fleet is here now. As a matter of fact, I would be delighted to be able to tell you that tomorrow's merchant fleet will be here tomorrow. Unforunately, I can do neither. I can very definitely tell you that it is not here today.

I can also tell you that without the continuing efforts of all of you in the exercise of your daily duties that it will not be here tomorrow.

All of us know that the United States merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense, both during a cold war and in time of actual conflict. Unless we continue our efforts to protect it from those who would ignore its needs during peacetime, it will fall into decay and ruin as it did prior to World Wars I and II. We must continue our efforts to improve and modernize this great industry.

Let us suppose a child is born tonight who, upon reaching his 7th birthday asks his father to take him down to the docks to see the new ships flying the flag of the United States. If the father is well enough informed, he could explain that on the night the boy was born 7 years ago, over 70 percent of the United States merchant fleet was in such a condition that the vessels are obsolete in 1963. He could further explain that these were the ships built during World War II and that because the United States did not have a sound, long-range shipbuilding program, very few new vessels were

financed, designed and constructed during the intervening 20 years. This condition resulted in the decay of the major part of the merchant fleet. The father then could, and with great difficulty I believe, try to make the child understand that because we did not have an active, healthy, vessel replacement program, our shipyards fell into disuse. With the resultant disintegration of existing facilities, labor skills were lost. There was no opportunity to utilize the skills that had been perfected. He could point out that capital was not available to build ships, because opponents to a strong merchant marine or those who fail to understand this problem, insist that subsidies and aids provided by the Government be on a temporary and piecemeal basis.

Thus, shipowners and investment bankers, as prudent businessmen, could not advocate the necessarily large investment required for new ship construction because of the impermanent nature of our maritime aid program and our lack of a long-range, sound ship construction program.

Then, I am afraid, he would have to tell the boy, rather lamely, something along this line. "You see, son, back in those days we were at peace and we wanted to reduce our taxes and we just couldn't see giving aid to a private industry just so it could meet foreign competition. When the time came and we needed the merchant marine to supply our requirements away from home, we found that ours just wasn't much help." I am afraid all this would be rather complicated for a 7 year old boy. It seems to be too complicated for grown, mature adults, and our record, out of two world wars, proves this. But wouldn't it be wonderful if that father could take his son down to a harbor and point with pride to gleaming streamlined efficient vessels and say with pride, "There you are, son. That's part of the merchant marine of the United States—the finest fleet of any country in the world."

To build, to operate, to experiment requires labor. Our ships are manned by fine American officers and seamen. Each day they are on their jobs swells their fund of experience and knowledge of their particular duty. They become more efficient and better qualified. They are ready for advancement, either at sea or ashore. Such training and experience cannot be purchased anywhere on earth.

The labor problem in the shipyards is acute. It has been 10 years since the end of World War II. During that 10 years, many skilled craftsmen and engineers, who were essential to the success of the World War II shipbuilding program, have left the industry. Who is taking their place? In 1944, the young men were away at war. Yet, in 1964, in case of an emergency, it will be these same men who will be called upon to enter our labor force. Because of our lack of building during this 20-year period, we will not only lack an adequate merchant marine, but we will not have an adequately trained labor force.

Fortunately for us, the rumblings of World War II were loud and ominous enough to give a little time to prepare for the task ahead. We cannot count on a similar preparatory time in the future. In fact, everything that I have read and heard would indicate exactly the opposite. With no time to prepare, untrained labor, inadequate facilities, our position will be materially different than it was in 1940. It is necessary for all of us to do what we can to prevent this dismal picture from ever becoming a reality.

LEGISLATION

Merchant marine legislation, like other types of legislation, is not perfect. Changing times and conditions require amendments and additions to existing law. As chairman of the Senate Committee for Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have personally supervised 34 merchant marine bills in the 84th Congress. Twenty-five of these bills have passed the Senate. Thirteen of these bills have become law. Probably one of the most important bills to the maritime industry in this Congress is S. 2584 which threatens the principle underlying our 50–50 law. That bill is now before my committee. In essence, S. 2584 would amend Public Law 480 and exempt certain cargoes from the provisions of Public Law 664 (50–50), which requires that 50 percent of all cargoes financed or purchased with Federal funds be transported in American-flag vessels. If I may, I would like to digress a moment and give you some background on the origination of this policy.

FIFTY-FIFTY

Historically, the United States has attempted to protect its merchant marine from foreign competition and to prepare it to act as the fourth arm of defense. Initially, such protection was directed to all domestic commerce in support of our overseas Military Establishment. Later it was extended to include all foreign shipments created by loans made by agencies of the United States. The 1936 act reduced this volume to a substantial portion of the United States export and import waterborne commerce. Public Law 664 (50–50) further defined the area as 50 percent of our foreign aid program. As a result, since 1946 foreign-flag vessels have steadily increased their advantage in this field until today they carry 75 percent of the United States foreign commerce. Cargo preference (Public Law 664) has been a great factor in retaining for United States flag vessels the 25 percent that we now carry. In the market place the American owner is at a disadvantage in competing for pure commercial cargo for several reasons. Exchange restrictions, the terms of sales imposed by overseas buyers and most important, the traditional policy of and economic incentives for foreign governments and citizens to patronize vessels of their own national registry, are the primary factors. Now, certain maritime nations are attepting to reduce the American-flag traffic to an even smaller figure by recommending the elimination of 50–50 to certain Government-aid cargoes.

Gentlemen, we should face up to this problem. The United States, to continue as a Nation, must maintain a strong and adequate defense system. An important and essential arm of that system is the merchant marine. To maintain a trained and efficient personnel and to stay abreast of maritime technological developments the peacetime American merchant marine must receive Government aid.

We certainly cannot accomplish this by removing the basic plans upon which our entire policy is founded, or by weakening legislation specifically designed to keep our merchant marine strong. We certainly cannot give our foreign friends a commercial carte blanche in peacetime and still give them adequately staffed and efficient ships in wartime. It merely evolves to the question of whether we desire unlimited free trade in peacetime and an inadequate or nonexistent American merchant marine—or whether we insist upon certain trade advantages for our own ships (which, incidentally, every foreign maritime nation does) and have a strong fourth arm of defense if the need arises.

I have been fighting for the latter principle for many years. I shall continue to fight for it. Changing times and conditions require changes in existing law. It is the function of Congress to determine whether such changes are in the best interest of the people of the United States. Accordingly, in the discharge of my duty, I ordered that hearings be held on the merits of this suggested amendment.

RESEARCH—ATOMIC SHIP

While it is necessary to work with the tools at hand to improve the status of our merchant marine, we cannot ignore the possible tools of the future. Nothing in this world is static. If we do not progress, we are, in effect, retrogressing. The speed of the retrogression is dependent upon how fast our competition is progressing. In the merchant marine field, our failure to devote a proper amount of time, money, and men to research and experimentation has retarded our overall progress. Our generation lives in the age of the atom. The experimental age, to be sure, but nonetheless, it is our lot to be faced with this challenging situation. If we meet the challenge, we can turn it to our advantage. If we fail, the world may go down with us.

I have advocated the construction and operation of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship. Certainly the national interest requires that the Federal Government take the lead and bear the brunt of the cost during the experimental and development stages. The full cooperation of the atomic-energy people, the nuclear-reactor manufacturers, and the representatives of the shipping companies would be essential to the success of such an undertaking.

With the reality of nuclear vessel propulsion upon us, I suggest the maritime industry is on the brink of an event of even greater impact than the coming of steam to trans-ocean movement of goods and people. The application of atomic energy to merchant vessels will make all of us hardly recognize this trade in the near future as judged by today's standards.

The potential carrying capacity of each vessel will be so great due to the increase in revenue space per ship and high speed that present trade volume could be handled with far fewer units. Concomitant changes will therefore be necessary in the entire steamship organization. Policy decisions will be rendered by or in close consort with engineers and physicists. Sea speeds will mean trade routes will necessarily be altered as distances shrink in terms of voyage days. Cargo handling time will stand in even greater contrast to present sea time and require courageous and forward-thinking solutions. Terminal facilities will require radical reshaping in order to adapt to the more modern ocean carrier. Port time must be cut to avoid retarding of the rapid movement of vessels.

Purely commercial and private operation of atomic-powered merchant vessels may be a greater distance away than their mere physical existence because of the heavy initial capital investment. Government and industry will have to work hand in hand to reduce the costs so that such a plan is practicable. Regardless of financial considerations, the private ownership of atomic-powered vessels is not so far off that the industry can dismiss the prospect of having soon to recast its total rate structure. With such recasting the true and total impact of atomic vessel propulsion will be felt. Competitive pricing of merchandise will undergo sharp changes worldwide as ocean transportation costs are drastically reduced. With the lower freight costs, goods will be moving across the ocean of a nature and in a volume as cannot presently be visualized. The atomic merchant ship will surely bring dramatically new patterns of international trade. These patterns will affect not our maritime industry alone but the very roots of our domestic economy. I hope the maritime industry stands ready to adjust to and pioneer in these developments. Ultimately, the net benefit thereof will be reaped by the peoples around the world.

The overall project is so vast and overwhelming that all of us could devote the remainder of our lives to this one task, and yet there would still be much to do. The fact that we may fail or encounter prodi-

gious problems along the way should not deter us one singe day. Who among you can tell me with accuracy how much time we have left to accomplish these necessities? The answer is obvious. Such research and development is essential to our national welfare and to the well-being of every operator of an American-flag vessel, as well as to the world.

Planning for ships which make up tomorrow's fleet is important. But we must plan ahead for the men to man them, too.

Finally, we are making important headway on the training facilities for the men our fleet will need.

By unanimous action of both the Senate and the House of Representatives the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point became a permanent Federal academy last February.

Ironically while administration spokesmen these days praise the American Merchant Marine, the Defense Department has threatened withdrawal of the Naval Reserve status held by the cadets at Kings Point and at the four State maritime academies. However, the Senate has passed a measure (S. 1748) designed to insure the continuation of this important reserve program and it is to be hoped tht the House will take similar action before they adjourn for the summer.

Veto of the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of a letter to the editor of the Deseret News written by Mr. Evan M. Hess of Plymouth, Utah, which was printed in that newspaper under date of May 7, 1956, and called to my attention by Mr. J. A. Watts of Logan, Utah.

This letter, which commends President Eisenhower for his veto on H. R. 12, also exhibits a rare quality of self-reliance seldom seen these days. Because it is typical of the philosophy epitomized by down-to-earth farmers, and is a refreshing expression of individualism, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH FARMER PRAISES THE VETO—PERMANENT SECURITY HELD UNATTAINABLE

Looking at the present farm situation through the eyes of one whose income is derived wholly from the soil, I find it impossible to find the proper words of praise with which to express the feelings of gratitude and thankfulness that came to me upon learning of our President's veto of a farm bill that would be impractical, impossible and nothing less than a burden on the Nation as a whole and a shortcut to farm regimentation, or in plain English, dictatorship.

After watching for 20 years or more the farmers of our Nation being sweet-talked into putting a price tag on their God-given right to do and act as they see fit, I can feel only respect and admiration for the action of our President and his Secretary of Agriculture in their attempt to loosen the chains of compulsory farm legislation and give back to us the priceless heritage of freedom our forebearers so gallantly defended for those who were to follow to enjoy because in this struggle for temporal salvation there is no man, body of men, or any political party that can guarantee temporal security in a material world.

Now that we are being offered an opportunity to think and act for ourselves and put to use our own initiative and ingenuity I sincerely hope the majority of the farmers of this great Nation can realize and understand more fully just what our President and Secretary of Agriculture are trying to do for us because it is when we sit back, drifting with the crowd and letting someone else do our thinking for us that we will eventually lose the right to do our own thinking and better would it be for us than were we mere beasts of burden in the field.

Strong men demand the fight for freedom while weaklings sit idly by and whimper for security.

EVAN M. HESS.

PLYMOUTH, UTAH.

Mike McDermott, a Democratic Missionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if a future historian relates the contribution of our present political parties I have to concede that he would credit the Republican Party with making the advertising jingle and the soap opera a political asset. Likewise, he must credit the Democratic Party with the organization of individuals of all walks of life into a party that gives all the opportunity to effectively express their governmental ideas. The Cook County Democcratic Organization has been a leading contributor to this democratic achievement. Coronet, one of our national magazines, recently depicted the operation of the basic unit of the great democracy of Cook County, the ward or neighborhood organization. It relates the poiltical story of Michael H. McDermott, a close personal friend and committeeman of the 13th Democratic ward organization, part of which is in my own congressional district. I think the article ought to be included in the RECORD.

BOSS OF THE THIRTEENTH

(By James A. Skardon)

Chictago, like many big cities, is divided into wards which, in turn, are divided into precincts. Biggest of the wards is the 13th, sprawling along the city's South Side from 55th to 75th Streets, north and south, and from Ashland to Harlem Avenues east and west. The ward includes the Chicago Midway Airport, Marquette Park, industrial plants, many homes and some 100,000 residents.

Of these, it is doubtful whether any one of them is more important to the ward as a whole than 5-foot-5, 172-pound, 55-year-old Irishman who each Tuesday and Thursday evenings from 7:30 to 10 p. m. sits at a desk in a murky office at 6509 South Kedzie Avenue and receives an endless stream of visitors. He is Michael H. McDermott who, as committeeman of the 13th Ward Regular Democratic Organization is, in effect, Democratic "boss" of the ward. As such, he is a key figure in the party organization that starts on the block level with the workers, and goes up through the assistant precinct captains, precinct captains, ward committeeman, and county and State committeemen to the national committee, paralelling governmental offices and often exceeding them in power. For when the party organization is strong, as in Mike's case (he has never lost the ward to the Republicans), the organization not only decides who is to run but, through the officials it elects, it governs.

To the people of his ward, Mike is government they can touch. He worries with them over their problems, visits with them when they are sick and, in general, sees to it that the party takes care of its own.

In doing this, he wraps up the ward for the Democratic Party.

For most of his life Mike has known little but politics. His father was a Chicago precinct captain before him. Mike got his start 30 years ago as an assistant precinct captain, became successively a precinct captain and then, after 18 years, ward committeeman.

The organization chose him to serve out the term of a man who had died; and the party elected him to a full 4-year term in 1952. This year he is running again for a job that pays him no salary and takes up so much of his spare time, including 2 evenings a week and most of Saturday and Sunday. But there are benefits in being a strong party man. Mike earns $8,000 a year on a fulltime job as chief clerk in the county clerk's office and, as a representative in the State assembly, he serves 6 months every 2 years at a salary of $10,000 a term.

Mike does an untold number of favors for the people of his ward. Some are done out of friendship, some out of sympathy; but by far the greatest number are done for the good of the party—for the simple and straightforward reason that when Mike, or perhaps 1 of the 98 precinct captains who work under him, helps someone out, just one thing is expected in return for the time, trouble, and thoughtfulness of the organization's man. That one thing is a vote for the candidates of the regular Democratic organization.

For this vote Mike might help to make it easier to get a license to run a school bus, give a letter of recommendation, get a jail guard transferred, help a boy apply for Annapolis, get a tax assessment more fairly adjusted, or find a job for one of the faithful. This is the you-do-this-for-me-and-I'll-do-this-for-you game that gets candidates elected in the precincts of American democracy.

If Mike plays this game skillfully, he is able to count on enough votes among the 54,000 registered voters in the 13th ward to carry the ward for the Democrats. He has won new friends and workers for the party. And the more people he and his organization convert, the bigger and more formidable Mike's own little empire becomes; and the stronger the party grows all the way from the precinct to Washington.

Every Saturday and sometimes on Sunday, Mike makes the rounds of his neighborhood, checking on needed civic improvements, calling at the maternity hospital to welcome a new baby, chatting with priests, ministers, storekeepers, policemen, teachers, club leaders, and householders.

Most of Mike's activities are of the practical sort that deal with the voters in his ward and their immediate problems. He gains as much from the on-the-spot associations as the voters do; for, especially at election time, he and his men must not only get out the vote, but must be able to give the party chiefs a running, up-to-the-minute report on the political feelings and voting intentions of the people within his ward.

By talking with people, checking on situations at first hand, and studying the reports from his captains, Mike knows, almost to the house, how the voting will go in his ward.

Thus, he is the party's eyes and ears as well as its helping hand and its gentle but firm persuader.

In the chain of command that controls the operations of a major political party, Mike reports to the higher ups just as the precinct captains report to him. When he gets a problem he can't handle on his own level, he takes it downtown to Democratic headquarters in the Morrison Hotel, where he talks with County Committee Chairman Richard Daley, who is also mayor of Chicago.

To Mike, whatever they say downtown is law, be it about the choice of a candidate, the use of party funds, or the handing out of jobs. This absolute obedience is a prime requisite for success in Mike's chosen profession; for without it a party, like an army, would not be able to function. Mike's loyalty and obedience to the party are steadfast, for, as he says, "I was born a Democrat and I believe in them."

A bachelor, Mike lives simply with his widowed sister in the same house in which he was raised. He neither drinks nor smokes and likes to get in a round of golf when he can. Evenings, when he is not at headquarters or attending some party function, he studies the latest changes in Chicago laws and reads books on politics.

Outside of the Democratic Party, one of his main interests in life is his young niece, Sharon Doran, who lives just down the block and sees to it that Uncle Mike doesn't forget the $1 allowance he gives her each week.

People leave Mike pretty much alone at night; but they know they can catch him at home on Sunday mornings before 10:45 when he leaves to attend 11 o'clock mass. He will spend the rest of the day doing numerous local political chores.

With most of his time and energy voluntarily contributed to the party, Mike has little left for himself; but he would have it no other way. He is proud of his party, and proud to be able to serve it. He would fight you at the merest suggestion that his work is not as honest as any other; or that he is not serving the public good. For Mike loves people with the same intensity that marks his devotion to the Democratic Party.

As a result, things would not be the same for him if he were not able to walk along calling everyone by their first name and having them answer, "Hiya Mike!" This makes it all worthwhile, and for Mike it makes the 13th ward the finest place in the world to live and work.

Address of Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts Before Reserve Officers Association at Remington Hall, Anniston, Ala., April 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the speech made by my colleague, Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS, on the occasion of the annual convention of the Reserve Officers Association in Anniston, Ala., April 28, 1956. It is an excellent speech depicting the great contributions which have been made by our Reserve forces, and the important role they play in our national defense today. It is important that in this time of international tension, we all recognize and support the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 as one of our strongest bulwarks of peace.

The speech follows:

This evening we are observing Military Reserve Week. I think it is altogether fitting and proper that this meeting be held here at Fort McClellan as by this coming together, we are in a sense honoring an institution that has contributed in every possible way to the defense of this Nation and to the defense of the free world. I have met many people in other parts of the country who remember the days of World War I and World War II and the training at Fort McClellan which fitted them for the defense of this country.

I am sure all of us know that during World War II, 350,000 troops were trained at McClellan and went on to practically all of the battlefields where American troops were found during World War II. During the years of inactivity at Fort McClellan, which have been few, National Guard and Reserve officers have trained here and have gone on to participate in Korea and, in fact, on every front where democracy is being challenged. We are indeed grateful for the fact that McClellan is again being given its right to prepare not only our men, but also the women of the WAC for their duties throughout the world. McClellan occupies a three-fold position, or I may say, has a three-fold mission. It is the center for the Chemical Corps Training Command, the permanent home of the WAC, and is the center for National Guard and Reserve training in the Southeast. I could not in all fairness pay tribute to this three-fold mission without emphasizing the tremendous contribution which is made by Anniston Ordnance Depot at Bynum. I am sure you know that had it not been for the preparation made there, the readiness and the efficiency of this installation, our troops in Korea would have had no ready supply of armament in that conflict. It has been reported that MacArthur's intelligence told him that heavy tanks could not be used in Korea because of the flimsy bridge structures and narrow roads, but, as you know, those of you who were in the Korean conflict, tanks were used by the Communists and had it not been for the fact that installations like Bynum had prepared for this eventuality, we would have been kicked completely out of the peninsula of Korea. With these two great defense installations, both having a tremendously important mission, certainly Calhoun County has contributed a great share to the defense of democracy.

Now, let me get back to my mission which constitutes a rare privilege in many ways. In the first place, having served in the Navy as a member of the Reserve Corps, I think I have an understanding of the attitude and I might say I know something about the treatment Reserves have received in the past. I suppose there will always be a certain amount of healthy competition between the Regulars and the Reserves, and while we like to talk about the importance of the citizen soldier, I think that without the regular establishment we could never hope to compete with the military of the dictatorship nations. I know that I speak the sentiment of all here when I say that we are all proud of West Point, Annapolis, and the new Air Force Academy. We are grateful for the products of these institutions and you have to admit that these establishments have a great deal on the ball when you consider the fact that from these schools have come men like Robert E. Lee, U. S. Grant, Phil Sheridan, Chester Nimitz, John Towers, Smedley Butler, Dwight D. Eisenhower, James Van Fleet, Lawton Collins and many others who have attained the heights of glory in military achievement. At the same time, however, the great mass of military personnel has always come from the ranks of average citizens and it has been the ability to convert people from the plough handle, the store, the factory, the mine and the forest in a short time which has made them equal or superior to the Nazi storm trooper and the regular soldier of our enemies in arms.

So, you might say that with the leadership provided by the Regular Army, Navy and Air Force, this country will doubtless continue to rely on a highly trained Reserve.

It occurs to me, however, that with the new nuclear weapons and with the crashing of the sonic barrier, the United States will never again have a breathing spell between the time of the first enemy attack and the period of retaliation on our part. I think there is general agreement on this fact and I sincerely believe that upon the success of our military reserve training program may well hinge the outcome of the next conflict. Historically, the subject of trained reserves has been with us since the latter part of the 18th century, but never before has this subject been so well pointed up as it was in the Korean emergency. Never before has the cost of the lack of a military program been so illustrated in terms of human unfairness and military unpreparedness. Between World War II and Korea, about 4½ million men came of military age; about 1,100,000 saw service through induction or enlistment; 3,500,000 did nothing and although about 900,000 of the 3,500,000 would have been 4–F under present military standards, the balance were fit in every way for military service and were required neither to train nor to serve. When the Korean conflict came we had no source of trained manpower except the National Guard and the veterans of World War II who still had a reserve obligation. About 986,000 reservists were recalled for Korea and of this group 70 percent—between 600,000 and 700,000—were veterans of World War II. These men were heads of families, defense workers, scientists, technicians, farmers and just plain citizens earning a living. They were ordered into active Federal service regardless of any of the above situations which might have deferred them from induction, while others younger than they who had never before worn the uniform and who were heads of families, defense workers, scientists, technicians, farmers and just plain citizens earning a living were exempt or deferred from induction on that basis. It was an odd situation that the county would call up a 32-year-old World War II veteran, completely inactive in the reserve, with a wife and 3 children, and yet a young man 19 years old, a college freshman or sophomore taking a campus course could be deferred "in the interest of national safety and welfare" as essential to the civilian economy. Further, if this young freshman or sophomore could do some successful wooing and get himself a wife and become a father while the fighting was going on—and immense numbers of them did—he was given a permanent exemption from service on that basis. In short, some men paid twice for their ticket to freedom while a larger and younger group drew free passes. Such a situation was repeated thousands of times during the Korean conflict. It could not be charged to a lack of patriotism on the part of this younger group, but certainly it demonstrated the lack of a fair system and one might even say the lack of good commonsense. The Korean war began in June 1950 and in 4 short months over 300,000 reservists had been recalled. By the end of the year, 700,000 reservists were on active duty.

Now let's look at the draft. In July not one soldier was inducted. In August about 1,500 were inducted, and in September 50,000 per month. In the following months the draft level was about 50,000. It is crystal clear that the first and most horrible year of the Korean war was fought by regulars brought quickly up to strength by veteran reservists, some of whom were in Korea less than a month after receiving their recall.

Aside from the aspect of human suffering, what did this cost the country in terms of dollars? Roughly, before Korea, dependency allowances were about a quarter of a billion dollars a year. After the war began these costs jumped to $1 billion a year, or a grand total of $3 billion for the 3 years of the conflict. Clearly, since men with families were not inducted during this period, the bulk of this money was required because of the recall of reservists, most of whom had families. The older veteran cost the Government more for dependents, housing, and schooling, as well as for other nongovernmental expenditures for emergency needs of wives and families by the Red Cross. No matter who spends the money, the American people pay the bill.

I cannot spend time in this talk trying to convince you of the importance of trained men; your presence here is sufficient proof of your belief. I think most of us know also that it is not weapons alone that wins wars, but the men who handle the weapons. In the final analysis, it is the man, his training, his morale, his courage that determines the survival of nations.

It has been said that from the earliest days of the Republic, a military obligation has been recognized and it will be remembered that the first reservist to serve his country was the minuteman of 1776. Most of the States followed a plan of setting up the office of adjutant general as one of the first provisions in their constitutions. This was natural and proper because before the pioneers could establish homes, churches, and schools, there undoubtedly had to be some semblance of order and security. From Washington's time down to the present, the citizen's obligation to serve in the defense of his country has been legally established. It is sad to note, however, that until last year with the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, no mandatory training had ever been provided for the future soldiers of this country.

I suppose one might say that the reluctance to provide for military training is due in part to the fear of the people of military dictatorship. Having been oppressed for so long by the mother country, by having troops quartered on them without their consent, the heroes of the Revolution probably transferred their hate of the Red Coats down to successive generations, and I might say that I think this hate has served a good purpose. Today, however, when we are living on the brink of nuclear war; when we are, as Senator Barkley said last Saturday night, attempting to see how close to the brink we can rollerskate without going over; it is well that we officially establish not only military obligation, but mandatory military training. The Congress has determined that since we need military manpower, the best way and the economical way is to have a smaller standing regular force and a large Reserve of 3 million men trained and ready. So it is that the Congress last year, for the first time, passed a universal military training law which will, it is hoped, do much to remedy these weaknesses in the Reserve.

From the moment children are born parents watch over them, protect them, and prepare them for the life ahead. We teach them to be careful in heavy traffic on the way to school and we call the doctor at the slightest sign of sickness. We do without many things we would like to have and sacrifice so that we can give our children the best education within our means so that they will be prepared to meet the challenge of life and the professional or business world, but we have utterly failed to make available to them the military training that will be so essential for their service in the event of war. In previous wars many men lost their lives because of the lack of training. The new 6-months training program at least gives them a chance to learn physical survival.

I will not spend much time trying to explain the details of the new act as I am sure that this group is quite familiar with it. As you know, it provides that young men between 17 and 18½ years of age can join the Army Reserve, the National Guard, or the Marine Corps Reserve, take 6 months of basic training and return home for Reserve service of 7½ years. Going in at this age, these men by the age of 25 or 26 will begin to have family responsibilities or to advance in their civilian jobs and will be completely out of service. The program also provides that young men who are over 18½ years old can enlist in the Reserves for 6 years by volunteering for 2 years' active service and 4 years as a part of a Reserve component. Because he chooses 2 years' active service instead of 6 months, his total Reserve obligation is 6 years instead of 8. In the third category a man has the choice of being drafted instead of volunteering and he would then serve 2 years of active duty.

Generally speaking, we will have 3 categories besides the National Guard; one, the Ready Reserve, consisting of 2.9 millions, of whom 1 million will be available immediately in an emergency proclaimed by the President, the remainder being on call in a national emergency announced by the Congress. This is our fire brigade. Secondly, we will have the Standby Reserve, which can be called only in time of war or a national emergency declared by the Congress. The third group is the Retired Reserve, whose members may be ordered to active duty if the Nation is at war or if Congress declares a national emergency.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the cooperation of the group this evening in putting this program across. It has advantages to the Nation, to you and me, to every citizen, to every family in this Nation of ours. With the confused and discouraging picture which we face on the international front, we cannot afford to become overconfident nor can we fail to recognize the facts of life. While I have a feeling that things are never as good as painted by the Republicans nor as dark as painted by the Democrats in an election year, I would be less than frank with you if I did not say that we are facing an enemy that has for its goal the complete domination and control of the world. The enemy is resourceful, ruthless, and persistent. In the past we have been assured that we held the advantage in science and technology, but we know that the enemy has the world's largest submarine force in existence. We know that the enemy has the atomic and hydrogen bomb. We know that he is outproducing us in long-range intercontinental bombers. We have been told on pretty good authority that Russia may come up with a long-range ballistics missile which would undoubtedly carry an atomic warhead and would enable him to immobilize and destroy many of the overseas bases, as well as the countries in which these bases are located.

In conclusion, we have our work cut out for us and it may be later than we think. This week—from April 22 to April 28—has been designated as National Reserves Week by the National Security Committee. It has been recognized by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and General Sarnoff, Chairman of the National Security Training Commission. This Reserve program must succeed, and it is our business to see that it does. While today we marvel at the wonders of science, the next war will be won just as have all wars in the past—by the ingenuity and courage of man himself. I do not subscribe to the business of a 1-bomb or 1-rocket war. I believe that we can hold our own in the production of nuclear weapons and the means with which to employ them. If we ever lose a war it will be because of our own lack of decision, our softness, and the lack of a real basic spirit of sacrifice. Let us remember, too, that while we prepare and teach our young men the art of war we hope that in so doing we shall convince the aggressor of the folly of an attack on this Nation and the free nations of the world. Let us hope and pray that there will come about an understanding of men everywhere, and that by continuing to work through agencies such as the United Nations we shall eventually reach that time so desired and so desirable, the time of peace on earth and good will toward men.

Speech by Representative Edna F. Kelly at the 50th Anniversary Banquet of the Tralee Social Club, May 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, of the 10th Congressional District of New York, at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Tralee Social Club on Saturday, May 19, 1956.

At the same time, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Congresswoman KELLY for the stanch support she has given to our efforts here in the Congress to secure passage of a resolution urging the elimination of partition in Ireland. Much of the credit for the success we have had in the past rightly belongs to Mrs. KELLY. She has been a great source of strength in the fight and her diligent work and intelligent counseling have been of inestimable help.

The ending of partition has long been a matter of concern to Congresswoman KELLY and she has devoted much energy and attention to it. Mrs. KELLY and I both feel that passage of the resolution would materially aid in bringing about mutual discussions and the eventual amicable settlement of the border problem in Ireland. I am sure that with the continued assistance and untiring efforts of Mrs. KELLY, the day will soon come when we will be successful in securing the approval of the House of Representatives in declaring that all Ireland should be united unless the people of that country, in a free plebiscite, otherwise declare.

The address follows:

I appreciate the honor of being called on to speak at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Tralee Social Club. I am grateful for this opportunity for many reasons. First, to pay tribute to your president, Bryan Sheehy, a constituent of mine, a neighbor, and a personal friend for many years. His loyalty, sincerity, and integrity are some of his characteristics which have contributed to his being an outstanding citizen of our community and of our city.

My second reason is to pay tribute to the Honorable John Joe Sheehy, of Tralee, Ireland. While of no relation to Bryan, I dare say they come from the same clan. John, too, is well known as an athlete and a statesman. He is visiting the United States to attend the Gaelic games next week, as the chairman of the Ballyseedy Memorial Committee.

Another reason for my being here is to rededicate myself and you to the cause which is a united Ireland. It was my responsibility the first year I sat as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, to guide through the committee the Fogarty resolution of which, incidentally, I was cosponsor. I succeeded in seeing the resolution through the committee but it went down in defeat on the floor of the House of Representatives.

We know that Ireland should not remain divided any more than Korea, Germany, and Vietnam. The United States is striving for the unification of these latter countries. Why not Ireland? Ireland, too, must be united for political, economic, social, and moral reasons. In 1918, after years of struggle, Ireland won her independence from England but the six northern counties of Ireland, gerrymandered by England to assure British control, remain under England's rule.

Unification is necessary in order that Ireland may take her rightful place in the community of nations. The principles of the Irish people are well known and are needed now more than ever in the affairs of the world.

History records Ireland's great contribution to western civilization. Let us never forget that when darkness engulfed the hearts and minds of men and the lamps of learning were blown out by the barbarian invasions in Europe, the only light that the eyes of man could and finally did take bearings by was the single strong flame which was kept alive on the little green isle. So powerful was this flame that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the western world. It burns because it was nurtured by faith in God; His justice, His wisdom, and His mercy.

I renew my sponsorship for unification of Ireland and I need not, I am sure, urge you to do the same. Jointly we will succeed.

State Water Rights Must Be Reaffirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Denver Post entitled "State Water Rights Must Be Reaffirmed." It deals with the need for legislation to protect our most vital resource—water.

The editorial follows:

STATE WATER RIGHTS MUST BE REAFFIRMED

So far as the 17 Western States are concerned, there is no more important legislation before Congress than the Barrett bill (S. 863). This measure which was introduced by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, is designed to settle and, in effect, quiet title to the water rights of water users in these States against claims that the United States owns virtually all the water in all the rivers and streams of the West.

The Barrett bill would (1) prohibit any Federal interference with the exercise of existing water rights which have been granted by the Western States, and (2) require that water rights for any Federal programs or projects shall be acquired in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, and use or distribution of such water.

"This legislation," Hatfield Chilson, of Loveland, attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board, told the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at the recent hearing, "merely places the Federal Government on a parity with other water users. If it wants to use water, it comes in and gets it with the same priority and by the same method that an individual or a citizen of the State would obtain his water right." That, we had assumed, has always been the rule. But the Supreme Court found otherwise.

"The position of the State of Colorado," Chilson said, "is that the State of Colorado, since it was admitted to the Union, is the owner and has full control over the waters and the water use in the State of Colorado. (That is in the State constitution which was accepted by Congress.) We do not recognize that the Federal Government has any rights in the body of water or water use in Colorado except such as they have acquired under the doctrine of appropriation, which is the official water doctrine of the State of Colorado.

"The basic issue involved is very simple. The question is, Does the Federal Government own and thereby control all of the unappropriated waters in the Western States; and secondly, Does the Federal Government by virtue of withdrawals and reservations of Government land thereby have a water right which was vested at the time of the withdrawal?"

The theory or philosophy of Federal control of western waters, of which J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, seems to be the principal proponent, is:

1. When the lands which now compose the Western States were ceded to the United States, the United States became the owner of the lands and waters and the rights to use of that water.

2. While Congress has the power to give waters and the use thereof to the States, it has not done so and the title to unappropriated water remains in the United States.

3. Any water right initiated by a water user after the date of Federal withdrawal of public lands from settlement is subject to any future uses of water which the Federal Government chooses to make in connection with the withdrawn lands.

The construction placed by the Department of Justice on the United States Supreme Court in the Pelton (Oreg.) case has alarmed Western States. The time has come when Congress should say, in unmistakable words, that adjudication of water rights is exclusively a State matter, and that all claimants—Government or individual—are on the same footing. It can do that by passing the Barrett bill.

Eighty-fifth Anniversary of the Deisroth Stores of Hazleton and Bloomsburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker on May 17, 1956, in which this newspaper calls attention to the long and successful history of the Deisroth Department Stores, which had its inception at Hazleton in the year 1871 and is now a flourishing enterprise:

DEISROTH'S 85TH YEAR

With three generations still active in the management of 3 stores operating under the family name, a business established by Peter Deisroth 85 years ago continues to grow. Today the firm operates department stores in Hazleton and Bloomsburg and an appliance store here, reflecting the progress made.

To commemorate its 85th anniversary, Deisroth's yesterday staged an oldtime street parade, with the participants wearing costumes, many of which were probably bought from Peter Deisroth himself.

As the unique demonstration moved down Broad street under a cloud-flocked sky, the garb brought to the minds of many of the older spectators the time when a great part of Deisroth's stock was displayed in sidewalk showcases.

Peter Deisroth entered the mercantile field in 1867 with the firm of Lauderburn and Smith, which occupied the site where Deisroth's store stands today. In 1871 he joined the firm and soon his name became a byword in Hazleton's growing business life.

Later his sons Will A. and Alvan Y. became associated in the business.

Will Deisroth died in 1933 and today his 3 sons, William M., Frederic W. and Philip M. Deisroth and several of his grandchildren carry on the traditions of the firm together with Alvan Y. Deisroth.

Mrs. Amanda Deisroth, widow of the founder, lived to a very ripe age, passing away in recent years. It was her pleasure to see, and to take part in the official opening of the modern Deisroth store in 1935, a year which marked the 87th anniversary of her birth.

Arthur B. Deisroth, another son of the founder, died at an early age and a daughter, Mrs. C. J. Kirschner, died in recent years.

Several years ago the family gave evidence of its appreciation to the community by giving the Deisroth homestead on North Church Street for use as a community center which today houses many of Hazleton's social service agencies.

The Greater Hazleton area extends best wishes to the Deisroth firm as it progresses toward its centennial.

Extend Authority for Flood-Protection Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of a statement I made this morning before the Davis subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee on H. R. 9554.

The material follows:

EXTEND AUTHORITY FOR FLOOD-PROTECTION PROJECTS

(Remarks of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN before House Subcommittee on Public Works, May 23, 1956)

I am very thankful to my distinguished friend, Chairman DAVIS, and all the other able members of this committee, for the opportunity to present my views on H. R. 9554 and similar pending measures to provide additional general authorization for small flood-protection work.

The basic bill before you was introduced by our good and able friend the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK. I have a

companion bill which relates to the subject matter and I understand that there are several other bills now pending.

Mr. McCORMACK's bill has already been passed by the Senate and I believe it is here before you.

I am sure that you all appreciate the extreme urgency of these measures not only for my district, State, and area, but also for the entire flood-stricken Northeast as well as other sections of the country, which are visited from time to time with devastating floods.

The objectives of Mr. McCormack's bill and related bills are very well known to all of you and I, therefore, will not take the time now to analyze their provisions.

In effect this measure, which I personally think is one of the best on the subject presented to the Congress in a long time, would greatly facilitate and accelerate urgently needed flood public works by increasing to $500,000 the present cost limitations in small flood control project authority.

As you know, yesterday the House passed the regular public works appropriation bill, which contained many necessary projects that will be very helpful to the States and communities concerned. However, even when these projects get underway there will be large gaps in the overall flood-protection program, which will have to be met by Mr. McCormack's bill and other bills now being considered by this very able committee.

I understand that the bill has been not only passed by the Senate as I stated before, but it is also approved in principle by the Secretary of the Army.

It unquestionably would promote speed and efficiency in carrying forward a number of not only desirable but urgently needed smaller projects and I think that it is imperative for the House to take action on the measure as soon as it possibly can.

In my opinion, it is the answer to the alleviation of a large variety of water resources and water-flowage conditions throughout the Nation. It will afford many necessary protective measures.

So far as my own district and State are concerned—and this is true of the entire Northeast area—the early passage of this bill would be of greatest value in helping us to secure relief and rehabilitation as well as future protection against the floods which have periodically ravaged us and with such terrible results last summer and fall.

I am confident that this capable committee will give this vital matter prompt, careful attention and come up as speedily as possible with the McCormack bill, or a composite bill containing its basic principles, so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House at an early date.

I earnestly plead with you especially for expeditious action in this matter, and thank you all for your kindness in hearing me at a time when you are so busily engaged.

Thank you for your generous consideration.

The Agricultural Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House today completed final congressional action on H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956, which was introduced by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The measure now goes to the President.

For the convenience of the Members and to answer numerous inquiries from throughout the Nation, I am inserting at this place in the RECORD a concise statement of the major provisions of this legislation.

Major provisions of H. R. 10875, as finally passed by Congress, are:

First. A $1,200,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) An acreage reserve designed to reduce acreages of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Payments to farmers would be made to reduce their acreages of these crops below their acreage allotments and could be made as soon as the acreage is measured. The Department of Agriculture's present estimates of the payments to be made per acre for this reduction are: tobacco, $100 to $300; cotton, $48 to $60; peanuts, $50 to $70; wheat, $18 to $25; corn, $36 to $50; rice, $60 to $75. A maximum of $750 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

Deleted from the bill in its final form were three provisions relating to the soil bank which were included in the House bill. These would have provided acreage reserve programs for feed grains, other field crops, and grazing lands.

(b) A conservation reserve designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in H. R. 10875; limits have been put on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds; and provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers.

Second. Corn: The bill authorizes four different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports on corn in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—will be eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51-million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program recently announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Producers outside the commercial area will receive a support at 82½ percent of the level of the support for compliance corn in the commercial area—or about $1.24 a bushel.

Third. Feed grains: The level of price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats is set at 76 percent of the parity price for each commodity as of May 1, 1956. Thus, the 1956 supports will be: barley $1.02 per bushel; oats 65 cents per bushel; rye $1.27 per bushel, and grain sorghums $1.97 per hundredweight. These higher level supports thus supersede the 70 percent supports announced by the Secretary. The Secretary had set the supports at 93 cents for barley, 59 cents for oats, $1.16 for rye, and $1.80 for grain sorghums.

Fourth. The bill directs that the soil bank be started with 1956 crops, as provided in the bill as it originally passed the House. The Senate bill directed only that the Secretary start the program with the 1956 crop to the extent he deems practicable. The return to the House language is a clear indication of congressional policy that the fact that some crops have been planted is not to stand in the way of starting the program this year.

Fifth. Appeals procedure: Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil-bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violation.

Sixth. Production on Government-owned lands: The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

Seventh. Cotton: (a) A freeze of the 1957 and 1958 national acreage allotments at no less than the 1956 allotment; (b) a provision that no State acreage allotment can be cut in 1957 and 1958 by more than 1 percent below 1956; (c) a special 100,000-acre national reserve is created to add to the allotments of small farmers; and (d) the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to sell Government cotton for export at the price necessary to regain America's traditional world market at around 5,000,000 bales annually.

Eighth. Transitional parity: The bill freezes transitional parity for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts—the only three basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula—will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they otherwise would have been. The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, 1957, and to include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out this recommendation.

Ninth. Rice: The bill provides that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 shall not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955; and that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1953 shall not be less than the final national allotment for

1956, and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment. The bill provides a certificate program for rice. This is identical with the certificate program provided in the vetoed H. R. 12 except that inauguration of the program is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and will not be put into effect unless he determines and proclaims that the initiation of a program is "administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States."

Tenth. Cottonseed and soybeans: The bill requires that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

Eleventh. Surplus commodities—Other provisions: The bill embraces improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other important provisions, some of which are discussed below.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grains, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to donate food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

Solution of our surplus problem, particularly in textiles, would be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this bill to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

An appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities.

The bill authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the bill authorized a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem—authority which the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have—there are other directives in the bill designed also to deal with the surplus situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing of surplus food commodities domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan. He is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter. He is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency. He is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

Civil Rights Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS REPORTS

The majority and minority reports of the House Judiciary Committee on the administration's belated civil rights bill may not add greatly to the sum total of human knowledge but they do emphasize the unhappy sectional split over this issue, which needs no emphasizing.

The 32-man committee acted favorably on the bill late last month. For some reason the 2 reports have only just been released, revealing a minority of 6 Democrats and 1 Republican, all from the South, united in deep opposition. The measure, they say, is absolutely shocking, would devastate the principle of States' rights, and would permit the Federal Government to invade local jurisdictions. On the contrary, says the majority, the purpose of the bill is to make more certain that rights guaranteed by the Constitution and law of the United States will be enjoyed by all. We entirely agree with this latter view.

In brief, what the bill does is to set up a bipartisan commission on civil rights with subpena power, establish a new civil-rights division in the Justice Department, grant the Federal Government powers to prevent intimidation at the polls, and give persons deprived of their civil rights direct access to the Federal judiciary without first having to go through State courts.

The most interesting thing about this series of proposals is that the administration did not see fit to embody them in legislative form sooner than the spring of this presidential election year, when they would be calculated to cause maximum embarrassment to the Democratic Party. But that does not alter the fact that the proposals themselves are entirely desirable and ought to be adopted.

Whether they can get past the difficult barrier of the Rules Committee, then the House itself, and above all the Senate, is another question. Chances are slim, and the late date at which this legislation is being pushed doesn't increase the probabilities.

Mr. Speaker, Americans care much less about the politics involved, who will get credit, or who may be embarrassed by this legislation than they care about giving every citizen a fair shake under our Constitution.

I can see no partisanship in a matter so basic as the strengthening of civil rights, and urge the Committee on Rules to report out this legislation without further delay.

The Carrot Approach To Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, for several months, the threat of the Powell amendment has hung over H. R. 7535, delaying action on the Kelley bill to provide needed Federal aid to school construction.

Meanwhile, we have at hand the alternative approach offered by our colleague from Arizona, Congressman UDALL, who would have the Federal Government share the cost of integration.

Under the heading "The Carrot Approach To Integration," Mr. Richard L. Strout discussed these two contrasting approaches to integration in the following article in the May 19, 1956, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

THE CARROT APPROACH TO INTEGRATION
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—If I lift my glance from my typewriter and look out across Pennsylvania Avenue, I can see a glint of gray-blue water a mile or so away (over the red tile roof of the enormous Commerce Department Building) and that is the Potomac River. On the other side of the river is Fairfax County, Va., an area that apparently is willing to go ahead with integration of schools. But Fairfax County is in a State where (although its ratio of Negro population is lower than that in the District of Columbia) integration is frowned upon. (The District of Columbia, incidentally, has integrated its schools and is a practical example both of the difficulties and possibilities involved.)

Well, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, lives over in Fairfax County. He comes from a State which maintained dual school systems until the Supreme Court ruled them illegal. And now Mr. UDALL comes forward with a moderate, middle-road proposal which is attracting much attention. It is an application of the ancient idea of using a carrot instead of a stick.

Why shouldn't the Federal Government, he asks, pay some of the heavy costs of school integration in those areas which are willing to undertake it? Why not drop the punitive features of the so-called Powell amendment (by Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Demo-

crat, of New York, barring States from Federal school aid which continue segregation) and substitute the proposals of the Udall amendment, to have the Federal Government help meet the costs of integration?

Mr. UDALL told the House about his proposal last February 21; a House labor subcommittee has just this week approved it. It's now or never for the pending $1.6 billion Federal aid to school construction bill. If it doesn't pass in the next 2 months it will be lost for this Congress. Educationalists call America's overcrowded schools a disgrace, but the chances of getting the pending bill through hinge very largely on whether the stick approach is tried (the Powell amendment) or the carrot approach (the Udall amendment).

The thing that stands out in the District of Columbia experience with integration is that the schools for Negroes that were supposed to be separate but equal were not in fact equal; that the educational standards of the Negro students were well below those of the whites; and that integration means a big new cost unless the whole Washington school system is to be leveled down.

Here is the start of the argument Mr. UDALL advances. Southern States built up a dual school system believing it legal (as it was for 58 years). Now it is suddenly illegal and a great many old school buildings will have to be abandoned and a lot of new ones built, let alone other costs.

Doesn't the Nation owe an obligation to meet part of this cost? Wouldn't the application of some of the proposed new school-construction money to this purpose—say $25 to $50 million annually—be warmhearted testimony to areas concerned that the rest of the country appreciates their difficulties and stands behind them?

Mr. UDALL recalls that, for a while, Representative POWELL thought of withdrawing his own punitive amendment if the Udall proposal were adopted as a substitute. That compromise fell though. But the Udall idea still stands.

A feature of Mr. UDALL's proposal is that local school districts would be allowed to apply direct to Washington for aid irrespective of the official attitude of their State as a whole. Obviously few districts would apply in some Southern States. But Mr. UDALL now has evidence that a lot of marginal areas, willing to apply local option, like the idea very much.

Dr. Clifford Blackburn, superintendent of schools, North Little Rock, Ark., for example, said it would aid many districts. Dr. Oscar V. Rose, superintendent of schools in Midwest City, Okla., writes Mr. UDALL that he and Dr. Oliver Hodge, State superintendent, think the proposal of inestimable value.

Again Dr. Robert R. Martin, Kentucky school superintendent, writes that the plan has outstanding merit and value. It is not integration itself but the cost of integration, Dr. Martin points out, that puts a terrible burden on many small affected areas.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the same issue of this great newspaper calls attention to the effect of the punitive provisions of the Powell amendment, and to the fact that its adoption would probably lead to defeat of H. R. 7535 without helping integration at all. The editorial follows:

POWELL AMENDMENT: COSTLY, FUTILE

Supporters of the measure to extend Federal aid to education now believe they have enough votes lined up in the House of Representatives to defeat the Powell amendment. With this out of the way, passage of the aid bill has seemed a foregone conclusion for some time.

The Powell amendment looks reasonable enough at first glance. The Supreme Court has ruled laws invalid which would segregate public school children simply because of race. The Powell amendment would deny Federal aid to school districts which continued to separate Negro and white children.

But rearranging institutions and practices which in most of the 17 States affected have always been based on segregation is a complex and costly business. It is also a delicate business. For the change flies in the face of mores centuries old.

In fact, the feeling runs so deep that if the Powell "rider" were attached the school-aid bill would fail. For opponents from the Deep South would be joined by some who oppose Federal aid anyway and would likely welcome the opportunity to defeat it without attacking it directly as such.

A vote for the Powell amendment would put some Congressmen on record before some of their constituents as striking an ostensibly sturdy blow for integration and punishing those who hold out for segregation. But this would be done at the expense of the children, both Negro and white, from whom better facilities would thus be withheld. And it would not help the cause of racial desegregation one bit. To put it more strongly: It might set back progress in racial amity and make even more difficult an already difficult search for solutions.

Why is this so? Because the Powell amendment is punitive. It says to school districts: If the school buildings or additions you are building or plan to build are not opened to both races when they are finished, you get no help. And the feeling in many areas of the South is now so strongly aroused that the effect of such an approach could only be to harden, not to weaken it.

The Powell amendment would undertake the delicate process of adjusting to desegregation with the bulldozer of legislation instead of with the trowel of equity powers in the hands of the local Federal courts. It will be recalled that the Supreme Court directed these tribunals to retain jurisdiction and to give utmost consideration to individual local conditions and difficulties.

If Congress feels, for any reason, that the school-aid bill must be designed to further the desegregation decision, let it enact the Udall bill. This would offer extra and direct Federal aid to school districts which must and wish to build additional facilities in order to obey the Supreme Court's decision. This would proceed upon encouragement, not upon punishment—use the carrot, not the stick. This bill would work toward solutions, not provoke defiance.

For is it not apparent now that if the substance, not the mere legal shadow, of equality of opportunity between the races is to be achieved, citadels of resistance must be won by the warmth of a pervading sunshine, not the blasts of an angry wind?

The Kremlin and Katyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1956, which discusses the Katyn massacre of 4,000 Polish Army officers in 1940:

Justifiably, freemen everywhere are skeptical when the scissors of world communism snip whole chapters from history books—even when the revised version tallies more closely with generally accepted fact. The whole Orwellian technique of using scissors and paste to rewrite history is odious to the free world. Yet—although Soviet motives are often dubious—it would be a mistake merely to scoff every time Russia's new masters admit that Stalin's version of history was a grotesque perversion of truth.

A case in point is the still unconfirmed report that the Polish Communist Government may reopen the case of the notorious Katyn massacre in 1940. This mass slaughter of more than 4,000 Polish Army officers has been steadfastly blamed on the Nazis by Moscow historians. Other investigations have established that the Russians themselves were responsible, and there has been a good deal of testimony in the United States Congress on the subject. But now, according to reports, Stalin may now be made the scapegoat for the massacre.

If this admission should be made, it would be significant and welcome. And although such an admission might be considered as another flip-flop in the Soviet line, surely it is to the interest of the free world to encourage further confessions of responsibility for such Communist offenses against humanity as the Korean war and the germ-warfare fraud—even if, to save face, they must be blamed on the unspeakable Stalin. Even an approach to the truth that would recognize Communist fallibility in the party's history books would be a major gain.

Israel's Peace Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial appeared in the New York Times today, entitled "Israel's Peace Move," and I would like to insert it at this point.

ISRAEL'S PEACE MOVE

In a new and dramatic bid for peace Premier Ben-Gurion of Israel has offered to meet Premier Nasser of Egypt at any time and in any place, including Cairo itself, to discuss a settlement that would end the technical state of war between their countries and serve as a model for a peace settlement for the whole Middle East. What is more, he has offered to discuss any questions Premier Nasser wishes to raise, including not only political, economic and military matters, but also the issues of the borders and of the Arab refugees.

This offer assumes special significance in view of still unconfirmed reports that Premier Nasser is also revising his policy toward Israel and is now advising all Arab states to drop their insistence on the United Nations partition plan for Palestine, which would strip Israel of about one-third of the territory it now holds, and to adopt a new policy based on the demarcation lines of the armistice agreements of 1949. If true, this revised policy would open up new and hopeful possibilities.

The way to such promising developments was paved by the recent mission of Secretary General Hammarskjold, who obtained new ceasefire pledges which, if kept, would rule out a settlement by force. But the developments themselves were initiated by an unprecedented visit to Israel by an Egyptian newspaperman who came with the approval of both sides and is now presenting to the Egyptians a picture of Israel rather different from that offered them by their own prop-

aganda. He is able to tell them that, contrary to their propaganda, Israel does not want war and that peace is the dream of all Israelis, from the Premier down. He is also able to tell them, again contrary to their propaganda, that Israel is not falling apart and is actually making great economic and industrial progress.

Thus the first breach in the curtain set-up by the Arabs against Israel has let some fresh air into a stifling atmosphere, and the visiting newspaperman, Ibrahim Izzat, and his magazine, Rosa el Youssef, deserve due credit for this. May others follow their example.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when Egypt has already recognized Peiping, and at a time when Syria is due to follow, it would be nice if we could get the Arab states to recognize Israel and the fact that it is here to stay. Certainly peace in the Middle East could be assured if the Arabs would accept this simple fact.

It would also be nice if Mr. Dulles recognized from all of this that we must never abandon our proven friends if we are to continue to deserve the respect and confidence of our allies.

One Party Press?—Which Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Press-Telegram of May 21 carried editorial comment of exceeding interest to those who make, echo and reecho "one party press" charges every campaign period. The eye-opening editorial is as follows:

POLITICAL NEWS REPORTING

As the campaigns enter the climactic phase, the old cry about the so-called "one-party press" echoes in the hustings.

By now any newsman can recite the charges heard from Democratic partisans:

The press is a propaganda organ for the Republican party.

Democratic activities are squeezed into the corners or not published at all.

The people don't get a chance to hear "the other side."

Curious as to the truth of the charge about disparity in the space devoted to Republicans and Democrats, a member of our staff took a ruler the other day and thumbed through the home edition of one of the newpapers.

He measured the inches of space devoted to the local reporting of activities of the two major political parties.

His survey, which can be duplicated by any interested person, covered the period since April 16 when the present election campaigns were beginning to get under way in earnest in this community.

Here are the results:

Inches devoted to Democratic activity	362
Inches devoted to Republican activity	84
Pictures of Democratic partisans	9
Pictures of Republican partisans	2

Do these results mean that our political editors have been bending over backwards to print Democratic publicity, meanwhile giving the Republicans a cold shoulder?

That theory is no more correct than the accusation that Democratic news is suppressed.

The fact is that the Democrats have simply been making more news. The Republican presidential preference primary offers no contest, while on the Democratic side, Adlai Stevenson and ESTES KEFAUVER have been talking volumes. Both, incidentally, have brought their campaigns into their community personally. Meanwhile, the intraparty contests for assembly and congressional nominations in this community are on the Democratic side. Republican candidates are unchallenged in their respective races for Republican nominations.

Under such circumstances, it is quite natural that most of the action should be taking place on the Democratic side of the fence. And it is quite natural that the news reported in the press should be in the proportions noted above.

Talk of maintaining a balance of news—in the sense that Democrats and Republicans must get the same amount, line for line—is obvious nonsense.

It's the newspapers' job to report what happens. If more is happening in the Democratic Party than in the Republican, then of course there will be more Democratic news. If more is happening in the Republican Party than in the Democratic, the opposite will be true.

Another factor influencing the handling of political news is the importance of other news which occurs simultaneously. A political story that might make page 1 on Monday might be cut short and pushed to inside pages on Tuesday—because some other event may have occurred which overshadows it.

The fact is, however, that in the Nation as a whole, the Democratic Party comes out very well when the press space is measured after the elections are over.

When Democratic bigwigs talk about a one-party press they are just venting their spleen at publishers for reserving a bit of space on the editorial page to express their views.

They Will Not Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News, Tuesday, May 22, 1956:

SOVIET SATELLITES VERSUS RUSSIAN POLICE-STATE RULE: THEY WILL NOT REVOLT

(By Ludwell Denny)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Moscow-dictated new look among Russia's Eastern European satellites could mean 1 of 2 drastic results—they could revolt, or go maverick Communist like Tito. In this, the second of a series of five articles, Ludwell Denny pinpoints the possibilities and analyzes the risks the Kremlin runs by trying to pretty up the face of puppet regimes.)

VIENNA, May 22.—The Allies hope the police-state relaxation in the satellites will lead to anti-Communist revolt, or at least the Tito-type national communism.

But there's no firm evidence of this yet—and none in sight, short of a world war.

There is fear in the puppet regimes that relaxation may be getting out of hand. And it's true the populations are 80 to 90 percent anti-Communist and anti-Russian.

It's also true the East European peoples for centuries have been very nationalistic and still are.

FACTORS

So revolt seems the logical result. Unfortunately, however, other more powerful factors are operating. Even a major attempt at rebellion is unlikely. These unfavorable factors include:

Complete Soviet military and police control.

Western Europe's preference for Soviet-style peaceful coexistence at satellite expense.

Fear of German revenge which makes Poland and Czechoslovakia dependent on Soviet alliance to hold their German territories.

Lack of any popular will to revolt, except remnants in East Germany and Poland.

Lack of able anti-Red and anti-Russian leaders—all are dead, imprisoned, or in exile.

Russian military and police control of the satellites has not been lessened by the much-publicized new look in Moscow.

The fact that the Kremlin has relaxed its police state method a little in some satellites (as Poland and Hungary) but tightened control in others (as East Germany) shows that it is moving cautiously.

GAMBLE

Controlled relaxation is a good gamble because of the propaganda value of neutralizing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and getting more production out of slave peoples. But the Kremlin would not consider these results worth risking the loss of the satellites.

Of course Moscow can misjudge the situation. But the significant fact is that if relaxation does go too far to suit the Kremlin it has the will and means to crack down—even to the point of slaughtering millions, as has been done in Russia in the past.

Red regimes not only have all the guns and the populace none, but the regimes also have a secret police system which sees into every factory, office, farm, and virtually every home. Relaxation instead of weakening has strengthened this internal spy system by uncovering critics. Any incipient revolt would be permeated by Red agents.

A second factor—the satellite peoples' loss of faith in the West—is increasingly important. This distrust began when the allies failed to come to the rescue in the heroic, unarmed revolt of East Germans against Soviet tanks June 17, 1953.

BETRAYAL

The American and allies' phony clasp of friendship with the Soviet dictators last summer at the summit conference seemed a betrayal to the satellite countries. So did the recent London welcome of Red party boss, Nikita Khrushchev and Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin, and the pilgrimage of the French Prime Minister and Foreign Minister to Moscow.

Overall, the satellite peoples know that Soviet developments of the hydrogen bomb eliminates the slight possibility Western Europe might help them win liberation.

At the same time, West Germany's spectacular economic recovery and potential as major military power, plus revival of German nationalism, force even anti-Russian Poland and Czechoslovakia to cling to the Soviet alliance. That's their only protection against Germany's claim to her lost provinces.

DISSATISFIED

The satellites in general are very dissatisfied now but not in the sense of rebellion. The will to fight for freedom, which the Poles have shown in the past and which the East Germans demonstrated 3 years ago, is not typical.

Czechoslovakia lost her freedom to Nazi Germany without fighting, later lost her freedom to Russia without fighting, and is now even more timid. Hungary, where hatred of Russia probably is greatest, has accommodated to the regime almost as much as Czechoslovakia. Rumania and Bulgaria

have given up and are virtual Russian provinces.

This complaisance—general throughout the satellites except in East Germany—is the result of economic controls as much as police terror. When keeping a job or room or food depends on going along with the regime, and this desperate situation is prolonged year after year, even the strongest rebel either escapes or is broken.

INFLUENCE

Titoism has had surprisingly little influence on any satellite so far. The only major effect has been that imposed by Moscow to woo the Yugoslav Maverick.

The Kremlin, in line with its de-Stalinization program, has replaced Bulgaria's anti-Tito leader, Vulko Chervenkov, with another stooge.

In Hungary, Tito's arch-enemy, Matyas Rakosi, remains in power though he has "rehabilitated" Foreign Minister Laszlo Rajk who was executed for Titoism in 1949 and has released some of Mr. Rajk's friends from prison.

There's no Tito-type national communism of any importance in any Red satellite parties except in Poland where it is only potential. If the first step, "relaxation" of police terror, is successful, probably the second will be satellite autonomy—a la Titoism. But if so, it will be prapaganda camouflage applied by Kremlin orders without reducing Soviet control.

DIFFERENCE

The basic differences between Yugoslavia and the major satellites is that she was never under Russian military rule and they were—and still are.

Geography enables Tito—the only non-Russian European Communist of any stature—to free himself from military and economic dependence on Russia and therefore any part subservience to the Kremlin.

Titoism is making more headway in western Europe, the Middle East and Asia than in eastern Europe.

Arms Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Daily of May 21, 1956:

ARMS AGAINST ISRAEL

We wonder whether it is stupidity or ignorance that leads the State Department into its continuing faux pas in connection with the arms to the Middle East situation.

On one hand we had the administration sanctioning a second shipment of arms and ammunition to Saudi Arabia last Tuesday and then condoning the cancellation of a shipment of half-tracks to Israel last Friday.

Does this appear to be discrimination? It sure does. Can we blame Senator LEHMAN, Congressman CELLER, and others in Congress from screaming their lungs out at this apparent inequity? We cannot.

As Adlai Stevenson remarked when told of the Saudi Arabia arms shipment, "This is a curious way to end an arms race."

We think Messrs. Eisenhower, Dulles, and their advisers better take stock of the predicament they are in very quickly.

It appears that a case of rank favoritism has set in as regards the Near East. And it appears all too boldly that little Israel is getting a kicking around from Washington.

This blatant double standard practiced by our State Department has done us much harm already. It seems that we've not only lost face with the free nations abroad, but this double dealing has sickened a lot of us here at home.

Bradley Commission's Recommendations Should Not Be Carried Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the distinct pleasure of attending together with other Members of Congress, a breakfast given by the Disabled American Veterans. This honored and venerable organization is opposed to the recommendations recently made by the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

The speech which I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was made by Mr. Irving Peltz, national service officer of Brooklyn, and spokesman for the New York Department of DAV. Mr. Peltz is a disabled veteran of World War II with a total disability for multiple amputations. He would, in all probability, personally benefit if the Bradley Commission's recommendations were to be carried out. From experience gained in this field, however, he knows that adoption of the recommendations would be harmful to thousands of other disabled veterans and he, therefore, opposes them as do the 2½ million disabled and partially disabled veterans throughout the country.

I have always felt that, in order for our Nation to remain secure, we must not only be strong ourselves but we must also have strong allies. For that reason I have been an ardent supporter of foreign aid legislation. But in doing so, we should not forget for a single moment our own boys who have bled and who continue to suffer from the wounds inflicted on their bodies and souls by the ravages of war. Any doubt, if such doubt exists, should be resolved in their favor because they gave wholly of their body and spirit without the slightest reservation.

It is a source of deep regret to me that our veterans should have to come to Washington to plead their cause or to defend themselves, when actually we should be doing everything in our power to alleviate their suffering since we can never sufficiently discharge our great obligation to them.

I believe that both major political parties would be discharging a small measure of this obligation if they were to include a plank in their 1956 platforms opposing the recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, because they are harmful to the interests of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the text of Mr. Peltz's speech referred to above is as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be here, and I am appreciative of the opportunity to appear before you. It is not, however, by any stretch of the imagination, a pleasure to present to you the views of the 15,000 members of the Department of New York, Disabled American Veterans, on the recently issued report of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, which has wrongly gone into the question of compensation of wartime service-connected benefits.

It seems Disabled Veterans, are always on the defensive; fighting overseas defending against our Nation's enemies, later defending ourselves against the ravages of our service-connected injuries, diseases, and wounds, only to be forced again to appear before our representatives to defend ourselves as citizens, veterans and disabled veterans. The President's Commission on Veterans Pensions has made a statement, "military service in time of war or peace, should be treated as discharging an ogligation of citizenship, and not of itself as a basis for future government benefits."

We have always felt dutybound to defend our country against its enemies in time of war. We don't need the President's Commission to tell us that defending our country is the duty of every citizen. When we landed on the shores of Normandy, Iwo Jima, Anzio, did we do so because we wanted to preserve our Nation and our way of life, or did we do so because of possible Government benefits? We resent the implication of the President's Commission that the benefits and not our Nation were uppermost in our minds.

We are of the firm conviction that this commission does not know the true picture concerning veterans benefits. They state, "Veterans programs on the whole are meeting veterans needs effectively." Then they reverse themselves and a proposal is made to completely dismember the basic structure of present rating criteria. This, by employing physicians, economists, sociologists, phychologists, and lawyers, to revamp Veterans Benefits. They apparently don't know, or don't care to know, that the Veterans' Administration is expertly staffed with the finest medical brains, psychologists, attorneys, etc., who have been doing proper evaluation for over 40 years. The Veterans' Administrator has full authority, already law, to revise rating schedules. This is done daily via Veterans' Administration instructions, regulations, and procedures, to conform with present day medical and social knowledge.

The basic law is vested in Veterans Regulation 3A which states, "The Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall from time to time readjust this schedule of rating in accordance with experience." This experience is gleaned from the finest experts within the Veterans' Administration and outside sources, in the field of medicine, law, economics, sociology, psychology.

General Bradley, himself, the Chairman of this Commission, was highly instrumental when he was the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in creating the present structure and policies, which resulted in the finest care for veterans the world has ever known. It is strange indeed to see the former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who was instrumental in the creation of our present-day Veterans' Administration, heading a Commission to destroy it.

It is discouraging to our veteran population when there are moves in this country to restrict veterans' benefits. This, occurring in a country which has always been known as the veterans stanch and trusted defender, makes such moves particularly painful. The psychological impact on our veterans populations moral and trust would be a far greater loss than any possible monetary savings would justify.

The Bradley Commission speaks of the welfare of our veterans within the welfare of our country. They cite that the disabled veterans have higher income than the average nonveteran. Will they help the welfare of our Nation by reducing veterans' benefits?

These negative type recommendations on veterans' benefits present to the American people and veterans an appealing Christmas package chockfull of arsenic candy. We can think of a no greater blow to the morale of our vast veterans population, than to implement this report.

To know veterans and disabled veterans in their preoccupation, their hopes, their worries, is an absolute necessity to complete a true report. The Bradley Commission does not know them. It is from these realities that reports should be compiled, and not only from cold, inflexible statistical studies, that have proven in the past too easily twisted, distorted, misapplied, and harmful.

We say to you that for the first time in the history of veterans organizations, all veterans organizations are banded together as one, for the sole purpose of condemning the infamous recommendations presented by this Commission. We know that you, our representatives, will not allow the veteran, the disabled veteran, his widow and dependents to be forsaken.

Why Work in a City?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the May, 1956, issue of Dun's Review and Modern Industry contains a most interesting and informative article, written by Mr. Louis B. McCarthy, of Exeter, New Hampshire, on the advantages of relocating industrial plants in northern New England, specifically in New Hampshire.

I believe the article is of wide general interest and of considerable importance in connection with the dispersal policies of the Federal Government, and, therefore, I wish to commend it to the attention of Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WORK IN A CITY?

(By Louis B. McCarthy)

It's quite possible that some day the historians of our economy may decide that the tide of urban industrialization, which flowed so strongly through the earlier years of our era, turned back at the century's midpoint. At any rate, there's a sizable number of us newcomers to upper New England in general, and New Hampshire in particular, who appear to support this premise.

That early drift to big city markets and big city labor had been further aggravated, in this neck of the woods, by departure of the textile industry to the South, beginning with cottons in the 1920's and followed by woolens in the 1940's. It was seduced by promises of public financing, tax concessions, and, at least temporarily, cheaper labor. Textiles were unraveling for fair. Along many a stream or river, whose dammed-up power had whirled a thousand spindles or moved a hundred looms, many a fine old brick or stone mill stood empty. As one Manchester bank president put it, not profanely, "There are more New Hampshire plants vacant, by a dam site, than there are occupied."

Yet, by 1950, northern Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and southern Maine were already gaining new industries. In the intervening years this trend, steady, though as yet slow, has become increasingly apparent.

What leads a manufacturer to decide to move out of a city or a congested industrial area into the more or less wide open spaces? What are the things to look for in this kind of relocation? Most of all, how do the advantages and drawbacks stack up for employees as well as employers after the period of shakedown? As one who has recently been through this particular mill, along with many of his corporate neighbors and friends, I may be in a position to supply at least some of the answers.

At the beginning it is well to recognize that hard and fast advantages do not automatically follow the transfer of a plant from city to small town. Whether such relocation is desirable for you, and where, depends on what you make, the number of workers and the kind of skills you need, the sources of your raw materials, and the location of your market. My own commentary, of course, focuses on New Hampshire. Other areas and other States may well prove more desirable for your firm. In any event all relevant facts about any contemplated community should be pondered before choosing it.

In the majority of instances the factor that motivates a move is the outgrowing of existing plant and layout. This was undoubtedly the biggest single reason with us here at Macallen, as it was with a number of other New Hampshire recent arrivals such as Gates, Inc., of Antrim (makers of chests and boxes for precision tools), Sanders Associates, of Nashua (electronics), Hudson, of Franklin (overhead doors), and Armstrong & Botsford, of Bath (machine parts). It is also a reason why little relocating is done except in periods of general prosperity when volume is expanding and labor and desirable space are in limited supply. A concern will put up with bad plant conditions for years, through force of habit. It usually moves only when it must.

Broadly speaking, desirable plant space in great cities and heavily industrialized areas is not easily found. City ordinances and zoning codes restrict most manufacturing to industrial slums, out of which all but the least skilled and lowest paid labor has migrated, thus posing, among others, growing problems of public transportation and private parking. Bars and taverns, always cheerfully willing to cash pay checks, surrounded us in our former Boston locale, contributing their share to Monday morning tardiness and absenteeism. Land, for building, is scarce, sometimes prohibitively priced, and heavily taxed.

REAL ESTATE IS CHEAP

In towns and villages well out of such metropolitan zones, however, not only is real estate cheap and construction costs a little less, but where vacant plant space already exists it can often be bought or leased at a fraction of the cost of urban facilities. This is especially true where a factory can be shared by a number of smaller tenants who can jointly use its main powerplant, elevators, loading ramps, sidings, warehouses, and other features.

Almost all these firms who have come up to New Hampshire and southern Maine in the last few years report some tax savings. Indeed, taxes appear to be the second most important reason for moving. Fred Chamberlin, of Hudson, for instance, reports material savings. In our own case the tax on property is about one-third of what we paid before the move—a saving of one-fifth in State taxes, by no means inconsiderable. Tax laws of other States, along with local assessments and rates, should be examined before deciding where to relocate.

A third reason for moving that I've heard frequently mentioned is traffic congestion and the fact that it's darn near impossible these days to get adequate parking space near plants in metropolitan districts. This was a big reason for the move of the Insuline Corporation of America from Long Island to Manchester, N. H.

But let me warn you that though there's a lot of gold in "them thar hills, way out yonder," there's a lot of tailings, too. Take the training of new labor. Country people learn pretty fast and up here in Yankeeland they're traditionally versatile—but, even so, the training period is apt to stretch out longer than you think. If your experience runs parallel to ours, it's unlikely you'll be worrying much about excess profits, or any profits, the first year or two. On the other hand, once this is over, the slightly lower wage scales of smaller communities, plus the increased efficiency and loyalty of small-town workers, compensate for this initial cost.

You'll find insurance rates higher, on the average, unless your new building is sprinklered and you're more than apt to end with a larger inventory tie-up. Local dealers don't carry much stock of spare parts, office supplies, and other such items on which you've been accustomed to prompt delivery.

If you're a large consumer your utilities rate will be about the same. If you're small or only fair-to-middling, it's apt to be higher, as are oil prices, too, the further you get from a basing point. Or you may have to use bottled gas, which is more expensive, though pipelines are spreading fast. Also, you're apt to have more power failures than in the city, due to overhead lines. On the other hand, if your plant can use river or lake water, you will have little trouble finding all you want at a marked saving. Freight rates have no relevancy to the problem of city versus country but rather to markets and raw materials.

What of the workers? What are their gains or losses in this matter of town and country?

Well, there's no universal yardstick. What's one family's Arcadia is another family's Siberia. But it's my observation that our own employees enjoy a higher standard of living now than before. Take housing. Nearly 10 percent of our folks made the transfer up here from the Greater Boston area. As the truckers who moved them put it: "Seems as if we moved everybody into a better place than we took them out of." In terms of cost, space, light and general surroundings, rural community housing is apt to be better.

WORKERS AS FARMERS

On the score of food, prices run considerably lower for locally raised staples. Most of our people have gardens and a lot of them keep chickens or a cow. Quite a number, with the help of their families, even go in for small-scale farming. Rural communities are often in or near hunting and fishing country and this adds spice and variety to the larder. In this respect, our location at Newmarket is an especially happy one.

Our plant is located on a meandering little river called the Lamprey. A lot of our people have homes along its banks, almost within a stone's throw of their work. There's pretty good fishing in the Lamprey, and in Fall and Spring it's popular with migrating Teal and Mallard. You may have glanced at the picture that shows our mill and the wide pond below our dam where the river broadens before merging with Great Bay and the Atlantic. Here the tides ebb and flow and here a lot of our folks keep skiffs and small craft, as you can see, for clamming and lobstering and salt-water fishing. The State Game Commission keeps adjacent fields and coverts well stocked with pheasant, and in a dry year the deer can be as much of a nuisance to our gardeners as they are a joy, in season, to our hunters. In

fact there are almost as many hunting licenses among our force as there are driver's licenses.

This brings up an interesting aspect of the situation. As I believe I mentioned earlier, the Yankee employee, hereabout, is a rather versatile and self-reliant character. For several generations the Portsmouth Navy Yard sort of set the pace of employment and wages around the area. When the "Yard" wanted carpenters, most everyone showed up as a carpenter. When it was hiring plumbers and steamfitters, the local talent just left their tool chests at home and appeared with a Stilson wrench and a lead pot.

I've already mentioned that nearly everyone has a garden or a farm of sorts, and the number of Nimrods and Waltons runs about 12 to the baker's dozen. The point of all this is that if your business is subject to wide seasonal or cyclical fluctuations, laid-off workers suffer far less hardship and return with far less resentment than city dwellers. A week or two off in Spring or late Summer can be very useful in sowing or harvesting. Chicken houses and barns always need roofing and houses, painting. A few days with a power saw can turn hurricane windfalls into a Winter's supply of firewood.

TREATING BUCK FEVER

It took us a year or two to learn, but we make sure that some of our official holidays, when we close the plant, fall within the hunting season. We might just as well; they'd be taken unofficially anyway. The personnel manager calls this virulent and contagious malady, which results in a marked increase in "out sick" reports for a few weeks each fall "buck fever."

Our friends, Armstrong & Botsford, are a good example of what I mean. They moved upstate to the little village of Bath, N. H., from Stamford, Conn. They make machine parts, chiefly for dirt moving and road equipment. Their main reason, like many others, was cheap and suitable space. They found it in an abandoned church with a concrete basement and reinforced hardwood floor that would support heavy machinery. They've rebuilt what were the balcony and choir loft into general offices. The two principals brought only a foreman with them when they moved up. The rest of their handful of employees, all machinists, they hired in the area—including one machinist, struggling along as a farmer, who had served an apprenticeship under his father, a master mechanic with a prominent firm in Glasgow, Scotland.

A couple of years after they established themselves in Bath the recession of 1953 hit them with cancellations. They explained the situation to their small force, who, knowing that the two owners had plans for certain eventual alterations to the premises, volunteered to work on these property improvements until more orders came in. A couple turned out to be excellent carpenters and 2 or 3 stonemasons. Another, who had a tractor, brought it along. As a result, floors and partitions were constructed, ground leveled and drained, and a 4-foot retaining wall raised along one side of the property. When things picked up they all went back to their machines. It's hard to imagine this happening in any large city.

THE GOOD LIFE

School conditions vary widely. Our New Hampshire schools rate well above the Nation's average but in many towns they're below it. In general, smalltown instruction runs fair to good and overcrowding is definitely less.

On the score of medical care, emergency, and specialized clinical facilities are not usually available, as in cities. General hospital care, however, is almost always within reach, as are good general doctors, and fees run below urban charges.

Only in the area of entertainment and cultural life does the city offer marked advantages. Theaters, art galleries, lectures, good music, and musical instruction are lacking in the country unless you're fortunate enough to be located in or near a university or college town as we are. While TV is bridging the general entertainment gap, there is no doubt that very talented children desiring to pursue the arts are handicapped in their development. Average kids find a healthy, truly American cultural and moral environment in the country. Chores at home and the nearness to woods, fields, seashore, streams, and ponds, all keep growing youngsters occupied and happy.

FRIENDLY FOLKS

In conclusion, there's one thing which all of us who have moved up here from the city, managers and workers alike, have noticed and commented on. It might be termed friendliness or neighborliness and, just as taxes and plant investment, it has a tangible value. On the individual side I'll just cite one incident which is typical of what I mean.

One of our folks, a mother of several children, cut her hand badly and was rushed to the hospital. Everyone in the plant knew about it and by the time the first shift went off at 3 o'clock that afternoon an informal ways and means committee had been organized. Volunteers took the children into their own homes. When the mother returned a week or so later, badly shaken, her right hand bandaged, relays of neighbors cooked, cleaned, babysat, and generally ran the house. In the city her close friends might live blocks or miles away, and her apartment-house neighbors might never even have heard about her accident.

These smalltown and country folks take a real interest in their jobs and they value them. This slows down turnover and boosts productivity. It extends to the community, too. Officials and local organizations are glad to have you and show it in their cooperation, in many ways, for you bring in desirable income that is considered a community asset. Every hundred employees represent hundreds of thousands of dollars more personal income per year to the community. They also add proportionately to local bank deposits, hundreds of thousands more in retail sales, and actually add over 200 more folks who will vote, swell the tax rolls, support churches, charities, and clubs—in short, strengthen the country community.

The Problems of Asian Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a significant article entitled "The Problems of Asian Labor" appeared in the AFL–CIO American Federationist March 1956 issue. Its author, Richard Deverall, is a man whose experience qualifies him as an authoritative voice on the subject he discusses. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEMS OF ASIAN LABOR

(By Richard Deverall)

The Asian labor movement, in the days before World War II, was closely linked with, if not dominated by, radical and leftist parties. In some countries of Asia organized labor was used as a transmission belt for the struggle against colonialism. Organized labor was not, as in the West, directed principally to securing economic gains for the working people through collective bargaining.

In Japan, from the time of World War I forward, the unions were highly political. They were under the influence of anarchist-syndicalist, Socialist, and Communist ideologies. The authorities, regarding all unions as anti-Japanese, repressed them.

In India, Mahatma Gandhi was the first well-known labor leader. His labor philosophy derived from his ideology of nonviolence and peaceful negotiation. As the Indian labor movement grew, Gandhi tied it to the overall struggle for independence. By the mid twenties such men as Ben Bradley and Philip Spratt had journeyed to India from Britain to give aid and encouragement to the All-India Trade Union Congress, and thanks to their work that organization was penetrated by the Indian Communist Party. Then the Government of British India sternly repressed trade-union activity, which was regarded by the authorities as both communistic and directed against British power in India.

In Indonesia, in prewar days, the Communists made themselves felt in the then tiny unions. The Dutch Government wrecked the country's Communist Party and made trade unionism rather dangerous. In Indochina and other colonial areas of Asia, the association of trade unionism with communism, in the period prior to World War II, was bad for both. And when the Chinese were involved in trade union activities, as in Thailand and Malaya, the political unions were split by the Kuomintang-Communist quarrel and struggle for power.

Even in the Philippines, where working people evidenced a surge for self-organization as early as World War I, the later association of unions with Socialist or Communist activities was such that organized labor in the islands did not grow as one might have expected it to do under American rule.

In much of Asia, in the early days of unionism, such know-how as the early labor movements received often came from such writers as Karl Marx and Lenin. In those days any labor organizer who went to India, Ceylon, Indonesia or Japan would be deported as a subversive alien. The illegal dissemination of Communist and leftist trade union propaganda enjoyed a virtual field day.

Another major characteristic of the development of labor in Asia has been the colonial labor legislation, which had the effect of discouraging free collective bargaining. Colonial governments wanted labor-management disputes to be submitted to labor courts and settled by those courts. As a result, many of the men in Asian countries who professed to be labor leaders were not workers but lawyers—men who had never toiled in factory or mine but, having been educated in the law at universities, knew how to make use of the labor laws and the industrial courts.

Illiteracy has been another significant characteristic of much of Asian labor. For example, in colonial India the illiteracy rate ran as high as 99 percent. It was just as high in Indonesia. Mass illiteracy of working people and the role of government in industrial disputes attracted to Asian labor leadership—in addition to the lawyers—a number of social reformers, welfare workers and politicians.

From my first days in Asia, I pointed out that William Green and Philip Murray came out of the coal mines and were genuine working people. Usually the Asian workers who heard my statement were amazed, for in their own countries, they said it seemed that leaders of labor, in most cases, were anything but workers.

Yet another problem in Asia is that, while labor is national, employers very often are international. Tea, rubber, and tin are produced by large companies which are part of vast cartels controlled from Europe and subject to the conditions and manipulations of the world tea, rubber, and tin markets.

Because of this situation, Indian tea laborers could not secure significant wage gains for the simple reason that the Indian tea producer who granted higher wages would be out-pricing himself on the world market and might bring down on his head the wrath of the operators of the huge cartels which play such a vital, if little realized, part in the exploitation of Asia and the world market.

In 1940, as Pearl Harbor approached, the Japanese Government dissolved such unions as still existed in Japan and the areas ruled by Nippon. All workers were put into a government-run "union" called Sampo. As the Japanese armies advanced, they stamped out any genuine unions in the vast occupied areas stretching all the way from the Philippines to Burma.

In India, where the nationalist leaders were bitterly opposed to the Allied war effort, the government jailed most of the top leaders. However, after Russia entered the war, the British released the Communists jailed in India, and during the rest of the conflict the Indian Communist Party ran a production-minded AITUC while consolidating its hold over the Indian labor movement and the peasant unions which had been built so carefully by Mahatma Gandhi's Congress Party and the smaller Congress Socialist Party.

Japan's surrender in 1945 marked the beginning in Asia of a new trade-union era. Throughout Asia the organization of trade unions became more popular and less difficult. In Japan itself the government of the defeated country was ordered to favor and give encouragement to democratic trade unionism, and model labor legislation was rapidly formulated. Unfortunately, prewar Communists and Socialists were able to grasp leadership of the Japanese trade-union movement. Communist domination advanced rapidly, and in 1950 General MacArthur purged 12,000 alleged Communist union leaders.

The Communists in Asia also seized their opportunities after the war in the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, and Ceylon, and in Indonesia they obtained working control of SOBSI. In Malaya, where the Communist hold was strong, the government cracked down, and one result of the government's action was that the Chinese leaders took to the jungle in 1948 and joined the Communist guerrillas.

In 1949 the Communist-controlled so-called World Federation of Trade Unions held an Asian-Australasian conference in Peking. That conference directed Communists and trade unionists throughout Southeast Asia to take to the hills and wage guerrilla warfare against their respective governments. This Communist order took many Asian Communists out of positions of labor leadership, thus in a sense opening the door to the rapid expansion of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which soon followed.

With the departure of the British from India, that country was divided into India and Pakistan. The labor movement of Pakistan which has since developed has been remarkably free of leftist politics. Pakistan's trade unionism is quite similar to that of the West. In India, where Communist control of the unions was strong, Home Minister Sardar Patel took the lead in inspiring the formation of a trade-union center which would be friendly to the aspirations of the Nehru government. Angered at this move, India's Socialists joined with independent labor centers to form their own trade-union movement. Today India has three major trade-union centers—one following the ruling Congress Party, one following the Socialists and one following Moscow.

I have outlined some of the postwar developments in Asian labor to demonstrate that, if anti-colonialism dominated the labor movements before Pearl Harbor, the period following Japan's surrender has been one in which Communist and Socialist forces have played a major role in winning trade-union leadership. There is an expanding area for trade-union organization in Asia as a result of the end of occupations and the achievement of independence by India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, and the Philippines. The leftists have tried to make the most of the situation.

We have seen that in India the political party in power inspired the establishment of a national trade-union center in opposition to that of the Moscow-dominated Communist unions. In Socialist Burma the Government smashed the Communist union organization and inspired the formation of a more nationally disciplined organization. In Thailand the Communist-dominated General Labor Union was countered by a Government-inspired Thai labor union, now known as the Thai National Trade Union Congress. In Malaya, after the Government smashed the Chinese-dominated unions, skilled British trade-union advisers played an important role in building up an educated rank and file who could take over and successfully run free and democratic trade unions.

Thus, if in prewar days colonial governments interfered to minimize the impact of labor unions in Asia, the situation in recent years has been vastly different. Since the war governments have repeatedly intervened to support anti-Communist labor movements in order to blunt the force of Communist movements.

There have been two notable exceptions. One is Japan and the other is the Philippines. Since the end of the occupation, Japan has seen the rise of a sound trade-union center, Zenro, which is dedicated to work with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, pledged to freedom and democracy, and absolutely opposed to Communist or any other intervention. Since April of 1954, Zenro has conducted several clearly economic strikes and has won each one. On the other hand, Japanese unions in which communism remains a force have been unable to win their strikes.

In the Philippines, following a police raid on the CLO, various disunited unions went their own way, as before the war. A new trade-union center, the Free Workers, appeared. The past few years have seen new groupings, such as PAFLU and PTUC. Although they have not done so well in growth and size as has Zenro in Japan, the varied labor groups in the Philippines have pointed a course toward nonideological trade unionism, which I believe will lead, in time, to the emergence of a freely united, democratic labor movement worthy of the respect of all Filipino workers.

Left-wing and nationalist forces which are active today in many of Asia's trade unions insist vehemently that there be "no outside influence" impinging on their labor movements. Others claim that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions is European-dominated and subject to European ideas and therefore unable to understand Asia's problems. Naturally, the Red Chinese ACFTU and its World Federation of Trade Unions manipulators have been ready to seize upon such rumbles.

Last May they tried to organize an Afro-Asian Trade Union Council with the object of splitting the ICFTU and reestablishing the Communist hold over Asian labor that obtained in 1948 and 1949 before the World Federation of Trade Unions committed temporary hara kiri in Asia.

The charge of "outside influence" is extremely interesting, especially when one reviews the different types of influence at work. The oldest outside influence is, of course, the disciplined Communist Parties of Asia and their various union transmission belts, such as AITUC in India, SOBSI in Indonesia and Sanbetsu in Japan.

Since 1952 the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions, working through the Chinese ACFTU, has interfered enormously in the affairs of labor movements in other parts of Asia. Just one among many examples is the appearance in Japan not long ago of Liu Ning-I, vice president of the WFTU. This Communist "labor leader" lectured Sohyo leaders on strategy. He told them to maintain contacts with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions while at the same time promoting unity of WFTU ideology and ICFTU affiliations. If any American or Briton had appeared before the leaders of Sohyo to tell them how to manage their international and national strategy, he would have been denounced.

When I arrived in India in 1949 as a representative of the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor, Indian trade unionists were suspicious. But when they discovered that the AFL had no ax to grind and had nothing to sell except democratic trade union know-how, friendships developed and a healthy interchange of ideas took place. In Burma, on the other hand, I found many of the trade unionists rather hostile. For some odd reason, they seemed to fear that if they read the American Federationist, it would lead to American domination. I pointed out to the Burmese trade unionists that ideas are universal and that American labor sought only to spread the idea of democracy and its practical implementation through democratic and effective trade unionism. In both Japan and the Philippines, as in other Asian countries, this friendly type of outside influence has been a force assisting nascent Asian labor unions to grow stronger.

History tells us that in its early days our own American labor movement received enormous assistance from European labor in the form of the migration of millions of men and women to America—men and women who brought precious know-how of trade unionism, credit unions, and workers' education across the Atlantic Ocean. Asian labor has experienced no similar windfall. It is natural and quite in the order of things, it seems to me, that a nation and labor movement which so freely received gifts of European labor know-how in past decades should want now to share some of these gifts of know-how with our brothers and sisters of Asia.

In Calcutta, India, there is now in operation the ICFTU Labor College. This college, which is operated by Asians and for Asians, has among its instructors men from non-Asian areas. The participation of the non-Asian instructors has not been regarded as interference in Asian trade-union affairs, but as an utterly good outside influence.

In recent years, and particularly with the development of the American foreign-aid programs, such as the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, the FOA and now the ICA, United States labor men have entered our Government's service and have worked in Asia as labor officers and labor information officers. Today, in many an Asian country, the American Embassy has both a labor attaché and a labor information officer. These men, on a governmental and official level, observe and report on the progress of labor in the countries to which they have been assigned and—when asked—inform Asian trade unions about American trade-union procedures. The British Government follows the same

practice, as do the Governments of Argentina and Yugoslavia.

American trade unionists having no extensive knowledge of an Asian country's history and its unions are inclined, at first look, to conclude that the unions are not really unions. Such a conclusion is unfair, for it overlooks the historical circumstances which have conditioned the rise of trade unionism in most of Asia. It should be remembered, too, that the Communists have been active in Asia since the 1920's, whereas we are latecomers. In offering either criticism or unsought advice, Americans in Asia should be cautious.

As communism has been and is a major influence and a conspiracy in so many Asian countries, it seems proper and inevitable that American trade unionists, to counter the Communist influence, should be eager to share their know-how with the workers of Asia. The word "share" is used advisedly. If there is anything which is certain to meet with disaster, it is any action wherein any American tries to play politics with Asian trade unions or attempts to manipulate their internal affairs. On the other hand, the friendly sharing of experience is dignified and shows our respect for our Asian brothers and sisters. And in the long run this is the only way to help new and relatively inexperienced trade unionists anywhere to build strong unions.

Another disastrous mistake is to back one union against other unions. In Japan some organizations inside Sohyo are openly pro-Communist, while other Sohyo unions are anti-Communist. There are also dozens of independent unions. While it is natural to feel at home with Zenro leaders, one must never forget that many other union leaders in Japan are aiming at the same target of free and democratic trade union growth. This situation is found not only in Japan but also in the Philippines, Malaya, Thailand, Vietnam, Hong Kong and other places.

Asia's trade unions are coming of age at a time when the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions, through its oriental bureau, is stepping up racist appeals to try to win away Asian trade union centers from the democratic International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

I think it is incumbent upon American trade unionists in Asia to share their experience with all trade unionists and trade union centers that are pro-democratic and anti-Communist, just as we support the work of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in strengthening existing bona fide trade union centers in Asia and assisting in the efforts to organize the tens of millions of Asian workers who are now unorganized and exploited.

From the immigrant trade unionists who came to American shores from various European lands, our trade unionists of the past obtained valuable labor know-how and aid. Today, in our turn, American trade unionists should be glad to give assistance to our Asian brothers and sisters who are striving to establish effective, democratic unions in their countries.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, because of an unavoidable delay in airplane travel from Hartford to Washington today, I was 1 minute late for the vote on the farm bill. Had I been present, I would have voted for passage.

That Recaptured Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 20, 1956, is of extreme importance. I learned of the facts reported by Mr. Alsop when I went through the Middle East last fall. I am certain that other Members of both Houses of Congress learned of these facts during their travels in that area last year.

It seems that everybody knows these facts except our traveling Secretary of State, who has never had time to learn them first-hand or to read them from the reports which are in his files in Washington.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THAT RECAPTURED INITIATIVE

BAGHDAD.—Ever so often, the bewildered traveler stumbles upon an episode of American foreign policymaking so strange and apparently irrational that it poses the question whether we have any policy at all. Such is the story of the Baghdad Pact. This defensive alliance among Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain, is one of the hottest potatoes in the Middle East—which is so full of hot potatoes that the area sometimes makes you think of one vast potato roast. And the first thing to note about this major Middle-Eastern hot potato is that the primary responsibility for the pact clearly lies in Washington. It is all but impossible to resist the suspicion that the real reason for Washington's original sponsorship of the Baghdad Pact was the hankering for some Middle-Eastern development that could be advertised as proof of a "dynamic new foreign policy," a "recaptured initiative." The hankering was strong in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, before world events began to catch up with the Madison Avenue phrase makers. It looked good on paper to link up the so-called Northern Tier of Middle-Eastern States in an alliance against Soviet aggression. To be sure, the real danger in the Middle East was not and is not Soviet aggression. Instead, the real danger here is, was and always has been, internal subversion and Soviet political chicane.

To be sure, all the prospective Baghdad Pact states already had military and economic aid agreements with the United States, and close general relations with the West. If they needed more military power, therefore, the machinery already existed for providing it. All the same, it made a fine headline when the first news of the pact was published at home. Our "recaptured initiative" was mentioned with gratifying frequency in the ensuing editorials.

In this early period, the United States took the lead in encouraging Iraq and Turkey, the first signers of the pact, to get together to establish the Northern Tier defense system. As Washington observers with good memories will recall, the State Department in those days haughtily accused the British of "dragging their feet." And at that time, the present American Ambassador to Iraq, Waldemar Gallman, was actually sent to Baghdad with instructions that securing the signature of the pact was his most important mission.

Iraq and Turkey signed. Egypt's Premier Nasser promptly exploded, partly because he genuinely regards the pact as Western imperialism in a new guise, and partly because he disliked the leading role accorded to Iraq's Nuri Pasha. All the same Pakistan came in. The unimaginative British foot dragged, then they signed up too, perhaps because they could find no other way to maintain their established treaty relations with this country. And last came Iran.

In Washington, however, presumably because of Premier Nasser's attitude and the Israeli dislike of the new pact, the recapturers of the initiative were now blowing on their finger nails in an embarrassed manner and saying, "Who, us?" when it was suggested the new pact was their work. This ostentatious American tepidity toward the pact was rather prolonged.

If the State Department had followed up its first initiative with boldness and decision, other Middle East states might well have joined the pact. Then the position of one of the West's best friends in the Middle East, Prime Minister Nuri Pasha, would be a great deal easier today. In any case, the American tepidity in itself rather gravely undermined Prime Minister Nuri's position. This deeply alarmed the British. British protests and representations, beginning roughtly with the Eden-Eisenhower meeting in Washington, then caused the dawn of the third or present series of American pact policy.

In this period, warnings of the need to help Nuri Pasha and somewhat ungentle reminders of the original American responsibility for the pact, have driven the State Department as far as "Darling Daughter" in the old song. We have, in effect, taken off all our clothes but have not gone near the water. In other words, we have joined the antisubversion and economic committees of the Baghdad Pact, but we have not joined the pact itself.

There is only one trouble about this strange intermediate position. The expectation is universal here in Baghdad, and it is reportedly universal too in the Turkish, Iranian and Pakistani capitals, that the United States will join the pact as a full member after the election. If we do not then join the pact, the resulting disappointment will deeply damage the whole Western position in the Middle East.

One might say that if this represents "recapturing the initiative," then this famous phrase needs a new dictionary definition. Maybe it might be translated as "making the worst of both worlds," or "falling between two stools" as alternative renderings.

United States Foreign Aid During the Period July 1, 1940, Through December 31, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have been submitting for the RECORD figures on the extent of foreign aid. At this time I submit the figures for United States foreign aid during the period July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1955. In other words the record on our spending programs abroad is brought down almost to date, at least to December 31, 1955.

The information contained in this report was furnished by Dr. Ernest S.

Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, and particularly by Mr. Hermann Ficker, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, Economics Division. I am indebted to these men for this material and commend them for the excellent service they have rendered:

As summarized in the first table United States foreign aid to all countries and international organizations for the period covering World War II and the postwar period ending December 31, 1955, amounted to $111,126,234,000. This total does not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development ($635 million) and the International Monetary Fund ($2,750 million) although these add to the foreign aid underwritten (reclaimable) by the United States Government.

Lend-lease totals were divided into two sections, namely for the war emergency period and for the postwar period. During the postwar period additional funds were not authorized; the totals extended for lend-lease were merely for the supplies in the so-called "pipelines" and final settlement of goods not yet delivered.

Grants-in-aid are also divided into the war and postwar periods. In general no repayment was requested. The only condition stipulated in all grant agreements was that the United States could request a return of a percentage of Counterpart Funds in national currencies or in strategic raw materials from the recipients of aid.

On the other hand, net authorized credits are loans or other agreements which gave rise to specific obligations for repayment. Utilized credits for the war period amounted to $1,096,000,000, but only the total for the overall period July 1940–December 31, 1955, is given by country as there was a continual readjustment in payments as well as previous grants being transferred to the loan account.

Summary of aid

Lend-lease (grants-in-aid):	
I. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945 (war period)	$46,728,287,000
I. (b) July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1955 (postwar period)	2,040,033,000
Total	48,708,320,000
Grants-in-aid, other than lend-lease:	
II. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945 (war period)	1,400,010,000
II. (b) July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1955 (postwar period)	44,102,380,000
Total	45,502,390,000
Net authorized loans and credits:	
III. July 1, 1940–Dec. 31, 1955 (war and postwar period)	16,855,524,000
Summary total	111,126,234,000

I. (a) Lend-Lease—July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Bolivia	5,026
Brazil	347,945
Chile	22,038
Colombia	8,278
Costa Rica	156
Cuba	6,154
Dominican Republic	1,458
Ecuador	7,208
El Salvador	877
Guatemala	1,736
Haiti	1,362
Honduras	368
Mexico	38,621
Nicaragua	885
Paraguay	1,952
Peru	18,001
Uruguay	6,942
Venezuela	4,480
Unspecified Latin America	108,539
Belgium	68,774
United Kingdom	28,600,797
Australia	896,641
India	610,172
New Zealand	249,432
Union of South Africa	93,370
China (Formosa)	845,743
Czechoslovakia	2,760
Ethiopia	1,238
France	2,613,543
Greece	75,365
Iran	7,791
Liberia	236
Netherlands	114,690
Norway	37,039
Poland	12,119
Saudi Arabia	5,489
Turkey	99,041
U. S. S. R.	10,760,975
Yugoslavia	32,050
Unclassified	1,245,077
Total	46,728,287

I. (b) Lend-lease—July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

Brazil	3,616
Colombia	11
Dominican Republic	3
Guatemala	1,347
Mexico	553
Paraguay	2
Peru	237
Belgium	59,480
United Kingdom	341,462
Australia	12,300
India	3,000
New Zealand	2,300
China (Formosa)	729,418
Czechoslovakia	2
France	372,441
Greece	5,956
Iran	750
Italy (civilian supplies)	134,444
Netherlands	64,334
Poland	92
Saudi Arabia	1,591
U. S. S. R.	277,254
Yugoslavia	76
Unspecified	29,364
Total	2,040,033

II. (a) Grants-in-aid—July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Argentina	1,239
Bolivia	1,926
Brazil	12,693
Chile	2,864
Colombia	2,230
Costa Rica	1,722
Cuba	503
Dominican Republic	400
Ecuador	4,132
El Salvador	1,026
Guatemala	1,484
Haiti	1,131
Honduras	2,720
Mexico	8,130
Nicaragua	2,267
Panama	989
Paraguay	2,406
Peru	3,485
Uruguay	814
Venezuela	2,557
Unclassified Latin America	4,373
Austria	1,022
United Kingdom	16,158
Australia	108
Bermuda	1
British East Africa	301
Hong Kong	368
India	77
Trinidad and Tobago	3
China-Formosa	385,116
Czechoslovakia	5,717
Egypt	1,700
Finland	1,489
France	7,449
Algeria	15,945
French Equatorial Africa	118
French Morocco	68
Greece	3,627
Iceland	99
Iran	353
Ireland	308
Italy	310,166
Eritrea	15
Ryukyu Islands (Japan)	4,122
Liberia	236
Indonesia	3,625
Norway	70
Philippines	52,515
Poland	84
Portugal	1
Spain	1,759
Sweden	766
U. S. S. R.	15,205
Yugoslavia	1,028
Trust Territories in Pacific	1,826
International organizations	53,238
Unclassified areas	447,379
Total	1,400,010

II. (b) Grants-in-aid, July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1955, and calendar years 1954 and 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

	July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1955	1954	1955
Argentina	$198		
Bolivia	42,554	$14,718	$21,331
Brazil	20,091	2,833	5,550
Chile	10,504	1,358	1,825
Colombia	7,155	1,322	2,184
Costa Rica	13,899	1,858	2,400
Cuba	1,437	242	416
Dominican Republic	2,002	276	534
Ecuador	8,514	1,267	1,681
El Salvador	5,026	883	1,196
Guatemala	20,964	403	10,708
Haiti	11,719	2,844	3,934
Honduras	6,005	1,006	1,812
Mexico	104,758	3,964	1,625
Nicaragua	10,530	1,326	2,012
Panama	9,113	1,796	2,756
Paraguay	8,271	1,047	1,944
Peru	14,703	2,462	3,206
Uruguay	1,994	235	253
Venezuela	2,152	152	189
Unspecified	300,109	49,011	30,827
Afghanistan	3,375	1,228	1,655
Albania	20,444		
Australia	239		
Austria	1,057,470	18,251	7,534
Belgium-Luxembourg	521,980	6,285	574
Burma	20,725	1,052	720
Canada	3,964		
Ceylon	167	9	112
China (Formosa)	1,420,111	105,538	92,941
Czechoslovakia	185,825	839	1,535
Denmark	247,600	1,117	248
Egypt	30,954	4,513	22,332
Ethiopia	8,736	1,607	3,885
Federation of Rhodesia	1		
Finland	3,522	46	1,424
France	3,914,830	461,789	405,871
Algeria	107		
French Morocco	647	201	175
French West Indies	17		
Tunisia	335	56	137
East Germany	17,349	6,946	2,099
Federal Republic of Germany	3,768,428	75,494	31,399
Greece	1,649,328	55,934	64,143
Hungary	5,855	2,999	497
Iceland	29,791	831	501
India	170,206	28,790	88,429
Indochina (total)	403,912	69,496	264,709
Cambodia	27,957	12	27,945
Laos	36,873	4	36,869
Vietnam	230,249	38,322	191,928
Unspecified	108,833	31,158	7,967
Indonesia	114,083	5,912	6,743
Iran	171,358	65,273	33,395
Iraq	7,382	2,216	2,908
Ireland	18,346		
Israel	240,167	55,958	22,909
Italy (civilian supplies)	2,401,706	112,495	65,354
Trieste	47,821	360	734
Japan and possessions	2,579,391	16,240	30,333
Jordan	26,120	6,705	13,418
Korea	1,310,360	161,746	230,223
Lebanon	15,315	3,796	6,777
Liberia	6,238	1,292	1,697
Libya	24,814	4,263	17,307

II. (b) Grants-in-aid, July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1955, and calendar years 1954 and 1955—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1955	1954	1955
Nepal	3,076	637	1,946
Netherlands	846,870	15,424	[1] 1,854
Surinam	422	220	202
Norway	235,419	15,077	3,465
Pakistan	161,699	12,202	64,607
Palestine	175	----------	----------
Philippines	750,584	17,279	13,165
Poland	364,886	----------	----------
Portugal	15,979	3,031	1,370
Saudi Arabia	2,652	764	340
Spain	68,211	12,750	53,939
Sweden	87,143	8	1
Switzerland	1,803	----------	----------
Syria	970	452	21
Tangier	17	17	----------
Thailand	36,589	4,624	14,327
Turkey	444,490	75,892	49,183
U. S. S. R	188,180	----------	----------
United Kingdom	3,396,667	163,457	81,343
Bahamas	34	----------	24
British Borneo	137	----------	136
British East Africa	29	----------	29
British Guiana	97	18	74
British Honduras	147	----------	85
British Leeward and Windward Islands	163	----------	163
Federation of Malaya	546	47	488
Gambia	25	----------	25
Gold Coast	16	----------	12
Hong Kong	2,568	1,464	1,104
Jamaica	506	----------	503
Malta	596	86	356
Nigeria	27	----------	25
Sierra Leone	7	----------	6
Singapore	24	----------	24
Yugoslavia	730,305	52,931	81,411
Trust Territories in Pacific	4,444	----------	----------
International organizations	1,092,148	43,447	47,759
Unspecified areas:			
Asia and Pacific	2,603,938	759,075	456,909
Europe	10,153,496	2,039,745	1,365,653
Near East Africa	1,506,676	324,369	308,509
South Asia	15,654	13	1,127
Other	330,979	38,541	40,185
Total	44,102,380	4,949,968	4,128,343

[1] Credit.

III. Net authorized loans and credits, period July 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Total period July 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1955	Unutilized on Dec. 31, 1955
Argentina	162,137	60,072
Bolivia	47,043	2,621
Brazil	784,942	89,558
Chile	148,764	4,550
Colombia	86,293	2,812
Costa Rica	21,335	10,303
Cuba	80,228	8,060
Dominican Republic	3,284	----------
Ecuador	38,565	6,499
El Salvador	1,476	----------
Guatemala	2,619	2,125
Haiti	37,891	7,163
Honduras	1,118	----------
Mexico	309,747	64,836
Nicaragua	5,550	300
Panama	6,488	----------
Paraguay	13,900	7,670
Peru	147,755	120,134
Uruguay	22,011	2,673
Venezuela	23,822	5,376
Unspecified	144,624	7,111
Afghanistan	40,934	14,300
Australia	22,559	----------
Austria	34,807	4,446
Bahrein	17,048	----------
Belgium	234,972	----------
Luxembourg	3,000	----------
Belgian Congo	1,550	----------
Burma	5,043	----------
Canada	198,621	2,625
China (Formosa)	367,858	16,723
Czechoslovakia	30,377	----------
Denmark	54,341	----------
Egypt	25,674	7,740
Ethiopia	31,707	24,000
Eritrea	50	----------
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	60,686	11,291
Finland	152,313	----------

III. Net authorized loans and credits, period July 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1955—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Total period July 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1955	Unutilized on Dec. 31, 1955
France	2,463,407	1,430
Algeria	680	----------
French Equatorial Africa	4,368	----------
French Morocco	18,378	40
New Caledonia	1,501	----------
Germany	1,345,706	124
Greece	126,790	2,073
Hungary	15,917	----------
Iceland	6,249	----------
India	409,216	45,270
Indonesia	180,770	32,952
Iran	120,626	55,780
Iraq	889	----------
Ireland	128,200	----------
Israel	162,398	5,401
Italy	481,209	20,355
Japan	620,474	75,359
Korea	27,428	2,500
Latvia	11	----------
Lebanon	1,550	----------
Liberia	44,773	18,100
Netherlands	472,172	----------
New Zealand	20,453	16,120
Norway	140,830	----------
Pakistan	35,136	20,000
Philippines	144,652	7,686
Poland	81,268	----------
Portugal	59,465	4,548
Angola	65	----------
Saudi Arabia	31,826	----------
Spain	142,033	47,424
Sweden	28,311	----------
Thailand	8,505	1,250
Turkey	155,520	11,182
Union of South Africa	151,714	30,179
U. S. S. R	222,493	----------
United Kingdom	5,216,757	----------
British East Africa	2,394	----------
British Guiana	128	----------
British Honduras	482	----------
Jamaica	20,930	----------
Nigeria	674	----------
Yugoslavia	55,900	----------
International organizations:		
Schuman plan (European coal and steel)	100,000	----------
United Nations headquarters loan	65,000	----------
Export credits—Export Import Bank	167,143	167,143
Total	16,855,524	1,053,904

Sources:
(1) Foreign Aid, 1940-51; Office of Business Economics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1952.
(2) Foreign Grants and Credits, Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce, April 1956.

Swiss Watch Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks, I am including a very fine editorial which appeared in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal entitled "Swiss Watch Tariffs."

It is all too often that the national interest is not considered when it comes to a matter of tariffs. This editorial offers an eloquent need for improving our foreign-trade policy. The logic of the editorial is sound and the time is at hand when I think we should give serious consideration to this matter.

The editorial follows:

SWISS WATCH TARIFFS

Switzerland has been consistently among the best customers the United States has had in Europe. It has paid in cash, too, for a wide variety of our basic products, including considerable amounts of cotton. From this point of view alone it is difficult to understand why it should have been decided back in 1954 to raise the tariff against Swiss watches by 50 percent.

It is axiomatic that the Swiss, like anyone else, must sell if they are to buy and the watch industry is one of substantial importance to them. Aside from the alienation of the Swiss, however, the boost in the tariff on their watches was so at variance with the overall policy of the Nation in regard to reducing barriers and making international trade more free and easy that apprehensions were roused elsewhere.

When President Eisenhower announced the increase on Swiss watches, he indicated that he was moved in part by a feeling that his decision was necessary to maintain over here a number of workers skilled in the making of precision instruments adequate to safeguard us in this field in the event of war. At that time and since there has been question of the accuracy of that point of view. In any event, it has been proposed that other means would be preferable to unduly reducing trade with Switzerland if help is required to hold precision workers together.

At the present the Office of Defense Mobilization is studying fresh appeals from domestic watchmakers for additional protection which would accentuate the cutdown in Swiss trade and further alarm other countries. The Tariff Commission is restudying its 1954 recommendations for higher watch tariffs. The new proposals will be in the President's hands by the end of July and it is to be hoped the long-range view will be his.

It is understood it would not be expedient to remove all restrictions on export-import trade, but the general economic welfare of this Nation and the world are served if Swiss watches are permitted to enter here on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

The Late Eugene J. Butler

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, as a student at the Fordham University Law School in New York, it was my pleasure to become acquainted with a fellow student, Eugene J. Butler. A few years later, upon my election to the 75th Congress, our acquaintance ripened into a friendship founded on my part by my deep respect and admiration for him. Everyone with whom he came into contact in connection with his work for the National Catholic Welfare Conference shared that respect and admiration.

I was profoundly grieved to learn of his passing a few days ago after a long and painful illness. The fortitude with which he bore the long ordeal of his fatal affliction was a mark of the sterling character that he had displayed in his daily work. Never have I heard one

word of adverse criticism of him. By the same token, never would he voice a word of criticism against any of the thousands of persons with whom he became associated in his long years of service. That service has now come to an untimely end. Gene Butler will be sorely missed by his family, his employers and fellow workers, and by the membership of the Congress.

Dance of Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Ludwell Denny which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Monday, May 21, 1956, in which Mr. Denny analyzes the "new look on the face of Russia's European satellites":

DANCE OF DEATH—RED RELAXATION OF TERROR IS REAL, BUT LIMITED

(There's a new look on the face of Russia's European satellites, but it's only skin deep. The Red terror has been relaxed, but how far this has gone and what results it's having will be told in a series of five articles of which this is the first by Scripps-Howard's foreign editor and news analyst.

(In subsequent articles, Mr. Denny will cover these questions: Will the satellites go Titoist—or revolt? Is communism or religion winning the satellite youth? Is the Communist economic system working in the empire of puppets? And are the satellites a military asset or liability for Russia?)

(By Ludwell Denny)

VIENNA, May 21.—Russia's relaxation of Red terror in her East European satellites is real but limited.

There is no change in the fundamentals of Soviet dictatorship—absolute control by the Communist police-state regimes ruled by the Kremlin.

Any relaxation of that basic control would be suicide—and is most unlikely.

The shift to softer methods varies in different satellites. In general, it follows a similar trend set in the past year in Russia which was formalized by the recent Moscow Communist congress and the demotion of the deceased Stalin from a Red god to a Red devil.

There has been some relaxation in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, less in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. And the least in East Germany.

Results are mixed. The non-Communist 80 or 90 percent of the satellite populations are generally pleased but skeptical, and hate the regimes no less. Communist Parties are confused, disillusioned, and disorganized. Red puppet bosses are cautiously and cravenly trying to follow the unclear Kremlin line and guess its next move.

This is a net gain for Russia. The strain on the satellite parties is unimportant as long as Russia maintains military, police, and policy control in those countries.

MILDER METHODS ARE QUITE IMPORTANT TO THE KREMLIN

Meanwhile, milder methods of dictatorship in the satellites, as in Russia, have two all-important results for the Kremlin.

It is a most effective propaganda method for "peaceful coexistence" to neutralize Western Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, to destroy NATO and SEATO, and to isolate the United States.

At the same time, these milder methods get higher output from the satellites which are producing for Soviet world military supremacy.

Actually, the relaxation is less than advertised. It is limited and tentative even in Poland, where it is the most advanced. Political prisoners, including some famous Reds and Socialists, have been released. But these most dangerous to the regime have long since been killed. They remain as dead as before their present "rehabilitation."

Among the living, far more still are in Red prisons and suffer in slave labor camps than have been released. Cancellation of Stalinist "laws" violating so-called Leninist rules of justice are called a "return to legality." But in the satellites, all this is still a promise rather than a fact, and the promises contain loopholes which make them meaningless.

All that has happened is that several police chiefs have been made scapegoats for the dictators who controlled them and still control. Since all law is by dictatorial decree and all judges are tools of the regime, legality is a farce and justice is nonexistent.

FREEDOM OF CRITICISM HELD TO CONGRESS LINE

There's more freedom of criticism. This shows in the press, radio and—in the case of Poland and Albania—their so-called parliaments. But it's limited to the Moscow Congress line.

An attack on anything which can be called Stalinism is all right. Puppet dictators are lambasted for their crimes committed under Stalin and for which they already have expressed public regret.

There are demands for more honest and efficient management in food and housing. But there's no hint of criticism of party boss Khrushchev, not the faintest challenge of Communist control or Russian domination.

There is no press or radio freedom in the democratic sense, no academic freedom, no labor union freedom, no political freedom. Even so, dictators are fearful this limited de-Stalinization may go too far. Every one of these regimes has issued warnings that any attempt to "misuse" this criticism to undermine Communist control or relations with Russia will be punished severely.

Like freedom to criticize the lifting of the Iron Curtain has been much exaggerated. The widely publicized Hungarian promise to remove the barbed wire along the Austrian border was accompanied by an increasing number of guards and deepening of the border death zone which makes escape more difficult.

CZECHS DEEPENING THEIR AUSTRIAN DEATH ZONE

Czechoslovakia is now deepening its Austrian frontier death zone in preparation for another propaganda "curtain-lifting." East Germany is tightening police lines to prevent escapes into West German freedom.

Even more interesting, Russia is increasing the barrier on her Polish border. Satellite jamming of foreign broadcasts and bans on circulation of foreign newspapers are as tight as ever. Foreign diplomats and journalists are being watched even more closely.

Propaganda that the satellites are being de-Stalinized by purges of Stalinist bosses and substituting of so-called collective responsibility is phony.

No outsider knows just how much collective dictatorship exists in the Kremlin or how much "more equal" Mr. Khrushchev is than his rivals for Stalin's power. But it is clear that no collective responsibility can exist in any satellite regime because all are absolute puppets of the Kremlin.

Of the 7 Stalin satellite puppets, only 2 chiefs have been purged. Neither of those two was removed for ideological reasons, both were replaced by stooges who had been Stalinites. Poland's Jakub Berman was replaced by the equally vicious Edward Oachab. Bulgaria's Vulke Chervenkov, who as the Kremlin's chief anti-Titoist operator before the "new look," was fired as a sop to the now wooed Tito.

NO OFFICIALS RECENTLY DISMISSED WERE STOOGES

None of the other officials recently dismissed in the satellites was really a top stooge, although some had big titles. East Germany's Walter Ulbricht, Czechoslovakia's Antonin Zapotocky, Hungary's Matyas Rakosi, Romania's Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, all are the same old Stalinists. That, of course, is one reason the public hates the regimes as much as ever and why satellite Communist Parties are so demoralized by the new look.

The spectacle of these notorious Stalinists, who murdered so many anti-Stalinists in the past, now denouncing Stalin as a criminal, is as unconvincing to others as it is embarrassing to these criminals themselves.

Undoubtedly the Kremlin will purge Messrs. Ulbricht, Zapotocky, Rakosi and Gheorghiu-Dej—particularly Mr. Rakosi as another sop to Tito—if and when it can spare these odorous specimens. But there are so few able Communists in the satellites after the periodic purges of the past, that it is now hard to find efficient stooges. The Kremlin needs very smooth satellites operators to make the de-Stalinization trick work.

The Troika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Joseph Alsop discloses some additional very interesting information about the situation in the Middle East. Like the facts contained in his article of May 20, 1956, which I have also placed in the RECORD, everybody interested in the area is able to learn these facts except our Secretary of State. In traveling through that area, he could have avoided learning these facts only by closing his ears and his eyes. He could have learned them by staying right here at home and reading the reports that have been coming out of that area for several years last past.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THE TROIKA

DAMASCUS.—The Troika, as someone has called it after the three-horse team that draws a Russian sleigh, operates all over the Middle East. But here in Damascus, the lovely city of the seven rivers, the Troika not only operates but rules.

Syria's President, Shukri Kuwatly, does not govern his country. Except for a tendency to oratory, very little is left of the fiery Arab independence leader who once defied Turkish torture. Nowadays Kuwatly seeks only peace and comfort, perhaps comfort above all; so he obeys the Troika.

Syria's amiable, astute, decidedly temporary Premier, Said Ghazzi, does not govern

his country either. Even the chief of army intelligence, Abdul Hamid Saraj, the young, dynamic, left-wing captain who has the most important influence on the Syrian Army and is constantly being tipped as Syria's next military dictator, does not exercise any final authority. For both Ghazzi and Saraj also obey the Troika.

What then is this Troika, which has acquired predominate power in this country where the slightest hint of foreign influence used to stimulate paroxysms of anticolonial rage? It is simply the strangely assorted but highly effective combination of Egyptian political leadership, Saudi Arabian bribe money, and Communist organizational talent.

Of these it is necessary to say at once that the Communist Party is measurably the least important as yet. In the last year, the crafty chief of all Middle Eastern Communists, Khaled Baqdash, has managed to make communism almost respectable in Syria. He can turn out a street crowd of several thousand whenever he chooses. His organizers have partly penetrated the other left-wing groups.

But although Baqdash has the usual organizational advantage of Communists everywhere, he has much less real appeal as yet than the other left-wing leaders like the fiery Socialist, Akram Hurani, and the military politician, Captain Saraj. Furthermore, men like Hurani and Saraj are much more nationalist than they are leftists. And their angry, suspicious and violent brand of nationalism does not lend itself to final domination by the Communists.

As for Saudi Arabian bribe money, this is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the whole Middle East. In Syria and Lebanon, the main centers of expenditure, the Saudi Arabian Government is rather reliably reported to be investing something like half a million a month of its American oil dollars in politicians and the press.

You hear well-authenticated tales of organized press visits to Saudi Arabia, in the course of which the Syrian and Lebanese editors were each sweetened by a tactful little envelope containing the equivalent of $1,200—which is a lot of money hereabouts. Any one who wants to start a newspaper in Damascus, however silly his rag may be, can reportedly count on a sufficient monthly subvention from the Saudi Arabian Embassy to make journalism a paying proposition.

The stories of Saudi purchases of politicians of all colors are equally well authenticated and even more numerous. Altogether, the discovery of oil in Saudi Arabia has brought a glowing new prosperity to public life in this part of the world.

But Communist organization only give impetus; Saudi money only imposes unanimity. The real direction of Syrian affairs comes from Egypt, and more specifically from Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Undoubtedly, Nasser's authority in Syria is strongly reinforced by the other members of the "Troika." Undoubtedly, too, Egyptian authority is all the easier to assert because Syrian politics currently resemble nothing so much as a basket of eels. All the eels are in competition. The Egyptians, so to speak, hold every eel by the tail. Even Captain Saraj does not apparently have the strength to take over the Government without Egyptian backing, which there is good reason to believe he would like to have but cannot get.

For the purpose of any practical analysis of the Middle Eastern situation, it is vitally important to note these truly remarkable features of the situation here in Syria. But one should not stop there. Normally, the Communist organization would not be so effective. The Saudi bribery would arouse more indignation. The Egyptian leadership of Syria would be resented.

But recent history, and particularly the Palestine war, have created an abnormal mood in Syria, in which Gamal Abdel Nasser's special blend of militarism and anti-Westernism have a great appeal. And it is this all-dominating mood which causes the activities of Nasser's allies to be tolerated, as it also caused the voice of Nasser to be heeded at all times.

Fair Trial for the Farm Home Loan Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of my colleagues to the disturbing reports about the Farmers' Home Administration.

My appearance before subcommitees in both bodies and the editorial which I included with my remarks on page A3945 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1956, prompted an editorial entitled "Fair Trial for the Farm Home Loan Farmer?" in the May 10 issue of the Ravalli Republican, published at Hamilton, Mont.

The editorial listed eight questions for me to answer, although the man who wrote the editorial did not bother to send them to me.

As you will see, the editorial singled out a Farmers' Home Administration borrower. Here is the editorial:

FAIR TRIAL FOR THE FARM HOME LOAN FARMER?

This being a political year one can expect almost anything in the way of ballyhoo to curry favor for those important votes.

However, many people (Democrats and Republicans alike) were surprised at a recent article and editorial in which the Republican Party and the Democrat-instituted Farmers' Home Administration (including the local office manager who has no control of policy) were taken to task by the Honorable LEE METCALF and his local spokesman.

They made a big "to do" about some alleged individual cases which they would mistakenly lead us to believe had been unfairly treated by the local FHA office. We are reliably informed that although Representative METCALF was home at Easter he did not call at the local FHA loan office and investigate the Grenfell case or any of the other cases which they placed in question. As a one-time impartial jurist we are surprised that Representative METCALF does not believe in going to the source of what he and his spokesman are trying to stir up as trouble for the Republicans.

Our investigation indicates that there is definitely another side to the issue, the right one, which does not substantiate Representative METCALF'S or his henchman's charges, and to an inquiring voter should result in distrust of their motives.

The true facts can best be determined by the answers to a few questions which we feel Representative METCALF should answer for the benefit of the taxpayers who support the loans made by FHA. The answers are illuminating and should make the farmer wonder whether Representative METCALF is championing their cause or his own.

The questions:

1. For how many years has Mr. Grenfell been carried delinquent by the Farmers' Home Administration?

2. How much money did Mr. Grenfell pay to the Farmers' Home Administration during 1955?

3. How much money did the Farmers' Home Administration release to Mr. Grenfell for living and operating during 1955?

4. What was Mr. Grenfell's gross income for 1955?

5. Did the Grenfells raise a substantial garden for home use and canning?

6. What percent of Farmers' Home Administration borrowers are being carried delinquent in Ravalli County?

7. How does the average production of Mr. Grenfell's cows compare with others in the grade A field?

8. If the FHA supervisor ever refused to release mortgaged beef, pork, chickens, eggs, milk, and butter for Grenfell's family consumption?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Grenfell, the borrowers named in the above editorial, sent me a copy. They also wrote that "the content of these questions is such that it is certain the editorial writer must have had access to our confidential files with the Farmers' Home Administration." I have asked the FHA Administrator, Mr. R. B. McLeaish, to make a prompt investigation of this complaint.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank Grenfell already have answered the questions raised by this editorial. They did so in the following letter to Editor Miles Romney, who published it in the May 17, 1956, issue of the Western News at Hamilton, Mont.:

This letter is written by Frank and Dorothy Grenfell. We live on a farm near Stevensville which we bought in 1946. Frank Grenfell is a native of Stevensville. He attended school there and went into farming. He was married to Dorothy Donaldson when she was attending high school at Stevensville. We have six children. We have always tried to meet our obligations and believe we have many friends in the Stevensville district. Frank is a member of the school board.

It is not a happy state of affairs to be put into a position where intimate family matters must be discussed publicly. But when your home and years of work are at stake it is necessary that we no longer remain silent.

When we bought our farm it was necessary to go into debt. In order to better finance our operations in 1950 we took out an FHA operating loan and in 1951 a farm ownership loan.

We have continued to farm our 150-acre place and have been able to produce increasingly from it. By this we mean porducts such as milk and butterfat, livestock, feed, and so forth. But at the same time we have seen prices for the things we produce sink, until in 1955 our gross money return for the things we produced was approximately two-thirds of the gross money of years past.

Our financial condition began to get bad in 1952 and has got worse as time progresses. This despite the fact we have worked harder than ever and grew bigger crops.

An editorial in the Republican says this is a political year. This fact has nothing to do with our case as our trouble started several years ago as prices began to go down. This is shown by the fact that we have been delinquent every year since 1952.

Our trouble is twofold: Prices dropped and our obligations to the FHA stayed at the level at which we borrowed, which was upon a basis of high prices. We just can't pay off at the same rate with less income, even if we grow bigger crops. We couldn't even if we had a sympathetic administrator in the Ravalli FHA office instead of an administra-

tor dedicated to liquidating farmers who he smugly considers insufficient.

We Grenfells are not the only farmers who are experiencing such difficulties. We know numerous other farmers who are having trouble with Mr. Rodgers of the FHA. Some of them talk to us about the trouble but do not speak up for fear they will be persecuted. Pray tell us how we can be hurt more than we are?

Some farmers have gone to banks and secured refinancing to solve their problems. This is true of many farmers who do not have FHA loans as well as those who have FHA loans. We know of few farmers who are enjoying prosperity now. The Grenfells are not alone in this plight.

What we and many more farmers need, far more than painting word pictures in newspapers, and experiencing the humiliation of having to listen to Mr. Rodgers' diatribes without protest, is refinancing on a commonsense base whereby we can work and meet our obligations. If the people at the head of FHA in Washington would send somebody to the people on the farms, bypassing those in the field who seem dedicated to eliminating us from farming, perhaps the facts would be understood and the present cruel and impossible policies changed. Or does the National Government want to chase us from our homes and farms?

The editorial in the Ravalli Republican of May 10 shows that somebody, not us, gave the Republican editor access to our private confidential files in the Hamilton FHA office. So that editorial asks us eight questions:

1. For how many years has Mr. Grenfell been carried delinquent by the Farmers' Home Administration?

Answer: Ever since 1952 when President Eisenhower took over.

2. How much money did Mr. Grenfell pay to the Farmers' Home Administration during 1955?

Answer: More than $1,100.

3. How much money did the Farmers' Home Administration release to Mr. Grenfell for living and operating during 1955?

Answer: Nothing for living; released money to pay for 10 tons of hay and some grain and taxes. Rodgers wanted we Grenfells to sell all our young stock and turn the money over to the FHA. We saved the young stock and Rodgers released the money we finally realized from sale of it so we could pay taxes in 1955.

4. What was Mr. Grenfell's gross income for 1955?

Answer: A little over $6,000.

5. Did the Grenfell's raise a substantial garden for home use and canning?

Answer: Mrs. Grenfell was expecting a baby and not able to grow and maintain a garden; Mr. Grenfell in farming 150 acres and caring for his dairy, etc., was not able to properly maintain a garden.

6. What percent of Farmers' Home Administration borrowers are being carried delinquent in Ravalli County?

Answer: We have no access to FHA books to determine this answer; the editor of the Republican, having access to such confidential data ought to be able to answer his own question.

7. How does the average production of Mr. Grenfell's cows compare with others in the grade A field?

Answer: The Grenfells have no way of determining. Mr. Rodgers wanted us to sell our producing cows for which we might have got around $75 each and buy proved dairy stock which would cost us $400 or more a head. While we realize our cows are not the best in the county and we would like to improve our herd, as we have been trying to do, we know enough about dairying to know such a sale would have wrecked our production and broke us. Probably Mr. Rodgers or the Republican editor could do the trick but we don't think most dairy farmers would try it in one operation.

8. If the FHA supervisor ever refused to release mortgaged beef, pork, chicken, eggs, milk, and butter for Grenfell's family consumption?

Answer: We never asked for such authority nor need we as it is unnecessary. Such living expenses, like operating expenses; come before payment to FHA under terms of our mortgage.

There, we have tried to answer the Republican questions. We are wondering if the Republican editor or Mr. Rodgers would answer questions about their private affairs more honestly? As people endeavoring to be good citizens, raise our family, and finally own our own farm and home, we doubt if it is smart to gloat over misfortunes brought upon farm people through no fault of their own. We wouldn't even want the Republican editor to have hard luck, nor even Mr. Rodgers, though we think he should prefer, henceforth, to have some other FHA official visit our farm when official visits are necessary.

But we are not quitting. We hope someway to work out our problem. We have not given up hope that the FHA will come to its senses and refinance people in our situation. There are probably around a hundred families in the Bitter Root financed through the FHA (that's just a good guess) and if they all pay a thousand dollars in taxes (county, State, school, and irrigation district) as we do, it would mean a hundred thousand such dollars lost in this county alone. Multiply this over the Nation and it means a heap of money. We Grenfells don't think any Government in Washington is so unwise as to want farmers eliminated in order to achieve this end. Do you?

MRS. FRANK GRENFELL.
FRANK GRENFELL.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages. (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Propeller Club of New Orleans, La., on National Maritime Day, Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHARLES E. POTTER BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, LA., ON NATIONAL MARITIME DAY, MAY 22, 1956

Mr. President, members of the Propeller Club of New Orleans and distinguished guests, I find it difficult to tell you in adequate terms what a very great pleasure it is for me to be your guest here in New Orleans today to celebrate national maritime day and to commemorate the 137th anniversary of the sailing of the first American steampship across the Atlantic.

Senate business brought me to your wonderful city of New Orleans—the Queen City of the South—in June 1953.

I shall never forget your warm reception, your friendly cooperation and your magnificent, unparalleled hospitality. I long to return, and in fact, as chairman of the newly constituted subcommittee on water transportation, I had scheduled another visit to your fascinating city for December 1953. What more perfect opportunity to renew my brief but enjoyable acquaintance with New Orleans hospitality and, at the same time, seriously to view this great port providing access between the vast agricultural and industrial heartland of America, the Mississippi Basin, the Gulf States, and the ports of all the free world. I thought nothing could prevent my visit at that time, but fate decreed otherwise.

I have had to wait until now to come back among you.

I was, therefore, not only honored, but greatly pleased to be invited to appear before you on this occasion. My only regret is that the press of business in these final months in the Senate will keep me from lingering long enough to savor the atmosphere and hospitality of New Orleans as much as I would like.

Today we are celebrating a major national anniversary, one of deep significance to this country whose origins and growth developed from commerce on the seas. This banquet here tonight is being repeated all over the country by the hundreds of thousands of informed Americans who know the part that our maritime commerce has played in making the United States, from pioneer beginnings, the greatest nation on earth. They believe, with firm conviction, that we must develop and maintain a strong merchant marine if we are to continue to enjoy the bounteous blessings of this great and productive country of ours, and remain secure against forces from without that would destroy our culture and our way of life.

When we celebrate birthdays or anniversaries we frequently think in terms of growth and the making of comparisons of one year with another.

Today, more people with higher incomes are creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and for many items which were once considered luxuries or nonessentials. Along with all this demand for new goods has come new demands for travel, brought on by paid vacations and a reduction in the workweek. At present the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 3 million persons per year. I have heard estimates that by 1965 it will be one-fifth larger than it was in 1953, while production will be one-half again greater, disposable income per person will be one-third larger, and the hours of work one-tenth less.

This amazing growth is vividly reflected in the overall tonnage flowing through the port of New Orleans from 1950 through 1955. Considering domestic, foreign, Department of Defense, and in-transit cargoes, we have seen a steady rise from just over 35 million tons in 1950 to well over 41 million tons in 1955, an average annual increase in total volume of waterborne trade in excess of 1 million tons. The picture is similar when we examine the overall export and import foreign commerce through New Orleans, where over 8 million tons of cargoes were handled in 1950, as compared with the import and export foreign trade of approximately 11 million tons enjoyed in 1955.

Making still another comparison, at present levels our total export foreign trade is almost 3 times the monthly average of approximately 2 million tons exported in 1938. And our 1955 imports are double the 1.7 million tons imported monthly in 1938.

We are clearly, then, enjoying a growth and expansion of economy unprecedented in the history of the world.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Maritime Day this year seems to me to have more than usual significance. Almost exactly 1 month from today marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Magna Carta of American shipping—the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In 1935, after over 15 years of effort to establish a privately owned merchant marine—with almost every conceivable form of aid—the Government owned some 250 vessels, approximately 40 of which were being operated under agency agreements on four foreign service lines owned by the Government. There were around 300 vessels in private operation engaged in the mail contract services—only 29 of which had been built under the provisions of the 1928 act.

American ships were carrying less than 35 percent of our overseas foreign commerce.

Many of our ships were already obsolete, and most of them, ranging in age from 15 years up, had an economic life of 5 years or less to go.

The net working capital of the ocean mail contractors was a little more than $4 million, and the net worth of the companies operating those 300 vessels was only a little more than $76 million.

Two oil tankers, each of about 9,000 gross tons, were the only seagoing merchant vessels under construction in the shipyards of the Nation. The ship-repair segment of the industry was comparably impoverished.

The maritime situation in those early prewar years was depressing and steadily worsening. When the small, but threatening, dark cloud of Hitler's rise to power in Europe was recognized by only a few, the Congress was directed to bend its full efforts toward restoration of our merchant marine.

The committees of the House and Senate worked arduously and continuously for over 18 months. Seven or eight legislative proposals were introduced and exhaustively examined before the final resulting compromise, which became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In the long and sometimes bitter battle that produced the act the future of the American merchant marine frequently hung in the balance between the forces who favored Government ownership and operation and those who—while recognizing the necessity for Government aid—fought for the maximum degree of private ownership and operation. Above all, however, the sense of the majority of both Houses was for the need for a strong merchant marine.

In the final compromise—adopted in the House of Representatives on June 20, 1936, by a vote of 225 in favor and 21 against—the private-enterprise proponents won out overwhelmingly. This victory came only after yielding to the proviso that if private enterprise could not, or would not provide what was needed, the Government itself must take the initiative to establish or augment essential services until competent private ownership could take over.

The framers of the act insisted that its provisions be made applicable to the carrying out of a specific long-range program of additions and replacements to be developed immediately after its enactment to meet the needs of commerce and defense in the foreseeable future. Immediately after the new act became effective, the Maritime Commission, on consultation with the Navy Department, directed itself to the task of determining a realistic and tangible program to serve as the guide and goal for action during the coming years.

The record discloses that such a program might be made effective in a minimum of 7 years.

The Commission studied the flow of our overseas commerce, and established a system of some 30 essential trade routes. Account was taken of the flow of our trade existing at that time, and trade which might be developed to the long-range advantage of our national economy.

The Navy indicated that its minimum mobilization needs required the construction of about 500 modern ships in the ensuing 10 years.

Thus, it was that the Commission adopted its long-range building program calling for 50 ships a year over a 10-year period to rehabilitate the dry cargo portion of the merchant marine.

Happily, time was on our side, and the early steps to implement the long-range program previously adopted proved—as has been repeated time and again—the wisdom and foresight of those who conceived and molded this basic legislation.

It is now history that the start we made in the few years before war broke out in Europe in 1939, revitalized our shipbuilding

industry and provided us with a nucleus of modern ships which may well have been the margin of victory in World War II.

TWENTY YEARS OF THE 1936 ACT

Implementation of the 1936 act had scarcely begun before World War II broke out in Europe. And the abnormal conditions prevailing throughout the world from September 1939, until the end of the war, denied us the opportunity of true perspective on the effectiveness of the act during its first 10 years. The second 10 years has also been characterized by violently changing conditions, not consciously anticipated in the prewar years.

In the first years after the war, before the rehabilitation of the foreign fleets—when we were carrying better than 50 percent of our foreign commerce—I have heard cynics say that the Merchant Marine Act was in no way responsible for the health of the American merchant marine. They pointed to the impending war—to the war itself—and to the devastated condition of the rest of the world as being both cause and effect in the development of our maritime strength.

I cannot argue against the obvious fact that wartime construction and the wartime demands for transportation greatly accelerated the attainment of the original goal of the framers of the act. They strengthened the financial position of operators who were in serious financial straits in 1935. Wartime and postwar conditions, plus the Ship Sales Act, brought previously nonexistent operators into the American-flag fleet.

Yes, those things are true, but from the vantage point of a score of years, let us look at that part of the merchant marine today which has been operating under the provisions of the 1936 act, and decide whether it has been effective—whether it has proved its worth.

The original Maritime Commission went into action immediately upon its formation, and established a definite program for the immediate future. In this program was the development of the excellent, high-speed, modern, and safe C-type cargo and combination vessel, designed in collaboration with vessel owners, to meet the requirements of our commerce and defense. Many of these fine ships were actually in being long before we got into World War II. Their construction affected the revitalization of our shipbuilding capacity. The operators who acquired them, under the carefully developed requirements of the 1936 act, set about the improvement of their services on the previously determined essential trade routes.

The fast, regular, and frequent services required under the law are now paying dividends to American exporters and importers, and to the areas which they serve. As was stated by your own E. J. McGuirk, president of the New Orleans Steamship Association, and dean of the New Orleans steamship fraternity, "In spite of all the provisions of nature, the great port of New Orleans did not begin to grow until there was established regular and dependable services by the American merchant marine." The farsighted terms and requirements of the 1936 act are responsible for the highest development of the conception of regularity and dependability of shipping services.

The wartime chairman and the other members of the Maritime Commission kept their eyes closely on the postwar needs of the merchant marine under the 1936 act. They firmly insisted that a good part of the emergency ship construction program be devoted to building of modern vessels suitable for peacetime commerce—those ships are the backbone of our present fleet.

Today, as we approach the 20th birthday of the act, we find that the original 12 operators have grown to 16. They are presently operating 300 large, fast vessels. Through the wise provision for the establishment of reserve funds and replacement obligations, they are now beginning to replace their present fleets on an orderly basis with ships of the latest design. Twelve of the sixteen subsidized lines, having existing replacement obligations, will build 180 new ships between 1955 and 1970, at an estimated total cost in excess of $1,500,000,000. We have seen the strengthening effect of the 1936 act dramatically reflected in comparison of the net worth position of the mail contract operators in 1935, and the subsidized operators today, as mentioned earlier, the net worth of the companies operating 300 vessels under the 1928 act was only a little more than $76 million. According to the latest available figures—as of September 1955—the subsidized lines had an aggregate net worth of approximately $550 million. The working capital of most of the individual subsidized lines today exceeds the $4 million which was available to all of the mail contract operators in 1935. And, by no means the least of the achievements made possible by the 1936 act, are the standards of safety, working and living conditions, and wages of the American seafarer, who can no longer be labeled a second-class citizen.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was conceived and developed as an integrated whole, each section and each chapter deliberately and carefully interlocked with one basic objective—the development and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine.

Every precaution was taken to assure that that merchant marine should be owned, operated, and manned by American citizens, and that the Government's substantial interest and contribution be protected. But the objective was paramount in every provision.

THE MERCHANT MARINE TODAY

I have recited the phenomenal facts of growth and development of our national economy and our foreign commerce. I believe I have presented the facts that prove the foresight of the fathers of the 1936 act—facts which show that its principles have been sound and effective, where previous efforts had met miserable failure. Therefore, having painted such a rosy picture, you may wonder why I have entitled this address "Hope for the American Merchant Marine"—for hope implies the need for correction of an unsatisfactory situation.

I do not wish to belabor you too much with statistics—but a few figures can sometimes tell a story better than a thousand words.

Our national maritime policy has been construed as setting a goal of approximately 50 percent American-flag participation in the foreign commerce of the United States. Yet, since World War II, we have seen our participation drop from 70 percent in 1946 to 54.8 percent in 1948, to 35.8 percent in 1952, to 29.6 percent in 1953 at the conclusion of the Korean war. Then, in 1954, it dipped to 27.8 percent, and by the end of 1955, the American-flag was only carrying 22.7 percent of our foreign trade—far lower, even, than the proportion which was viewed with alarm in what were deemed to be the dark days of 1935. This depressing but baffling situation prevails despite the firm retention of the 50–50 principle in the carriage of our vast Government programs. It exists despite the fact that all, or nearly all, of our subsidized operators are in a substantial recapture bracket, signifying highly profitable operation in recent years.

Within the past 4 years, our privately owned oceangoing merchant fleet has dropped from the postwar peak of 1,300 vessels in 1952, to 1066 vessels as of the 1st of April 1956. These things have occurred while our export and import foreign trade has nearly doubled itself since 1946.

The shipbuilding picture is nearly as bleak as it was 20 years ago. And the projected replacement plans will not maintain a safe level of activity in the shipyards.

Three years ago, I was appointed chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, and directed to conduct merchant marine studies and try to find why our relative position on the seas was plummeting so drastically and so rapidly. Our subcommittee was directed to find the answers.

Our aims in the studies that were commenced at that time were somewhat similar to the aim of the fathers of the 1936 act. For the problem was relatively the same in many respects.

We took note of the violently changing times, the accelerating pace of our industrial economy, the shifting patterns through the world as the result of the hot war and the tensions of the cold war. We attempted to evaluate our maritime needs in the light of the completely new era which burst upon the world with the explosion of the first atomic bomb at Alamogordo, N. Mex.

We wanted to find out what our needs were for commerce and for defense—how close we were to satisfying those needs—and finally to take action accordingly. In the course of this program, we wanted to determine the adequacy of the 1936 act to serve its high purpose in a world vastly different from that in which it was conceived.

In hearings held throughout the spring, summer, and fall of that year we compiled a voluminous and valuable record on the first phase of our program—a study of the size, composition and quality of a modern American merchant marine. While the particular program which I had determined upon could not be carried to fulfillment, the subsequent years have seen continued dedicated efforts in the Congress to adjust our merchant marine legislation to the postwar world.

Thus, no one can say that we have been guilty of the complacency of indifference and ignorance which led to the disappearance of the American flag from the seas after the passing of the clipper ship era, prior to World War I. Each year since World War II has seen some new legislative approach designed to arrest our downward trend, by patchwork amendment to our basic shipping laws, and other measures. They are obviously not measuring up to their purpose, however, for despite these well-meant efforts, we are faced with the sobering fact that our participation in foreign trade is only 22 percent. Ships are annually disappearing from the American flag. We have built only three new passenger ships in the last 10 years, in the face of ever-accelerating waterborne passenger traffic. Our shipyards are depressed notwithstanding recent programs for tanker construction, modernization of Liberty ships, repair of reserve-fleet vessels, and conversions of mariner vessels sold to private operators.

This time we recognize the dangers of an inadequate American-flag merchant marine, and we are making motions in the hope that we can restore ourselves to our proper place among the fleets of the world. I firmly believe that this can be done. Before we do so, however, we must overcome another type of complacency which derives from a strong tendency in the shipping industry to preserve the status quo. There seems to me to be a failure to realize that we are in a completely new era of world development, notwithstanding some notable steps of a revolutionary nature being taken in some segments of the industry. Finally, the intervention of World War II and the special postwar problems that had to be met by new legislation have obscured the fundamental soundness of the clear concept of original 1936 act. Too much reliance has been placed on patchwork panaceas, and too little adherence to the carefully integrated principles which brought about the creation of the hard core of what is left of our merchant marine today.

With all humility, I would like to suggest the following steps which, if taken by the Government and supported by the industry, offer hope for a modern American merchant marine, adequate in all respects to serve our commerce and national security in this new era in world civilization.

First, I suggest that there be a redetermination made as to the size, composition, and quality of an American merchant marine adequate to meet our initial mobilization requirements in the immediately foreseeable future to carry our domestic waterborne commerce and at least 50 percent of our foreign waterborne commerce. The importance of such a goal cannot be underestimated. Only through the establishment of a previously determined program can we know for what we strive. There is not now any tangible target of this kind.

Secondly, I suggest the initiation and adoption of a long-range program similar to that called for by section 210 of the original 1936 act. That program, excellent and adequate though it was for the times in which it was adopted, has been virtually completed, even though there still remain some few essential routes or services not served by American-flag vessels.

Thirdly, in developing such a program there should be no hesitancy in departing from traditional concepts if they offer adequate promise.

Fourthly, when the goal and the program have been determined—we should then proceed to take whatever action is necessary to assure the accomplishment of the program. If new blood and sound new ideas can be brought into our merchant marine, all necessary assistance should be provided by the Government.

We should not be inflexible. For example, in insistence upon private financing, which would prevent the birth of a new venture and the type of growth and expansion of the 16 existing subsidized operators. This is not an advocacy of getting the Government more deeply into the shipping business. On the contrary, some direct Government financial assistance to private enterprise embarking upon new ventures will, I am sure, make it less necessary for the Government to construct and operate ships that are needed to build up our mobilization potentials.

None of these recommendations are in any way revolutionary. They merely restate, in the context of 1956, what was contemplated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. They urge that that act be carefully reexamined and viewed as a whole. They urge that the objectives and statement of policy of the act, which are as sound as ever, should override restrictive influences which are of only incidental importance in relation to the goal we are trying to achieve.

In closing, I firmly believe the basic principles of the 1936 act can produce the merchant marine we need just as they produced the merchant marine we have.

An Opinion Shared by All the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Valley Journal of Halstad, Minn.:

Here's one newsman's opinion on the farm situation:

"How long does it take a surplus to turn into not quite enough to go around? Ten years? Five years? One year or a couple of months? Who knows? With all this discussion in the newspapers and magazines about what to do with food that is stored away, some people have come to believe that we'll never run short again as we did during World War II. So let's take a good look around.

"Look, for example, at what is happening to soybeans and flaxseed. A year ago many diverted acres diverted out of wheat and corn went into those two crops. A lot of farm experts began to fear that there would be a surplus. What has happened? Just the opposite. There's a big demand for export, because of poor crops in a number of countries. Now we're scraping the bottom of the bins for soybeans and flax. Prices have edged upward. Soybeans have hit $3 a bushel, flaxseed is nudging at the $4 mark. It shows for one thing, that nobody can ever predict the future for sure.

"That same thing could happen to other crops. Almost overnight it might happen. There's drought now in a big section of the country. It might get worse. Let's hope it won't. But the truth is we don't know.

"So all of us ought to be thankful for one thing we do know about—the big reserves of crops like wheat and corn that we've got stored away. Plenty is cheap when there's danger of scarcity. Of course, there's no danger we'll be hungry as a Nation. Farmers will see that we have plenty to eat by bettering their already fabulous efficiency record.

"But what happens when food surpluses turn into shortages, when there is barely enough to go around, even with careful scrimping? Every housewife knows the answer. Prices go up. It costs more to fill family dinner plates. The wage earner's paycheck doesn't go as far. We are sure that won't happen, but farm prices can't continue to go down and down forever. They're down about 30 percent now from 1951. All that time we've had a steady inflation in prices of manufactured goods, in rents, services, wages, clothing, and so forth. Low farm prices have hidden that inflation—balanced it off. The cost of living hasn't changed, because farmers have been carrying the cost of consumer price stability on their backs."

Water: Our Valuable Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a very fine editorial on the Perilous Water Waste appeared in the Evening Star of Wednesday, May 18, 1956. This editorial extols the activities of the 43d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which was held in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. I take pleasure in presenting this editorial to the Congress:

PERILOUS WATER WASTE

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress last week evidenced justified concern over the continuing waste of our most important resource, water. Our negligence in taking adequate steps to prevent the senseless dissipation and deterioration of our once-abundant water supplies could lead to grave shortages in the foreseeable future. Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri warned that unless prompt conservation measures are adopted on a nationwide scale the Nation within two decades will face a critical water scarcity.

Senator SYMINGTON proposed a six-step remedial program that, while involving nothing new, is nevertheless worth reviving and adopting now. Some of the plans already are being carried out, although usually through a piecemeal approach. Others are awaiting action by Federal, State or local authorities. Mr. SYMINGTON urged the Rivers and Harbors Congress to give vigorous support for these resolute steps: (1) Development of a coordinated program of flood control, water storage and power production through multipurpose reservoirs wherever feasible; (2) a cooperative national and State program to control rainfall runoff; (3) a strong antipollution program, calling for interstate teamwork and Federal grants-in-aid for sewage treatment plants; (4) reclamation of used water; (5) tapping of new underground water reservoirs; (6) a national research enterprise to study means of including rainfall artificially, desalting of sea water and development of fresh-water substitutes in industry and agriculture.

The threat of a water scarcity is too serious to permit of the brushing off of such proposals as "old stuff." We have been indifferent too long to a national resource which generations of Americans have been inclined to take for granted. Recent reports on the extent of river and stream pollution, shoreland erosion and falling water tables should be sufficient warning against further neglect of an element that is just as vital to life as the air we breathe.

Agricultural Appropriations for 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for a very good statement on this bill.

May I ask the chairman one question for the RECORD. I believe we should make this record positively clear in case there is need for interpretation.

You will note that on page 5 of the report we use this language under the heading "Soil Conservation":

In this bill, the committee has exceeded the budget for the Soil Conservation Service by $5 million, to assure adequate technical assistance to an increasing number of soil conservation districts, and to accelerate the watershed protection and flood prevention programs of the Department.

Further, on page 9 we use this language which could be construed as contradictory. This is under the heading of "Soil Conservation Service":

The committee has substantially increased funds for soil conservation technicians to enable this organization to meet the additional responsibilities which will result from the new soil bank program.

I am sure the chairman joins me in the interpretation that despite the need for the soil bank program the increased funds here made available are definitely for additional technical help to soil conservation districts for this nationwide operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is right. Our reference to the soil bank and to the problems that would come from it was an indication that that would increase the need for technicians and all that within the regular existing service. Of course, actually the soil bank is not yet the law and we have had no intention of trying to implement that law through any separate organization. This merely implements the existing Soil Conservation Service so that it can meet its existing problems and such other work as may be referred to it in the future.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's interpretation, which is in agreement with mine.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the bill we have before us. As is customary, the subcommittee chairman has just presented a detailed analysis of the various appropriation items. In the years in which I have served as chairman of the subcommittee it has been my responsibility to make such a presentation to set the stage, so to speak, for debate and approval of our bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has done his usual excellent job, and little remains to be said other than by way of emphasis.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

As has been indicated, we recommend a total of $49,972,000 for research. This is $10,816,845 above the appropriation just last year. It is also an increase of over $18 million over 1953, an increase of 56 percent in just 4 years. That is a most significant increase, and it reflects an important trend both in agricultural appropriations and in the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Personally, I am pleased with this trend and am proud to have been party to it. Agricultural research, like most research, is designed to find answers to problems. American agriculture is faced with a complex array of problems ranging all the way from falling commodity prices to invasions of our forest lands by gypsy moths and our fields by alfalfa aphids. Research takes time and money. Time is always running against us and our only hope to catch up is through expenditure of more money on vital research—and this bill out of our committee makes that additional money available.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, we have shown our confidence in the research personnel of the Department of Agriculture by leaving them rather wide discretion in the budgeting and use of the funds proposed for research. We have approved the full budget estimate of $29,503,708 for payments to the States, representing an increase of $4,750,000 or about 20 percent above the funds provided last fiscal year. This expansion of research in partnership with the States is most encouraging to those of us interested in concrete results from our research dollars.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Our committee has taken into consideration the fact that research by itself is no end unless the results of such research are given practical application, and we have accordingly materially expanded the appropriation for the Extension Service. We recommend $49,615,000 for payments to the States and Territories. This is an increase of $5,125,000 over last year, and is more than $17 million above 1953—an increase of 54 percent in 4 years.

You will note the close relationship between the increases for extension and those for research. In the last 4 years, we have provided a total of 54 percent in increases for extension and 56 percent in increases for research. There is a very sound reason for this. From a purely practical standpoint, research is wasted if the results are not applied in actual practice. Primarily, it is the job of the Extension Service to convey research findings to the farm people who need them and thus complete the research process. The Extension Service—all the way from the land-grant college to the county agent and his assistants—bridges the gap between the scientists and the men and women on the soil. That is why I have through the years urged approval of increased appropriations for the Extension Service not only to help our farm people help themselves but also to protect our investment of tax dollars in important agricultural research.

The men and women who make up the Extension Service throughout the Nation have done an outstanding job in their field, and I can assure you that this is one of the wisest possible expenditures of agricultural dollars. I cannot too strongly urge approval of the full amount we propose for this purpose.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

We are recommending $67,500,000 for conservation operations—an increase of $4,557,255 over last year of which $2,285,000 is above the budget estimate. As one of the more persistent advocates of an expanded and effective Soil Conservation Service, perhaps I owe a brief explanation of my personal position on the subject.

While most of the agricultural programs included in this overall appropriation are for the immediate benefit of agriculture and farm people, the work being carried forward by the Soil Conservation Service is not only of benefit today but represents a permanent contribution to the physical wealth and well-being of our Nation. Many of the problems of agriculture could be solved tomorrow almost as well as today, but this is not true when it comes to conserving our precious soil and water resources. Topsoil is not replaceable. Once it has washed away and been deposited in the Gulf of Mexico or the bottom of the great rivers and tributaries, it is lost forever.

Our scientists have found substitutes for almost everything else, but so far they have not presented us with satisfactory substitutes for soil and water. It therefore behooves us, as a Nation looking to the future, to take steps now to conserve for our own time and for the generations yet to come these irreplaceable resources.

As has been established in the exchange a few moments ago between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself, we fully intend that these increases be made available to the Soil Conservation Service without any contingency upon soil bank or any other legislation which may be subsequently enacted. Reference has been made in our report to the pending soil bank legislation, but that is purely explanatory and has no real bearing upon the funds we propose to appropriate in this bill.

The increases over last year fall in three major categories. As I said earlier, $4,557,255 of the increase is for conservation operations. This will provide for more technicians in the present conservation districts and also for the staffing of new districts as they are organized. We have also suggested to the Department that clerks be employed where needed to relieve highly skilled and higher salaried technical personnel from clerical duties. By this provision of additional technical guidance and leadership to farmers interested in conservation, we fully expect to obtain many, many times the cost of the program in actual conservation practices.

The second major category is watershed protection, and we propose an increase of $5,505,935 in this field. This is an increase of $1,500,000 over the budget estimate. I have a deep personal interest in the watershed protection program as evidenced by my joint authorship of the Andersen-Hope pilot program and active support of Public Law 566 which came the following year.

The watershed programs have been widely accepted and are proving to be extremely popular not only with farm people but also with municipalities seeking protection from flood damages. In my own congressional district, I have seen townspeople join enthusiastically with their neighboring farmers in efforts to advance the watershed projects. I am happy to report that later this year we will start actual construction on one of the major watershed treatment projects in my district and the people in that area are giving it their all-out support.

The appropriation proposed for flood prevention is an increase of $2 million over last year and an increase of $1,300,000 over the budget estimate. We hope by increased appropriations and emphasis on this important work to make a further contribution to efforts to reduce the devastating effects of floodwaters on the upper streams with collateral benefits on the main channels themselves.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

We propose an advance authorization of $250 million for the 1957 program and an appropriation of $217,500,000. If this

appropriation is insufficient, the committee is agreed that it will recommend more money as needed. We also feel that this program serves an extremely important purpose in its own right and should be continued whether or not a soil bank program is enacted. The fundamental purposes of the two programs are quite different and the enactment of the soil bank would have no bearing on ACP as a conservation program.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Research and related marketing services are vital to our agricultural economy. We propose an appropriation of $26 million to be divided equally between research and marketing services. This is an increase of $1,672,860 above last year. Personally, I would like to see even more funds made available for this important work if overall budget conditions permitted.

The very substantial increase we propose will facilitate expansion of crop and livestock reporting services and increased marketing research. As the hearings will show, our committee has impressed upon those responsible for research in the Department of Agriculture the desirability of placing increased emphasis on utilization and marketing research to develop new outlets and uses for agricultural products and to expand the old. Proper emphasis on such research can do much to solve the perplexing problem of surpluses of some commodities.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

As in previous years, we have materially increased above the budget the appropriation for the school lunch program. We propose $100 million for the next fiscal year—an increase of $16,764,788 over last year.

Personally, I recognize the urgent need for even greater increases in this item and we propose to meet that need in part at least by increased distribution of surplus foods and perishables under the section 32 program. Despite past increases in the Federal contribution to the school-lunch program, the Federal share of the cost of individual meals served in the public schools has been shrinking each year. This is attributable to both increased school enrollment and improvements in the quality of the meals.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

We recommend $3,600,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, an increase of $157,000 over last year. I am sure our colleagues are well aware of the intense interest our committee has demonstrated insofar as the Foreign Agricultural Service is concerned. We have nurtured it through the years and now we believe it to be on the threshold of outstanding service to American agriculture. With a staff of men and women who excel in their field, this agency is now moving our agricultural products in increasing volume into markets throughout the world. Today, we are not only recapturing old markets lost through inept handling or neglect in previous years, but we are also opening up new markets we never enjoyed before. It is to the advantage of this Nation as well as our customers to move our abundance of food and fiber into world trade channels for the good of all. We are much encouraged by the progress that has been made and look with confidence to the future of this program.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

For electrification loans, we have approved the entire budget estimate of $145,300,000 in regular funds and have increased the contingency funds from the budget estimate of $25,000,000 to $68,700,000. This will make available a total loan authority of $214,000,000, if necessary, to meet the maximum demand anticipated by the REA co-ops.

The REA program has shown good progress in recent years and we want to assure sufficient loan authority to maintain that progress. Among the encouraging developments in recent months was the approval of a loan to the Elk River Cooperative in Minnesota to facilitate the construction of an atomic-energy generating plant. Here we have demonstrated the pioneering of REA co-ops and in the months and years ahead this new plant is expected to contribute not only to the area it serves but also to the badly needed experience and know-how of this new source of power.

We have also approved the budget estimate of $49,500,000 in regular loan funds for the telephone loan program plus contingency funds of $50,500,000 for a total loan authority of $100,000,000 if needed. Again, we are pleased with the progress that is being made and want to assure sufficient loan authority so that no deserving application will be denied or delayed.

The repayment experience in both loan programs has been so outstanding as to warrant the full confidence of the Congress in them. I strongly urge the approval of our recommendations on these items.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

We have approved the entire budget estimates for loan authorizations of the Farmers' Home Administration. These include $19 million for farm ownership loans; $140 million for production and subsistence loans; and $5,500,000 for soil and water conservation loans—a total loan authority of $164,500,000.

Both farm mortgage and short-term debt have been rising sharply in recent years. Accompanied by continuing declines in farm commodity prices and farm income, credit has gradually tightened in farming areas. As a result, it may well be that many farmers who previously had little or no difficulty in obtaining necessary credit from commercial sources will find it necessary to turn to the Farmers' Home Administration for credit.

This credit problem is being met in two ways. First, I have introduced bills to materially liberalize the credit operations of the Farmers' Home Administration. If enacted, these bills will permit the consolidation of existing indebtedness and also the refinancing of both unsecured and mortgage obligations. A number of other bills have been introduced along the same general lines, hearings have been held by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I hope that such legislation will be enacted at this session.

The other step we are taking is the provision in the bill before us of a contingency fund of $50 million to meet these anticipated needs as they arise. This additional credit may mean the difference between survival and failure for many good farmers throughout the Nation.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The committee will note that on page 19 of the report we have made available for restoration of the capital fund of the Commodity Credit Corporation the total sum of $929,287,178. That constitutes about one-half of the money in this bill.

The point I should like to call to the attention of the committee at this time is that basic commodities, concerning which we have had all the fuss and furor in the Congress recently, have consumed only $194 million of this $929 million. In other words, the only loss chargeable to the five basics which could possibly be shown on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounts to approximately one-fifth of the total figure.

If you will refer to the bottom of page 18, you will see that we have expended $441 million that could be construed as a loss on dairy products, a mandatory nonbasic commodity, and on other nonbasic commodities we have entailed a loss of $162 million. This, with about $135 million in administrative expenses makes up the total of $929 million restored to the Commodity Credit Corporation in this bill.

I would think the fact that we have found it necessary to restore only $194 million properly attributable to basics, in itself would be clear proof that the 90 percent of parity price-support program on the basic commodities has not been prohibitive as far as the taxpayers of the United States are concerned. Advocates of flexible price supports would do well to consider that it was necessary to practically give away $441 million worth of dairy products in this past fiscal year, largely because the Secretary reduced price supports on dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent. Why, Mr. Chairman, dairy products represent more of a loss to the taxpayers of the Nation than the so-called potato fiasco. But, the point I am emphasizing here now is that in the face of these facts and figures certainly no one can make out a good case for flexible price supports.

Will the Farmers Beat Eisenhower?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kittson County Enterprise which the editor of that paper thinks

is a good approach to the coming election. These facts are substantiated by mail which is being received in the congressional offices of Members from the farm-belt States.

WILL THE FARMERS BEAT EISENHOWER?

From the shaky end of a limb, some political statisticians began forecasting last December that a revolt among farm votes could produce a long-shot Democratic victory next November, even over President Eisenhower.

They based their projection on the size of the farm swing vote in Harry Truman's upset victory in 1948, and they offered three premises for a repeat performance in 1956. First, the farmer is mad. Second, the farmer blames his troubles on Ike. Third, farm prices will skid still lower during record fall marketings of catttle and hogs next September, within 60 days of the election.

When such forecasts first appeared 4 months ago, they had been wishful thinking. Today, judging by Midwest opinion polls, primary election voting, and a sampling of congressional mail, a major switch of Republican votes to the Democrats in the farm belt is no longer questioned. Some careful vote analysts, after receiving the April farm forecasts which indicate beef will slump next October to its lowest price in 10 years, are quietly predicting a switch of half the farm belt States to the Democrats.

The argument of the analysts runs like this. In 1952 President Eisenhower carried all of the 12 Midwest States—North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio—and the 3 adjoining States—Colorado, Idaho, and Oklahoma. These 15 States represent 155 electoral votes. Four years earlier Harry Truman won 120 of these electoral votes. These are the swing States that elect or defeat candidates.

Assume, the analysts suggest, that the Democrats hold the 89 electoral votes captured by Adlai Stevenson in 1952. Add to this the 120 farm State votes which Truman carried in 1948, and also the 4 Southern States which went to Eisenhower in 1952—Florida, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. This adds up 89, plus 120, plus 57, for a total of 266. That is the exact number required to elect a President.

Under these assumption the Republicans could take New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Michigan, and still lose the election. Or conversely, if Democrats carry anyone of the big industrial States they could lose several States to the Dixiecrats, and still recover the White House.

Evidence to prove that events in 1956 are moving toward this political outcome is admittedly fragmentary, but the evidence is growing and is impressive when set against the pattern of 1948.

In 1948 farm prices began to drop in January, and the decline continued for 2 years, until reversed by the Korean war boom. Farm income dropped 10 percent in the election year of 1948. Several developments caused the farmer to blame his troubles on the Republicans. For example, in the spring of 1948 the Republican-controlled 80th Congress passed a law forbidding the Commodity Credit Corporation from building any more Government storage bins for grain. When the bumper crops of 1948 were harvested—more than a billion bushels of wheat in the spring, more than 3 billion bushels of corn in the fall—there was not enough storage space, and since a farmer can get a price-support loan on his grain only if it is properly stored, most farmers could not qualify. Their crops were sold for cash, causing the price of corn to skid from $1.78 a bushel in September 1948 to $1.38 in October, to $1.21 in November. That was election month.

In the midst of this disastrous grain market slide, Harry Truman traveled tirelessly around the Midwest, denouncing the 80th Congress. One of his noted speeches of the campaign was delivered at the national plowing contest in Dexter, Iowa, on September 18. He told an audience of 90,000, gathered in a cornfield:

"These Republican gluttons of privileges are cold men. They have already done their best to keep price supports from working. Many growers have sold wheat this summer at less than support prices, because they could not find proper storage. How many times do you have to be hit on the head before you find out what's hitting you? This Republican Congress has already stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back."

When the voting was over, Harry Truman owed his reelection to the windfall of farm votes in the six Corn Belt States of Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

Compare this pattern, then, with 1956. Farm prices have been declining for 4 years—that is, since the last year of the Democratic administration, but at an accelerating pace during the Eisenhower years. In 1955 farm prices dropped more than in any other year of this century. Hogs dropped within 2 Eisenhower years from a high of 25 cents a pound liveweight to less than 10 cents at the close of 1955, which is actually below the break-even point. Since then hog prices have recovered moderately this spring, because of scarcity, but another big run of hogs to market, normally accompanied by a price slump, will begin in September.

Fat beef cattle are another principal form in which Midwest farmers send their corn crop to market. Cattle dropped during the Eisenhower years from a high of about 38 cents a pound liveweight to a present top of about 22 cents. This year farmers have put a record number of cattle into the feed lot, partly as an escape from the disastrous hog market. Those cattle will begin to flood the market in September. By election day the top price of fat cattle will sink, according to present forecasts, to the lowest top price since V–J Day, probably 18 or 19 cents a pound. That is below the break-even point for the farmers who do the feeding.

Thus the election campaign of 1956 will be fought against a background of acute farm distress in the Corn Belt, just as it was in 1948.

The farmer who feeds his corn neither to cattle nor hogs can get a price support loan from the Government. There will be no acute shortage of storage space as in 1948. But the politics of the Government farm program will take another form. Since the President vetoed the 1956 farm bill, Democratic candidates will blame the President for the existing low level of crop loans. It was President Eisenhower who denounced the bill. It was Vice President Nixon who cast the deciding Senate vote against 90 percent supports.

The politics of farm prices has begun to change the farmer's vote, 7 months before the general election. This was brought into the open in the Minnesota primary of March 20. Total Democratic votes in the primary exceeded Republican votes on a ratio better than 2 to 1, whereas President Eisenhower had carried the State in the 1952 election by a margin of 5 to 4. To some extent the percentages are affected by the fact that President Eisenhower did no campaigning in Minnesota, whereas both Stevenson and Kefauver traveled extensively in the State.

Nevertheless, the genuineness of the shift away from the Republicans was borne out by a Minneapolis Tribune poll taken in mid-March but published after the election. In a "trial heat" Minnesota farmers favored Kefauver over President Eisenhower 52 to 45 percent, while in the cities Ike led 56 to 40 percent.

The Wall Street Journal, after interviewing Minnesota farmers for a week following the election, concluded that 3 out of every 5 who voted for Eisenhower in 1952 would vote Democratic this November.

Farmers gave various explanations for their political shift. A Blue Earth, Minn., corn-hog farmer, Richard Quaday, told one of the Journal reporters: "This is a real farmers' rebellion against Ike, his hired man Benson, and their farm program. You bet I'm voting Democratic this fall. I never knew I would hurt myself so much when I voted Republican in 1952."

Another Blue Earth farmer, Francis O'Neil, commented at his 240-acre farm: "I switched over from Ike to the Democrats last October when I got as low as $9.25 a hundred for 250 hogs I marketed."

A farmer from Ortonville, unloading hogs at the South St. Paul yards, told the reporter: "I don't know what some folks got against Mr. Benson. I wish I had a hired man that good. He does everything the boss tells him to do." This farmer said he voted for Ike in 1952, for KEFAUVER in the 1956 primary, and will support any Democratic candidate in November.

In the Wisconsin primary of April 3 farm opposition again hurt President Eisenhower and helped Senator KEFAUVER. KEFAUVER made his largest gains among the corn-hog farmers along the Iowa and Illinois borders, and among the smaller dairy farmers in the northern part of the State. The fact that cyclones struck the State on election day held down the rural vote considerably.

A clearer indication of how Wisconsin farmers feel about the administration farm program was presented in a State-wide poll of the Wisconsin Agriculturalist on March 1, a month before the primary. Directed only to farmers, the poll obtained the following opinion on how Secretary Benson is doing:

	July 1953	September 1954	September 1955	January 1956
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Doing good job	30	14	12	4
Doing fair job	42	38	34	20
Doing poor job	13	37	45	56
No answer	15	11	9	15

The poll indicates a rapid increase in hostility during the closing months of 1955 when hog prices dropped to the lowest level since World War II.

In North Dakota the decision of the Nonpartisan League to break away from the Republican Party after a four-decade affiliation and file this year with the Democrats, an action announced March 29, was prompted in part by the bitterness of farmers within the league.

In the same State a poll of Stutsman County taken by the Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, in connection with the regular township elections on March 20, asked this question: "If the following men were the Republican and Democratic nominees for President, which one in the group would you vote for?" The results:

(A) Eisenhower, 225; Stevenson, 293.

(B) Eisenhower, 145; Kefauver, 446.

In 1952 this same county favored Eisenhower over Stevenson by more than 2 to 1, and even in 1948 it supported Dewey rather than Truman by a closer margin.

C. J. Barry, administrative assistant to Representative USHER L. BURDICK, Republican, of North Dakota, offered this comment on the Stutsman County poll:

We know there are plenty of Republicans planning to vote Democratic. In 6 years of reading a Congressman's mail, I have never seen people so mad. I can recognize a phony protest when I see one, but these people are heated up. We can only hope that the voters

will not take out their anger on Republicans like Mr. BURDICK who have fought for higher supports and against the administration program.

In Iowa a February poll by the Des Moines Sunday Register reported nearly two-thirds of the Iowans on farms and in small towns, and just over half of those in cities, feel the Democratic Party best serves the interests of farmers. A poll of Wallace's Farmer published February 18 showed only 15 percent of Iowa farmer operators think the Eisenhower farm program will bring any improvement in conditions in 1956.

On a national scale a Gallop poll of January 18, 1956, asked farmers only: "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the Republican administration is handling the problem of farm prices and supports?" The replies:

	January 1956 percent	October 1955 percent
Satisfied	24	30
Dissatisfied	62	43
No opinion	14	27

The notable hardening of farm opinion against the administration in the last 3 months of 1955 is consistent with the results of most Farm Belt polls, and coincided with the hog market slump.

The farmers' opposition to Eisenhower farm policies is likely to have more effect of the presidential race than upon congressional elections, since the majority of Sentors and Representatives from farm States have opposed the administration farm program and championed higher supports. The same was not true in 1948, when Democrats captured 35 House seats from Republicans in the Midwest farm States, including 6 in Illinois, 5 in Indiana, two in Michigan, 3 in Minnesota, 8 in Missouri, 1 in Nebraska, 8 in Ohio, 2 in Wisconsin.

The Wall Street Journal interviewers in Minnesota reported that farmers who plan to switch their Presidential votes to the Democrats show little inclination to vote against rural Republican Representatives, all of whom opposed the administration farm policy.

The New Republic recently asked the principal farm editor in each of 12 Midwest States to express his personal opinion on how many Congressmen would be defeated next fall because of farmer opposition. Their replies indicated the possibility of 2 or 3 Republican losses in Illinois, 3 in Indiana, 1 in North Dakota, 1 in Kansas, and 2 in Iowa.

All this evidence on the farm revolt should suggest an answer to the question: Will 1956 prove a sequel to 1948? The best answer at this time is:

In 1948 Harry Truman could not have won without the swing votes of the farmers, which gave him six swing States in the Corn Belt. Even there he could not have won, despite his furious campaigning, without the disastrous slump in corn prices during the 60 days before election. Farmers were hurting worst at the time they entered the voting booth.

What of today? In April 1956 the evidence that farmers are revolting against the Eisenhower administration is not sufficiently strong to suggest a National Democratic victory if the election were held today. That was the conclusion of all the farm editors polled by this magazine. It is undoubtedly correct.

But falling of the second shoe immediately before election—that is, the predicted drop of cattle prices below the break-even level, and the seasonal decline of hogs to a point approaching last winter's disaster—would recreate the hot anger of 1948. And if farm forecasters are right in their count of cattle now fattening and sows now farrowing for the fall market, a political time fuse is already burning.

—New Republic.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, it gives me much pleasure to present a very able address delivered at the 43d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956, by Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Representative from Colorado. The address is as follows:

RECLAMATION

It is a happy and pleasing experience for me to be here at this time to meet with this congress dedicated to programs for flood control, river and harbor development, and navigation. I know that much of the success of the programs in these areas is due to the diligent effort of this rivers and harbors congress, and I wish to compliment not only the officers of this group but all of those on the working front.

I cannot in the few minutes of your time which I propose to take do justice to the subject of reclamation. I cannot in this time cite to you all its virtues, nor even trace its history. Federal assistance in the "reclaiming of land" in the West is nothing more or less than a continuation of the historic land policies of this Nation. It has been of great and demonstrable value to the whole Nation, and its value is becoming more evident every year, even though opposition to this wise development program has, if anything, increased of late years. It has never been my policy to lambaste the opposition in any field. There are many comments I could make about various narrow and sectional types of opposition that reclamation has faced in the past, faces today, and undoubtedly will face in the tomorrows, but I much prefer to make my case on the merits. I am convinced that merit is on the side of reclamation.

Reflect with me for a moment. This Nation was founded in no small part by those who wished to acquire their own land—a hope denied to them in their homeland by laws of primogeniture and entail and by the great estates of the nobility. Early attempts at communal agriculture here in this New World established the real worth of the individual unit of the family farm. The land policy in this Nation, over the years, represented a struggle between the speculator and land monopolist on the one side, and the individual enterpriser on the other. Hardy pioneers forced the Nation to accept the principle that he who first reclaimed the land from the forest or grass and, unfortunately, the native Indian, had first right to continued possession. Unfortunately, the issue has never been clearly resolved—nor will it ever be. In our own time, we are seeing an inexorable reversal of our pattern of land ownership. There is a steady decrease in the number of family-unit farms; a steady increase in the average size of farms, and, right, now, a most serious decline in family-farm income. It is my conviction, both from experience and from study, that this Nation owes much to the determined men who carved farms out of the wilderness and who then insisted upon their possession. You may take it as histrionics if you like, but I am convinced that the hardy enterpriser who fought for land and who carried the tide of settlement westward to the Pacific, has done more to advance the continuing democracy in this land than any other single force. This great force is recounted in many places, but none greater nor better known than Frederick Jackson Turner, the great historian, who traced the value of the frontier to this Nation. We should never forget, in an age when the pursuit of the Jones family or the romance of certain Hollywood stars seems to constitute the major interest of the Nation, that the individual who has a life interest in the soil will contribute far more to a good society than a host of modern-day serfs or factory farms.

By the turn of the century hardy pioneers had settled and developed the favorable lands of the West—the private development had reached its limits. Accordingly, President Theodore Roosevelt proposed to the Congress that the Federal Government should enter the field for, as he said, "The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and the Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States." The Reclamation Act of 1902 still stands, with some modifications, as a process by which construction costs advanced by the Government are to be repaid by water users, with public lands made available to family unit farms under homestead laws. True, the initial thought that interest-free money for 10 years would do the job has proved to be too optimistic, but the amendments to the act providing for a longer repayment period and incorporating the multiple-purpose concept of water development, have served to maximize the development of the West to the gain of the Nation.

Nothing less than a major program would have been adequate. Policies which had been adequate for land settlement in humid areas, that is, the 160-acre homestead under the act of 1862, proved to be of little value in the more arid West. Other programs were tried and had value, but they tended to be at variance with established land settlement policy. I am proud that this Nation, in 1902, saw fit to continue the policy of providing an area of operation for the family unit farm for enterprising individuals. I am happy presently to support programs which still aim to reward individual initiative by aiding in the establishment of family unit farms under reclamation—farms not to exceed 160 acres in size for each individual or 320 acres for a man and wife. Indeed, in many reclamation projects the average landholding is much less than this where the nature of the crop permits a family operation on smaller units. We should here, I think, examine some of the special problems faced in the West and the "why" of reclamation development.

First, although it is vastly different than your usual problem of too much water, especially at certain times, the major problem of the West is a persistent shortage of water. West of the 100th meridian, it is almost impossible to grow crops without irrigation, except for wheat on a rotating basis. The average moisture available, the great bulk of which comes in the winter, is just not adequate for row crops. In my home area where we raise some of the world's finest peaches, the average rainfall is on the order of 10 inches annually. All through the summer, the ground loses more moisture than comes from the heavens. Irrigation is essential to make the desert bloom. Without a sure supply of water, we have little but a dry and seared desert, hardly capable of supporting animal life, let alone great cities like Denver, Boise, Spokane, Phoenix and others. Without irrigation, the population of the West would be negligible indeed and it would not constitute its present great market for the goods of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and other great manufacturing centers.

This is not to indicate that it took the helping hand of the Government to provide all of the irrigation development. Something on the order of three-fourths of all irrigated land in the West was developed under private plans and programs, including

some 10 million acres under the Desert Land Act of 1877. An additional 1 million acres were developed under State programs and the Carey Act of 1894. Reclamation projects now bring water to something over 7 million acres scattered in some 69 projects over the 17 Western States. This land is divided into about 125,000 family unit size farms. An additional 125,000 suburban units receive water from these projects and there are over 400 towns with a total population in excess of 1,600,000 within these projects. Taking it all together, that is, irrigation, power, municipal and industrial water, more than 5 million people in the service areas of reclamation projects obtain their living directly or indirectly by reason of the Federal project development program.

Many figures exist to show the buying power of these people—the market they form, the taxes they pay—and any, or each, of these are but additional testimony to the national value of reclamation projects. Taking tax returns alone, it is carefully estimated that the cumulative returns to the United States Treasury from net new income created by these projects totals over $3 billion, an amount comfortably in excess of total expenditures to date for reclamation. I might also remind you, although I do not wish to labor the point, that these tax returns and market potentials are cited for demonstration only, as, under reclamation law, all reclamation projects are required to repay the great bulk of their costs to the Federal Treasury. When these loans, and the fact is that the Federal contribution should be considered a loan, are repaid, many revenues, especially power revenues, will continue to come back to the Treasury. These returns, of course, include all interest on moneys advanced for power and municipal water features.

I wish it were possible to report that each and every project was either on time or ahead of schedule in repayment, but the situation is not that rosy. Many of the early projects have not worked out as effectively and successfully as originally expected and hoped for. Most of these difficulties were due to the newness of the program and the lack of information that can come only with experience. However, the record has, over the years, improved and we are looking forward to an increasingly sound investment-return program. May I also make passing comment that we have what is known as the reclamation fund—the reclamation area's own "operation bootstrap." It is not too well recognized that a substantial proportion of the land in the States in the West is held as public domain by the Federal Government—in some Western States over half of all land. We collect no taxes as such from that land. Still, it is not without virtue, for much of this land is valuable for oil and gas and other minerals and metals. A portion of the royalties and fees obtained by the Government from these leases goes into the Federal reclamation fund, and each year, we are able to supply an increasing percentage of all reclamation expenditures from this western generated fund and a decreasing percentage from the general treasury. This is a revolving fund and repayments now being made from big projects like the Central Valley in California and the Coulee project in Washington, will be most helpful.

It took the mighty Hoover Dam to break the back of the wild and dangerous lower Colorado River, making it a servant and not a menace to man. The vast storage provided sure supplies of water for irrigation and municipal use and also flood control for a river that had run rampant many times with great damage to cities and rich agricultural areas. The falling water activated turbines to provide power, vital power, for the development of the whole metropolitan area of southern California—one of the most important industrial complexes we have in this Nation.

Likewise, other great projects are as useful—the Central Valley in California, the Grand Coulee in Washington, and many more. In my own State—Colorado—projects range from small single-purpose projects to substantial transmountain diversion projects, and each is of great value to its own area and to the Nation. I have a little clipping, hardly deserving of the dramatic story it tells, stating that the Colorado-Big Thompson project contributed an estimated $126 million in direct and indirect benefits to its users—or to say, this represents $126 million of income and spending power obtained by water users of this project which otherwise would not have existed. This might be compared to another story from Colorado where, on lands not under irrigation, farmers suffered a loss of $290 million from drought, high winds, and other causes from 1952 to 1955. The benefits of reclamation are tangible, measurable, real. That $126 million of income cited above, like all income, was spent for many goods—tractors, cotton shirts, fertilizers, irons, furniture—goods produced all over this broad land.

There is much more that I could say, but it could not tell the story any better. Reclamation makes the desert bloom and become productive. The net new income which it generates contributes to the well-being of the whole Nation, as well as to its own area.

We who have lived on the edge of disaster, have a great sympathy and understanding for other water problems, including that of too much even though with us it is most often too little water. We of the West have an understanding of the benefit of low-cost transportation for we have long been a high rate area for transportation. Water is our life and we understand its importance in all its uses as well as its destructive force when not properly harnessed and controlled. We are great believers in multiple-purpose development—in controlling a whole river or river basin so that the water can be put to the use of man—so that it may become man's servant and not his everlurking enemy. We have accordingly been pleased over the years to lend our support to projects and programs distant to our area and different than our own needs—great flood-control projects, including dams and new channels and floodways. We have seen the benefit of water transportation and harbor improvement. We are conservationists by conviction. We are dedicated to the wise use of our resources, especially water, for we have seen productive land lay idle and bake in the sun, and sudden torrents of wild water that cut and scar the land, washing away its productivity.

Our interest in water extends from the raindrop or snowflake to the ever-increasing flow of water right down to the sea. Our interest is that water should not be wasted nor waste the land. Water, controlled and regulated, is the servant of man providing irrigation and food, municipal and industrial water for our great productive machine, recreation for a busy people, transportation for our goods, and power for the wheels of progress. Uncontrolled and unregulated, it becomes a vicious enemy, eating away the soil, despoiling the city and factory, and carrying our vital topsoil to the sea.

Curbing the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, May 17, 1956:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—CURBING THE SUPREME COURT

Some 70 bills which would in some way or other affect the United States Supreme Court have been introduced by Congressmen disturbed by recent rulings of the Court. A great many of these Senators and Representatives discern a pattern in decisions which takes power from the States and thus makes more powerful the central Government. Others see in the rulings a tendency to say what the law should be rather than what the law is.

In the school segregation cases, the Supreme Court knocked down the separate but equal formula for race separation which had been the land's law for 75 years—and that decision was based as much on a psychological interpretation of the Constitution as on a legal interpretation. The ruling nullified laws of 17 States.

In the 1954 National Gas Act decision, the Supreme Court closed its eyes to a specific exemption for natural gas producers from controls Congress had written to cover pipelines. The Supreme Court decided Congress was wrong to exempt producers. The decision affected a great industry. Thirty States produce natural gas.

In the sedition case, *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, the Supreme Court outlawed all State laws prohibiting knowing advocacy of overthrow of the Government by force. The Court said that since Congress had passed a similar law Congress had "preempted" that field of legislation and the States had no right to legislate on such matters. This rule invalidated the sedition laws of 42 States, Alaska and Hawaii.

In the Slochower case, the Court held unconstitutional a New York City charter provision requiring dismissal of employees who refuse to answer questions asked by legally constituted bodies. The automatic dismissal of Professor Slochower, the majority said, violated due process. The decision threw a cloud over similar laws elsewhere, as well as a protective cloak over teachers who choose to be less than honest and forthright.

It is no wonder, then, that Congress is disturbed or irritated or just plain bewildered. And the views of Congress are reflected in dissents of members of the very Court that decided some of these cases.

Of the Slochower decision, Justice Harlan wrote that "a State may justifiably consider that teachers who refuse to answer questions concerning their official conduct are no longer qualified for public-school teaching, on the ground that their refusal to answer jeopardizes the confidence that the public should have in its school system."

The majority opinion in the Nelson sedition case moved Justice Reed to observe "This Court should not void State legislation without a clear mandate from Congress."

Of the Natural Gas Act ruling, the minority wrote that the majority had transgressed the exemption granted producers and that good faith required the Court to interpret the act as "its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it." Other minority opinions can be found that are equally forceful and equally critical.

It is just this situation which has led the authors of the 70 bills to seek a way to do something about the Supreme Court. Exactly what to do about it is another thing entirely.

Former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes points out that the Congress has the constitutional power to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in a great many matters. To do that, though, would raise more problems than it would settle.

One problem raised immediately would be the effect of a curb on the Court on our concept of a government of balanced powers. A curb on either the judicial or the legisla-

tive or the executive would necessarily throw the power out of balance. There will be men in Congress today who will remember—or should remember—that Congress itself once stood as the champion of a Supreme Court a Chief Executive sought to "reform" by packing it with men he thought more loyal to him than to the Constitution's words. It is not too much to say that the present Court suffers still from that proposal; it suffers because politics since has played as much a part in choosing members as has any other factor.

The cure for this, though, is not in attempts to make over or reform or curb the powers of the Supreme Court. To do that could lead to destruction of an institution when the gentlemen in Congress are angry not about the insitution but only about its occupants. No responsible Congressman would wish to destroy the office of President because the Nation happened to choose an unwise or irresponsible one for a time.

There is a cure, though, for what presently bothers so many people in and out of Congress. And it is a cure which does not endanger the Court or our Government of separate but equal powers.

The Congress can, as Senator BYRD has proposed, tell the Supreme Court to stop reading into Federal law destruction of State laws unless Congress spells that out. The Congress also can pass laws to remedy rulings when it believes the Court has wandered from the judicial field into the legislative.

Above all Congress can demand the highest qualifications in experience and learning in the law of the men a President nominates for the Supreme Court or other Federal courts. The Congress can do this through action of the Senate.

There is no need to curb the Supreme Court's powers. There is only a need to curb the use of the Court as a reward for political service or a sine-cure for political friends.

The truth of the matter is that every Justice sitting on the Supreme Court is there by vote and choice of the United States Senate.

Armed Forces Day Speech by Rear Adm. John E. Clark, United States Navy, Delivered at the Armed Forces Day Program, Altoona, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Armed Forces Day speeches that I have ever heard was delivered May 19, 1956, in my hometown of Altoona, Pa., by Rear Adm. John E. Clark, United States Navy, Director of Guided Missiles, Department of the Navy.

The speech follows:

PRESENTATION GIVEN BY REAR ADM. J. E. CLARK TO ARMED FORCES DAY GATHERING IN ALTOONA, PA.

Mr. Chairman, your honor Acting Mayor Adams, reverend clergy, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a genuine pleasure to be here with you on this Armed Forces Day and a privilege to have this opportunity to talk to you about your Army, Navy, and Air Force. To tell you in a very compressed way something of where we are and where we hope we are going. And at the same time to try to answer for you some of the questions current and classic that keep appearing in the daily press and which are confusing even to those who deal with them intimately day in and day out.

Armed Forces Day, it seems to me, should be three things. First, an objective manifestation of unification about which I will have more to say later. Second, the day on which the Armed Forces make their annual status and progress report to the Nation. This we do by means of the press, by holding open house at military installations, and by means of personal appearances such as mine before you here. We are grateful for the confidence that is constantly displayed in us and we owe you such a report. And further than this, we find at every turn that it is the sincere desire of the public to help us and cooperate with us wherever they can and without such a report your help and cooperation cannot be intelligently directed and applied. Finally, Armed Forces Day should be a day of high resolve and renewed dedication to the battle for freedom and liberty, for sadly enough it is a never-ending struggle. Jefferson said, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance," and believe me the battle is grimmer and of more terrifying proportions today than ever before because of the lightning-like suddenness with which disaster can strike. Never before has America and the free world faced a threat so serious nor so vast, for international communism is nothing more nor less than a bid for total, complete world power and the imposition of a way of life that reduces freemen to the status of chattel. And we must guard constantly against falling for Russian gestures of apparent friendship—for proposals that every sane man's whole being yearns to accept—none of them are sincere—the recent statement that Russia intends to cut her armed forces by 1,200,000 men is just another Trojan horse. And the struggle will never be over so long as man inhabits the earth; communism is simply the threat of the moment; if it isn't communism, it will be something else just as vicious—it always is.

Where do we stand today in readiness. The gigantic strides in technological progress since World War II are truly staggering and a prodigious effort is called for to keep abreast of this progress. In a little over 10 short years, we have stepped up the yield of aircraft bombs from a thousand pounds of TNT to well over a thousand million pounds of TNT. We have discovered the means of employing nuclear power for propulsion as exemplified by the submarine *Nautilus*. Guided missiles for use by surface forces and by Air Forces both for attack and for defense are in the hands of the forces in the field and on ships at sea. Electronic marvels that detect, classify and track surface and air objects are in daily use and have become commonplace. And the pace of progress is so rapid and constantly accelerating that almost before we can complete a new weapons system it is on the brink of obsolescence. In fact since this weeks's issue of Time magazine, I'm not not so sure this speech which I wrote last weekend isn't obsolete. And we dare not relax the pace for in the face of the world situation we must at any minute be ready with weapons that are as advanced as the state of technology at that minute can provide us with. Right here I wish to pay tribute to the scientists and engineers who work for us and with us. There are hundreds who devote full time to the matter of studying our research and development programs, to assure that there is no duplication of effort and what is more important that no bets are missed. There are hundreds of others who devote many hours of their own time to us in an advisory capacity—university presidents, leaders in industrial research organizations and many others of the scientific fraternity.

We have developed in the free world the capability for retaliation as the best deterrent to a full-scale Soviet attack. We also have developed a flexibility of military power so that its use may be selective and adapted to circumstances, both military and diplomatic.

Our 1956 defense program is designed to meet the military needs of today—superior retaliatory potential, flexibility, and defensive capability. It represents the continuation of a reorientation of our Armed Forces to meet current needs that has been in progress since cessation of hostilities in Korea.

The program makes provision for steadily increasing efficiency in step with scientific advances. It is designed to assure a stability that will not veer, like a weather vane, with every wind of propaganda by unfriendly nations.

Our 1957 defense program places renewed emphasis on the purchase and development of missiles. The proposed budget for the coming fiscal year provides $2 billion expenditures for missiles Of this amount, $1¾ billion would be for procurement and production, and the rest for research and development.

Our airpower plays a primary role in both defense and retaliation. The budget estimates an expenditure of nearly $7 billion for procurement of aircraft, chiefly by the Air Force and Navy. This will mean continued acceleration in the production of the Air Force's B–52 long-range bombers, the F–101 and F–104 supersonic interceptors and substantial procurement of the Navy's new supersonic F8U fighter.

The Air Force, during the coming fiscal year, will complete its planned buildup to 137 wings, with personnel planned at 936,000 by mid-1957. The buildup of the strategic air command forces is scheduled to be completed by June 30 of this year. The medium bomb wings are already fully equipped with jet-powered B–47's. All Air Force combat wings except those using B–36's will be jet equipped by June 1957. The Air Force also will increase the number of airborne early warning squadrons for the continental defense system.

The Army is adding to our deterrent power by development and expansion of its atomic capabilities. It is streamlined and pointed toward an active duty strength of slightly over 1 million. It has Corporal guided missile battalions, Honest John missile batteries and 280 mm. gun battalions, all with atomic capabilities.

Under its expenditure allocation of $8½ billion and its prescribed force level, the Army at the end of 1957 will be organized into 19 divisions, 10 regiments and 140 antiaircraft battalions. There will also be an increase in units armed with new weapons.

One infantry division will be converted to airborne, raising the number of such divisions to three. The new airborne division will be devoted to experimental work in organization, tactics, and weapons.

During the past few years the Army has been testing various organizational and tactical concepts to determine how it should fight an atomic battle. The third infantry division and the first armored division were reorganized in accordance with atomic fighting concepts and recently tested. Study of the effectiveness of these changes will affect the future organization of Army units.

Doubtless a significant part of our deterrent force is the presence of American soldiers in many foreign countries. Although they make up an important segment of NATO forces their real deterrent power lies in the fact that they are constant reminders to would-be aggressors of our unshakeable resolve to defend free peoples everywhere.

The Marine Corps fills a vital need of a predominantly maritime nation. Since the time of the American Revolution, the United States has appreciated the principle that a naval commander, in order to operate effectively at sea, must have the means to project his power ashore in any locality the control of which is essential to the accomplishment of his mission. The more than 300 landings made by marines during the last 180 years have been in response to this principle.

All Fleet Marine Force units are constantly engaged in a program of vigorous air-ground training. When possible this training is conducted in conjunction with fleet exercises. During the past year marines have taken part in combined NATO exercises in the Mediterranean and European areas. In the Pacific, the Navy and Marine Corps conduct a coordinated amphibious training program.

Present plans indicate that the marines will make future landings from fast-moving, dispersed ship formations in assault helicopters, under a protective shield of closely coordinated fire support delivered by planes, guns, and missiles. This will be followed by the early seizure of beaches from the rear to facilitate the rapid buildup of logistic support ashore. A new doctrine for the conduct of the amphibious assault, reflecting major alterations in organization, tactics, weapons, and equipment has been placed in the hands of forces in training and is now included in the instructions at all Marine Corps schools.

For some 170 years our welfare, our freedom, and our security have depended, in great measure, on the seas that surround us and on our ability to use those seas in peace and in war. In this—the air-missile-nuclear age—our welfare, our freedom, and our security is threatened by forces that would control the world if they could have their way. But so long as we can exercise control over the seas that protect us, so long as we can control the sea approaches to our allies and our forces overseas, we can deny the enemy his objectives.

The traditional role of the Navy has been to keep our sealanes open—those between our country and the countries of our allies. This means control of the seas, the air above, and the depths beneath.

Since 70 percent of the earth's surface is water, this in itself is a gigantic task.

Since the days of the Phoenicians, the dominant nations of the world have been seafaring nations. They have exploited the sea to build up trade and develop their industry.

It may be difficult for you here in Altoona to realize that North America is in fact an island surrounded by the Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic Oceans, and the Gulf of Mexico.

We are not self-sufficient, but must rely on imports, in whole or in part, for over 60 basic materials vitally necessary to pursue a major conflict, and thereby escape annihilation in event of a surprise attack.

Do you realize that annually we import by ship: Petroleum, 520 million tons, 40 percent of our needs; Iron ore, 143 million tons, 20 percent; bauxite and aluminum ore, 7 million tons, 90 percent.

Some of our other imports include manganese, tungsten, uranium, asbestos, chromite, cobalt, lead, nickel, industrial diamonds, cork, copper, quinine.

During World War II the Allies lost 24 million tons of shipping in 5 years—this equals 1 ship per day of the war. Furthermore, our Government is fully committed in writing to defend nearly 700 million people and 21 million square miles of land in 39 nations on 6 continents and across 3 oceans.

There are only 164 million of us, yet the United States is the military guardian of 29 percent of the land area of the world. In addition to this we have mutual security and mutual defense assistance agreements with 25 other nations. These do not bind us to go to war, but they do imply a strong obligation.

The United States has therefore, in effect, undertaken to defend a total of 64 nations, 28 million square miles with 1½ billion people, or a total of 54 percent of the world's population.

How is the Navy prepared to play its role in carrying out this committee? By convincing any potential enemy that if he strikes first, he cannot prevent an overwhelming and possibly fatal counteroffensive. By being prepared to put the man with the bayonet on the other fellow's beach. For this mission we have tough, thoroughly trained, combat-ready, amphibious marines qualified with the latest weapons and prepared to utilize helicopters to establish beachheads deep in enemy territory. By maintaining fast carrier task forces in a high state of readiness—able to launch high performance aircraft in the area where they can be most effective.

As far as we know, submarines are likely to be not only an enemy's greatest naval threat but his greatest total threat. Today we believe that one potential enemy has about 400 submarines. This is more than 7 times as many as Germany had at the beginning of World War II. What can we do about this?

We would endeavor to restrict submarines from leaving their home bases by destroying these bases, as well as the shipyards where they are being built; we would mine their habors and channels leading to the open seas and would place our own killer submarines across their exits.

We would form hunter-killer groups to isolate and destroy enemy submarines on the high seas, using the latest weapons science has developed, including nuclear antisubmarine weapons.

To do these things our Navy must be strong. To do this our Navy must be ready. To do this our Navy must maintain deployed elements in many parts of the world. This, with the trust and understanding of the American people and with the support of their Representatives in Congress, I sincerely assure you the Navy is doing and will continue to do to the very limit of its available strength.

This we do in peace. Should war come, obviously the Navy must expand. That expansion must be rapid. It obviously must depend upon capable, trained naval Reserve officers and men. These are the members of our community who, as loyal citizens, give part of their time—give part of themselves—in order that the demands of war can be met without undue delay. It is of such people that the Navy is deeply proud.

As you undoubtedly know, United States Navy Capt. JIM VAN ZANDT not only in his role as a public servant but also in his enthusiastic leadership within the Naval Reserve, has done much to insure the readiness for the tasks for which the Navy must be prepared. It is quite appropriate that on this day—Armed Forces Day 1956—the Navy express its appreciation to him.

To the question of where are we going, I can only say that we are dedicated to the proposition of progressive action and advanced thinking. And as more technological wonders make their appearance we hope to be alert to their application to defense purposes and incorporate them into our weapons systems. We are constantly monitoring and improving our training and service educational systems to the end that this complex equipment may serve us to its maximum efficiency. For despite the fact that modern machinery and equipment do awe-inspiring things automatically, there must still be the man to care for it and under many situations exercise judgment which can't be built into a machine. In the final analysis these things are new tools in a trade which has never and likely will never change in its fundamentals.

At the beginning of this talk, I said that I would have more to say about unification—a subject about which there is probably as much misunderstanding and confusion as any other concerning the Armed Forces. To begin with unification does not mean, and Congress never intended it to mean, merger. Unification was conceived as meaning an elimination of duplication in certain areas of weapons development, an elimination of competition between the services for goods, people and services and finally a closer collaboration in war planning and in the meshing of complementary and mutually supporting functions. While there is still room for improvement in all areas I am pleased to report to you that all services are sincerely supporting these policies and that there exists a unity now that some years ago would not have been thought possible. It would be rare indeed to walk into a committee room or a planning agency in the Pentagon and not find officers and civilians from all three services represented. We have single service procurement in many items—systems are established for cross servicing in the field not only in supplies but in services such as repair and maintenance and now-a-days no service would think of initiating a research and development program for a weapons system without advising the other two and taking steps to incorporate the special requirements of the others if they say they have an interest in such a program.

Related to this question there is currently in progress, as you are well aware, a congressional investigation as to the adequacy of our airpower. The subject has likewise been explored at length in all our newspapers.

This subject is of profound interest to the Navy for, as you well know, the Navy is geared to the employment of airpower. So when the question is asked "How much is enough?" let us not forget that included within the national airpower there is a strong contribution from the Navy. Navy airpower is overseas today. It is in the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. It is in the Seventh Fleet in the western Pacific. It is flexible and mobile. It can be moved into troubled areas on a moment's notice. It is ready to do its job.

But, the Navy is not naive. The Navy is not complacent. We know that, despite the fact that ours is the best Navy in the world, the United States is not secure without, in quality, the best army and the best air force in the world. Our sister services are good. In quality they have no peer and it is with great pride that the Navy—on this Armed Forces Day—salutes the United States Army, the United States Air Force and that great arm of the Navy, the United States Marine Corps.

Together, the Army, the Air Force and the Navy are teamed to do a job—a big job. It is difficult—perhaps impossible—to say how much is enough of any particular weapon or equipment. But it is completely healthy and assuring to know that the people and Members of the Congress keep such questions foremost in mind. So long as this attitude prevails, we can feel certain that as the facts and figures become more concrete, the people will approve, and their public servants will promote, the Army, Air Force, and Navy strengths required to preserve our freedom and our security. It will be expensive—it will be fantastically expensive, but as to this I would remind you that there is only one thing more expensive than an adequate defense and that is an inadequate one.

And finally while it is popular to say that in modern war there is no winner, it is better to win and win nothing than to lose and lose everything.

Republican Giveaways: The Charges and the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article Republican Giveaways: The Charges and the Facts, which was written by Warren Unna and published in the May issue of Harper's magazine. This piece is a major contribution to the discussion of the conservation policies of our country:

REPUBLICAN GIVEAWAYS: THE CHARGES AND THE FACTS

In this presidential election year when party issues are far too few, the Democrats have borrowed the giveaway slogan from television's guessing games and pasted it liberally over the Republicans' natural-resources program. The Democrats hope their charge will stick to the Eisenhower administration the way mink coat and deep freeze stuck to Truman in the 1952 campaign. Charges so gross demand fair and public weighing.

Giveaway has already been applied to everything from public power dam sites to synthetic rubber plants; from offshore oil deposits to national forest timberlands; from public domain grazing lands to rapid tax-amortization certificates. The conservationists and the public-power advocates have backed up the politicians. The United Auto Workers have gone so far as to compute a facetious giveaway price tag: $1 trillion. And the Democratic National Committee in its monthly Digest last fall, named the Secretary of the Interior, who was then Douglas McKay, "The Giveaway King."

Now it is true that neither the Democrats nor the conservationists nor the public-power advocates are the exclusive guardians of the 768 million acres of public land in the continental United States and Alaska. The great protectors of natural resources, President Theodore Roosevelt and his forestry adviser, Gifford Pinchot, were, after all, Republicans.

But it is also true that if the giveaway charge is justified against the Republican administration, such gifts of the Nation's property are irretrievable—no succeeding administration can hope to recoup them.

To investigate—let alone prove or disprove—these charges is a job beyond the scope of one article. However, I have made a reporter's check of career and political appointees in this administration and the last, of key members of Capitol Hill watchdog committees, and of lawyers and conservationists close to the issue.

The basic facts are these:

(1) There is definite substance to some of the giveaway charges—in some instances to a greater extent than the Democrats have intimated.

(2) A good many Republican projects might have resulted in giveaways if the Democratic Congress had not thwarted the administration.

(3) There are resources still in danger of being given away.

(4) Some of the giveaway charges are quite unfounded and, in at least one field—the national parks—the Republican record is better than that of the Democrats.

THE GIFTS ALREADY GIVEN

Taking the blackest side of the score card first, what exactly have the Republicans given away? And to whom?

By March of this year, in six major instances, pieces of Federal property or national rights have been passed, sold, or surrendered to private hands. Here they are:

(1) The national wildlife refuges, heretofore sacronsanct, have been opened up to the drilling rigs of the oil industry. Not all, but plenty of them.

Historically, the Nation's 264 refuges have been off-limits to oil exploitation, with 2 exceptions: in cases where previous owners never did surrender their mineral rights to the refuge land; and in cases where the Government entered into cooperative agreements with oil companies which were drilling nearby to prevent them from sucking out all the oil from underneath the Government's own land.

In August 1953, not long after coming into office, Interior Secretary McKay issued a stop order on further leasing ostensibly to tighten up the regulations. Last October 27, McKay assured an audience in Corvallis, Oreg.: "I can tell you flatly that no new regulations will be authorized unless they give far more protection to our refuges than they did before the stop order."

Then began some of the choicest bits of doubletalk heard in Washington for some time.

Interior now concedes it granted some 274 leases between August 1953, when the stop order began, and last December 2, when it was revoked. Not many more leases have ever been granted in the 34 years of refuge history, and these without the so-called protection of a stop order.

In addition, Mr. McKay issued new orders in December to "protect" the refuges in future leasing. Hereafter, he promised, 12 of the refuges would be inviolate from all leasing and the other would be leased only under controlled conditions. The trouble with that promise was that these 12 refuges had never been sullied with oil derricks anyway; and the "controlled conditions" for the 252 other refuges will be supervised by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, an office McKay made subject to political instead of career appointment.

Inaugurating the new regulation, Interior granted the Frankfort Oil Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., a subsidiary of Segram Distilleries, permission to seek oil on 12,000 acres of the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana. Frankfort gained the lease under noncompetitive terms at the minimum 50-cents-per-acre fee and 12½ percent royalty. The lease was curiously dated December 1, 1955, a day before McKay's new regulations permitting it had even been promulgated. Interior later explained the lease actually had been back-dated at the oil company's insistence.

2. A sizable parcel of national forest timberland in Oregon is now being cut over by a private company, under the legalistic guise of complying with the Federal mineral laws.

Until Congress changed the law last year, the country had sought to encourage discovery of its underground mineral resources by granting title to the land to any prospector who could show there was enough ore to justify a "prudent" man in mining it. This law included national forest land. Previous administrations, aware that high lumber prices might induce "timber mining," kept a wary eye out for applications on these forest lands.

Such an application came from the Al Sarena Mining Co., of Trail, Oreg. In 1948, under its new owners, the McDonald family, of Mobile, Ala., the mining firm had applied for 23 patents in the Rogue River National Forest in southern Oregon. They announced there was sufficient gold and silver under the forest floor to justify putting the mine back into active operation. Eight of the claims were granted. But the 15 others, totaling 303 acres, were denied after the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and several private assay firms failed to find sufficient evidence of gold and silver ore to justify either Al Sarena in its digging or the Government in ceding its land for the nominal $5-per-acre fee.

The McDonalds had Democratic Representative FRANK W. ("All is made for love") BOYKIN, of Alabama, intercede for them with Democratic Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman but got nowhere. They have had better luck with Republican Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, of Oregon and the Republican Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence A. Davis. Unbeknownst to either the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management, Davis ordered a third government agency, the Bureau of Mines, to take a new look at the case and specifically to permit the Al Sarena people to have their say about which assay house should test the ore samples. The McDonalds accordingly chose a firm in their native Mobile, 2,400 miles from the Oregon site, which up until then had specialized in testing timber for telephone poles. Once a favorable report was made, representatives of both the company and the Bureau of Mines disposed of the spare samples of the ore by tossing them into the Rogue River. Davis himself was so solicitous for the company's welfare that he personally telephoned the Bureau of Mines employee out in Oregon to find out how the case was coming. He then approved the Al Sarena claim, in January 1954—days before the required field report had ever reached Washington.

Davis has subsequently told Congress he was acting completely within the law. He has not chosen to notice the fact that since being granted its $250,000-or-so hunk of the National Forest, Al Sarena has timbered off lumber worth more than $100,000 but has not mined 1 cent's worth of gold or silver.

(3) At least one parcel of the National Forest in Minnesota has gone into private hands through a secret long-term lease.

International Nickel Co., anxious to justify investing $56 million for nickel and copper mining in northern Minnesota's Superior National Forest, had asked the Democratic administration for a 99-year lease on 12,000 acres. It got nowhere. Once the Republicans came in, the company confronted the Forest Service with an Office of Defense Mobilization letter declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the mining were not permitted. International Nickel next visited the then Assistant Interior Secretary, Orme Lewis. In the presence of a former high-ranking Bureau of Land Management official, Lewis told the company officials:

"If you gentlemen draft the kind of lease you want, we'll be glad to look it over."

The 50-year option they gained is an irrevocable commitment by the Government. Yet Lewis E. Hoffman, top minerals official of the Bureau of Land Management, says that as far as his records go International Nickel has only a 2-year prospecting permit, and that the memorandum of conversations with Assistant Secretary Lewis "is in the confidential file of the Secretary [McKay]."

Fifty-year leases in the National Forest are unheard of, yet M. A. Hanna Co., formerly headed by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, and Kennecott Copper, have similar agreements pending with Interior for Superior National Forest Land.

(4) The Federal Power Act has been rewritten through a sort of administrative fiat, as the public-power advocates call it.

This involves the Hells Canyon controversy in which Secretary McKay withdrew his predecessor's objections to private development of the Snake River Gorge on the Idaho-Oregon border. McKay also told the Federal Power Commission that it would be nice if the Idaho Power Co. applications were approved so that the project could be developed by private enterprise.

After 18 months of hearings, an FPC examiner said that a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, the deepest untouched natural gorge in the United States, would produce the maximum development of the area. But the examiner also declared that since Congress had repeatedly refused appropriations for a Federal dam, it would be only practical to let the Idaho Power Co. go ahead on 1 of 3 proposed smaller dams. The Commission waited until Congress went home last summer. It then announced approval of not 1, but all 3 of the private utility's proposed dams.

By this giveaway, Oregon's 2 Democratic Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, say that the country will lose potential electric power, since the 3 low dams can never develop as much energy as the single high dam. They further contend that the private dams will result in higher power rates to consumers and less water storage, flood control, and navigation benefits. They also argue that private-utility development of the Hells Canyon area will make impossible the low-rate power necessary to mine Idaho's vast phosphate deposits.

(5) The Government's $35 million synthetic fuel plant in Louisiana, Mo., has gone to the Hercules Power Co. for $5 million.

Here the so-called giveaway ratio is 14 cents on the dollar—considerably more of a disparity than the 25 cents on the dollar charged by the Democrats. Hercules originally built the plant to manufacture ammonia for the Army during World War II and retained an option to meet the high bidder whenever the plant was put on the block. Before the sale in December 1954, the plant was used to experiment in the production of oil from coal.

(6) The traditional wheeling regulation—which required private power companies using Federal power to transmit some of this power over their own lines to such preference groups as cooperatives and public power companies—has been abrogated.

Buried in an unpublicized memorandum of the Department of the Interior, this change in policy went unnoticed until last year, when the House Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, headed by Democratic Representative EARL CHUDOFF, of Pennsylvania, uncovered it. Ten of the memorandum's 13 recommendations—including the one on wheeling—were copied verbatim from a paper submitted by the Pacific Gas and Electric Co.'s Washington lobbyist, Herman Kruse. Two other recommendations made by Kruse were adopted in substance. All found their way to the desk of Interior Under Secretary Davis and were promtly promulgated.

THE MIGHT HAVE BEENS

So much for what has already been done. How much more of the Nation's natural resources might have been given away, if the Democrats in Congress had not nipped the Administration's incipient generosity? The list is impressive:

(1) The offshore submerged oil lands (the so-called tidelands) might have been given in their entirety to a few lucky States and, probably, from them to the large oil companies.

The Republican majority in the 83d Congress voted to give the Coastal States the rights to oil found by drilling in the shallow waters just beyond their shore lines. The Democrats, however, tacked on amendments guaranteeing the Federal Government continued ownership of whatever oil was discovered further out. Most States now own drilling rights in a strip of submerged land reaching only 3 miles out to sea. Texas, however, was granted a 10½-mile strip for historic reasons and Louisiana is trying to get the Supreme Court to recognize a similar offshore limit for her. Even so, it has been estimated that 80 percent of the submerged oil wealth lies beyond the State territory—in that part of the Continental Shelf still controlled by the Federal Government.

The Interior Department issues glowing reports declaring the Federal Treasury is richer by $252 million in offshore oil-lease revenues since the program began. But the Department consistently fails to add a footnote explaining it was the Democratic amendments which made these revenues possible.

(2) The D'Ewart grazing bill (H. R. 4023) would have given 17,000 ranchers now holding grazing permits in the National Forest the right to deed them to their heirs or sell them at will.

This bill was sponsored by Montana's former Republican Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart, whom the administration made Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, after he lost out for reelection. Although D'Ewart's bill had the backing of the National Wool Growers and the American National Livestock Associations, it never was reported out of committee. At stake were 200 million acres of grazing lands in 14 States. Only about 3½ percent of all western stockmen would have benefited from the bill. Since the Federal grazing charge is only nominal—15 cents a cow per month; 3 cents a sheep or goat per month; 30 cents a horse per month—the advantage of possessing a grazing permit as a vested right would have been considerable.

D'Ewart was not very happy with the treatment his bill received and declared sarcastically during a Washington interview:

"If the Federal Government cares for natural resources it is conservation. But if private individuals seek to acquire any land now publicly owned, the object is steal."

Even Interior Secretary McKay called D'Ewart's bill lousy in an unguarded moment. But then he could afford to: D'Ewart was not yet on his payroll and the bill came under Agriculture Department legislation, not Interior.

(3) The Ellsworth timber exchange bill would have given a private lumber operator the right to select a piece of public timberland as compensation for land the Government might have to acquire from him for a public dam or reservoir.

This bill was sponsored by Oregon's Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH—of Al Sarena fame—and managed on the floor of the House by D'Ewart. Democratic Representative LEE METCALF of Montana said the bill would have permitted "big lumbermen to trade stumps for trees." He found its worst aspect was in creating a legal precedent in condemnation suits which in time might well have obligated the Federal Government to replace gas stations in kind to make way for highways, and the like. The Government agency deeding over this land to a timberman was to be given no control over what piece he selected; no insurance the land the Government was acquiring had been maintained under "sustained-yield" conservation conditions (the harvesting of an annual crop—no more—from the forest); nor any guarantee that the private operator would continue sustained-yield timbering on the Government land he took over.

The fight in behalf of the Ellsworth bill supposedly had a direct effect in the 1954 defeat of both Senator Guy Cordon in Oregon and Congressman D'Ewart, who at that time was running for the Montana Senate seat.

When a House subcommittee held a hearing on the bill on July 14, 1953, testimony was taken from James L. Lanigan, at that time acting chief counsel for the Bureau of Land Management. Lanigan began itemizing the bill's shortcomings.

The transcript then reads: "Lanigan: 'I just had a message that I had a telephone call. They want me to answer before I finish testifying.'"

Lanigan never returned to the witness stand after that call from his superiors in the Department of the Interior.

(4) Government-owned helium-production facilities worth $20 million would have been sold.

These valuable properties were endangered twice in 1954. Early in that year, Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN of Michigan and Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, then chairmen of the Government Operations Committees, introduced identical bills—presumably at the Administration's behest—to give the Interior Secretary the right to dispose of the Government's helium properties. These facilities have been rigidly conserved as a Government monopoly for 30 years. Such a bill as HOFFMAN and MCCARTHY introduced is normally considered procedural and rides through unnoticed. However the Democrats spotted this one and tacked on enough amending words to nullify its intent.

A few months later, a Bureau of Mines survey team composed of an oil and a copper corporation executive, two coal-mine operators, and a mining-school dean recommended, among other things, that the Government make its helium properties available for private purchase. Secretary McKay's profuse letter of thanks to the survey team failed to note exception to its helium recommendation. It was then that Montana Congressman LEE METCALF couldn't resist remarking that the Secretary's request for helium-plant disposal seemed "premature" in that the administration at that very moment had pending a request for $5 million to purchase still another helium plant.

A few days later, the then Interior Under Secretary, Ralph A. Tudor, declared there were no "immediate" plans to sell the helium plants.

(5) Federal inspection of mines might have been jeopardized by the confirmation of Tom Lyon as Director of Interior's Bureau of Mines.

Lyon, who has a revocable annual pension of $5,000 from the Anaconda Copper Co., was one of the Republican administration's first nominees. At his Senate confirmation hearing he unhesitatingly declared he had no use for the Federal mine-inspection laws he would be required, as director, to enforce. He explained:

"Human life is becoming very cheap these days on the globe."

If there was any doubt that the Senate might refuse to confirm Lyon, this clinched it. President Eisenhower withdrew the nomination.

This, however, did not end Interior's tinkering with the Federal coal mine safety law. The same Bureau of Mines survey team recommended in July 1954 that the States take over coal-mine safety regulations. Congressmen, on both sides of the aisle this time, took a dim view. They declared a coal-mine operator could look forward to greater leniency from a State inspector than from one responsible to Washington. Republican Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR (Pennsylvania) termed the recommendation a "direct defiance of the 1952 Federal law."

But Interior has inched ahead anyway by creating a new office of "education" to help States get into the inspection habit. Already some half-dozen States are conducting joint inspections with Federal authorities.

ON THE DOCKET

The Eisenhower administration has indeed run into decisive opposition in many of its attempts to dispose of national properties. But even more substantial giveaways, it is charged, are in prospect. Here are the cases pending:

(1) Under the guise of partnership, Pacific Northwest power groups are slated to receive all power revenue from the huge 1,500,000-kilowatt John Day Dam on the Co-

lumbia River border between Washintgon and Oregon.

Senator WAYNE MORSE calls this the real payoff. He says the private utilities involved will be getting a low-cost Government loan for 50 years. They will receive tax-free revenue for Federal power, delivered on Federal transmission lines, which they can market at high rates, and yet they will be under no obligation to put up any of their own capital in advance.

Legislation has already been introduced by Representative SAM COON, of Oregon, with the administration's blessing.

(2) The Nez Perce Federal dam site on the Northwest's Snake River is to be abandoned in order to permit private utilities to build smaller dams elsewhere—thereby pinching off maximum utilization of the watershed.

Instead of a Federal Nez Perce, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., a private utility combine formed by Washington Water Power, Pacific Power and Light, Portland General Electric, and the Montana Power Co., is expected to gain approval for two smaller dams at Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley. It is estimated that, compared with the Nez Perce development, this will mean a loss of 4,300,000 acre-feet of water storage and 500,000 kilowatts of power capacity. Abandonment of the Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, also on the Snake, has been estimated to mean a loss of another 2.9 million acre-feet of water storage and another 500,000 kilowatts of power.

(3) The Government may forfeit all future power development in the Northwest.

The administration has curtailed the Bonneville Power Administration's budget for further long-range planning in the huge Columbia River Basin. The planning function has been taken over by an ad hoc committee composed of the Governors of Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Montana—all outspoken opponents of public power. As their executive director, they have hired an official of Ebasco Services, Inc., the Electric Bond & Share Co., subsidiary which figured so prominently in the now defunct Dixon-Yates power proposal. The Northwest Governors have even permitted their executive officer to remain on Ebasco's payroll so that he may retain retirement benefits. Interestingly enough, Idaho Power Co., which has never announced membership in the Pacific Northwest Power Co. combine, was nonetheless billed by Ebasco for services rendered, along with the other private utilities.

(4) The "downstream benefits bill," proposed by the President in his 1954 budget message and now pending in the Senate Interior Committee, would suddenly permit upstream private dams to charge the Government for "storage" of water on its way to a downstream Federal installation. Although the FPC has told Congress the idea for such legislation was its own, Kinsey Robinson, president of the Washington Water Power Co., couldn't resist informing a reporter a while back that paternity really rested with him.

(5) Speculators may find it easier to obtain bits of Government land with no strings attached. Under the terms of a June 1955 Interior executive order which eased the Small Tracts Act regulations, a purchaser may now acquire land without first showing his good intent by leasing and improving it for a 3- to 5-year period. The easement supposedly is confined to areas where local municipalities have their own power to regulate building, sanitation, and water supply. Interior says it has so far only applied the easement to the Las Vegas area, where there was a backlog of 20,000 applications for small tracts on the public domain. But if this easement on the regulations goes unwatched it might assist land speculators in obtaining Government land cheap, selling it high, and still not being inconvenienced by having to get near it.

(6) The Government may drop its protection of the Indians.

Secretary McKay has already made it emphatic it is high time to stop looking on the American Indian as a "museum piece." He thinks the Indian should have the right to dispose of his own share of the tribal lands, the same as any other adult citizen. He estimates the Government can get itself out of the Indian business in 25 or 30 years.

What will happen to an Indian's land rights once a slick grazing, timber, or oil man starts to bargain with him? Already the Klamath Reservation in Oregon has been given the right to sell 1 million acres of tribal timber now, instead of drawing income from the land in the years to come. Similarly, the Department sponsored a congressional bill to remove protection from some 200,000 acres of timber on the Menominee Reservation, Wisconsin's last sizable forest land.

STILL OUR OWN

Now, finally what has not been given away? Despite wholesale charges against them, the Republicans have preserved certain basic and precious natural resources.

(1) The National Parks have actually gained 130,000 acres and had their current budget boosted from $32 million to $44 million

"To give the devil his due," one disgruntled former Interior official declares, "it isn't all bad. The National Park Service is getting better appropriations and he, Secretary McKay, is beginning to do something about the terrible condition of roads." McKay's "Mission 66" means to put the parks in shape to accommodate the estimated 80 million people who will be visiting them in 1966, the 50th anniversary year of the National Park Service.

(2) Some national refuges and park lands have escaped threatened incursions. Secretary McKay himself mounted a white charger in their defense.

When the Army angled last fall to acquire 10,700 acres of the Wichita Mountain Refuge in Oklahoma as part of a 36-mile long, 3-to-6-mile wide gunnery range for Fort Sill, McKay generously offered to let the boys fire from the Wichita refuge and into Fort Sill proper—but allowed absolutely no monkeyshines the other way around.

When the Air Force had its heart set on nightlong photoflash bombing on Matagorda Island, within a mile of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas, McKay hearkened to the conservationists. Aransas is the only wintering ground of the world's 28 remaining whooping cranes, the largest and probably best publicized birds on the North American continent. The Air Force has since decided to do its photoflash bombing somewhere else.

McKay also stood firm against lumber interests who wanted the boundaries reduced on the Olympic National Park, Washington's huge virgin wilderness which covers an entire Puget Sound peninsula.

(3) National forest timber on the Kentucky-Tennessee Cumberland plateau was not ceded under the guise of mineral rights. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson rode to the rescue this time.

The Sterns Coal & Lumber Co., of Sterns, Ky., sold 47,000 acres of land to the Government with the understanding that the company retain the mineral rights. After the sale, Sterns contended its quest for coal entitled it to strip the surface as well, particularly since only strip mining was profitable. This would have meant a nice bonus to the company in valuable timber. Secretary Benson, who is guardian of the National Forest, turned the company down flat last summer.

(4) Many small land parcels have been sold from the public domain—but they are considered expendable.

The administration has sold some 163,000 acres in small tracts during the past fiscal year, more than double the 74,500 acres the Democrats sold during fiscal 1952. However, the Democratic administration, as far back as 1949, agreed that some 3,500,000 acres of physically isolated public-domain land could not be managed effectively by the Government or policed for fire hazards and trespassing.

Here then is a rough "giveaway" scorecard on natural resources: items which the Republicans have indeed given away; items which they might have given away if it were not for Democratic opposition in Congress; items which are on the brink of being given away right now; and items which have never been given away at all, but only falsely included in the overall accusations.

Since President Eisenhower's February veto of the amendment to the Natural Gas Act, the political potency of the "giveaway" charge has been considerably watered down.

After all, lifting Federal controls from the production of natural gas carried a price tag too—between six and eight hundred million dollars a year in increased annual income to a relatively few oil and gas companies, according to Democratic Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS. And though more Republicans than Democrats finally voted for the bill, it was pushed hell-bent by the Democratic Party's House leadership in 1955 and its Senate leadership in 1956.

The scorecard ends up with dollar signs opposite both teams.

ODM Supports Program of Nickel Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter I received from Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in reply to my letter of April 10, 1956. On April 10, 1956, I transmitted two letters to Dr. Flemming wherein Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Spring & Axle Co., raised a number of pertinent questions with respect to the current nickel situation. Because of the widespread interest in this subject I placed Colonel Rockwell's letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 10, 1956, and advised Dr. Flemming that I should do likewise with his reply.

The following is Dr. Flemming's reply of May 21, 1956, wherein he reviews the history of the nickel situation as he sees it for the past several years, and his conclusion that—

The fundamental problem faced by both Government and industry is that there is not enough nickel available to the United States market to satisfy actual total demand for defense and nondefense purposes. The only solution to the problem is to accelerate the bringing into production of additional sources of supply. On May 17, 1956, we announced a program designed to provide incentives for achieving expansion additional to that already underway.

The insertion of Dr. Flemming's letter in the RECORD does not mean that I agree with his solution of the problem. As I have stated, it seems to me that two

steps are desirable prior to engaging in a costly expansion program. They are:

First. Discontinue the stockpiling of nickel for an indefinite period of time.

Second. Establish, under the supervision of the United States Government, some minimum requirements governing the allocation and use of nickel.

I consider it only fair to Dr. Flemming, however, to insert his entire letter in the RECORD in order that numerous interested people and concerns may have full opportunity to consider the full statement relative to action taken and proposed:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: This has further reference to your letter of April 10, 1956, in which you asked for an analysis of 3 letters which you forwarded from Mr. William F. Rockwell, of the Rockwell Spring and Axle Co. of Coraopolis, Pa.

The burden of Mr. Rockwell's letters may be summarized as follows:

(a) He asserts that nickel from stockpile diversions and normal sources of supply for nondefense uses is finding its way into the premium price market.

(b) He further asserts that nickel allocated by the Government for defense purposes is in excess of defense requirements and that such excesses are also finding their way into the premium price market.

(c) Being a member of the plating industry, he refers to the severe shortage of nickel and the results thereof on his industry and the added cost burden which members of that industry have to bear because of purchases of premium price nickel in order to stay in business.

(d) He criticizes the stockpiling of nickel for defense purposes.

Before replying specifically to each of the foregoing, it would be well to review several aspects of the recent history of the nickel industry.

During the Korean period the Government entered into contracts for the expansion of nickel production which have or will ultimately result in additional capacity of 124 million pounds of nickel annually. Had it not been for this Government assisted expasion program, industry would face a much more serious situation in nickel today.

After the termination of hostilities in Korea important segments of the nickel-consuming industry petitioned the Government to take off all controls on the use of nickel. In November 1953, the Government acquiesced in this request and lifted all controls on the distribution of nickel in the civilian market. The reasons for such action were reflected in a memorandum which was filed with the Joint Committee on Defense Production, a copy of which is attached hereto for your consideration.

Since that time the Government has not exercised any control over the distribution of nickel except to the extent of assuring the availability of adequate supplies for defense and AEC orders. You will note from the attached memorandum that prior to removing controls on the distribution of nickel, the Government was assured by the producers that they would exercise their best efforts to distribute the amounts of nickel available for nondefense purposes in a fair and equitable manner.

Toward this end, the producers adopted a pattern of distribution which was based on a historical use of nickel by industrial consumers, adjusted to take care of certain factors such as special arrangements for those industries which had severe end-use restrictions during Korea, new industries, etc.

The Department of Commerce through the Business and Defense Services Administration has maintained close liaison with the suppliers of primary nickel to facilities an equitable distribution. In this respect, major suppliers have voluntarily allowed BDSA personnel to conduct a monthly audit in order to make sure that consumers do not place duplicate orders. In a statement furnished the Office of Defense Mobilization, it reported that in its judgment the periodic surveys and audits of the distribution system have indicated that generally there has been an equitable distribution of nondefense nickel since decontrol. Where inequities are observed or reported, the Department of Commerce calls this to the attention of the supplier.

During the past year and a half Defense and AEC requirements for nickel have been increasing. As a consequence of a slowly improving defense position for nickel and in order to offset the impact of larger requirements on the normal supply, it has been possible for the Government to divert increasing quantities of nickel from scheduled deliveries to the Government. These diversions have approximated or exceeded the increase in defense requirements and thus availability of nickel for nondefense uses has not lessened over the past 2 years.

The Office of Defense Mobilization does not exercise control over nickel diverted from deliveries to the stockpile. Any effort to do so would represent a partial imposition of controls. Under our free-enterprise system we do not believe controls on nickel for civilian purposes can be justified in the current situation.

When the diversions are authorized and appropriate contractual arrangements are made, the Government, in effect, releases the producer from his obligation to deliver nickel to the stockpile or DPA inventory and permits him to sell it directly to United States industrial customers. However, the producers are requested to use their best efforts to sell the diverted nickel in an equitable manner. Arrangements also are made to avoid windfall profits for producers and subsidies for the consumers when the material is sold to industry.

We do not believe that the controls that were taken off in November 1953 should be reimposed at this time. We believe that if they were, no benefit would accrue either to the nickel-consuming industry or to the economy as a whole. The available supply of nickel would not change. There would still be a substantial shortage. Since controls would be imposed under a defense authority, there would be inevitable pressures for a larger share by industries claiming to be defense-related, and demands for prohibition against the use of nickel for non-defense-related purposes, e. g., decorative or other nonfunctional uses. The use of substitutes in these areas could bring about the loss of normal markets and as a matter of equity this situation could result in demand for imposition of controls on other materials. Further, the burden of filling out the inevitable Government forms that are an inherent part of the administration of controls would not be welcomed by industry. While all of this was going on, we would still be faced with the fact that the demand for nickel is considerably in excess of the supply.

In light of the foregoing, the several assertions made by Mr. Rockwell can now be considered.

It is the opinion of BDSA that most of the highest price nickel originates in Japan, France, Germany, and from the sale of secondary nickel obtained from scrap. The sale of this material at higher than market prices is not illegal. However, if there is any substance to the assertion that nickel from stockpile diversions and usual normal sources of supply for nondefense uses is finding its way into the exsessively high-price market, it would mean that some consumers are receiving more than they can currently use, and thus the pattern of distribution is faulty. As was pointed out above, the Department of Commerce is well acquainted with the methods and manner of distribution of nondefense nickel and is persuaded that there is no substantial basis for criticism. In addition, it must be remembered that the only alternative to the present arrangement is the imposition of Government controls and that such a system in theory could result in a leveling of prices only if the area in which nickel could be used were limited to such a degree as to assure that the supply would equal or exceed the demand.

We are informed that the sales contracts used by nickel producers and suppliers generally provide limitations on the resale or remeltng for resale of nickel. This is one of the methods which nickel producers have employed to discourage resale of nickel at premium prices. In addition, nickel suppliers attempt to maintain a close surveillance of their customers' use of nickel since it is not to their advantage to have such nickel resold at premium prices.

Mr. Rockwell charges that there are excess allocations of nickel for defense purposes and at one point makes the somewhat equivocal statement that: "We have absolute proof that some steel companies have sold nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders."

The BDSA has a strict and explicit regulation which prescribes the disposition that is to be made of allocated nickel which is found to be in excess of defense needs. Violation of this regulation carries with it criminal penalties. If Mr. Rockwell knows of any such violation he has an obligation to notify the proper authorities of the circumstances.

In addition, the BDSA is vigorously patrolling the use of defense rated orders and nickel received thereunder. We are informed that these investigations have revealed that only an insignificant portion of the nickel allocated to defense orders has been improperly used.

Mr. Rockwell's third point deals primarily with the added cost which the plating industry has to bear because of its resort to premium price nickel. We assume in this instance that Mr. Rockwell refers to very high cost nickel and not to the more moderately priced nickel deriving from Government diversion. As you know, some of the nickel distributed through regular channels comes from diversions of premium price nickel from Government contracts. However, the price of this nickel in ingot or ferro nickel forms ranges from about $1 to $1.25 per pound, or approximately the cost to the Government.

The sale of certain imports of nickel or nickel excess to nondefense consumer needs at very high prices is not illegal. While the Government has complete sympathy with the problem of the consumers regarding the added burden that is placed on them by any necessary purchase of high cost nickel, it has no acceptable alternative course to follow which would substantially improve the situation, as indicated above.

The last point referred to by Mr. Rockwell deals with policies which are followed in accumulating stockpiles of nickel for national security purposes. He refers to several informal conversations with officials of other countries and concludes that our present stockpile policy is unrealistic and detrimental to the needs of the economy as a whole.

As indicated above, almost all of the material being acquired for the stockpile comes from expanded capacity brought about by

Government financial assistance or from Government-owned plants. Industry would not now be receiving as much nickel as it is by reason of current diversions, were it not for the enormous expansion program undertaken and financed by the Government.

Lastly, it is sufficient to state that stockpiling policy is determined on the basis of advice from the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Mobilization Board, and other cognizant agencies. These policies are revised from time to time and adjusted in accordance with changing defense and world conditions.

The fundamental problem faced by both Government and industry is that there is not enough nickel available to the United States market to satisfy actual total demand for defense and nondefense purposes. The only solution to the problem is to accelerate the bringing into production of additional sources of supply. On May 17, 1956 we announced a program designed to provide incentives for achieving expansion additional to that already underway.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

American Friends of Middle East: Spokesmen for Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "American Friends of Middle East: Spokesmen for Arabs" is deserving of the attention of every Member of this House. It appeared in the April 6, 1956, edition of Israel Speaks:

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF MIDDLE EAST: SPOKESMEN FOR ARABS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Within the network of pro-Arab propaganda activities in America, the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME) holds a central and strategic place: it is, in fact, the most effective pro-Arab and anti-Israel organization in this country. Precisely because its approach is more subtle and its designs less candid is it able to make greater advances than the blatant and violent official Arab propaganda.

(The face AFME puts on for the American public is that of a pious neutralism seeking only peace in the Middle East and the protection of American interests. The Zionists, in AFME literature, are darkly referred to as "special interest groups" and "pressure groups," though Zionist organizations openly proclaim their "special interest" in the welfare of Israel. AFME, however, though in fact a pressure group for Arab interests, has chosen to conceal its purposes and has consequently misled many Americans who accept its stated aims at face value.

(On the following pages, we present a factual report on AFME—its sponsors, its composition, its activities and its financial sources. The report was prepared by writers with much experience in the investigation of pro-Arab and anti-Semitic activity in America, with the collaboration of the editorial staff of Israel Speaks. In order to protect the writers' future work, their names are being withheld.)

The American Friends of the Middle East (AFME), a name both patriotic and high-sounding, is an outfit set up for pro-Arab and anti-Israel activity—the first such organization to make significant inroads in the traditional friendship of the American people for Zionist aspirations and for the state of Israel.

The sponsorship of AFME is American and distinguished. The top executives are Dorothy Thompson, the well-known journalist, and Garland Evans Hopkins, a clergyman best known as an international committee promoter. They are buttressed by a board of directors and a national council of some 65 influential makers of opinion: writer-lecturers, ministers and executives of church organizations, educators, and a few lawyers and businessmen; and a paid staff of over 30.

AFME carries on a wide range of activities: news conferences and releases (1,254 items last year), radio and TV programs, an information service, speakers, lecture and study programs, pamphlets, student activities, travel and numerous others. The major objective of these activities is to make the Arab cause acceptable to Americans and to generate hostility both to Zionists and to Israel.

As its national center of operations AFME maintains an East Side mansion in New York City called Middle East House. AFME has 59 representatives well placed elsewhere in the United States and 20 centers in the Middle East. The American representatives are teachers, clubwomen and the like who can provide audiences for itinerant pro-Arab propagandists and distribute the several pieces of free literature, mailed first-class, that AFME sends out each week.

OBJECTIVES

As announced in its initial full-page ad in the New York Times on June 27, 1951, AFME was set up to "increase understanding of common spiritual values of some 200 million people of Islam and 7 million others, Jews and Christians among them. Americans and the peoples of the Middle East must strengthen their bonds of culture and religion, of literature and education. • • • We shall encourage a mutual effort to advance the cause of human freedom and dignity." The people of the Middle East—meaning Arabs—were told that "they are democracy's outposts against communism" and that "more than bread alone, they must also have American friendship and understanding."

These laudable objectives, stated in this high-flown language, were intended to characterize the organization and to attract new recruits to its program. A close study of the activities of AFME since its inception, however, indicates that the organization was set up expressly to carry on pro-Arab and anti-Israel propaganda. The phrase "Middle East" in its name stands for the Arab states: Israel has been amputated from the heart of the Middle East as a sort of useless appendage poisoning the rest of the body. The effect of AFME's propaganda is to deny the right to existence of Israel as an integral part of the Middle East. It is this objective of the self-proclaimed "non-political" organization which inspires AFME's declaration that it proposes to tear away "the curtain of obscurity and distortion" in the Middle East.

STUDY OF MATERIAL SHOWS PRO-ARAB BIAS

An impartial study of AFME's material was recently made to determine whether it really presented, as the group claims, both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict or whether it presented one side more favorably with a view to influencing public opinion—in other words, not enlightenment but propaganda.

This content analysis was made by Eugene Maier, a student in the divinity school of the University of Chicago. He set out to test Dorothy Thompson's assertions about AFME's policy, such as: "I want to emphasize that we are not a propaganda organization and we are not out to grind axes for anyone." And: "We only want the American public to learn the facts as important observers see them."

Maier analyzed by modern opinion measurement techniques over 1,500 pages of AFME material: news letters, pamphlets, and AFME conference reports, from mid-1953 to mid-1954. He came up with the conclusion that about two-thirds of this material was strongly pro-Arab and over one-fourth of it was anti-Israel. A similar content analysis of AFME's propaganda since 1954 would undoubtedly show a larger proportion of it pro-Arab and anti-Israel. The organization's anti-Israel bias has grown through the years and has increasingly come out in the open.

THE MAJOR THEMES

The plight of the Arab refugees has understandably been given major emphasis in AFME's material as the appeal most likely to touch people's hearts. The origin of the problem in the Arab invasion of Israel, and Israel's repeated offers of compensation receive little notice.

AFME's next major technique is to panic Americans: If we do not make concessions to the Arabs we will lose the Middle East to Russia. Of late this theme has taken first place. That the Arab States are buying arms from the Communists and welcoming their missions, indicates, by a peculiar AFME twist, not their bad faith toward us but our guilt for not giving the Arabs more arms ourselves.

Another important theme is the harm done by Zionist activities, a subject given major emphasis by both AFME and the Arab propaganda network. At the AFME convention in January 1955, for example, about half the time was given up to attacks on Zionists and on Israel.

Two further arguments given prominence are: The State of Israel wants to expand its territory at the expense of the Arab States; Israeli armed forces have committed atrocities. In the report already cited, Maier found 27 references to atrocities by Israeli armed forces in the AFME material he analyzed for 1953–54; but none by Arabs. The few pro-Israel statements that did appear in AFME material, Maier notes, were used as a preface to something hostile to Israel.

Maier's conclusion: "AFME has overt and covert purposes. AFME is not friends of the total Middle East, but only of the Arab Middle East, and with a pronounced bias against Israel."

LEADERS OF AFME: THOMPSON AND HOPKINS

AFME's record of hostility toward Israel and toward Zionists generally can be put at the door mainly of the president, Dorothy Thompson, and the executive vice president, Garland Hopkins, supported by a compact executive group with varying degrees of aversion to the Jewish State.

What has come over Dorothy Thompson? During a great part of her life, she stood up as the champion of oppressed people and as the enemy of dictators; today she is a paid propagandist of AFME, an outfit speaking for the Arabs and their feudal societies and military dictatorships.

On repeated trips to the Middle East she and Hopkins have consorted with kings and dictators. They have not concerned themselves with reforms to remove feudalism from the Arab countries. AFME is scrupulously careful not to stress subjects distasteful to the Arab leaders or which may make a wrong impression on the American reader. AFME nowhere hints that perhaps Arab politicians themselves have been exploiting the plight of the Arab refugees to gain sympathy abroad. AFME describes frontier conflicts as results of the Israeli Army's aggression while Arab incursions are those of poor Arab farmers trying to visit their former homes in Israel.

MISS THOMPSON AND ZIONISM

Once an eloquent Zionist and friend of Jews, Dorothy Thompson's reversal has surprised many observers. As possible explanations, various personal experiences have been

cited. Miss Thompson herself, however, explains her change in attitude by saying that originally she "was touched by the tragedies which befell European Jewry under the Nazis." She favored a home for them in Israel. But on a visit to Israel years later she became convinced that she had been misled on basic assumptions and that Israel's evolution was not compatible with what was humane or even democratic.

Back in 1943, in I Speak as an American, Miss Thompson wrote:

"The Jews are alive today because they remembered Zion. From the time when, by the waters of long-extinct Babylon, they sat down and wept, yea, hung their harps upon the willow and wept because they remembered Zion, they have remembered, and remembered without a break. * * * And how any Jew can divorce his religion from his nationhood is beyond my powers of comprehension. * * * The fear exists that the recognition of this nationhood will prejudice the status of Jews as citizens of other countries. I hold that to be an exact perversion of the real situation."

But in April 1952 she was awarded a Medal of Honor by the Syrian Government for her services to the Arab cause.

POLITICAL SALESMAN

Garland Hopkins is the dominant executive in all AFME activities. A man in his early forties, articulate, energetic, and smartly dressed. Hopkins is an enterprising sales manager pushing his merchandise with a Messianic tinge to his convictions. Hopkins likes to regard himself as a man of many talents, and has long been a champion joiner.

In origin, Hopkins' background is that of a small-town Virginia preacher. He early identified himself with everything having an international flavor: he taught French, became active in the English Speaking Union, and became a non-Government delegate at United Nations sessions. Hopkins also was notably active in the Committee for Peace and Justice in the Holy Land and in the Holy Land Emergency Liaison Program.

Hopkins has both the handicaps and talents of a jack-of-all-trades. He gets around and has met everybody. While he has failed to make a name for himself as a writer, he does influence opinion effectively in a number of ways. He knows the kind of emotional appeal that moves the hearts of his listeners or readers. He feels himself an authority on almost any international political question. He also likes to think of himself not as a clergyman but as an unofficial ambassador calling on top statesmen here and abroad to lend them his counsel. He has boundless energy and ambition.

HOPKINS AND THE JEWS

In the first years of AFME, Hopkins made an effort to stay friends of both Jews and Arabs. He contacted a number of leading Jews and Jewish organizations and emphasized that his friendship for the Arabs and opposition to Israel should not be taken as hostility toward American Jews. On one occasion he even invited an Israeli Counsel to an AFME social function. But this caused such an uproar among the Arab officials that he hastily explained to them the invitation had been extended in error. But on his annual trips to the Middle East, Hopkins has gone to great pains to ingratiate himself with Arabs in high places by registering his hostility to Israel and to Zionists generally.

Hopkins still clings to his hope of maintaining friendly contact with American Jews. Only a few months ago he publicly registered his disapproval of crack-pot anti-Semitic letters AFME received and said that he had turned some of them over to a large Jewish organization for analysis. This distressed some of his associates who felt that this was an indiscretion which might alienate some of their following.

It is American Zionists who are the chief butt of Hopkins' attacks, in which he exploits the old charge of dual allegiance. But increasingly the line between Zionists and Jews is blurred—as it certainly is for most of the American public—and the American Jews as such become the objects of what Max Lerner has called Hopkins' "Goebbels line."

WARNINGS

Hopkins was quoted in the "American Zionist," April 5, 1953, as saying: "If the American people ever find themselves losing another war in the Middle East, and begin to ask why, and discover what the cause has been, you will find the same things happening here (to the Jews) as happened in Germany. I hesitate to think what might happen in New York."

On his return from the Middle East, October 10, 1955, he said:

"Zionist activities in the United States might raise the question who is responsible for the loss in the Middle East. That is the kind of question which could produce a wave of anti-Semitism here."

In a speech to the annual AFME convention in January, 1954, and repeated in the anuual report as AFME's policy, Hopkins warned Israel:

"Israel is in the Middle East and of the Middle East and must eventually conform to the pattern, or it has no other alternative but to cese to exist." What the pattern is that Israel must conform to is not spelled out, but the threat of extermination is used repeatedly.

The matter of the corrupt and feudalistic autocracies of the Arab States is not, as mentioned above, given prominence by AFME or by Hopkins. When it is considered, however, it is handled in terms like these:

"Democracy as we know it is a luxury of the literate. It simply cannot exist in a largely illiterate country. In such countries the army is not infrequently the most democratic institution in the land. I is about the only organization in which the son of a poor peasant has some chance of getting to the top. Its personnel is drawn from all elements of society. Its group thinking in the barracks comes a lot closer to representing the people than do the members of parliament * * *."

With such logic, Hopkins hopes to persuade his American readers that in the Arab countries the autocratic and oppressive Army dictatorships are actually models of democracy.

VALUABLE AID FROM DISSIDENT JEWS

Collaboration of prominent dissident Jews with AFME is a special chapter in itself. Here it may be sufficient to mention only two.

Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive head of the American Council for Judaism, has been giving valuable assistance to AFME from the start. He is a member of the board of directors, and helped AFME get its office started with the cooperation of his own staff. He even made the mailing lists of the two outfits interchangeable. He has been a frequent speaker for AFME. Last year he spent two months in the Arab countries and a couple of days in Israel—also mainly for AFME. Hopkins always is lavish with praise of Berger and speaks of the effective work their organizations are doing together.

Among Berger's services to the Arab cause in the United States is his advice on how to combat "Zionist propaganda." In a speech given to an Arab student conference in Colorado in 1954, Berger exhorted his audience not to "yield to the human temptation to answer in kind the Zionist vilification, character assassination and slander. Give your audience the facts and leave the Zionists to wear out their own audience with a surfeit of invective."

ANOTHER FRIEND

Rabbi Morris Lazaron is on AFME's council and also is given a prominent place at AFME functions. At the organization's conference this year, Lazaron gave the invocation. This was at a luncheon where the main speaker was Comdr. Elmo H. Hutchison, a notorious anti-Israel soldier, and now AFME's chief representative in the Middle East. Lazaron gave a long and dignified invocation, mainly in Hebrew, followed by Hutchison who gave as bitter an anti-Israel analysis of border conflicts as was ever given outside of Cairo or Damascus.

Lazaron, accompanied by 1 Protestant and 1 Catholic clergyman, went on an AFME-sponsored trip to the Middle East. On their return, the three participated in round-table discussions at meetings, and on the radio, and wrote a pro-Arab pamphlet, all given wide distribution by AFME.

Lazaron has been concerned about what he considers the second-class citizenship accorded the Arab minority in Israel, which leads him to the following interesting conclusion:

"If Israel continues to treat its minorities as it does, what is to present other nations where Jews live from treating their Jewish minorities in the same way?"

THE MEMBERSHIP

Little need be said about the group of 59 prominent American clergymen, educators, writers, and businessmen who are on the national council of AFME. This is because their active participation in office operations has been insignificant. Some of them were associated with American groups working with the Arabs. As such they have a paternalistic concern for their former Arab wards and students. The pro-Arab slant of educators from American colleges in the Middle East is well known. Some of the board lent their names to AFME, an organization whose announced aims sound worthy, without troubling to look too closely into it. Some of these may still not be aware of the actual intent and operation of the group.

AFME's prestige is that of the distinguished educators, Protestant pastors and missionaries who sponsor it. They have in common the fact that most of them have ben associated in the past with American institutions in the Near East. Today these educators with their special knowledge are influential in the State Department. Others have found well-paid consulting jobs with the oil companies operating in the Near East. Others are still active in American colleges.

Members are primarily window dressing in a propaganda outfit like AFME. The leaders of the organization like to convey the impression that AFME is a popular movement of patriotic Americans interested in fair play in the Middle East. Actually, after 5 years of activity, AFME has less than 3,000 members. Members' dues have shrunk from 11 percent to 4 percent of AFME's income. AFME activities from the start have been run with little concern for the number of members, the amount of their contributions, or their desires. Members do not elect directors and have nothing to say about policy.

WHAT AFME HAS ACHIEVED—AND HOW

AFME's score on newspaper effectiveness is not clear. Dorothy Thompson has complained bitterly about neglect by the press, and protested particularly to the New York Times. But in the last annual report, AFME stated: "Our coverage in the Middle East press approximates the spendid coverage, with some few exceptions, that the American press has given us." The Arab press, of course, gives the organization flattering notices.

On the score of pamphleteering and group activities—lectures, discussions, etc.—AFME's energetic propagandizing has been clearly effective. An increasing number of pamphlets have been brought out dealing with special subjects. These provide material for AFME's associates around the coun-

try as well as information for members, schools, and the like.

AFME has considerable lecture talent and it is here that much activity is currently concentrated. Now that the Middle East is on the front pages again, Hopkins has recently been appearing several times a week in debates and discussions on radio and television. Among AFME's sponsors are many others with first-hand knowledge of the area and they too are busily lecturing. In addition, AFME has provided live TV shows. Canned propaganda on platters is distributed to radio stations. Now color films are being produced, the first two on Egypt and Turkey.

PROPAGANDA ON CAMPUSES

Student affairs are given a fair amount of attention in the organization's program. Last year 43 college campuses were visited by members of AFME's staff. In the first year of AFME, before the anti-Israel pattern had taken such definite shape, AFME proposed calling a conference of students from all Middle East countries, including Israel. But the Arabs protested so violently that the conference was deferred for several months, finally dropped, and instead AFME sponsored one for Arab students only. This was held at the University of Michigan in 1952.

AFME called these Arab students "ambassadors of good will" and offered to assist them in fulfilling this role. AFME helped the Arab students form a national organization and then set up local campus clubs.

Arab governments at first did not see the full propaganda potentialities in using their students on college campuses, but in recent years they have made up for lost time. In the last 2 years, the Arab States, and now the Arab League through the Arab Information Center in New York City, have taken over the direction of Arab student propaganda, notably by intensive advance briefing. Many of these Arab students have too scanty a knowledge of conditions in their own countries to be effective ambassadors. But they can arrange invitations for visiting Arab propagandists and can distribute literature. This they do zealously.

Intercultural relations are emphasized by AFME, including visits of Americans to the Middle East and visits, mostly of Arabs, to this country. Arab propagandists speaking good English are given priority and AFME arranges speaking dates for them across the country. For example, Mrs. Hussein, wife of the new Egyptian Ambassador, was sponsored on such a trip. AFME assisted in arranging lectures for Mrs. M. F. Jamali, wife of the Iraqoi Foreign Minister.

A lecture tour of Anwar Nashashibi, of Jordan, a lawyer with a good command of English and well known for his violent anti-Israel attitude, was financed by AFME, and allowed him to engage in such declarations as, "Communism in the Middle East is directed by Red underground movements in the Arab states and the legal Communist Party in Israel."

AFME has been spending money freely to get Americans over to the Middle East who can return and do effective propaganda. In 1953 the organization arranged a lecture tour in the Middle East for Rev. Edward Elson, pastor of the Presbyterian Church which President Eisenhower attends. He lectured at numerous colleges there and paid special attention to the Arab refugee problem. On his return he came out strongly for the anti-Israel line and has become chairman of the National Council. Among Elson's choice declarations: "Israel has no moral right to exist."

WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM?

Last year AFME operated on a budget of about half a million, $497,622. This is about twice the size of the budget of 3 years earlier. If volunteer aid and activities related to AFME, but financed separately, are added, AFME did well over a million in propaganda last year. In contrast to this is a lag in AFME's membership, and a lag in payment of even the nominal $2 a year dues. How then does AFME finance its operations?

The picture has been intentionally blurred by AFME's executives. They keep their financing as much of a mystery as possible. The picture given the public is of enthusiastic members and "devoted friends" who come forward with money. In its early days AFME announced "hundreds of responses and contributions ranging from $1 to $1,000." The initial funds came through Treasurer Cornelius van H. Engert from unnamed foundations and from "generous friends." To this unspecified initial capital was added in the first year "$75,000, of which $50,000 was from a friend of Miss Thompson's who desired to remain anonymous."

OIL CONTRIBUTIONS

Why this passion for anonymity? No individual donors were named. About half of the revenues seem to have come from the Dearborn Fund. This fund was set up by a group of Chicago businessmen of whom Clarence Randall of Inland Steel is the best known. The fund name, incidentally, comes from nearby Dearborn Street in Chicago and has no connection with Henry Ford nor the old Dearborn Independent.

Earlier, Hopkins chose to mention that there were no oil contributions, but added that oil contributions would be welcome. His wish was granted because some of the Dearborn funds are believed to come from oil and this past year the San Jacinto Fund of Texas, believed to be mainly oil, gave a contribution.

It was stated in the last report that "the Arab American Oil Co. has again made a grant." But AFME had mentioned no previous grants. It should be noted, however, that oil companies with interests in the Middle East and notably ARAMCO have shown a sympathetic interest in AFME's activities from the start. Terry Duce, vice president of ARAMCO, has been a close friend and an honored guest of AFME, and his assistant Harold B. Minor is on the AFME board, the top steering committee. This support from oil companies with their interests in Arab countries goes far to explain some of AFME's anti-Israel activities.

SERVING ARAB PROPAGANDA NEEDS

Today AFME is performing a useful propaganda service for the Arab States in this country, a service at which, over the last decade, the Arabs themselves failed miserably.

The Arab States, shortly after the close of World War II, set up an information center in Washington that failed and later an Arab-American group in New York City that also failed. For some 5 years, the Arab League played with the idea of opening an information center in New York before getting one underway last year.

What was wrong with the Arab's approach that led to their propaganda failure?

Arab spokesmen were ineffectual because they did not know how to present their views in a way that does not annoy or irritate their listeners. They employ too much emotional violence. In addition, their mutual distrust is a handicap. When two or more of them appear on the same platform, they vie with each other in patriotic zeal, more with an eye on the effect back home than on how effective they are in persuading their American audience.

Arabs found it difficult to recruit Americans for the defense of feudal and dictatorial systems. They had to turn to propagandists and political adventurers who either did not know the Middle East or who could stomach the rottenness of the Arab political and social systems.

The common attribute of most of the Arabs who came to America was their passionate hostility toward Israel and their aversion for Jews. They therefore found American anti-Semites their most willing recruits. But association with these professional anti-Semites was poison for reputable American citizens.

Many Arab propagandists assumed that the kinds of primitive pressures and bribery used at home would also work here. As a result, they antagonized many media people. Instead of analyzing and correcting their failures, they found an easy scapegoat by throwing it all on the Jews, blaming their shortcomings and blunders on Jewish hostility and on the worldwide Zionist conspiracy. Thus they started out with a distorted sense of values, blunting their own critical sense, and annulled much of the effectiveness of their propaganda.

AFME TO THE RESCUE

With the rise of AFME, an important advance was made in Arab propaganda work in America. The "cause" was the same—the bolstering of corrupt and antidemocratic forces in the Middle East. The facade was new.

The relative success of AFME was that it had a distinguished American sponsorship. It did not start off with the initial handicap of being an official Arab agency or even an avowed pro-Arab agency. AFME made its operation appear as the encouragement of friendship with an important area of the world. It painted an attractive picture of the "free peoples" of the Middle East invited to join the free peoples of the West in defense against communism. Such an appeal, at a time when the Western World particularly needed friends, was, for some Americans, convincing.

AFME's operation is based on the latest discoveries of Madison Avenue. It is smooth and well-oiled, in many senses of the term, and has a veneer of respectability. It utilizes skillfully and effectively American public-relations techniques.

But both in intent and in actual operation, the line it has been selling is not far removed from the official Arab propaganda line aiming ultimately at the destruction of the State of Israel.

A GARLAND OF TRICKS

The quality of Garland Hopkins' smooth and slippery performances may be gaged from his handling of AFME's Jewish collaborators. These are typical maneuvers:

He presents Elmer Berger as the leader of an important Jewish organization. Nowhere does he mention that the membership of the American Council for Judaism is insignificant in number and has been overwhelmingly repudiated by the American Jewish community.

Morris Lazaron is presented as a Jewish leader of importance rather than what he is: a well-heeled aspirant to leadership—with no following.

At the annual convention of AFME this year, a Zionist "spokesman" was found in the person of a young ultranationalist extremist. This member of a minority Zionist group proceeded to fall into the trap laid for him by declaring, among other things, that Israel must annex adjoining territories—whereupon the Arab League propagandists on the program had a clear field for charges of Israeli aggressive and expansionist policies.

A couple of years ago, for a meeting of American tourists, Hopkins had Israel represented too. The representative: an unkempt member of Neturei Karta, the minute ultra-orthodox sect of Jerusalem.

One Hundred Years of Work and Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, St. John's University at Collegeville, Minn., is observing its centennial as a Catholic educational institution for men dedicated to carrying on the ideals of the Order of St. Benedict.

Last Sunday marked the 100th year since the first Benedictine monks came to Minnesota to carry on the work their order has been engaged in for 14 centuries—preserving, enriching, and handing on the secular learning and religious thought of the Western World.

To Rt. Rev. Abbot Baldwin Dworschak and the monks of St. John's we offer our felicitations on 100 years of work and worship and our best wishes for the centennial observance.

Mr. Speaker, I include a brief article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune picture magazine of May 20, 1956, entitled "St. John's Is 100 Years Old.":

Exactly 100 years ago today, 3 Benedictine fathers and 2 brothers stepped off a Mississippi River boat at Sauk Rapids, Minn. At the request of the Most Rev. Joseph Cretin, first Catholic bishop of Minnesota, these five sons of St. Benedict had come to central Minnesota from Charlemagne abbey of Metten, Germany, via St. Vincent's abbey in Pennsylvania, to build the now world-famous Benedictine abbey of St. John's and found St. John's University.

St. John's is the oldest Catholic college in the State and Minnesota's oldest institution of higher learning in continuous existence. The seminary that began classes in November 1857 with 5 students has grown into modern St. John's with a 1956 enrollment of 1,350 men. From their first priory on the banks of the Mississippi, St. John's monks moved in 1866 to the present Collegeville site, 12 miles northwest of St. Cloud. In 1866, too, the priory was raised to the full status of an autonomous abbey.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an article from the St. Cloud Daily Times of May 21, 1956:

COLLEGEVILLE.—One hundred years ago Sunday evening the first Benedictine monks to arrive in Minnesota stepped off the Mississippi River boat *H. M. Rice* at Sauk Rapids and began to build what is now the world-famous Benedictine Abbey of St. John's, located 12 miles northwest of St. Cloud.

The 1 priest and 2 brothers who came up the river by steamer were soon joined by 2 fellow Benedictine priests and most Rev. Joseph Cretin, of St. Paul, who had made the trip by stagecoach.

It was Bishop Cretin, first bishop of Minnesota, who had invited Abbot Boniface Wimmer, of St. Vincent's Abbey in Pennsylvania, to send monks who could assist him in administering to the spiritual needs of the German Catholic immigrants settling in central Minnesota.

Two of the priests had been ordained only the day before, on Monday, by Bishop Cretin, and after a day and a half journey the party entered St. Cloud, a metropolis of five buildings, about 5 p. m. on Tuesday, May 20, 1856.

The attic of a two-story frame building belonging to Joseph Edelbrock was the scene of the first mass which was offered for the public on May 22.

The first monastic buildings were two "claim" cabins on the banks of the Mississippi below the present site of the St. Cloud Children's Home. The buildings and 320 acres of land had been donated by two Catholic pioneer settlers, the brothers Louis and Wilhelm Rothkoop.

In the following months, however; it was the foresight and shrewdness of Rev. Bruno Reiss that brought the pioneer monks to establish claims in the "Indianbush" country west of St. Joseph on the shores of Lakes Watab and Sagatagan.

Meanwhile, Prior Demetrius de Marogna, a former Italian nobleman who led the small community, and John L. Wilson, "the founder of St. Cloud" and representative in the Minnesota Territorial Legislature, were busy obtaining a charter for St. John's Seminary. The prior was anxious to begin a school in which he could educate pioneer youths for the priesthood.

The monks opened their doors to five students, Henry Emmel and Anthony Edelbrock, of St. Cloud; Joseph Duerr, of St. Joseph; Henry Klostermann, of Richmond; and Andrew Stahlberger, of Lake George, on November 10, 1857, and the first Catholic institution of higher learning in the State began holding classes. Since that date St. John's has been the only college in the State to never close its academic doors.

It was 3 years later in 1859 that the monks moved west to their "Indianbush" property after a claim-filing error had cost them their property on the river. And so it was that at Collegeville St. John's has grown steadily for the past 97 years.

Statement in Support of Housing Bill Introduced by Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in the provision of off-base housing for occupancy by or rental to military or permanent civilian personnel and their dependents. At the present time, there is no housing law under which financing can be made available for the construction of 1 to 4 family dwellings for such personnel in areas or communities outside of military bases. Therefore, I believe this will provide a most worthy and needed addition to present military family-housing laws and one which will certainly prove useful to the armed services in the State of Oklahoma and I feel sure in many other States.

My bill would authorize the Federal Housing Administration to provide insurance on mortgages for 1 to 4 family off-base housing, under the same terms as provided in the basic FHA title II sales-housing program. Because I believe housing constructed under these provisions will prove most useful to military and other personnel if they are held for rent by builders, I have provided that the FHA Commissioner shall have power to require properties covered by mortgages insured by these provisions to be held for rent for such periods of time as he may prescribe.

This bill should provide our armed services with another housing program which will supplement those now in the laws and which should prove extremely useful in providing off-base housing for those enlisted and officer personnel for whom the Armed Forces cannot now provide on-base housing. Because I am also advised that the provision of housing for atomic-energy installations is a similar and closely parallel problem, I have included language so that the Atomic Energy Commission may also take advantage of the financing provided by this bill.

Under the provisions of this bill, either the Secretary of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission, as the case may be, is in a position to control the number of units which will be available under this program. As a further safeguard, the FHA is given veto power over their requests unless, in an exceptional case, the Secretary of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission is willing to guarantee the FHA's Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund.

Afghanistan Celebrates Its 37th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to feliciate the people of Afghanistan, His Majesty Zahir Shah, King of Afghanistan, and His Excellency Mohammad Kabir Ludin, Ambassador of Afghanistan upon the occasion of the celebration of the 37th anniversary of independence of Afghanistan, May 27, 1956.

As soon as King Amanullah had establish himself upon the throne of Afghanistan, he gave voice to the long-suppressed desire of his people for independence of their land. This demand resulted in the Afghan War of Independence, 1919. The termination of the war brought freedom and independence for the people of this long-oppressed nation. Having achieved the goal of independence, the nation then turned its attention to the necessary reforms in internal affairs and the required orientation to prepare themselves to play their part in international affairs. In 1933 His Majesty Zahir Shah, the present King of Afghanistan, assumed the leadership of his people and continued to work for the attainment of the objectives of sound development.

The government has vigorously attacked the basic problems of the country and is looking hopefully toward the future. Programs of economic and social development have been undertaken which bespeak the interest of the people in the vital needs of the nation.

Afghanistan has adhered to the principle of full participation in the international life of nations. She supports the

cause of independence for all peoples, and is desirous of preserving world peace. To these ends Afghanistan has been anxious to take part in international activities. A faithful member of the League of Nations until its dissolution, Afghanistan today attaches great importance to the work of the United Nations. She is also a member of the United Nations Specialized Agencies: the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, and the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Afghanistan remained neutral in the First and Second World Wars and the justice of this policy was recognized by the nations of the world when in 1946 Afghanistan was unanimously admitted to the membership of the United Nations.

I salute Afghanistan as she embarks upon her 37th year of independence and pray for her continued success and progress.

Ike's Aid Program Slaughtered in Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the May 21 edition of the Detroit Free Press entitled "Ike's Aid Program Slaughtered in Committee":

IKE'S AID PROGRAM SLAUGHTERED IN COMMITTEE

The administration's foreign-aid program is being dealt a series of blows by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Senate, and the full House itself, are still to be heard from. But there is no minimizing the effect of these committee jolts.

Then can tend to brake the momentum of foreign spending which has zipped along since before World War II for a fantastic mileage of more than $100 billion.

This is an election year—a time when the hearing of Congressmen tends to become remarkably acute. What they hear from all quarters of the country is opposition to further long-range, grandiose giveaways bringing the United Sates no specified benefits in return.

Logically, therefore, the vote went against commitments for economic projects taking a long time to complete. This was the heart of the New Look in the United States giveaway program. Its backers asserted that in order to compete with the Russian economic programs, ours, too, had to be based on planning ahead.

For the first time in the 8-year history of the present aid program, the committee voted to put all economic assistance on a loan basis and severely to restrict general regional development assistance.

The administration has had to employ its pressure to restore key parts of the program.

The whip was cracked at first against those nations which ship goods to Russia or her satellites and allies if the goods in question are on United States lists of strategic materials. This would automatically cut almost all our allies off from further aid.

Now White House influence has caused the committee to drop this ban.

When Ike has been right he generally has had his way. Much of the country is behind him, even in making hard choices, like on the farm bill.

The President wields the great prestige he enjoys because, until now, he has exhibited a remarkable political intuition for a man who only 4 years ago was an unblushing amateur. Almost unfailingly he has seemed to embody the will of the majority—a talent which is a great asset to his country.

But we doubt that even the President's great popularity will see the foreign-aid bill through in the form that its backers want. And we doubt that the President's advisers are themselves well-advised in placing his reputation behind this plan.

The plain fact is that most people cannot see any value in further frittering away of tax billions.

By this time most of us would agree that if there are any Hottentots who need milk, and who haven't got it, we will try to get it for them. But the administration program comes too close to saying that every Hottentot who wants a hydroelectric dam in his backyard ought to get one from the American taxpayer—and before the decade is out.

The voice the House committee has been hearing from the countryside keeps saying "call it off." Ike should give ear to it also.

Jordan Celebrates 28th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend greetings to the people of Jordan, His Majesty Husayn al Hashimi, and His Excellency Abdul Monem Rifa'i, Ambassador of Jordan, upon the occasion of the celebration of the 28th anniversary of independence of Jordan, May 25, 1956.

On May 25, 1928, the people of Jordan threw off their shackles and proclaimed their freedom and independence. It was not until 1939, however, that the sovereignty of the country was recognized. Later, in 1946, Jordan started establishing their diplomatic relations with other countries and the nation was declared a monarchy under the kingship of his late majesty, King Abdullah, the founder of the state.

The Kingdom of Jordan is rightfully proud of its accomplishments during its period of national life. The nation has always stood in defense of the principles of democracy and freedom. It is well remembered that its gallant army fought side by side with the Western Allies in the last World War.

In the words of His Excellency Abdul Monem Rifa'i:

The Jordan Kingdom is the protector of the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem, where the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque of Omar stand side by side to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of the Nativity, a living symbol of brotherhood and fraternity.

Well aware of the tensions in the Middle East, the Kingdom of Jordan is contributing to the stability of the area by shouldering many of the burdens of the Arab refugees. By offering shelter to more than half the number of the Palestine Arab refugees Jordan is to a great extent alleviating their suffering.

I salute Jordan as she embarks upon a new year of national life and pray for her continued success and progress.

What Would Pat Henry Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the season is about upon us to hear the ringing declarations of why we must continue our foreign aid programs with American tax dollars. My own position on these international WPA projects has not been changed from the inception of this giveaway of American tax dollars. Instead of cutting these appropriations a billion or so, I have always advocated cutting them off entirely—not a dollar should be spent. I append to these comments some very, very timely remarks from a county editor, Mr. Ned Huycke, of Ellsworth, Kans.:

[From the Ellsworth (Kans.) Reporter]

WHAT WOULD PAT HENRY DO?

The cases or barrels of tea which Pat Henry and his Boston tea party boys dropped into the ocean in protest against England's taxing the Colonies without representation, was only an iota drop compared to the multitude of things which the American people of today should drop into the laps of the tax instigators—without representation. If taxes seemed high to Pat in his day, he would be petrified at the gigantic load which has been harnessed on the shoulders of the poor American today—and such an immense part of that load is only because of foolish squandering.

The greatest rathole into which our hard-earned dollars are poured goes under the name of "foreign aid." Our slaphappy tax-money spenders at Washington toss billion-dollar appropriations around like a circus juggler does a dozen articles, only his act is amusing, but our Washington spenders' act is critical to our American wage earner and small-business men. The learned men whom we have elected in good faith to save our country from ruin and disaster think nothing of throwing $4 million away as a gift to Israel some more billions on a project of building a dam in Egypt, which in all probability not even the "big-hearted donors" will ever see or reap any benefits from its construction; and their latest brainstorm calls for $4,900,000,000 as vital foreign aid (gift) to save us from the enemy. These "learned" men have spent such huge sums of our hard-earned wages for "foreign aid" that there aren't enough zeros to fill the average line of type to denote the amount spent; all in the name of "buying friendship of foreign nations."

Russia, the big bad wolf, which is the cause of this perpetual fear, hasn't spent a red coin to buy anybody's friendship—and

yet they are making inroads into every country on earth, and internally as a nation are pulling themselves up by their bootstraps to a well-grounded national economy. Her offers of assistance have rarely involved more than simple proposals of trade, at considerable disadvantage to the beneficiaries. Should we not wonder if the recent Soviet offers of assistance to our Western allies? cause dark forebodings both in and out of our State Department?

Can we as a Nation continue to be complacent to these perpetual gifts which have reached the point in the psychology thinking of the receivers that we either continue to give, or else—?

How many of you readers are aware of the fact that in the past 10 years the lawmakers whom we sent trustingly to the Nation's Capitol to wisely steer the ship of state have foolishly and intentionally squandered approximately $51 billion net. Of this, 64 percent went to Western Europe, 20 percent to East and Southeast Asia; 8 percent to the Near East and Africa; 2.1 percent to Eastern Europe, and a meager less than 2 percent to Canada, the U. N., and other international agencies all rolled into one?

While the American wage earner and small-business man is stooped under the huge taxload, West Germany is proposing a tax cut, under the plan a married man with two children and earning the equivalent of $1,400 a year, would pay only about $10 in tax instead of the $53.

On top of all this we learn that despite the fact that we are praying and pleading for peace, more than $12 billion worth of arms have been shipped to our allies. Will we collect cash or get paid in trade for these arms; or is this just another gift in the name of bringing peace into the world for which you and I will have to help pay in high income taxes on the wages we earn; and maybe in the end once again spend the most priceless treasure on earth, the lives of our young men on the very battlefields where these very arms will be used against them.

Yes, Patrick Henry, we wonder what you would have done about taxes with representation.

Falls Power Still Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the following editorial which recently appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y.:

FALLS POWER STILL STYMIED

The picture page of Wednesday's News, showing what rapid progress the Canadians are making in developing their share of Niagara Falls power provides an ironic background, and indeed an infuriating commentary, on the political deadlock in our Congress which, after 6 long years, still permits the American share to go completely to waste—except for the part that Canada is able to use.

Next week the Niagara power issue will finally come to a head in the Senate. But the bill being debated finds New York's two Senators sharply divided, and neither of them on the same side as the majority of the States' Representatives in the House. Meanwhile, the Eisenhower administration is still standing aloof, and the chance of this Congress actually settling the issue and getting some kind of development underway is practically nil.

Three years ago the House voted better than 2 to 1 for the private-enterprise bill sponsored by Representative MILLER, Republican, Lockport, but that bill died of strangulation in the Senate when the 83d Congress adjourned. Now, with the adjournment of the 84th Congress only weeks away, the Senate is debating Senator LEHMAN'S bill, which goes to the opposite, public-power extreme. Senator IVES, who has been moving unhappily between the two, is leading a fight to get the Lehman bill recommitted, but apparently hasn't decided what to support instead.

Enough Senators apparently are undecided so that the vote could tip either way. But even if the Lehman bill is passed, it hasn't a chance of getting passed by the House, and if the Lehman bill is killed, there probably won't be time to put anything in its place, so another Congress seems on the verge of passing out of existence with nothing finally decided about the Niagara power development.

One thing the Senate debate and vote may accomplish, besides giving the whole issue a thorough airing, is to give proponents of all the rival plans a better measure of where they stand in terms of votes. It may thus provide some clues as to what kind of compromise may have to be made if the deadlock is to be broken any time soon.

Certainly the time has come when almost any plan of development is better than no development at all. Meanwhile, there is one way that the project could be started now. Representative RADWAN, Republican, of Buffalo, is still waiting in the wings with his bill to authorize the Army engineers to start building the project at once, and then bow out of the picture whenever Congress can make up its mind who should run it. That interim plan at least has the merit of making constructive use of the time now being wasted in fruitless deadlock.

The Big Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the very able minority report of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee accompanying H. R. 11319 which passed the House on May 22, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 19, 1956, is very appropriate:

THE BIG BOONDOGGLE

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which President Eisenhower once described as creeping socialism, has stopped creeping and started running. It had an assist from the United States House of Repesentatives and, indirectly, from Republican leaders who sacrificed principle to politics out of fear of giving the opposition an issue.

The House voted permission to TVA to use revenues from the sale of electric power to build and expand steam generating facilities almost at will, without further consultation with Congress. The vote was a clear abdication of congressional duty and a tacit invitation to runaway bureaucratic socialism.

The administration had opposed use of TVA income to build steam plants, and on very sound economic and political grounds, but backed off from a last-minute fight in the House to avoid an election-year debate over TVA. We believe it was a misguided withdrawal, even from the standpoint of political expediency. There is no good reason to believe that a majority of American voters would favor further entrenching socialism in the national life.

Entrenchment it is, for this is now the situation: American taxpayers from Maine to California are forced to contribute toward maintaining TVA existence on an artificial economic level while the Government ownership advocates who run TVA are encouraged to divert revenue into creating an even more gigantic system. It should not be overlooked that it is not "profits" out of which new plants will be built, but revenue—total income.

If the same proposal were put forward in any private corporation, the protests of the stockholders would kill it overnight, even in the unlikely event that it got through the board of directors. Yet here the board of directors—Congress—has in effect said to the operating personnel, "Do whatever you please." And the stockholders—the taxpayers—are not given so much as a chance to hear the matter debated.

TVA has never presented a fair comparison with private utilities. Its financial statements cannot be believed, because capitalization, amortization, and similar accounting items have no real relation to business as it must be done in private enterprise. Its rate structure is highly artificial, set up as it is against a background of taxpayer support.

Indirectly, but nevertheless truly, TVA taxes the many across the country for the support of the few in its operating area. To give such an organization the right to divert its revenue to further expansion without any public control whatsoever is to force self-perpetuating socialism down the throats of millions without giving them the right of protest. If this bill passes both Houses of Congress the President should veto it.

National Library of Medicine in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, all 13 Congressmen from the Chicago and Cook County area have introduced or signified their intention of introducing a bill similar to H. R. 11273, which I introduced last week to create a National Library of Medicine in Chicago.

Under date of May 22, I received a letter from the president of the Medical Center Commission in Chicago, which commission was created by an act of the Illinois State Legislature to foster development as a medical center of the district bounded by Ashland Boulevard, Congress Street, Oakley Boulevard, and Roosevelt Road. Dr. Walter H. Theobald, president of the Medical Center Commission, advised me that the commission will donate the land for the location of the proposed National Library of Medicine.

The members of the Medical Center Commission are as follows: Hon. William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois; Hon. Daniel Ryan, president, Board of Cook County Commissioners; Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago; Hon. James H.

Gately, president, Chicago Park District; Hon. Latham Castle, attorney general, State of Illinois.

The commissioners of the Medical Center Commission are Walter H. Theobald, M. D., president; Karl A. Meyer, M. D., vice president; Thomas J. Downs, treasurer; C. Hilding Anderson, secretary; Otto L. Bettag, M. D.; Charles J. Burg; Park Livingston; George W. McLester, executive director.

The body of Dr. Walter H. Theobald's May 22, 1956, letter, on behalf of the Medical Center Commission, reads as follows:

This is to let you know that we of the Medical Center Commission deeply appreciate your introducing the bill to establish the National Library of Medicine in Chicago.

Since Chicago is the acknowledged distribution and communications center, as well as the medical center of the United States, the library, when located here, will be more useful to doctors, medical teachers, and research personnel throughout the country than it could be at any other site.

You, of course, are familiar with the unique composition of the Medical Center District on Chicago's West Side. The famous hospitals, professional schools, and related institutions concentrated here make this the world's foremost medical center. The important functions of medical research, medical teaching, and medical care, as featured here, emphasize the suitability of the Medical Center District as the location for the library—where it will be available to the thousands of doctors, teachers, and students who come to this mecca of the healing arts. Establishing the library in the Medical Center District will make it easily accessible also to the personnel of the many other professional institutions and medical organizations at various locations in Chicago.

In view of the immeasurable good that will come from having the library as an important facility of this center, we are pleased to tell you that the Medical Center Commission will donate the land for this purpose.

The offer of the Medical Center Commission is most commendable. With all of the advantages offered by a Chicago location and with no cost to the Federal Government for the land involved, the location of the National Library of Medicine in Chicago is a must.

For Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address entitled "For Cultural Exchange," by Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, professor of the Department of Music at the University of Michigan and the president of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich., at Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis, Mo., April 16, 1956, on the occasion of the Golden Anniversary Concert by the National High School Orchestra, Band and Chorus for the Music Educators' National Conference. The idea expressed by Dr. Maddy in this address presents a refreshing viewpoint in the field of foreign relations. A viewpoint which I believe will be entirely worthy of serious consideration by our State Department. The opportunities here to spread good will are unlimited and I agree with Dr. Maddy that while we are spending our billions for defense, it might be well to consider a few thousand for a project such as he suggests.

The address follows:

The orchestra to which you are listening is the greatest orchestra in the world. Every violinist in this orchestra is a concertmaster of a fine high-school orchestra, while every wind instrument player is a State champion. Player for player, these young musicians (chosen from 46 States) are practically the equal of the players in the greatest symphony orchestras, but these boys and girls play with an enthusiasm and fervor which is lacking among professional players who play for money.

Their conductor, Thor Johnson, is a native-born American, brought up in our American public school tradition. He received his first important musical inspiration when playing third-chair viola in the All Southern High School Orchestra, which I conducted, at Asheville, N. C., in 1929.

Trained in our own schools and colleges, Thor Johnson has reached the top of his profession as conductor of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. He is one conductor of a major symphony orchestra who knows American music and traditions well enough to present adequate performances of American compositions.

When our major symphony orchestras appear in Europe, with European conductors and mostly European-born players, people have good reason to believe that the only thing American about these orchestras is the American dollars that pay for the services of European conductors and performers.

Last year our United States Information Service sent one of our major symphony orchestras on a tour of Europe for the express purpose of showing that we have not only cowpunchers, gangsters, comics, bathing beauties, and athletes, but also art and artists. But this orchestra played not one American composition. Instead, it played major works by the Russian composers (Shostakovitch, Prokofiev, and Kabalewsky) whose compositions were avowedly written to further the cause of communism. Even though we may believe that music cannot have political influence, the mere act of programing music written admittedly for the promotion of communism is a gesture of approval of the ideology which we in America dread most.

There is a fund called the President's fund amounting to $5 million a year, which is earmarked expressly for the purpose of financing international exchange programs in music, drama, and related arts. This fund is administered by the United States Information Service and the State Department. It is our tax money that is now being spent to promote communistic music in Europe. We can do something about it if we will.

Why not send this great National High School Orchestra, with Thor Johnson as conductor, to Europe—yes, around the world—to demonstrate American culture, instead of sending our major symphony orchestras which are made up largely of foreign musicians with foreign conductors who are not capable of giving American music authentic performances? This would prove to be the most effective goodwill mission we Americans could possibly sponsor.

Why not send the three groups which are performing for you tonight—orchestra, band, and chorus—on a goodwill tour around the world—on a battleship with guns spiked? The young musicians could live on the ship and present concerts in port cities throughout the world. Between concerts they could carry on their academic studies and hold daily rehearsals in preparation for their musical programs.

Every concert they gave would be made up of American works, except for one selection which would be a representative work by a composer of the nation being visited. American works would include compositions by Edward McDowell, John Philip Sousa, Victor Herbert, Henry Hadley, George Gershwin, Howard Hanson, Deems Taylor, Roy Harris, Don Gillis, and others who grew up in our own country and who are able to interpret American ideals and traditions in their music.

At each port of call the band could march down the principal streets playing Sousa marches, with two flags (the Stars and Stripes and the flag of the host nation) and majorettes instead of guns ahead of the band. While the band is making friends downtown small ensemble groups could visit schools presenting programs of American music. Whenever possible, arrangements could be made for our young musicians to visit homes of young musicians in all countries visited. Such visits would greatly accelerate our high-school-age student exchange program.

Inasmuch as every member of these national high school groups has ancestral roots in some foreign country, it will be possible to locate distant relatives of our student musicians in every country visited. This reuniting of families, after perhaps hundreds of years, would do more to convince our neighbors that we are all of one world, than any other act or deed.

When you have given this proposal careful thought, you will realize that such a world tour, on a battleship, by these highly gifted young American musicians, can do more for world friendship and international peace than all of the conferences, peace treaties, and diplomatic efforts of centuries. If you believe this, you will help to bring about the proposed trip by the National High School Orchestra, Band, and Chorus.

Pressure Is on for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of May 1 on the subject of foreign aid:

PRESSURE IS ON FOR FOREIGN AID

New billions in foreign aid have been directly asked of Congress as a part of the administration program intimately tied up with its entire foreign-relations planning. Secretary of State Dulles, with the personal backing of President Eisenhower himself, has stressed what he regards as the necessity of almost 5 billions in new funds to be spent abroad.

A program of such magnitude is bound to meet with disagreement. Throughout the Midwest, particularly, there are unanswered questions as to just why the program should be maintained on the scale proposed. The answers which have been given—always related in some manner or other to the cold war with communism—have given no satisfactory explanation as to why we have provided funds for some vast projects in spots where anti-Red influence certainly is of minor consequence.

If there is any constitutional justification for taxing Americans for the benefits of other nations, it ought to be limited certainly to (1) charity aid to relieve suffering on the basis of need; and (2) projects with some reasonably logical connection to American security or defense.

Such a classification leaves out much of the economic aid that is now being extended, and it also tends to eliminate fuzzy thinking about such things as giving away commodities which we cannot use at home. We ought to recognize that we cannot buy foreign friends; that gifts for the purpose of making over other nations into prototypes of America are likely to fail, even conceding that the end sought is a desirable one; and that our chances of winning leadership for our cause are not furthered by charity which violates the pride of other countries or financial meddling which tends to upset their internal and independent economy.

Our record so far provides little optimism toward the new plans of Secretary Dulles to convert NATO from a military to a European political instrument. There is a call for a lot more explanation than has been offered so far as to why the United States should become more deeply involved in the European political situation, especially when such an adventure is to be financed on American tax dollars.

Naturally enough, the State Department becomes engrossed in matters beyond the seas. Perhaps it can be excused if it fails to keep a finger on the pulse at home also. There are spending limits beyond which we cannot go, a fact which often seems obscure to the diplomats. There are also pressing needs for Federal funds at home, many of which cannot be met. We are deeply in debt—much more deeply than many of the nations we are aiding. We are hoping for, but not getting, tax reduction because there is a general realization that a start on debt cutting is necessary.

Finally, there are the facts and the plans which raise suspicions about the whole purpose and future of foreign aid. Why, we have asked again and again, is it necessary to demand new billions when there are billions already appropriated which are unspent? The fact is, foreign aid money is voted faster than it can be given away.

We are equally suspicious about the plans for a sort of perpetual giveaway. Foreign aid used to be on a year-to-year basis, or for a 5-year period. More recently we have been hearing about the need for "assuring" foreign nations continuing American tax dollars for long periods of time. Some spokesmen have mentioned periods up to 50 years or even 100.

If we must have diplomats completely preoccupied with all of the needs of all of the nations of the globe, we are entitled at least to another arm of the administration equally devoted to looking after the needs and interests of Americans here at home. Of the two, the home folks ought to have a little edge on the foreign-aiders, since they are the ones who must foot all the bills, here and abroad.

Our Stake Is Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the following timely editorial in the Costa Mesa (Calif.) Globe-Herald of May 13, 1956, is typical of the thinking of millions of Americans today on a vital matter yet to be resolved by this Congress. As I understand it, more than 30 bills are now pending in the House providing for the extension of the GI home-loan program for World War II veterans. The time for action on these bills is getting very short.

The editorial follows:

OUR STAKE IS LARGE

The time is about a year from now—spring of 1957. A Mesa veteran and his wife, after months and maybe years of planning, have selected the house they want to become their home.

They've chosen a home in one of Costa Mesa's medium-priced subdivisions. After careful comparison with other available houses, they've found just the one they want; it's perfect.

The salesman describes fine points of their choice enthusiastically—until they tell him they want to use the husband's veteran status to buy the home on a Veterans' Administration GI loan.

"Sorry," the salesman says disappointingly, "No more GI loans available."

The VA-backed loan program for World War II veterans will, unless Congress extends the deadline, expire July 25, 1957. Even before the deadline, homebuilders will be shutting off home sales backed by the VA program. And the disappointment of the young veteran and his wife will be mirrored in the families of thousands of other veterans who until then just hadn't piled up enough money to buy a home.

For the lusty, booming city of Costa Mesa, the impact may be serious.

Costa Mesa will build more than 1,000 homes during 1956. It's probable that 70 to 80 percent of them will be purchased with VA-guaranteed loans. That upward trend in homebuilding—nearly half again as big as 1955—could be tottering seriously if the stabilizing factor of the GI loan is removed.

Builders say—and back it up with statistics—that the GI-loan program kicked off the tremendous post-World War II building boom. Today, GI loans still are an integral part of the economy in many key spots in the United States. Southern California, Orange County and, more specifically, Costa Mesa are keyed to building. When it lags, our community development seems destined to lag too.

How many veterans are affected?

By December 1955 only 29 percent of World War II veterans had been issued loan guarantees by the Veterans Administration. Only 7 percent of Korean veterans had been able to receive GI loans.

Yet 30 percent of the new housing units in the United States were backed by GI loans. And this 30 percent, say building authorities, is the key portion—the trigger which exploded the building boom and the power factor which kept it going.

It's difficult to call a GI loan a gift—or even a subsidy. Basically, a GI loan is simply a Government underwriting of a home loan. Losses to the Government are all but unheard of and the program has been praised by even the most ardent of the keep-Government-out-of-everything critics.

Why, then, is it ending?

When the GI loan provision was written into the huge GI bill during the closing part of World War II it was felt that 10 years was sufficient time to offer help for the men whose lives were interrupted by duty in the Armed Forces.

And, in most cases, it was. Ten years is enough time to decide for or against a college education. A few years was plenty for the famed 52–20 club unemployment benefits. But buying a home is different; it's a lifetime decision that can't be put into action in a short time.

Gen. Omer Bradley's Commission on Veterans' Benefits has recommended extension of the GI home loan deadline so rights will gradually expire over the following 2 years after July 25, 1957. At least two bills asking the same stretch have been introduced into Congress; both are undergoing the mysteries of committeeing—locked inside a House committee without hint of their future.

What the committee does, and what Congress does, should be watched with interest by Costa Mesa.

Not many communities have a higher stake in the GI home loan program.

Sukarno Speaks for Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, all the Members of Congress were very much impressed with the speech before the joint session by President Sukarno of Indonesia.

H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune in the issue of Tuesday, May 22, wrote the following editorial which contains a few practical and factual suggestions on our Far East foreign problems:

President Sukarno's frank speech before a joint session of Congress could not have been made at a better time. It came while Congress is in the midst of a debate over foreign aid, and Sukarno's strongest points concerned our aid policy.

Sukarno's homeland of Indonesia is one of the new Asiatic nations developed since World War II. We had much to do with its freedom, in urging the Netherlands to adopt a liberation policy. But Indonesia has been among the neutralist countries; it has shied away from accepting United States military aid.

Indonesia wants technical assistance, rather than arms aid, Sukarno told Congress. He makes out a good case for the Indonesian policy. Military aid is no substitute for Asian stability, he told Congress. And these words deserve attention:

"The main aim should be for the people of Asia, like the western nations, to become economically stable, but also politically stable, and thus be able to defend their freedom against all assaults."

We must be concerned with people, not just governments. "To a famished man, democracy can never be more than a slogan," Sukarno said to Congress. Unless headway is made against famine and disease, there can be no stability in the government and military aid will be of no value. If there is economic and political stability, there will be little need for military aid.

It is sometimes difficult for us to understand the great desire on the part of Indonesians and other newly freed Asian peoples to maintain their independence in every way. Sukarno gave expression to it.

Economic assistance will be of mutual benefit, he said; it will mean "a greater measure of goodwill" and "a greater volume of production." Then he cautioned:

"But from whatever quarter * * * that assistance comes, we are determined that no material advantage will buy from us any part of our hard-won freedom, for that freedom is more dear to us than the products which any country can give or sell.

"We welcome assistance on terms of mutual benefit. We reject the idea of exchanging intellectual and spiritual independence or physical liberty for momentary advantage."

There are other nations that feel the same as the Indonesians, and as strongly so. They will welcome aid and technical guidance on a basis of mutual benefit. They are intensely jealous of their new-won freedom; they resent any suggestions that they barter some of it away.

If we gear our foreign aid program to meet this situation, we can make real friends among the Asians—and friends are much more to be desired than purchased allies. Russia has discovered the fact of this, and is sending its technicians wherever they can get in the door.

We should have no thought of a give-away race with Russia. But we can establish our aid program on a basis which will convince Sukarno and leaders of the other "have-not" nations that we have a sincere desire to help them as full members in the family of nations and not as puppets.

The Panama Canal: Opposing Designs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a revealing news story growing out of meetings of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., and the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in the Nation's Capital on May 12, 1956, was published on Page A7 in the Washington, D. C., Sunday Star, on May 13.

Of special interest are the statements of Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, who for more than 3 years, 1910–1913, was a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving as Governor of the Canal Zone, and later a Member of Congress for many years, with service throughout on the Committee on Appropriations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the material referred to:

PANAMA CANAL DEBATED ANEW—LEVEL OR LOCKS?

A 50-year-old controversy over whether the Panama Canal should be sea level or its present lock type flared into the open here yesterday.

The closing session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress convention unanimously urged conversion of the 50-mile-long canal to link the Atlantic and Pacific at ocean level.

The estimated cost of the undertaking, according to the congress, would be $4.8 billion. The canal is now 85 feet at its highest elevation at Gaillard (Culebra) Cut.

At almost the same hour, in another downtown hotel, the Panama Canal Society of Washington was paying tribute to the engineer who 50 years ago finally beat down sea-level proponents and won congressional and executive approval of a lock-type canal.

THATCHER COMMENTS

The society membership nationally consists of about 2,000 surviving engineers, designers and "ditch-diggers" who actually worked on the great project 4 decades ago.

A leader of the local chapter, informed of the Rivers and Harbors convention recommendation, reacted strongly.

Maurice H. Thatcher, former Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, sole living member of the original Isthmian Canal Commission and honorary life president of the local society, said:

"The expense of the proposed conversion would be astronomical—between $5 and $10 billion—with every sort of imponderable to threaten even higher cost.

COULD BE MODIFIED

"Proper modification of the present canal would cost only a fraction of the sea level estimate.

"We should hold fast to that which has been proven good."

In its resolution, the Congress convention contended that a sea level canal is vital to national defense. Damage wrought by a nuclear attack could be more easily cleared away, they contended. This could be of vital importance, it was held, since the big ditch carries about 40 percent of the Nation's coast-to-coast movement.

Representative BROOKS, Democrat of Louisiana, president of the rivers and harbors organization, said he will soon have the report published as a document of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Thatcher, a former Representative from Kentucky, depreciated the proposed alteration as a security measure.

SEES LANDSLIDE DANGER

"If a direct atomic bomb hit should be made, the canal—no matter what type it is—would be wrecked," he asserted.

One of the greatest hazards, moreover, would be the increased danger of landslides, he added.

While the convention report accused the executive and legislative branches of "continued inaction" in the recommended "vital security measure," another official of the Panama Canal Society saw it in another light.

"It would be," he said, "an unmitigated raid on the Treasury of the United States."

At the indicated meeting of the Panama Canal Society, the principal feature was the formal honor paid to John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, who was chiefly responsible for the adoption, by President Theodore Roosevelt and the Congress, of the lake-lock plan, under which the Canal was constructed and has since been operated with such splendid success. The guest speaker was Congressman Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania who delivered a brilliant and highly informative address narrating the essential facts of the fateful, historic discussion of 50 years ago in which Stevens played such an outstanding role, which was published in the May 17 and 18, 1956, issues of the Star and Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama. The Speaker paid high tribute to the great engineer and gave certain very interesting and hitherto unnoted incidents concerning the latter's Isthmian service.

In the well-known English-Spanish newspaper, the Americas Daily—Diario las Américas of May 1, 1956, there appeared the following article relative to the described occasion:

THE LOCK AND LAKE SYSTEM OF CANAL IN PANAMA HAS BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS

WASHINGTON, May 14—The Panama Canal Society of Washington held its annual dinner here as a memorial to honor John F. Stevens, chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1905 to 1907.

Occasion for the memorial was the 50th anniversary approval by Congress and President Theodore Roosevelt of a locks canal at Panama rather than a sea-level waterway.

After years of debate, Congress adopted the high-level lake and lock plan recommended by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers and Stevens.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in an address to the society said that this was the great decision in the United States construction of the canal.

"The wisdom of the original determination has long been recognized as completely established," FLOOD said.

"Whatever may have been urged at the time of the decision as to the merits of the so-called sea-level design, it is a matter of history that the existing canal was constructed substantially according to the plan strongly recommended by Chief Engineer Stevens.

"Moreover, it has proved an eminent success, with the transit since 1914 of more than 249,980 vessels of various classes of all nations commercial and military, with toll rates measurably reflecting the costs of construction, maintenance, and operation."

FLOOD said that in historical perspective, facts demonstrate that Stevens was the basic architect of the Panama Canal, and that he has gained stature with the years.

"A man of eminent vision whose great gifts were harnessed to practicality, Stevens made no major mistakes, either of engineering or policy," he said

"His great constructive contributions for the Panama Canal have now emerged into historical perspective."

The Stevens family was represented at the memorial dinner by Earl Harding, a former editor of the New York World.

Toastmaster was Maurice H. Thatcher, former Governor of the Canal Zone, and last living member of the United States Isthmian Canal Commission.

In this connection, I also desire to invite attention to an extension of my remarks appearing in the RECORD of June 1, 1955, giving an account of the annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of New York on May 7, 1955. This includes the address by Governor Thatcher on "Isthmian Memories and Problems," in which, with temperate and convincing reasons, he set forth major objections to a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, and arguments in favor of increasing the capacity of the existing canal by means of the proposed terminal lake plan.

A brief résumé of the address was published in the English section of the May 8, 1955, edition of the newspaper, the Americas Daily-El Diario Las Americas, which I quote:

PANAMA CANAL EXPERT RECOMMENDS IMPROVEMENT OF PRESENT LOCKS—HE URGES A GENERAL REVIEW OF ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, ENGINEERING AND INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE CANAL

NEW YORK.—Maurice H. Thatcher, last surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in an address yesterday urged improvement of the present Panama locks canal rather than a sea level Atlantic-to-Pacific waterway.

Thatcher was former governor of the Canal Zone and also served five terms from Kentucky in the House of Representatives. He is a recognized authority on the interoceanic communications problem.

He spoke before the Panama Canal Society of New York, at a meeting presided by Maj. Goy W. Hebard.

Thatcher urged the necessity of a general review of economic, political, engineering and international problems related to the canal situation. This would be undertaken by a proposed interoceanic canals commission.

Bills authoribing the interoceanic canals commission have been introduced in the Senate by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republi-

can of Iowa, and in the House by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat of Texas.

Thatcher said that sooner or later, increased facilities must be provided for transisthmian shipping.

"Congressional debates since 1947 have brought the principal issues into focus, and the canal proposals are now better understood," he said. "These include three principal ideas as follows:

"1. Increase of canal capacity and operational facility by means of the maximum utilization of the existing waterway according to the well-known terminal lake-third locks plan.

"2. Abandonment of the present canal and construction of a new canal at sea level with tidal locks near the Pacific end of the canal.

"3. Construction of a canal at another location, such as Nicaragua.

"The implications of these proposals are tremendous and affect the future welfare of the United States. The problems are not merely engineering and marine in character. In addition they include grave questions of international relations, interoceanic commerce, and economics."

Thatcher said that a sea-level canal at Panama would cost between 5 and 10 billion dollars, and would require higher tolls for transit.

"Any material increase in tolls would inevitably harm our own merchant marine more than that of any other nation, because of higher wage and benefit conditions obtaining in our own shipping systems than in those of other nations," Thatcher said. "The net outcome of such a situation, in my judgment, would be well calculated to drive our ships from the seas."

Based on his experience in Congress, Thatcher said, "I cannot believe that congressional sanction may ever be given to the abandonment of the present Panama Canal and the construction of an entirely new waterway of unknown design and at astronomical cost, unless convinced in the most satisfactory way, that such action is absolute and indispensable solution required.

"Indeed, I believe that, rather than authorize such a source the Congress is more likely to turn to Nicaragua or to some other region if a new canal—to meet the growing need of shipping—is required, meanwhile retaining the Panama Canal in its present general form."

Thatcher said that a sea-level waterway at Panama would be menaced by landslides.

"I cannot believe that Wallace, Stevens, Goethals, Siebert, and Gaillard, and all the host of distinguished engineers who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal—were they alive today—would favor the abandonment of the present design for one that required a deepened excavation of 100 or more feet in Gaillard Cut, with all the slides that would inevitably result," he said.

True Brotherhood: Harmony, But Not Single Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people who reside in the San Fernando Valley in California are extremely fortunate in being privileged to read the fine, reasoned articles written by Mr. George H. Todt, which appear in the Valley News. It is my purpose to accord that opportunity to the House with respect to one of the recent features carried in his column.

Mr. Todt's article concerns the problems of integration. Mr. Todt, without rancor and with great sensitiveness, has written this thought-provoking article that should be read by all Members of both Houses of Congress. The article is entitled "True Brotherhood, Harmony But Not Single Race." It is a learned and understanding approach to this issue. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this article in its entirety in the RECORD:

TRUE BROTHERHOOD: HARMONY, BUT NOT SINGLE RACE

(By George H. Todt)

"When man to man shall be a friend and brother." (Gerald Massey.)

What is it that constitutes "brotherhood" among the races of mankind and how is it measured?

The National Council of Christians and Jews is one organization which proclaims an annual Brotherhood Week. The idea behind it is that, since we are all spiritual children of God, we should consider ourselves a brotherhood within the human race. And it naturally follows that we must subjugate our differences with each other in order to gain increased stature through the application of tolerance and respect to one another in our daily lives.

Such an idea is commendable. However, in attempting to carry it out, some people go overboard in the wrong direction. They think in physical instead of spiritual terms, and their aims become confused. These persons seem to think of world brotherhood in the sense of ultimately mixing—or scrambling—the present races of man into a world omelet, or perhaps a stew.

"Mix the whites, blacks, yellows and reds to the point where they all become an eventual dark green," they tell us. "Then there will be no more racial antagonisms, and we shall have true brotherhood."

I cannot agree with such fallacious reasoning. I believe we can better obtain a righteous measure of brotherhood by retaining our individuality—as people, as nations, and as races within the human family. For true brotherhood is measured more by good will and unselfish service to our fellow man than any outward physical resemblances to each other.

In truth, there may be said to be more real brotherhood between strangers who are men of good will than between two sons born of the same woman where friendship does not exist between them. And that is the test.

To those who advocate forcible mixture of the various races, my reply to them is that it was Almighty God who created our physical differences on this planet—and who is he with the spiritual authority to order the handiwork of God to be undone?

For if He had not loved his children in all the colors of their skins, He would not have created them so.

From the historical standpoint, all the races of man have had their proud moments in the past. First one has been in the ascendancy, then another. It is useless to speculate on superiority and inferiority of the different strains of mankind. Actually we are in a constant state of flux as we move upward in the cosmic scheme. Who can foretell tomorrow?

The point is that we are all human beings entitled to be judged on our individual merits rather than as mere components of any racial package. To obtain a realistic measure of brotherhood in the world of the future, perhaps the qualities of good will and respect for each other should be based upon correct behavior patterns.

But God never intended for us to become a racial mixture which was neither fish nor fowl.

Beyond the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. Otto Gibson, a fireman with the Missouri Pacific Railroad, who is a fellow citizen of my hometown, Falls City, Nebr.

A courageous and heroic act by Mr. Gibson recently saved the life of a small child. Appropriately Mr. Gibson received the Presidential Medal of Honor—the highest civilian award for courageous action.

An article from the May issue, 1956, Benefit Association of Railway Employees—BARE magazine—entitled "Beyond the Call of Duty" relates the full story and the high honor accorded to Mr. Gibson:

BARE HERO WINS MEDAL OF HONOR—BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

Running through the waning light of early evening near South Omaha, Nebr., one June day in 1954, BARE member Otto L. Gibson, Missouri Pacific fireman, and his engineer got the shock of their lives. Moving swiftly toward them out of the dusk on the track ahead they saw the form of a small child.

In the split second it took to slam on the emergency air brakes, Brother Gibson realized that the train could not stop in time. Even as this thought flashed in his mind, he was moving out of the diesel's operating cab toward the front footboard. As the engine slowed, he leaped to the ground and raced ahead of it, scooping the youngster up in his arms and rolling down the embankment to safety.

In recognition of his act of bravery Gibson became the first MOP employee to receive the Presidential Medal of Honor for outstanding heroism above and beyond the call of duty—the Nation's highest civilian award for courageous action.

The presentation of the bronze medal was made on behalf of President Eisenhower by Anthony Arpaia, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Nation's Capital recently. The ceremony took place in the hearing room of the ICC. It marked the 69th awarding of the medal for outstanding heroism, and it was the first time an employee of the Missouri Pacific has been so honored.

At the time the incident occurred, Gibson dismissed it as "just one of those things which happen all the time." However, the grandfather of the rescued youngster told the story to the Omaha police and to the newspapers there. The heroic railroader's action was recognized and steps were taken to honor him for saving the youngster's life.

Accompanying Gibson to Washington for the presentation ceremony were Mrs. Gibson and 6 of the couple's 10 children. They were guests of the MOP while on the trip. The children making the trip were Douglas, 20, attending college; LaMarr, 17, Robert, 16,

Constance, 15, and Karen, 13, all attending high school at Falls City, Nebr.; and Yvonne, 19, who is in the Air Force stationed at Hamilton Air Force Base near San Francisco. She was on leave for the ceremonies.

After the ceremonies in Washington, the Gibson family was shown around the Capitol, the Senate and the House, by Nebraska Congressman PHIL WEAVER, and next day enjoyed a sightseeing tour of the Nation's Capital before going home. Missouri Pacific Vice President R. P. Hart, and Gibson's division superintendent, T. E. Fox, accompanied the family to Washington where others of the line's officials in Washington and St. Louis public relations representatives joined them to participate in the impressive ceremonies.

Mr. Gibson, who fires on the Omaha-Northern Kansas division of the Missouri Pacific, has carried BARE insurance for nearly 8 years, having obtained hospital-surgical protection for himself and his family in 1948.

Some Good in Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared recently in the Wall Street Journal. Some would have us believe that nationalism is wrong in principle, that it is a narrow selfish attitude. This editorial suggests otherwise:

NATIONALISM

In the common search for the ideal world, the term nationalism has come to be looked on almost as a synonym for selfishness and narrow insularity. But President Sukarno, of Indonesia, equated it with some different things in his speech before the Congress. What he had to say was a reminder of some truths we have perhaps forgot and a warning to us that others haven't.

Asians and Africans haven't, because to them nationalism means a new pride in country, ambition for self-rule, and determination to plan and carry out their own future. There is very little else but nationalism to make a people such as the Indonesians, so recently colonial, stand together. It was Benjamin Franklin who warned, in grim if jocular fashion, that our own early founders would hang separately if they didn't hang together.

Nationalism to Mr. Sukarno is a sound and progressive creed, the mainspring of their efforts. "Understand that, and you have the key to much of postwar history. Fail to understand it, and no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment."

What is true of the Indonesians is also true of all the others recently risen from colonial status. They cannot be brought; friendship never could be bought and never will be bought. What they seek is understanding and help to work out their own destinies. They will accept gladly, Mr. Sukarno said, "any assistance that may come to us, from whatever quarter it may come * * *." He thinks ill of our contributions to Asian nations to build their military establishments. He would accept help equally from Russia or the United Sattes, and he does not want any strings of military or ideological alliance attached.

There are many thoughtful people who will think Mr. Sukarno wrong. They will argue that the interests not just of the free world but of the Indonesians are best safeguarded only through an alliance.

Whether he is wrong is beside the point, however. The point is that under his leadership, and unless he changes, Indonesia will be a neutral country. The problem he has placed forthrightly before the Congress is, what should the United States do about neutral countries? Another is whether it is necessary or to our interests to try to change them.

Perhaps we should realize that a neutral country, after all, is not an enemy. Perhaps this means a reassessment of foreign policy and a change from the military emphasis of our foreign aid. It is worse than useless to spend a Niagara of dollars when the return is only disillusionment.

Above all, perhaps we have forgot what must be the views of people so recently a colonial people. A new nation, struggling for its place in the councils and market places of the world, a proud and intelligent people as are the Indonesians, will do nothing to jeopardize that new-won freedom. This includes refusal to choose between two great powers of differing ideologies, a reaction not so strange, or new. Mr. Washington warned this young nation against the dangers of choosing sides.

We should be thankful to Mr. Sukarno for his instruction that nationalism is not always the vice it's said to be. It has great virtues, too, which must be understood and respected by us; the danger is in not doing so.

For if we insist on a neutral nation choosing sides through either our power or our purse, we are likely not to gain a friend but to lose a neutral and make an enemy. And that, indeed, would be bitter for both.

Ezra's Changing Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "Ezra's Changing Image" from the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch dated April 27:

EZRA'S CHANGING IMAGE

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has now completed the job of putting into force a new schedule of election-year farm-price supports, and it seems clear that the popular image of the Secretary will have to be revised.

Ever since coming into office, Secretary Benson has been known as a perfect lion of a man, brave, flinty, indomitable foe of expediency, embodiment of unyielding principle—in short, just great. When he called the Brannan plan "morally corrupt," his own purity of character shone forth like the new weather beacon on top of the General American Life Insurance Building. Here was a man who, as he himself did not mind suggesting, would always do right, the whole right, and nothing but the right.

Now it does not quite track. Brave and flinty Ezra, etc., etc., turns out to be just about as flexible as the sliding-scale price supports he used to advocate up to a few weeks ago. Basically the farm situation has not undergone any drastic change within the last month. Yet Secretary Benson is now setting all the major price supports well above the levels where he had previously announced they would be set.

How does it happen that brave and flinty Ezra, etc., could consider 75 percent of parity an adequate support level for cotton in March, but in April deems 82½ percent necessary? What considerations impelled him to raise wheat from 76 percent to 84 percent, commercial corn from 81 to 86, rice from 75 to 83, and so on?

The answer is, of course, well known, and it does not have much to do with principle. Secretary Benson changed his mind because the President told him to. And the President told him to because sugar coating was needed—at least enough to last until November—for the pill of the farm bill veto.

Secretary Benson turns out to be quite a generous man. When the new price support levels are applied to estimated 1956 crops, he is offering the farmers $1,611,000,000 more than he had intended to offer them before the veto. He has even told corn growers in the commercial corn States that they can produce all the corn they want to this year, disregarding acreage restrictions, and still receive price support loans at 82 percent of parity. In the old days, they had to restrict their production in order to qualify for price supports.

Of course Secretary Benson is not as openhanded as Congress. Nobody could expect that. Congress, with its 90 percent supports across the board, offered farmers $2,200,000,000 more in prospective crop values for 1956 than they would have received under the old, or flinty, Benson program.

All the same, Ezra, we think, is doing pretty well. Pretty well for Ezra, anyhow.

Farm Legislation, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 11 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained my impression of the farm bill which I characterized as Christmas tree legislation with something hung on it here and there for about every segment of agriculture. Relief for the northeast dairy industry, however, was conspicuous by its absence and the same held true for our fruit and poultry industries.

I sometimes suspect that first impressions of this nature will bear further scrutiny, but in this case my judgment was vindicated by the President's veto of the measure.

On May 3 another farm bill came before the House, practically without notice and certainly without an opportunity for the various farm organizations to examine or comment upon it. Again, the basic commodities seemed to be pretty well provided for with a total disregard for milk, fruit, and poultry. Once more I voted against the proposal under the impression that it was no improvement upon the first attempt.

On even date we have the resulting conference report before the House and I note with considerable interest that the two proposals from the Senate which might tend to give the northeastern farmer a little relief, have been elimi-

nated: First, the sale of 100 million bushels of surplus wheat for low-priced live stock feed; and, second, the growing of wheat to be used on the farm without penalty.

This action on the part of the conferees removes any doubt as to the desirability of the bill and I can claim consistency at least in voting against the conference report.

Reduction of Premium Rates for FHA Insurance on Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 4443, which provides for the reduction of premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent.

This morning I had an opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to urge that this particular legislation be enacted, and I would like to include herewith my testimony:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first I would like to express my appreciation to you for granting me an opportunity to appear before you to testify in behalf of H. R. 4443, a bill I introduced during the last session, which would reduce the premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent.

I realize that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has not reported favorably on this legislation, indicating that it is the Agency's view that the amount of mortgage insurance premium should be directly related to the risk involved and the adequacy of the various insurance funds set out in the National Housing Act. The Agency also states that from their experience they have found no evidence which would indicate that the risk involved in the case of cooperative housing is any less than the risk involved in the other insurance programs administered under the National Housing Act, or that the insurance fund for cooperative housing is of such a nature that a reduced premium is warranted.

However, I would like to point out a few facts. Since the end of the war there has been a very critical shortage of housing for the middle-income group, many of whom are veterans. Section 213 of the Housing Act was designed to fill the gap between public housing for the low-income groups and private homes and luxury apartments for the high-income groups. Unfortunately, as we have learned, some builders were able to use section 213 for their own private gain, far in excess of a reasonable profit, to the detriment of the very people for whom section 213 was intended. The net result has been that in every section 213 cooperative which has been built, increases in carrying charges have occurred ranging from 10 to 30 percent and more, forcing many of our citizens, most of them veterans, to vacate their apartments because they were unable to meet these increased charges.

The residents of the 213 cooperatives are deserving of relief. Practically all of them relied upon the representations of the builders that the various cooperatives were under the supervision and guidance of the FHA, which implied that the FHA had carefully scrutinized the proposed carrying charges and verified them. That, in fact, was not done, and it either should have been done, or the FHA should have forced the builders to represent the true picture of the co-op corporations before the tenant-stockholders purchased stock and signed occupancy agreements.

One feasible avenue of relief for the section 213 cooperatives is the reduction of the FHA mortgage insurance premium from one-half to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum of the amount of the principal application of the mortgage outstanding at any time.

Experience has shown that there have been practically no foreclosures of section 213 cooperatives, and thus the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums has not been touched. It is reasonable and fair to assume that the continued prosperity of section 213 cooperatives and the nonexistence of foreclosures will continue. Moreover, the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums is not an escrow or separate fund, but is part of the general funds of the FHA, not specifically designated to indemnify the Government in the event it becomes liable, pursuant to Government guaranteed mortgages issued pursuant to section 213.

Reduction of the mortgage insurance premiums as set forth in my proposed bill will enable all cooperatives built under section 213 to resist further carrying charge increases at no expense to the FHA, and without causing any detriment to that agency.

The section 213 cooperatives have proven to be excellent insurance risks in the past, and the reduction in the present mortgage insurance premiums will be a tremendous help to the tenant-stockholders. The cooperatives have shown that with strong and intelligent management they have been able to operate and maintain their properties at a minimum cost.

If the FHA had taken definite steps in the first place to protect the tenant-stockholders who bought into the cooperatives, the terrific increases in carrying charges would not have taken place.

These people are entitled to our consideration and support, and I urge you to study H. R. 4443 carefully with a view toward reporting it favorably to the House of Representatives.

In addition, I might suggest that you permit some of those most closely associated with the operation of these cooperatives to testify before your committee so that they can give you a true and factual picture of the problems faced by these projects under the present system.

The Camp Drum Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N. Y., on the question of naming Camp Drum for a permanent base for year-around use. The editorial states the arguments logically and with good reasoning. I hope the Army will reconsider.

THE CAMP DRUM ANSWER

The Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, has tried to explain to Congressman KILBURN why the Army has no interest in operating a year-round program at Camp Drum. The only difference between this explanation and the previous explanation is that it is longer. The principal reason is $1,500,000 expense for which, in the eyes of the Army, there is no military justification.

The military mind at work is truly something to behold. The Army, quoting from a report made several years ago, says that Camp Drum "offers no outstanding or peculiar terrain or weather condition which requires its use for specialized training." Secretary Brucker says that an Army installation board had once considered Camp Drum as a possible suitable site for cold weather training. Its conclusions were that snow conditions at Camp Drum are unreliable.

One of the beauties of modern mechanized warfare is that it requires not only reliable weather for training, but also reliable weather for fighting. In the old days, of course, unreliable weather created unnecessary military problems. In this day of specialization, however, it is much simpler to eliminate the problems by selecting reliable weather. Apparently, somewhere in the Army training manuals the requirements for cold-weather training are specified. The temperature must be such-and-such, and the snow depth will be specifically X number of inches or feet. Anything more or anything less is unreliable and, therefore, not fitted for appropriate training.

Mr. Brucker, in his letter to Congressman KILBURN, further pointed out that the Army reviews Camp Drum's status every year, and the last review of the status was in the 3-month period ending March 31. There was an evaluation, he said, of the Army's requirement versus budgetary and manpower limitations, and the concluding recommendation was that Camp Drum not be reactivated. It is very clear as of now that the Army's mind will not be changed.

It becomes increasingly clear that somewhere in the upper ranks of the Army there are several officers who are particularly stubborn with respect to using this military reservation on a round-the-year basis. Who they are and where they are located to date has not been revealed. They are not included in the ranks of the military leaders who come to Camp Drum each year. All of them on many occasions have committed themselves to the desirability of the camp for year-round use. Some have gone into retirement, to be replaced by successors who are every bit as enthusiastic about the camp. They, like Congressman KILBURN and Senator LEHMAN, however, have been unable to penetrate that back room where the antagonism to the camp is located. They will succeed someday. The letter from Secretary Brucker is convincing evidence that greater effort must be made to root out the opponents of Camp Drum.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the results of a poll conducted among my constituents on questions pertinent to present issues. I am sure that the

Members will find the results of this poll quite interesting:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE H. SMITH, SUPPLEMENT TO ISSUE NO. 191 IN THE MILL AT WASHINGTON, MAY 22, 1956

1. President Eisenhower is asking for $4.9 billion in foreign aid:

(a) Do you favor continued military aid? Yes, 976; no, 1,242.

(b) Do you favor continued economic aid in dollars? Yes, 574; no, 1,564.

(c) Do you favor continued technical aid as self-help? Yes, 1,475; no, 668.

(d) Do you favor a 10-year aid program. Yes, 642; no, 1,589.

2. Should our immigration laws be liberalized to permit increased immigration? Yes, 679; no, 1,595.

3. Should the free-world nations supply Communist countries with strategic materials: copper, machine tools, etc.? Yes, 44; no, 2,205.

4. Do you think East-West trade should be permitted? Yes, 983; no, 966.

5. Do you think the free world can coexist with the Communist world, under existing conditions? Yes, 796; no, 1,338.

6. Do you think Red China should be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 112; no, 2,101.

7. Should the United States vote against Red China's admission to the United Nations? Yes, 1,834; no, 302.

8. Do you think the new Russian attitude indicates a desire to live at peace with the free world? Yes, 86; no, 2,024.

9. Do you think United States aid is stopping the spread of communism? Yes, 737; no, 1,333.

10. Should the United States share its knowledge of atomic energy with other countries? Yes, 688; no, 1,439.

11. Do you favor the soil-bank plan for agriculture? Yes, 1,028; no, 987.

12. Do you approve of the flexible price-support idea? Yes, 1,201; no, 807.

13. Do you approve of 90 percent of parity for all agricultural commodities: milk, corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, etc.? Yes, 151; no, 1,936.

14. Do you think a self-help program is advisable for the dairy farmer, with some aid from the Federal Government? Yes, 2,295; no, 291.

15. Do you believe that Congress can solve the farm problem? Yes, 692; no, 1,364.

16. The Federal Government proposes aid to education:

(a) Do you favor the Federal Government providing school-construction funds to States on a matching basis, but under strict State control? Yes, 964; no, 1,128.

(b) Do you approve the Federal Government making long-term, low-interest loans for school construction? Yes, 1,138; no, 673.

(c) Are you against Federal aid to schools in any form? Yes, 965; no, 1,129.

17. Do you approve Federal funds for local library purposes? Yes, 562; no, 1,635.

18. The Federal Goverment proposes a long-range highway program:

(a) Do you think we should pay for it as we go by a gas-tax increase? Yes, 1,162; no, 799.

(b) Should we finance it by bonds? Yes, 858; no, 913.

(c) Should we delay this program to a later date, in view of existing deficits? Yes, 869; no, 1,040.

19. Do you favor a right-to-work law? Yes, 1,921; no, 163.

20. Do you think labor unions should enter political contests, as such? Yes, 96; no, 2,107.

21. Do you think that union funds should be used for political purposes without consent of members? Yes, 21; no, 2,195.

(a) Or with the consent of members? Yes, 281; no, 1,785.

22. Do you favor requiring registration of pension and welfare funds collected by unions? Yes, 2,138; no, 82.

23. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Yes, 592; no, 1,645.

24. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet postal deficits? Yes, 1,474; no, 670.

25. Do you favor lowering the social-security age limit for women from 65 to 62 years? Yes, 1,241; no, 961.

26. Do you approve extending social security to all groups of workers not presently covered by this plan? Yes, 1,316; no, 820.

27. Do you approve Federal funds for research in the field of health? Yes, 1,396; no, 770.

28. Do you favor appropriations for public housing? Yes, 401; no, 1,715.

29. Do you favor appropriations for housing for elderly people on a modest basis? Yes, 1,183; no, 982.

30. Do you favor granting pensions to war veterans 65 years of age or older, on the basis of need? Yes, 1,318; no, 878.

31. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today:

Government spending, 1,649.
Maintaining peace, 1,512.
Control of communism in America, 1,460.
Balancing the budget, 1,416.
Taxation, 1,387.
Communists or fifth amendment people in Government, 1,372.
Reduction of debt of Federal Government, 1,330.
Farm prices and policies, 1,254.
American foreign policy, 1,240.
United States foreign-trade policies, 1,205.
Defense and war preparedness, 1,190.
Labor policies, 1,176.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the late Mary McLeod Bethune:

MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE COMMEMORATION WEEK, MAY 18 TO 26, 1956—THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, MRS. WILLIAM THOMAS MASON, PRESIDENT

It was along journey from a crude cabin in the middle of a cotton field in the country beyond Mayesville, S. C., to the White House as an adviser to the President of the United States, but that is the almost incredible saga of Mary McLeod Bethune, who passed a year ago, May 18, 1955, and whose creative life and influence generated power that affected thousands of people.

Born of parents who had been slaves, her early childhood years were spent working in the fields. She was 9 years of age before she had the opportunity of attending a Presbyterian mission school for at that time there were no schools for Negroes in her community. She trudged back and forth down dusty country roads—happy in the knowledge that she was learning to read and write for she perceived at an early age that the key to life was education and she was determined to grasp that key for herself and others.

Through the kindness and generosity of Miss Mary Crissman of Denver, Colo., this young girl whose promise and intellect were superior, secured scholarships to Scotia Seminary in Concord, N. C., and Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Here a word of tribute must be paid to that faithful devoted band of Christian men and women from the north who directly after the Civil War, left family, home, and familiar surroundings to teach academic subjects and implant the idea of service, freedom, and truth in the hearts and minds of the freed men. The youthful protege learned that lesson well for in the nearly 80 years of her life, she exemplified the teachings of her rugged parents and dedicated tutors.

This intrepid pioneer became one of the country's great educators for she built Bethune-Cookman College from a one-room school with orange crates as desks, to a million dollar college, located amidst the Florida pines at Daytona Beach. She built a college on faith and hard work, instilling these twin qualities in thousands of young men and women who flocked to the college and were trained in trades and professions; in character and citizenship responsibilities. "Enter To Learn—Depart To Serve," the motto engraved at the portals of White Hall was one of the cornerstones of the institution. A love of music was ingrained in the students for the poignancy and immortal tragedy of Negro spirituals were understood and sung with the same rapture as the immortal works of the masters. Singing groups of students traveled across the Nation telling the story of this woman's great dream and its fulfillment.

Mrs. Bethune was a born organizer for she set in motion many groups for teachers, organized women on national levels, parents, business enterprises, religious institutes, and conferences. She was a militant crusader for civil and human rights. She never avoided meeting a situation that might have resulted in unpleasantness or even danger, but held fast to the principles of human rights and dignity. When the Ku Klux Klan invaded the campus of her college, riding through the grounds hidden by concealing sheets, she never faltered but continued to invoke her students to understand and struggle for their rights as American citizens and to accept responsibility for securing and discharging those rights.

She was a great humanitarian and administrator. Her love for young people, her sympathetic understanding of their hopes and fears of the inequalities that beset them and her eagerness to give them a lift on the ladder of life, brought her into governmental service during the depression years, for she was called by the President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, to head up the Office of Negro Affairs of the National Youth Administration. She brought into this organization scores of gifted young leaders who bolstered and restored the faith of discouraged youngsters in the dark days of the thirties, helping them learn useful trades and professions and to secure employment, enabling them to remain in school or support themselves or their families. She was a consultant to the Women's Interest Section of the Defense Department during World War II and was an invaluable mediator in the adjustment of women in the armed services.

She founded the Southeastern Federation of the National Association of Colored Women; was the 8th national president of that organization and remained a consultant to the group until her death.

On December 5, 1935, she founded the National Council of Negro Women, uniting national organizations of Negro women of the widest possible range of interests, who united their corporate strength to give broad leadership to Negro women as they increasingly integrated into the spiritual, social, economic, cultural, and political life of America. Mrs. Bethune served as its first president for 14 years and gave distinguished leadership to these program objectives.

This dynamic leader gave prodigiously of her talents and influence to many organizations concerned with the betterment of people. She served on the boards of the NAACP, the United Church Women, the National Council of Women of the United

States, and others. During her lifetime she was showered with honorary degrees and citations for distinguished services to mankind. Among the most coveted awards bestowed were the Spingarn medal and an honorary degree of doctor of humanities from Rollins College in Florida.

Mrs. Bethune was known and beloved in other countries. She visited the Republic of Haiti at the invitation of the President of that country and he invested her with the Medal of Haiti. She was President Truman's special representative to the inauguration of President Tubman in 1952, who conferred the Star of Africa upon this brilliant American, for all that she had accomplished for humanity. Mrs. Bethune represented thousands at the birth of the United Nations and under her tutelage the National Council of Negro Women became a member of the National Council of Women of the United States and the International Council of Women of the World, thus linking the membership with the women of the universe.

This great woman had a hard and difficult road to travel all the days of her life for there were few guideports and landmarks to which she could repair. To most people the goals she set were out of reach but to her they were always possible, first because she had faith in God that all things are possible, and secondly because she believed that once American people knew and understood what she was striving for they would give support. She was justified in those beliefs, her prayers were answered and people all over America contributed to the building and maintenance of Bethune-Cookman College and to the Mary McLeod Bethune Foundation.

She had the miraculous faculty of turning every impediment into a light that deflected any course that was not essentially good. She conquered by love; she lifted by compassion; she built by faith. Like the sturdy pioneers of old she took the raw earth and brick by brick, building by building, built an institution that will withstand the ravages of time. She molded untrained human substance into self-confident, persevering people and they caught the beauty and passion of her dream of a nation and a world where all men would be up and no man down. Like the founders of our country she understood the meaning of opportunity and privilege; of civil and human rights and worked without ceasing to maintain and extend these so that they would be common to all men.

Mrs. Bethune possessed a keen and discerning mind and her wisdom was incalculable. Her unforgettable eloquence when she spoke, the unalterable strength of her convictions, the vast spiritual fortifications of every enterprise she undertook, the full measure of her achievements in helping to propel her race toward its destiny is a chronical of human endeavor, moving and proud, and will live in the hearts of a grateful nation and be recorded in the annals of American history, forever.

The Mozart Piano Concertos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am happy to present an article by Mr. Herschell C. Gregory, of Lebanon, Ind., on the form of the piano concerto as established by Mozart. The article follows:

THE MOZART PIANO CONCERTOS

(By Herschell C. Gregory)

The form of the piano concerto as we hear it today was established by Mozart, and while many modifications have been introduced over the past century or more, its general outline of construction remains the same. Representing as they do, the purest and most ideal beauty, the playing of them must inevitably lead to greater delicacy, finish, and loveliness of tone. He raised the concerto to a pitch of perfection which has seldom been surpassed by later composers, while their flexibility of structure, astonishing variety of idea, and the harmonious balance betwen the orchestra and piano makes them above all others typical of their form.

Most of the concerts are embellished with the mastery and grace that lend such charm and variety to all Mozart's melody, for he believed melody to be the essence of music, "I compare a good melodist to a fine racer, and contrapuntists to hack post-horses."

Many of his early concertos belong to the domain of chamber music. They employ the full orchestra but they do not take the term "grand," which in the modern sense means suitable for brilliant public performances. Because of their lovely qualities, not all pianists can present them with the necessary refinement and strength. They are not symphonic in style and their spirit is not the high poetic or the intensely dramatic.

For one reason the concerto as we know it today had no existence in 1775. For another they could not have been played in the modern way, because the modern technique of the piano was not yet devised. For a third reason the people to whom he played, and for whom he wrote the concertos, did not want portico-symphonic music.

The Mozart concertos are exquisite art; they live in beauty but the art is light, and the beauty is simple. Everything connected with these concertos has a fascination for the imaginative musician. They are unique in the history of piano music, forming the sole link between one age and another. In respect to style and character they relate to the immediate past rather than to the immediate present; that is to say, their forms and moods make them less modern than the symphonies Mozart composed at that time.

During his short lifetime Mozart desired nothing so much as to have a good time and write music. Composing for him was an economic necessity, and he was the first composer for whom piano playing was a means of earning a livelihood. In fact, he was the first artist to travel and give concerts and was also among the first to reveal the qualities of the new pianoforte. Some of the concertos were composed for pupils, some for his own use at concerts, and conceived with a view to more or less brilliant display, and there were a few that were intended to appeal to a smaller circle of music lovers and connoisseurs.

In the concertos of Bach and Handel the need for distinguishing between soloist and orchestra is not very apparent, but with Mozart the difference is strong and fundamental, giving the soloist an opportunity to set one thematic content against the other.

The concerto as conceived by Mozart in its final form consists of a three-movement composition. The first movement, an adaptation of the sonata form, begins with a tutti passage for the orchestra in which the principal subjects are announced. With the exception of the concerto in E flat (K. 271) the first appearance of the piano is delayed until the orchestra has completely stated the exposition. Sometimes the second subject is omitted at this point, but it is usually introduced. The first tutti always ends in the original key, and not in the dominant or the relative major (if the concerto be in a minor key), as would be the case in a sonata. The piano then enter with a brilliant introductory passage, but usually with the principal subject. The first tutti with considerable modification now follows divided between the piano and the orchestra. The second subject is introduced and ends in the key of the dominant (or relative major as the case may be). These subjects undergo considerable modifications in the succeeding section called the development, and there is a return to the original key.

The first subject returns in a compressed form in the orchestra and is continued by the soloist, and after a final tutti the movement comes to a close. In most of the concertos a pause is made near the end of the movement upon the 6–4 chord on the dominant for a cadenza for the performer. It was the custom to end the cadenza with a long trill over the chord of the dominant seventh, and after a short passage for the orchestra alone the movement came to a close.

The second movement instead of being fast and powerful was slow and melodic, forming a distinct contrast to the opening movement. In some of his concertos Mozart substitutes the minuet instead of the usual andante, or adagio, while in the two concertos in B flat (K. 450 and K. 456) he employs the variation form. The solo part of this movement is of a quiet, florid nature, with many passages of ornamentation. In his concertos in A (K. 414), in C (K. 415), and G (K. 453), he introduced short cadenzas at the close of the movements.

The final movement was always fast and gay and usually in the rondo form, although in the concerto in C minor (K. 491), and the concerto in G (K. 453) Mozart returned to the variation form. Since he was always unhampered enough to try many formal experiments, his rondos were sometimes interrupted by a complete change of tempo. The concerto in E flat (K. 271) has a minuet as the middle portion of the finale; the C major (K. 415) in 6–8 time contains two interruptions by an adagio in 2–4 time; and an andantino cantabile is introduced in the middle of the rondo of the concerto in E flat (K. 482). Short cadenzas are found in the finales of the concertos, some of which are to be improvised by the performer, while others are written out in full.

One of the distinguishing features of the concertos is the fact that except in the tuttis, the orchestra has little to do beyond a simple accompaniment of the soloist. The orchestration of the earlier concertos consists of relatively few instruments, but this limited number of color combinations becomes larger and more sonorous as he adds flutes, oboes, clarinets, horns, and trumpets.

During the spring months of 1767 when Mozart was 11 years of age he decided to write music to play with the orchestra. Between April and July he completed his first four piano concertos, but evidently he was in such a hurry to play these works with orchestra, that he used a great amount of thematic material, or sonata movements from other composers, or Germans who were living in Paris. He retained the original parts and added light accompaniments to them, as well as inserting orchestral tutti.

In the first Concerto in F (K. 37) the first movement is by Herman Friedrich Raupach, and the third movement by Leontzi Honnauer. Some historians believe that the second movement was by Johann Schobert, but the original movement was never found among his extant works. In the second Concerto in B flat (K. 39) the first and third movements consist of material by Raupach, and the second movement by Schobert. In the third Concerto in D (K. 40) he used material by Honnauer in the first movement, and material by Johann Gottfried Eckhardt in the second. In the fourth Concerto in G. (K. 41) Honnauer's material is found in the first movement, while in the remaining two he returned to Raupach. Notwithstand-

ing the circumstances that the music was not by Mozart the manner in which it was arranged, and the understanding of the orchestra were remarkable for a boy of 11.

Mozart now turned his attention to other forms of composition and it was not until the fall of 1773 that he composed his fifth Concerto in D (K. 175), in which the opening theme foreshadows an opera, "The Elopement" composed 9 years later, while the finale starts with a canon. A change in style is noted in this concerto as his music up to this time had been influenced by Italian models but which now was—for a brief period at least—to be dominated by the seriousness and depth of German art.

After a trip to Munich, the entire year of 1776 was passed quietly in composing numerous compositions testifying to his industry and revealing music which far surpassed those of his contemporaries, and finding a place by the side of the music by Hayden. He began to take pupils and among them were several belonging to the aristocratic families of Salzburg. One of the families was that of Countess Lodron, whose two daughters Aloysia and Josepha studied the clavier with him. In February he wrote his seventh Concerto in F (K. 242) for three claviers and orchestra, and the manuscript bears the following dedication to them in the hand of Mozart's father, "Dedicato al incomparabile mento di Sua Excellenza la Sgra Contessa Lodron, nata Contessa d'Arco, e delle sue figlie le Segre Contesse Aloysia e Giuseppa * * * in F dal loro devotissimo servo Wolfgango Mozart."

It is clear that one of the performers of this work was less advanced as a harpsichordist; for the third clavier part was written much easier than the other two. Mozart probably felt that the third part was an ineffective adjunct, for soon afterward he rewrote the composition for two claviers, and on the title page of the new manuscript he wrote in his own hand, "I Soli del Concerto a tre Cembali, accomodati a due." (The soli of the concerto for three harpsichords arranged for two).

The sixth Concerto in B flat (K. 238), and eighth Concerto in C (K. 246), were also composed in 1776. In both works the composer indicated that the soloist was to fill in the figured bass during the tuttis. The latter is dedicated to Countess Lutzow who made secret trips to the Mozart home in Salzburg to be coached by Nanneri, Mozart's sister, the secrecy being so that her regular teacher Spitzeder would not be offended.

In January of the following year he wrote his ninth Concerto in E flat (K. 271), the first of his truly outstanding works in this form. In all his concertos with this exception, he delays the appearance of the piano until the orchestra has completely stated the exposition. In the slow movement the tricks of the Italian operatic recitative are adopted to an instrumental form, while the difficult rondo has a minuet incorporated in it. This concerto shows an immense advance over the preceding works. He had not yet emancipated himself from French influences, but the treatment of the tutti is bolder, and the dialogues between soloist and orchestra are more frequent, the melodic line of the solos being more dramatic and extended.

Two years later he wrote his 10th Concerto in E flat (K. 365) for two pianos, which was probably composed with a desire to play a work of this nature with his sister, but its first performance was given by the composer and Josepha Aurnhammer, a young Vienna girl who studied with Mozart. This girl was one of the best pianists then living in Vienna, and the composer wrote an interesting account of her countenance, and the impression she made upon him to his father.

Early in 1782 he sent home a copy of his Concert Rondo in D (K. 382) (listed as Concerto No. 23) composed for his piano Concerto in D (K. 175) a rondo which he had composed expecially for himself, and which no one except his darling sister must play. On March 3 he gave a concert presenting the new work that made a great noise from the audience.

In December he composed his Concerto No. 11 in F (K. 413); the Concerto No. 12 in A (K. 414); and the Concerto No. 13 in C (K. 415). These works were written for his own concerts, and he wrote concerning them: "They are very brilliant, pleasing to the ear, and natural without being vapid. Here and there are spots which connoisseurs will best appreciate, yet such as another class of hearers will like without knowing why." The three works were published in the following April by subscription.

On February 9, 1784, he completed his Concerto No. 14 in E flat (K. 449). His time was taken up with concerts and compositions for the piano. He was expected to write a new concerto, or set of variations for each appearance and often he would put off the writing until the last possible moment. Mozart played the new work for the first time on March 17, and wrote to his father: "The first concert went off very well. The hall was full to overflowing; and the new concerto won extraordinary praise. Everywhere I go I hear praises of that concert."

The Concerto No. 15 in B flat (K. 450) was completed on March 15, and probably played in public by the composer without having been rehearsed as was frequently the case. In a letter to his father he refers to this and the following two concertos as, "concertos to make one sweat."

Seven days later he completed his Concerto No. 16 in D (K. 451) a less difficult work than the one in B flat; and on April 12 he finished his Concerto No. 17 in G (K. 453), a work composed for his pupil Barbara Ployer. On May 27 he heard a starling pipe a phrase not unlike the first theme of the finale of this concerto. The tune which the starling had been taught to sing was so curious, and it so delighted him that he bought the bird paying 34 kreutzers for it. He entered the transaction in the account book, jotted down the theme roughly in the form piped by the bird and then wrote: "That was beautiful."

On May 24 he wrote his father concerning the new works: "I am unable to tell you which of the two concertos (in B flat and D) I prefer. I take them both to be concertos (die schwitzer machem) "that will make the player sweat"; but in regard to their difficulty, the one in B flat has certainly the advantage. However, I am very anxious to know which of the three concertos in B flat, D, and G major most pleases you and sister. As the talk at present concerns nothing but these three concertos I am anxious to know whether your opinion coincides with the general one and mine also. It is necessary that they be well performed and arranged with all the parts. I can spare them until you examine them, but take care not to let them out of yours hands, for I might have sold one for 24 ducats today; but I think it more to my advantage to keep them in my possession for a couple of years or more, and then publish them."

In October he wrote his Concerto No. 18 in B flat (K. 456) for the blind pianist Marie Therese von Paradies. This work belongs to the period at which his treatment of the concerto form had reached its most masterly development. On December 11 he completed his Concerto No. 19 in F (K. 459) a work intended to appeal to the smaller circle of music lovers and connoisseurs. Each concerto has its own beauty and the F major concerto with its haunting first subject has a delightful freshness. It is evident that Mozart thought well of this work, for 6 years later he player it at the coronation of Leopold in Frankfort.

On February 10 of the following year his father arrived from Salzburg for a visit and it was on this day that he completed his Concerto No. 20 in D minor (K. 466). For the first time in a piano concerto he chose a minor key and the work transcends its period as it agrees in value with the Symphony in G minor. This concerto confirms the oft repeated observation that Mozart's compositions in the minor keys are his deepest and most important, for its last movement is distinguished above all others by its fire and intensity of expression. This as well as the Concerto in C minor are passionately agitated. It is a well known fact that it was carefully studied by Beethoven, in whose early compositions its influence can clearly be traced.

This concerto was completed only a few hours before the concert at which it was played by the composer. His father attended its premiere and wrote home to his daughter: "Wolfgang played a new and admirable piano concerto on which the copyist was copying yesterday when we called, and your brother did not have time to play through the Rondo once, because he was obliged to look over the copying."

If it is surpirsing that a concerto could be played without a single rehearsal, often with the ink scarcely dry upon the pages, one must consider that Mozart would have exhausted more of his time and money than he could spare. No doubt many of his private concerts were given without rehearsals as he knew the abilities of his orchestra which consisted of able sight readers, he always examined the separate parts for the orchestra and usually left the most important part of the performance technically speaking to his own nimble fingers.

On March 9 Mozart completed his Concerto No. 21 in C (K. 467) and performed the work for the first time 3 days later in Vienna. His father was present and again wrote to Nannerl regarding the beauty of the concerto and the remarkable success that it achieved. The orchestra was amplified to include flute, 2 oboes, 2 bassoons, 2 horns, 2 trumpets, and 2 kettledrums besides the strings. Only a few days before Joseph Haydn came to the home and declared to the elder Mozart: "I declare to you before God, as a man of honor, that your son is the greatest composer I know, either personally or by reputation. He has taste and beyond that the most consummate knowledge of the art of composition."

On December 16 his Concerto No. 22 in E flat (K. 482) was completed. This was one of the works he was composing for the Lenten subscription concerts of 1786, for which he secures 120 subscribers. This is one of the longer works, and 1 of the 7 arranged by his pupil Hummel for a piano of more extended compass, for which he also wrote two cadenzas. In this concerto Mozart replaces the more usual oboes by clarinets, which gave it quite a new color, and when it was performed the Andante was acclaimed and had to be repeated, which his father reported was "a rather unusual occurrence."

In March of 1786 Mozart completed his Concerto No. 23 in A (K. 488) and Concerto No. 24 in C minor (K. 491), works for his subscription concerts in Lent. The former is notable for a good many things, but especially for the element of pathos in its extraordinary Andante. Trumpets and kettledrums are absent from the score and it makes things happen that had not happened before in music written for piano and orchestra. The C minor work follows a different course in its arrangement of themes, instrumentation, and unity of atmosphere. Beethoven admired it and once told his pupil Ries: "Oh, my dear fellow, we shall never get any idea like this."

On December 4 he finished his Concerto No. 25 in C (K. 503), another work for the Lenten season of subscription concerts. It was published by Mozart's widow in 1798 at her own expense, and it is as perfect in style, melody, and balance as any music can be.

The charm of the piano concertos lies not at all in their technical intricacies but rather in their striking simplicity. Nor are Mozart's commentators prone to ascribe this quality to any point of early training. A feeling for beauty of tone and of form seem, indeed, to be the hallmarks of his compositions, but more particularly is this true of his concertos.

The Concerto No. 26 in D (K. 537), known as the Coronation, was completed on February 24, 1788, and takes its name from the fact that Mozart played it in 1790 during the festivities for the coronation of Leopold II. Ludwig the doublebass player was one of the members of the orchestra at this concert, and he has narrated how at the rehearsal Mozart would frequently leap up from the piano, spring in lively fashion onto the stage (jumping over the prompter's box) and, after exchanging animated remarks with this or that member of the orchestra, leap as lightly back to his instrument. As usual the concert yielded him considerable honor but little monetary returns. Upon his return home he could not understand why the public could applaud the performances of the wonder child, but could not appreciate the masterworks of the mature genius. The thoughts of this filled his soul with bitterness, and he sat down to study his condition.

On January 5, 1791, he completed his last Concerto for Piano in B flat (K. 595), which was performed 2 months later on March 4. Mozart trusted his concertos would secure sufficient fame and enable him to sell his music in order to bring him a fixed income. While his earlier concertos possess a delicacy in their melodic line, the later works reveal great force and virility. If he had not been a pianist he would not have written concertos in the way he did, and the movement of music toward the 19th century would have been seriously deflected. While his contemporaries wrote for the piano and their works influenced the future, Mozart's concerto music flowered to perfection in itself, and fertilized the art for the future.

Nine months after the premiere of the B flat concerto, a hearse containing his remains went creaking through the rain on its way to the cemetery of St. Marx. The weather was too severe for the mourners and his body was accompanied only by the driver of the hearse. There had already been two pauper funerals that day and Mozart was to be the third and uppermost in the grave. When his wife went to the cemetery later the gravedigger had been replaced by another who could not point out the spot of his grave. While no monuments mark his resting place, his operas, symphonies, the requiem, the concertos, and a host of other works, mark his memory until the end of eternity.

Results of Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I would like to include in the RECORD the result of my annual questionnaire. About 12,700 of these questionnaires went out to the persons who are on my mailing list to receive my semimonthly newsletter. In addition, I sent my questionnaire to every newspaper which is published in Maricopa County and asked that it be printed in such a manner that it could be cut and mailed to me. I received many questionnaires from this source. A total of 1,868 questionnaires were returned to my office; 95 percent of the answers came from persons residing in Maricopa County, Ariz. I do not claim that my poll is a scientific sampling of the opinion of voters in Maricopa County. It does reflect, however, as broad a cross section of the voters as it was possible for me to obtain.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's foreign policy?	75	15	10
2. Should we continue military aid to friendly foreign nations?	71	18	11
3. Do you favor amending the Walter-McCarran Act to allow a greater number of immigrants to enter the United States?	24	64	12
4. Do you favor Secretary Benson's farm program?	68	15	17
5. Should defense spending continue at the present level?	68	17	15
6. Do you favor a tax reduction prior to the attainment of a balanced budget?	20	75	5
7. Do you believe that the Eisenhower administration has done a good job in governing the country in the past 3 years?	89	8	3
8. Do you favor Federal aid to school construction?	53	38	9
9. Should the United States postal service be self-supporting	79	14	7
10. Do you favor a national right-to-work law, outlawing compulsory membership in any labor organization?	86	11	3

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-five: One of the Worst Disaster Years in the 75 Years of American Red Cross Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1955 was one of the worst disaster years in the whole existence of the American Red Cross. In that year the American radio broadcast industry achieved its highest order of public service to the stricken sections of the Nation. This story is well told in a letter written to the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters by the president of the American Red Cross, Mr. E. Roland Harriman. The letter, together with another written to the same organization by the Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, Mr. F. W. Reichelderfer, constitute a glowing and timely tribute to the station managers, the announcers, and the technical employees. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include these two letters and to add my own praise and commendation to all the members of the radio industry for the superb work done by them. My own personal experience with the station operators in Arkansas reflects the highest type of real service to the areas served by them:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1956.

Mr. HAROLD E. FELLOWS,
President, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FELLOWS: The year 1955 was the worst disaster year in the 75 years of American Red Cross experience. The severe eastern States floods which followed in the wakes of hurricanes Connie and Diane and the unprecedented floods of the west brought widespread hardship to both coasts. During the emergency period the homeless were sheltered, the hungry were fed, the sick and injured were given medical care.

After the emergency, the Red Cross provided assistance in restoring more than 24,000 families to normal living; nearly 9,000 homes had to be repaired, 866 had to be rebuilt, and 1,500 small businesses required assistance. The Red Cross has spent over $29 million for disaster relief operations during this past year and our disaster relief funds at this time are practically exhausted.

Fortunately, with the spontaneous and wholehearted support of radio broadcasters and other mass media, we were able to conduct a disaster fund campaign last fall which provided over $16 million in disaster emergency funds.

The role of the broadcasting industry, not alone in aiding with disaster fund appeals of this type but in interpreting to the Nation the enormous task faced by Red Cross in these disaster situations is of the greatest importance. Without their help this job could not have been adequately fulfilled. Therefore it is my great privilege to extend to the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters our deepest thanks for a job well done.

Faithfully,

S. ROLAND HARRIMAN.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
Washington, April 6, 1956.

Mr. HAROLD E. FELLOWS,
President and Chairman of the Board, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FELLOWS: The year 1955 goes down in Weather Bureau storm records as the most costly one in United States history. Property losses of more than $1 billion resulted from hurricanes along the Atlantic coast, floods in New England and California, and tornadoes in the Middle West. Hundreds of our citizens lost their lives and thousands were injured as a result of the many severe storms in 1955.

Great as these losses were, they nevertheless would have been far greater without the services and splendid cooperation of the commercial radio broadcasting stations of the United States.

Our weather forecasters in all parts of the United States are told dozens and dozens of times after each major storm how Weather Bureau advisories "heard over the radio" helped in saving life, in avoiding damage and hardship, in protecting property, in reduc-

ing widespread apprehension, and in the planning of daily activities.

We in the Weather Bureau are grateful for the constant help offered by commercial radio stations throughout America in providing the public with up-to-the-minute weather information. Our natural concern that there be complete and immediate distribution of storm warnings makes us especially conscious of the valuable services provided by radio stations at all times of the day and night, in all areas, however remote, and for all segments of society.

We also deeply appreciate the continuous efforts of commercial radio stations in making certain that storm information announcements and news stories are told in a manner that merits public confidence at all times and reduces apprehension during tense storm periods.

All of the above, plus the daily dissemination of the usual weather forecasts over the past 3 decades, make it a pleasure to congratulate the radio stations of the United States for their valuable contribution to the convenience and safety of our citizens everywhere.

Sincerely yours,

F. W. REICHELDERFER,
Chief of Bureau.

The Rock From Which You Were Hewn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1956, ceremonies in connection with the celebration of the centennial of the founding of Uvalde County, Tex., were held in the Honey Bowl High School stadium at Uvalde. The 4-day celebration was attended by thousands. Uvalde being the hometown of former Vice President John Nance Garner, his presence was very much in evidence during the ceremonies. That, of course, added to the dignity and the significance of the occasion.

A sermon was delivered at the Honey Bowl Stadium on that eventful Sunday evening, by Rev. Dow H. Heard, D. D., Washington, D. C. Reverend Heard, a native of Uvalde County and a distinguished minister, is now chaplain of the Veterans' Administration. His address was published in the Uvalde Leader-News, edited by Harry Hornby, Jr., on May 17. I think the sermon, so eloquent and inspiring, should be made available for everyone to read. I therefore include it as a part of my remarks:

THE ROCK FROM WHICH YOU WERE HEWN

As a preacher I am expected to take a text from the Bible. That I will now do. In the Bible, Book of Isaiah, the old prophet is urging the people to live right. In ringing words he tells them where to start. He said: "Look to the rock from which you were hewn, and to the quarry from which you were digged." Isaiah 51: 1 (RSV). In the next sentence he said: "Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you."

What is the prophet saying? In a bit of vivid and understandable analogy:

He is reminding them of their ancestry.

He is calling attention to their history.

He is pointing out their heritage as a people.

He is asking them to examine their foundations.

I cannot think of a better thought for a county centennial sermon—"The Rock From Which You Were Hewn."

I want us to take three looks:

1. Retrospection—a look back.
2. Introspection—a look within.
3. Prospection—a look forward.

I. RETROSPECTION—LOOKING BACK

It would be delightful to dwell on my memoirs. It would be pleasant to recall and eulogize my grandparents, my father, mother, brothers, sisters, kinspeople, friends, schoolteachers, pastors, and many others. But I will resist that enticing temptation because it is too personal.

I am interested in a larger picture, comprehensive and composite. I want us to take a look at the quarry from which we were dug. I am thinking now of the pioneers who came from the old countries to settle the new land of North America. And about their descendants, with many of the same ideals and methods who came on to settle Texas and Uvalde County. Particularly I am thinking of the houses they built, four little houses. These houses symbolized their aspirations, ideals, dreams, and philosophy of life for themselves and their posterity. The houses were:

1. The house called home.
2. The schoolhouse.
3. The church house.
4. The courthouse.

These houses are basic. They are bedrock. And the pioneers built them in about that order. The early settlers of America, of Texas, of Uvalde County, cut the timbers and hewed the stones with their own hands. And most of this has been within the lifetime of our parents and grandparents.

Henry Van Dyke in his great poem on Texas put it grandly when he said:

"Men of mark from old Missouri,
Men of daring from Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana,
Men of many States and races,
Bringing wives and children with them,
Following up the wooded valleys,
Spread across the rolling prairies
Raising homes and reaping harvests.
Rude the toil that tried their patience,
Fierce the fights that proved their courage,
Rough the stone and tough the timber
Out of which they built their order!
Yet they never failed nor faltered
And the instinct of their swarming
Made them one and kept them working,
Till their toil was crowned with triumph,
And the country of the Tejas
Was the fertile land of Texas."

I come back to those little houses. Out of them came our American heritage.

Out of the little house called home came the continuing family tradition—husband, wife, and children.

Out of the little schoolhouse came learning, enlightment.

Out of the little church house, with its big open Bible, came the teachings of our religion.

In the little courthouse they filed their deeds, their marriage licenses, their public records. It was here they held court. The courthouse became the symbol of governmental authority. I know it stimulated county, State, and national pride and patriotism.

Out of all these houses working together grew, in a good climate, the precious heritages of our freedoms. Freedom of speech. Freedom of the press. Freedom of religion. Freedom of education. Trial by jury, etc.

The enemies of any or all of these houses—the home, school, church, court—are my enemies and I will be fighting them 'till the cows come home, and after that, too.

II. INTROSPECTION—LOOKING WITHIN

An old Chinese proverb says there are five important points on the compass—north, south, east, and west, and the place where you are. The most important place and time in the world to you is here and now. Near the Roman forum in the center of Rome was placed by Caesar Augustus a golden milestone. It was the "zero" monument. All distance was measured from this marker.

Let us take a look at where we now stand. We have just taken a look through a big picture window toward the past. Today we live in a fine house of achievements. It was built on the foundations laid by our fathers. We of our generation have proudly added to it. And our children will add other rooms to it.

We now live in comfortable houses with all the modern conveniences—water, lights, heat, furniture, radio, and, lately, television.

Look at your stately and commodious churches.

Look at your public-school buildings—grade school, high school, and junior college—all staffed with well-educated and competently trained teachers.

Have you taken a good look at your town library lately? It was made possible by the generous gift of Uvalde's No. 1 citizen, the Honorable John N. Garner.

Have you really taken a good look at your courthouse lately? It is probably manned by an efficient group of public servants—the ones you elected. Think of all the services to all the people of the county emanating from that courthouse—and also from the city hall.

What about the new public hospital?

Take note of your chamber of commerce, your lively service clubs, your lodges, your women's organizations, and your splendid newspaper—the Uvalde Leader News.

This catalog is of such absorbing interest. Taking an inventory of all our gadgets, equipment, and assets proves a fascinating experience.

III. PROSPECTION—LOOKING FORWARD

Now let us turn and look through another large picture window toward the future. Of course it is enthralling to look back—and around us. That is some quarry from which we were dug. That is some rock from whence we were hewn. And we shall be proud of it forever. We should be. The English historian, Lord MacCaulay, in his story of the siege of Londonderry ends with these thoughtful words:

"A people that take no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."

However, our most compelling and rewarding challenge is in the forward look. The past is gone. The particles of sand are running fast through the hourglass of the present. Only in the future can we make any worthwhile contributions.

Lincoln, in his second annual message to Congress, December 1, 1862, said to his generation: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth." They saved it. We have a vast responsibility to the future. This is no place to stop and put our judgment curse on all the fast-moving scenes of life that we do not fully understand or do not approve. Remember the wise old adage:

"Judge not the play before the play is done;
Her plot hath many changes; every day speaks a new scene;
The last act crowns the play."

Many tugging thoughts crowd my tongue for utterance. I can proclaim only a few.

1. Maintain a strong attachment to the land. We need to love the good earth. Texans, like so many other Americans, have been such wastrels of this rich heritage. There are recent evidences of a more adequate concern for the conservation of the

soil and the water. This love for the land also involves a needed reverence for the homes built on that land. We should always be ready and anxious to assume full responsibility to love and maintain our own homes. We have too many cuckoo birds. Cuckoo birds make no nests of their own. They lay their eggs in the nests of other fowls. Other birds have to foster and feed the cuckoo's young. Cuckoos steadfastly refuse to assume any responsibility in such matters.

Grace Noll Crowell said:

"So long as there are homes to which men turn
At close of day,
So long as there are homes where children are—
Where women stay,
If love and loyalty and faith be found
Across those sills,
A stricken nation can recover from
Its gravest ills.

"So long as there are homes where fires burn
And there is bread,
So long as there are homes where lamps are lit
And prayers are said;
Although people falter through the dark
And nations grope,
With God himself back of these little homes
We still can hope."

2. Maintain a continuing concern and support for your free public schools.

Mirabeau B. Lamar, distinguished cavalry colonel at San Jacinto, while serving as the President of the Republic of Texas, said:

"The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy and, while guided by virtue, is the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that free men acknowledge and the only security free men desire."

The free public school is the seed corn of American democracy. As the basic institution in our democracy, it needs and deserves our full and dedicated support. Keep it a publicly owned and operated institution. Let us never sell, lease, contract or grant to any special group—however good that group appears to be—the right or authority to take over the education of our youth. I am unalterably opposed to any action that would transfer this education responsibility to others. Think of what it would be like for the American Legion to run one of the schools, the Baptists one, the Masons one, the AFL–CIO one, the Chamber of Commerce one, the Cattlemen's Association one—ad infinitum. To do that would destroy the genus—democracy as we know it and love it.

You do not appear surprised to hear me say this. Why should you? After all I learned it 30 to 40 years ago right here in Uvalde County schools.

Please permit me to say a word to the young people present. Contrary to the plaintive pleading of a recent popular song—I say, let the stars get in your eyes—let the moon break your heart. This has been going on for a thousand years. It happened to your parents and grandparents. They turned out pretty good. Who are you to be sheltered and shielded from the normal reactions, emotions, and romances of life? Don't permit yourselves to be boxed in—to a hothouse where they grow plants free from the natural world of wind and rain and sunshine. Contrary to the occasional concerned opinions of those of us who are your elders, I think you will turn out all right. I cannot think of a single reason why you young people should not do better than your forbears. I hear somebody ask: "What about this 'rock and roll" craze?" I believe this, too, shall pass.

I can hear the tramp, tramp, tramp, of a marching army—an army of invasion. A conquering army. That army will take over Texas. It will install a new governor in Austin. That army will take over Uvalde County and fill every position of authority, responsibility, and leadership. Those people will put in a new county judge and a new sheriff. They will give you a new school superintendent. They will even put new pastors in all your churches. I am talking about that marching army of youth—composed of your children and grandchildren. They will take over like you and I have taken over from our grandparents.

3. Now a word about the churches. My primary concern is with your religious institutions. On purpose I mention the school and the church together. I think a poet was right when he said:

"Fear not the skeptic's puny hands
While near the school, the church spire stands;
Fear not the blinded bigots rule
While near the church spire, stands the school."

The Bible says: "Blessed is the nation whose God is Jehovah." Do we really believe and practice that? Or do we just pay lipservice to the theory that our country rests on a godly foundation? "In God we trust" should mean more than just four words on our silver coins. It should be basic in our philosophy that the only permanent security is in the Eternal God. The Psalmist David said: "Lead me to the rock that is higher than I," Psalms 61: 2. Jesus commended the "wise man which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock." Then he added the solemn word of warning about the foolish man, who built his house upon the sand: "and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it." Matthew 8. Jesus said: "I build my church upon a rock." And the Apostle Paul said: "The church of the living God, the pillar and bulwark of the truth," I Timothy 3: 15.

Why support and attend your church:

Your church brings law, habit, and discipline to life. It gives you wise rules to regulate your impulses. Otherwise you are left without vision, direction or goal—to idle drifting.

Your church gives you standards. Without standards you can have no stability, and chaos is not far away. From rugged, vital standards iron men are made.

At church you hear the teachings of Jesus—the incomparable man.

In the atmosphere of the church wrongs die.

It is poor taste to belabor or low rate the church. The churches may not be ideal but they save the race from rot and ruin.

The churches of America are growing. They are making a stronger impact on this Nation than ever before. Recent census figures show that 1956 church membership stands at 97.5 million. That is 60 percent of the total population. One hundred years ago only 16 percent of the then population of the Nation was enrolled in the churches.

4. Now a word about freedom and democracy. The Poet Wordsworth said:

"We must be free or die who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spoke; the faith and morals hold which Milton held."

Freedom is both an inheritance and an achievement. We get it from the past. We can strengthen and enrich it for ourselves and for the future. Freedom must be re-won in each generation and in some measure reborn in each citizen. It is never finished. It is never static. It must march or die. Gen. Omar N. Bradley said:

"Freedom—no word was ever spoken that has held out greater hope, demanded greater sacrifice, needed more to be nurtured, blessed more the giver, damned more its destroyer, or came closer to being God's will on earth. May Americans ever be its protector."

We live in troubled, perilous times. There seems to have been many such times—one or more in each generation—that have appeared as dark and dangerous. But wisdom has fled from us if we permit disillusionment, skepticism, cynicism and despair to lead us by the hand into the graveyard of nations.

Sir Francis Drake, most famous of all sailors, on a dark and stormy night, was bringing his ship up the Thames River to dock in peaceful London Harbor. The ship was caught in a squall and the swirling waters wrenched his big sailboat off its course and turned it completely around. The gale almost capsized it. In the maddening darkness and danger the great sea captain—in anger more than fear—above the storm was ehard to shout: "Is it possible that I, Francis Drake, who am master of the seven seas, am now going to flounder here and be lost in this muddy ditch?"

Too often we confuse a troublesome ditch for a stormy ocean that is threatening us with immediate destruction. Shame on us. Sons of the Alamo, where is our faith in God and in ourselves? You ask, what will it cost us in sacrifice? My answer is that it may cost us more than we have been doing. Some may answer back surely you do not mean that we might have to give as much as the pioneers gave. My reply is that I do not know. But what of it? The poet was right when he said:

"Though love repine and reason chafe,
There comes a voice without reply
'Tis man's perdition to be safe,
When for the truth he ought to die."

Let us not flinch now. Let us not break stride. Let us not even hesitate. For "on the plains of hesitation lie the bleached bones of countless millions who at the dawn of victory sat down to rest and then awoke to die."

To Uvalde County I would say:

"Give us men to match our mountains
Give us men to match our plains
Men with empires in their purpose,
Men with eras in their brains."

Ponder the words of eloquent, post-Civil War Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, who said:

"Who saves his country saves himself, saves all things, and all things saved I do bless him. Who lets his country, die, lets all things die, dies himself ignobly, and all things dying, curse him."

During this centennial celebration there has been much reminiscing about people, places and achievements of the past. That was good. But I challenge you to start now on plans and projects for the second 100 years. Hats off to the past. Coats off to the future.

Excerpts From Remarks Made by Consul General Herve J. L'Heureux Before Export Study Club of Montreal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vital importance in the continuation of the excellent relations which have existed between Canada and the United States for considerably more than a century, and the imperative need in resolving quickly any apparent misunderstanding, I am pleased to include

in the RECORD excerpts from the remarks made by Consul General Herve J. L'Heureux before the Export Study Club of Montreal, at its tenth annual dinner meeting, on April 5, 1956.

A delegation of the Canadian Exporters' Association was in Washington on February 23, 1956, for the purpose of discussing Canada-United States trade relations. One of the major problems raised was the fact that the United States last year sold Canada $850 million more goods than Canada sold to the United States.

In his address to the Export Study Club of Montreal, Mr. L'Heureux gave a clear explanation of the reasons for such an adverse trade balance in favor of the United States; and he pointed out that the result may be that of a "healthy expanding economy demanding large amounts of investment capital" on the part of Canada.

I am happy to state that Mr. L'Heureux is a native of Manchester, N. H. He has been an able and distinguished member of the Foreign Service since 1927. He is one of New Hampshire's outstanding citizens, and one in whom we feel great pride. He is well known on Capitol Hill, where he worked his way through school from 1919 to 1927. While Chief of the Visa Division from 1947 to 1951, his work was so effective and his relations with the Members of Congress were so excellent that a special law was enacted unanimously authorizing the Secretary of State to retain him in that assignment for an additional year.

On November 1, 1955, Mr. L'Heureux assumed his present duties as consul general at Montreal with the personal rank of Minister. His appointment has been widely acclaimed by the Canadian press and by Canadians in every walk of life. Because of his wit, his great facility of expression, his keen sense of humor and his bilingual ability, he is increasingly being sought as a speaker by various groups. He has given 28 talks during the past 3 months, including several radio and television appearances. Mr. L'Heureux is doing an outstanding public-relations job in Montreal; and the administration is to be commended for having given him this delicate and important assignment.

Aside from his official duties, Mr. L'Heureux initiated a prayers-for-peace movement at Manchester, N. H., in October 1948, which has spread all over the world. The movement, very simply, calls upon all persons who believe in God to offer a silent prayer at 12 o'clock noon each day in order that a just and equitable peace might be established. Its adherents are called minute men of prayer. They number in the millions. Reference is made to this movement, daily at noon, by two of the leading radio stations in Montreal.

Many leading officials, industrialists, and businessmen have commented that the United States is well represented in Montreal. One prominent banker has proclaimed: "L'Heureux is the greatest import Montreal has received from the United States in many years."

Excerpts from the speech follow:

It is with a sense of high privilege and deep gratitude that I accepted your invitation to participate in your 10th annual dinner meeting today. The study and exchange of information on problems pertaining to foreign trade, which is the primary object of the Export Study Club of Montreal, together with other similar groups sponsored by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Inc., contribute very substantially to the economic well-being and better understanding in our respective country.

Canada, like the United States, is being called upon increasingly to play a leading role in world affairs. She has accepted this challenge with courage and determination. The counsels of her astute statesmen have been sought and listened to in the United Nations and in other international deliberations. Her ascendency in the political sphere of the world has been increasingly evident.

Moreover, Canada's economic development has shown signs of great expansion. With this growth, increasing competition in world markets must be expected which, in turn, may reasonably give rise to more vital and tenacious differences of opinion between Canada and the United States.

In view of the common heritage, the many years of close friendship that has existed, and the complete candor that has characterized the political and commercial relations between our countries, I have no doubt that the people of Canada and the United States will be able to continue to endure sincere differences of opinion with entire equanimity.

But friendship, however long it may have existed, or mutual may be its foundations, must never be taken for granted and neglected. It must continually be cultivated; and one of the most effective means of cultivation is through study and understanding of mutual—or the other's—problems. Your study group is dedicated to this very purpose; and that is why I am so glad that you have given me the opportunity of being with you today to present, for your study and consideration, a comment on United States-Canadian trade.

In a speech last autumn, your distinguished Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, commented that the day-to-day problems between Canada and the United States are now more numerous and more complicated than with any other single country. Most of these problems are perhaps to be found in the economic field.

You recall that on February 23, 1956, a delegation from the board of directors of the Canadian Exporters' Association met with United States Administration officials in Washington for the purpose of discussing Canada-United States trade relations. One of the major problems, among several others, discussed at that meeting was the fact that the United States last year sold Canada $850 million more goods than Canada sold to the United States. The discussions, which were held on a very high governmental level, were exceedingly frank, positive, and helpful. Both sides became familiar with and appreciative of the other's problems and point of view. The discussions will be continued and solutions will be sought through the existent, normal channels.

Considering the character of your study group, and the widespread interest and apparent concern in this problem of seemingly unbalanced trade, I raise and will comment upon the question: "Why is it that 16 million Canadians purchase more from the United States than 160 million Americans buy from Canada?"

The answer to this question can be found in large part by an examination of the structure of the foreign trade of the two countries and the relationship of this trade to the organization of their national economies. But it might perhaps be wise at first to dispel the concept that bilateralism and bilateral balance of trade are particularly desirable goals in themselves. After all, the most important advantage of the free-trade economy is the opportunity it offers to buy goods in any market without restrictions at the lowest possible price and, conversely, to sell in the market offering the highest return. This is obviously as sound business practice in domestic trade as it is in international trade. Why should Canada, for example, sell all its lumber to the United States to obtain a balance when it can get a higher return by offering at least some of these planks and boards to the United Kingdom or to Australia? Furthermore by such sales Canada to a certain extent can cancel its adverse balance with the United States.

In fact, lack of balance in a bilateral trade account can be considered as the rule rather than the exception and is, of course, not restricted to the United States and Canada. The United Kingdom traditionally purchases more from Canadians than it sells to them. To balance the account with the United Kingdom by buying more of their goods would mean that Canada would have to pay higher prices for merchandise than it at present obtains elsewhere. Selling and buying in those markets offering the most favorable returns gives the free-trade economy its multilateral (rather than bilateral) character and is of economic benefit to all the nations involved not only because of its greater profit but also because it induces and encourages a greater volume of trade.

That an adverse trade balance is implicitly wrong or dangerous is an old mercantilist doctrine. Actually an adverse balance, as it is in Canada, may only be a result of a healthy expanding economy demanding large amounts of investment capital. In the postwar years Canadian economic growth has been phenomenal. To make such growth possible heavy capitalist investments are necessary. A sizable proportion of this capital has been provided from sources outside Canada, largely the United States. When a country borrows capital abroad for investment, it is a natural phenomenon for that capital to be transferred in the form of goods. By importing more goods than it exports, the capital transfer is made effective by the borrower. The Canadian adverse trade balance then is a result of a healthy and rapidly growing economy, whose expansion is aided by large amounts of foreign capital. Conversely, the United States as a capital-exporting country will export more goods than it imports.

With these thoughts in mind, we can examine United States and Canadian trade figures with a more judicious eye. More important than the balance of trade are the significant facts that Canada and the United States are each other's best customer and that no two other countries in the world exchange so great a volume of merchandise.

Canadian exports and imports to all countries and to the United States, 1953–55

[Millions of dollars]

	Exports (all countries)	United States	Imports (all countries)	United States
1953	4,173	2,463	4,383	3,221
1954	3,947	2,367	4,093	2,961
1955	4,351	2,612	4,712	3,452

To pinpoint the data relating to our question more directly, it should be noted that approximately 60 percent of all Canadian exports from 1953–55 have gone to the United States and about 73 percent of imports have come from the United States. While capital inflow, as noted above, offers an explanation for the adverse balance phenomenon, it is necessary to examine the structure of the

trade and economy of the two countries to discover not only why the trade is adverse but how it can be that Canada, with a population approximately one-tenth that of the United States, buys more from the United States than the 160 million Americans buy from Canada.

From an international trade viewpoint, the structure of the economies of the United States and of Canada differ markedly. The contrast has largely arisen not as a result of deliberate policy but from basic differences in resources, in climate, and in stage of development.

Canada's exports to the world, for example, are concentrated upon a relatively limited number of commodities in which it has certain natural or competitive advantages. These articles enter international trade channels because they can be offered at prices equal to or lower than those prevailing in consuming countries. With extensive softwood forest resources readily accessible Canada has long been known for its forest products, notably newsprint and lumber. Intensive exploration and development of mineral resources has placed Canada into the forefront in the production and processing of such nonferrous metals as nickel and aluminum. In wheat and other grains harvested from its rich prairie soils Canada has a well-recognized quality product. Products from such resources comprise the bulk of goods shipped into markets abroad. In the last 3 years, 1953 to 1955, approximately three-fourths of all Canadian exports have been products of agriculture (largely grains) wood, and nonferrous metals.

From many of the leading commodities that Canada has to offer in trade, the United States buys an extremely large share, in the case of wood, wood products, and paper an average of close to 80 percent for the past 3 years.

Exports from Canada of wood, wood products, and paper to all countries and to the United States

[Millions of dollars]

	All countries	United States
1953	1,295.4	1,091.5
1954	1,377.8	1,107.4
1955	1,520.0	1,221.0

In some individual items of great importance, such as newsprint, the United States may buy as much as 85 percent to 90 percent of what Canada offers abroad.

This story can be repeated in nonferrous metals, of which fine nickel is an outstanding item. With total exports of $108 million in 1954, the United States purchased $101 million, or about 95 percent.

The Canadian and United States economies are not completely complementary but are in many instances competitive—in wheat, for example. Since the United States produces far more wheat than it can use domestically, the United States is not a consumer of the Canadian products but a competitor in the world market. However, volume of trade indicates that the two economies are far more complementary than they are competitive.

Canada, then, is able to maintain its high standard of living by concentrating upon the production of those items in which it has a comparative and competitive advantage and by exchanging these goods for a wide variety of items that cannot be produced in Canada, i. e., cotton, rubber, tin, or that can be manufactured abroad comparatively more cheaply than it can be made in Canada.

In sharp contrast to this orientation of Canada, a country which satisfies so many of its basic needs by foreign trade, stands the United States, also a power of continental proportions. With a tremendous variety of resources, a large population, and a highly ramified industrial and agricultural structure, the United States is easily able to find within its own borders so many of the items that Canada must seek abroad. The total amount of goods and services produced, the gross national product, compared to the total value of foreign trade—exports plus imports—highlights the contrast between the two countries.

In 1954, for example, the gross national product in the United States was about $357 billion, while the total foreign trade was $25 billion, or only about 7 percent. For that same year in Canada, the gross national product was estimated at $24 billion, but total foreign commerce was $8 billion, 33⅓ percent of the gross national product. If these billions in trade are brought down to an individual basis—total foreign trade divided by total population for per capita figure—perhaps, then, differences may become even more meaningful. While the volume of United States trade is so much greater than that of Canada, the per capita data emphasizes the differing degrees of dependence on foreign trade. Again, in 1954, per capita foreign trade amounted to approximately $536 in Canada but only $156 in the United States.

In essence, then, the expanding Canadian economy creates a demand for foreign capital that results in an adverse trade balance, that is, more imports than exports. To gain a high standard of living, Canada has developed an economy that is greatly dependent upon foreign commerce for its health and prosperity. Specializing in the production of a rather limited number of commodities in which it has certain natural advantages, Canada exchanges these products on the world market for the consumer and industrial goods that it cannot produce as cheaply at home. Sixteen million Canadians purchase more from the United States than 160 million Americans buy from Canada because those 16 million Canadians are far more directly dependent for their prosperity upon foreign trade than are 160 million Americans. Canada must buy abroad the many items the American can find so easily within his own borders. Because the United States is the cheapest and most readily available source of supply, Canadians purchase so much more from the United States than from other countries. In iron and its products, by far the largest class of Canadian imports—comprising about 30 percent of total imports in the past few years—the United States was the source for more than 85 percent of the goods; being so highly industrialized, the United States can so easily provide the many thousands of items that comprise an iron and steel schedule and that are so necessary to the expanding and wealthy economy of Canada.

Imports into Canada 1953 and 1954

[Millions of dollars]

	1953	1954
Total (all merchandise)	4,383	4,093
Iron and steel products:		
All countries	1,532	1,322
United States only	1,325	1,144

Conversely for those products in which Canada specializes and in which it complements the United States economy, that is, wood products and nonferrous metals, the United States is by far Canada's most important customer. As the Canadian economy expands and offers a greater variety of products, the United States will continue to purchase enormous amounts of goods. A number of outstanding examples of these changes in trade can be mentioned. With the development of extensive iron-ore beds in the north, Canada has reversed its position from a net importer of United States iron ore to that of a net exporter to the United States. The discovery and exploration of oil beds in the west has made Canada less dependent upon other countries for its needs and has also provided another important product exported to the United States.

It might be submitted, therefore, that this seeming imbalance in United States-Canadian trade is a perfectly healthy, normal situation; and yet, as a simultaneous occurrence, the very existence of this gap is a challenge to those in the export field. The delegation of the Canadian Exporters' Association to Washington last February spoke to the White House representatives of a fear complex which some Canadian exporters have in approaching the United States market, a psychological bloc set up by, among other things, unfortunate or discouraging experiences with United States customs authorities which, I hope, were due more to misunderstandings than intent. Let me suggest that this $850 million we have been discussing ought to have a tremendous counterbalancing effect, psychologically. As far as the simple exchange of consumer goods is concerned, those dollars are there in United States pockets, and it is up to the Canadian producer and the Canadian exporter to lure them back with quality, price, and service that will make purchase on the Canadian market more attractive than purchase farther afield, or more attractive than spending those dollars for investments.

With reference to that fear of entry into the American market, which the delegation of the Canadian Exporters' Association brought to the attention of the United States, it is my understanding that it was agreed at the meeting in Washington on February 23, 1956, that if Canadian exporters should run into specific difficulties, such as what might appear as customs inequities, they should bring such problems to the attention of appropriate authorities in Ottawa and Washington. This can be done through Canadian business associations, such as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which can inform the Canadian Ministry of Trade and Commerce and thus gain the assistance of Canadian Trade Commissioners in the United States. It can also be done by directing inquiries to the United States consulate general here in Montreal, to our Embassy in Ottawa, or to the other United States consular offices situated in major cities across Canada.

In conclusion, I again emphasize what I have repeatedly stated in talks to other groups: While representing the interests of the United States in your midst, I would consider my job less than well done if I did not also act as aid and interpreter of your country, and of Canadian businessmen in the Montreal district, in dealing with the United States. Whenever problems arise in your business in which you believe my office can assist, I hope you will remember this; and every effort will be made to help you as quickly and as efficiently as possible. That spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding to which I referred in opening these remarks can best be continued by frank and open discussions of our differences. If the minor irritations which might be solved by early attention are brought forth as they arise, then there should be no accumulation of petty annoyances growing out of all proportion into serious misunderstandings. The strength of the free world today depends so much upon the continued cooperation of Canada and the United States that misunderstandings must be kept at an absolute minimum, not only for our own benefit, but for that of other nations who looks to us as leaders and outstanding examples of harmonious existence.

The affinity which has endured for so many years between our respective people must not be permitted to become impaired by useless misunderstandings in the field of trade and

commerce. You enjoy the respect, admiration, and affection of the overwhelming mass of the people of the United States. We rejoice in the fact that our Nation is blessed in having you as our partners to the north. Let it ever be thus.

Address of Former President Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to bring to the attention of the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of former President Harry S. Truman, one who will be reported in the annals of history as one of the great Presidents of the United States. It is significant that he spoke at a dinner honoring the Honorable Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, on the occasion of the presentation of the four freedoms award to Governor Harriman. Governor Harriman as our Ambassador to Russia will be remembered as one of the first to alert the United States and the free world of the insincerity and true objectives of the leaders of the Kremlin.

The address follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES HARRY S. TRUMAN AT THE FOUR FREEDOMS AWARD DINNER HELD IN HONOR OF THE 1956 AWARD RECIPIENT, THE HONORABLE AVERELL HARRIMAN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, IN THE GRAND BALLROOM OF THE SHERATON-ASTOR HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, ON MAY 9, 1956

It is quite an honor and a privilege for me to be with you tonight to make the presentation to my good friend Averell Harriman. * * * I'm very glad you invited me to make this presentation of the four freedoms award because I don't think there is a man in the United States whom I think more highly of than I do of that one sitting right here—Averell Harriman.

I know Governor Harriman very well and I cannot think of anyone who is more worthy of this award.

Few men have done more to protect and expand the four freedoms throughout the world.

For many years—and through some of the most critical episodes in history—Averell Harriman has been a tireless worker in the cause of the four freedoms. Today, he is cultivating them, strengthening them, and stimulating their growth in the soil of his home State of New York—and the great State of New York doesn't need that any worse than the other 47 do.

His work for the four freedoms began under President Franklin D. Roosevelt—the man who formulated them and placed them before the world as the goal of all free people, all the free peoples in the whole world.

Time passes and events lose their freshness in our minds. Now it is important to remember that President Roosevelt launched his conception of the four freedoms not in a time of peace—not in an atmosphere of optimism—but at a time of the greatest national peril. The four freedoms were the climax of his state of the Union message on January 6, 1941, and I sat right down in front of him when he read that message—when he came before the Congress and said that "at no previous time has American security been as seriously threatened from without as it is today."

That was the time, you remember, when three powerful dictatorships—the German, the Russian, and the Japanese—had banded together in an onslaught upon the divided and unarmed nations of the free world. That was the time when Britain stood alone under a rain of Nazi bombs, and if you remember that great speech of Winston Churchill in which he said that all we can do is to give our sweat, blood, and tears, we will come out of this. And we did. That was the time when the whole world trembled before the prospect that the dictatorships would violently overwhelm human liberty all over the globe. President Roosevelt's annual message to the Congress called for stepping up our defense program and for the launching of a lend-lease program. The outlook was dark and grim, but at the end of that speech the President looked forward into the future and envisioned a world founded upon four essential human freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

That was more than a battle cry. It was a vision of hope placed before the peoples of the world.

President Roosevelt himself said that a world based on the four freedoms was not a vision "of a distant millenium." "It is," he said, "a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation, and I am here to say to you that we are still trying to attain it and we shall eventually—I am sure of that as I am that we stand here."

In that spirit, this Nation went forward, first as the arsenal of democracy, and then as a belligerent in the dreadful war that was forced upon us. In that spirit, this Nation led the free peoples out of the darkness and peril which seemed about to engulf them, toward peace and a world organization to guarantee the peace, and that organization is working concretely today, thank God.

That is the spirit which we need today if we are to overcome the perils that again beset us. That is the glowing faith we need if we are to continue to lead the free nations toward a world based on the principles of the four freedoms.

Averell Harriman is a man who understands this vision. He has worked with a wisdom and a skill that few others possess to make that vision a reality.

Shortly after I became President, he returned from his post in Moscow to tell me that the Russians were threatening to block and sabotage the peace that was almost within our grasp. Averell Harriman was right then, and he has been right since about the Russian threat to peace and freedom. He was not taken in, as so many other political leaders were at that time, by Russian avowals of peaceful intent. He is not taken in today, as so many of our leaders seem to be, by the smile on the face of the Kremlin.

Freedom cannot be preserved just by wishful thinking. We need leaders who recognize threats to freedom—no matter how cleverly disguised—and who take vigorous and clearheaded action to meet them.

The Soviet Government is the enemy of freedom today as it was in 1941 and 1945. But the danger at this moment lies not so much in Russian threats of force—serious and ominous as these still are—as in Russian intrigues and in their fake promises to help the cause of freedom. The present rulers of Russia are spreading a trap before the free peoples of the world. They are baiting this trap not only with smiles and bogus joviality, but with lavish promises of economic aid.

This is a dangerous trap. But for poverty-stricken peoples in the underdeveloped countries of the world, it has a powerful attraction.

The first and greatest demand of millions of people all over the world today is freedom from want. This demand is impatient and irresistible. It is voiced with increasing intensity by millions of people from Latin America through Africa and across the continent and the islands of Asia.

Russia says: "We will satisfy these demands. Listen to us, adopt our ways, accept our aid, tie your economic system to ours and you can have freedom from want."

The Russians do not tell the millions of Asia and Africa the rest of the story. They don't tell them that Russian aid will be accompanied by subjugation to the Communist dictatorship—that this means the loss of freedom of speech, that it means the destruction of freedom of worship, that it means enslavement to the tyranny of fear. Actually, this is what their offer does mean. But all too many people are willing to overlook the devil's side of the bargain if they can get help in their struggle against poverty.

There is only one answer to this new and insidious Soviet offensive. And that is to show by word and deed that our way—and not the Russian way—can alone offer freedom from want together with freedom from fear, freedom of worship, and freedom of speech.

We must rise to this challenge and make this answer. Every year the cry of humanity for a better economic life becomes more and more insistent. Looking forward to 1941 through doubtful years of war, President Roosevelt knew that this would be the great problem of the future. When I was inaugurated, in 1949, after the 1948 election that couldn't be won, the problem had become much clearer. I sought to meet it, at least in part, with the point 4 program.

Those were years, during my administration, when some of the best talent in the United States was harnessed to the task of economic rehabilitation and economic progress for the world.

These men worked hard and came up with practical plans. They were not interested in contriving homilies or compiling a dictionary of platitudes. They came up with plans for action, plans that worked—the Marshall plan for example, the mutual-aid program, the point 4 program—and other measures of this kind. And a nation united in its foreign policy helped to put these practical measures into effect.

I do not remember that we tried to pin a partisan label on those measures. We called on men, regardless of party, in the executive branch of the Government and in the legislative branch to formulate these measures and make them work. And we called on men, regardless of party, to administer them in Washington and in our missions abroad. The names of many eminent Republicans are on the honor roll of those years, and I am proud and happy that a Democratic administration put them there.

I might add that it is no credit to the present Republican administration that it has excluded most of these Republican names and all the Democratic ones from the list of those whom they have called to work on the Nation's foreign policy.

One of the men who carried the heaviest burdens in those creative years in American foreign economic policy was Averell Harriman. We miss his wisdom and energy and sure touch in our foreign policy today.

Averell Harriman had a leading part in formulating the Marshall plan. Then I sent him to Paris to carry it out, and after it had become a living reality and had lifted Europe to a new level of economic activity I called him back to the White House to help plan new measures for the economic strengthening of the free world. I then put him in charge of planning for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and finally he became the Director of Mutual Security, in charge of the national effort to bolster the free world.

These were vital tasks in building the four freedoms, especially freedom from want and

freedom from fear. We had to build a military shield to protect the free peoples from the fear of aggression. Behind that shield we had to build up their economic life.

Today, Russian strategy has changed on the surface. But the Russian threat remains. Behind the Russian smiles and the Russian promises for better things, there is still that weapon of fear. In an outburst in England the other day, one of the present leaders of Russia told his audience that the Soviet Union will soon have the absolute weapon, a guided missile with the hydrogen warhead. And he added: "Never shake your fist at a Russian." And I want to tell you that the best thing you can do is shake a fist at them.

That is the same old bullying to which the free world has been subjected since the end of World War II. And I have no doubt that if and when the Russians get that absolute weapon, the element of fear will move to the forefront of their strategy and their threats will become more violent and more frightening.

To meet the Soviet threat to freedom we must maintain and improve our defenses. We must keep our lead, whatever the cost, in airpower and atomic weapons. You know there has been a lot of weeping and wailing and shedding of tears over the fact that we had to use an atomic weapon to bring World War II to an end in Japan. It was necessary—it saved a half million lives—a quarter million Japanese and a quarter million Americans and accomplished its purpose in war. Now our objective is to harness the terrific power of released atomic energy for peace. Nobel, the Swedish scientist who discovered nitroglycerin, the most destructive power of his day, thought that it would cause the destruction of his world. He set up a foundation to give prizes for work toward peace, for scientific advances, and for distinguished work in art. Nobel's foundation was one of the greatest things ever done in the world, but he set it up because he thought that dynamite would bring the world to destruction. Now, I'll say to you that when we finally discover proper means of using atomic fission for the welfare and benefit of the peoples of the world, we will have made a contribution which will make nitroglycerin look like a glass of water in comparison. And our contribution will be for the benefit of the world, don't let anybody tell you anything different. But in all this we must be true to ourselves. We must stand before the world as we really are—powerful, yes, but generous, peace-loving and honest—that word "honest" is not in the Russian dictionary.

We are not true to ourselves if we threaten to use the atomic weapons unilaterally. We are not true to ourselves when we talk about massive retaliation, or when we try to coerce small nations into military pacts.

Today, in some parts of the world, the people believe that we, the United States of America, are a threat to world peace. These misguided people fear us. They think of us as an imperialistic Nation run by greedy capitalists—cruel to the poor and heedless of the rights of the weak. They do not understand that we truly desire independence for subjugated peoples. They do not understand that our capitalism is based on a system of social insurance and social benefits for the common man, and on a sense of government responsibility for the general welfare. You know it took us 150 years to find out that the preamble to the Constitution provided for the general welfare and along with the Roosevelt administration we began to put it to work. These people do not understand that we are creating an economic and social system which, far from being cruel to the poor, offers employment and opportunity for everybody.

Of course, these misconceptions are due in part to Communist propaganda. But they are also the result of the foolish statements and reckless conduct of some of our own leaders in foreign affairs. In recent years, our Government has not helped us to stand before the world as we really are.

The real American self—our true self—is in a sense epitomized by the career of the man to whom you have voted your award this year. Here you have a capitalist who has long been engaged in the war on poverty throughout the world. Here you have a businessman who is working to expand social security, to support the income of farmers, and to expand and protect civil rights and civil liberties of all our citizens. Here you have a believer in private enterprise, once active in investing American dollars abroad, who—far from being an imperialist—has given his best efforts to secure and protect the freedom of other countries. Averell Harriman is a man who combines the practical commonsense and creative ingenuity of American business with the democratic and humanitarian impulses that make our country great.

I want to congratulate you, Judge, and all the members of this Four Freedoms Organization for choosing Averell Harriman as recipient of this award. And it is with great pleasure, Averell, that I bestow this award on you.

The Displaced Shopkeeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of May 10, 1956. It deals with an important problem, which is receiving the continuous attention of the House Small Business Committee:

THE DISPLACED SHOPKEEPER

A frequent casualty of slum clearance for public housing, both low rent and middle income, is the displaced shopkeeper. The displaced housing tenant is also a problem, and opinions differ on how well he is handled, but some attention at least is given to him. But the shopkeeper is likely to be a forgotten man when a site is cleared.

New York City Housing Authority current policy, with certain exceptions, is to build store space only if it has to. The theory is that subsidized public housing should not go into a competing business, of renting store space or providing competition with merchants across the street from housing projects. Ordinarily when a block is cleared, or several blocks, and new, modern housing goes up, the surrounding area is rejuvenated, old stores are refurbished and new ones built.

But it has been recognized at the Housing Authority that such a policy, even if generally sound, leaves highly regrettable consequences in some projects. On March 21 Warren Moscow, executive director of the authority, announced that East Harlem shopkeepers displaced by several new projects would get priority to return to the site's new housing similar to that granted residential tenants. This policy, applying to East Harlem only, was prompted by the fact that slum clearance had displaced 1,500 to 1,600 stores since 1940. Stores are being put into two East Harlem sites. But on these 2 sites there were originally 186 stores, as against 44 new spaces to be built. On five other projects elsewhere in the city the authority is now studying the store question. In clearance for title I work the setting aside of some land to be privately acquired for shopping sites is a solution.

Hardship to storekeepers previously on a site to be cleared is, of course, one major consideration, and the man worst hurt is usually the "little fellow," a marginal operator, whose fixtures bring little at condemnation, and who finds it hard to start in business again elsewhere.

Another consideration, pertinent to some larger projects but not necessarily all, would seem to be the convenience of new residential tenants, who would benefit if the projects installed store space on the outer fringes. Certainly the whole question deserves review and the illumination of debate, sure to follow, over Government versus private enterprise. The small, independent shopkeeper is a neighborhood feature of New York City. We wouldn't want to lose him.

New Horizons for Banking Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent approved by the House, I am including an interesting and informative address by the distinguished educator and administrator Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University. Dean Malott was reared in Abilene, Kans. He is former chancellor of the Kansas State University:

To be with you today is for me a high honor indeed. As the black sheep in a Kansas banking family, I have personally known three generations of KBA executives, and those Kansas bankers whom I feel I know through your friendship over the years for my father, who was president of this association 43 years ago, are legion.

As your 69th annual convention draws to a close, I shall draw you away entirely from your professional problems of loans and discount rates, of service charges and time deposits, of credit files, and banking policies. I shall not even discuss the wheat outlook or the weather, for there are still enough optimists among you, I know, to unfurl your umbrellas whenever a cloud is reported over Western Kansas.

Rather, would I talk to you briefly about your community leadership, that personal responsibility devolving upon you by virtue of the prestige which is yours and from which you cannot escape. The future life of America, some segment of it, lies at your disposal, and the account of your stewardship will be indelibly written on the history books down the long years of the future.

This responsible leadership is not met by the successful record of your loans, by the skillful manipulation of your investment portfolios, or by your dividend rate, but by what you are doing in your community, be it large or small, to channel the people's thinking into sound solutions for the great national and international problems upon which you must be both informed and articulate, effective leaders at the grassroots of America.

I shall discuss with you some of these great problems as they present themselves today; I shall conclude with some of the problems of education which have, I believe, a bearing on the kind of America our grandchildren will inherit, and in the solution of which your help is needed.

I am concerned first of all by what appears to be a growing divergence between our stated national aims and our specific actions—a divergence sufficient to jeopardize our moral leadership. We talk about the equality of men under our Constitution, and, when this great concept is defended by the United States Supreme Court, we go through such antics of irrational behavior as to demonstrate to all and sundry that we do not mean what we say.

We have supported the United Nations as a federation of sovereign states; but we have negated this policy, by allowing Russia to bring in some of her constituent units under a false guise of sovereignty. Yet I have heard nothing about giving Texas or New York separate and additional membership in that important deliberative body.

We have been hazy and indecisive about our policies in Asia, a renascent focal point of political and economic power. We deplore Communist China; we rightfully criticize her but, by our refusal to consider her for United Nations membership, we give her no opportunity for those "face-saving" rituals so vital to Oriental diplomacy. In the meantime, she joins Russia in an ever-tightening mutual embrace, as we slowly lose any bargaining power with her, against the inevitable day when she will most certainly be admitted alongside Nationalist China into the United Nations framework.

In Burma, Prime Minister U Nu seeks American help but proudly rejects a dole and wants some quid pro quo. The only "quid" in this case is her exportable rice crop, but we are stocked long on rice, and while we chew our fingers in the dilemma, Russia buys the rice in exchange for manufactured goods and technical advice, possible first step in Communist infiltration. Ten million dollars for rice or teak wood may have been saved by our ineptness; the price may be at the expense of freedom for all Southeast Asia.

It should be clear by this time to every American that the Communist-free world struggle is more than competition for intercontinental missiles and atomic weapons, but rather will be fought on the economic level. With the change from Stalin to Khrushchev and Bulganin, the battering-ram has given way to the termite, the latter a far more subtle and insidious weapon. America's lack of affirmative policy, as our State Department officials fly nervously over the globe from conclave to conclave, gives evidence of unreadiness for wars of erosion. The American people must help to determine upon and to back an imaginative, bold, and sensitive policy in Asia. Is it too much to expect that incomparably strong and rich America might somehow find a genuine program of help to these economically and politically weak nations of the East, who have the same desire to be independent, free, and self-sufficient democracies that we so successfully aspired for in 1775?

In the Near East lies perhaps the world's tinder-box of the moment. Few Americans seem aware of the peril. Militant Zionism, created largely out of the revolt from the pogroms and peregrinations of Adolph Hitler, cut a new nation out the ancient pattern of the Arab world. There is justice on both sides of the dispute; our every effort should be to calm the troubled desert sands, to create the necessary give and take to preserve stability. For remember, on the borders of these restless countries lie the greatest oil resources in all the world. And just beyond stretch the limitless miles of the Iron Curtain. A blazing war might screen a raid by the oil-hungry Russian bear—a raid which if successful in cutting off this oil supply from the free world, would, in the short space of days, stifle and bring to complete stagnation the economic life, first of Europe, and then of America. These are shattering realities to which Americans are somehow blinded in this great era of prosperity—a prosperity more and more resting on the unstable foundation of all kinds of expanding credit.

Internally, the Nation is dazzled to the point of blindness by the radiance of our somewhat lopsided industrial prosperity. Installment borrowing is growing apace, the Federal budget expands and with it a Federal deficit which in volume staggers our conception; how, or when, or whether this deficit will ever be paid or even its growth halted, is scarcely ever discussed. It was, once upon a time, a subject of vigorous debate; it is now complacently accepted with all too little thought, even in recent weeks, of its eventual impact on the next generation or the next.

America seems committed to a slow inflation, a concept as difficult to envisage as Einstein's postulate of a mushrooming universe.

The fact that Government has assumed responsibility for, and will in the future exert a direct and energetic leadership in, the Nation's economic destinies, is one of the little recognized changes which have come over our national life. Geoffrey Crowther, writing in a recent issue of the Economist, points out how the same thing happened in England. In the last 20 years, he says, "by far the most far-reaching change has been the assumption by the state of responsibility for the condition of the national economy."

In our own country, national policies over the economy were invoked during the depression of the thirties. First, there were experimental and emergency attempts, largely invoked by the Chief Executive, to correct the disastrous trend of the economy, through his responsibilities for the natinal welfare. By slow decay, both of our personal freedoms and of our very desire to be self-respecting and self-sustaining individuals, we have now, as a major and permanent concept of Government, a Federal program of protection from the cradle to the grave; social security for ever-widening segments of the population; sickness and hospitalization protection; unemployment insurance; labor unions exempt from the restrictions designed to keep business enterprises competitive; and Federal grants for everything from lunches for school children (a large proportion of whom do not need them), to practically every segment of the population who can band together into a group of special pleading. Even educators—who ought to know better—are stampeding to get their feet into the Federal trough through all kinds of proposals for direct aid to education.

I have only to hear of a special grant to Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey to know we are approaching, full circle, those trends which caused the fall of the Roman civilization, where the emperor was finally expected to provide food and entertainment for all the populace, with not enough producing power left to pay the bills or to furnish the taxes. Parenthetically, Rome, of course, might have lasted a bit longer with the credit machinery of Treasury bills and the powerful controls of the Federal Reserve System.

Macaulay, recently quoted by a leading business executive, sounded a warning, back in 1857: "Either some Caesar or Napoleon," he wrote, "will seize the reins of Government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman empire was in the 5th—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

For further and later reference and corroboration, look under the "M's" for Mussolini, under the "S's" for Stalin, and under the "H's" for Hitler. But, on the other hand, while you are looking cast your eye down under the "A's" to the American people, whom somehow we must count upon, as we have always been able to before, to come to their senses in time, and we may hope in this instance, to realize before it is too late, that government produces nothing; and that what it bestows upon one it must take away from another. And we cannot always be on the receiving end. We must somehow be made eternally and everlastingly aware that: "There is always free cheese in a mousetrap."

Now, of course, there is no sure and known specific for all the economic and political ills of these sensitive times. But there are points of view, attitudes of mind, to which I should like to call your attention. I am talking to you, not to the Kansas Bankers Association, but to each individual "you" who in your own community, in your own orbit of activity and contact, can help to establish these attitudes which to me seem so important as America makes up its collective mind on these grave issues.

The first attitude I call upon you to adopt is to be willing to take some time each week for serious reading and discussion of the great issues of the day, that you may form a hard core of personal opinion, and exert an influence upon others in your community, consistent with the banker's prestige and leadership.

The second attitude is to try to look in terms of decades, not of years. Only in that way can you avoid the excursions and alarms that constitute the daily grist of rumor, recrimination, exhibitionism, complacency, fear, gossip, and braggadocio which so fills our lives. On the 20-year look, we can more easily evaluate the $50 billion which the United States has given away abroad since the Second World War; we can look with some assurance over into the year perhaps some two decades hence when it is expected one-half of all our energy and power will be produced by nuclear fission; we can look upon the probable effects on world peace, of a balance of military power so nearly equal between the free and slave states as to constitute a new and protective element never before present in modern history—the defending powers as ready and as mighty as the potential aggressor nations. Over the long view, too, we can look with equanimity at the dislocating changes which automation is inevitably creating in industrial America. While the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report traces a drop in the work week from 70 hours in 1850 to an averages of just over 40 in the 1950's, a mere century later, it also predicts that automation will create 15 million more jobs by the mid-1960's. More work to do; more workers to do it; more people with more leisure to enjoy.

And this new freedom of leisure and the rising population, brings me to my third point, so essential to the long look as we face the future. Here I become the schoolmaster incarnate, the special pleader of the chosen profession of this black sheep of a banking family, and speak in the role of a university president. I represent the merchandiser of ideas and ideals, the operator of the type of enterprise by which the storms and stresses of today may be forged into the civilization of tomorrow.

Kansas has always supported education. The growth and distinction of our State institutions of higher learning, and the stature of our endowed colleges attest to Kansas people's interest decade after decade.

It has been over 90 years since a bridge keeper in central Kansas recounted the passage of 4,472 wagons, 5,197 men, 7,669 horses and mules, and 38,281 oxen whose combined efforts transported in a 6-month period in 1865 more than 26 million pounds of freight over the old Santa Fe Trail.

The pioneer spirit was then in full flower. It has gone on to carve out of Kansas the heartland of a great agricultural and industrial empire. I like to speculate on the part which the devotion of Kansas people to education has played in this development since the first school was established in Kansas Territory on January 16, 1855, in Lawrence, under the determined leadership of the New England Emigrant Aid Society.

The population of Kansas in the college age group is simply bound to grow in the decades ahead and if the immediate past is any criterion, the proportion in that age group which will seek a college and university education is growing also.

Statistics are too difficult to handle in an address of this sort. Suffice it to say that Kansas must inevitably provide more resources—more and more—for its colleges and universities in the years ahead. This money can come from only three major sources—the Legislature of Kansas; gifts, aids, and bequests from eleemosynary foundations, from corporations, and business, and from individuals; or the burden can be further shifted to the Federal Government.

The legislature has wisely and forthrightly backed the State colleges and the University of Kansas, but it acts always and properly in reflecting the sentiment and desires of the Kansas people. Again, I say, you are leaders of Kansas thought; is your shoulder to the wheel, are you exercising the foresight, are you helping to prepare our institutions in advance for the burden that is coming? It is no theoretical forecast we face; these youngsters are here now, alive, growing up in the elementary and junior high schools of the State. It takes time to prepare, even to adjust our minds to the exercise of the necessary future planning.

Other States have large programs already under way. Slowly, too, under the pressures of numbers, the gates are closing in State university after State university, to out-of-State applicants. Kansas must be prepared either to care for its own, or to reciprocate exchange of students on some stringent basis. Municipal universities face much the same problems.

Now a word in behalf of the privately endowed colleges which have played a vital part in Kansas education. I am sure the present chancellor of the university and the presidents of the State colleges would agree with me that it would be a calmity to have only publicly supported higher education in Kansas. The private colleges, small, selective, with the opportunity to be experimental, with emphasis on the vital field of the liberal arts, should and must survive. If they are to do so, it must not be up to the "other fellow," but up to you, too.

Corporate giving on the part of the large corporations has had a phenomenal growth in the past decade; indeed in the past 5 years. It is estimated by Keith Funston of the New York Stock Exchange that the corporations of America gave close to $100 million to education during 1955. Those that gave at all, either through their own charitable foundations or directly for charitable purposes, gave somewhere between .36 percent and .66 percent of net income before taxes, far below the 5-percent maximum deductible by corporations under Federal income-tax law. The present minimum needs of the endowed colleges and universities of the country, so it is estimated, are for gifts from these sources of around $300 million or roughly three times the present rate of support. To prepare adequately for the future will require even larger sums.

The Council for Financial Aid to Education, composed of a group of far-seeing business and professional men and women, is working toward that day when businesses will give perhaps 1 percent of net income for educational support.

But this means all business, not merely the great industrial corporations, or the great banks of New York City, but your institutions, too. Your stockholders must be as ready to contribute their fair share as the stockholders of General Motors or the Standard Oil of New Jersey. Here again your individual leadership is needed, so badly needed, to help pattern the future of America.

If you and the other business leaders fail, the Federal Government will take on the task, another and desperate step along that road of ancient Rome, with all of the drawbacks and dangers of a burgeoning bureaucracy. I make no apology for my plea to you. You need college and university men and women in your banks and in your customers' organizations, on the farms, and in the mills, and in the homes of Kansas.

Thomas Paine said many years ago that "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

We started out with the problems of America. I return to that starting point, in final defense of education and in quest of your support for it.

The statement attributed to the late Justice Robert Jackson, of course is true. He said, "one of the paradoxes of our time is that modern society needs to fear only the educated man. The primitive peoples of the earth constitute no menace. The most serious crimes against civilization can be committed only by educated and technically competent people."

But if education has given to the world diabolical power if placed in unscrupulous hands, it is equally true that only the educated man has at his command the sweep of history, the broad tolerance and understanding, the appreciation of values, the patience and the courage, to form policies and to implement decisions.

The great victories of tomorrow will not come from the guided missiles of the stratosphere, they will not come from bombarding miliary targets at supersonic speeds with nuclear warheads. Tomorrow, we must win, with its deep and hidden obscurities, the battle for the minds of men. Our military might, let us hope, has given us the time and the strength for this more important battle. May the bankers of Kansas ever be in the front line in such a clarion challenge to freedom's survival.

H. R. 11366, a Bill To Provide a National Veterans Cemetery in the First District of Florida

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill that would provide for an additional national cemetery on the central west coast of Florida. This is known as H. R. 11366.

Florida at the present time has had four cemetery sites recommended by the United States Army. These would include the present location in west Florida, reactivation of the St. Augustine site, a centrally located cemetery, and one in southeast Florida. My bill would provide location, provision for the site, and activation of the project in central Florida that has been recommended.

The veterans population of the State of Florida is increasing at such a tremendous pace that it is imperative we adequately provide for the final resting place of these men who qualify who have served our Nation. In the concentration of veterans on the central west coast of Florida we find that this need is particularly felt. The State is conservatively estimated to be the home of 650,000 veterans by 1960. The trend to the west coast will be particularly noticeable in the next few years and the facilities of Bay Pines Veterans Hospital attracts many of these men.

The many veterans associations of the State and particularly in the First District have urged this action after careful and thorough study of the problem as presented by the present influx of veterans. It is the unqualified opinion of the many communities in the area that this need is urgent.

Under the survey conducted by the Quartermaster General, as requested by the Committee on Military Affairs in 1945, it was proposed that a cemetery be established with a 250-mile radius of planned use. In the State of Florida a centrally located cemetery such as requested in my bill would fully meet this recommendation.

The importance and need of such a cemetery in view of the general requirements of 12,394,522 veterans of World War II, 134,415 Spanish War veterans, and 3,897,483 World War I veterans, is clear.

I urge favorable consideration and an early provision by the House of this needed supplement to the care of our veterans and their families.

Labor Against the Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most clearly stated articles in behalf of the labor union worker, that I have seen, is that from the pen of Suzanne La Follette, in the National Review, of April 11, 1956. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD:

LABOR AGAINST THE WORKERS
(By Suzanne La Follette)

On the pretext that only compulsory unionism can protect it from union busting, organized labor is demanding control over every American worker.

On February 7, a superior court judge in Indianapolis regretfully told 84 employees of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad that he lacked jurisdiction to protect them in their jobs. These men had resigned from various railway unions in protest against compulsory

unionism, and had joined the independent United Railroad Operating Crafts. Failing to get this union elected as their bargaining agent, they applied for readmission to their former unions, which refused to accept them and demanded their discharge under the terms of the B. & O.'s union-shop agreements. This act of vengeance—with which the B. & O. had no choice but to comply—deprived the road of the services of 84 experienced employees, and the men not only of their livelihood but of seniority and pension rights accruing to them from their years of service.

This case is one of several before the courts, brought by workers who object to being forced, as the price of employment, to join a private organization and pay taxes to its directors. One such case, *Hanson* v. *Union Pacific*, is expected to come before the Supreme Court this month. In this case the Nebraska supreme court has ruled that the union-shop provision of the Railway Labor Act violates the first and fifth amendments to the Federal Constitution, and the 15 railway labor unions against which the decision was directed are appealing. If the Supreme Court does not evade the constitutional issue, its decision will affect the future of every American worker. It will determine whether or not Congress has the right to permit forced unionization and to delegate the taxing power to organized labor in the form of union dues and assessments.

American workers with the courage to petition the courts for protection of their constitutional rights have arrayed against them the economic and political power of an organized labor movement which annually collects some half-billion dollars in union dues alone; a movement which has pressured Congress into granting it privileges and immunities that in 20 years have made it the most powerful labor organization in the world.

PROTECTION THEN PRIVILEGE

The National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 (known as Labor's Magna Carta) recognized and protected the right of workers to organize. In 1935 a rubber stamp New Deal Congress passed the Wagner Act, which greatly extended the scope and power of unionism. Among other privileges, it permitted the closed and union shops. It also set up the National Labor Relations Board to supervise labor-management disputes in industries engaged in interstate commerce.[1] In the thirties the CIO formed the left wing of the New Deal Party, and its Communist secretary, Lee Pressman, was not only influential in determining labor policy but exercised an effective veto on all Government hiring; which probably accounts for the fact that the NLRB was provided with one Communist member, a Communist secretary, and a plethora of Communist attorneys, regional directors and examiners whose policy it became never to give the employer a break.

During World War II, the War Labor Board, in a rather startling departure in public policy, imposed one form or another of compulsory unionism on industry. That is, assuming that patriotism wasn't enough to keep the unions from striking in wartime, the Board offered up the liberty of the individual worker as a bribe to organized labor. Even the bribe wasn't enough, as the Smith-Connally Act attests. The sacrifice of the individual not only failed to insure labor peace, but by turning workers over to the unions as a matter of Federal policy, it encouraged the arrogant expectations of organized labor.

By 1947 Labor had succeeded in alienating enough friends that it was unable to prevent the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, even over President Truman's veto. The act removed the most flagrant inequities of the previous law, in an attempt to give some protection to the rank-and-file worker, the employer, and the public. It outlawed closed-shop contracts (under which no worker may be hired who is not a member of the contracting union) but it continued to permit the union-shop contract (under which workers employed by the contracting employer must join the union within a specified time or forfeit their jobs, and of course the seniority and pension rights accruing from them). But it also (sec. 14b) excluded the union shop in those States where it would come into conflict with laws protecting the worker's right to join or not to join a union.

The benefits reaped by organized labor from Federal protection are evident, among other ways, in the increase of union membership from less than 4 million in 1935 to more than 16 million by 1952. Not all this increase represented voluntary membership. But neither was it entirely due to the closed or union shop; for by 1951, when Congress amended the Railway Labor Act to permit the union shop, the nonoperating railway unions had already organized 80 percent of the workers in their crafts.

The increase resulted, rather, from another privilege, known as "majority rule." As Dr. Leo Wolman has written, the labor leaders, encouraged by their phenomenal success, "conceived unions to be a species of government. As such it was to be expected that unions would rightfully and by law be made the sole and universal representative of all labor."

So labor demanded, and obtained from Congress, the provision that a union chosen as bargaining agent by a majority of those voting in an NLRB representation election becomes the exclusive bargaining agent of all employees, whether union or nonunion. This provision effectively excludes nonunion workers from dealing with their employers. Their legal disability and its implications are correctly described in a union brief presented in the famous Santa Fe case:

"With this vesting in the collective representative of the bargaining rights of all of the employees in a craft or class of service, the so-called liberty or right of each individual employee to contract privately for his own terms and conditions of employment has been greatly curtailed if not totally destroyed."

In other words, the nonunion worker has been absorbed involuntarily into the bargaining unit and has therefore no will or choice of his own. From this loss of liberty the brief drawns an ingenious inference:

"Modification of the collective-bargaining contract by the statutory collective bargaining representative [the union] is in effect, or comparable to, modification of an individual contract of employment by the employee himself, and, of course, one is not unlawfully deprived of a vested right when he agrees to a modification of his own contract."

This sounds like a pretty clear definition of a union privilege. But the unions shrewdly construe majority rule as a privilege enjoyed by nonunion workers. They call their nonunion captives free riders and use their legal disability as one of the main arguments for compulsory unionism—the argument that since they enjoy the benefits of union bargaining they should be forced to join up and pay union dues and assessments.

Armed with all this power, the unions, you might think, hardly need the union shop to protect them from union busting. Yet the newly united AFL–CIO has announced a campaign to bring all unorganized workers into the unions; and an important target of this campaign will be the State right-to-work laws. When the Railway Labor Act was amended in 1951 to permit the union shop, labor was able to persuade Congress to declare that the amendment superseded these State laws. It is now out to erase section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; which may help to explain Mr. George Meany's recent announcement to 60 labor tycoons assembled at Miami that the AFL–CIO plans to collect a voluntary contribution of $1 from each of its 18 million members, to be used for political activity this year.

OBJECT: MONOPOLY POWER

The object, then, of the union oligarchies is monopolistic control of the whole American labor market. They intend to make it impossible for any American worker to earn a living unless he joins a union and remains "in good standing"—that is, unless he pays union dues and assessments and obeys the orders of union officials. And they intend to enforce this monopoly by electing—at the expense of their captive members—State legislators, Congressmen and Senators, and even Presidents who can be depended upon to do their bidding. They are conducting a perfectly open conspiracy against the liberty of every American who has to earn his living. Their euphemism for this monopolistic power is "union security."

Union officials are surprisingly frank about what they are after. When Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, appeared on behalf of 21 railway unions to argue for the union-shop amendment to the Railway Labor Act, he made some significant admissions. Asked whether he thought the union shop would strengthen the unions in industrywide bargaining, he answered:

"No; I do not think it would affect the power of bargaining one way or another. * * * If I get a majority of the employees to vote for my union as the bargaining agent, I have got as much economic power * * * as I will ever have."

Further questioning elicited from Mr. Harrison the fact that what the unions wanted was to be able to collect dues and assessments from those who were not union members, and to obtain "disciplinary power" over them. Just what this meant he made clear to the Senate committee:

"Senator DONNELL. * * * you want to have the disciplinary power over these, at least 280,000 or 350,000 people, whatever that figure may be, who are not now members of the union? * * *

"Mr. HARRISON. Not only over those people but over all of our members.

"Senator DONNELL. * * * you want to have disciplinary power over your present membership which you already have?

"Mr. HARRISON. But not able to exercise because of the voluntary character of the membership."

The appetite for power seems to impair the capacity for logical thought: President George Meany of the AFL–CIO is one of the most eloquent enemies of Communist totalitarianism.)

This sinister ambition is a new development in the history of the American labor movement, fostered by labor's heady triumphs under the New Deal. The revered patriarch of the movement, Samuel Gompers, speaking in El Paso, Tex., in 1924, warned a trade union audience:

"I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty—the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come

[1] Federal labor laws are based on the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce between the States. There is great confusion, however, over Federal and State jurisdiction, since it is often hard to draw the line between intrastate and interstate commerce. This may lead to arbitrary rulings e. g., and NLRB ruling that a small Idaho firm selling and repairing farm machinery was engaged in interstate commerce.

from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible."

There are labor leaders today who echo this thought. Warren S. Stone, a past grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, has said:

"I do not believe in forcing a man to join a union. * * * It is contrary to the principles of free government and the Constitution of the United States to try to make him join. We of the engineers work willingly side by side with other engineers every day who do not belong to our union, though they enjoy without any objection on our part the advantages we have obtained. Some of them we would not have in the union; others we cannot get."

And the present grand chief of the Brotherhood, asked in an interview with U. S. News & World Report whether his organization had sought the union shop, answered:

"Not only did we not ask for it, the BLE was the only labor organization I know of which opposed it as a matter of policy * * *. Engineers just simply resent being told that they must join something. We still think that labor in the long run has a good enough product that you won't have to force men to join."

These views have become rare in the American labor movement. They may also be rare in the British labor movement, but they are backed by no less an authority than Charles Geddes, chairman of the British Trade Union Congress (and our ambitious labor tycoons might do worse than heed him):

"I do not believe the trade union movement in Great Britain can live for very much longer on the basis of compulsion * * *. Most people belong to us or starve whether they like our policies or not * * *. I believe the trade union card is an honor to be conferred, not a badge which signifies that you have got to do something whether you like it or not."

If American labor is to win its fight for compulsory unionism, our constitutional safeguards of liberty and property will have to be nullified by Supreme Court decision. Will the Court, under pressure from labor and its liberal supporters in and out of Government, disregard these constitutional guaranties? To do so, it must reverse its previous pronouncements on the right to work—for example, this one:

"There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their own working standards, a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all other persons who will not or cannot participate in union assemblies."

And this:

"Insofar as a man is deprived of the right to labor his liberty is restricted, his capacity to earn wages and acquire property is lessened, and he is denied the protection which the law affords those who are permitted to work. Liberty means more than freedom from servitude, and the constitutional guaranty (14th amendment) is an assurance that the citizen shall be protected in the right to use his powers of mind and body in any lawful calling."

These and similar pronouncements place the Court far ahead of Congress in its recognition of the meaning of individual liberty and its constitutional safeguards. There is reason, therefore, to hope that when the Court is faced with deciding whether or not Congress acted unconstitutionally in permitting the union shop, it will uphold liberty instead of labor.

THE DANGER OF COMPULSION

One often hears the argument from union sympathizers that since Congress has made the union shop merely permissive, the Federal laws involve no compulsion. The answer is that for a powerful labor oligarchy armed with congressional sanction of compulsory unionism and operating through industrywise unions, the sanction is sufficient. The rest can be accomplished through threats of stoppage, and through the tactics of discrimination and violence with which certain unions—most conspicuously the Teamsters and the International Longshoremen's Association—have made the American public familiar.

These tactics are employed equally against recalcitrant workers and reluctant employers. The unions have the resources to finance long and ruinous strikes—vide the recent strike at Westinghouse—and the union bosses have shown a callous indifference to the losses and hardships suffered by their striking members. The employers, on the other hand, especially the great industrial corporations, have to consider not only the loss to their stockholders from long industrywide stoppages, frequently attended by violence, but also the inconvenience to the public—toward whose interest organized labor appears indifferent. It is significant that after the amendment of the Railway Labor Act the railways, almost without exception, accepted the union shop, even though it involved forcing employees with long records of loyal service to choose between joining the unions and losing their jobs, with the seniority and pension rights gained over the years.

As for the worker who resists union demands, he must be prepared for such delicate attentions as harassment of his family, bombing of his home, mauling of his person—even the loss of his life. The records of congressional hearings are full of appalling instances of this kind of union persuasion. And it is by no means used only against nonunion workers. The union man, for example, who attempts to replace his union officials, however peacefully, lays himself open to expulsion and even mayhem.

Violence aside, workers who resist the union shop by forming independent organizations risk permanent exclusion from their jobs if they fail to win NLRB elections against the established unions.

The fight for compulsory unionism is an object lesson in the behavior of pressure groups whose appetite for power grows by what it feeds on. A weak labor movement, fighting for its life against hostile employers and yellow dog contracts, wins congressional recognition of the workers' right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. But as it gains strength it demands, and obtains, not rights but privileges, until at last it comes to regard itself as a government within a government, and stretches out its hand to control the whole economic and political life of a great nation.

But the more arrogant it becomes, the more numerous and determined become the forces which resist its ambition. Other pressure groups are coming to the fore against union aggression—e. g., the Farm Bureau Federation. And the States—18 so far—are adopting laws to protect labor from a discipline which cannot be exercised against a voluntary membership. Above all, union members such as the 84 B. & O. workers are leaving their unions in disgust and risking vengeance in attempts to bargain through voluntarily chosen representatives. This is significant; for it proves that in the decision whether a great society is to continue to permit an organized pressure group to disrupt its economy and mulct its industries at will, the group's officials cannot be sure of keeping its own members in line. In the end Samuel Gompers may have the last word: "No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible."

Spring: Cleaning the Inner Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time a most refreshing editorial which appeared in the April 13, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette on the subject of spring house and heart cleaning. The editorial points out that our mental furnishings as well as our house furnishings can be revitalized by conscious reflection upon and appreciation of the spring seasonal change that can bring a sparkle to the spirit as well as to the hearth. We should make this wholesome spring cleaning objective an annual objective.

The article follows:

SPRING: CLEANING THE INNER MAN

As most men know, April is apt to bring with it an annual flurry of spring cleaning. Doors and windows are opened, rugs are shaken vigorously, dust is agitated and pursued with great energy, and furniture is moved about with sound and fury that varies inversely as to purpose and design. Most men are not enamoured of the spring-cleaning ritual.

But there is another kind of spring cleaning that might well be explored by even the most slothful male, and female, too. That is the spring cleaning of the mind, heart, and spirit.

There are dusty closets in the mind, just as there are in houses. There are dank recesses of the spirit which sadly need a rubbing and a scrubbing. There is mental carpetry to be hung out, to be aired by the clean breezes of April, and there is intellectual furniture and baggage that is beyond further patching and should have been thrown on the junk heap years ago.

April is a good time to replace musty convictions with newer, brighter ideas. Linen should fly from every window of the spirit. Dust should be attacked and banished from the innermost corners of the soul. A fine way to start this therapeutic process is to walk abroad on a fine April day, letting the clean winds of the outdoors blow through the clogged and dusty passages of the brain. Far above, the blue, blue sky stretches upward to the reaches of infinity. The sun, burning brightly down, puts an almost forgotten sparkle on the face of the world.

Down in the meadow a springtime brook gurgles through the bending grasses, flushing them with the first hint of green. The man who follows it along its winding, half-hidden course into the woods beyond can see how it scours and cleans its bed of debris. And so, as he sits on a mossy stone and contemplates its bright splash and murmur, he can gradually feel it begin to flow through the waste reaches of his mind. There, too, is debris to be carried away. There, too, are places to be polished bright and clean.

Most important, there is the clean, pure air of April and springtide, and this has a purifying effect upon the inner man. This balmy air, entering into the lungs, brings with it spaciousness, and imagination, and elevated thoughts. Let it blow into musty and dusty places. Let the newness and wonder and beauty of April enter the inner man as well as his house. And let there be a furious cleaning, arranging, and reassorting of mental furnishings during this the most important part of the spring-cleaning ritual.

Special Diploma of Honor Awarded to Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, March 4, 1956, the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn held a reception and tea in honor of Brooklyn's distinguished citizen, Max Abelman, in the Nurses Residence Hall, where he was presented with a special diploma of honor by the University of Manila for his humanitarian activities. The presentation was made by His Excellency Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States and Past President of the United Nations General Assembly. Surrogate Maximilian Moss, chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish Hospital, presided.

Mr. Abelman has devoted his lifetime to the service of his fellow man and has been the recipient of many great honors. He has long been identified with philanthropic and hospital work in Brooklyn and his host of friends speak of him affectionately as "Brooklyn's ambassador of good will."

He was formerly secretary to the president of the Jewish Hospital in Brooklyn, and also director of public relations. Only recently he was appointed an honorary sovereign grand inspector general, 33d and last degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for Italy and its dependencies.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the special diploma of honor; also several letters of congratulations and commendation in connection with this occasion:

SPECIAL DIPLOMA OF HONOR

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANILA,
Manila, Philippines.

Know all ye by these presents the board of trustees of the University of Manila hereby awards to Max Abelman this special diploma of honor, with all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining, in recognition of his outstanding activities as a great humanitarian charity worker, family reconciliator, hospital fund raiser; for exemplary demonstration of human understanding beyond the bounds of religion, race, and color; for being a beloved citizen and benefactor of Brooklyn; for his unstinted efforts in helping and encouraging Filipinos who need his advice in the United States; and for being a good brother to many fellowmen who are in distress.

In witness whereof, this special diploma of honor is signed by the president and the secretary of the university, this 8th day of December 1955.

M. V. DE LOS SANTOS,
President.
LETICIA S. DOMINGO,
Secretary.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., *February 18, 1956.*
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I appreciated your letter of the 10th, and I am very pleased that you are to be recognized in this manner.

From my acquaintance with General Romulo, I know that such an honor would not be offered you if he did not believe it to be highly deserved.

I am very sorry that my calendar will not permit my making a trip to New York next month, for it would have been a pleasure to join you on this occasion. I shall be there in spirit, however.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

NEW YORK, *February 29, 1956.*
Mr. MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
The Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I am in receipt of your most kind invitation to be present at the reception and tea in honor of our good mutual friend, Max Abelman, who will be presented by the University of Manila with a special diploma of honor for his humanitarian activities, by His Excellency Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, on Sunday afternoon, March 4, at 3 p. m.

Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be among those present on Sunday afternoon when Max will be so honored, but unfortunately for me, I shall be en route to Atlanta on business at that time.

There is no one I know who has made a greater contribution to the welfare of his fellow man than has Max Abelman; he is indeed nature's nobleman and I have for him esteem and affection which know no bounds.

Regretting my inability to be with you on Sunday afternoon and offering my congratulations to the guest of honor, and my personal regards to you and Mr. Leviton, and the guests assembled.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 28, 1956.*
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Thank you for your letter advising me of the honor to be bestowed on you by the University of Manila. I am very happy for you. However, I regret that because that afternoon I have a personal engagement with Mrs. Wagner and the boys, I cannot be present at the ceremony.

My kind regards and congratulations to you.

Sincerely yours,

BOB WAGNER, *Mayor.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 1, 1956.*
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: As I have mentioned to you before, I have another speaking engagement for this afternoon, but I shall make every effort to be present at the presentation by General Romulo of a special diploma of honor for your humanitarian activities.

Better than anyone else, I know of your wonderful work and that you well deserve this tribute.

It reminds me of the time dating back to 1944, when you and I worked day and night to obtain recognition for the Middlesex Medical College in Waltham, Mass., so that 600 deserving students, regardless of race, creed, or color, could attend. Our efforts can be attested to by such prominent men as former Governor Dewey, Jim Farley, Henry Wallace, the Honorable Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Judge David Benjamin, Victor Ridder, Matthew Woll, Henry Turner, and the late and beloved Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Fortunately, through our efforts the board of regents made it possible for these young doctors to receive their licenses and to take their rightful places in the medical profession.

A great deal of this success was due to your arduous and untiring efforts in behalf of this worthy cause. This is the first opportunity to personally express my thanks to you—for only through you was this dream made a living reality.

May good luck and good health, which is most important, be with you and yours for many years to come.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABE STARK,
President, City Council.

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I am delighted you are going to receive this fine recognition from the Philippine Government and it is grand to know that General Romulo will present it personally.

I wish so much that I could be with you to join in paying tribute to your lifetime of generous service for your fellowman and only the fact that I will be in Florida at that time prevents my being present.

With warmest regards and heartiest congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

SOUTH SALEM, N. Y., *February 21, 1956.*

DEAR MAX: It is a great honor which the University of Manila is conferring upon you on March 16. And you are especially honored to have the presentation made by such a distinguished citizen of the Philippines, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo. He has endeared himself to many millions of Americans. He has fought for our joint cause in southeast in a most remarkable way.

I am leaving for scientific and business work with our company out in Iowa next Sunday and fear I shall not be able to be present on this unique occasion.

With warmest personal regards,

HENRY A. WALLACE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 1, 1956.*
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I am sure I needn't tell you how sorry I am that prior commitments prevent me from attending the reception in your honor on Sunday afternoon, March 4, when you will be presented with a special diploma of honor at the hands of His Excellency General Carlos P. Romulo from the University of Manila.

It is most fitting that a man who has spent so many years as you have on behalf of humanity should receive it at the hands of another great humanitarian, General Romulo.

If all the people you have helped could attend the function, you would have to hire Madison Square Garden and it would be crowded at that.

I send to you my heartfelt prayer for your continued well-being.

Please extend to the general my heartfelt greetings too.

With warm regards,

Cordially,

EDWARD S. SILVER,
District Attorney.

FRANKFORT, KY., *March 1, 1956.*
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

MY DEAR MAX: Thank you very much for your kindness in inviting me to the presentation ceremonies. You know how much I would like to be with you, but I am sure you will understand that during our legislative session I cannot be away from Frankfort any more than is absolutely necessary.

It warms my heart to learn that you are receiving the recognition which you so richly deserve. Please add my heartfelt congratulations and best wishes to the thousands which will come to you.

Be assured of my warm regards always.

Cordially,

A. B. CHANDLER,
Governor.

UNION TEMPLE OF BROOKLYN,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 21, 1956.
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: Permit me to extend to you my belated, but sincere, congratulations for the recognition which you have received from the University of Manila for your humanitarian activities. We of Union Temple bask in your reflected glory.

May God bless you with many more years of continued service that all mankind may benefit from your concern for the dispossessed of the world.

With best wishes for a happy and healthy Passover, I am,

Sincerely yours,
ALFRED L. FRIEDMAN, *Rabbi.*

FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., March 2, 1956.
Hon. MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR JUDGE MOSS: It would have given me a great deal of personal pleasure to be with you on the occasion of the presentation of a special diploma of honor to our mutual friend Max Abelman by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, in behalf of the University of Manila. I regret that commitments which cannot be changed will keep me from joining you and the many friends of Max to mark this further recognition of a lifetime of service to the community.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
M. HINENBURG, M. D.

Expiration of GI Home Loan Guaranty Program July 25, 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, of utmost importance to the veterans of this Nation is the anticipated expiration of the GI home loan guaranty program on July 25, 1957. Unless there is legislation to the contrary this expiration would be effective January 1, 1957, under plans of the Veterans' Administration.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 11367, which would provide a maximum additional period of 36 months for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans. This bill would amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

This portion of the act has been a prime factor in the readjustment from a war economy and in the continued prosperity of the Nation. This has been accomplished with no burden upon the taxpayer and has provided benefits to the veteran which would be normal in a period without wars.

This act since its enactment has been used by millions of veterans to establish their right to a home in our free land. At the present time, however, some 11 million veterans have not had the opportunity to take advantage of this entitlement. Many of these young men are just now reaching the age and acquiring the income in which they will establish a family and a home and we should in no way cut off their rights and privileges when they are extended to other veterans of the same wars. This large percentage of the men who have qualified for this present privilege but who at an average of 35 years of age will be denied participation unless this legislation passed should receive every consideration at this time.

The bill that I have introduced provides for the termination of the program over a period of 3 years from the present date of finalization through provision of a 1 month—not in excess of 36 months—credit for each 2 full months served on active duty in World War II and also provides a full 3-year extension for disabled veterans. In further assistance to the veteran I have provided that the veterans sworn oath may serve as satisfactory evidence of his period of service to alleviate the many problems of and delay resulting from lost records.

I sincerely hope that this bill or similar legislation will be approved before the adjournment of this Congress, and I strongly urge such action.

Polio Vaccine for Every American Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very fine article which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette issue of April 12, 1956, written by Mr. R. C. Achorn, of the editorial staff, tracing the progress that has been made this past year in the use of Salk vaccine in combating polio.

It is true that substantial progress has been made, but nevertheless, there is still a deplorable lack of the vaccine for use by both public and private medical units and practitioners. Since we have the vaccine formula, nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of the production of sufficient allotments to take care of all American children at the earliest possible moment, and the legislative and executive branches of our Government should cooperate in this objective that is unquestionably in the best and widest national interest.

The article follows:

A YEAR OF PROGRESS AGAINST POLIO

Some of the Worcester children who received polio shots this morning cried a little.

But this is a happy anniversary, nonetheless.

On April 12, 1955, the University of Michigan polio evaluation center announced that the Salk vaccine had proved 69 to 90 percent effective in national tests.

Later that same day, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, signed licenses authorizing six drug companies to manufacture Salk vaccine and distribute it nationally.

That was the beginning.

IMPRESSIVE FIGURES

What has that year brought? The figures are impressive.

Some 1,300 persons were spared paralytic polio in 1955, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis estimated.

Enough vaccine has been made to give 2 shots each to almost 20 million persons—most of them children.

The incidence of acute paralytic polio dropped 52 percent among 8-year-olds and 40 percent among 7-year-olds. And those were the youngsters who had the shots.

But cold figures don't tell the whole story. There is no real measure of how much suffering has been spared American families. Nor of how bright the future is in this regard.

ON THE RUN

"Polio isn't licked let," the National Foundation says.

But it is certainly on the run.

Take Massachusetts, where there was an epidemic last year.

Among the unvaccinated children between 6 and 10, the polio rate was 157 cases per 100,000.

Among those who had received only a single shot, the rate was only 63 cases per 100,000 children.

There are still problems. The demand for vaccine far exceeds the supply.

In Worcester, the health department has announced that it has free vaccine to meet only one-third of the requests for physicians. In other words, 2 children out of 3 still cannot obtain shots in this manner.

CONTINUING SHORTAGE

Why the continuing shortage?

One reason is the difficulty of producing the vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk.

It takes about 4 months to produce a batch of vaccine. Complicated testing methods are involved. In its final stages the vaccine is tested on monkeys. And a minimum of 20 monkeys is required for a thorough test of each lot of vaccine.

The shortage has another fact behind it.

Only 3 of the 6 companies licensed by Mrs. Hobby have produced vaccine for public release steadily since last April.

STIFFER TESTS

Cutter Laboratories stopped releasing vaccine after the United States Public Health Service reported it found live polio virus in some lots of Cutter vaccine. Test requirements were stiffened after that.

Sharp & Dohme, Inc., and Parke, Davis & Co. also stopped issuing vaccine. Parke, Davis & Co. recently returned to large-scale production.

Those in steady production have been Eli Lilly & Co., Pitman-Moore Co., and Wyeth Laboratories.

The Public Health Service has estimated enough vaccine will be released this year to give two shots each to about 80 million persons.

That would be cut to about 55 million if it is decided to return to a 3-shot program.

AGE LIMIT

There is also the question of age. Last October the Public Health Service began allocating vaccine to the States for all children through 14 and expectant mothers. Some States have raised the upper limit to 19.

But polio cannot be regarded as simply a children's disease.

During last year's polio epidemic in this State, 3,819 persons fell victim to the disease. Of these 989 were 20 or older. Some 133 of them were 35 or older.

So the next step, as production permits, will unquestionably be to raise the upper age limit.

Massachusetts, however, still has to catch up on shots for children.

For many months, the State department of public health opposed use of the vaccine. Not until January did it agree to permit resumption of a large-scale public program.

The distinguished doctors on whom the State relied for advice considered that delay medically wise. Wise or not, it cost us some vaccine.

TO OTHER STATES

Use fell off so much during the period of delay that some of the Massachusetts allotment was reallocated to other States. In only four other States did the demand lag.

Now the demand is brisk again, so great that it temporarily cannot be met in full.

But progress is being made. And from the long-range view of history, it will certainly appear to be spectacular progress.

There are unanswered questions. A big one is: How long will these shots protect those who receive them?

The scientists simply don't know yet. They are keeping close watch on children who were given experimental shots even before the 1954 field tests.

PROTECTION RETAINED

At last report, they retained some protection against the disease 2½ years after the first injection.

When and if this protection declines below what is considered a safe level, the scientists will know when to give more booster shots.

Dr. Salk has hinted that protection may remain even when it is beyond measurement by available means. That has yet to be determined.

In another year of progress, some of these answers may well fall into place.

Judge-Made Law

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News was recently brought to my attention and at request I ask its inclusion in the RECORD. I am heartily in accord with the sentiment of this editorial and with the proposed legislation to restate the intent of Congress in regard to the recent action of the Court in overthrowing the sedition laws of 42 States of the Union. I believe it to be the clear intent of Congress that this body at no time seeks to usurp the rights of the States to provide for the national security as the action of the Court would indicate.

I commend the editor of this paper and hope through inclusion in the RECORD of these remarks that the distinct threat to the rights of the States and their courts will be brought sharply into focus and immediate action taken to correct the interpretation as given in the ruling.

The editorial follows:

JUDGE-MADE LAW

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." (Sec. 3231, title 18, United States Code.)

In view of the above general provision of the Federal criminal code, which includes the Smith Act and most of the other antisubversive legislation in the Federal statutes, the Supreme Court had to reach pretty far last month when it outlawed the sedition laws of 42 States and territories on the theory that Congress intended to take exclusive jurisdiction over national security when it passed the Smith Act.

But this is one case where the Supreme Court may not have the last word after all. Since it handed down its 6-to-3 ruling, overthrowing the Pensylvania statute under which Steve Nelson was convicted of sedition, a movement to "repeal" the decision has been gathering momentum in Congress. And it has now received the solid support of the Justice Department, and in fact the official top-level blessing of the Eisenhower administration.

In outlawing the State sedition laws, the Supreme Court made no claim that they were unconstitutional, but held rather that the intent of Congress was to "preempt" the field. The three dissenters found no such intent expressed or implied in any law, and the majority even conceded that Congress had not specifically asserted exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Rather, it seemed to be saying that, because many State sedition laws are obpectionably vague or arbitrary, it would be better to leave the subject to Uncle Sam.

But the Supreme Court's function is to apply the law as Congress has written it, not to declare what the law should be—and it was this clear intrusion on the legislative function, reading into the mind of Congress something that plainly wasn't there, that has spurred the move in Congress to tell the Court in effect to tend to its own business.

Actually, the bill which the Justice Department has now endorsed would simply restate the intent of Congress—exactly as Congress thought it had already stated it—"that the States may exercise concurrent power" to punish acts of sedition within their border. Passage of this legislation is not only necessary to restore the validity of the various State sedition laws, but under the circumstances it would be a timely and deserved reminder to the Supreme Court that its job is to interpret and apply the laws, not to rewrite them.

Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Cotton Trade Journal, published in the city of Memphis, has wide circulation and its editorial comment is greatly respected. Recently there appeared an editorial on Swiss watches. It is so provocative that I have asked permission to include it in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SWISS WATCHES

The concept of free trade, once a seething issue which divided Americans into opposing political camps, has largely ceased to be controversial. In a shrinking world both political parties accept progressively freer trade as a desirable economic goal. The only area of disagreement lies in the consideration of claims of individual industries for special protection.

It is recognized by all countries that certain exceptions to the general freeing of trade are justified. No one today seriously advocates the lifting of all restrictions—except in a limited geographical area and embracing specific commodities, such as was accomplished by the European Coal and Steel Community.

While cottongrowers have traditionally been in the free-trade camp because of the important export volume of American cotton—and they still are in that camp, as are the merchants—not many growers would agree, for example, to let Mexican cotton be sold freely in this country.

Because of such necessary restrictions, it is doubly important that where possible trade barriers be eased as much as possible. This is why we deplored the boosting of the tariff against Swiss watches by 50 percent at the time this action was taken, and why we now urge the hike be rescinded.

There are the valid reasons that the Swiss are good customers for American products—including cotton—and that they pay off promptly in dollars. But the central issue to us is this: is the higher tariff necessary in order to maintain in this country an adequate number of skilled precision instrument makers necessary in time of war? This is the reason the President recommended the tariff boost.

Studies made subsequent to the President's statement indicate it was not based on fact. Washington defense officials are now considering removing the "war necessity" veil from this issue and letting the economic facts speak for themselves.

Let Swiss watches enter our country on a competitive basis. We believe cotton men generally feel the same way—and will lend their aid to see that the unfair restrictions are lifted.

Bureau of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded to read in the official publication of the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, The Reclamation Era, published at the taxpayers' expense, a report on the recent authorization of the Colorado River storage project that completely omits what, in the minds of many Members of Congress, was a most important—in fact, an essential provision of that act. I refer, of course, to the provision that no dam or reservoir authorized by this act shall be built within a national park or monument.

Before this provision was put in the bill, all polls indicated that the Members of this House would reject the proposal by a majority of some 70 to 100 votes. When the Managers on the part of the House made their report after the conference with the Senators, the first matter that they discussed had to do with this threat to the national parks. This report said, and I quote:

The matter of retaining intact our national park system was an important issue in the consideration by Congress of this legislation.

It went on to point out that the House-approved bill "makes clear the intention of the House that there be no invasion or impairment of the national park system by the works authorized to be constructed under this legislation."

Yet the Bureau of Reclamation's own official report completely ignores this—it is a very pointed omission.

This park provision occurs in section 3 of the bill and there are only two sentences in this section. The first one states that it is not the intention of Congress to preclude consideration of other projects, and the Bureau of Reclamation takes pains to emphasize this sentence.

However, they say not a word about the sentence that immediately follows and makes plain that Congress does not want any dam built by the Bureau of Reclamation or anybody else in our national parks or monuments.

How does the Bureau expect to have support for the appropriations of these projects if it is going to ignore so flagrantly one of the essential requirements of Congress in carrying out the authorization of this project?

The statement which appeared in the May 1956 issue of The Reclamation Era follows:

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT HEADS NEW RECLAMATION AUTHORIZATIONS

"Signing into law by President Eisenhower of the Colorado River storage project authorizing legislation is an historic milestone in the annals of the upper Colorado River Basin States and of the Nation," Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay said on April 11, 1956.

"It is gratifying to see the way cleared for construction of this great project. Future generations will owe a debt of gratitude to the President and the Congress for their conservation foresight in enacting this legislation," said Secretary McKay.

Reclamation Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer said, "Even though we proposed to start construction immediately, it will not be completed and fully operative in our time."

Comprehensive development of the water resources of the uper Colorado River Basin has been initiated by authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

A full or supplemental irrigation water supply of more than 366,000 acres of land, installed hydroelectric power capacity of about 1,100,000 kilowatts and other multiple benefits are contemplated by the authorized construction. Several decades will be required to bring the comprehensive basin development to fruition.

The construction of 4 major multipurpose reservoir storage units and 11 participating reclamation projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming is authorized. The Secretary of the Interior is also instructed to give priority to investigations and preparation of planning reports for an additional 25 irrigation projects. This initial authorization of projects and priority in planning, however, is without intent of the Congress to interfere with or preclude consideration and authorization of other additional projects in the comprehensive plan of development.

The upper Colorado development is the largest reclamation project in point of dollar authorization ever to be approved by the Congress in a single, specific piece of legislation.

The act authorizes appropriation of not more than $760,000,000 for construction of the initially authorized development of the upper Colorado River storage project. A separate fund in the United States Treasury, known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund, is established for construction, operation, and maintenance of the units and projects.

Funds appropriated by the Congress will be credited to the basin fund as advances from the Treasury. Project revenues also will be credited to the fund and those in excess of operating needs will be paid annually to the United States Treasury to return construction costs allocated to power and municipal water supply, both with interest, and costs of the storage units allocated to irrigation without interest within 50 years after completion.

Project revenues in excess of those required for the foregoing needs will be apportioned among the States of the upper division as follows: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent, except that revenues in the fund from any participating project are apportioned to the State in which the project is located. Such apportioned revenue is to be used only to assist in repaying irrigation construction costs of participating projects in the State to which apportioned. The Secretary will submit business-type budgets annually to the Congress covering the basin fund operations.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the units and participating projects will be governed by Federal Reclamation laws, and operation of these facilities will be in accordance with the Mexican Water Treaty, the Colorado Basin compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, and other documents which are commonly referred to as the law of the Colorado River.

Contracts to provide for repayment of irrigation water users' obligations, within 50 years exclusive of a development period and for irrigation distribution systems, are required prior to construction of the participating projects.

For a period of 10 years following enactment of the legislation, no water from any participating projects authorized by this legislation is to be delivered to new lands for production of any basic commodity as defined by the 1949 Agricultural Act which is in excess of normal supply unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for such production in the interest of national security.

Public recreation facilities and facilities to mitigate losses and propagate fish and wildlife are also authorized by the legislation.

More Scientists Are a National Necessity for Survival in an Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Important Fair for Young Scientists," which appeared in the April 17, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

The article follows:

IMPORTANT FAIR FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS

Don't let anyone tell you the days of pioneering are over. There are plenty of challenges ahead—but in different fields.

The pioneer of old was a man of courage, a hewer of timber, and a crack shot.

Today's pioneer is the scientist. And instead of fighting Indians and hacking his living out of a wilderness, he wrestles with the problems of aviation electronics and elaborate office machinery.

American industry is practically begging for competent physicists, mathematicians, metallurgists, chemists, and mechanical or electrical engineers. Many firms want to build atomic powerplants for fleets of ships, new operational instruments for military aircraft, reliable scientific instruments to permit increased use of radioisotopes in medicine for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes.

The possibilities are almost endless. But one reason industry is begging for qualified help is that scientific subjects are not being taught in secondary schools as they used to be nor as they must be in this new scientific age. There is a serious shortage of science teachers. And students often turn to easier subjects.

The Worcester County Regional Science Fair to be held April 19–21 at Worcester Polytechnic Institute's Gymnasium is a splendid effort to whet the interest of secondary school youngsters in scientific pursuits.

The Worcester and Greendale Kiwanis Clubs, which sponsor it, have done a fine thing for the youth of this area. A total of 2,872 students in grades 10, 11, and 12 in the public, private, and parochial schools entered the competition. Sixty winners will enter their exhibits in the regional fair at WPI. From these, two will be picked as top winners. They and their science teachers and their exhibits will be sent (expenses paid) to the National Science Fair to be held in May 1956 in Oklahoma City.

This fair is something young and old alike should see. In addition to the students' exhibits, there will be adult exhibits. These include a replica of the 50,000-ton press for aircraft forgings at Wyman-Gordon Co., and a sample Westinghouse atomic reactor in color.

The adult displays are to show the students what can result from devoting their lives to science.

This fair should prove a healthy stimulant to creative thinking, which is so important to science. It should also dramatize the importance of the role of the science teacher in the pioneering days of the second half of the 20th century.

Youth Likes Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague JOHN ROBSION recently called our attention to a survey conducted among 433,253 high-school students from 12,140 classrooms throughout the country by Wesleyan University which showed that an astonishing 62 percent of these students preferred a Republican over a Democrat as President of the United States.

There can be no doubt that President Eisenhower has captured the confidence of our young people everywhere with his successful efforts to provide honest, sound, efficient Government for all people, young and old.

Further indication that young people like Ike has been dramatically shown in mock political conventions and primaries held on university and college campuses in each of the 48 States.

Not long ago, I had the opportunity to address the student body of Case Institute of Technology. The students then proceeded to nominate Dwight D. Eisenhower for a second term as President of the United States.

Today, my good friend Prof. Donald A. Koch sent a clipping from the Baldwin-Wallace Exponent to my office which tells of another college campus victory for our great President, not only among the students, but also among the members of the Baldwin-Wallace faculty.

The results of the Baldwin-Wallace College mock primary are extremely revealing, and I commend this article from the Exponent to your attention:

IKE IS LIKED BY B-WITES VOTE SHOWS

Dwight David Eisenhower is well liked by Baldwin-Wallace students if the mock primary held on campus May 8 is any indication. The man from Kansas tallied 218 votes, 72 percent of the 302 votes cast.

Eisenhower drew 207 of his votes from students who marked Republican as their party preference. Eleven Democrats supported him.

Of the 302 votes cast, 212 were Republican while 90 were Democrat. Adlai Stevenson led the Democratic voting with 52 supporters. ESTES KEFAUVER, the coonskin cap Senator from Tennessee, was runner-up with 20.

In the Republican vice president race, RICHARD NIXON led the pack with 132 votes while, surprisingly enough, Gov. Frank Lausche, of Ohio, an independent Democrat, was second with 33. George Humphrey, Eisenhower's Secretary of Treasury, finished third with 20.

Averell Harriman, Tammany Hall's New York Governor, won the Democratic Vice President contest with 30 votes. KEFAUVER was runner-up with 19, and LYNDON JOHNSON, majority Senate floor leader from Texas, placed third with 14.

C. William O'Neill, Ohio attorney general, won the GOP gubernatorial nod with 131 votes, a goodly margin over second place John Brown who tallied 53.

Mike DiSalle, Office of Price Stabilization chief when Harry Truman occupied the White House, had little trouble snaring the Democratic bid for the governor's mansion. He copped 50 votes; runner-up Charles Sweeney, Cleveland municipal judge, tallied 23 votes.

The faculty showed a GOP preference, but not to the same extent the students did. Of the 26 votes cast, 16 were Republican and 10 Democratic.

All 16 Republicans indicated Eisenhower as their presidential choice. Stevenson took 9 ballots and Harriman grabbed 1 on the Democratic ledger.

Other faculty GOP results were: Vice President, Nixon, 10; Humphrey, 4; Lausche, 2. Governor, O'Neill, 12; Brown, 3.

Other faculty Democratic results were: Vice President, Harriman, 4; Kefauver, 3; Johnson, 1. Governor, DiSalle, 9.

The B-W Young Republican and Young Democrat Clubs sponsored the primary in cooperation with the Citizenship Clearing House of Northern Ohio, Mr. Reed Smith, B-W representative.

For President: Republican, Eisenhower, 207; Knowland, 3; Humphrey, 1; Nixon, 1.

Democratic: Stevenson, 52; Kefauver, 20; Eisenhower, 11; Harriman, 4; L. Johnson, 1; Lausche, 1.

For Vice President: Republican, Nixon, 132; Lausche, 33; Humphrey, 20; Knowland, 14; C. Herter, 2; Stevenson, 3; Kefauver, 3; William Fortner, 1.

Democrat: Harriman, 30; Kefauver, 19; L. Johnson, 14; Stevenson, 9; Lausche, 7; Clements, 3; Nixon, 3; Knowland, 1; G. Humphrey, 1.

For Governor: Republican, O'Neill, 131; Brown, 53; DiSalle, 4; Sweeney, 1.

Democratic: DiSalle, 50; Sweeney, 23; O'Neil, 7; Brown, 3.

The Dairy Farmer and Falling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a letter which I have received from a farmer and his wife on the dairy situation in my congressional district. My constituents make out a very good case to show that they are getting shortchanged in their farm operations. Under leave to extend, I am including this challenging letter:

DELAVAN, WIS., *May 2, 1956.*

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We are in agreement with your views on recent farm legislation, per the bulletin.

There is one gross injustice practiced on Wisconsin dairymen that should be rectified. As you know, a base is set for the Chicago market during the fall months and we are penalized for anything shipped over that amount. For several years past the months, when the base is now figured, has been a time of drought and poor pasture—just in between barn feeding and fall pasture and consequently short milk production. Dairymen voted against such a plan, but it was forced on them anyway.

Like most dairymen, we try to maintain an even flow of milk throughout the year in order to meet monthly expenses. Nature just will not permit all the cows freshening in the fall without a loss connected with feeding, delayed freshening, etc., as you know.

I would like to list below just how this affects dairymen like ourselves. We had a 3.6 test for the month of February (paid March 18) which makes the prices paid somewhat higher than dairymen with a lower test receive.

We shipped 14,004 pounds of milk from our farm.

We were paid $3.51 per hundredweight for 10,757 pounds.

We were paid $3.11 per hundredweight for 3,247 pounds.

Our regular deductions (nearly the same each month) were:

Hauling	$21.64
ADA deducted	2.80
Disinfectant	2.70
Cleaner	2.30
	29.44

We ended up with a milk check for $457.37 for 14,004 pounds[1] of milk. This means we received $3.26 per hundredweight for 3.6 grade A milk after Borden deductions. This figure certainly does not compare with what we are supposed to receive and Government prices set should consider hauling, etc., in figuring prices paid. Who got the extra profit from our milk during February?

Dairymen are rightfully disgusted when they read the newspaper figures that we are paid and then see what we get. If it is legal for the Government to set the price that we receive why isn't it legal to put a ceiling on the selling price during this period of farm depression? Cheaper prices to the consumer would move the surplus.

There is never a reference to parity by the Agricultural Department that does not say "high rigid support prices to farmers," which is misrepresentation to the public and poor publicity.

The stockpile of dairy products which depresses the market was first built, as we remember, during the Democratic administration as a stockpile for war emergency and the reason it accumulated was that because of rationing it was not for sale and the public had to deny themselves to build it.

Ammunition, machinery, clothing and many other materials were stockpiled in the same way. After the war was over the material no longer needed was scrapped and the worker who produced these goods has not had to exist on starvation wages since.

The surplus food should have been disposed of to the hungry and indigent at that time and there was a great need that was worldwide. Just one segment of the American people should not still be penalized for doing their patriotic duty.

The fabulous sums paid for storing surplus farm products should be discontinued immediately. Let the goods seek the market level during the emergency and pay the subsidy to the farmer who is the party supposed to benefit. Also, limit the amount paid by way of subsidy and the "hobby" farmers will soon get out of the farming business and the Government can collect the income tax they are using to build up farm surpluses.

It seems to farmers I know, after reading about cheese maker and butter manufacturer "windfalls"; that 75 percent of parity has saved the dairy industry, etc. that the Republicans would be wise to replace the sheep and wheat man before November.

We wish you success in your own campaign.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. J. TOTTEN.

[1] Same milk would sell for over $1,600 as we ship to Chicago fluid market. Butterfat content would be reduced to 4.2 also, for which producer would be penalized about 28 cents per hundredweight more. Extra fat makes butter.

Industrial Health and Safety at Atomic Installations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent radiation exposure of a group of workmen employed on a nuclear reactor project at Fort Belvoir, Va., has focused attention on the need for a comprehensive study of the problem of industrial health and safety of those engaged in this important work in the atomic-energy field. Our laws affecting workmen's compensation, disability insurance, medical care, and unemployment insurance should be reviewed as they apply to workers who risk their lives through exposure to atomic radiation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the recent statement of Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, before the Joint Commit-

tee on Atomic Energy, in which this problem of industrial health and safety in atomic installations is thoroughly discussed. Mr. Biemiller's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, MAY 21, 1956

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am a legislative representative for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, with offices at 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C. I am accompanied by Mr. Leo Goodman, of our research department.

The subject of today's hearing is one of utmost importance to organized labor. Just last week many representatives of our organization participated here in Washington in the President's Conference on Occupational Safety. At this conference the AFL–CIO's position was stated by Secretary-Treasurer William Schnitzler. He stressed the important role labor unions could play in a campaign to reduce industrial accidents and improve the record of occupational accidents and industrial safety. He noted that unions are frequently ignored in these campaigns. The fact is that we are here today primarily because of the annual toll of 14,000 dead and nearly 2 million injured as the result of industrial accidents. Admiral Straus also addressed that conference and in his comments, in our judgment, painted too rosy a picture of the safety precautions and the comparatively low level of accidents associated with the nuclear science industries.

Mr. Chairman, we in organized labor have had some experience with the actual developments in this industry and we do not feel the picture is as good as has been portrayed here and elsewhere, nor are the remedies proposed here adequate to meet the realities of the situation.

In this field of protection from hazard, organized labor has an obligation not only to its own membership in atomic installations but also to the general public in the community, who are the families of the workers in the plants, their relatives and friends. Insofar as we are able, we shall insist upon the kind of protection which will minimize the possibility of harmful effects resulting from the application of nuclear science to industrial uses.

In the background materials submitted with the McKinney panel report, on page 503, the members of the labor seminar stated the criteria which they recommended to the McKinney panel in regard to health and safety. Mr. Chairman, I request that that section be inserted in my remarks at this point. The McKinney panel adopted some of labor's recommendations. On page 128 of the McKinney panel report they urged the Commission to step up its program of research into "the causes, effects, and control of atomic hazards * * * in order that both those concerned with protection against harmful levels of radiation and those concerned with providing insurance to cover such damage."

Mr. Chairman, we of organized labor find ourselves vitally concerned in both aspects. The various proposals pending before this committee make us apprehensive, that insufficient consideration has been given to the problems which lie ahead. A number of witnesses have appeared here before the committee including some who participated in an executive advisory seminar back in March, advocating adoption of Federal residual insurance as a condition for progress by private enterprise in the atomic power field.

Shortly after that meeting, the members of Local 301, IUE–AFL–CIO, the Knolls Laboratory in Schenectady, N. Y., held a fifth memorial to the first worker who died in the atomic power industry. I would like to introduce into the record a circular issued by Local 301 at the time of Joe Stevens' death. The circular is headed "Joe Stevens Did Not Have To Die." The circular ends with the appeal that Joe Stevens' fellow workers contribute to a fund to help meet the expenses for Joe Stevens' then unborn child, which was born during the summer of 1951.

Mr. Chairman, the problem that is new in regard to workmen's compensation, disability insurance, medical care, and unemployment insurance in this new industry is that exposure to physically harmful radiation can take place and the individual worker or workers, or the whole community which has been affected, may not even know it. We were surprised, therefore, when we noted the establishment of a committee of lawyers, whose purpose it was to formulate a statute of limitations for claims to be filed subsequent to exposure.

Chairman ANDERSEN pointed out in his remarks to the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, in April, that the Supreme Court ruling in *MacPherson* v. *Buick Co.* prevails today. So the lawyers for the insurance industry come before this committee and recommend a Federal assumption of residual risk on a limited basis, with the recommendation that there be a limitation of amount with human life valued at $25,000 to, and I quote: "Serve as a brake on runaway juries which might sometimes be as great a threat to the new industry as the runaway reactor."

I can understand the necessity of trying to limit by Federal statute the amount of awards for injury because only last month the Aetna Casualty and Surety Co. settled out of court 7 of a series of 8 personal injury claims at the Y–12 plant in Oak Ridge. Mr. John W. Henderson of Chesnee, S. C., who suffered permanent blindness and a fractured collarbone, received a settlement of $75,000. This settlement resulted from an explosion which the AEC has hushed up.

The local newspaper in Oak Ridge has editorially called for more information regarding accidents so that they could be avoided rather than the application of the security clamp which leaves doubt, fear, and ignorance as to how to avoid their recurrence prevalent in the community. Last week the Y–12 plant had another explosion; this time the facts were admitted and it is revealed that zirconium oxide stored in the scrap pile "just went boom." William Stooksbury of Andersonville was killed and two other workers seriously injured.

Mr. Chairman, while the Cole bill and the Price bill propose Federal assumption of residual risk, the AEC has sponsored a series of meetings with State officials which have brought some thinking regarding health and safety around to the point where there is pending before this committee H. R. 8676, which states, and I quote (line 11): "Whenever the Commission receives from the governor of any State a certificate to the effect that the State has an agency competent to exercise jurisdiction in any portion of the health and safety aspects of the Atomic Energy Commission, then the Commission is directed on the day 6 months after the date of the receipt of that certificate, to relinquish the jurisdiction of health and safety in the area specified in the certificate."

It seems to us, Mr. Chairman, that it is highly inconsistent to have the Federal Government assume the risk while consideration is being given to handing over control of the standards to the States on the say-so of the governor. Mr. Chairman, this question should not be acted on too hastily. We are dealing here in the future with many unknowns. New diseases formerly unheard of are being created by this industry. New legal problems, as the chairman has pointed out, face us in the future. Many developments will occur which we cannot possibly imagine in this room.

One of our affiliated organizations, the International Association of Machinists, is still trying to get redress for a member.

Arthur L. Cardwell, employed at Oak Ridge in 1945 and required to handle beryllium with his bare hands, became infected with what was later diagnosed as beryllium poisoning. No precautionary measures were taken by the contractor until April 1948. The gradual course of the disease has brought Mr. Cardwell to a continually deteriorating condition in the hospital, without funds, and his savings completely exhausted. Because he accepted a $4,000 payment from the employer's insurance carrier, the AEC wipes its hands of the case, and on January 25 of this year advised President Hayes of the Machinists, "It does not appear that Mr. Cardwell's situation is one which would warrant further study or action by this office."

The AEC always minimizes the impact of any accident but the workers in Oak Ridge know that the Arco reactor blew up, and I quote from the Oak Ridger of April 10, 1956, "Rather than a wrong button or a misunderstanding he (the Argonee spokesman) describes what happened as split-second indecision or underestimation of the necessary shutdown time." Nearby at Fort Belvoir where the most penetrating type of emission from radiation, gamma rays, were "left unshielded for about 3 hours * * * contrary to standard practice * * * the AEC says the men who were exposed are unharmed." Today's paper carries the story that one person who was exposed has died. There may or may not be some connection.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of controversy regarding the level of safe exposure. I am sure this committee is familiar with the point of view of Prof. G. Hoyt Whipple of the University of Rochester, that the present exposure standard of 0.3 roentgen per week be reduced to "a figure no greater than one-tenth of this as the criterion for nuclear powerplants."

Organized labor has sought the facts regarding hazards in this industry. Five years ago my colleague, Mr. Goodman, asked the AEC to establish a training course on safety and hazard problems. The request was refused. But the papers released at Geneva, particularly that of the ILO entitled "Protection of Workers Against Ionizing Radiation," pointed up the seriousness of the high permissive level of exposure which has been permitted in the United States. As we pointed out in the labor seminar report, exposure is cumulative and the level of exposure may be exceeded by excessive X-rays following accident or other medical treatment procedures. We recommended, therefore, for the protection of the human race itself as well as the individual workers involved, the establishment of the highest standards of protection—a shorter workweek, longer vacations, and rotation of workers from jobs where high levels of exposure are likely. In addition, each worker should have a copy of his own tally sheet regarding his total exposure for life.

Existing compensation legislation and restrictive statutes of limitations not designed to deal with this atomic problem should be reviewed. A comprehensive study should be made with adequate representation of the affected unions involved so that we are given an opportunity to participate and help formulate the new standards which are needed.

I do not pose at length the even greater problems which are raised by such presentations as that of Senator WELKER on the floor of the Senate March 20 in regard to the whole problem of location of atomic installations in relation to their proximities to centers of population, nor the equally serious problem being studied in connection with the investigation of civilian defense of what happened

when an industrial power reactor becomes a potential military target.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we renew two pleas:

1. It is high time the AEC stops hiding behind the cloak of "security" in its refusal to give information in accident cases. We trust the committee will look into this question.

2. The need for thorough conference with labor representatives on safety questions and many other aspects of manpower and labor relation questions grows greater day by day. We urge the committee to initiate the necessary legislation to establish a satutory labor-management advisory committee to the AEC.

Statement on H. R. 9424, Antimerger Bill Before Senate Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith my statement made before the Senate Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee, in favor of H. R. 9424, on May 24, 1956:

The hearings being held by this distinguished committee on H. R. 9424 are most timely and important indeed. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you to present my views and to urge prompt and favorable consideration of this bill which is essential to enable the Federal enforcement agencies to deal more effectively with the merger threat to the competitive economy.

To determine how serious this threat is, our House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee made an extensive study and report on the entire corporate and bank merger problem.[1] It found that the present rate of corporate and bank mergers is not only alarming but constitutes one of the most ominous clouds on the economic horizon, since it is drastically reducing competition in many areas and accelerating the trend toward greater and greater concentration of economic power.[2]

To cite a few statistics, in 1955 the number of corporate mergers set a 25-year record and proceeded at a rate 4 times that of 1949. What is more, since 1951 over 3,000 independent concerns in the manufacturing, mining, trade and service industries have disappeared in the process.[3]

Our subcommittee found the same merger trend exists in the banking field as well, which is concentrating control of the Nation's financing resources into fewer and fewer hands. In fact, the rapidly accelerating trend of mergers stands out as the major development in the field of banking during the past 5 years. From 1950 through 1955 about 850 of the commercial banks of the Nation have been lost by way of mergers and consolidations. In 1955 alone 250 mergers have occurred, a 22-year record.[4]

It is against this background that the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee after extensive hearings,[5] the House Judiciary Committee, and the House of Representatives, each without dissent, approved the present bill. I would also point out that the bill is supported by the President, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Specifically, what does the bill do and why is its passage imperative? First, the bill plugs a loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act resulting from the fact that the present section covers only bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to cover bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. The bill plugs this loophole by providing the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as they now have to move against stock acquisitions.

Second, it further amends section 7 to require prior notification of certain corporate mergers.

Finally, the bill amends section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining the completion of a merger until adjudication of its legality.

Each of these provisions I should now like to discuss with you.

BANK MERGERS

Bank mergers are circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition; it is immaterial whether the merger was accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act adopted in 1914 on the other hand, deals specifically with corporate and bank mergers and bans those achieved by stock purchases where there is a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Responsibility for enforcing the section insofar as banks are concerned was vested concurrently in the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board.

Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Antimerger Act of 1950. However, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of this act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission. This gap in existing law which allows a bank merger accomplished by purchase of assets irrespective of its injurious effect on competition has no logical basis. What is more, many bank mergers in recent years have been accomplished by this device.

There is no doubt that this loophole in section 7 has seriously hampered the efforts of the enforcement agencies and that legislation is urgently needed which would provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions as they now have to move against bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions.

The purpose of the first paragraph of section 1 of the present bill is to provide such authority. That paragraph, it will be noted, is identical with H. R. 5948 which was approved by the House on February 6, 1955, without a dissenting voice. Since the present bill incorporates H. R. 5948 in toto, separate consideration of that bill is, of course, unnecessary.

It is important to note that the bank-merger provisions of the present bill do not extend antitrust jurisdiction to any area not previously covered by the antitrust laws. Authority of State banking supervisors to approve or disapprove mergers under local law would remain unaffected subject, of course, to the right of Federal enforcement agencies to proceed in the event of a possible violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act as amended by the pending bill.

The right of Federal enforcement officials to intervene in such situations is one of long standing. For example, the Attorney General now can proceed under the Sherman Act against bank mergers, regardless of how accomplished, where they restrain competition unreasonably. Furthermore, either the Attorney General or the Federal Reserve Board can move under section 7 of the Clayton Act against bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create monopoly. Thus the bill, in providing the same right of action under the Clayton Act against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions, merely follows the existing Federal statutory pattern insofar as State-Federal division of responsibility is concerned.

Moreover, section 7 as proposed to be amended, would provide a far more effective weapon than the Sherman Act in dealing with bank mergers. This is because the Clayton Act requires proof only of a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition whereas the Sherman Act requires proof that competition has actually been lessened ureasonably. Consequently, the bill would allow Federal enforcement agencies to deal with bank mergers well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding. At the same time it is recognized that in some cases a bank merger would not be contrary to the policy of the antitrust laws or of the present bill even though it may lessen competition. For instance, an acquisition of a bank which otherwise would be faced with the possibility of failure would be permissible. Also permissible would be a situation where the acquisition is the most practicable means of dealing with a problem bank having inadequate capital or unsound assets or where the acquired bank has no adequate provision for management succession. Also, where several banks in a small town are compelled by an over-banked situation to resort to unsound competitive practices which may eventually have an adverse effect upon the condition of the banks, the merger of two or more of the banks may well be in the public interest. The same principle applies where there are not adequate banking facilities.[6]

I would stress that the bank merger provisions of the bill represent no departure whatsoever from the basic principles of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Nor do I believe that the characteristics of the banking industry are so unique as to justify such a departure. I am aware that the Office of Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation take the position that while they are in accord with the general purpose of the bank merger provision of the present bill, they believe that this purpose can best be accomplished by an amendment of the banking statutes rather than by an amendment of the antitrust laws. Their proposal would vest administrative responsibility in the bank supervisory agencies and most important of all, would deprive the Department of Justice of enforcement responsibility in the bank merger field.

The position taken by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency must be viewed in light of the fact that the Comptroller, Mr. Ray Gidney, has repeatedly assured our Antitrust Subcommittee that he would not in the exercise of his responsibility approve any bank merger which would be contrary to the policy of the Antimerger Act of 1950, which prohibits corporate mergers where the

Footnotes at end of speech.

effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. But, contrary to these assurances, Mr. Gidney in the some 3 years since he has occupied the office has approved over 300 mergers throughout the country, many of which have had extremely damaging competitive consequences. The amazing fact is that in no instance has Mr. Gidney disapproved a bank merger on the basis that it might substantially lessen competition. What this indicates more than anything else is Mr. Gidney's predilection for rubber stamping bank mergers.

Mr. Gidney has not issued anything specific to the examiners in regard to considering anticompetitive factors; he has never notified national bank examiners or given them any specific admonition that it is his policy as Comptroller to disapprove any bank merger violative of the policy of the Antimerger Act. Nor has he required examiners to make findings of fact with regard to competitive considerations in recommending approval or disapproval of proposed bank mergers.

In this context Mr. Gidney's statement that his office will disapprove any bank merger that might jeopardize competition must be taken with a grain of salt. Furthermore, it is doubtful that Comptroller Gidney is even aware of the purposes of antimerger legislation or of the dangers that mergers pose to the competitive banking structure. This conclusion is indicated by Mr. Gidney's testimony before our subcommittee that he "would not say any banks have been eliminated from competition" as a result of the mergers that have occurred in recent years. In his view, even if a merger takes place between the only two banks in a community, "there is still competition in the community." As was pointed out to him, under this theory "that there is still competition where you have mergers * * * that consolidations bring about competition * * * you can never have the application of the Antimerger Act."

It is significant that the position of these two agencies differs sharply from the position taken by the President, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission, all of whom conclude that legislation limiting bank mergers which have substantial anticompetitive consequences should come through revision of antitrust legislation. The President, for example, in his Economic Report transmitted to the Congress on January 24, 1956, had this to say:

"Mergers have become more numerous of late and an eye, at once vigilant and discriminating must be kept on such developments. Many mergers have a solid economic justification and serve the general interest by increasing competition; others have neutral effects; while still others place obstacles in the path of eeffctive competition. Over the years Americans have wisely viewed excessive business concentration, or any other undue concentration of economic power, with uneasiness. To serve the basic American desire for an economy in which business opportunities are increasing and in which economic control is widely diffused, it is desirable to strengthen our antitrust laws and provide larger appropriations for their enforcement.

"Toward this end, the following revisions of antitrust legislation are recommended. * * *. Federal regulation should be extended to all mergers of banking institutions." [7]

The approach suggested by the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation fails to recognize that monopolistic tendencies in the banking field have since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890 been dealt with under the antitrust laws and not under the banking statutes. It also fails to recognize that since passage of the Sherman Act bank mergers whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions were banned if they resulted in an unreasonable restraint of trade. The Clayton Antitrust Act passed in 1914 to supplement the Sherman Act by arresting monopolies in their incipiency dealt with mergers and prohibited any corporation (including banks, banking associations, and trust companies) from acquiring the stock of another where the effect might be to substantially lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly. Beyond that section 8 of the Clayton Act deals specifically with banks and prohibited interlocking directorates, thus presenting another instance where antitrust problems in the banking field have been covered under the antitrust laws.

On this question Assistant Attorney General Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division, testified before our subcommittee that—

"This committee should weigh carefully the wisdom of tailoring section 7's strictures to the assertedly unique needs of the banking industry. In the more than 60 years since the Sherman Act's passage no one has suggested its provisions did not apply to banks as well as to all other sectors of American business. Similarly, in the Transamerica case, never was it urged that unamended section 7 did not apply with equal force to both banks and nonbanking corporations. And finally, in its 1950 amendment to section 7, Congress reiterated prohibitions on stock acquisitions to fit banks the same as all other corporations. Against this background, * * * this committee should move slowly in creating or encouraging special antitrust treatment for banks." [8]

Furthermore, the proposal of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to oust the Attorney General of enforcement responsibility in connection with bank mergers would alter the established statutory scheme in a manner which is most inappropriate. As Judge Barnes testified:

"This congressional decision to give the Department of Justice some say in enforcement of bank merger prohibitions is firmly rooted in enforcement realities. Without the Department's right to intervene, there might be as many different views of section 7's standards and scope as there were agencies charged with its enforcement. The result could well be disparities in view which in turn spell real enforcement inequities. Enforcement effectiveness as well requires some procedure for this Department's intervention. Otherwise, in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement the Department would be bound by bank merger precedents it had no voice in picking or shaping." [9]

In gaging the necessity for bank merger legislation of the kind here proposed, I am sure that this committee will be particularly mindful of the fact that competition is one of the strongest single factors which safeguards a sound banking system. In this context the rash of recent bank merger activity has had serious competitive implications to the extent where the merger trend is considered by the Federal Reserve Board "a matter of deep concern." [10]

In New York City alone, in the last 7 years, there have been 17 bank mergers. Since the first of this year the New York City area has experienced, in terms of total deposits, the three largest bank mergers in the history of the country. First in March 1955, the Chase National Bank with total assets of $5,669 million merged with the Bank of Manhattan Co. with assets of $1,629 million and the Bronx County Trust Co. with assets of $76 million. This merger provided the new entity, the Chase Manhattan Bank, with total assets of $7,374 million or 21.7 percent of total assets of all banks in New York City and jumped it to first place in New York City and second place in the Nation.

Also, in March 1955, the National City Bank of New York with total assets of $5,767 million merged with the First National Bank of New York with total assets of $713 million. Less than a month later the Bankers Trust Co. with assets of $2,207 million acquired the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York with assets of $562 million. This was only the last of a series of acquisitions by Bankers Trust Co. which had absorbed since 1940 the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

These mergers have resulted in a steadily increasing bank deposit concentration in New York City. In 1900 that city's four largest banks had 21 percent of the total deposits; now the 4 largest banks have about 61 percent of all deposits.

This wave of bank mergers is not peculiar to New York City. In Philadelphia, for example, the Pennsylvania Co. for Trusts and Banking, which is now the second largest bank in the area with total assets of approximately $305 million, proposes to merge with the First National Bank which is fifth in size with total assets of $218 million. The consolidated bank would have total assets of about $1,023 million which would make it the largest banking institution in the area with control of 25.3 percent of total banking assets.

This is just the most recent of a series of bank mergers that has occurred in Philadelphia. In 1953 the Tradesman's National Bank & Trust Co. with total assets of $139,801,596 merged with the Land Title Bank & Trust Co. which had assets of $96,378,000. Also in 1953 the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank with assets of $579,978,000 acquired the National Bank of Germantown with assets of $39,833,432. The Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank itself resulted from a merger in 1951 between the Girard Trust Co., one of the hundred largest banks in the Nation, with the Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Co., another leading bank.

In Pittsburgh the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. now controls 61 percent of the total bank assets in that area. This has been accomplished by a long process of absorbing a number of smaller institutions.

In Providence, R. I., the Industrial Trust Co., with assets of $312 million, merged with the Providence Union National Bank with assets of $168 million. The resultant Industrial National Bank now owns 57.7 percent of all assets while the first two banks in that city own 93.3 percent of all assets.

In California during 1954 the First Western Bank & Trust Co. of San Francisco, itself a subsidiary of Transamerica Corp., acquired 14 other California banks and increased its assets in the process from $333,537,000 to $798,645,000.

These are only a few examples of the bank merger activity going on throughout the Nation which is wiping out competition of strong independent banks and strengthening the position of the giant banking institutions. In fact, considering national banks alone, some 494 banks have been absorbed between 1950 and May 1, 1955, involving in excess of $13,478 million.

The fact is that due in large part to merger activity the 100 largest banks today control approximately 46 percent of the total assets of all the commercial banks in the country and more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. In 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial-bank assets. In 9 of these financial centers, 2 banks own more than 60 percent of all commercial-bank assets. In each of the 16 leading finan-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

cial centers the first 2 banks own more than 40 percent of all commercial-bank assets; the first 4 banks more than 60 percent.[11]

In light of these considerations additional legislative precautions of the nature that are contained in the present bill are vital to preserve that competition which still exists and to guard against the very real possibility that banking credit, which is the lifeblood of our entire economic system, be dominated to an ever-increasing degree by a small, tightly knit group.

PREMERGER NOTIFICATION

H. R. 9424 would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act in a second respect and require that where the combined capital structure of parties to a proposed merger exceeds $10 million, the acquiring corporation must notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission (or the appropriate commission or board vested with jurisdiction) 90 days in advance of the transaction. Together with the notice, the acquiring corporation must also supply the Attorney General and the appropriate agency with specifically enumerated information which would enable them to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. During this 90-day period the merger could not take place, although in appropriate cases this prohibition could be waived. It must be observed that the waiting period requirement would not operate to bar an agency from instituting proceedings at a later date and would not expressly or impliedly serve as a statute of limitations against the Government.

The merging corporations would also be required to furnish the appropriate agencies with such additional relevant information as may be requested, within 30 days. Willful failure to submit the notification or furnish the required information is subject to a civil penalty or from $5,000 to $50,000.

Premerger notification would not be necessary in all transactions. It would not be necessary (1) where stock is acquired solely for investment and does not exceed 5 percent of the outstanding share capital of the corporation in which the investment is made; (2) where the assets acquired do not exceed $5 million or 5 percent of the capital structure of either the acquiring or acquired corporation, whichever is less; and (3) where the assets acquired are stock in trade sold or held for sale by the corporation in its ordinary course of business.

Experience over a period of 5 years in administering the 1950 Antimerger Act has demonstrated the basic need for advance notification legislation. At the present time, the staff of the antitrust enforcement agencies must rely upon newspapers, financial periodicals, trade journals, and other publications for information regarding proposed mergers which the companies themselves could without difficulty supply. Present procedures are quite unsatisfactory, especially since many significant mergers are not even publicized in advance of consummation.

The enforcement agencies also are confronted with the problem of collecting elementary information about the companies involved in a proposed merger in order to determine the merger's impact upon competition and whether a full investigation should be made. This information includes the nature of the business of the merging companies, the products and services sold or distributed, the total sales, the total assets, net sales, and trading areas of both the acquiring and acquired corporations. While this type of information is ordinarily requested from the companies, they neither have a legal obligation to furnish such information let alone make it available expeditiously.

The bill therefore would obviate the considerable time, effort, and investigative expense required to determine whether mergers are about to occur and make unnecessary the haphazard methods of scanning newspapers and trade publications to ascertain where merger threats to competition are arising. It would also enable the antitrust agencies to be informed of mergers not publicly announced before consummation.

Particularly important, the advance notice requirement would afford the enforcement officials a reasonable period of time in which to study the competitive implications of a merger before deciding whether to seek a preliminary injunction restraining its consummation pending a determination of legality.

An additional consideration is that advance notification is necessary in the interest of even-handed enforcement. With that requirement incorporated in the statute, the company that tries to obey the law and seek advance clearance from the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission will no longer stand by and watch its competitor who chooses to remain silent, complete a merger and thereafter rely on the natural indisposition of the enforcement agency to bring a suit to unscrable the commingled assets at some later time.

The force of these considerations was recognized by the President, who, in recommending enactment of a premerger notification requirement, stated:

"All firms of significant size that are engaging in interstate commerce and plan to merge should be required to give advance notice of the proposed merger to the antitrust agencies, and to supply the information needed to assess its probable impact on competition." [12]

The committee is undoubtedly aware that no burden is imposed upon small-business mergers by this bill, since premerger notification is required only where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the acquiring and acquired corporation are in excess of $10 million. This figure was recommended by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission and would probably cover most mergers that have a significant economic effect. Of course, there may be mergers which have a substantial effect on competition, where the aggregate capital structure is less than $10 million. It is clear, however, that the possibility of such transactions having a substantial competitive effect does not justify burdening all corporations with notification and reporting requirements, especially since the antitrust authorities would not, in any event, be foreclosed against taking action against an indicated violation.

Further minimizing the possibility of hardship, the bill authorizes the enforcement agencies to waive the 90-day period in appropriate cases. For example, if a corporation is in bankruptcy and a quick sale of the aassets is proposed no good purpose would be served by requiring a waiting period of 90 days, assuming the transaction will have no competitive significance. Undoubtedly, there will be a wide variety of other transactions where no possible antitrust implication is involved and where a waiver of the waiting period would be entirely appropriate.

FTC AUTHORITY TO SEEK PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Equally as necessary as premerger notification is the provision giving the Federal Trade Commission authority to seek a preliminary court injunction to prevent consummation of mergers, or after consummation, to preserve the status quo until completion of administrative proceedings before the Commission.

The authority so provided is similar to that which the Federal Trade Commission now has in certain cases under section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. It is also similar to the authority of the Department of Justice under section 15 of the Clayton Act, which authorizes the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief in the Federal courts to prevent and restrain violations of the Clayton Act, section 7 (the Antimerger Act).

Since the Federal Trade Commission has concurrent responsibility with the Attorney General to enforce that act, logic and policy dictate that the Commission have coextensive authority to invoke the injunctive powers of a district court upon an appropriate showing of necessity. The anomalous situation existing now is that the Commission lacks authority which even private parties have to petition a Federal district court to enjoin the consummation of a reasonably probable illegal merger in order to avert irreparable injury.[13]

Lack of such a provision enabling the Commission to prevent mergers prior to consummation or after consummation, to take action to preserve the status quo until completion of proceedings, has created a serious loophole indeed in the Antimerger Act. It has allowed companies to obtain the benefits of a completed merger even though the legality of the transaction has been challenged by the Federal Trade Commission and notwithstanding the fact that pending final disposition of the complaint, the merger may have caused the very damage to the competitive structure of the industry which the Antimerger Act was intended to safeguard. Furthermore, in many mergers the acquired competitor is completely swallowed up and disappears as an identifiable entity. This makes it practically impossible thereafter to restore completely the preexisting competitive situation.

Consequently while premerger notification is a necessary preliminary step, it is just as important to provide the corollary power to seek an injunction preventing the commingling of assets, management, and productive facilities to a point where they cannot be effectively unscrambled.

I would make it clear the preliminary injunction provision may well benefit the business community itself. Representatives of numerous merging companies believe, in fact, that disruption of business plans is lessened by agency action before merger consummation; some companies point out that if the agencies are to proceed at all they should sue before completion of the merger itself.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Interim Report of Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary, Corporate and Bank Mergers (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955).

[2] Id., pp. 1, 37.

[3] Id., pp. 1, 2.

[4] Id., pp. 26, 40.

[5] Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 5948 (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955); Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 6758, 7229, and 8332 (84th Cong., 2d sess., 1956).

[6] House Committee on the Judiciary, Report No. 1417 on H. R. 5948 (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955) pp. 5–6.

[7] Pp. 78–79.

[8] Hearings on H. R. 5948, p. 11.

[9] Id., p. 12.

[10] Testimony of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 2159.

[11] Testimony of George A. Mooney, superintendent of banks, State of New York, id. pp. 1995–1999.

[12] Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress January 24, 1956, pp. 78–79.

[13] See *Hamilton Watch Co.* v. *Benrus Watch Co.* (114 F. Supp. 307 (D., Conn. 1953) affirmed 206 F. (2d) 738 (2d Cir. 1953)).

Address of Robert Kingsley, Dean of the School of Law, University of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the school of law at the University of Southern California recently celebrated its 50th anniversary. Dean Robert Kingsley delivered an address on this occasion in which he outlined the great contribution in the field of legal education made by the University of Southern California.

The address follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(By Robert Kingsley)

We meet this evening to celebrate a half century of existence of the law school as an integral part of the University of Southern California.

As some of those present on this occasion will remember, we started, in 1896, as the Los Angeles Law School, with James Brown Scott—later to become one of the world's greatest authorities on international law—as dean and with a roster of lecturers famous in the tradition of our bar. One of them, who first appears on the lists in 1900, was our own beloved Judge Hartley Shaw.

After 8 years of separate status, the school became part of the university in June of 1904. Frank Porter—well remembered by many of you—was dean. The faculty included such names as Claire Tappan, Gavin Craig, John Works, Curtis Wilbur, E. V. Camp, and Earl Rogers.

The history from that date on parallels the story of legal education in America. For 20 years the quarters were in the vicinity of the courthouse on Broadway, on Hill, and, after 1912, in the Tajo Building at First and Broadway—a location still full of tradition for many of you. The faculty was largely practicing lawyers giving of their time to train young men and women for their profession. Instruction was mainly by lecture with textbooks for outside reading.

As one scans the annual bulletins, he sees the changes appear. An entrance requirement of 18 years of age with an education deemed adequate by the faculty gradually increased to 2, then 3, and finally 4 years of college. More and more full-time personnel appear on the teaching rolls, and the shift to the case method is also reflected in the listings.

In 1925 came a major event. The school moved from downtown to its present quarters on the campus and, in 1927, Dean Porter laid down the burdens of administration and they were taken up by a younger man, Dean Miller. In 1930, he left us for Duke University and its challenge of the creation of a modern law school there, and Dean Hale came to us from Washington University in St. Louis. There followed 17 years of growth and consolidation, including the period of a world war and its aftermath. Then in 1947 Dean Hale turned over the duties to Shelden Elliott. In 1952 Shelden also felt the call of a challenge, as director of the institute of judicial administration, to perform a vital task for the bar of the country, and I was chosen to be the school's sixth dean.

I have spoken of the gradual changes in the educational service of the school. Over the years it has made such changes to keep step with the changes in the world about it, so that it might always fulfill its single function, to train and develop men and women adequately to serve their community at the bar and on the bench. As new and better methods of teaching were developed, the school moved to make use of them. As the subjects of importance in practice changed, so did the curriculum. The past few years have seen much activity on our part to maintain this tradition of service.

The postwar years found the members of the bar anxious for opportunities to continue their legal education after admission. In 1947, under Professor Ervin's guidance, we started the tax institute, now with its published volumes of annual proceedings nationally recognized as a major contribution to education in that field. In 1951 we began to offer the evening graduate professional program—regular classroom courses, of full semester length, designed to afford a chance to explore new fields of law, to bring old fields up to date, and to broaden the lawyer's view of the law as a whole. Almost 200 of you take advantage of these offerings each semester.

In 1952 we took two other steps in connection with preadmission training. For many years, the school had offered courses in the evening, for the advantage of students whose needs compelled them to earn a living. In the late twenties, for many reasons, that form of education was abandoned. But after the war we became increasingly conscious that there existed a need in this community for more opportunity for such young men and women to secure a legal education of high quality. So, beginning in the fall of 1952, we reinstituted the evening division—staffed by the same faculty and with the same requirements for admission and the same standards of instruction and performance.

For many years, our faculty—and legal educators the country over—had been concerned about the pressure for adding more and more courses to the curriculum. At the same time, we began to wonder whether the time spent in the last 2 years of college was being spent to its greatest benefit. Accordingly, also in 1952, we instituted a program, still experimental, whereby we take a carefully screened group after their first 2 years of college and train them ourselves for 4 (instead of the normal 3) years. It is still too early to give a final judgment, but we think it is working out well.

One aspect of this so-called 2–4 program deserves special mention. We felt that these students peculiarly needed special training in the humanities and, more specifically, in knowledge of good literature. And we also wanted them to gain, as early as possible, some feel of the profession for which they were training. Associate Dean Evans and our curriculum committee therefore designed a course—manned by a brilliant teacher borrowed from the English department—called legal literature. (Most of you, I am sure, read about it in Time magazine a year ago and again in the American Bar Association Journal last month.) By selecting fine examples of good literature, written by or about lawyers, we have made, we think, a real contribution to education. The students get a much needed introduction to good and effective writing (surely a vital lawyer's tool) along with an acquaintanceship with famous (and infamous) lawyers and their ways.

We are conscious that many rules of law find their rationale in theories of psychology, frequently in theories in vogue a century or more ago. This next spring we shall borrow a distinguished scholar from the university's department of psychology to explore, with the senior students in this 2–4 program, some of those traditional rules in the light of modern knowledge.

We have moved in another direction also. We think that a great metropolitan law school owes a duty to its community beyond formal education. Hence, under the direction of Professor Holbrook and with funds provided by the Haynes Foundation, we are cooperating with the American Bar Association in a 3-year study of judicial administration in this county. In cooperation with the ABA and the traffic institute we have for 7 years held annual conferences for traffic-court judges and prosecutors looking to more effective administration of the law in the field. In cooperation with the American Arbitration Association, we have held a successful conference on labor arbitration and with the Food Law Institute, and the women's division of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce a significant conference on the food and drug laws. We plan other similar conferences in these and like areas.

I cannot close without referring to what I regard as our most important contribution to legal education. More vital than anything else is our duty to turn out young men and women with a real sense of professional responsibility. In 1952, under the direction of Judge Philbrick McCoy and with the dedicated help of a panel of lawyers and judges, we started our course on the legal profession. Its details were so recently presented in an article in the ABA Journal for April 1954, that I will not repeat them here. Suffice it to say that we have already had imitators in other schools and national recognition for a contribution toward solution of this part of the education process.

This, then, was and is your law school. One-half of the lawyers and over half of the udges of this county are our graduates. You know them and their quality. As proof of our stewardship in administration of your school, then, I give you the bench and bar of Los Angeles.

Religion in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Phoenix Gazette written by the Reverend Oliver Kehrlein, S. J., of Brophy College Preparatory, in Phoenix, Ariz. I recommend this article to the attention of all Americans during this period between Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day. It would be well for us to ponder the meanings of the words of Father Kehrlein.

The article follows:

RELIGION IN WAR

To the EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

Considerations for Armed Forces Day today.

Recently the Communist army newspaper, Red Star, attacked military chaplains in these words: "A great role is given to the church in the ideology of American military men. Reactionary churchmen of all creeds and faiths act in the role of active support of the Pentagon. Officers in cassocks are considered to be official representatives of the churches in the armed service. They try to

inject religious fatalism in the soldier. They also give them so-called patriotic lectures and talks which glorify the United States, the American way of life, and American democracy."

To that charge military chaplains gladly plead guilty. There is no chaplain who has never spoken these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

There is no mystery in communism. The whole is explained clearly in Stalin's little book, "Historical and Dialectical Materialism." The world is divided. The hammer and the sickle with its subjugated peoples against the cross and the flags of free nations. On one side a small group of men dedicated to forcing the whole of humanity into the forms of a fictitious society of collective man; on the other side, some 800 million who have succumbed to the Red terror, together with the rest of humanity whom they are determined to make its victims.

Our only hope of survival is to face these facts, and act accordingly.

With the Communist, coexistence is meaningless. Peace is impossible, and peaceful coexistence is a contradiction in terms. You cannot coexist peacefully with one who is dedicated to your utter and complete destruction to make room for the new collective man who will displace you. Peace, therefore, between the free world and the slave world of Communist materialism could never be anything but a mirage of spurious peace.

Military power, then, is essential—power, not to commit aggression, but to be always ready to defeat it. But spiritual power is more essential—power based on respect and liberty of men. This power will be the rock against which the aggressive materialism of the Soviets will smash itself.

President Eisenhower gave us this stern but just code for Americans of the Armed Forces. It begins: "I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense." The code concludes: "I will never forget that I am responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America."

Is loyalty to this code only for the membership of the Armed Forces? Or is it a sacred privilege for all Americans?

OLIVER KEHELEIN, S. J.,
Brophy College Preparatory.

Horning-Cooper, Inc., Develops High-Speed Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, two companies in southern California have recently developed a high-speed rocket designed to give our country the best possible defense against an attack by an aggressor nation. The Horning-Cooper Co. and the Grand Central Rocket Co. of southern California are playing a vital role in our national-defense program.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent press release by the Department of Defense discussing this new rocket which is also described in an article of the May 17, 1956, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The press release and article follow:

ASP RESEARCH ROCKET DEVELOPED BY THE NAVY

A high-speed rocket, Asp, especially designed for studies of the upper atmosphere, has been successfully field tested, the Navy announced today.

The rocket, named from the initials Asp—atmosphere sounding projectile—will be used to gather weather information, study cosmic ray emanations and other geophysical data.

The Asp was constructed under a program involving research, development, and production that brought it to a successful test flight stage in less than 5 months' time. It was developed and built by Horning-Cooper, Inc., Monrovia, Calif., under contract with the Bureau of Ships. The contract also included the development of a system for receiving and recording the scientific data on the ground.

Scientists of the United States Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory, San Francisco, Calif., a field activity of the Bureau of Ships, prepared the specifications for the transducer. Asp will be used by the laboratory in its studies of the upper atmosphere.

The Asp rockets are small, with a diameter of 6½ inches and length of 12 feet, and are launched from simplified portable launching racks. They may be directed vertically to attain high altitudes, or horizontally to achieve long range. Asp is equipped with specially instrumented heads from which the observed data are transmitted to earth by tiny, high-frequency radio transmitters.

Asp is powered by a new high-performance solid-propellant rocket motor. This propulsion system enables the rocket to reach speeds of more than five times the speed of sound within a few seconds of launching.

Asp has been successfully tested at full-scale field firing at the naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif., and the White Sands proving grounds in New Mexico.

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 17, 1956]

NEW ROCKET WILL PROBE SECRETS OF IONOSPHERE — MISSILE DESIGNED TO DART STRAIGHT UP AT MILE A SECOND PRODUCED BY MONROVIA FIRM

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—The Asp, a new rocket missile designed to dart straight up at mile-a-second speeds and probe the secrets of the ionosphere, has been successfully tested and will be produced by the Southern California firm of Horning-Cooper, Inc., the Times learned today.

Unlike Cleopatra's deadly viper, this supersonic Asp has no sting and serves a peaceful purpose. Its name is derived from "atmospheric sounding projectile" and it will sample and report by radio what it finds in the little-known regions 30 miles or more above the earth.

The Asp can get up there in 30 seconds at 5 times the speed of sound.

BUILT IN 5 MONTHS

Even more remarkable than the 3,500 mile per hour speed of the missile, however, is the record speed in which it was designed and produced by Horning-Cooper's plant at 2626 South Peck Road, Monrovia.

Research, development and production of the Asp, a brandnew type of rocket missile, was completed less than 5 months after the contract was awarded by the Navy last July 8. The first test firing was conducted December 27 at Point Mugu.

Since then eight further firings have been made without failure. The principle difficulty encountered, it was learned, was that photographic tracking equipment proved too slow to follow the missile.

TWELVE FEET LONG

The Asp is a slim steel pencil 12 feet long and only 6½ inches in diameter, with 4 delta fins and a needle nose that doubles as a radio antenna. Its warhead houses compact radio telemetering transmitters to flash back data on weather, cosmic rays or other radiation at altitudes far beyond the reach of piloted aircraft or even radiosonde meteorological balloons.

Weather balloons, which have reached heights of 100,000 feet, take some time to get there and cannot be controlled after they are loosed—as evidenced by the ruckus raised last February by the Russians over some United States balloons that rode the jet streams across the Iron Curtain.

TEST HURRICANES

Besides being able to reach altitudes above 150,000 feet the Asp rocket will enable almost instantaneous investigations of hurricanes and other atmospheric disturbances. As the specifications were prepared by the Navy's Radiological Defense Laboratory at San Francisco, a division of the Bureau of Ships, it can be assumed that the Asp also will be able to sample drifting radioactive particles from nuclear explosions anywhere in the world.

The new missile uses a high-performance solid propellant and can be launched from a single-track portable launcher either on land or shipboard. It is not a guided missile but its firing angle and trajectory can be regulated so that it may be recovered.

Asp missiles probable will be used extensively in the upper atmospheric studies of the International Geophysical Year starting in mid-1957. While not a weapon itself, its findings could be of immense value to the United States guided missiles program.

Address by Albert W. Highsmith Before Arlington Optimist Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Albert W. Highsmith, organizational director, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Washington, D. C., before Arlington Optimist Club, on May 9, 1956:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is indeed a pleasure to meet with the Arlington Optimist Club to discuss a very serious subject.

It is so serious a subject that I would like to compare it, if I may, to a very personal experience.

I rather suspect that as each of you walked in here today, with the exception of my good friend, Lee Bean, you gave little thought to the process of walking. Walking is something that we all enjoy and that we take for granted.

But for me, like Lee, it is different. To me walking is a very wonderful experience. The reason that it has special meaning for me is that I came so close to losing the ability to walk.

It was only a few years ago that what "couldn't happen to me" did happen. I had polio.

But I did walk in here today. The doctors gave much of the credit for my rapid and

complete recovery to the fact that the disease was diagnosed quickly and corrective treatment was immediately applied.

Something else that we take for granted—our way of life—is also in danger. It is in danger of being paralyzed by the disease of big government.

Big government is sapping away the strength of the Nation in taxation. Yet it is leaving staggering financial obligations for the future.

While imprisoned at Landsberg after his abortive attempt to take over Germany in 1923, Adolph Hitler spelled out for all mankind to see his plot to bring the world quaking to its knees before him.

The world paid little heed to Hitler's threats as blueprinted by him in Mein Kampf until he had already touched the torch to Europe and ignited the conflagration of the Second World War that threatened to consume civilization.

The godless masters of the Kremlin have been more subtle than was the madman of Munich, but they, too, have boasted of their long-range aim of world domination.

Lenin, a lasting hero of communism, spelled out part of their plan for domination of our own Nation. He said: "We will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, told the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington last year: "Our debt is equivalent to the full value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value in the United States."

"I think no one can deny we are mortgaged to the hilt."

How rapidly is Lenin's diabolical dream being fulfilled.

But a financial stranglehold is not the only paralyzing effect of big government.

It is sapping the rights of the individual and the State by extending its powers more and more.

It is sapping the vital strength of free enterprise by placing itself in unfair competition with private business.

Former President Hoover has said that it goes with the instinct of the vegetable.

After a 2-year consultation, the doctors have diagnosed the disease and have prescribed treatment. The prescription is called the second Hoover Report.

James A. Farley has called it "one of the most exciting and encouraging governmental developments of our time." Mr. Farley, the former Postmaster General, is one of the outstanding Democrats who teamed with former President Herbert Hoover and other Republicans to form the Hoover Commission.

I think that therein can be found one major reason that the Hoover Report is exciting and encouraging. It is a bipartisan product.

The idea of Government reorganization is not new. The Republic was still very young when a congressional committee made its first study with an eye toward Government reorganization. There have been no less than nine commissions established during this century to study the problem.

Before 1947, they could boast very little success. In that year something new was introduced to the idea of Government reorganization—a bipartisan approach.

In that year, by a unanimous vote of the Congress, there was established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. In September of that year, the 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans appointed to membership on the Commission met at the White House with President Truman presiding until they elected former President Hoover as their chairman.

Thus began an intensive study of the Government with an eye toward greater efficiency and economy. It was conducted by task forces made up of more than 300 experts, most of them volunteers, who submitted their recommendations to the 12-man Commission.

The Commission in 1949, submitted to Congress 24 reports including 273 recommendations.

The spirit of bipartisanship that had marked the establishment and operation of the Commission, manifested itself after the reports were submitted. They met with greater success than any similar attempt at Government reorganization ever made in this country.

Seventy-two percent of the recommendations were adopted with a saving of billions of dollars.

I am afraid that I sometimes miss the point when the discussion turns to terms of billions of dollars. I just don't know what a billion dollars is. It is too huge a sum for me to fully grasp its meaning.

We are told that if in the year 1, a man with a billion dollars had started burning a thousand dollars a day and had continued at that rate to this day in 1956, his descendants would have to continue it another 510 years before that original billion dollars would all be gone.

Probably of even greater importance than the monetary savings, was that the discussions resulting from the Commission's reports sparked a vigorous reawakening of popular interest in the governmental process.

Mr. Hoover called it the "widest spread education in civil government" that the Nation has had "since the Constitution was under debate."

It was in this atmosphere that, in July of 1953, the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch was created.

Like the first, it was created by unanimous vote of both Houses of the Congress.

Like the first, its membership was bipartisan.

And, like the first, Mr. Hoover was elected as its chairman.

Unlike the first, its instructions from the Congress went beyond just recommending ways to increase efficiency and economy in the operations of the Government. It was instructed to make recommendations for "eliminating nonessential services, functions and activities which are competitive with private enterprise."

This put the second Hoover Commission, by a unanimous vote of both parties in both Houses of Congress, squarely in the field of policy.

While the first Hoover Commission had been concerned only with the question of whether or not the Navy was manufacturing rope efficiently, the second Commission was charged with considering whether the Navy should be manufacturing rope at all or should be buying its rope like anyone else.

The second Hoover Commission like the first used the task force approach in making its study, but with one major difference. The task forces of the first Commission had conducted their study on a departmental basis. This time they made their study on a functional basis. That is, one task force made a survey of all aspects of Federal lending agencies going into each of the 104 agencies concerned with the problem, while another studied 26 agencies involved in the Federal medical program.

There was no inquiry made into the party affiliation of the task force members, Mr. Hoover reported in an article he wrote for the November, 1955, issue of "The Democratic Digest," that the 325 task force members were about evenly divided in party affiliation.

In addition to many outstanding Republicans, the task forces included three former Democratic Cabinet members and six former subcabinet members.

"First get the facts * * * both sides. No preconceptions. When you get all the facts, come up with whatever conclusions they induce."

With these instructions from Mr. Hoover, the task forces embarked on the most intensive study of government ever attempted in modern times.

At the end of 2 years, they submitted their findings to the 12-man Commission.

The Commissioners and their staff drew from the more than 3 million words of the task force reports their own reports to the Congress. The Commission's reports were contained in 19 volumes and included 314 specific recommendations. The last one was submitted to the Congress last July.

The Commissioners were not always in complete agreement on the reports. Even Mr. Hoover registered some dissents. But always in its deliberations, the Commission remained resolutely above partisan politics and the reports of the Commission were the product of majority decision.

Let us look at some of the dimensions of the Hoover Report.

Something of its volume is reflected in the fact that with its supplemental task force reports, it includes 3½ million words.

Something of its importance is reflected in the fact that adoption of the 314 recommendations made in the report could result in an annual savings in the cost of government of $1,500 for each of its 3½ million words. That is a total savings of more than $5½ billion a year, or another way to say it is a savings of more than $10,000 a minute in the cost of operating our Government.

Here are a few of the things the task forces found:

The task forces found that because the Government keeps more records than it needs, a file drawer 5,000 miles long would be necessary to hold them all. They found that Federal paperwork now costs more than the entire Government cost during the Taft administration.

The Commission recommended more efficient methods that could reduce Federal paperwork expenses by $255 million a year.

The task forces reported that some Government agencies lend money at less interest than they pay to borrow it, and that some borrow money from the Government at low interest and reinvest it in Government bonds that pay a higher interest so the Government is paying itself interest.

The Commission recommended that the Government lending program be reorganized on a financially sound basis.

The task forces discovered frightful waste of much-needed medical and technical manpower as well as millions of dollars as the Government rushed from blueprint to reality additional Government hospitals destined to stand half empty beside existing Government hospitals that are only partly utilized.

The Commission recommended that the Federal medical program, now involving dozens of agencies, be coordinated so as to offer the best medical service possible at the most economical cost.

The task forces brought to light instances of the Army shipping 800,000 pounds of tomatoes eastward, coast-to-coast, while the Navy was sending 775,000 pounds of tomatoes in the opposite direction, coast-to-coast; of the Navy storing enough canned hamburger to last 60 years although, by the Navy's own specifications, it would keep only 2 years; and of enough ketchup in Navy warehouses to float each pound of that hamburger in a gallon.

The Commission recommended coordinated purchasing and handling procedures for the Armed Forces. Savings resulting from this one report would be approximately equal to the personal Federal income tax paid by Virginians last year.

I could go on. The list of waste and inefficiencies pointed out by the task forces, and for which the Commission recommended corrections, is almost endless.

In that important matter of Government competition with private business, they found more than 3,000 such enterprises.

There were more than 2,500 in the Defense Department alone. They included 3 ice cream freezing plants, 2 paint manufacturing plants, 2 steamship lines, 244 eye glass manufacturing establishments, 4 coffee roasting plants, and 68 garden nurseries, among others.

In civilian agencies they found such businesses operated by the Government as 75 banks, 110 electric power projects, a fertilizer plant, and 5 insurance agencies.

They found that although some of these enterprises showed a profit on the books, in many cases the goods or services being produced by them could be obtained more inexpensively from private business when all of the facts were taken into consideration.

Take as an example the Military Sea Transport Service. In 1953, it reported a profit of $4 million in its operations. That profit, closer study revealed, was very much akin to the profit a child's lemonade stand makes when the child fails to take into account the cost of the lemons, ice, water, and sugar that came from his mother's kitchen. MSTS, like the youthful lemonade salesman had failed to include legitimate costs such as the pay of its military employees, depreciation of vessels, interest on invested capital and Panama Canal tolls. These four items alone cost $101 million in 1953, leaving an actual operating loss of $97 million for the year.

The Commission recommended that the Government get out of all business enterprises that were not essential to the national security. That was what the Congress had instructed it to recommend.

This is the theme of the second Hoover report. To cite all of the recommendations it made, would be to repeat the report.

I can only suggest that you make it your business, individually or through a committee of your club, to study the Hoover Report. To see just what it does say, and to decide which of its recommendations you can support and then do just that vigorously.

Just as the prescription by my doctors to treat my polio in 1950 would have been useless if the treatment had not been administered, all the work of the task forces, all the work of the Commission will go for naught, if the Commission's recommendations are not acted upon.

If they are to be acted upon, the bipartisanship that has marked the Hoover Commission and its work since its inception must continue. It will require the active support of both parties.

There are some who would block action on the report.

Among the less informed and more vocal of the opponents of the Hoover Report are those who contend that it is a monument to the past. They charge that it would sacrifice the pleasures of today to glorify the past.

As a young men who looks forward to living many years under the economic and governmental systems we are molding now, I take exception to this view. To me, the Hoover report, far from being a monument to the past, is a blueprint for a better tomorrow, and where it suggests that we tighten our belts today, and it does in some cases, it does so because what we are wasting is not ours but belongs to our children.

Future generations will judge us harshly if we fail them now. What more appropriate audience could I have than this club dedicated to boys. In almost every case, opponents of the Hoover report have been found to have vested interest in the status quo and more often than not they have been found to be misinformed on the true nature of the report to which they object.

Some would put political party against political party or faction against faction, knowing that if they succeed in drawing the Hoover report into partisan politics, it will fail of adoption.

In spite of their attempts, some progress can already be reported in implementing the report.

Approximately 45 percent of the recommendations can be put into effect by administrative action within the executive branch.

President Eisenhower has appointed a special assistant to coordinate this effort in the executive branch, and Secretary Wilson has appointed a special assistant to do a similar job in the Defense Department.

A number of the recommendations of the Commission have been implemented, at least in part, in the executive branch.

In the Congress more than 200 bills have been introduced by members of both parties to implement various recommendations. Although few of the bills have been passed, early hearings on many of them have been scheduled.

But where do we go from here?

Mr. Farley summed up the entire problem very neatly. He said:

"Make no mistake: The Hoover report tells us plainly that we have been a foolish people in our use of our resources, both human and material; that our citizens have been neglectful of their responsibilities; and that we must now, or never, adopt some of the simple self-disciplines which free, self-governing people must practice if they hope to remain free.

"This brings us to the big questions: What is the outlook for implementation of the Commission's 314 recommendations? Where does responsibility lie? What are the obstacles to action? And what can we, as citizens, do to make sure that the national benefits of this document are not lost and forgotten in the dusty pigeonholes of Washington?

"The answer to the last question is the key to all the rest. There must be teamwork on a bipartisan basis between the administration and Congress—between any administration and any Congress. But first and foremost there must be strong, bipartisan citizens' support. If we as citizens want maximum action, demand maximum action, and work for maximum action, there will be maximum action. If we are indifferent or neglectful, the results of the Commission's work will be negligible. It is just as simple as that."

The disease has been diagnosed. A prescription has been written. If the treatment is to be administered, it is up to you.

The Small Get Smaller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that the backbone of the American economic system is without question the small-business segment of our economy. Destroy that segment and surely it will result in a controlled economy, or, as has happened more recently in certain European countries—dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, recently I have observed the operations of a powerful organization, namely, the National Federation of Independent Business. I believe many of my colleagues will agree as to the all-out efforts of that organization in behalf of small business. It is fortunate that we have in our economy a sincere group of leaders such as is typified in the leadership of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Recently they took it upon themselves, in view of the importance of my proposed bill, H. R. 9514, to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax, to poll their nationwide membership, comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men—all voting members. The National Federation took this action without any prompting on my part, Mr. Speaker. In presenting the question to their members they gave both sides of the proposition, the arguments for and the arguments against, and I think it is well, Mr. Speaker, to note these arguments for and against.

Argument for: To help our Nation stiffen its small-business backbone—that is the aim of these bills. Ability to keep a greater share of gross earnings would help in many ways; supply funds for expansion and modernization, higher salaries to hold key employees. Further, there would be less incentive to merge with larger units. This bill would not cost the United States Treasury a red cent. Surely Congress, which has just given farmers a $60-million tax cut by exempting them from Federal gasoline excises, can spare as much consideration for small-business men who need assistance equally.

Argument against: With many demands being made on Government for spending, we just cannot afford any business tax reduction or any other tax cuts. Our big job is to keep Federal income in line with outgo. Otherwise we promote inflation which cheapens our dollars. This bill does not offer independents much of a saving—just $2,000 yearly at the outside. Are small firms desirous of selling their birthright of a stabilized value currency for this mess of pottage? Why not stop this move for tax cuts until the Federal finances are brought into order, until spending cuts can be made.

I have been advised by the Washington office of the federation through its vice president, Mr. George J. Burger, that the poll, reaching in excess of 100,000, has been completed, the results of which appear in their current Mandate, the official publication of the federation, and the result is as follows: 84 percent for the bill, 12 percent against, and 4 percent no vote.

This poll, Mr. Speaker, should be noted by my colleagues that small business of this Nation, both at the production and distribution level, must have the necessary reserves built up so they can carry on their businesses not alone in the war periods but, more important, under business conditions when they are normal or below normal. A more important aspect of this poll coming from the grassroots is that small business expects this long overdue relief from the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a still more important aspect of keeping small business an important segment of our economy is that it will open up the door of op-

portunity for the youth of this Nation, if they have the efficiency and ability, to enter into their own respective businesses.

It is my hope that the respective committee will take appropriate action on my bill.

I include here the following excerpt from a broadcast over CBS radio by Eric Sevareid:

THE SMALL GET SMALLER

(By Eric Sevareid)

All who read as they run are by now aware that one deep fissure, or fault, endangers the American prosperity structure, which looks so solid on the surface; they know that farmers generally are suffering a recession. But it is not yet widely recognized that there is a second fissure in the structural foundation. That is the condition of American small business, defined as those concerns with less than a quarter of a million dollars in assets. In net figures, they are not disappearing as small farms are disappearing, but neither are they growing in number as the economy grows, and the number of small-business failures has risen to levels that alarm some observers.

While the press gives page 1 spreads to the profit margins of the giant concerns and their expanison plans, little is said about the present or the future where small business is concerned. But the information is there for anybody willing to look trouble in the face in these days of mass hypnotic belief that there is no trouble.

One so willing is the director of the Public Affairs Institute, who bases his argument on the uncontroverted figures of Dun & Bradstreet, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. For one thing, net growth in the number of business firms stopped in 1953, after growing by 200,000 new concerns in the previous 4-year period. Furthermore, the profit margin of small businesses has not only stopped growing, it has sharply dropped, while that of big business has continued to grow. For example, the smallest size group of manufacturers last year suffered a tremendous 66 percent drop in profit after taxes, compared with 3 years before; funds available for reinvestment or expansion tell the same kind of story—a 40 percent drop.

The story on small-business failures is quite a tale; the chapter on firms that handle wearing apparel, for example. The number of retail failures there increased last year by 7 percent over the year before; the number of wholesale failures increased by 36 percent.

In a report earlier this month, the Senate Small Business Committee reached essentially the same troubled conclusions—unanimously. What deeply troubles them, they said, is that there simply is no evidence that the American small-business man is going to be able to hold his ground, shaky as it is, in the future. They find a direct ratio not only between size and success but between size and survival.

There seems much agreement that what chiefly is choking small business is heavy taxation plus lack of credit. Big business can arrange big, long-term loans; any workingman can buy a house, car, furniture, or what not for about 10 percent down and 3 years to pay. But a small-business man in Los Angeles writes me, what about the modest retailer, jobber, wholesaler, or service man? He has to pay more for rent, labor, supplies, insurance, and taxes, yet his credit situation hasn't changed at all; he still has to pay for his goods in 30 to 60 days. If he applies for extra help to the Federal Small Business Administration, what happens? Well, as the Public Affairs Institute points out, the SBA has received about 11,000 inquiries a month and has granted fewer than 400 direct loans in 2 long years.

So far, hardly a whisper of concern has been voiced by the administration over the profound social fact that the big get bigger while the small get smaller—a fact, concludes the Senate committee, that will ultimately change the fundamental character of the American economy, perhaps beyond easy recognition by the present generation.

Statement of Omar B. Ketchum, Director, National Legislative Service Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, With Respect to Report of President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, May 11, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Omar B. Ketchum and I am the national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I appear before your committee today to express the current viewpoint of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, more frequently referred to as the Bradley Commission. The viewpoints herein expressed are based upon longstanding policy, current National Encampment resolutions and consultation between national officers and the national staff.

Accompanying me this morning are other national staff members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who have had many years of experience in dealing with many of the problems discussed in the Bradley Commission report. They are Mr. H. A. Calkins, director of the VFW National Rehabilitation Service, whose hair has turned white during long years of service to veterans; Dr. Robert A. Bell, USN (retired), medical consultant for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and who, in addition to a long career of medical practice, has served the Defense Department as an expert on disability determinations; and Mr. Elmer P. Richter, technical consultant to the VFW rehabilitation service, and an amputee from World War I who has devoted over 30 years to the problems of veterans, first with the Veterans' Administration and then with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I suggest to your committee that these men, through their training and years of experience, have accumulated some knowledge on the subject under consideration by your committee.

One of Shakespeare's plays dealt with, "much ado about nothing." I hope that insofar as the Congress is concerned the Bradley Commission report will also turn out to be much ado about nothing. It is our understanding the Commission report was submitted to the President and that it will not officially be before the Congress unless and until some or all of the recommendations have been submitted by the President. The Bradley report, in our opinion, is closely akin to the Hoover report on veterans and is entitled to about the same congressional consideration.

We shall not attempt to analyze and comment on each of the 70 specific recommendations contained in the Bradley Commission report. We will discuss some of the recommendations in the hope that we can prove to this committee that the report as a whole is impractical, contrary to national tradition, and replete with distortions and exaggerations. Before taking up any specific recommendations we should like to discuss the underlying philosophy of the report and our interpretation of what it means now and for the future.

We charge the underlying philosophy of the Bradley Commission report is an attempt to reverse the traditional national policy of the United States with respect to those who have served in the Armed Forces. The heart and soul of the report clearly infers that veterans are entitled to no more consideration than nonveterans and seeks to repudiate the hardships, dislocations, and hazards of service in the Armed Forces.

We are at a loss to understand the attitude of the Commission toward veterans which gave birth to this new philosophy. It has been suggested that perhaps the Commission has been seeing too many television shows and has been overly influenced by the weekly poking fun at the Army and starring comedian Phil Silvers in the role of Sergeant Bilko. May we express the hope that the great body of men and women who have served in the Armed Forces are not being measured by the platoon of "characters" commanded by Sergeant Bilko in the television show.

The report attempts, with one hand, to deal generously with the service disabled, but with the other hand, to withdraw benefits to many who are badly disabled. In paying lip service to the service disabled the report attempts to deceive both the disabled and the American people by making fish of one group of veterans and fowl of another.

Let me suggest to this committee the existence of a hidden time bomb in the Bradley report and a warning of what is inevitable in the future. The report states that "ordinary or non-service-connected veteran needs should be met through general welfare programs which cover all the people but that service-connected benefits should be accorded the highest priority and should be liberal, even generous." Herein lies the delayed fuse of the report which seeks to make fish of some and fowl of the others and should be tagged with a warning flag.

If the philosophy and recommendation of the Commission to the effect that, in the absence of proven service-connected disabilities, veterans in need should be dealt with out of the same pot with nonveterans is sound, would it not also be valid to insist that veterans with service-connected disabilities, combat or otherwise, be dealt with out of the same pot wtih nonveterans who suffer industrial disabilities? It needs only a slight nudge for the Commission to go the whole way and insist that a leg lost in combat is deserving of no different consideration than a leg lost in an industrial accident. If the first premise is sound and accepted it is not difficult to anticipate the next target.

There is a current popular song which says "Love and marriage go together like a horse and carriage and you can't have one without the other." Would it be unreasonable to suggest at this point that non-service-connected disabled and aged war veterans and service-connected disabled war veterans go together and that you can't ignore the one and honor the other?

The value and validity of the Bradley Commission report and recommendations, in general, depends upon the viewpoint of those who read and study it. If you agree with the proposed new philosophy and reversal of tradition where consideration of veterans is concerned, the report makes sense. If you disagree with this strange new philosophy and reversal of tradition, the report makes little or no sense. We, of the Veterans of

Foreign Wars, do not agree with the underlying philosophy in the report and, consequently, recognize it for what it is—some warmed-over thinking cribbed from various sources, including the Budget Bureau, the Pentagon, and a 1953 report by the old Phillips Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has long been concerned over the repeated surveys and task-force investigations, outside the Congress, of the veterans' benefit program and the Veterans' Administration. The Bradley Commission study and report is further evidence of a determination in not too well defined quarters to create public suspicion against expenditures for veterans. We strongly suspect the principal value of the Bradley Commission report is to provide a Roman holiday for that portion of the daily press which is either cynical or openly hostile toward veteran benefits. Editorials are blooming in all parts of the United States applauding the wisdom and courage of the Bradley Commission and a large segment of the public, including many pensioners and disabled veterans, has jumped to the conclusion that the recommendations have the force of law and are being put into effect.

Contrary to the Bradley Commission report there is and has been a national policy with respect to veterans. The Congress, with the approval of Washington and Lincoln among others, established the pattern and tradition of special consideration for veterans which has been followed over the years. The Congress has determined, largely by its own initiative, what benefits and special consideration should be extended to veterans. The Congress, from time to time, through standing or special committees, has instituted studies and investigations affecting or involving veteran benefits and has enacted legislation to adjust or liberalize the benefits in accordance with its findings. The Veterans of Foreign Wars supports the principle of congressional studies and determination with respect to special consideration and benefits for veterans. We strongly suggest that any future studies or investigations of the veteran benefit program or the operation of the Veterans' Administration be left to the House Committee on Veterans Affairs or an appropriate committee designated by the Congress.

In the highlights of the Commission's findings and recommendations the report proudly observes that "veterans today are better off economically than nonveterans in comparable age groups." Some fancy charts are served up to illustrate this disclosure. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is not yet ready to accept the conclusion but in the absence of factual evidence to the contrary we would like to offer the following observations: In comparing the income of veterans with nonveterans in the same age groups let's keep the following point in mind. In World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, of all the millions of men who were examined for military service approximately 30 percent were rejected. It can, therefore, be safely assumed that those who were accepted for military service represented the cream of the crop both physically and mentally.

Now, the Bradley Commission researchers no doubt run a cross section test of the incomes of a group of both veterans and nonveterans in comparable age groups. Considering the fact that the veterans in this group were the cream of the crop, physically and mentally, and that among the nonveterans were the 30 percent of rejects, should it be surprising and astounding that the veterans' income is at least equal to, if not higher than, nonveterans? If the law of supply and demand and the traditional reward for intelligence and ability are still factors in our national economy, one could assume that the veterans should have a substantially higher income.

However, the ratio of income between veterans and nonveterans in comparable age groups is not necessarily a true index to economic security. Other factors, such as liquid assets, unencumbered property, paid-up insurance, and home and business mortgages, should also be taken into consideration. It is possible the veteran with the same or slightly higher income than the nonveteran may not be as far along the road to security through liquid assets and unencumbered property.

In addition to painting a rosy picture with respect to the economic status of veterans in comparison with nonveterans in the same age group the Bradley Commission, in recommending a gradual elimination of special consideration for veterans and benefits for the non-service-connected disabled, places great stress upon what it calls "changing conditions in military service, warfare, readjustment benefits and general welfare programs." The Commission insists that pension levels—if paid at all—should be based on public assistance standards and should be consistent with old-age and survivors insurance. The Commission further contends that the present income limitations of $1,400 and $2,700 are too high and should be geared to the average needs test applying to public assistance rolls.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars vigorously disagrees with the foregoing findings and recommendations of the Commission. We have repeatedly pointed out to the Congress and to the Bradley Commission itself that the only effect that these changing conditions might require insofar as pensions are concerned would be the imposition of a reasonable income limitation. Need is need and must be met wherever it exists regardless of changing conditions. The VFW has accepted the reasonableness of a modest income limitation affecting eligibility of veterans to receive pensions, but we utterly repudiate the theory that pensions should only be paid to veterans on a public assistance or "bare-bones" existence level. We believe that, if veterans are worthy of special consideration by reason of their special service, such consideration should be based on more than the lowest levels.

As recent as last February 7 the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through Commander in Chief Timothy J. Murphy, stated its position to this committee on veterans pensions. In asking for the enactment of a separate pension program for the aging group of World War I veterans, Commander Murphy acknowledged that improving social and economic conditions along with social security and the growth of retirement and pension programs in Government and industry would sharply lessen the need for veterans' pensions in the future. Commander Murphy predicted that, with a continued expanding economy and the absence of another war, it was quite possible that the aging group of World War I veterans might be the last to require liberal group-pension assistance.

Murphy pointed out that, as long as a modest income limitation is attached as a condition to the payment of veterans' pensions, it was quite possible that in the years to come the only veterans who could meet the income and unemployability tests for the pension rolls would be those who became disabled before attaining security under some retirement or pension program sponsored by Government or private industry. May we repeat today that the need for pension assistance for veterans will diminish and eventually disappear; (a) when economic factors, such as retirement programs and social security maintain disabled and aged veterans at an economic level not below semiskilled workers; or (b) when there are no more veterans. Consequently, it is not changing conditions which are paramount but rather whether those changing conditions have alleviated need below the level of earnings of semiskilled workers.

It is significant to note throughout the Bradley Commission report emphasis has been placed upon past, present, and future costs of the veterans' benefit program. A series of charts, together with the body of the report, has attempted to paint a frightening picture of what United States taxpayers will be confronted with in the future. We charge exaggeration and distortion in the presentation of both the text and the charts.

One of the most glaring distortions in the projection of estimated cost of veteran benefits for the future is the constant repetition both in charts and text, "assuming the enactment of a general service pension for all veterans." Why does the report continuously assume the enactment of a general service pension when no responsible veterans' organization is asking or advocating such a program? The only pension bills of any consequence before your committee are bills which incorporate disability, age and income limitations, or where only an age requirement is incorporated, the bills are limited to one group of veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has made two pension recommendations. One would set up a separate pension program for World War I veterans and incorporates age, disability, and income limitations. The other recommends a modest liberalization in the existing part III pension program which, as you know, incorporates not only age, disability and income limitations but also an unemployability requirement. It is my understanding the American Legion is advocating legislation which would liberalize the part III pension program, but would retain most of the limitations, including the income limitations. The World War I Veterans Association is supporting a general service pension bill, but it is confined to World War I veterans. Under these circumstances, where did the Bradley Commission get the inspiration to "assume the enactment of a general service pension for all veterans?"

Another distortion in the Bradley Commission report on projected estimated cost is the use of some charts labeled "Income Maintenance Payments Under Public Programs." One of these charts, on page 121, is identified as general Federal, State, and local programs plus VA compensation and pensions in selected years 1940 to 1985. This chart lumps together pensions and compensation costs, assuming a general service pension, plus social security, plus all other general or public assistance programs participated in by the Federal Government. No doubt railroad retirement is also included. With all of these programs, the Bradley researchers were able to present a startling projected estimate of cost for the year 1985 which reached a possible $40.7 billions. Again we ask why does the Bradley Commission add together the cost of veterans' pensions and compensation with social security and all other general Federal programs including public assistance? The clear inference contained in the chart is to the effect that United States taxpayers will be confronted with a staggering bill on handouts by the year 1985.

It may not be generally understood that most of the cost of social security and railroad retirement is borne by contributions made by employers and employees. When social security and railroad retirement are included with gratuity programs to create a taller column in a chart, without regard to the nature of the expenditures, it constitutes distortion and borders on deception.

It is significant that in dishing up all these charts purporting to show projected estimated costs for the future, very little consideration has been given to the relation between the cost of pensions and compensation and the amount of United States national income. A casual study of these projected costs might lead one to believe that the cost of pensions and compensation will continue to climb to dizzy heights, but the United

States national income will remain at the present level. A study of the relation between the cost of pensions and compensation to United States national income over a long period of years reveals that notwithstanding the increase in the number of veterans and the increase in the number of dollars paid out, the percentage of national income necessary to support this program has varied little and, if anything, is smaller.

As previously pointed out, the Bradley Commission report professes great sympathy and concern for the service disabled. Let's examine more closely some aspects of the report to determine whether this sympathy is real or merely lip service. The Commission among other things has proposed three specific changes in compensation payments to the service disabled: (1) Monthly compensation payments to those whose service-connected disabilities are rated 10 and 20 percent would be dropped from the compensation rolls and some vague form of lump sum payment would be substituted; (2) statutory awards for certain obvious loss or loss of use of parts of the body would be eliminated; and (3) presumption of service-connection for certain chronic, tropical and other diseases would be withdrawn. A careful study and evaluation of these recommendations by the VFW rehabilitation service reveals that the savings which would result if these recommendations were put into effect would amount to at least $400 million annually, on the service-disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the members of your committee and others in this room who recall the 1953 report of the former Phillips Subcommittee on Appropriations will find a striking similarity in that report and the recommendations and the amount of money which would be saved under the Bradley Commission report. It could be a coincidence but when the amount of savings and the methods proposed by the subcommittee report so closely parallel the Bradley Report it is difficult to believe that it was only a coincidence. Reducing compensation payments to the service disabled by not less than $400 million annually with some vague proposals as a substitute does not appeal to the Veterans of Foreign Wars as expressing real sympathy and concern for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities.

REVISION OF RATING SCHEDULE

The Bradley Commission complains that the schedule for rating disabilities has not been revised since 1945. They fail to acknowledge, however, that the rating schedule is under constant study and there have been a number of revisions in recent years. The VFW agrees that further study and revisions are in order and from time to time we have submitted suggestions concerning revision. The VFW further recommends that all studies and revisions should be made by experts in rating practice and there would be no point in taking this function away from the Veterans' Administration.

The Bradley Commission states it obtained an up-to-date view on medical aspects on disability compensation from the views of 155 medical specialists. The qualifications of these medical specialists as rating experts are not set forth. The report claims that an overwhelming proportion believed that neither the 10 nor 20 percent ratings constituted an actual impairment of earning capacity. Now the Bradley Commission recognizes and knows that earning capacity is not the basis for according percentage disability ratings. Ratings are designed to compensate average impairment of the average man to function in daily life, including employment. If the principle of rating on degree of impairment is sound, the veteran with only a 10 or 20 percent impairment is equally entitled to his proportionate compensation.

STATUTORY PRESUMPTION FOR CHRONIC DISEASES

The Bradley Commission recommends withdrawal of statutory presumption of service connection for certain chronic and tropical diseases on the basis that the physicians surveyed were in general agreement that service connection should be determined in accordance with sound medical principles and not by fiat. This naive view overlooks the experience of the Congress and of veterans' organizations in arriving at the need for statutory presumptions in order to protect the best interests of worthy war veterans.

The determination of service connection for disability is a theoretically desirable objective. Can it work in practice? The everyday spectacle of fundamental differences between equally qualified specialists testifying (on medical principles) in our law courts hardly indicates any unanimity of opinion in this field. Where are the accepted medical principles published? In what way are they taught in our medical schools? In the particular area covered by statutory presumptions the veterans' organizations and the Congress have, over the years, found no satisfactory basis for according justice and equity in disability awards other than through such presumptions, accorded as a matter of law, and with the decision removed from the realm of opinion, judgment, narrow experience, prejudice, or colloquial views.

ELIMINATION OF STATUTORY AWARDS

The Bradley Commission would eliminate statutory awards and substitute some new procedure in the rating schedule which presumably would more equitably dispense justice to those veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of some part or organ of the body. The VFW suggests the Commission failed to consider the facts behind congressional decision to authorize statutory awards. Over the years the Veterans' Administration, in applying an average rating schedule to determine percentages of disabilities, were unable to place monetary emphasis upon the obvious loss or loss of use of certain parts of the body. The Congress, aware of this problem and recognizing the difficulty of properly evaluating the loss of a hand or foot on an average impairment basis, reached the decision that there was a handicap above and beyond the rating schedule which could only be recompensed by a special monetary award. This decision resulted in the establishment of what is known as statutory awards which the Bradley Commission would eliminate. The VFW believes the statutory award to be reasonable and sound approach to a most difficult problem and that withdrawal of the statutory awards would be neither acceptable to the veterans nor to the public.

The Bradley Commission report, in addition to the many recommendations with which we have disagreed, would join with the Hoover Commission in taking away from the Veterans' Administration and placing with another Government agency the administration of a veteran benefit. The Commission, in recommendation 45, on pages 312 and 313, states that the home-loan programs for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict be transferred from the Veterans' Administration to the Federal Housing Administration and that the terms for said loans which are now favorable to veterans be gradually changed until they are identical to the terms available to the general population. We vigorously disagree with this recommendation and make the observation that under the conditions recommended by the Bradley Commission we cannot understand how such a program then could be identified as a veterans' benefit program. If such a benefit as insured home loans are no longer advisable for veterans, the Commission should have the courage to recommend outright repeal and veterans would then be limited to the same loan programs as nonveterans.

In recommendation 46 (b), on page 319, the Commission proposes to sharply curtail existing preferences for veterans in the Federal classified civil service. Under this proposal veterans would be limited to a 5-year period after discharge in which they could take advantage of special appeals procedure and in receiving preference in appointments and retention. However, the Commission would make an exception where veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 30 percent or more are concerned. Here again is a renewal of the effort to sharply distinguish between and divide veterans. Does the Commission agree that a service disabled veteran with a disability of 30 percent or more should be entitled to preference over a nonveteran who has suffered an industrial disability of 30 percent or more? The VFW agrees that the service-disabled should have added preferences but we emphatically disagree that the so-called nonservice disabled veterans should be denied preferences longer than 5 years after discharge from active service. This is a further example of the new philosophy which insists that veterans are entitled to no more consideration than nonveterans.

We are in agreement with recommendation 61 (a), on page 390, which states that survivors' pensions should be made available to the widow and/or children of any deceased eligible war veteran who are in need because their total family income falls below an amount fixed by the Government. This should apply equally to the widows of World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict. We do not agree with certain other items under recommendation 61 which impose additional restrictions and/or limitations beyond those presently existing in the payment of widows pensions. We favor continuation of the so-called non-service-connected widows and orphans pensions on the basis of a reasonable income limitation.

We agree with that part of recommendation 67 (a), on page 404, which would give serious consideration to making the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a member of the Cabinet. We disagree with the suggestion the President should establish a Cabinet Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. The responsibility and authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as a Cabinet member should not be limited more than any other Cabinet member. We recognize the possibility of the Administrator as a Cabinet member becoming involved in political matters. However, there has been a trend toward keeping the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense out of partisan political discussions and we believe that a precedent and condition could be established in keeping a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs from engaging in partisan political discussions and campaigns. We can visualize many advantages and a better understanding of the veteran benefit program with a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs who is a part of high level policymaking and decisions.

We can find little justification for recommendation 68 (a) and (b), on page 406. It seems to us that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, if anything, needs more freedom to operate within the framework of existing laws, and less domination by the Bureau of the Budget. It is unlikely that any changes in the rules by the Administrator in large matters affecting eligibility of veterans for benefits or involving changes in program objectives have ever been made without consultation with the President and/or the Bureau of the Budget.

Recommendation 69, on page 408, would maintain the finality of decisions by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs but would make provision for a central administrative review of all decisions by field boards be-

fore final appeal to the Board of Veterans' Appeals. It is doubtful if any substantial benefit would accrue from such an additional review. It would incur additional expense. It would seem to the VFW that the present Board of Veterans' Appeals could continue to handle this work without any undue hardship upon either the claimants or the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the general viewpoint and observations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the report of the Bradley Commission. If your committee so desires we can, at a later date, furnish an itemized list of VFW reaction to the 70 specific recommendations made in the Bradley report. Some of the recommendations are not objectionable and we are not concerned with others. However, if it would be of any interest or value to your committee we will furnish you, in the near future, an item by item comment on the entire 70 recommendations.

We should like to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to members of this committee, that we have the utmost confidence in the committee. We have no doubt that if and when the President should send up any of the recommendations of the Bradley Commission report you will exercise sound, commonsense in reaching your conclusions. We are confident this committee will not report any bill which does violence to the longstanding policies of your committee and the Congress with respect to our Government's responsibility toward veterans and their dependents as a special class of citizens.

We regret the necessity of taking issue with General Bradley and his associates on the President's Commission. We have admired and respected General Bradley as an able soldier and general and the Veterans of Foreign Wars has named one of its highest medals in his honor. We believe General Bradley was given an assignment and, like the good soldier he is, accepted the assignment and carried on. We do not agree with many of the conclusions in the Bradley Commission report but we bear no animosity or ill will toward the general or his associates.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we are hopeful this committee will give favorable consideration to bills liberalizing benefits for the service disabled, for the widows and orphans, and for the pensioners. We respectfully recommend that careful consideration be given to the pension bill identified as H. R. 9121 which would establish a separate and liberalized pension program for the aging group of World War I veterans. Nothwithstanding some of the optimistic conclusions in the Bradley Commission report, it is our considered opinion that it is the group of World War I veterans who are on the borderline between the old era of pension necessity and the new era which promises a more assured security for old age and lessens pension need in the future. Let me assure you that the Veterans of Foreign Wars will appreciate any liberalization of veteran benefits, regardless of whether it is a bill now pending before your committee or a new one that might be drafted.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear and your courtesy in hearing us out.

Hon. James P. Richards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in private and undoubtedly much more will be said publicly concerning the retirement from the Congress of our very distinguished colleague, Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. It is generally conceded to be lamentable that the Congress and the country should lose the services of one who has earned for himself the universal admiration and respect of all his colleagues and who has served with credit and distinction as the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during these difficult and dangerous times and who has in such service earned an enviable reputation for fairness and capacity. It was my intention to include in these remarks the article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 18, 1956, on Mr. RICHARDS, but a Member of the other body has set forth that article in the RECORD. It is an interesting but by no means complete word picture of a great American and a distinguished legislator.

In Texas: A New Bronc Rider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Lubbock, Tex., Morning Avalanche of May 8, 1956, in regard to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, who has recently won additional honors in the field of State and national leadership:

IN TEXAS: A NEW BRONC RIDER

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S overwhelming victory over Gov. Allan Shivers for control of Democratic precinct conventions on Saturday is, as we forecast last Friday, that it would be, the one big hope of the party in Texas and, further, offers opportunity for Texas to raise a louder, clearer voice in national party affairs.

To be sure, the JOHNSON victory of Saturday was only round 1 in the battle; round 2 will come in the county conventions today and the final round 3 on May 22, at the State convention in Dallas. But the results of Saturday's melees, from the big cities to the crossroads, put the handwriting on the wall. It reads: "In for JOHNSON, out for Shivers."

The move to the JOHNSON camp in such great numbers proves the Senator's appeal to those who are sick and tired of constant bickering; sick and tired of the blatant extremists on both sides of the party split in Texas. The middle-of-the-roaders are the ones who chose the senior Senator as their outspoken champion. With JOHNSON in the saddle, Texans may hope for relegation to the back seats of the radical and ultra-conservative elements and the ascendancy of the more reasonable. That's what we need in the Democratic Party in this State—and the Nation over.

As a result of his victory in Texas, Senator JOHNSON will return to Washington and his post as majority leader in the upper House as a stronger and more powerful figure than ever before—one with whom the national party leaders must cope and to whom they will be forced to pay more than passing attention. His position today is not only that af twice-elected Senator and majority leader but also it is that of unchallenged spokesman for a State whose Presidential electors pack a potent wallop.

LYNDON JOHNSON can tell the national party bosses, from Paul Butler to Carman di Sappio, about political thinking in Texas and their memories are not so short that they have forgotten that Texans will, whenever they choose, cross party lines in a national election. The Senator knows, as well as anybody, what Texans will take and what they won't take. And he knows as well as anyone, too, that neither he, nor Speaker RAYBURN, or anybody else can force a radical Presidential candidate on the majority of the voters of this State. Furthermore, he is the sort of fellow who will tell 'em—and without stuttering.

It is entirely possible that what happens in Texas Democratic circles this spring will have an important bearing on the action of the national convention in Chicago in August. At least there is room for hoping that this is so.

Senator JOHNSON'S leadership of the Democratic organization in Texas will not be a bed of roses—at least until he welds that organization firmly, and just as firmly explains to all facets of support that his is and shall continue to be a middle-of-the-road program.

The Senator's leadership, in fact, depends upon his ability to exercise it to the satisfaction of the middle-of-the-roaders who put him where he is and who can jerk the rug out from under him should they ever so desire.

But, fortunately, the senior Senator is an amazing man—persuasive, intelligent, fair—and, when needs to be, tough as a boot, three times as high and twice as hard to make. He is quicker to bring about compromise than he is to kick out the teeth of those who do not wholly agree with him and that talent should serve him well in the first months to come.

It may be asking too much of any man to bring complete peace and accord to the divergent wings of the Democratic Party in Texas and it certainly is too much to expect any man to do that overnight. But as we noted last Friday, Senator JOHNSON is the only Texan currently on the political horizon who might, conceivably, turn the trick.

We hope he can do it.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Niagara River Power Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 20, it was my privilege to address the concluding session of the Electric Consumers Conference, the chairman of which was the Honorable Clyde Ellis.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I prepared for delivery on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT ELECTRIC CONSUMERS CONFERENCE, HELD AT THE STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON SUNDAY, MAY 20, 1956

This is a most satisfying occasion. Last Wednesday we tasted together the fruits of victory. As deeply gratifying as that victory was to me, I am sure that it was no less gratifying to you.

But while we claim it as our victory, climaxing not only months, but years of effort—it was in a real sense a victory for the people of the United States.

This I deeply believe. With this, I think you wholly agree.

This organization, encompassing as it does many of the public-interest groups in our country which are interested not only in public power but in the public welfare, contributed much to the successful outcome of the Senate vote on the Niagara bill.

But that was not your sole contribution. You contributed much also to the formulation of the bill. Your representatives in Washington spent long hours in consultation with members of my staff and with me, in working over the provisions of the bill, not only this year and last year, but during all the years that the Niagara bill passed through its many forms and changes.

From the beginning I wanted a bill that served not only the immediate interests of New York State, but also the interests of the Nation. The formulation of legislative provisions that would serve the interests of the people of New York and simultaneously advance the interests of the country as a whole, was the result of these long studies, deliberations, and consultations.

That is one of the reasons, I said, a moment ago, that the passage of S. 1823 was not only our victory, but a victory for the people. It was, of course, a great victory for New York State, and a long step forward in a direction desired and needed by New York State. But it was more, very much more.

It was a resounding reaffirmation of principles which have been fought for by farsighted men, and men of good will generally, since the turn of this century—basically the principle that our water resources belong to all the people and should be developed in a manner to provide the maximum possible benefits to the maximum number of people.

One of the leading opponents of the Niagara bill said, in the course of the debate, that he did not see the difference between our water resources and our resources of coal, oil, and farmland. Senator KERR, I believe, in his own picturesque manner, effectively answered that argument.

But the most convincing answer was given by the Senate itself in voting, by a substantial majority, the approval of a bill which asserts the inalienable right of the people of New York State to develop the great waters of the Niagara River primarily for the benefit of the people, and not—I repeat, not—for the benefit of private, profit-seeking monopolistic utility corporations.

This victory was not an isolated one, although it has been some time since we have had such a satisfying and resounding one. This victory was built upon other victories of the distant and recent past—victories against the same kind of selfish and self-serving forces as those which sought, and still seek, to oppose our Niagara power development legislation.

In recent years, in the years during which I have been in the Senate, we well recall the strenuous efforts which were made to defend the public's right to another public resource—the offshore oil deposits; and more recently still, the public's interest in the peacetime uses of atomic power. All those efforts, those which succeeded and those which failed, contributed in good measure to the victory on the Niagara bill.

And, my friends, the victory on Niagara will contribute, I trust and believe, to victory sooner or later, and I hope sooner, in the fight for a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

I pledge my efforts to supplement yours toward this end.

Sometimes in our concentration on the battle, we foget that low-cost power is not the final object of our efforts. Electric power, high cost or low, means nothing in and of itself. It is with the use of electric power that we are ultimately concerned. We see the real consequences of low-cost hydroelectric power in terms of happier lives, relief from needless drudgery in the home and on the farm, and a vast expansion in industrial development. It is in this context that I see the benefits from public development of our publicly owned water resources.

It is for this reason that it is necessary for the Congress to be ever-vigilant to protect this precious public resource and prevent its alienation to private monopoly.

The victory in the Senate means we have won the initial battle in this Congress. Yet we know that final victory is not won until the bill is safely through the House and is signed into law by the President.

So even while we join in mutual congratulations over success in the Senate, we must waste no time in girding for the fight ahead.

Make no mistake about it, there is a real fight ahead—a tough and uphill fight all the way.

Remember that the private utilities' lobby has historically considered the House of Representatives its own particular hunting ground—and their hunting license seems to cover all sorts of weapons.

So we should be sure our own ammunition supply is adequate. I would like to review with you briefly the strategy and tactics involved in this grueling fight ahead.

In the House, there will be many more than in the Senate openly opposed to any form of public power development, and openly favoring a naked giveaway of Niagara to private monopoly interests.

But, of course, there will also be the busbar boys—those who pay lipservice to public development and then demand that the power produced be immediately turned over to private utility interests right at the project site.

We must, therefore, be sure that the Members of the House thoroughly understand the basic issues so familiar to all of us.

We will have to explain again and again why public development is necessary to preserve the public interest in resources belonging to all the people.

We will need to say over and over again that not one cent of Federal money is involved in paying for the Niagara development since the New York Power Authority is ready, willing, and able to finance the construction.

Then we will need to reeducate the House—and the general public, too—on the difficult but vital subject of preference and transmission lines.

Referring to the preference provision, we must make sure that we get over to Members of Congress, and the general public, exactly what "preference" means. In the course of the Senate debate, it was evident that there still lingers in the minds of some the mistaken impression that preference means discrimination in favor of a few selected customers.

You, of course, know that the preference clause is really an antimonopoly clause. Perhaps it should be called an equal-opportunity clause in that it insures a supply of low-cost publicly developed power to rural consumer cooperatives and to municipally owned utilities—in other words, to nonprofit and public groups—to the people themselves.

That is what the preference clause is: a device for marketing the people's power to the people, and at the same time establishing a rate yardstick for the benefit of those people who are served by private utilities—so that all the people benefit.

Nor is it enough to show that private utility companies tend to reduce their rates to their own customers when there are municipal utilities and rural electric cooperatives in the area. It should also be brought home that the private power companies are not only not driven out of business by the rate reductions resulting from the yardstick, but actually, to their own surprise, sell more power and reap greater profits.

We must anticipate that the private monopoly interests will step up their propaganda efforts. We must recognize and explode their phoney arguments about the taxes they pay—and want to pay. A person hearing these arguments might be led to believe that the highest aspiration and most urgent desire of the private utilities is to pay more taxes. A moment's sober reflection should convince anyone that this is not their goal. The fact is that the private utilities do everything they can to escape paying taxes. And as soon as they pay them, or even before, these taxes are passed directly on to the consumers. We know that. But do the Members of the House know it? Does the general public realize it? We must make sure that they do know it, and that they understand further that even greater revenues come to the Federal, State, and local

governments when there is, in any area, an abundant supply of low-cost power.

Well, there is much more I can say. But it isn't necessary. I am sure we all realize what must be done in this fight and in others which we face on this whole issue of public power.

If we can get the Niagara bill through the House, it will help break trail for a Federal high dam in Hells Canyon. It is, in essence, all one fight. But let us not forget for a moment that the fight ahead will be rough and tough. The private utility lobby will see to that.

But let us take heart and look at the larger picture. Our efforts on behalf of a public-power policy are but a part of our larger concern for the cause of conservation and for the proper use of all of our natural resources for the benefit of all our people.

And this, in turn, is but an integral part of our struggle for the general welfare. Each success adds that much to the ultimate living for all of our people. Each success is one degree of fulfillment.

Our fight on this front—public power—is part of a great fight for the public good. Let us get on with it, and spare no efforts.

The Highway Program and How It Affects the State of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the very able junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] on the highway program and how it affects the State of New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR SENATOR REPORTS

(By Hon. NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire)

The President's highway program, which has been batted back and forth for the last 2 years like a bird caught in a badminton game, went through another bout in our Committee on Public Works this week.

The committee rejected the new House bill and resurrected last year's Senate bill, expanding it to a complete 13-year program so that it conforms more nearly to the President's plan. The House bill was acceptable in the main to the administration, and had the blessing of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway commissioners. Yet I voted for the Senate version. Why?

Because the apportionment of Federal funds under the House bill is monstrously unfair and New Hampshire is about the worst victim.

A few facts and figures will demonstrate this clearly. Two years ago each State was invited to furnish the Bureau of Public Roads an estimate of the cost of completing its interstate highways. Apparently no standards were set, and each State was allowed to use its own judgment and imagination as to how much it would spend and how elaborately it would build. New Hampshire, with typical Yankee thrift and frugality, estimated about $300,000 a mile. Vermont's estimate was $500,000. Delaware a million and a half, and New Jersey nearly $4 million per mile. Result: Under the House bill, New Hampshire's share of Federal funds is second lowest in the Nation. Delaware, with only 42 miles to be built, gets only slightly less than New Hampshire, with 214 miles. Little District of Columbia, with 28 miles of road, gets twice as much as our State. Both our neighbors, Maine and Vermont, far outstrip us, and New Jersey, with only 354 miles, gets 19 times as much Federal money. Figuring it another way, we would get back only 83 percent of what we pay the Federal Government in gasoline taxes. Maine would get 111 percent; New Jersey, 173 percent; Vermont, 317 percent.

Now you are asking, "Why would the administration and the highway commissioners agree to such a bill?" The answer is that, on the face of it, the discrimination is corrected later in the bill. It provides that at the end of 2 years the Bureau of Public Roads shall review the requirements of each State, standardize them, and recommend a fair reapportionment for subsequent years, taking into consideration overpayments already made. The fly in this ointment is that the new schedule must be approved by the Public Works Committees of the Congress. I wouldn't worry about my own Senate committee. Eight out of the thirteen members come from the poorer States which have made modest estimates, and no State has more than one member. The House committee, however, is a horse of a different color. It has 34 members. Eight of the larger, richer States have two members or more, and these dominate the committee. New England has one lone member. The Bureau and the administration may press for a complete and fair reapportionment, but don't think that the more powerful States will give up the frosting on their cake without a fight. Everyone who has ever served in a legislature knows what would then happen—a compromise. That means that a portion, at least, of the discrimination would be frozen into the law permanently and the loss to the less fortunate States over the whole 13-year period would run into many millions.

The method of apportionment in the Senate bill is based on population, area, and highway mileage as reflected in mail routes. It is not perfect, but it is at least a definite formula, not a haphazard group of independent estimates. Under it, the same yardstick would be applied to every State. For the first 2-year period the Senate bill gives New Hampshire's interstate highways $17 million; under the House bill, we would get less than $8 million. The House bill dishes out $160 million to New Jersey in those 2 years; the Senate bill reduces it to $60 million.

Many other provisions of the highway bill are controversial and must be ironed out in the Senate and in committee of conference. On these I shall report to you later. Whichever of the highway bills is finally enacted into law, we shall fight to include in it a definite formula for a just division of Federal aid among the States.

Above all, our first and main objective must be to secure the passage of an adequate national highway program this year. Otherwise the 40,000 deaths and a million and a half injuries occurring annually on our highways will continue undiminished.

Division of Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., of Tuesday, May 15, 1956, entitled "Dictation to Congress by a Federal Judge." The editorial follows:

DICTATION TO CONGRESS BY A FEDERAL JUDGE

Alexander Hamilton, the ardent advocate of a Federal Government of supreme centralized power, insisted during the writing of the Constitution that the judiciary branch of the Government would and should be the weakest of the three branches. He held that the power of the executive branch to make appointments, and of the legislative branch to impeach judges after appointment, would keep the judicial branch from any intrusion into either the legislative or executive branches.

In his Federalist papers, Hamilton declared that there never could be serious "controvention of the will of the legislature (Congress) by the courts because the judges would never "hazard the united resentment" of a Congress holding the power of impeachment.

Such reasoning now seems quaint, indeed, in view of the number of intrusions by not only the United States Supreme Court but the lower Federal courts into fields presumably reserved to Congress.

The latest attempt from the Federal judiciary to dictate to Congress came a few days ago when the Methodist Federation for Social Action, a leftist organization disavowed by the Methodist Church itself, persuaded Federal District Judge Wilkin in Washington, D. C., to order a delay in publication of a committee report authorized by the Congress of the United States. This individual district judge granted an injunction forbidding the Congress of the United States from publishing a report by one of its own committees because the report characterized the Methodist Federation for Social Action as a religious Communist front.

The Assistant Attorney General handling the case for the Federal Government declared the judge's action unprecedented in the entire history of this country. Later that day he went before another Federal judge, who countermanded the delay order.

The Methodist Federation's attorney then asked the United States Court of Appeals to reinstate the first judge's order and the appellate judges took the matter under advisement. This, in legal circles, means that the appellate judges decided that the issue of judicial control over the Congress of the United States was something for them to consider and probably act upon.

The mere fact that they were willing to accept such a case shows how far the Federal judiciary has traveled from being the weakest of the three branches of Government or from the accepted designation as coequal with the legislative and executive branches.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which issued the report in question, naturally has ignored the original order of the Federal district judge and is printing and distributing 75,000 more copies of the pamphlet, which is entitled "Handbook for Americans." This book exposes Communists and Communist-dominated organizations, the labeling of the Methodist Federation for Social Action as a religious Communist front being purely incidental in its content.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, chairman of the Committee on Printing, cracked down on what he called the impudent invasion of congressional rights by the judiciary and ordered the Public Printer to proceed with the printing of the publication and disregard as unconstitutional the processes of any court.

"If a court can enjoin Congress from issuing a report," said HAYDEN, "it will only be a matter of time before our remarks on the floor of the Senate or House of Representatives would be subject to judicial review, and a complete breakdown of the constitutional principle of separation of powers would ensue."

Under the Constitution, Congress alone has the power to legislate. Congress created the Internal Security Committee and its subcommittees and instructed that complete investigation be made of Communist activities and Communist fronts in all phases of American life so that Congress might have information on which to act legislatively. A subcommittee made the investigation and made its report, which the Government Printing Office was instructed to print under authority of Congress itself.

Nowhere along the line is there any point at which the judicial branch of the Government has any authority or any reason to intrude. If the judiciary can prevent Congress from publishing official documents recording investigations by its official committees, there is no reason why the judicial branch should not also determine when and where Congress may investigate and whether it may legislate on the basis of its investigations.

In other words, if the judicial branch can control the activities of Congress in its own constitutional functioning, then the judicial branch can control all activity by the legislative branch and in time probably would seek to control all executive branch activity, too.

The result would be an oligarchical dictatorship in no way related to the American form of government.

Soviet Education: A Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by the Honorable Joseph D. Cavallaro, chairman of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, at the meeting of the National Council of Business and Professional Men on May 16, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET EDUCATION: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

(Address of the Honorable Joseph D. Cavallaro, chairman of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, before the National Council of Business and Professional Men, New York Times Service Dining Room, 229 West 43d Street, New York City, Wednesday, May 16, 1956)

Mr. Bayern, Mr. Levy, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, officers and members of the National Council of Busines and Professional men, at the outset I want to thank you for your most cordial invitation to address you this evening. I consider it an honor and a privilege to have been selected as one of your speakers this year. The subject assigned to me, Education With a Purpose, involves many things. I selected one aspect of it: Soviet Education: A Challenge to America. I selected this because it drives home the point about education with a purpose. Its phraseology is not meant to imply my admiration for Soviet education or any suggestion that I think it is something for us to emulate. Education, however, is such an important factor in the strength of a nation in this age of science and technology, that it is of immediate concern to each one of us.

Since the close of the last war, our Nation has emerged as the leader of free peoples throughout the world. It is a position which carries with it a tremendous responsibility. We must be prepared to meet whatever challenge the future may bring forth. Our age requires greater knowledge, skill, and understanding of a greater number of things than ever before. We have constructed a society which calls for a more educated leadership for its successful operation and to make the necessary adjustments if we are to preserve the blessings of our way of life. This is true in every field—business, industry, the professions, the arts, and the crafts. We need more doctors, more engineers, more teachers, more scientists merely to hold our own among the great world powers. There is a very real danger that unless we can continue to build leadership and trained minds, we shall court disaster at home and abroad.

During the past year the American people became increasingly aware of the fact that the Nation's supply of scientists and engineers shows signs of diminishing. Just when the requirements of national defense and the increasing needs of modern technology are placing the greatest demands upon us for a steady flow of scientists and engineers, we find the supply endangered. This was brought home to us in a striking fashion by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, in an address before the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation in November of last year. Speaking on the subject, "Freedom's need for the Trained Man," Mr. Strauss said: "If there is to be another war among the great nations of the world before the human race discovers a method of abolishing recourse to combat, that war may be survived by the country with the greatest stockpile of nuclear weapons and instruments of their delivery. But such a war will almost certainly be lost by the country with the fewest resources in trained manpower." He pointed out that of the three essentials to meet our defense needs—resources, money, and skill—the real shortage is in the last. We have not enough trained minds, trained for the exacting requirements of modern science and technology.

This shortage would be less serious were it not for the fact that our principal enemy—Soviet Russia—is forging ahead. Today the Russian technical schools and universities are turning out scientists and engineers who are well trained and highly competent. While the number of scientists and engineers in the two countries is about equal at the moment, the Russians are actually outstripping us. We need about 50,000 new trained engineers every year and are getting half that number. Last year Russia produced 53,000 new engineers and is expected to increase that number this year and each year hereafter. In 1955 Russia graduated 120,000 new scientists and engineers of all types, compared with our total of 70,000 graduates. Between 1960 and 1970 she is expected to produce 1,200,000 trained engineers and scientists against our 900,000.

Some of you may have read the article which appeared about a year ago in the magazine section of the New York Times by former Senator William Benton, entitled "Now the Cold War of the Classrooms." In this article Mr. Benton gives an interesting description of Russian education based on his observations and study. He points out that 4 million new specialists are to be trained before the current 5-year plan ends in 1960. That Russia is educating for export scores of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters, and technicians of all kinds. These are being trained to help develop the resources outside the Soviet Union and to help convert the world to communism. The Russian plan is to keep all children in school from 7 to 17 years of age. These youngsters go to school 6 days a week and more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours do. The discipline is strict, study hours are long, the curriculum demanding, and the examinations severe. During the last 6 years (covering the years from 12 to 17 years of age) more than 40 percent of their time goes to science and mathematics. They must take algebra, geometry, trigonometry. Also compulsory are 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 years of biology, a year of astronomy and a year of psychology. In addition, each student is supposed to take 6 years of a foreign language. There are now 4,300,000 students enrolled in institutions of higher learning as compared to our 2,700,000. Of the 800 institutions of higher education, 33 are universities, the remainder being specialized institutes for doctors, engineers, lawyers, electrical experts, agricultural experts, etc. The universities concentrate largely on the training of teachers, scientists, scholars, and professors. In addition there are 3,500 institutions known as tekhnikums giving 2½- to 4-year courses in various vocational fields. And here is a point to bear in mind: Russian higher education is free, open to men and women who can make the grade.

One must admit that these statistics are significant. For a number of years we have taken for granted our superiority over other nations in the fields of engineering and science. We have assumed that the Russians with their slave methods could never match us in scientific initiative and progress. Now we are brought face to face with the disturbing fact that our greatest enemy, perhaps the most dangerous this Nation has ever confronted, is forging ahead in an area of vital importance to our security.

Convinced that the future belongs to them, that opposition to their triumph must be eliminated by one means or another, the Soviet masters have carefully blueprinted the requirements of their country in 5-year plans. Whatever they deem important for strength is given emphasis and support. In this planning education plays a major role. The attention given to scientific and technological education is in keeping with the overall goal of world victory.

One may be quite certain that whatever is taught in the Russian schools and colleges, whether it be in history, economics, science, engineering, literature, philosophy, or politics, is intended to serve the cause of world communism. Viewed from the standpoint of the goal, there is a certain advantage in the Russian type of education. It is based upon one philosophy, the philosophy of dialectical materialism, and no other is tolerated. Stalin and Stalinism may be eliminated, but this means no change in the basic elements of Communist thought. Its ideals of humanity, of the mass man, of the worker, must be accepted without debate and without questioning. Students in all Communist countries are taught that there is only one cause to serve. They are imbued with a sense of destiny, of greatness, and of future victory. This single-minded devotion to a common faith, however much we may criticize its moral aspects, means power and strength rather than weakness in the struggle for world domination.

In mentioning this advantage of the Russian system, I do not mean to suggest that we emulate it. This would be contrary to my way of thinking. It does, however, point up some of the weaknesses in our own educational process. It raises the question as to what we are doing to meet the challenge.

I would like to discuss what I consider to be some of these weaknesses and what might be done about them. I must admit that my premise is that communism constitutes a real danger to this country and that our very survival as a free people is at stake. In other words, I view with alarm the present situation. I contend that we are now engaged in the struggle for survival—that this has been going on for the past decade and does not merely represent a future possibility. To my way of thinking, the idea of coexistence is absurd, because it can be achieved only on Communist terms.

One of the weaknesses in American education has been the failure to attain within the framework of our democratic system a stronger appreciation of what is meant by the American heritage and American ideals. The ideals which have come to us from the past, which link us to the great events in our history, to the foundation of this Nation and its struggles, have suffered from the process of debunking which began about 30 years ago. While we should be intelligent enough to avoid the excesses of nationalism, we have no moral right to sacrifice patriotism or love for our country. Devotion to one's country is an element of its strength. We must know what it is we are struggling for—what we have to offer that is worth fighting for. Sober reflection should lead us to understand that debunking serves no useful purposes today, that it subtracts rather than adds to our strength as a nation. I would suggest that we study ways and means of creating in the minds of our schoolchildren a richer appreciation of our heritage and of our ideals. The least we can do is to require courses in American history in all tax-supported schools and colleges.

More difficult than the problem of understanding our past is the task of planning for the future. Here the advantage of the Communist system is apparent. Whereas it has a clear-cut philosophy, we have conflicting philosophies. Just what are we planning for, what ideals do we aim to attain and how? You will admit that here we are faced with a real difficulty. Our people are divided between those who favor greater concentration of power in the state and those who oppose it, between those who support collectivism of economic forces and those who prefer greater freedom for individual enterprise, between those who think in terms of a world state and those who think in terms of the power and greatness of America and do not wish to sacrifice its sovereignty. Even more confusing is the manner in which our citizens interpret the concepts of democracy and freedom. Such differences would be relatively unimportant were it not for the fact that we are facing in communism a determined and relentless enemy bent upon the destruction of our constitutional Government, our freedoms, and our ideals. While we pride ourselves upon the free exchange of ideals in the market place, we must give heed to the dangers in store for us. At the very least we must know that while we indulge in this free exchange of ideas, we can count upon the loyalty of our citizens to the end that America will not be sold short. We must not allow ourselves to become victimized by the Communist softening-up process of capturing the minds of our people and of obtaining their cooperations for the destruction of our way of life and of our freedoms. While complete agreement about the future may be impossible to attain, we have the moral right to protect ourselves against ideas which tend to undermine or destroy what has been built up at such sacrifice during the past 167 years of our history as a nation. I am here suggesting a problem rather than the means of dealing with it. But it does concern our schools and colleges.

Our failure to provide only half as many engineers as Soviet Russia annually and half as many as our industries require, is also a problem for our schools. If we are to be realistic about the danger which threatens us, we must give greater thought to the curriculum in our schools. The plain fact is that too much attention is given to planning the brave, New World of the future and not enough to such basic subjects as mathematics, chemistry, and physics. Only about 16 percent of the high-school graduates entering college enroll in engineering courses—or about 66,000 of them. More than half flunk out or switch to other, easier courses. The reason for this, according to the deans of our engineering schools, is "poor high-school preparation in science and mathematics." A recent survey indicates that from 250,000 to 400,000 high-school students in our country are learning mathematics from teachers not trained to teach it, and the same situation prevails in science teaching. Less than 25 percent of high-school students study algebra. Only 1 out of 22 studies physics. Chemistry has fallen off 30 percent. Many of our high schools no longer offer courses in mathematics or physics. With fewer and fewer high-school courses in mathematics and science, there are fewer and fewer college students of science and engineering and fewer graduates and fewer trained teachers. Compare this with schools in Soviet Russia, where every student by the time he completes high school has 2 years of biology, 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, and 4 years of mathematics. No public high school in our country gives so thorough a preparation in science and mathematics. In Soviet Russia first things come first and the basic sciences are given special emphasis. We must decide if it is more important for the high-school student to study mathematics, chemistry, and physics or to indulge in planning future utopias.

As it is my belief that education in Soviet Russia is designed to serve the Communist masters in their aim of world domination, so I am convinced that we cannot afford to overlook or neglect our shortcomings. Nothing, I believe, could be more unrealistic than to allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by the idea of coexistence. Our attention should be riveted to one thing and that is our strength as a nation. Whatever contributes to that strength in the full sense of the word should be encouraged and supported and any weaknesses should be eliminated without sacrificing our freedom. Here then is the challenge of Soviet education to America—the challenge to our survival as a free people.

Thank you.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, May 24, I addressed one of the sessions of the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, a fine organization with a very large representation among the people of my State.

I spoke, for the most part, on the subject of social security, a subject which will be before the Senate very soon.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made at the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE 20TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is good to be here with you today. It is always deeply satisfying for me to attend an Amalgamated convention. It is like old home week. I know that here I am not only with friends, but with tried and true, first-line friends.

The Amalgamated is like a familiar landmark to me. It has been part of the economic and political scene in which I have moved as long as I can remember. The great names in the history of this union were friends and associates of mine from the earliest days of my mature life. It was a privilege then, and a source of satisfaction still, to have had the friendship of the late great pioneer leader and president of this union, the late and deeply beloved Sidney Hillman.

I remember the early days of struggle of your union—when one of the main objects of struggle was mere existence and bare recognition. Those days are long gone now. But it is well to think of them once in a while, in order to realize how far we have come.

One of the highest tributes I can pay this union, however, is to say that you do not look backward into the past, but forward into the future. You continue to struggle toward the goals which lie ahead.

It is good to be with a group which sees and clearly realizes that great challenges confront us, and great efforts are needed to meet those challenges. Indeed, one of the greatest dangers our entire Nation faces today is the false, but widely spread impression that all is well with us, at home and abroad, and that those in charge of our Government have found the keys to lasting peace and permanent prosperity.

The hards facts indicate quite a different situation. In my judgment, the economic situation is far from sound. Great segments of our economy, including farmers and small-business men, are experiencing distress to a greater or lesser degree. There are many for whom this is a time of real hardship.

And over and above this, is the fact of the deepest internal crisis this country has experienced in many years—the crisis resulting from the Supreme Court decision and decree in the school segregation cases. Tensions rise steadily in some parts of the South. The Constitution is openly defied and flouted. Tides of hate and fear roll through the delta lands and canebreaks of the Deep South.

Abroad, the new masters of Soviet Russia move in triumphal procession from one country to another, not with armies, but with false words of peace. They speak in new terms which fall on willing ears, and the initiative of leadership has been taken from us.

What are the leaders of our Government doing or saying about all these things? Very little. They say as little as possible about the danger spots in our economy. They maintain what amounts almost to a conspiracy of silence about the segregation crisis. They move with slow and timid steps to counter the bold Russian moves on the world front.

In such troubled areas as the Middle East, where the existence of the democratic Republic of Israel is at stake, our Government exhibits a hesitant policy of part appeasement and part aloofness, trying to be all things to all men, and succeeding only in passing the buck—and the leadership—to others.

I do not wish to be harsh in my judgment, or criticize for the safe of criticism. But I am deeply disturbed and alarmed, at the present situation at home, and the trend of events abroad. Most of all, I am concerned over the lack of concern over the dangers and problems of the day exhibited by the leaders of our Government, and over the climate of complacency which has been so assiduously cultivated and so widely disseminated throughout our land.

These are the real dangers.

But I do not think I need to convince the leaders and delegates of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers that what I have said is so. Your union is one of the organizations which is trying, I know, to dispel the fog, to point out the dangers, and mobilize the American people for action on all the troubled fronts we face.

You see the dangers of Soviet initiative in the world abroad.

You understand the menace of the Middle East.

You favor and support, as I do, all necessary measures to bolster up the sagging sectors of our economy, and to restore to it an expanding and dynamic momentum, designed to bring an ever-higher standard of living to more and more people.

You favor and support, as I do, a comprehensive program of action to assure to all Americans the full enjoyment of all basic rights, including the right to vote, the right to be secure in one's person, and the right of equal opportunity, without segregation, in employment, in access to public and semi-public facilities, and in education.

But these are not the only challenges that face us. There are others, many others. One which I want to discuss briefly today is the need for vast improvement in our provision for the aged, the disabled, and the disadvantaged members of our society.

A great man once said, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

The man who said this was a historic apostle of the creed of practical humanitarianism, a man who led our country out of darkness into light, and out of the shadow of defeat into victory, a hero to all of us, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He spoke wise words, and we may well examine our present condition in the light of them.

We have a system of social security, an old-age and survivors insurance, enacted under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1935.

But there are still millions of employed persons who are not covered by that system. And there is a growing number in our country who, for reason of age or disability, can no longer work, and who live today, in this land of plenty, on the barest level of subsistence, and dependent for even that on public or private charity or on relatives.

The question is one of revising our social-security laws. We must extend coverage to classes of workers and self-employed individuals who are not now covered. We must lower the age at which women, for instance, can become eligible—it is now 65—for social-security benefits. And we must provide for payment of social-security benefits to men and women whose working years are suddenly cut short by permanent and total physical disability.

As most of you know, there is legislation pending in the Senate—it has already been approved by the House—to make desirable changes in our social-security laws.

The changes approved by the House do not go far enough to suit me. But apparently they went too far to suit a majority of the members of the Finance Committee in the Senate. And so the bill reported out by the Senate Finance Committee eliminated the provision for payments to the permanently disabled, and struck out the provision reducing the retirement age of women from 65 to 62.

There will be a fight on the floor of the Senate on these two major provisions. It will be a sharp fight, pitting against each other two distinct philosophies of government—those who think of government in terms of promoting the general happiness and welfare of all, and especially of those least able to care for themselves, and those who think of government in terms of promoting the special interests of the few—and especially of the already strong and the already powerful.

The case for the lowering of the retirement age of women from 65 to 62 is obvious. I would prefer to see it lowered to 60, but I will support the House-approved provision for 62.

Not so obvious, but even more appealing, is the case for making benefits available to the permanently disabled.

Here are men and women who, in the prime of life, while engaged in gainful employment covered by social security, are suddenly rendered physically incapable of continuing work. Struck down by crippling disease or totally maimed by accident, they are thrown upon the mercy of society.

While our society recognize them as part and parcel of present company, and entitled them to receive at least the minimum benefits of our social-securiey system, or will we continue to say, as we do today: Shift for yourself, live on charity, starve to death if you must, but you will not get social-security benefits until you are 65.

The House approved a provision making the physically disabled—those who were working in jobs covered by social security before they were disabled—eligible for social-security benefits when they reach the age of 50. The Senate committee eliminated even this improvement.

I strongly favor striking out the age limit entirely. But the majority of the Senate Finance Committee does not wish to make these unfortunate people eligible for social-security benefits until they reach the statutory age of 65—if they ever do. What happens to these people betwen the time of their disability and the time they reach the age of 65 is not a matter of Government concern, under the terms of the bill reported by the Finanec Committee.

Two major arguments were made against the disability amendment by the powerful lobby which worked against this provision. And I regret to say that the Eisenhower administration joined in the opposition to this humane provision and worked with the lobby of the National Manufacturers Association, the American Medical Association, and other like-minded organizations.

First it was maintained that this provision was adrhinistratively impractical—which is just gobbledygook—and second, that it would lead to socialized medicine, which is even worse gobbledygook.

They said further that making these disabled people eligible for social security will discourage their rehabilitation and return to productive life.

This argument, too, is sham and humbug. The fact is that only a percentage of those who become totally disabled can be rehabilitated under any conditions. And it is a further fact that the facilities which are available in this country for rehabilitation of the physically handicapped is so pitifully inadequate that only a fraction of those who could be rehabilitated are actually rehabilitated.

There are already more than 2 million physically handicapped persons in this country. A total of 250,000 people are added to the list of totally disabled every year, by disease and accident. Of these, only 50,000 annually are being restored to productive life. I have fought for many years for an expansion of Government assistance for the training of experts and the increase of facilities for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. Some of the very same lobbyists who are now fighting the disability provision in the social security bill, using this argument, opposed me in my efforts to get more money for vocational rehabilitation.

No, the disability provision must be included in the social-security legislation we shall enact this year. The people must insist upon it. Organizations like yours must insist upon it. The Congress must know that the people want this provision.

In every session of Congress since 1950, I have introduced a social security bill which included a provision for benefit payments to the permanently disabled, at whatever age. I now have an amendment pending which proposes the same thing. So has Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, the ranking Democratic member of the Finance Committee. Once this was considered a visionary proposal. Now it is within reach.

We must join the battle on the ground of principle. Are these disabled people, growing in number year by year, and the aged women who can no longer work past 60 or 62, to be thrown on the scrap heap of our society, with no more consideration than is given to a broken or wornout machine?

Are these unfortunate people to continue to be one of the abandoned, forgotten, and neglected elements in our society? No social order imbued with a philosophy of human dignity can continue to tolerate the present situation.

But the issue is even deeper. The issue is whether the motive of fear is to continue to be used as the impelling force in our society—fear of want, fear of old age, and fear of physical disability. The reactionaries believe and profess that with these fears, people must be driven to work, to save and to provide for their own security.

I do not agree with this philosophy. I believe that the driving force of life is and should be fulfillment, contentment, and happiness for all individuals everywhere.

I believe that material comforts are a means, not an end, and if our social and economic order cannot provide for the weak, the aged, and the infirm—those who can no longer themselves carry their share of the load—there is something drastically wrong with the social and economic order.

Life expectancy is being extended. People are living longer. Our social and economic order must be so managed as to keep pace with this advance. This is one of the most arresting problems we face today. I have just touched on one aspect of it. There are many others of equal urgency, and even greater complexity.

My friends, there are horizons of challenge beyond even the horizons we see today. We must adavnce. We must have a leadership which calls constantly for advance. The explosion of the H-bomb out in the Pacific a few days ago was not only a warning to the Russians. In a sense, it was even more of a warning to us.

Can we master the arts of building and living as well, or even nearly as well, as we are mastering the arts of destruction and killing?

Will that blinding flash and shocking roar that came out of the far Pacific usher in a new day, or does it herald the coming of a total darkness?

We do not know the answers, but we must find the answers. We must hasten our advance in the area of the heart and the mind. The greatest achievements and victories in that area remain to be won.

Rivalry Among Military Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rivalry Among Military Forces," published in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on May 24, 1956. I feel that the editorial warrants the attention of the Senate, as well as that of the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVALRY AMONG MILITARY FORCES

It is not unexpected that there should be rivalry between the three divisions of our military defense. Agencies cooperating in the same task are likely to face doctrinal differences and to trample occasionally on each other's toes. The Air Force was part of the Army up to only a few years ago, and it is not surprising that its rapidly growing prominence in defense should arouse some Army jealousy.

The part that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are to play in our defense strategy is an important matter. This gives ground for reasonable discussion to see that these parts are played efficiently. But for the Army, Navy, and Air Force to be dominated by jealousy of each other and to try to belittle each other's prestige is something that can do serious harm. Our national defense must be a program of cooperation in which these three branches of our military forces fill their part and together guarantee our security.

Each branch of our defense has its work to perform. The threat of nuclear destruction has given the Air Force a dominant role. But this does not mean that either the Army or the Navy no longer has a vital role to perform. Rivalry in nuclear weapons may deter their military use and lead to dependence on conventional weapons and forces for national safety. In that case, we must not allow ourselves to be outclassed in this field. We cannot rely solely on nuclear power.

It is dangerous for the Army or the Air Force to contend that it will be the decisive defense in the future, while the other amounts to nothing. Both have a mission to fill. Cool judgment requires that they study their relation carefully and fulfill the function required of them.

Otherwise, the international position of the United States will disintegrate to a point where we shall face a total war and probable subjugation. So it is hoped Secretary Wilson will cool things down. If he can't, some other measures should be taken.

Pope Pius XII Praises Fulbright Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pope Pius Praises Fulbright Program," published in the Washington Star of May 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPE PIUS PRAISES FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

VATICAN CITY, May 18.—Pope Pius XII praised America's Fulbright program today, saying it maintained the proper balance between the spiritual and the material.

The Roman Catholic leader received 86 American professors, researchers, students, and their families in a special audience.

Under the program devised by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the United States uses foreign funds acquired through the sale of surplus war material to send American scholars to study abroad.

Among those attending the audience were William Graham, voice student; John T. Dugan, associate professor of speech and drama, Catholic University of America; John Scali, diplomatic reporter, the Associated Press, all of Washington, D. C.; and Alexander Weinstein, research professor of applied mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park.

The Use of Television in Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast by Edward P. Morgan on Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How often do you get a chance to look a political candidate in the eye and take his measure? What opportunity do you have to ask him one question or hear him answer another?

I am wondering if one of the weaknesses of this American political system of ours is not the fact that a gap separates the politicians from the people, a gap bridged in election years only by a swaying catwalk of campaign flapdoodle. The candidate edges his way across it like an acrobat on a tightrope balancing gaudy promises in his hands.

There may be a certain excitement to his act but your impression of him is likely to be a blur, as he moves frantically on to the next ring of spectators or swings to the next channel.

Which brings up the question, more than by the way, of television's role in politics. We are told, particularly by the Republican National Committee, that this is going to be an electronic election year—that President Eisenhower, while he won't whistle-stop or barnstorm, will make history by conducting what might be called a television screenporch campaign, lighting up the country's forty-million-odd TV sets with periodic messages from the White House.

This will be a fascinating spectacle to watch but, personalities quite aside, there are dangers in a televised campaign. The candidate's contact with the people may be even more remote; worse yet the impressions created may be all the more superficial and artificial. It is difficult enough to try to judge a politician when he is making a speech in the flesh, as it were. When he is delivering it on television, not only (as in the other case) is he likely to be reading something that somebody else has written but he may appear not to be reading it, thanks to a gimmick called a teleprompter which rolls out his speech on a kind of mechanical scroll concealed in the lectern in front of him.

And yet, with all the deceptive dangers it holds, with all the capacity it has for making political histrionics more synthetic and less sincere, television may well hold the magic key to a new and priceless dimension in political campaigning: a clear, candid picture of the candidate. Unknowingly perhaps, Adlai Stevenson and ESTES KEFAUVER had their fingers on this key, I think, last night in their joint appearance on ABC from Miami.

The program left much to be desired. Ballyhooed as a debate, it may have caused a certain audience letdown when it turned out to be almost entirely a discussion of issues. Yet there was something quite genuine in what happened. The two leading contenders for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency said things that were not previously rehearsed, or drawn from canned speeches or read or recited from a prompting machine. Although both men were plainly tired from the brutally demanding schedules of barnstorming, there was a certain freshness, a certain soberness of thought and reflection, a certain serious sincerity to their remarks which somehow most candidates, these two included, fail to get across in a formal speech. Although KEFAUVER and Stevenson earned some bravos, I think, for guinea pigging this campaign experiment, there is no one-party monopoly on the idea, and, for this voter's money, it ought to be encouraged. Properly handled, this television format of confronting candidates with searching questions and with each other can serve as your own personal political microscope under which you scrutinize a politician and his characteristics in the privacy of your living room laboratory.

We voters have an enormous stake in the men and women we elect to office, from the President down. They make decisions that will affect your taxes, your son's draft call, your daughter's education, your whole family's future. It's always struck me as a little monstrous and more than a little frightening that in choosing candidates we seem to insist on a show that is a combination bingo game and revival meeting. Properly focused, our newly found eyes of television ought to give us a more penetrating view of the participants without spoiling the fun.

This is Edward Morgan, saying good night from Washington.

Fulbright Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I received a very moving letter from Arthur Mizener, a teacher, and the author of an interesting biography of the late F. Scott Fitzgerald. Since the letter is, in a sense, addressed to the entire Senate as well as to me, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON, N. W. 8, ENGLAND,
March 29, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR IVES: As one of your constituents, I want to say thank you, through you to the United States Senate, for the year I am now spending in London on a Fulbright. I am a professor of English at Cornell University, and the Fulbright Commission is giving me this wonderful year in London to lecture at King's College and Bedford College of the University of London, where I teach American literature.

I think you will be able to imagine something of what it means to a person who has spent his life teaching English and American literature to live here for a year. Yesterday my wife and I went out to Keats Grove in Hampstead and stood in the room where Keats was introduced to Fanny Brawn; not long before we had stood in the church in Lower Thames Street (St. Magnus Martyr) which Mr. Eliot evokes in The Waste Land. It is like this everywhere and all the time. Little America—as the Londoners call it—around Grosvenor Square always stirs your patriotism: there is President Roosevelt, and there are the marines in their magnificent dress uniforms (a splendor the Londoners especially admire), and there is the flag.

But the house John and Abigail Adams lived in still stands there, too, and the ghost of Anthony Trollope is with you also.

The job of teaching American literature to English students is a revelation; they are pathetically ignorant of America. When we did Whitman's When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd, none of them knew what Lincoln looked like (though there is a fine statue of him in Parliament Square next to Westminster Abbey); when we did Huckleberry Finn, the geography of the Mississippi Valley was a complete mystery to them. On general subjects you run into the same thing: Are all American children undisciplined savages? Do we spend the misery of winter in Ithaca, N. Y., huddled around our coal fires? Do any American Negroes have plumbing? Of course, many English adults know better than this, but many of the young do not; they are eager to know, and I think the Fulbright program does more to reach them than anything else we do. That program is, as a whole, magnificently organized here in England. It has, of course, the immense advantage of not being what the English deeply distrust, a public-relations program; it is an educational organization. It has the further advantage of having been run with great intelligence, so that the best educators here trust it and work with it.

Pardon my going on at this length. All I have really wanted to do is to thank, from the bottom of my heart, someone in the United States Senate which has made this year possible for me, and to tell someone there how deeply impressed I have been by what the Fulbright program is doing for America's relations with England.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR MIZENER.

Rejection by Jewish Labor Committee of Unity With Communists on Civil Rights and Liberties Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Jewish Labor Committee has recently issued a declaration rejecting unity with Communists on civil rights and liberities issues. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this declaration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION REJECTING UNITY WITH COMMUNISTS ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES ISSUES ISSUED BY JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE, SECOND NATIONAL TRADE UNION CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, MAY 6, 1956

Following the Soviet policy of seeking unity with pro-democratic organizations, the Communist Party in this country has embarked on a vigorous and concerted campaign to infiltrate and capture pro-democratic organizations. Especially earmarked for such infiltration and domination by the Communists have been community organizations concerned with problems of civil rights and liberties.

It is unthinkable that there can be unity with those who condoned and defended Soviet anti-Semitism, who remain mute now while Khrushchev refuses to make known the fate of imprisoned democratic leaders, and who condone the slave-labor system of the Soviet Union. Until freedom and dignity are reestablished within the Soviet Union, until all those in slave-labor camps are freed, until a system of democracy is established in that nation and the satellites are liberated and permitted to become genuine democracies, there can be no unity with those who condone practices of enslavement, of murder, of human indignities.

We reject the beguiling tactics of the Soviet Union through their agents and dupes in this country to win us over into programs of unity.

Open or clandestine flirtation with Communists or their collaborators in civil rights activities is a negation of the high principles involved.

We shall, through the free and united labor movement of this country, fight every attempt by the Communists to infiltrate or dominate community organizations.

We shall continue to warn civil rights and liberties organizations whenever Communist attempts of infiltration are made and will aid these organizations with material and moral support in combating any Communist encroachments when attempted.

Ideals and Purposes of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine and eloquent statement about the ideals and purposes of the Democratic Party, which was written by Mrs. Marshall Swearingen, of Bend, Oreg., as published in the May 17, 1956, issue of the central Oregon newspaper, the Midstatesman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY YOU SHOULD VOTE, DEMOCRATS

(By Mrs. Marshall Swearingen)

The Democratic Party has faith in America and the American people. We believe that if we help people when they need help they will stand on their own feet as soon as they are able. We do not think help to the individual citizen undermines his morale any more than subsidies to big business undermine its morale. We do not fear the Federal Government because we know that our Government is, after all, only the American people at work.

The Democratic Party has hope for the future. We are the party of imagination and youthful ideas. Alben Barkley, our beloved Democratic veep who died at 79, was younger in his ideas than many young Republicans. We welcome new ways to make democracy real for all our people. We would rather try and fail than not to try at all.

The Democratic Party has the love of people that recognize the worth and dignity and needs of each American.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The Democratic Party has had control of our National Congress for 20 of the last 24 years. during this time they have given us unemployment compensation, old-age pensions, guaranteed bank deposits, laws to protect small business from monopoly, legislation to help the farmer in his time of hardship, protection of our productivity through soil conservation, the great Federal dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee that have brought industry to the Northwest, REA that has brought light to our farms and made it possible for farm women to share in our great labor-saving inventions.

The Republican Party has controlled Congress 4 years out of the 24. During this time they passed the Taft-Hartley Act, gave the tideland oil revenues needed by the schools of 48 States to only 4 States, and have worked hard to give our remaining great dam sites to private power companies for private exploitation.

In Oregon the Republicans have controlled our State for over two decades. Their leaders are a cozy close-knit group of the elite—sort of like the royal families of Europe. But like the royal families too much inbreeding produces bad offspring, and we have had some monstrosities of laws and policies. We need new and vigorous blood in Oregon politics, some faith and hope and love in a new approach to Oregon's problems. We need a change.

Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1957

SPEECH

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my gratification over the inclusion of items for the Dardanelle and Eufaula Dams in the pending bill. As part of the comprehensive development plan for the Arkansas Basin, the Appropriations Committee has voted $1 million for the sister projects of Dardanelle and Eufaula. This marks the continuation of congressional policy to promote the multipurpose development of the Arkansas River, a program which received initial approval in the 1946 act authorizing construction. Last year the Congress appropriated $450,000 for Dardanelle in fiscal 1956, and with new funds for 1957 I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will be able to proceed with its construction.

It is only just and right that the last major river in the United States to remain undeveloped is at last to receive its fair attention. The Army engineers' plan for multipurpose utilization of this water resource was authorized 10 years ago. In 1950 there was an appropriation of $1 million to start construction of the Dardanelle Dam, but the Korean conflict intervened and all work on the project was suspended. Some of the $450,000 appropriated last year was used to complete planning, and the Army engineers are ready and able to carry forward the construction work. While under the Budget Bureau's old formula the benefit-cost ratio was impressively favorable; the ratio is still favorable even under the rigid new formula A–47. Thus these projects are a real investment for the

United States and will bring the Nation rich dividends in the course of time.

The Dardanelle Reservoir will be located on the Arkansas River about midway between Little Rock and Fort Smith. The project is a major unit of an integrated system to serve navigation, develop hydroelectric power, stabilize river banks, provide flood control, and other related purposes. Hydroelectric power facilities at Dardanelle Dam will consist of 4 units with a total installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. The storage capacity would be 495,000 acre-feet, of which 70,000 is for power and 425,000 for navigation. The total estimated cost of the project is $94,600,000. Not only would this money provide these benefits, but it would also contribute to the realization of the vast potentialities of the Arkansas Valley. Such realization will obivously be accelerated by the availability of cheap transportation and electrical energy. Industrial development will be based on utilization of vast quantities of coal, oil, timber, bauxite, and rare minerals in the region. The 4 million people in the Arkansas Valley will then be able to contribute more substantially to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

Address Delivered by the Bolivian Ambassador on Fundamentals in United States-Latin American Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Victor Andrade, Ambassador of Bolivia, during World Affairs Week at the Rotary Club luncheon in Dallas, Tex., on May 16, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel at home in Texas. Partly it is your generous hospitality and partly the feeling that, because of geography and your Spanish heritage, you understand the importance of Latin America to the United States. Here, one does not have to sell Latin America or spell out the things we have in common. You know them. Your financiers and industrialists and your ambitious young men are looking more and more to the south.

Latin America today is one of the few economic frontiers left in the world. The Latin-American countries are in various stages of development, but almost all are years behind the United States. They have great wealth—timber, minerals, oil, and tropical agricultural products which do not compete with the United States. To a great degree, our common future depends upon the use which is made of this wealth.

The reasons for the economic lag in Latin America are interesting. As you know, North and South America were discovered in approximately the same time period and exploration and settlement paralleled each other. Why then did the United States advance so rapidly by comparison with most of the Latin-American countries?

Some of the factors were geographical: the high Andes Mountains and the tropical jungles, for example. However, a primary factor was the difference in viewpoint between the English colonists and the Spanish and Portuguese colonists. The English settlers came here prepared to make the New World their home. They did not expect to make their fortune here and return to the Old World and enjoy it. This country was their physical and spiritual home.

Most of the Spaniards thought of the mother country as home and always hoped to return there. Even after the revolutions which cut the political ties with Spain, they still looked to the Old World. The wealthy and influential educated their children abroad and they retired there to spend their last days.

All the settlers in the New World, or almost all of them, searched for gold and silver. The Spaniards found the precious metals and, in doing so, intensified their interdependence upon Spain and Europe. They did not develop the land as did the English settlers.

The Indian tribes in North America were relatively few in number; they were mostly hunters and fishermen. The Spaniards found well developed civilizations in Mexico, Peru, and in other areas of South and Central America. The Indians were conquered, but they still comprised the bulk of the population.

The North American Indians were swept away by the advance of the settlers. Most of them died in battle, or from disease and alcohol.

In several Latin-American countries the relatively few conquerors spent a lot of their time and energy in keeping the Indian subordinated. They succeeded so well that the problem today is how to rescue him from second-class citizenship.

One could detail at length other reasons for the failure of Latin America to make the material progress which has characterized the growth of the United States. It is more important to take a look at the situation and relationships of the republics in this hemisphere today in terms of what these may mean to all of us tomorrow.

The United States has preoccupied itself with events in Europe and Asia since the end of World War II. You have given away and loaned more than $50 billion to help economic recovery in Europe and Asia. Obviously, you had a political purpose in so doing; you wanted to stop the spread of communism and hold the free world together.

I do not intend today to try to pass judgment on the success or failure of the United States policies since the end of World War II. Many persons think the danger of another world war has receded. I hope so; we have been very close to another holocaust on several occasions in the past 11 years. But obviously the conflict between capitalism and communism, a conflict symbolized on the one hand by the United States and on the other by Russia, still continues. It will continue in all probability for years to come. If the danger of an all-out war has receded, then the necessity for prosperity and stability in the free world becomes all important. The two systems are on trial and will be judged by the masses on the basis of performance.

In making this statement I hope I am not misunderstood. My own personal opposition to communism is well known. I opposed it at a time when some leaders of the Western World thought the two systems could live harmoniously side by side. My Government is on record in opposition to communism and has proved it by its actions. Yet as beneficent as capitalism has been to the masses in the United States, it has been something else in other countries. The opposition to colonialism which is keeping the world upset today is in part opposition to capitalism. The United States has abandoned imperialism. Some other countries have clung to it and have used colonialism as the means of exploiting and victimizing backward countries and peoples.

One may say with a good deal of truth that Communism also is imperialistic and that it also exploits countries. Yet it is possible that the techniques which have resulted in a great increase in heavy industry in some of the Communist countries could result in similar increases in consumer goods. Or to put it another way, the standard of living in the Communist countries may rise sharply; with that rise may come a better feeling on the part of the people under communism. Moreover, communism could become more attractive to people in backward and poor countries, who might see little hope of improvement under the existing system.

Some western leaders already have pointed out the dangers inherent in the new attitude by Communist spokesmen. It could result in making international communism seem rational and logical once more; it could revive its appeal to the intelligentsia and to the youth of many countries.

Therefore, the situation of every country in Latin America becomes of particular concern to the United States. For the prosperity of the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon Latin America. Likewise, the material prosperity and stability of Latin America is becoming increasingly dependent upon the United States.

The trade between the hemispheres averages around $7 billion annually, being pretty evenly divided. The United States has more than $6 billion invested today in Latin America, and the return is over $750 million a year. Since World War II the United States has loaned and given Latin America less than $1 billion, and the profits from investments alone in Latin America exceed that in 2 short years. More and more American money is going into Latin America each day, since developments are making it one of the few places where capital can be put with any assurance that it will be safe.

And as important as Latin America is today, it will be much more important tomorrow. The population of Latin America is growing at an amazing rate; someone has termed it a population explosion. The United States today has a population of about 166 million; Canada has approximately 15 million; the combined population of the Latin-American countries exceeds that of the United States by nearly 10 million. If the present rate of increase continues, there will be a half billion people in Latin America before the year 2000.

Along with this rise in population will come, in all probability, a great increase in the living standard in Latin America and a lessening death rate. Together with a corresponding rise in the United States standard, this could mean an era of material prosperity such as the world has never seen. It also could mean the triumph of the free-enterprise system. And finally, the right kind of relationship between the countries in this hemisphere could mean an inter-American system which would assure the peace of the world. Its capacity to retaliate in case of attack could be so great that no aggressor would dare start a war; its geographic sweep would be so great that its defeat even in case of attack would be almost impossible.

There are encouraging factors in the relationship today between the Americas. The United States is not imperialistic; it has taken the lead in trying to outlaw the use of force in the hemisphere. There was a time when the marines landed and punished defiance of the national will of your country. We still hear echoes of the resentment which this policy caused, and it was a long step toward hemisphere solidarity when it was abandoned. I believe that most of Latin America today gives the United States credit for good intentions, and undoubtedly the loans and grants given Latin American nations in recent years have been very helpful.

Since Latin America, generally speaking, produces raw materials and is a purchaser of manufactured products, the two economies complement each other. The clash of interests which attends your trade with Europe and some parts of Asia does not evidence itself to any great extent in the dealing between our continents.

Nor is there any significant ideological conflict. Communism does not attract Latin Americans to any great extent. There are some exceptions, but on the whole communism is only a threat—whatever may come in the future.

I do not mean to say that the Latin American countries have solved their political problems. The reverse is true. Over the years there has been a familiar pattern in Latin America. A strong man rises and, with the help of the army, he rules for a time. He dies, or there is a revolution, and an attempt is made to solve familiar and pressing problems through a democratic and revolutionary program. All too often this effort fails. Once again there is the military dictatorship.

So familiar is this routine that some persons feel it is the solution to the political problems in Latin America. There is a question in the minds of some North Americans about the capacity of the Latin Americans to govern themselves, as you know government in the United States. But let me point out that the unrest and turmoil which forced the military dictatorship continue. The mass of the people in all too many Latin American countries remains poor and discontented. The contrasts between wealth and poverty are too great.

The military dictatorship is an expedient which may have worked for a long time. It will not work indefinitely unless it is accompanied by programs which help the people as a whole and give them something to look forward to and to hope for. This is extremely unlikely. It should not be forgotten that the imperialistic nations held down their colonies for generations. Yet the time came when force availed no longer. The steam within the kettle had too much power.

The danger in Latin America today is that the forces of repression will be followed by radical revolutions. In many countries the United States might find itself unable to work with the leaders of the governments. They could be men who had lost faith in private enterprise and the democratic processes.

The result would be chaos and an end which no one could foresee. All concerned would be injured. Then the United States would be forced to concentrate its attention upon Latin America. The republics to the south could no longer be taken for granted. But surely there is enough wisdom among us that we do not allow affairs to drift and degenerate. Surely we can work together to strengthen the forces of constructive reform in Latin America. Surely we can see that the development of Latin America must proceed in a way that will help the masses. The capitalism of the United States has been dynamic. The average workingman in your country laughs at the idea of becoming a Communist. Why? He feels that he has more opportunity and is doing better under your system that he would do under any other system in the world. He likes the feeling of freedom which he has; the absence of fear because of the religious and political views which he holds. That is the kind of system then which all of us should work for in Latin America.

Let us proceed from the general to the specific. My own country of Bolivia, which is half again as large as your great State of Texas, is backward and poor. It is a country whose masses have been repressed even if the dictators ruled in the name of democracy. The masses of our people are Indians.

The one fully developed industry in Bolivia is tin. The development of this industry made three families rich and kept most of the rest of the country desperately poor. The rich men concentrated upon their own interests. Bolivia has oil, iron, lumber, almost every valuable mineral known, and rich agricultural resources, but these remained almost untouched. The ownership of the tin mines gave the Patinos, Aramayos, and Hochschilds, the tin barons, great political and economic power. They used it to rule the country behind the scenes. They scuttled every attempt at reform. They bribed the politicans who could be bribed; they intimidated those who could be intimidated; they turned the machine guns on the miners when the latter rebelled; they took their money abroad and lived there in a style which attracted the attention of the world. They gave an example of the very worst side of capitalism.

In 1952 a revolution overthrew the power of the tin barons, and that same year the government nationalized the mines. A great hue and cry went up. The United States did not like nationalization. Neither did we. We took the drastic step only because we felt that the only way to make Bolivia a modern and prosperous state was to eliminate the power and influence of the tin mine owners. Otherwise they would bribe and bully their way to power again and the country would be back in the gutter.

Since 1952 Bolivia has systematically tried to develop its great resources. We have great faith in private enterprise, and we want the partnership of United States capital. We have given guarantees against expropriation of private property and assurances that profits mades and the capital invested can be taken out of the country. The government recently issued a new oil code, the most liberal, I believe in this hemisphere. Experts tell me that the Bolivian oil fields which extend diagonally across the country from north to south, probably will be some of the greatest in the world. Private operators are moving in. Glenn McCarthy of Houston, Texas, has held a concession since 1953; one of the world's great companies, the Gulf Oil Co., recently obtained a sizeable concession.

I have mentioned our links with Texas. We have another link, an economic link, the tin smelter at Texas City, which processes ores from Bolivia.

This smelter was built because of the crisis which the United States faced in World War II. Bolivia is the only source of ore in the hemisphere and was the only source available to the Allies after 1942. The mines in Malaya, Indonesia, and Africa were cut off.

The Texas City smelter was hurriedly built to process Bolivian ore, since you had to have tin for many, many uses. The United States wanted to be certain that for the remainder of the war—and the future—it had available the tin in this hemisphere and the means to process it.

Now the proposal has been made to sell the Texas City smelter to private operators, and if that cannot be done to close the plant. If the plant is shut down, it will deteriorate to the point where it will become valueless in a short time.

I only want to point out that the situation which caused the Texas City smelter to be built in the first place is still with us. The Communists hold all China, and their influence is strong in the area where most of the world's tin is produced. Unquestionably, Bolivia would make its tin available to the United States if another war came, but before the tin could be used it would have to be smelted. The statement is made that a new tin smelter could quickly be built in this country if the need arises. I only want to point out that no one knows what the situation will be if another war comes or what demands will be made upon the time, manpower, and materials of the United States. It would seem to me that the Texas City tin smelter is a vital asset for national defense, not only for your country but for the hemisphere. All of us have an interest in preserving our vital assets.

The course which Bolivia has followed since 1953 should please the businessmen of Texas and the United States. Our program could have been written by a member of your own Rotary Club. I am glad to say that we have had the help of the United States and that invaluable aid is continuing. We had to have help. The price of tin fell after the Government took over the mines. The cost of mining Bolivian tin is between $1.10 and $1.25, and the world market price has averaged around 90 cents since 1952. Nevertheless, tin had to be mined. It was the only source of exchange which we simply had to have. Meanwhile, we were forced to spend money trying to develop our agriculture, in building roads, importing blooded livestock—doing all the things which should have been done generations ago. Lots going out; very little coming in. No wonder Bolivia has a bad case of inflation.

We made mistakes. Not long ago the President, Victor Paz Estenssoro criticized some of the workers in the nationalized mines. He said they did not work as they should and showed a lack of discipline. He spoke plainly and frankly, something which political leaders do not often do. The result was an outcry that nationalization had failed. Our enemies implied that everything would be all right if only the tin barons had kept their properties and had continued to machinegun the miners when the latter protested low wages and intolerable working conditions.

One of the reasons for nationalization was to end maltreatment of the workers by the tin barons. From that standpoint, nationalization has succeeded very well indeed. Not a worker in the mines has met his death because of labor strife since 1952.

From the standpoint of the United States, the very worst thing which could happen in Bolivia now would be the fall of the existing regime. The Government has the support of the people and could fall only through revolution, and then only if economic conditions grow so bad that the workers give up in despair.

The tin barons—who never learn—seem to feel they could take over again. They would not. If they did, it would be for a short time, and then there would be a violent rebellion again. The people are through with them. The miners and the farmers—the repressed Indian masses—know there is no hope from the tin barons and their ilk. They will not submit to them again.

What would happen if the regime falls? Inevitably, the swing would be to the left. The leaders who have put their faith in private enterprise would be thoroughly discredited. The leaders who said that friendship with the United States was the way out also would be thoroughly discredited. The blow to the prestige of the United States would be tremendous, for it is well known that your great country has helped us. The assumption has been that if we do our part, aid would continue until we are solvent.

All Latin America is watching the Bolivian experiment and the relationship between our two countries. I have said, and I repeat, that this relationship may refute the Marxist charge that a strong, capitalistic country always exploits a weaker one with which it deals. The help given us by the United States has been generous with no strings attached. It has enabled us to start projects and programs which hold great promise for the future. In 1953 Bolivia was an importer of oil; in 1956 Bolivia is an exporter of oil and within a few short years oil may take the place which tin once held in our economy.

If the Bolivian experiment fails, it will be a blow to the future of private investment in Latin America. For Bolivia has tried to stimulate foreign investment. We have gone out of our way to allay fears caused by

nationalization of the tin mines and the expropriation of the Standard Oil properties in 1937. This latter expropriation grew out of a quarrel between Bolivia and Standard Oil during the disastrous Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay. In my opinion, the nationalization of the oil properties was unfortunate. In any event, the existing regime had nothing to do with it, since the MNR, the party now in power in Bolivia, was not formed until 1940. If Bolivia goes ahead to prosperity and stability, it will be with the help of foreign capital and will demonstrate what constructive capitalism can do to help develop a potentially rich country like Bolivia. It will encourage other countries to follow our example. It will show that true democracy and private enterprise will work in Latin America—provided they are given the right kind of chance.

The success of our experiment will increase the friendship of the masses in Latin America for the United States. The liberal forces in the continent know what is going on. They know my Government is really trying to help its people. They know that Bolivia is one of the few countries to attempt genuine land reform. It seems incredible that Indian farmers in some Latin-American countries have had the status of serfs down to the present day, but that is what they have had. We are giving land to the landless farmers and paying the owners for it. The plan has been described as collectivism. It is the opposite of collectivism. It is a program to base our agricultural economy upon the ownership of family-sized farms. It is action to perpetuate private enterprise and capitalism.

Incidentally, Bolivia acknowledges and is grateful for the help given by the United States. Our leaders speak of it openly. What is more important, they have told the people about it. The result is that the average Bolivian looks upon the United States as a friend and, when he has the opportunity, makes his views known. One of the things we cannot be accused of is ingratitude.

Since 1953 the United States has given Bolivia approximately $60 million in loans and grants. As I have said, we are grateful. We are hopeful, however, that your great country will take a close look at our situation and will provide enough aid to really put us on our feet. We do not want to remain, nor does the United States want us to remain, forever on a subsistence basis, always having to come back year after year to ask for more. It would take comparatively little to enable Bolivia to complete same of its programs and to be, as one of your sayings goes, out of the woods. It would be too bad if reactionary pressures caused this aid to be withheld at the very time when it spelled success or failure. The time will come fairly soon, if we work together, when we could be almost as rich as Texas. In that event we will have paid back the United States many times—in one way or another—the aid which you have given us.

I do not want what I have said here today to be interpreted as a threat in any sense. I have found that your people understand plain language and like it. As you say, they want to know the score. Bolivia has come a long way since 1952, and it will not take too much more to put us over the hill. Once we become self-supporting, I can say that every penny we have borrowed will be returned with interest and that Bolivia will be a good place for American business and businessmen.

My only concern is that our situation is not thoroughly understood and that the propaganda of the tin barons will have its effect. They have been busy of late, for they sense that the crisis is approaching. A few more difficulties and we may roll downhill; a little more help and we are in. It would be a tragedy if the help given by the United States should be, to use a familiar expression, too little and too late. It would be a calamity for Bolivia and a hard blow to the United States and the private-enterprise system which is fundamental to the preservation of our economic and political freedoms.

I do not think we will fail. I have never thought so; I do not think so now; and I will do all in my power to prevent its happening. I hope that the good people of Texas will help us succeed. It will be good business for all of us.

A Proposal To Revive Atlantic Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a lecture entitled "A Proposal To Revive Atlantic Solidarity," delivered by James P. Warburg to the students of Bard College, at Annandale-on-Hudson, on the evening of May 24, 1956.

I have received from Mr. Warburg a letter in which he says:

Time goes by and still nothing happens with respect to foreign policy. The administration creeps slowly on reluctant feet toward revision, while the Democrats seem more and more inflexibly wedded to our hopelessly outdated policy.

What worries me most is that, while the "wise men" ponder, NATO is disintegrating before our eyes. The enclosed summary of a suggested solution has been sent, in slightly shorter form, to a number of newspapers, including the Washington Post. It has already appeared in the Louisville Courier Journal.

Mr. President, I am pleased to submit the excerpts from the lecture for printing in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the lecture were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPOSAL TO REVIVE ATLANTIC SOLIDARITY

The following are the main points of a lecture delivered by James P. Warburg to the students of Bard College, at Annandale-on-Hudson, on the evening of May 24, 1956:

"The question we are to discuss is how to revitalize the rapidly deteriorating solidarity of the Atlantic Community.

"It is now belatedly recognized that something must be done to arrest the disintegration of NATO, but it is not yet recognized that action is required not only with respect to NATO but with respect to the basic organization of the Atlantic Community. If Atlantic solidarity depends solely upon NATO's existence, then that solidarity, so vital to the preservation of human freedom, is already moribund.

"NATO is obsolete, except only for its embodiment of the historic undertaking by the United States and Canada to consider an attack upon Western Europe as an attack upon themselves. In every other respect, NATO is an outmoded instrument of the preatomic age.

"The peoples of Western Europe no longer believe that NATO can protect them, if war comes. Nor do they believe that NATO's sparse and widely scattered forces are now restraining Russia from attack. It is not just the new look in Soviet policy that has dissolved the cement of the NATO alliance but, even more, the delayed comprehension of what war means in the atomic age. The Europeans know that, if war comes, they are finished. They know that it is not NATO but the balance of terror which now holds war in precarious abeyance.

"What is more, the Europeans now suspect that an alliance which involves the rearmament of a partitioned Germany is more likely to provoke than to prevent eventual conflict.

"If the Atlantic Community is to regain its inner solidarity and to recapture the moral leadership of the world, two things are necessary:

"1. The Community must present itself to the world through a vehicle other than a military alliance.

"2. The NATO military alliance must be drastically reorganized.

"As to the first requirement, we rightly think of the Atlantic Community as the cradle and breeding-ground of freedom. We must not forget that it has also been the cradle of colonialism and the breeding ground of many wars. It is neither fitting nor expedient that the vital center of Western civilization should stand embodied solely in a military coalition, particularly when that coalition is dominated by three nations, two of which are the world's greatest colonial powers. Atlantic solidarity must find expression in an organization universally recognized as a forward-looking instrument of progress toward greater freedom, toward human betterment and toward lasting peace.

"The needed transformation cannot be accomplished merely by giving NATO new jobs to do, or by creating, as Mr. Dulles has suggested, a cabinet within NATO charged with the consideration of nonmilitary problems. It can be accomplished only by leaving NATO to one side and creating a wholly new, nonmilitary Atlantic Council.

"This new embodiment of the western heritage would concern itself with three main tasks:

"First of all, the new Council would endeavor to develop and cement the political, social and economic solidarity of the Atlantic Community. In time, it might be expected to absorb or coordinate the existing organizations which already express Europe's will toward integration.

"Second, the new Council would seek to develop a common Atlantic policy with respect to Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

"Third, the Council would speak for the West in dealings with the Sino-Soviet orbit, instead of leaving such negotiations in the hands of the Big Three foreign ministers. Where NATO has been a mere object in these negotiations, the new Atlantic Council would become a principal.

"One of the new Council's chief aims would be to achieve universal security through peace settlements and disarmament agreements effectively enforced by a strengthened United Nations. If successful in this endeavor, it would thus eventually eliminate the need for military alliances and counter-alliances.

"Meanwhile, NATO must, of course, continue to exist as a still needed defensive alliance, but, even as such, it requires drastic reorganization.

"NATO needs a modernization of its strategic concepts so as to become relevant to the atomic age.

"Above all, NATO needs a long overdue revision of the bankrupt Western policy with respect to Germany. Such a revision would aim at the military neutralization of a reunified Germany and the creation of the widest possible neutralized belt across Central Europe.

"In these circumstances a militarily neutralized Germany would not become a vacuum, cut loose from its Western moorings. Such a Germany, while excluded from NATO, would not be prevented from joining the new Atlantic Council any more than a neutralized Soviet satellite, such as Czechoslovakia, would be prevented from maintaining its close political and economic ties to the Soviet Union.

"The creation of the new Atlantic Council would have this final advantage: Since mem-

bership would entail no military commitment whatever, it is entirely possible that not only a neutralized Germany but even such determined voluntary neutrals as Sweden and Switzerland might wish to join and thus round out the political and economic solidarity of the Atlantic Community.

"You will note that the first half of this proposal—the creation of a new Atlantic Council—is in no way dependent upon Soviet agreement. The reorganization of NATO requires Soviet agreement only as to the neutralization of a reunited Germany. Should such agreement not be obtained, there is nothing to prevent the West from revising its policy as to West Germany so as to release it from NATO but include it in the new Atlantic Council. This would leave the door open for continuing efforts to achieve German unification and would place the onus for Germany's partition squarely upon Moscow, instead of where it now lies—upon the bankrupt western policy.

"The question might be raised whether the nonmilitary Atlantic Council might not undermine or weaken the United Nations. Quite the contrary is the case. The Council's chief long-range aim would be precisely the strengthening of the United Nations and the reduction of conflicts which now impair its usefulness, until the day when the Atlantic Community's separate identity could be merged into the larger whole of a fully functioning world organization."

Itinerant Instructor Building Trades Apprenticeship Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Itinerant Instructor Building Trades Apprenticeship Training Program," which appeared in the April 1956 issue of the Bricklayer, Mason, and Plasterer.

This interesting article discloses a superb record of cooperation and public service on the part of our building trades unions, State labor and educational agencies, and our businessmen in Michigan. Their unselfish and unstinting efforts in establishing a highly successful itinerant building trades program have contributed tremendously to the welfare of our people in Michigan. To me, it is a classic example of true Americanism in action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITINERANT INSTRUCTOR BUILDING TRADES APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Probably one of the most unique and successful building trades apprenticeship related training programs carried on in this country is the Michigan itinerant instructor building trades apprenticeship training program, of which our Michigan State conference of the B. M. & P. I. U. is an active part, and through conference secretary and I. U. Deputy John Lodge has contributed much of the foresight and leadership that has greatly aided in the success of the program.

It is pointed out here that the itinerant program is for out-State Michigan only. Detroit has carried on a successful apprentice program for about 34 consecutive years, with 3 bricklayer instructors employed at the present time.

All of the nine building trades instructors in the itinerant program are supervised by a bricklayer, Brother Andrew Virtue, of local No. 31, Lansing, Mich.

The outstanding feature of apprenticeship in Michigan is that it is established on a sound footing with the cooperation of management and labor and education people working together to care for the manpower needs of the construction industry.

Public relations is an important part of this program. Graduation exercises are held, plus the fact that the Michigan State conference and the Association of General Contractors conduct a full-scale bricklayer apprentice contest every year in different sections of the State at a public function such as a county fair or home show.

This contest is unique inasmuch as apprentices compete with each other in their own training period. The period of indenture is 3 years; therefore, 3 separate contests are conducted, 1 for each year. This contest is honored every year with a visit from the Governor, members of the State legislature, United States Congressmen, and other dignitaries.

Following is a report on the building trades itinerant program as of January 1956, authored by Mr. John Harris, director of trade and industrial education of the Michigan State Department of Vocational Education, and Mr. Henry A. Reniger, of the Reniger Construction Co. Mr. Reniger is also the Associated General Contractors' member of the National Joint Bricklaying Apprenticeship Committee.

Following the depression in the 1930's there was virtually no apprentice training, particularly in the building trades and, consequently, there were very few new people entering those trades.

The craftsmen who had held journeyman status were naturally getting older with the result that the average age of building-trades journeymen in Michigan began to approach the 60-year level.

This alarming condition led, in 1939, to the establishment of an itinerant building trades program outside of the Detroit metropolitan area, where an adequate program was already in operation.

This new program which was established by the coordinator of apprentice training of the State board of control for vocational education, department of public instruction, with the approval of the State apprenticeship committee, was, unfortunately, discontinued after 2 years.

Two factors operated to make its continued operation difficult: (1) Inability of local communities to finance the program under existing reimbursement practices of the State office of vocational education, and (2) the siphoning off of great numbers of Michigan youth by the Armed Forces.

Though the itinerant program for apprentices outside of metropolitan Detroit was discontinued in 1941, its short operation had made a significant contribution; namely, it had established the concept of an itinerant program in which the instructor took instruction to the apprentices who assembled at certain selected centers for their related and technical training.

In the period between 1941 when the out-State itinerant program closed and the close of World War II, practically no apprentices entered the building trades. During this period the average age of journeymen in the building trades continued to rise alarmingly until it passed the 60-year level.

Then, in 1945, the Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors, the State department of labor, the building-trades groups of the Michigan Federation of Labor, local public schools, and the State office of vocational education set about to explore the possibility of reestablishing the program which had been dormant since 1941.

It should be noted that the Detroit Board of Education had continued the apprentice program in the metropolitan area, one which was intiated in 1922. Though enrollments were small, the principle of cooperative training as a public school responsibility was maintained.

Experience had taught that the apprenticeship shortage and the rapidly rising average age of building trades journeymen must be forever discouraged by some systematic and continued program for the training of apprentices.

The period from 1939 to 1941 had produced no aprentices outside of the Detroit metropolitan area and the resulting shortage of young men entering the building trades was a serious one.

In order to establish a stable apprentice training program, the State legislature was asked to earmark money from the State school aid fund for the employment of itinerant apprentice instructors who would travel to established local centers to provide related and technical training for building trades apprentices.

The legislature acted favorably on the proposal and funds for the employment of several full-time itinerant instructors were allocated to be administered through the trade and industrial division of the State office of vocational education.

Itinerant centers were established in certain desirable locations throughout the State with local school boards furnishing the physical facilities and the instructors were assigned on a regular schedule.

It was understood that these instructors were to be considered as employees of the local schools in which they worked and were to be considered by local school administrators as regular faculty members, although their salaries and travel expense are paid through the State office. They are, in fact, employed through the State civil-service commission by competitive examination and are subject to the commission's salary and travel regulations.

The nature and content of the apprentice instructional program was established in each center by joint apprenticeship committee. These committees cooperated with the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor in establishing training standards relating to on-the-job experience, related instruction, rate of pay, probationary periods, seniority privileges.

Administration of the standards rests with the joint apprenticeship committees, of which there are 48 in the State. Each center is in the jurisdictional area of the particular unit involved in bargaining agreements with contractors and labor unions.

In the operation of the program in local communities contractors, labor, building suppliers, public schools, and other interested groups have been involved. Much of the supplies used in the related class instruction has been donated by these groups.

One indication of the effectiveness of the apprenticeship program is the fact that of the apprentices who have once been indentured and started their programs, more than 90 percent attendance is maintained. Some of today's journeymen who hold positions of leadership in the building trades are men who completed the building trades apprenticeship program.

In 1945, when the present program was inaugurated, there were four instructors plus a coordinator of the itinerant building-trades program. The instructors were charged with the responsibility primarily of giving instruction to all apprentices duly indentured through the joint apprenticeship committee and registered with the Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, and the State board of control for vocational education.

STEADILY EXPANDING PROGRAM

The program has shown a steady expansion until at the present time there are 9 full-

time building-trades instructors and 1 coordinator. There are 3 electrical instructors, 2 bricklaying instructors, 2 plumbing instructors, and 2 carpentry instructors.

As the title would indicate, the coordinator is charged with the responsibility of coordinating the entire building-trades itinerant program and acts as the liaison contact man between the trade and industrial education division of the State board of control for vocational education, the bureau of apprenticeship, associations of general contractors (the Plumbing and Heating Contractors' Association, Electrical Contractors' Association, the various craft unions involved), and the local public schools.

In 1945 the budget for the program amounted to $26,840, which was used to defray all salaries and expenses in connection with the program. For the year 1956–57 it is anticipated the budget will be about $98,000.

The program now being conducted involves 16 cities; 2 cities, St. Joseph and Benton Harbor, operates as 1 unit. The apprentices coming into these centers are from many cities and villages, and the records show these apprentices have come from as many as 193 different locations into the centers nearest them for training, with none having to travel more than 35 to 40 miles. This brings the program within reasonable geographical reach of nearl all apprentices in the State.

The many principles of operation which make this a successful operating training program may be cited as follows: (1) the principles of hiring the instructors on a full-time salary and centralizing the operation of the program in an administrative unit for carrying on such training; (2) the principle of carrying on a program in accordance with approved training standards involving all interested groups; (3) the involvement of all associations, State and Federal agencies, and local schools in the promotion, establishment, and conduct of the program; (4) the carrying on of the program by the local joint committee working closely with the local public schools which maintains our philosophy of education and training, and (5) the indenturing of all apprentices to the joint committee in the various trades in which training will be given.

This, we feel, has been one of the most important contributing factors to the success of the program outside of the actual financing itself. Through this indenture process, the local joint committee is permitted to rotate the boy on jobs which may be conducted by different contractors keeping in mind the broad training which the apprentice needs to be an adequately trained person.

Another aspect of the itinerant building trades program which we feel has contributed much to its success is the teacher training carried on with the instructors to upgrade them in the matter of teaching techniques.

A teacher trainer from the University of Michigan has been assigned each year to work with the instructors to assist them in developing their techniques of teaching and training in accordance with present-day standards.

During the Christmas holiday season each year, the instructors actually go back to school for 2 weeks under the guidance and supervision of the teacher training institution. During the year, the teacher trainers work with the instructors through correspondence and visits to help them develop their many courses of study. Much of this material has been reproduced, and the instructors use it in their daily work.

EXPECT CONSISTENT NUMBER

Projecting our thinking into the future, we expect that the number of apprentices will be consistent with building-trades needs, and all present and future needs appear to indicate the number of apprentices now in training will continue. Among future considerations are additional centers for training and new occupations within the building trades area.

An urgent one being considered at this time is for iron workers in connection with the new Mackinac Straits Bridge. It is also anticipated that during the coming year an overall State advisory committee of the building trades will be formed to work with the State office of vocational education. This advisory committee, it is hoped, will furnish the necessary counsel and advice for a continued successful program.

Prosthetic Rehabilitation and Foreign Aid

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement this week by Dr. Rusk on foreign aid before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Dr. Rusk is the recognized authority in prosthetic rehabilitation both in this country and abroad. He is not only one of the distinguished physicians of his time but is a writer and author of note and serves on the staff of the New York Times.

FORMAL STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1956

My name is Howard A. Rusk. I am a physician and chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University-Bellvue Medical Center; associate editor, the New York Times; consultant in Rehabilitation to the United Nations, and president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. I am appearing before you today as a private citizen whose primary interest is the rehabilitation of the disabled.

It is my belief that rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach the minds and the hearts of men. It is natural for all of us to take improved agriculture industry and utilities for granted but men often regard these developments as somewhat remote from their immediate problems. Rehabilitation, however, makes a personal and significant impact not only upon the disabled person himself and his family but on those with whom he comes in contact. This as well as all international activities in the field of health are one aspect of our foreign assistance program which meets all yardsticks of economic soundness, simple humanitarianism and political expediency.

In his report to the Congress on our mutual security program covering July-December 1955, John Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, wrote: "The people of the United States recognize the value—economic, social, and moral—of health and the fact that health is a common need. We are also coming to recognize the vital relationship of health programs to any hopes we may have of helping to create conditions of economic progress, political stability, and democratic social development in the many areas of the world outside the United States, where our future national security is deeply involved."

Mr. Hollister then cited estimates from competent authorities that until recently the economic loss from malaria alone in India was $224 million a year, from bilharziasis in Egypt $57 million a year, from malaria and tuberculosis in the Philippines $660 million a year. Also, that we in the United States pay a hidden 5 percent additional cost for our imports from malarious countries because of disease-affection production.

It is, therefore, surprising that our contribution to bilateral health programs was reduced from $43 million in the 1955 fiscal year to $33,767,000 in fiscal year 1956, and that of this amount less than $50,000 was spent on all types of rehabilitation services throughout the world.

From the economic aspects alone, it would seem logical that our investment in international health would be increased rather than decreased. Over and beyond the economic implications, there are great social, moral, and political values in our support of international health activities.

These values are well illustrated by international activities in the field of rehabilitation. In this country and in the other developed parts of the world we have seen a remarkable growth of interest in rehabilitation in the last decade. This interest has not been prompted by humanitarian motives alone. It has resulted from the growing incidence of physical disability resulting from prolongation of the life span, increased public assistance costs because of disability, and our need for manpower in our expanding economy.

But what lies behind the interest of Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, India, Burma, and Thailand in the provision of rehabilitation services for their handicapped? It is not the need for manpower, for these nations have far more manpower than they can profitably utilize in their present stage of industrial development. It is not to reduce public assistance costs, for few of these nations have any social schemes whereby the disabled become a responsibility of the state. It is not to reduce demands for medical, hospitalization, and social services, for the chronically ill and disabled in most of these nations are wards of their families rather than of the state.

The real reason is that many of these nations, particularly those of the Africa-Asia area, have, after years of colonization, recently achieved the long-sought dream of political independence. Now they are desperately looking for ways of proving to the world, and more importantly to themselves, that they have the political and social maturity to justify their political independence.

Long before the Government became concerned with international health projects, the Rockefeller Foundation, W. B. Kellogg Foundation, China Medical Board, and other private groups had years of experience in the administration of such programs. As a result, we have more know-how in the conduct of international health projects than in some other forms of technical assistance and are able to administer such projects more effectively.

Health projects are welcomed by the nations in which they are undertaken, for such projects are initiated only at the request of host countries. They are cooperative projects involving both joint planning and administration.

Host countries furnish a part, frequently the major part, of the funds for such projects. The $6 million contributed in 1955 to joint health projects in Latin America by the United States was expanded by $19 million.

Since our Federal technical cooperation health programs, known popularly as point 4 projects, began more than 13 years ago, they have cost our citizens less than a penny a month a person.

It is reported that last year Russia graduated 27,000 physicians from their medical schools and 20,000 the previous year. At the present time we are graduating slightly more than 7,000 in the United States per year. It is granted that the level of education of these physicians is far below that of our physicians, but, even so, the health services they are providing to the country are so superior to those ever before available to the people to them it is considered a miracle.

It has also been reported that at the present time there are more doctors than can be readily absorbed in the health services of Russia, and the physicians are being used for the kind of job that we would ordinarily assign to nurses and technicians. If the production continues and the excess increases, it is rather obvious what the physicians will do. They will carry the skills they have learned along with the concepts of communism to the backward parts of the world. We must meet this challenge, and we can, for our physicians are better trained. By using total professional personnel, therapists, sanitary engineers, public-health administrators, and educators we can do a better job. But time is running out.

Here is one example of what could be done. The Veterans' Administration has, since 1946, conducted an extensive artificial-limb research program which is carried out by nonprofit contracts with universities. The Army and Navy cooperate by supporting prosthetic-research laboratories within their medical services. Work in the universities and armed services has been coordinated by the Prosthetics Research Board (formerly the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs) of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council under a contract between the Veterans' Administration and the Academy.

The need for a research program in artificial limbs became apparent early in 1945 when, at the request of the Surgeon General of the Army, the National Research Council brought together a group of scientists, engineers, surgeons, and prosthetists for the purpose of establishing standards for procurement of prostheses. At this meeting it was soon learned that the development of artificial limbs had proceeded through the years without the benefit of a scientific approach, whereupon it was recommended that the Government support a research program in this field.

As the result of this program our own disabled veterans have prosthetic devices far superior to those found anywhere else in the world.

Just as we are interested in sharing the technical advances in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the rest of the world, we could make a significant contribution to the effective understanding of American ideals of democracy and the value we place on human worth and dignity, if through an appropriation of one or two million dollars a year we could share our advances in artificial limbs with the world. Through demonstration centers, consultants, mobile clinics, and the training of foreign personnel in the United States, a magnificent program could be established. With the sum of $1 million a year for 2 years both the administrative and professional overhead cost of such a project could be met; highly qualified American consultants could visit all parts of the world and survey what is available and what is needed; 4 completely equipped mobile prosthetic shops, each staffed by a qualified American prosthetic technician and physical therapist, could be sent to southeast Asia, the Near East, north Africa, and South America to spend 4 to 8 weeks in a given community rendering direct patient services in fitting prosthetics and training wearers in their use; permanent demonstration prosthetic shops and training centers could be established in key parts of the world; and the components to provide modern artificial limbs could be made available to over 40,000 amputees; over 100 trainees could be brought to the United States for training in prosthetics; and all of the available technical literature and visual aids in prosthetics here in the United States could be translated and published in various languages for international distribution.

These prosthetic trainees would then join the 400 health workers receiving advanced training in the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. They and hundreds of others trained under the auspices of private foundations, their own governments and their own resources, are permanent ambassadors of our democratic ideals. Such persons make particularly effective proponents for democracy because as professional people they work intimately with their handicapped patients and have their confidence and trust.

Somewhere within the spectrum ranging from direct relief to long-range economic projects, there is a need for significant, tangible short-range projects that can be seen and easily understood. The Russians produced such a project when they paved the main street of Kabul in Afghanistan. Our foreign-aid projects there have been of economic importance, but their impact on the daily lives of the people will not be felt for many years. In contrast, several times each day the residents of Kabul have reason to be grateful to Russia.

This is the kind of an imaginative, constructive project which can be easily seen and understood. There are many hundreds and thousands of disabled persons throughout the world, each of whom could also become a living, dynamic example of American democracy. To illustrate their potential contributions, I should like to tell you the story of a little Bolivian boy, age 10. He was born without arms and legs with 4 little, sensitive fingers coming out of each shoulder and 2 normal feet coming from the hip joint but with no bony connection. When he was a year old, he was abandoned by his father, who then deserted the family and has not been heard of since. The boy spent the next 8 years of his life in an American mission in La Paz, where he had love and kindness but could not walk. To get from one place to another, he rolled like a little ball. He was seen there by a young physician from the United States who called me and said he had met this little boy, who was exceedingly bright and who, if he had a chance, he felt, could be a great force in the world. Pictures and case reports were sent and by coincidence seen by the secretary of one of our distinguished citizens. She made possible his trip to the United States.

Two weeks before he arrived, I had the Vice President of Bolivia and the Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations for luncheon. They knew all about Juanito and were excited about his coming. In the middle of the meal, I said to them, "You know, if we bring Juan here it is going to cost you a very large fee."

In consternation, they said, "How much?" I said, "The fee is this. First, that when he returns, you must promise him the best education your country affords; and second, if we can demonstrate in the most severely disabled child you will ever see what can be done, you will establish a national rehabilitation program in Bolivia."

Without hesitation, the Vice President said, "You take the boy; we pay the fee."

When he arrived, he spoke no English. Within a month, he had a vocabulary of more than 300 words. Special prostheses were designed and he now is walking. He has grown more than twice his height. He is doing well in school and one day soon will be ready to go back and take his place in his own country.

Several months after he was in the United States, the story was published in a national magazine. A few weeks later, a letter came to the editors, which read as follows:

"Congratulations on a brilliant piece of reporting. Am referring to your (February 21) on Juanito Yepez, the congential quadruple amputee from Bolivia. * * * For those of us who are in and out of Central and South America we found your article on Juanito gained us more friends (and respect) than all the millions our government is pouring into these countries. We noted no sudden pro United States of America feeling in Brazil as a result of the $75 million donation (given Brazil by the United States), but we were pleasantly surprised with the many compliments for what the United States of America is doing for Juanito. I do not know what your circulation is in Latin America but can tell you the peons in the backwoods knew all about Juanito within 24 hours after the issue was on the streets. * * *

"E. E. BUTLER, *Master.*

"TAMPICO, MEXICO."

What we need in the United States are friends like Juanito Yepez all over the world, with the recognition that in the United States we believe in the dignity of the individual and because of that belief want to share the things that we have learned in our country. We are not doing this to make friends—we are doing this to give service. If the service and the spirit are there, then we can't help but have their friendship.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed State-Justice-Judiciary appropriations and Garrison Dam bills.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8092–8101

Bills Introduced: 13 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3924–S. 3936; and S. Res. 272. Pages 8093–8094

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 6376, to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill in Alaska, with amendments (S. Rept. 2053);

H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956, with amendments (S. Rept. 2054);

Report of Committee on the Judiciary on Motion Pictures and Juvenile Delinquency (S. Rept. 2055);

H. R. 7679, transfer of land to city of Muskogee, Okla. (S. Rept. 2056);

H. R. 8490, authorizing transfer of certain U. S. land to city of Bonham, Tex. (S. Rept. 2057);

H. R. 8674, to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss. (S. Rept. 2058);

H. R. 9358, land transfer to Cheyenne, Wyo. (S. Rept. 2059);

H. R. 10251, land transfer to Grand Junction, Colo. (S. Rept. 2060);

H. R. 8123, authorizing conveyance of certain land to city of Roseburg, Oreg., with amendments (S. Rept. 2061); and

S. 3857, to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (S. Rept. 2062). Page 8093

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 8091

Indian Lands—Arizona: Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 2822, authorizing transfer of certain land in Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to school district in Mohave County, Ariz. This action clears the bill for the White House. Page 8101

State, Justice, Judiciary Appropriations: Senate passed with committee amendments H. R. 10721, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies.

Senate insisted on its amendments, requested conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Johnson (Texas), Ellender, McClellan, Magnuson, Hayden, Holland, Clements, Green, Mansfield, Bridges, Saltonstall, McCarthy, Mundt, Smith of Maine, Dirksen, and Hickenlooper. Pages 8101–8116

Garrison Dam: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 746, providing for return to former owners of mineral interests in certain lands acquired in connection with Garrison Dam project. Pages 8116–8117

Authority To Report: Committee on Finance was authorized to file reports during weekend recess of Senate. Page 8096

Narcotics Control: Senate debated S. 3760, to provide a more effective control of narcotic drugs. Pages 8118–8153

Confirmations: Nine nominations to membership on National Science Foundation, and numerous nominations in the PHS and Navy were confirmed. Page 8159

Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 6:21 p. m. until 10 a. m. Monday, May 28, when it will consider H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956, after temporarily putting aside S. 3760, narcotics control.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on Army items in H. R. 10986, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Defense Department, hearing further testimony from Maj. Gen. A. P. O'Meara, Deputy Chief of Research and Development, and Maj. Gen. W. S. Lawton, Chief of the Budget Division, who were accompanied by other representatives of the Army. Hearings continue Tuesday, May 29.

Appendix

The Atomic-Hydrogen Age—A Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 27, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at the 91st annual commencement exercises of Rider College, Trenton, N. J., at which time I was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. address follows:

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 91ST ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, RIDER COLLEGE, TRENTON, N. J., MAY 27, 1956

Dr. Gill, Dr. Moore, Reverend Wismer, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, the alumni association, distinguished guests, class of 1956, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be selected by Rider College as the recipient of an honorary degree and to be invited to deliver the commencement address at the 91st annual commencement exercises.

It is gratifying to me that honorary degrees are being awarded Dr. Frederick M. Adams and Mr. George R. Hill.

I congratulate them for the honor conferred upon them. And may I add that I find myself in select company in being honored with such distinguished Americans.

Every commencement speaker feels some emotion as he stands before a graduating class in its hour of triumph.

He knows something of the mixed feelings the students, the faculty, and the families are experiencing.

Parents are pardonably proud and beaming with joy because their sons and daughters, by their scholastic attainments, have justified the confidence they placed in them.

Commencement day is a reminder that an institution is made of people, not of buildings.

Here at Rider College there will be a new freshman class in the fall, and the life of Rider will go on.

It will have a continuity, but not exactly as it was, with the class which is leaving.

To you members of the class of 1956 these have been years of experience, both pleasant and trying, which have belonged to you.

Suddenly in your hearts you feel that Rider College, which you are about to leave, is more precious than it ever was before.

Now there are jobs to think of, whether already waiting or still to be fund.

Because this is a technical age, to some of you this commencement day is another step in your plans to acquire further education in graduate schools.

As your commencement speaker it is not easy to find words that will long be remembered, because there is so much competition for attention in your thoughts.

But my subject, nevertheless, is an important one.

It is a subject which will shape your lives in the years ahead.

This is true whether you take an active role in business, industry, government, politics, or the professions, or whether you think you can escape to a smaller though also important world of homemaking.

The subject of my discourse—the atomic-hydrogen age, a challenge to youth—relates to the importance of my duties as a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

This committee is aware that the development of atomic energy carries with it some of the gravest responsibilities in the world today.

It is the manner in which we employ this great source of energy now loose in the world that the fate of mankind will be determined.

The picture which I am about to present is neither wholly dismal nor wholly one of good cheer.

It is, however, exciting in its implications and significant to our lives.

Everyone living in modern-day America has some notion of the effects of atomic weapons and at least an awareness that there are peacetime uses of the atom which will be important to all of us.

In discussing the subject of atomic energy there is a definite feeling of adventure in exploring the nuclear field.

On the one hand we are exploring the unknown in sciences, physics, chemistry, metallurgy, biology, etc., as well as unknown fields in engineering and construction and in the business and industrial life of the Nation.

On the other hand there must be applied sound scientific engineering and business principles to solve unprecedented problems arising from unique and sometimes impossible situations.

The result has been that today as a Nation we are faced with a vast new science that affects the lives of all of us and which has had a marked influence on the business and industrial life of America.

Therefore, everyone of us sooner or later will come to realize that in our midst there are quietly working revolutions in almost every phase of the art of living.

Over a period of years the emphasis in exploring atomic energy has been in the weapon field.

The result has been a mad race for superiority.

Ten years ago the United States alone controlled a supply of fissionable material.

It was, however only enough for a token number of weapons of moderate yield.

Since then the supply of uranium 235 and of plutonium has increased tremendously.

According to the Manchester Guardian, a leading newspaper in Great Britain, it was recently estimated that the United States may have the makings of 35,000 weapons.

It was also estimated that the Soviet Union strength in such material might be the equivalent of 10,000 nuclear weapons.

In addition Great Britain was said to have the capability of producing over a thousand weapons.

Then, too, we know that a large number of other countries are building atomic reactors which will produce the necessary material used in weapons.

According to a recent newspaper article we know that President Eisenhower has offered for peacetime power development a supply of uranium 235, equivalent to more than 4,000 atomic bombs.

This generous action on the part of the American people in furthering the desire for world peace certainly reveals the adequacy of supply of fissionable material in our stockpile.

In recent years the American monopoly of such materials has been broken with profound significance for our position in the world.

Meanwhile the supplies of nuclear explosives have grown tremendously.

Then, too, the efficiency of weapons has increased, the variety of weapons has multiplied, and the means for delivery are in a period of revolutionary change.

It is not difficult to recall that less than 11 years ago the United States took out to the Pacific the bulk primitive weapons which were dropped on Japan.

These "model T" weapons could hardly be lifted by a B–29 bomber, and though we view them as crude today, they represented the culmination of the most complex scientific effort the world had undertaken up to that time.

In their single plane drops they wiped out Hiroshima and much of Nagasaki, which served as the excuse for the Japanese to end the war.

Today through improved design nuclear weapons have been shrunk small enough to be carried by fighter planes.

To fit inside an artillery shell.

To be used for antiaircraft purposes and indeed, perhaps, even a suitcase bomb which a saboteur can plant in a locker in a metropolitan railway station.

There is no reason why, in the near future, one cannot envisage even smaller weapons.

The increase in efficiency toward higher yields of energy has multiplied the destructive effects of the A- and the H-bomb to the extent that today they yield many more millions of tons in destruction.

Let me illustrate what this increased yield could mean.

A high-yield weapon centered on Trenton could wipe out virtually everything from here to Princeton in one direction and to the edge of Philadelphia in the other.

The radioactive rain of debris could drop its lethal fallout depending on the weather and wind in a swath across Greater New York City, Connecticut, and eastern Massachusetts without favor on rich and poor alike.

A Bison jet bomber or Bear turboprop bomber of the Soviet Air Force could fly a one-way mission above the altitude of our typical defending fighters.

It is quite possible these Soviet bombers, without detection of our radar, could drop such a weapon from a vertical distance beyond the range of our Nike batteries.

Or the weapon might arrive without warning as the warhead of a guided missile shot from a submarine suddenly surfaced off the Jersey coast.

Or an agent working from simple blueprints might assemble the components of a suitcase bomb in any basement workshop with only the fissionable core brought across our border by clandestine means.

This is the present-day horror with which we live.

If we become indifferent about it it is only because the world has feared the threat of retaliatory effects which up to now have discouraged Soviet aggression.

The picture is so fluid that it would be extremely dangerous to assume that because we have escaped so far we will continue to do so.

I hope and pray that we will not commit such an error.

Our survival demands that until an effective system of control and inspection has been created for the entire world we must constantly be alert and push our own weapons development to serve as a deterrent.

I wish that good will and peaceful example were enough to make us safe but they are not.

In this atomic-hydrogen age we must be realistic.

If we were to test the theory that we could disarm first or without fool-proof guaranties, the price of any error in the theory would be the destruction of the Nation.

But this does not mean that we must give up living, give up trying to find a solution to the ideological struggle which causes our danger.

It is not the fault of the impersonal fissionable atom that we are in danger—it is the inadequacy of man's social adjustments.

This maladjustment provides a constant challenge for the years ahead.

The solution is not to surrender to those who would enslave us; but, to the contrary, to possess the ability to take fresh looks at old concepts.

The problem is to preserve the freedom and integrity of the United States.

At the same time we should strive to modify international relationships to fit realistically the changing nature of the world.

As a small example, new questions of sovereignty over the space above a country will be raised by the launching of artificial satellites.

How far up can a nation control the air against invasion by observation satellites?

There is no adequate precedent for settling such a problem.

Therefore we must have faith that a solution will be found.

Meanwhile all our problems will not be solved by simply ignoring them.

Just as the passengers on a transoceanic plane have faith that their flight will be successful, so must we have faith that we can solve the problems of human relations before we destroy human life and civilization on this globe.

But even the safest transoceanic airline carries liferafts, gives ditching instructions, and insists on constant safety inspections of all mechanical equipment and pilots.

In like manner we Americans must take precautions in the dangerous world in which we live.

As a Nation we must have military, political, social, and technical information about all the world to a degree never required by this country in the past.

We must maintain an adequate national defense and cheerfully carry a heavy burden of taxation for the indefinite future.

We must have a maturity and grasp of foreign policy that no earlier generation needed to worry about.

We must have a strong industrial base, widely dispersed and decentralized, so that we never find ourselves being caught with "all our eggs in one basket."

We must support education and research by whatever means are necessary to insure our superior strength in an age of rapid scientific change.

Personally, we must be willing to take that inconvenience and trouble when survival requires.

This includes our share of military duty, of service with the civil defense program, or other activities of good citizenship, which can help us survive when the chips are down.

Facing such a grim state of affairs, we must maintain faith in our future and the sense of humor and individuality which have made us a great Nation.

These dangers are very real, but we have managed to live with them ever since the explosion of the first atomic bomb on the desert at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in 1945, which made such danger inevitable.

Yes, we have lived with these dangers ever since the first Soviet atomic bomb explosion in 1949, making the danger immediate.

But let me turn to the other revolution in our life which a clear understanding of nuclear processes will bring to our everyday living.

Very few people carry the illusion that the new age will be one which will immediately transform automobiles into plastic streamline shapes powered with tap water and atomic pills.

Most people understand now that even if atomic fuels become cheap in a powerplant, electricity will have a price.

This is true of hydroelectric power which burns no fuel at all.

The technical problems to be solved before the full benefits of the atomic age can be realized are staggering.

They are appreciated only as each becomes acute in blocking further progress.

It will be many years before present-day predictions will become a full reality.

Despite our accomplishments in the field of atomic energy and the fact that we have spent $15 billion to date—we have scarcely scratched the surface in producing the ultimate benefits to be derived by mankind through the peacetime uses of the atom.

It is possible within the next decade, barring atomic or hydrogen warfare, atomic powerplants will produce electric energy that will join the flow of electricity now generated by coal, gas, oil, and hydropower plants.

It is freely predicted that within 10 or 15 years uranium, which is the source of atomic energy, will be as common as present-day fuels.

Within that period of time it is anticipated that atomic-powered-planes, rocket ships, automobiles, locomotives, and farm tractors will be in everyday use and an accustomed sight on the world scene.

Homes will be lighted, heated, and cooled by the atom.

Food, clothing, medicine, and crops will be improved, and in general, our way of living will be completely revolutionized.

There is one important area of application of atomic power which I have not discussed, namely, atomic propulsion.

In this particular field the success of the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, an atomic-powered submarine, has removed any lingering doubts about the effectiveness of an atomic reactor to propel ships.

As a long-time naval Reserve officer I can assure you that this particular revolution in seapower is wrought with the greatest significance.

Our growing fleet of nuclear-powered submarines may in the years ahead sweep other naval vessels from the seas.

In the interim the same propulsion applied to the next *Forrestal*-type carrier and to a guided-missile cruiser in the program for this year will add tremendously to the fighting effectiveness, the speed, and the radius of action of our Navy's future nuclear-powered task force.

Within 5 years there should be an oil tanker with nuclear power flying the American flag.

In 15 years such power could be commonplace for merchant ships and possibly for new passenger ships.

Within a decade the same results will probably be achieved from the current projects in the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Norway, Japan, and West Germany.

Already an atomic reactor has been carried aloft in a B–36 and large sums of money have been, and are to be spent, in the development of an atomic-powered intercontinental bomber.

While the mad race for superiority in exploring the field of atomic energy continues, we cannot ignore the threat to our world leadership because of the lack of trained scientific minds.

In the beginning of our effort to explore the atomic field, not more than 500 scientists were at work.

Today, that number has grown to over 5,000.

In 20 years we will need in the field of atomic power alone 23,000 scientists and engineers, or nearly five times our present number.

When you add to this number the needs of the military program our requirements for the future will be in excess of 30,000 scientific minds.

At the present time we are training fewer than 500 a year, as compared with the 1,500 needed annually.

If the United States is to meet the competition of Soviet Russia and maintain its leadership in the field of atomic energy we must increase the reservoir of scientists and engineers.

Over a 10-year period Russia will graduate 1,200,000 engineers alone, against 900,000 to be graduated in the United States, or a deficit of 300,000.

This deficit is a serious menace to our problem of retaining our supremacy in the field of atomic energy.

It brings us face to face with the terrifying question: Can the world afford to permit Russia to gain supremacy in the atomic energy field, and employ it as a decisive force in her efforts to conquer the world for communism?

It is not sufficient to answer this question in a negative manner.

We must reinforce our answer by a positive program of action.

In this connection, as a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I can assure you that the subject is receiving serious consideration by our committee.

From what I have told you it is evident that these are exciting years which lie ahead of us.

As I suggested earlier in my presentation it is not the atom which is evil.

We can make it do useful things for us, or we can allow it to destroy the world.

What will happen not alone depends upon us as Americans, but upon our neighbors in other countries of the world.

The development of the necessary long-range policies will demand the highest efforts of every segment of our population.

It is your responsibility, to understand at least, the basic facts of this new technology if you are to influence public opinion and Government in the right direction.

Not only the lives of you and your loved ones are involved, but the very survival of mankind and the present-day civilization which has taken centuries to develop.

More than this, it is hard to prescribe for the individual.

The new atomic-hydrogen age will be a challenge to our ingenuity and, likewise, our resourcefulness.

Endless frontiers are being opened to human intellect which gives new emphasis to the age-old expression, "knowledge is power."

Some of us, of the older generation, may find it difficult to accept some of the changes that will demand that we alter our manner of thinking.

These changes, as they come, will give real meaning to the graduation day exhortation that atomic energy poses a challenge to you graduates as you embark upon your careers in life.

I wish you all the success in the world.

It will be a world with many uncertainties, truly an exciting one, yet one well worth living and fashioning.

It is my fervent prayer that God may grant you the courage and strength to meet life's responsibilities and may He continue to shower you with his choicest blessings.

Good luck and Godspeed.

Old Textile Center Stages a Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of yesterday, May 27, 1956, entitled "Old Textile Center Stages a Comeback." The article shows what has been done in the city of Lawrence, Mass., where so many textile plants ceased operations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD TEXTILE CENTER STAGES A COMEBACK

(By John H. Fenton)

LAWRENCE, MASS., May 26—This former textile city appeared this week to have reached a new plateau in its climb toward diversified economic stability.

The exercising of an option to lease the Shawsheen Mill property in neighboring Andover by the Raytheon Manufacturing Co., meant the probability of 1,000 new electronics jobs within a year, and the possibility of 6,000 in 5 years.

In the last 2 weeks, the idle Wood and Ayer Mills in Lawrence were purchased by two Boston men with an idea of leasing or selling space for diversified industries. At one time these two mills employed 11,000.

For a city that lost 18,000 jobs when the bottom fell out of the textile industry in New England, the road back has been long and rocky. And even now, the greater Lawrence citizens committee for industrial development is not letting up on the accelerator. There still remain the older unemployed and much empty factory space.

Estimated unemployment in Lawrence in 1949 was around 21,000. Although the staggering of jobs in the textile mills and multiple family employment helped keep food on the tables, the situation was critical. That figure represented about 37 percent of the labor force.

Former Mayor John J. Buckley asked all groups seeking to attract new industries to merge into the central citizens committee. The Eagle-Tribune, a combined morning and evening newspaper; bankers, retailers, labor leaders, public utilities, manufacturing, wholesaling, real estate, education and the clergy all contributed manpower or ideas.

Within 2 years, 30 new manufacturing enterprises moved into the greater Lawrence area. The city itself lost some population, from workers moving elsewhere looking for employment. Others remained in the area, but commuted 40 to 50 miles daily to other jobs. Many still do, but would welcome a chance to work nearer home.

Despite the progress, the slide downward did not halt at once. The Wood and Ayer mills, which turned out 1 million yards of cloth a month, finally were abandoned in 1952. The Shawsheen spindles ceased whirring a year later.

Today the estimated unemployment stands at 6,300. But this is a misleading figure, in some respects, according to State and city sources. Many of the older men have withdrawn from the labor market. They are too old to learn new skills. Their children are supporting them.

At the same time, there is a readily available pool of women workers. Many of these are women who worked for a few years during the war, then withdrew to raise families. They are ready now to take up such jobs as skilled work in electronics or in plastics. Some of these women are taking home up to $125 a week from electronics concerns that already have moved into the area.

Other young women are preparing to leave clerical and similar desk jobs at $45 or $50 a week to make $65 as parts assemblers when the Western Electric operation starts. The United States Internal Revenue Bureau's big new regional processing plant also has attracted clerical help in the area.

The Shawsheen property takes in five buildings and a power plant just off route 28 between Boston and Lawrence. There are more than 1 million square feet of manufacturing, office and warehouse space. Raytheon will start converting the property to its uses within 2 weeks. The lease includes an option to buy the property if defense contracts warrant. The company is developing military equipment for Army Ordnance.

The Wood and the Ayer mills have combined manufacturing and office space of 3,525,833 square feet. Already there have been inquiries about leasing space. This development will take time.

The new Western Electric plant has 900,000 square feet of space in its North Andover facility. The company also has working space in nearby Haverhill and in Lawrence. It may need all the space. Some 60 Western Electric and Bell Laboratories executives and their families have moved into the area, chiefly from New Jersey, in the last 2 years. Another 100 or so families are expected this year.

All of this has created a building and general housing boom all across Essex County, between Lowell, to the west, and Newbury to the seast.

The Massachusetts Development Commission, an agency for augmenting bank loans, and the Massachusetts Department of Commerce have played important parts in the growing boom. One concern, Balta products division of the General Tire & Rubber Co., for example, is completing a $2 million addition to its facilities for processing plastic products for the home. Balta is one of the past-recession newcomers.

All of the surrounding communities, including Methuen, Andover, and North Andover, are talking of industrial parks to be erected adjacent to new highways that are on the planning boards of the State Department of Public Works.

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, section 633 which was carried in the last defense appropriation bill as section 638 is quite well known to the House by this time. The best test of any piece of legislation is in its operation. Objectives, operation, and results are what you measure legislation by; not by the telegrams which attempt to influence your stand. The language of section 633 has been in operation for a year and we know how it works. I assure you that Congress has not created a monster in this section. Congress has created a safeguard, a simple and workable safeguard to protect the tax money of the people of the United States and to protect needed activities in the national defense establishment. I state categorically that section 633 has not resulted in any additional costs to the Government. Certainly it is reasonable to assume that before the Department of Defense decides to contract out to private industry an activity previously carried on within the Department, it would determine the economics of such a step. It would not be in the public interest to make such decisions blindly, without prior investigation.

Having determined the economy of such an action, it is only one step more for the Department of Defense to send to the Congress the figures showing why it is advisable to terminate that activity or dispose of it through private contract. It has worked no hardship whatsoever.

Now let us look at the actual operation of this section. The Department has sent to the Congress a list of 112 activities that it wanted to discontinue or contract out to private industry. What happened? The Congress gave its assent in all but nine cases. In only 9 cases out of 112 did the Congress say "We think you should not terminate or contract this activity." In most of those nine cases there was disagrement within the Department as to whether the work could be done more economically within the Department than it could under contract. In some of them there was important research aspects which would have been lost.

In 1 or 2 there simply was no private facility capable of doing the work, construction of facilities by private industry for such an operation at considerable cost—to be deducted from taxes of course—simply does not sound like good economy to me. In one operation it would have been necessary for the contractor to subcontract back to the Government for the operation to be carried on. There was nothing to indicate a saving.

Perhaps there were some more flagrant examples of activities scheduled for contracting to industry that the Government did not bother to send to the Congress because it was known there was no justification for a change.

Big business objects to this simple language which obviously is intended to protect the taxpayer. Why? It has shown by actual operation that there is nothing wrong with the section. It

gives the people who appropriate the money for the operation of a specific activity an opportunity to look before the activity is contracted or given away and closed down, with possible injury to the Defense Establishment.

Do not forget there is a human side to this problem. There is know-how and skill accumulated through faithful service to the Government by the workers who carry on these activities. Are they to be turned out without a word and without consideration because big business smells a profit in what they are doing? The skill of these workers will be invaluable in time of emergency. Where will you turn for know-how or facilities at that time?

Let me say this: Some of the drive to eliminate this section seems to have come from recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I remember many instances when the recommendations of the Hoover Commission have not been considered sacrosanct. As a matter of fact, I think most of them have had to be tempered down quite a little bit before we found them practical, workable, or acceptable. Secretary Wilson said that this is working no hardship. He showed no disposition, on being questioned by me, to have this section eliminated. I submit it is a good section.

If you want the final measure on this, the House Committee on Armed Services has prepared a bill, and will present it shortly, which carries on this same operation. It is in different language, yes, but it will carry on the same activity that we proposed a year ago and which was adopted a year ago, and which has proved itself in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

Refund of Federal Tax on Gasoline Used for Farm Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, many of the farmers of my district have indicated an interest in the question of how they should apply for gasoline tax refund under recently approved Federal legislation. Upon inquiry, the Internal Revenue Service furnished the following information which I thought might be of general interest:

Farmers will be able to obtain a refund of the Federal excise tax on gasoline which is used on a farm for farming purposes under the law approved by President Eisenhower on April 2, 1956. The present Federal tax rate is 2 cents a gallon. Commissioner of Internal Revenue Russell C. Harrington announced that under the new law the first refund payments will be made after June 30 with respect to gasoline purchased and used during the first 6 months of 1956. Thereafter, refunds will be made for a 1-year period from July 1 to June 30.

To get his refund, a farmer will have to file his claim after June 30 and before October 1. Claims are to be made on form 2240 and are to be filed with the United States District Director of Internal Revenue for the farmer's district. The form will be available after June 1 at Internal Revenue offices, county agricultural agents, and many banks and post offices.

Refunds will be limited to the Federal tax on gasoline which is used by a farmer for farming purposes, in carrying on a trade or business, on a farm located in the United States. A farmer may also request a refund of the tax on any gasoline which is used on his farm by a custom operator or a neighbor in connection with cultivating the soil, or raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity.

In general, the new law provides that gasoline shall be treated as used for farming purposes if it is used:

1. By the farmer or any other person in connection with cultivating the soil, or raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising of livestock, poultry, etc., on the farmer's own farm.

2. By the farmer in the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of his farm or its tools or equipment.

3. By the farmer in handling, drying, packing, grading, or storing any agricultural or horticultural commodity in its unmanufactured state, but only if the farmer produced more than one-half of the commodity which he so treated during the period for which the claim is filed.

4. By the farmer in connection with the planting, cultivating, caring for, or cutting of trees, or the preparation (other than sawing into lumber, chipping, or other milling) of trees for market, but only if the planting, etc., is incidental to his farming operations.

No refunds of tax are allowed on gasoline used off the farm, such as gasoline used on public roads or highways in transporting family members or workmen, equipment, livestock, crops, feed, etc. Also, no refunds are allowed for tax on gasoline used in processing, packaging, freezing, or canning operations.

Farmers are also given special relief from the Federal excise tax on diesel fuel and special motor fuels used on a farm for farming purposes.

Farmers who expect to file claims should keep sufficient records to enable the Internal Revenue Service to verify the accuracy of the amount claimed.

Commissioner Harrington said that regulations relating to the new law will be issued as soon as possible.

Here is a facsimile of form 2240:

FORM 2240

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT—
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Claim for refund of Federal tax on gasoline used on a farm—1956

See instructions on reverse side. Please print.

1. Name _____

Address (number and street or rural route)

_____

(City, town, or post office) _____

(zone) _____ (State) _____

2. Total gallons of gasoline purchased after December 31, 1955, and used on the farm before July 1, 1956, for farming purposes _____ gallons.

3. Rate of Federal tax _____ $0.02

4. Amount of refund claimed (line 2 multiplied by line 3) _____ $

I declare under the penalties of perjury that this claim has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge and belief is true and correct.

Sign here (signature) _____

(Date) _____

Danger in Domestic Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, by reason of our low tariff rates on uncontrolled importation of foreign textile finished products produced by cheap foreign labor, our domestic textile industry, including synthetics, apparel and other finished textile mill products, is fast becoming the sick man of the American industrial economy. This industry, which employs about 14 percent of our manufacturing wage earners, has in recent years been compelled by unfair competition from abroad to curtail production, shorten the workweek and discharge temporarily or permanently over 260,000 employees. Since 1947, domestic cotton manufacturers' exports have dropped from $748.8 million to $242 million. During the same period, foreign imports have increased from $24 million to $123 million. These imports now supply 30 percent of the domestic gingham market, 30 percent of the cotton blouse market and 70 percent of the velveteen market.

What accounts for this tremendous increase in imports and this alarming threat to our American textile manufacturers? Approximately 27 percent of the production cost of cotton cloth is wages. The average Japanese textile worker's wage is 13 cents an hour, as compared to our $1.35 an hour in the United States. It is unthinkable to expect the American worker to compete at this wage level with Japanese workers, and the manufacturer himself, faced with this fixed production cost, has no flexibility with which to meet foreign prices on the finished product. As a matter of fact, the cotton manufacturer is faced with still another inflexible factor which does not face his foreign competitor. About 53 percent of the production cost of the cotton cloth is raw cotton whose price to the American manufacturer is sustained at an artificially high level by the domestic cotton price-support program. Cheap foreign cotton is not available to him as it is to his foreign competitor, because America has placed an import quota on raw cotton of 29,000 bales. Compared with the 9 million bales required by the American manufacturer, this quota is not a drop in the bucket.

Those of us interested in the welfare of the American cotton manufacturer and his employees cannot understand why America will impose a quota on a cheap foreign raw-product import to protect domestic growers, but refuses to consider a quota on importations of the cheap foreign-finished product to protect the American manufacturer and his employees.

For similar reasons, we fail to understand why there continues to be such an unfair balance in tariff rates between the United States and foreign competitor

nations. According to the 1953 figures, which are the latest presently available to me, the United States tariff rate on imported finished cotton product was 21.55 percent. On the other hand, Britain's tariff rate on cottons was 30 percent, Italy's up to 25 percent, Germany's up to 30 percent, and Canada's up to 27.5 percent. With respect to synthetic textile products, America's tariff rate on foreign imports was only 19.7 percent, whereas Norway's was 22 percent, France's 20 to 25 percent, Italy's 25 to 27 percent, and India's 50 percent.

I do not profess to know whether the proper solution is an import quota or an increased tariff or a compromise combination of both. However, I do know—and every domestic manufacturer and worker will bear me out—that unless some firm and positive action is taken soon this Nation faces the bleak borders of bankruptcy of the domestic textile industry—an industry which is not only vital to our economic health in peacetime but essential to our very national security in wartime, when foreign imports might be suddenly and completely cut off.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the economic well-being of the Japanese. We are encouraged to hope that in the unhappy event of war Japan would be an ally. Indeed, we have been so concerned about Japan's welfare that we have used American taxpayer dollars to rebuild her shattered industries. The irony of the fact is that we have furnished the capital to install the very machinery which, with subsubsistence wage levels, produces textile products which are undermining our domestic industry. It is one thing to say that we should help the Japanese, but it is entirely a different thing to say that we should do so by hurting our own American citizens.

Congressman McGregor's Schedule of Meetings in the 17th Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session during the latter part of August and September, I will again this year follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, I have always deemed it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of my district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems. I will be at the courthouses in the various counties as per the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 27 and 28, Ashland.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 29 and 30, Mansfield.

Friday and Saturday, August 31 and September 1, Coshocton.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 4 and 5, Delaware.

Thursday and Friday, September 6 and 7, Newark.

Monday and Tuesday, September 10 and 11, Millersburg.

Wednesday and Thursday, September 12 and 13, Mount Vernon.

Weekdays, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

In the past these meetings have been most successful, and it is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences, and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. BELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I have the pleasure to announce that a constituent of mine, Mrs. Maria Reyes, of Beeville, Tex., has received the distinct honor of being designated mother of the year by the cadet corps of our great Texas A. & M. College on Mother's Day.

Mrs. Reyes, one of our fine Latin-American Texans, does not speak English too well, but in spite of this fact, she has managed to grow enough cotton to put 5 of her 8 sons through Texas A. & M. College. Another son, Marcarito, is an Aggie senior this year. Two younger sons, now in high school, plan to enroll at A. & M., also.

Mrs. Reyes has reared six daughters, and through her inspiration and efforts, has given them the help and encouragement to receive college educations.

Three of her sons served their country in the Armed Forces during World War II. Two returned as majors and one as a lieutenant colonel.

It is apparent that the cadet corps of A. & M. College chose wisely and well in selecting this great woman for mother of the year. It is on homes like these that our great American tradition is founded. I know all Texas is proud to claim Mrs. Reyes and recognize her contribution to her State and her Nation. It is with pride and humility that I commend her to you, the Members of the House of Representatives, as a wonderful mother, a fine Texan, and a splendid American.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers Files Application for Trade Practice Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Mr. George J. Burger, well known to many of my colleagues as the vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, I include a copy of the letter to which he refers addressed to the editor of the Service Station News inasmuch as I think it will provide much food for thought and reflection:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1956.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will note the attached letter which speaks for itself.

In view of the extensive action you gave these problems as chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, it would strike me that all independent members of the gasoline trade should realize the action of your committee in their behalf and they should put all emphasis on support of such constructive action that would eliminate the cancer that is destroying independent business establishments in the gasoline serving industry.

You are privileged to use these comments as you deem fit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BERGER,
Vice President.

MAY 16, 1956.

EDITOR, SERVICE STATION NEWS,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: In reviewing the May issue of your publication I noted with considerable interest the front page story National Congress of Petroleum Retailers Files Application for Trade Practice Conference.

Not being unduly critical of the action planned, we are just wondering whether such planning will bring about the long overdue relief to the many thousands of independent filling-station operators throughout the 48 States. It's a matter of public record as to the plight facing the efficient independent filling-station operators due to what appears to be the control exercised over their independent operations to serve the public.

This statement is confirmed by the actions of the Small Business Committees of both the House and the Senate in due public hearings during the past year, and the entire proposition was exposed in the first instance by the Senate Small Business Committee early in 1941, so it is our honest opinion that if the independent filling-station field is to get the long overdue and immediate relief, trade-practice conference through the Federal Trade Commission will not solve their basic problems.

The writer has had some experence with these trade-practice conferences as it applied to the rubber-tire industry. Although those rules were instituted in October 1936, here some 20 years later we find no attempt upon the part of the Government agency to vigorously enforce those rules.

Wholly in the interest of independent business of all descriptions, which would certainly include a substantial membership of independent filling-station operators in the federation, and merely as a help to them, it would strike us that all efforts should be used to bring about immediate relief so that the free enterprise system can actually operate in the independent filling-station field through:

1. Similar action to be instituted individually by gasoline suppliers filing their prices under the Fair Trade Acts, as has recently taken place by certain leading companies in the State of New Jersey. Such action, we repeat, must not be by collusion, but by the individual action of the suppliers.

2. Due to the disclosures made through congressional committees beginning in 1941, and more recently through the splendid actions of the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House on this problem, it would strike us that the only permanent correction for the protection of independent filling-station operators is the complete divorcement of the gasoline supplier operating in the retail field through their own setups.

Bear in mind that the federation is committed by its nationwide membership of 100,000 or more for all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. In fact that is the principal and main objective of the federation to protect independent business, and in view of this we make this suggestion as to the proper approach in correcting the cancer that is slowly but surely destroying independent establishments where certain large interests in the production field are operating in the retail field through their own setups.

These comments are made wholly for the best interests of the people your publication serves.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

A Tribute to Our Defenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a short article that appeared in the Coyote News, the Wichita Falls, Tex., high school bulletin. The article is entitled "A Tribute to Our Defenders" and was written by Albert Swarts, a senior in the Wichita Falls High School. I think this is a very fine and timely article as Memorial Day approaches and I would like to insert it in the RECORD.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR DEFENDERS

Memorial Day is drawing near, and all should stop for a moment to honor those men who have sacrificed their lives to protect this country and its ideals. This country, with its fast pace of life, often forgets these men and the cause for which they fought after its way of life is out of danger. These men, however, deserve to be remembered as long as the stars and stripes fly in the sun.

These men loved peace and life as well as any person living today, but they also loved democracy and were not willing to sacrifice their freedom for personal safety. They spilled their blood on soil far from home for ideals often taken for granted by their relatives and friends, but they preserved the freedom of these friends. These men would be greatly dishonored if the people they protected should forget the principles they saved. Deep thought on this matter is in order for Memorial Day of 1956.—Albert Swarts.

H. R. 5789

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have received several copies of a letter in the Oregon Labor Press which is the official publication of the Oregon State Federation of Labor and Portland Central Labor Council. This letter shows very clearly what a member of the Electrical Workers Union 125 thinks of President Eisenhower's partnership plan, and especially of H. R. 5789, the John Day bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

DEPENDS PARTNERSHIP PLAN

To the Labor Press:

I have just read Senator NEUBERGER'S report in the May 4 issue of the Labor Press. As a member of a union which enjoys excellent relationships with electric utility companies, and which has endorsed H. R. 5789, the so-called John Day partnership bill, I cannot let some of the misrepresentations contained in the Senator's report go unanswered.

The Senator states as a fact that the cost of John Day Dam will be $358 million. The truth is that this is by no means a settled issue. In a letter to CHARLES BUCKLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, the Secretary of the Army states that the estimated cost of $310 million for the modified John Day project is considered reasonable.

Furthermore, the United States Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors agreed at a hearing held in Washington, D. C., January 19, that the dam should be built at a height several feet lower than originally planned. Staff members of the Corps of Engineers have indicated this modification will substantially reduce the cost of John Day from the original estimate of $358 million.

It is also a fact that H. R. 5789 specifically says that any cost over $310 million shall be paid by participating utilities. Thus, in John Day, the non-Federal participants would pay not only for the entire cost of the power features of the project (above $273 million), but also agree to pick up the tab for any costs above the estimated total.

Congressman CLIFFORD DAVIS of Tennessee, after the 1-day "quickie" hearing on July 26, 1955, promised a full and complete hearing on the John Day bill during the current session of Congress. So far, he has not kept that promise.

If Senator NEUBERGER would help to get a hearing on this bill, the testimony would show that the cost of power from John Day under the partnership plan will be comparable to that from the other federally owned plants on the main stem of the Columbia River system.

Over the entire 50-year contract period for John Day power, its estimated cost is 2.87 mills per kilowatt-hour with private financing, which provides for State, excise, and Federal income taxes. This compares very favorably with the estimated cost of 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour at the Dalles project, which is federally financed.

If a number of tax-free municipalities or State power commissions enter the partnership program for John Day, it is estimated that the cost of power will be 2.7 mills (or less) per kilowatt-hour.

I cannot help but be amazed that Senator NEUBERGER still continues to compare Bonneville's average industrial rate to the average industrial rate charged by one particular private utility. Anyone who has even the vaguest knowledge about the electric utility business knows this comparision is as phony as a $3 bill. It is rather like comparing the tree in the woods to the cost of a delivered crossarm.

BPA sells energy to 18 industrial customers. Five of these are aluminum reduction plants that use more electricity than medium sized cities, and pay less than public or private utilities because they can buy continuous power around the clock at high voltage. The Senator compares the price of power sold by BPA to these 18 industrial giants with the average price which a private utility charges for all industrial use, starting with 1-man garage workshops.

If we look at the private utility customers using 3,000 kilowatts or more, we find the average rate to be 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, and this is just about what BPA would charge for the same service.

It seems to me that all of us had better stop using, and swallowing, fake arguments; and take a good long look at the facts of this so-called power issue.

JACK KEGG,
Electrical Workers 125.

PORTLAND.

Congressman Miller's Record on Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and a copy of a letter I am sending to the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN, of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, on May 22 the gentleman from Ohio made a serious charge against me in stating, "Nebraska has voted against every State that wanted public power." The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] was referring to seven votes which occurred on May 2, 1951. He was using this as his excuse for voting against public power and not supporting the administration's request which had budget approval for the 230-kilovolt line from Fort Randall, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr. His motion to strike this item from the bill denies the REA's of Nebraska a right to get public power. According to press reports he said, "This public power project would go in over my dead body." He also made the statement on the floor of the House that he doubted "if I would vote for the

second coming of Christ." This was in bad taste and offensive and to his credit, he did delete it from the permanent RECORD. It is a rare occasion when a Member's motive or votes or religion is attacked on the floor of the House.

The letter I have written to Mr. KIRWAN and which appears as a part of these remarks, shows that there are a total of 371 reclamation, hydroelectric plants, and flood-control projects which have been presented to the House in the last 14 years since I have been a Member. I have challenged Mr. KIRWAN to show where I have failed to support legislation or the appropriations for all but 4 or 5 of these projects. In fact, the criticism I get is that I have been a bit too liberal. I have always felt that reclamation, public power, and flood-control projects were an investment in the future of America. They return dividends, they are needed for an expanding population.

Close examination of my voting record will refute the charge that I have voted against "every State who wanted public power."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1956.

Hon. MICHAEL KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have just reviewed the debate we had in the House on May 22, 1956, in which you made some serious charges that the Nebraska delegation, and A. L. MILLER in particular, on May 2, 1951, failed to support seven rollcalls which you claimed was a vote against public power. You have stated, "Nebraska has voted against every State that wanted public power." The records, of course, deny this statement. The vote you refer to occurred on May 2, 1951. This was in the midst of the Korean war, which was not going well for this country. The budget was out of balance $14 billion. The votes I made to cut Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwest Power Administration was in support of an amendment made by Democrats. It was a small cut. One in the direction of economy. Both votes prevalled. The House voted with the Nebraska delegation and it was a Democrat-controlled House. I also voted for Mr. TABER'S motion to cut all appropriations including reclamation and power projects by 5 percent. Again it was an economy move and could not possibly be considered having voted against public power.

Now I want to cite to you my record of voting for reclamation projects and for public power. In the last 2 years I have voted for the Chief Joseph in Washington; Washita in Oklahoma; the great upper Colorado project with its numerous reservoirs and powerplants. The Trinity River project in California which is a great public power and irrigation project; the Ventura project in California, and others.

You will find on page A4107 and A4108, of the May 22 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of hydroelectric plants either constructed and operated or to be constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. This list was put in by our colleague, JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee. There are a total of 72 projects in all—59, while I have been a Member of the House, have been considered. I have been in support of everyone of the 59 Bureau of reclamation projects. I challenge you to show where I have failed to support legislation or appropriations for these projects. I list them as follows:

Hydroelectric powerplants

CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

State	Project	Name of plant
Alaska	Eklutna	Eklutna.
Do	do	Little Eklutna.
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon	Hoover.
Do	Parker-Davis	Davis.
California	Central Valley	Folsom.
Do	do	Keswick.
Do	do	Nimbus.
Do	do	Shasta.
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson	Estes.
Do	do	Flatiron.
Do	do	Green Mountain.
Do	do	Marys Lake.
Do	do	Polehill.
Do	Grand Valley	Grand Valley.
Idaho	Boise	Anderson Ranch.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Canyon Ferry.
Do	Hungry Horse	Hungry Horse.
New Mexico	Rio Grande	Elephant Butte.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Angostura.
Wyoming	Kendrick	Alcova.
Do	Missouri River Basin	Boysen.
Do	do	Kortes.
Do	Shoshone	Heart Mountain.

CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY OTHERS

Montana	Fort Peck (USCE)	Fort Peck.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Fort Randall.
Texas	Falcon Dam (IBWC)	Falcon.

UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Idaho	Palisades	Palisades.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Yellowtail.
Utah	Provo River Basin	Deer Creek.
Washington	Yakima-Kennewick	Chandler.
Do	Yakima-Roza	Roza.
Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Glendo.

UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS—POWER TO BE MARKED BY USBR

North Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Garrison.
South Dakota	do	Gavins Point.
Do	do	Oahe.

AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

California	Central Valley	Lewiston.
Do	do	Matheson.
Do	do	Tower House.
Do	do	Trinity.
Colorado	Collbran	Upper Molina.
Do	do	Lower Molina.
Do	Colorado-Big Thompson	Big Thompson.
Idaho	Minidoka	American Falls.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Absaroka.
Do	do	Kenil.
Do	do	Little Porcupine.
Do	do	Lyon.
Do	do	Moorhead.
Do	do	Portage.
Do	do	Tiber.
Nebraska	do	Lillian.
Oregon	Talent	Green Springs.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Pony Hills.
Utah	Weber Basin	Gateway.
Do	do	Wanship.
Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Bald Ridge.
Do	do	Fremont Canyon.
Do	do	Hunter Mountain.
Do	do	Sheridan.
Do	do	Sunlight.
Do	do	Thief Creek.

AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY OTHERS

California	Central Valley (USCE)	Iron Canyon.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin (USCE)	Big Bend.

If you will refer to your own report on pages 5 and 6, you list all of the appropriations for reclamation. There are 44 individual projects for irrigation and power. I challenge you to show where I failed to support legislation or appropriations for any one of these reclamation and hydroelectric plants. On pages 10 to 17 inclusive, are listed 299 projects for the Corps of Engineers. They are flood control and hydroelectric plants. The record will show that I have supported legislation and appropriations for all but 4 or 5 of these projects. Again I challenge you to show that I voted against power in these projects.

It was my amendment to the appropriations bill last year that placed 8 new irrigation and power projects in the Public Works legislation. I believe this was much to your discomfort.

The record will show that I have voted for steam plants for TVA; I have voted for all of the money to increase the appropriations for REAs. I have said repeatedly that these appropriations were an investment in the resources of this country. I complained bitterly on March of 1952, and you will find it on page 3066 of the RECORD of that date, when I said, in part "It comes to my attention that no new starts have been the Congress and the administration for some time and if this program continues, the present irrigation projects will have been finished and we will be without a new start for irrigation projects—I earnestly hope that the policy of the Government and the Committee on Appropriations might be changed so that we can proceed with the orderly development of feasible irrigation districts—electric power makes irrigation feasible—when the Congress spends money for the development of power projects that money and the fruits of this thing ought to be for the benefit of the people of the United States—the policy has been that there should be no new starts, this must be changed. I repeat, these new projects plus electricity, adds new wealth, brings new business, taxes, and security to our Nation. The resources must be developed to meet the needs of an expanding population." I believe, sir, that each year the record will indicate that has been my attitude on public power.

As a ranking member of the Interior Committee and chairman in the 83d Congress, we were diligent in protecting the rights of the preference customers getting public power.

I am a little surprised, sir, that you would attempt to mislead my colleagues and the country by stating that I have failed to support public power projects. The record denies such an allegation. I am wondering, also, that if I was wrong, as you say I was, in not supporting public power projects, that if you now consider your vote, which is against public power and the REA's of Nebraska, is right?

I think it is most unfortunate that you have used your position as the Democratic chairman of the subcommittee, to make the motion to strike the 230 kilovolt line from the appropriations bill when it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Republican administration. I think it was unfortunate that you stated, and I quote the press, "They will get it only over my dead body." You are in a powerful position to defeat the appropriation, but, sir, it is a vote against public power.

I note that you deleted the statement you made in the debate when you said, "I doubt if the gentleman from Nebraska would vote for the second coming of Christ." That, sir, was not in good taste and to some, quite offensive.

I can only conclude from your action on the floor that you have attempted to mislead the Congress and the country with the hope that you might gain some political advantages in Nebraska. I know your hopes will be in vain. I can only say that if I had voted as you have been voting, my people would not be returning me to Congress with such a handsome vote.

I expect, sir, to place this letter and report in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would again urge that you examine my record in the project list in this letter. If you will do that and examine my voting record you will find that it is as good as most Members in the House on public power. Your citation of the seven votes on May 2, 1951 was not against public power, they were for economy in our country when we were losing a war and had a $14 billion deficit facing the American people.

The hearings on the 230-kilovolt line will be held in the committee of the other body on May 31 or the early part of June. I believe it will again be presented to the House as a conference matter. I trust you will use your influence and support public power as I have done in the past.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Small Business Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, May 21, the 218th name was signed to the petition to discharged H. R. 11, the equality of opportunity bill. On that day the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], gave out a press release thanking and congratulating the 218 Members who signed this petition. I failed to see anything in the local press on this release, and it occurs to me therefore that the Members would be interested in knowing about the press release of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

On Tuesday, the day following the completion of the petition to discharge H. R. 11, the House Committee on the Judiciary met and reported another bill on this subject. This is bill H. R. 1840. I am not at this time prepared to comment on the relative merits of the two bills; I simply call attention to the fact that our chairman [Mr. PATMAN] has offered his congratulations to the Members who signed the discharge petition on his bill; and I likewise congratulate those Members.

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS—SMALL BUSINESS VICTORY: 218 MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE SIGN PETITION TO CALL UP H. R. 11

Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House of Representatives have now signed the discharge petition to call up H. R. 11, which means that this bill will definitely be acted upon by the House.

The 218 Members who signed this petition are to be warmly congratulated, both for the interest they have shown in preserving independent businesses in the United States, and for taking this affirmative action to pass this needed legislation.

H. R. 11 will strengthen the antitrust laws and plug the loophole created by the Supreme Court in the one antitrust law which affects the everyday practical operations of every small business in the United States. The bill will restrain abuses of power by which big businesses destroy equally efficient and even more efficient small businesses. This is the abuse of power which is exercised through price discrimination.

The House Rules require that after completion of the discharge petition, 7 days must pass before the bill can be taken up and voted on, and furthermore, that it be taken up only on any 2d or 4th Monday after expiration of the 7 days. This means that the bill will be taken up and acted on by the House on Monday, June 11.

My belief is that a great majority of the House is overwhelmingly in sympathy with preserving the free-enterprise system, which means restoring equality of opportunity for small business. The bill will simply make it illegal for any seller to engage in any discriminatory pricing practice which substantialy lessens competition or tends to create a monopoly.

I predict the bill will pass. Small-business people all over the United States will hail this as a great victory.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th of May the Armenians celebrate the 30th anniversary of the short-lived independence of the Republic of Armenia. This event which marks their brief independence between the years 1918 to 1920 causes one to reminisce on the principles of a great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, who actually believed in the freedom of all nations. He was not one to pay lip service to gain votes but acted with sincere effort to produce harmony and individualism in people throughout the world. What a different picture there is today.

Soviet Russia has consistently attempted to annex properties of foreign nationals as a guise of progress to its peoples, to plunder for the purpose of supplementing its treasuries, and to raid to obtain additional recruits for its slave-labor camps.

Following World War I in 1920, the Soviets took over the Republic of Armenia. The same year they also attempted to take over Poland but were defeated. Both these nations were looted, devastated, and unprepared to withstand these menacing hordes. Fortunately, Poland had assistance from America and France which helped defeat these ravaging savages.

The freedom of the nations I have mentioned and others was established by people with foresight and vision to the future. President Wilson recognized the practicality of independence of various nations. His foresight is woefully lacking today among administration circles for in the interests of peaceful coexistence, no real effort is being put forth to bring about any stability in the world.

The great ado about the Geneva Conference only brought about more confusion among Americans and throughout the rest of the world. What was accomplished; certainly no attempt was made to reestablish the right of self rule to the rightful people.

The Geneva Conference was actually brought about through Communist subterfuge, although a venerable gentleman from the other body is credited with having initiated the proposal. And, of course, the present administration fell for it hook, line, and sinker.

The Russians by their indirect interjection have gained beyond their expectations. They gained not only knowledge of our advancements in medicine, nuclear physics and other fields, but also gained in the implementation of exchange programs of visitors in vari-

ous nations. The seven Russians who visited America last year were typical examples. They were not just journalists but were professionals in various fields. From their trips they gleaned valuable information for the U. S. S. R. They are so far behind in Russia that they have had to buy innumerable items from us, such as a complete window assembly to be reproduced in Russia. Their constant boasting about their progress is I believe deflated by just this one item.

What did the present administration gain? Only a stroke of propaganda for peaceful coexistence. That makes many of us who are thoroughly familiar with Russia's actions not only in recent years but also in centuries past firmly convinced that the Russians are working only for their own benefits. Any agreements or treaties are simply scraps of paper for us to adhere to but for them to benefit by and forget at the opportune moment.

The purpose behind the present moves of Russia for peaceful coexistence is to neutralize Western Europe and Asia, to destroy NATO and SEATO and to isolate America.

Today, in spite of the attempt to follow many of the Roosevelt and Truman policies, the present administration is allowing itself to become more and more entrenched in an isolationist position. For this trend, we certainly have no cause to rejoice in America.

For instance, the so-called relaxation of terror in the satellite nations might have some truth to it, but it really is of no consequence. Russia has not and will not relax her complete military and police domination and policy control over any of the nations behind the Iron Curtain. She has willfully destroyed leaders of these countries and to a degree the spirit of active participation but never the desire for self rule.

Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman were controversial figures. Anyone who has the qualities of leadership and the ability to act when necessity arises will always be a controversial figure. This, of course, is not true today. So we may justly assume that we have a figure at the helm of our Government who will never be controversial.

To those of us who pray and hope for the reestablishment of a free and independent Armenia and of the other nations, the present looks hopeless unless this conglomerate giant falls of its own weight. From all indications, this is not immediately possible.

Eliminate Secret Agreements Under Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill, House Resolution 11454, to amend section 4 of the Sherman Act to prescribe a procedure with respect to consent judgments, decrees or orders and for other purposes.

The House Small Business Committee has had under study and investigation the effect of consent decree procedures upon small business. There is no question that small-business men can be benefited by the negotiation of consent decrees in antitrust actions brought by the Department of Justice. Small-business men need speedy and prompt relief from monopoly practices and often a consent decree may avoid long protracted litigation lasting 15 years or longer.

The Department of Justice may also benefit from the settlement of an antitrust case by consent of the parties. As pointed out by Judge Barnes in testifying before the House Small Business Committee in March of this year:

> The division is caught in a vice between increasing complaints of violation and decreasing appropriations * * *. Since savings in time generally spell like savings of men and resources, consent settlements mean lower cost per judgment entered. And, more important, it means quicker relief to the parties adversely affected by the acts charged in the complaint.

While these objectives are laudable there remains serious defects in the procedure by which consent decrees are negotiated and accepted by the courts. The purpose of my bill is to remove such defects without detracting from the advantages that can be obtained through the use of consent decrees.

A consent decree, under the procedures now in use by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, is in effect a private settlement between the Government and an antitrust defendant, resulting from secret negotiations and compromises.

The court in accepting such consent decrees has no record or objections before it, upon which it can make a determination whether in fact the compromise between the Government and the antitrust defendant is in the public interest. As stated by Judge Barnes in his testimony on March 29, 1956, before the House Small Business Committee:

> Though consent judgments bind both parties and estop future de novo proceedings involving matters covered, their provisions ofttimes receive only cursory judicial scrutiny. * * * These facts, it seems clear, support one commentator's conclusion that consent "procedure permits no conclusion of independent court determination."

How then is the public interest, and in particular the interest of small business, to be protected?

I submit that the only way to adequately protect these interests is to provide that any consent judgment, decree, or order in any civil proceeding brought by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act should not become final for a period of 30 days, during which time any person who may be aggrieved by the proposed judgment, decree, or order may formally make to the court his objections and have the same considered by the court.

Such a proposed procedure is not a reflection upon the integrity and the ability of the Department of Justice, whether it be under a Democratic or a Republican administration.

However, as stated by Judge Barnes, in consent decree negotiations—

> Shirt-sleeve conferences replace formal court trials; the give and take of bargaining supplants the atmosphere of an adversary proceeding.

An adversary proceeding is, of course, the basis of our system of jurisprudence; and certainly the history of Anglo-American jurisprudence has proved that the adversary proceeding best protects the rights of interested parties and is the best and surest means of ascertaining the truth in disputed matters. Consent decree negotiations, however, take away the safeguards inherent in adversary proceedings.

While the informality of shirt-sleeve negotiations may upon occasions, in the words of Judge Barnes, "resolve issues of fact, proof of which would be difficult if not impossible in a contested suit," upon other and probably the majority of occasions this same informality will result in the Government relying upon or being influenced by statements on the part of the defendant, which will never need to stand the tests and safeguards of either trial or public scrutiny. There are other factors inherent in the present consent decree procedure which further put the Government and the public interest at a disadvantage. One is the fact that the Antitrust Division is admittedly understaffed. In discussing the consent decree negotiations between the Department and the United Fruit Co., Judge Barnes stated that—

> Underscoring the complexity of our task is the fact that four law firms in Washington, New York, Boston, and New Orleans, in addition to United's own law department, now represent United Fruit * * * The Antitrust Division, in sharp contrast, during 1954 had only one man—albeit a capable and experienced one. * * * Beginning with 1955, I was fortunate enough to bring into the case * * * a man versed in trial work, who, in addition, had some 20 years of antitrust experience. Even now, however, our staff consists of too few lawyers, in comparison to the galaxy on the other side.

Such disparity in attorneys does not, of course, mean that it is impossible for a few representatives of the Department of Justice adequately to protect the public interest against a host of corporate attorneys. It does mean, however, that the job is extremely difficult and that the Government negotiates under a definite handicap.

Further, according to Judge Barnes, it is not only announced policy of the Department of Justice, but also an economic necessity, that Government antitrust cases be compromised and not brought to trial. The Government then indeed is in a poor bargaining position in negotiating the decree; and the Government's lawyer would appear to be subject to heavy pressure to take whatever he can get in a form of a compromise, even though this falls far short of the real belief which is needed adequately to protect the public interest.

There are also other pressures upon the Government representative to accept

less from the defendant than what the public interest requires. Present consent decree procedures may be long drawn out affairs. The Government lawyer negotiating such a decree, as a practical matter, does not want to see all of his work go for nothing. He may—and in the utmost good faith—rationalize away some of the dangers of a proposed consent decree in order to reach a compromise which the defendant is willing to sign. Or the Government lawyer may face a more practical problem—the fact that agreeing to a consent decree is a lot easier than preparing for a long and difficult trial. And finally, even though the Government were prepared for trial, there must inevitably lurk in the minds of the Attorney General down to the lowest employee in the Department of Justice the question—why take a chance on losing the trial when a consent judgment can be entered into which will look well for the "record?"

These criticisms of the consent decree procedure should not be taken as impugning the motives and good faith of the hard working and overworked officials of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. Bad decisions, however, can be made with the utmost of good faith. That, of course, is the reason why both our judicial and administrative system always carries with it the right of review. My bill, in some measure, will make possible a review by the court of what has heretofore been a private and secret compromise between antitrust defendants and lawyers in the Department of Justice. At the same time the basic values of the consent decree will be fully retained. The only loser will be he who has at first achieved an unfair and harmful advantage. The gainers will be all who have a right to ask that the Government consider their rights also.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend this bill to the members of the Judiciary Committee and ask my colleagues to give it careful consideration.

Don't Damn All Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, much has been said in recent months about the alleged adverse effects that construction of water-storage dams would have upon wildlife and recreation. It is gratifying to me that one of our leading sports magazines has now seen fit to look at the other side of the coin, and present for its readers an article giving the positive contributions that may be made to conservation and wildlife propagation by reclamation reservoirs.

I request unanimous consent to have this article, Don't Damn All Dams, reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article appeared in the April 1956 issue of Field and Stream, and I urge its reading by all who are interested in water-resource development and conservation, both of which may be achieved in carefully planned reclamation projects.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T DAMN ALL DAMS
(By Frank Dufresne)

The game protectors said it was just an average day. In the lakes below us 30,000 Canada honkers were starting to move out for the afternoon feeding. While we watched from a high spot on the road, flack after flock took off and formed into wavy ranks under the high wind clouds. Their haunting cries echode like fanfares of mellow horns in the sky as the great flocks cleaved into family groups, wheeled shining breasts against the October breeze, and began floating down to the yellow stubble.

Thirty thousand flying geese will quicken the pulse of any man. But that wasn't all. Twice that many ducks—a scurrying horde of mallards, sprigs, gadwalls, teals, baldpates, redheads, canvasbacks, ringnecks, ruddies, bluebills, and wood ducks—were also winging off the big waters to feed in the weedy ponds. Ten thousand coots, more or less, dabbled along the shorelines. Yet the Washington State game men called it just a routine show.

We heard only a few shots. In an expansive country like the Columbia Basin there is plenty of space for hunters to spread themselves and pick their targets. On the drive to the Ephrata airstrip, we'd seen gunners working their dogs along the hedgerows for Chinese pheasants and Hungarian partridge. Others were climbing the rimrock for chukars. If you looked close you'd note that some bird shooters had carbines slung across their shoulders in case they jumped a mule deer.

We belted ourselves in the small plane, and Supervisor Frank White, of the Washington State Game Department, took us upstairs for an air view. He pointed down at a couple of men in a rubber boat plugging for bass along a margin of bulrush. In an indigo pool, once a canyon fit only for rattlesnakes, some trout fishermen were flycasting for rainbows. But there was nothing special about any of this, said the game department field boss; all fall it had been the same. Game and fish stocks were on the upswing, and there was plenty of leg room for sportsmen to ramble around until they found what they liked.

Nothing unusual in all this, we were told. But it hadn't always been that way. First, there had to be a kind of miracle.

There had to be a coming of water to an arid wasteland, sun scorched for ages. That meant building a dam—a type of structure not generally designed to make sportsmen happy. But this dam was different. There was an enormous natural basin of more than a million acres of scablands and sagebrush, and it desperately needed water. Blocks across the lower Columbia River had already fouled up most of the fish runs; so building the Grand Coulee Dam could do little worse. Anyway, the Federal Government's blueprints promised a degree of participation by wildlife interests. This was an astonishing—unheard of—development, and the Washington Game Department lost no time in getting itself a toehold. O. K., build the dam, it told the Federals—but share the water fairly. No hogging by power people; no deadly drawdowns that kill off fish; no hindteat sucking for waterfowl and other game; no grasping of authority. Let's have some teamwork.

The Grand Coulee Dam, almost a mile long and standing 570 feet above bedrock, is the most colossal batch of cement ever poured across any river. Since the dam's completion, in 1941, the river has backed upstream 151 miles, until it extends well into Canada and impounds some 10 million acre-feet of water. And it possesses a second wonder, the grand gimmick that is transforming the Columbia Basin into one of the most important hunting and fishing grounds in America. They call this device the equalizing reservoir.

Our little plane droned in lazy eight's as young Supervisor White motioned to a barrier of lava rock rising above the dam and separating it from the Columbia Basin, where irrigation was urgently needed. A dozen gigantic pumps had been installed to suck water from the dam up 280 feet into the equalizing reservoir. From this pipe-fed lake, which is now 27 miles long, more than 5,000 miles of canals, ditches, siphons, and tunnels lead along both sides of the project to wet down the million acres of thirsty soil, producing in the bumpy terrain several hundred pools and ponds. Here and there throughout the basin, standing guard like so many watchdogs against water waste, are more pumps powered by Grand Coulee turbines, and they keep picking up the overflow and using it over and over again, even boosting it into high fields, whose rich lands had lain dry and dormant for centuries. When the water finally tumbles back into the Columbia River again near Pasco it has done a multiplicity of jobs.

To the game department every new plot of parched earth turned lush with river water spells more birds and mammals. Every filled gully, every sinkhole and alkaline puddle freshened by the pumps of the equalizing reservoir means more trout and bass. Director John A. Biggs, who yields to no man when it comes to gnashing official teeth at barriers flung across Washington's rivers, admits the Grand Coulee is different. "You can't damn all dams," he says. "We can work with this one."

What they had to work with was an utterly unproductive area. In the big bend of the Columbia, where the ancient riverbed is gouged from 300 to 2,000 feet deep, there is a huge parcel of land famed for its weird formations of porous volcanic rock, scablands, and arid bottoms sparce with sage, rabbit brush, and such plants as could pinch along on from 6 to 10 inches of rainfall a year. On its southwest border the Hanford Atomic Works is a mystery factory surrounded by miles of similar desolation.

Like the rain that came at long intervals, the wildlife was thinly spread. Such lake waters as could support fish life were mostly taken over by undersized spiny ray and trash species. "There wasn't much to lose," says Biggs. "Anything we could salvage figured to be clear gain. So we rolled up our sleeves and pitched in."

The dam builders altered the landscape on a titanic scale with their bulldozers, pumps, and blasting powder. But they were no busier than the Federal fish and game biologists. The Washington Game Department, carrying its own dreams and its own fistful of blueprints, managed to keep in step. As fast as new lakes showed over the sagebrush they were studied and tagged for development. If the waters were deep enough they were planted with rainbow trout, even though it required wholesale poisoning of suckers, chubs, squawfish, and carp. To date, 10 such lakes, 2,500 acres in all, have been treated with 140,000 pounds of derris root.

Now the rejuvenated waters bid fair to produce annually close to 500 trout to the acre. The fish will average 10 inches in length; the size dubbed blue plate special by the Department because of its high acceptability by the public.

Shallow bodies unfit for trout, plus other waterways that could not be manipulated to shut out undesirables, are being managed for largemouthed bass, crappies, yellow perch,

and catfish. Results are amazing. Where the piped waters wash over new bottoms wealthy with natural nutrients and fertilizer from the sheep that once grazed on the land, the fish are growing like Jack's beanstalk. Already, young bass in the Equalizing Reservoir are topping 6 pounds, and there are more of them than the average fisherman ever dreamed of seeing. The place is a cinch to become a national hotspot.

In the trout pools, of which there are uncounted numbers, rainbow trout fry reached a length of 9 inches in 4 months, a phenomenal growth. With fish stocks zooming, seasons have been set at 6 months. As the basin absorbs its fill of water, underground pressures and seeps cause new lakes to pop up unexpectedly in the desert, driving the biologists slightly daffy with the possibilities for fish culture. Don't start damning the dams around these fellows; they haven't any time to listen. They're too busy planting fish. And to make sure that anglers have a fair chance to catch these fish, the State game people are cinching public-access rights to every body of water stocked from their hatcheries. This means there will be auto roads over which a man can drive his boat trailer to lakeside, campsites, and the like.

Gunners are getting their share of the breaks, too. A grid system of publicly owned upland-bird tracts blankets the project, assuring safe breeding places. In every case where public access to fishing lakes is established, equal rights are extended to waterfowl hunters.

The spontaneous movement of pheasants into the greening valley is being stepped up with hatchery birds. Refuges to insure survival of quail, partridge, and grouse—no matter how heavy the gun pressure—are in the program. Meanwhile the Department has teamed with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to create a major waterfowl area along Crab Creek, part of it inviolate sanctuary, the rest open to harvest by hunters. However, the State would not go along when the National Park Service planned to take over the Equalizing Reservoir and set up what the State considers an overfancy and costly system of buildings, bans, and permits. They wanted it kept simple—a place where the outdoorsman would feel as free from redtape as it is possible to be. And finally, the State men wanted to run their own end of the show, not cede it to the Federal brass hats.

The State is considering old prejudices. Dams ruin fishing? Frequently, but not always. Not when a fish and game department is given a chance to carry out some of its own ideas. What's happening near the Grand Coulee is big news because of this fact. There are going to be more, many more, dams across our rivers. For all such projects, there are valuable lessons to be learned at the Grand Coulee.

Not that it is all milk and honey, of course. The level of the Equalizing Reservoir will vary 30 feet in a year, which is certainly not good for natural spawning. In the trout lakes there will be little or no natural reproduction, and that, strangely enough, is O. K. with the game department. It plans to plant a million fry each year, and says that the enormous yields it has in mind could never under any circumstance be accomplished by natural spawning. Nesting chances for waterfowl will be no better, but probably no worse, than before the project.

In the big view, things are working out well in central Washington's great water development. It's as close to being one happy family as you could reasonably expect of such diverse interests as the Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, State Park Service, Game Department and a host of other agencies. There's a 50-year signed agreement between the United States Department of the Interior and the State game department. Friction squeaks are being kept greased by regular meetings. Each faction is learning to respect the other's job.

Great gains are in the crystal ball for hunters, too—especially wing-shooters. Upland varieties available already include valley and scaled quails, Hungarian and chukar partridges, sage and sharp-tailed grouse, mourning doves and pheasants. To these you can add a dozen varieties of ducks and 3 or 4 kinds of geese; additional flights pour into the new flyway with every stroke of the electric pumps at Grand Coulee. When the irrigated farms are in full crop, the bird populations promise to be ten times greater than in the predam years.

The ranchers who must play host to game and gunner, and whose cooperation is vital, are being wooed by the game department. There will be no excuse for the hunter who cuts a wire fence or who leaves a gate open; cattle guards, paid for by the department, are being installed. Multiflora rose plants to the tune of 370,000 were handed out gratis in 1 year. In 3 years the plants, set 18 inches apart, grow to 4 feet and the fence they make is not only bullproof but impenetrable to anything bigger than a pheasant or a cottontail rabbit. This growth, plus wild acres of sage and other native hardies, means there is no problem of adequate cover.

Already some of the farmers are finding out that their best crop is likely to be game, not grain. Many waterfronts will be developed. Duck clubs will sprout along with corn and cabbage. This is one of the reasons why the State game department is pushing hard on its public-hunting plan. With 90,000 acres of the basin already under its control, it is shooting for 100,000. It figures that raising game is only half the job; the other half is to help hunters reap the crop.

Part of this hunter-managed area we saw real close on our final day in the basin. Jackknifed in our goose pits far out on the yellowed stubble, we heard the first mellow horns in the sky. The great flocks split apart under the evening-tinted clouds, and a band came our way. The birds spotted our profile decoys and came swinging past to scout the layout. The band split, and one group, yelping its suspicion, veered sharply away. The smaller flight wheeled back against the wind. We peered out from under the chicken-wire and wheat-straw matting, throats pulsing. The geese, now silent, came gliding in over the decoys and with outstretched black legs began floating down toward the cut wheat.

Boner at Salerno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of May 24, 1956:

BONER AT SALERNO

Former President Harry S. Truman has a gift for thoughts generated in a vacuum and expelled through a void. If any new demonstration were needed that his vocabulary has long since outgrown his discretion, it was provided in the reverberating Salerno incident.

Mr. Truman, out of the vast military cunning derived from World War I service as an artillery captain, took one look at the cliffs of Salerno during his current European tour and opined offhand that the sanguinary Battle of Salerno and the Anzio Beach landing were "totally unnecessary and planned by some squirrel-headed general."

The remark was not the kind that should come from a former President of the United States, speaking to newspaper reporters with the full knowledge that his words would make headlines around the world. Evidently, this time, even Mr. Truman came to a belated recognition of this fact. Through his secretary, he denied that the statement was directly his, and guessed that he may have been repeating what a reporter said to him, merely as a joke.

To tell loved ones at home that their sons died at Salerno needlessly and through the whim of some "squirrel-headed general" is a ghastly idea of a joke.

It is a fair suspicion that Mr. Truman was not concerned with all this, but that he had in mind that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during the war, and that there is a political campaign brewing in the United States in which Mr. Eisenhower will figure prominently.

Mr. Truman has never been notably careful with logic in discussing his political opponents, even indirectly.

Remarks by Eugene M. Zuckert at Industrial Nuclear Technology Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able members of the Atomic Energy Commission has been the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert. Following his retirement from the Commission last year, Mr. Zuckert retained an active interest in our Nation's atomic-energy program.

He has been a student of the atom for several years. He combines his knowledge of our atomic-energy program with a long business and administrative experience that makes invaluable his suggestions and contribution in this field.

Because of Mr. Zuckert's background in government and in the atomic-energy program, I recommend most highly to my colleagues the remarks which he made in addressing the Industrial Nuclear Technology Conference, cosponsored by Armour Research Foundation and Nucleonics magazine at Chicago, Ill., on Wednesday, May 16.

Under leave to do so, I extend herewith Mr. Zuckert's remarks:

REMARKS BY EUGENE M. ZUCKERT AT INDUSTRIAL NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE, COSPONSORED BY ARMOUR RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND NUCLEONICS MAGAZINE, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 16, 1956

In acknowledging my appreciation for Mr. Luntz's introduction, I want additionally to express my admiration for the part that Nucleonics, under his editorship, is playing in the development of atomic energy.

The first issue of Nucleonics was published in September 1947. Recently, I had the privilege of inspecting a copy of that edition. The contrast with today's assured format and varied content, mirrors the progress of

atomic energy in a particularly striking way. The articles in that first issue were necessarily concerned with only the very fundamentals of isotope techniques, nuclear particle technology, prewar nucleonics literature.

There are highlighted in that interesting first effort two quotations, which signaled a concern upon which Nucleonics has concentrated consistently determined effort, and made so great a contribution. These quotations express the maxim that diffused and widespread and informed knowledge are basic to progress in atomic energy.

Nucleonics has capably pressed for that diffusion. When I was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I was charged with the necessary and difficult responsibility for maintaining the objective of security protection of information. At many points this inherently conflicted with the pressures for telling more. In that capacity and since, I have known how firmly and intelligently—and with a great consciousness of responsibility—the pressure for spreading information has been exerted by Nucleonics. The momentum of atomic energy development will steadily grow and its fruits will be magnified as more information achieves an ever wider circulation. Nucleonics' contribution toward that end, and Mr. Luntz's leadership, are a unique and proud addition to the tradition of our journalism.

The Armour Research Foundation and Nucleonics are performing a service to industry in sponsoring this conference. There are many reasons why this is true, but two appeal to me particularly.

First, I think that there is exemplified here the revolution that is taking place in American industrial research methods. There must be—particularly for the companies that are not giants of industry—an ever greater turning to centralized research organizations and facilities, such as the Armour Research Foundation. The company that wants to stay abreast cannot afford to support under its own roof, all the specialized skills and equipment required to do the technical searching that is becoming a greater task for more and more industries. There must be a willingness by individual companies to engage in more cooperative effort and cooperative support, and to create research instruments of common usefulness such as the Armour Research Foundation reactor. This joining together is vital, not only to the progress of research, but also the preservation of a truly competitive system. The alternative can only be a growing concentration of effective industrial research in fewer hands.

Secondly, I regard this conference on nuclear science in other than power uses, significant because of attention those uses deserve. This meeting reflects so vividly the surge of atomic energy into areas where, just a few years ago, the outlook was believed so modest. For example, it was less than 4 years ago that, as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I inquired about the future prospects of radiation in chemistry. I asked a lot of people in atomic energy, many highly expert. The response was almost uniformly cautious, often downright discouraging—and usually for seemingly unimpeachable reasons.

It has taken only a brief interval to prove how wrong they were, and many of you in this room are responsible for that progress. Looking back, it is inconceivable that the brief history of atomic energy could have proved so conclusively to the pessimists that things which had never been tried, could not be done. Now it is clear, of course, that in radiation we have a new mode of energy with a versatility yet untapped: Radiation as a catalyst, radiation to effect new chemical reactions, radiation to create new or improved chemical products. Already we see, or can foresee, better plastics, revolutionary techniques of food preservation, and a whole host of other exciting possibilities well known to you. As we search and try more, as more radiation sources become available, and as knowledge disseminates and proliferates, possibilities yet undreamed of will become realities. Even at this early date, we know that the nonpower uses of atomic energy will have a steadily increasing impact upon the revolution of our technology.

It is truly amazing that so much can have taken place in atomic energy in such a brief period of time. Certainly, the world has never seen such a compression of research and development to attain significant new advances.

It must seem strange, therefore, that a major issue emerging today is whether this country is moving fast enough in atomic energy. The question focuses about atomic power, and, indeed, there has been much soul searching concerning it within recent months.

A majority of the Atomic Energy Commission and the leading spokesmen for industry maintain that the United States program is proceeding at a proper pace. But there are many informed dissenters. Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, has proposed a Government reactor program based on the failure of private industry since the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to make the necessary degree of progress. As the Senator stated recently:

"However laudable may have been the motives of the proponents of this act, 2 years of its operation offer conclusive evidence that we are simply not getting ahead with the job with proper efficiency and prompt development of atomic power."

Commissioned Murray goes a step further and has proposed that the Government undertake the construction of reactors producing a million kilowatts of electrical power here and overseas by 1960.

What these men have in mind has its principal impact upon the problem of our world leadership in supplying atomic power facilities for the other countries of the world.

The program for the peaceful use of atomic energy was nobly conceived. The President's address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, caught the imagination of all mankind. Here certainly was a bold attempt to overcome what was termed "the fearful atomic dilemma." The President's words were inspiring: "The United States pledges before you—and therefore the world—* * * to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

The Congress in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 broke the restrictions, which from the first had surrounded the field of atomic energy, and established the legal framework for a broad program of assistance and cooperation. It did this because it realized the need for leadership in bringing the benefits of this great force to the peoples of the world and the political advantage which would follow United States leadership.

That the world looked to the United States for leadership cannot be denied, nor can the fact that we held ourselves as willing to accept the responsibilities which accompany that leadership.

It would be unfair to say that only little has been accomplished in the period which has followed the President's historic address and the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. During that period there was convened the First International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, attended by representatives of some 73 nations and, during which, there was a heartening exchange of information on a broad scale. The United States Government has negotiated agreements for cooperation providing for assistance and collaboration and for a supply of reactor fuel with some 30 nations. A 12-nation working level group of the United Nations has agreed upon a draft charter with the creation and organization of an International Atomic Energy Agency. The President has allocated for distribution abroad in support of reactor projects 20,000 kilograms of valuable uranium 235.

Viewed in the light of attitudes and actions of just a few years ago, these accomplishments are indeed encouraging; but it is my heartfelt belief that even so, and considering further the difficulties of putting into operation and administering such a program, our words still outrun our deeds. It is my fear that the indications for the future portend that the responsibilities which we have accepted will exceed our accomplishments. Such can only defeat the high and noble intentions and expectations with which the atoms-for-peace program was conceived.

What is the difficulty, what has happened, and what is needed?

We have attempted to place the administration of this great program into the pattern of ordinary governmental operations. Any one familiar with the processes of our Government will understand the complexities which this has developed.

As a result, there is lacking a single authoritative responsible governmental unit dedicated to the fulfillment of the aims of the program, without redtape, and without the jurisdictional disputes and governmental infighting which inevitably follows.

The Atomic Energy Commission rightfully has assumed the lead in carrying the program forward, but it does not have that single authority and responsibility which is so essential. It must become involved, and thus the program must become involved, with the Department of State and with the various seemingly unrelated policies and programs of that Department. It must become involved with the International Cooperation Administration, with all of the entanglements, procedures, and inconsistencies which apply generally to our foreign aid program. As a result, the atoms-for-peace program stands in danger of becoming submerged by other programs.

I submit that the program should, to the utmost possible, stand alone as a simple, ambitious, and determined effort that would have as an immediate objective the construction and operation of power reactors abroad, with a definite near-term timetable as its core. Today the United States Government is not building nor planning to build a single power reactor abroad.

We cannot treat this great effort simply as another phase of technical assistance. As Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, who occupies a position of real eminence in the field, recently said before the Senate in connection with the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency:

"The only things that will make it work—and the only things that could make it work are the reactors which we are yet to build."

This applies to the whole atoms-for-peace program. Senator PASTORE said further:

"The international agreement is not worth the paper it is written on unless we build the reactors which will convert special nuclear material into electricity and power. The whole crux of the international agency idea lies in our ability to get on with the job to build these reactors."

This should be the basic approach—as I have said, simple, specific, and determined, carried forth by a clear, unmistakable command decision.

We have in this country on other occasions in history gone forth with great programs thought to be impossible. When we have succeeded, it was done because the program was uncomplicated in its essence,

direct and imaginative, because it had a priority understood throughout the Government, and because the organizational machinery to finish the job carried the necessary authority to do so.

Great programs accomplish the seemingly impossible and translate an idea into a reality. It is in the same spirit of single-mindedness and purpose that we should approach the problem of getting power reactors built abroad. Let us not diffuse responsibility, but rather let us give to one unit of our Government full authority to achieve the established objectives. And of crucial importance, let us assign to that task the dollars which will insure it can be done.

Toward this end, I recommend that the Congress give to the Atomic Energy Commission the authority to allocate up to a billion dollars to be made available, through any means at its command, for the construction, within the next 4 years, of at least 10 power reactors abroad, these to be followed within the following 6 years by another 40 reactors. I emphasize number of reactors rather than large numbers of kilowatts of installed power because in many places of the world, quite small amounts of power would be the proper way to accomplish the objectives of the program.

And let us not complicate the realization of this goal by entangling it in the difficulties of other phases of our foreign policy, or consider this simply as technical or financial assistance in the conventional sense.

We have spent many billions of dollars in developing an atomic-weapons program, designed to maintain peace throughout the world. It does not seem to me unreasonable to allocate $1 billion for a program of such importance for the same objective. The ultimate cost of the program will be considerably less. Even in the present uneconomic state of reactor-power technology, projects could be made partly recoverable. As we learn more, the economic self-sufficiency of the reactors will improve.

It is not my view that power reactors alone should be the sole objective of the program; but also that we should intensify our efforts in other fields, particularly in the matter of training technical personnel and in the humanitarian uses of isotopes. But power reactors abroad should be and can be the dramatic focal point of our effort.

We have spoken in clear tones to the world. Our program for action to implement our words should be as inspiring.

That the program I have suggested raises questions and difficult problems cannot be denied. The decisions that are to be made in carrying it out will make many people unhappy. But the hard fact is that time is slipping by, and we are talking of a wasting asset. Unless we move forward with an aggressive, tangible program, the advantage we seized in 1953 with the boldness of our conceptions will be diminished and, indeed, we may awake to find it gone. All the words that can be said about the importance of atomic energy as a force for survival have been said. God grant us boldness in meeting the challenges of atomic energy, for it may well be that our degree of boldness will determine the fate of life upon this earth.

Kennedy Lauds Magnuson Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address paying a compliment to the record of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], delivered by W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, at the annual banquet of the Northwest Association of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary Lodges, in Spokane, Wash., May 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY LAUDS MAGNUSON RECORD

(Address of W. P. Kennedy)

Here we are—and there you are—again in another enjoyable, friendly, and interesting annual meeting of the Northwest Association of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary lodges.

The good, wholesome, fraternal spirit so prevalent in your wonderful meetings makes is difficult to miss one. When Secretary Patterson's cordial invitation arrived, its acceptance was made so easy by my previous enjoyable visits with you.

The Northwest Association has another unusual and unique feature. It is the only international association in our groups. It is good to have the brotherhood and auxiliary members of British Columbia join in with those of Washington, Oregon, and Montana. This is a splendid example of the good and friendly relations existing between our two great nations.

Association meetings are always valuable to our members for the opportunity to exchange ideas and compare notes on progress being made in the several areas represented.

From my first visit to the Northwest, I have always thrilled at the wonderful natural advantages—the climate, the fertile soil, the timber, and the potential for power development. The railroads opened the first real opportunity for agricultural and commercial expansion—that expansion was limited due to lack of power—power at reasonable rates. I marvel at the phenomenal change in this territory during the past 15 years. Large increases in brotherhood membership indicates there has ben an upsurge of rail transportation business. The unbelievable increase in population is another indication of the tremendous change.

We do not need to look very far to discover the reason for growth in industry, agriculture, and population. We will find that the great changes in the Northwest followed substantially the same patterns as that developed in the Tennessee River Valley following the construction and use of the multipurpose dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

The inquiring person may ask why did it take so long to make use of the vast natural resources which have been with us, from the beginning. The only answer to that momentous question, is that private enterprise would not risk the capital investment necessary to build the dams large enough to serve the purposes of power, flood control, reclamation, conservation, irrigation, and recreation. It remained a job for the people to do through the Federal Government.

That TVA investment of the Government in the Tennessee Valley was not a waste of Federal funds—it was a Godsend to the people in that territory—it proved to be an important saviour to the Nation in its all-out effort to win World War II. It did not destroy or cripple free enterprise—on the contrary, there is more real free enterprise in the Tennessee Valley today by a hundredfold than before TVA. What about the Federal investment of taxpayers money? Well, that investment is being paid back into the Federal Treasury ahead of time.

When the farsighted and public-spirited Federal lawmakers of the northwestern States noted the transformation of the Tennessee Valley, they began the move to develop the Columbia River and its tributary valleys in the same manner. The powerful eastern capitalists did everything they could to prevent such a development in the Northwest. The newspaper they controlled carried items on fear of destroying free enterprise in the Northwest.

Despite the efforts made by the enemies of public power and public development of the Columbia River Valley for the benefit of all of the people, those gallant and determined Senators and Congressmen fought on and on until they succeeded in securing the enabling laws. The lawmakers were favored by a President, who also had the interest of the people in mind. That President and those Senators and Congressmen knew that America could not defend itself successfully without developing the power potential offered by the great Columbia River.

When I now visit the Northwest and especially Washington, I can see the tremendous improvements made possible by the Federal construction and operation of the great multipurpose dams—Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, Chief Joseph, and others.

The low-cost electric power developed by the great dams has made possible an industrial expansion never dreamed of in the Northwest or in any similar location. Industrial growth has increased in proportion to the availability of low-cost electric power. Aluminum is a new industry to Washington. Its production alone has created 36,000 new jobs. The fabrication of aluminum into articles of commerce requires the employment of thousands of others. The new industrial workers require the service of additional thousands of others in the retail and service trades and professions. It all means a growing, prosperous Northwest.

I am convinced the Northwestern States will continue to grow and expand in industrial and agricultural production if the sane and wise program of utilizing the vast natural resources will be continued in the future.

The recent change in the national administration of our country has brought great concern to those of us who believe that the Federal Government should do for the people, that which is needed to be done, but is not being done by others.

In this territory you have a good example of that change in public policy. A previous administration by appropriate action had surveys and plans made to continue further development of the Columbia River Basin, which included the Snake River Valley. That proposed improvement included a high, large, multipurpose dam in Hells Canyon.

When President Eisenhower selected the Secretary of Interior, he chose a man who had consistently opposed development of the natural water resources by the Federal Government. As soon as Secretary McKay took office he began to follow the Eisenhower program of curtailing Federal dams under construction, authorized on being planned. The most outstanding act of the new Secretary of the Interior was to do everything within his power to give the Idaho Power Co., a corporation owned and controlled by financial interests in the State of Maine, rights to construct a series of three small dams in the Snake River Basin in lieu of the big multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam.

The Secretary and the Eisenhower administration did not seem to be interested in the future progress of the Northwest, and particularly of that portion available to be served by an abundance of low-cost electric power from the Snake and Columbia Rivers. To give you an idea of thinking prevalent in the Eisenhower group on the matter of low-cost public power, it is reported that the President termed the great beneficial TVA as creeping socialism when newsmen asked what he thought of it.

People who watched with admiring pride the miracle changes in the Columbia and Tennessee River Valleys became alarmed at the President's words and at the attitude of his Secretary of the Interior.

It looked terribly bad for a while. The Nation had elected a President who was ready to give the utility interests all they wanted in curbing or destroying the ability of the people to use the natural resources for the public good.

Following the attempt to give the Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co. came the smelly rotten fiasco to destroy the future effectiveness of TVA through Dixon-Yates deal of providing Federal funds to finance a gigantic privately owned electric plant.

The big giveaway boys overlooked the effective roadblocks in their pathway. The roadblocks were stalwart statesmen, elected by the people—who believed in the people and who were willing to fight against all odds in protecting the people's interests.

From the State of Washington there was WARREN MAGNUSON, of Seattle, and HENRY JACKSON, of Everett, United States Senators, and in the House of Representatives DON MAGNUSON, the Congressman at Large. All three of them stood firmly and steadfastly against the giveaways—against the powerful utilities and the eastern bankers—against the administration's Secretary of the Interior. May I add that all three of them have excellent voting records in the interest of the people.

We are now in the midst of a critical and important campaign. The forces of reaction are working hard to defeat Senator WARREN MAGNUSON. He is up for election this year. The same reactionary forces fighting MAGNUSON in Washington are also fighting WAYNE MORSE in Oregon. Both of these courageous Senators are opposed because they have dared to stand up in support of the people's interests.

Who is this man, the big utilities, the eastern bankers and other reactionaries are fighting? What's his record? WARREN MAGNUSON first came to the notice of the brotherhood when he was serving as a member in the Washington Legislature. While serving in that body, he drafted the General Welfare Act which later became the State's first pension law. During his first term he was author of the first Unemployment Compensation Act to be adopted by the State of Washington.

When MAGNUSON was a candidate for Congress in 1936 he had the full support of the brotherhood. He was elected. He was reelected each 2 years until he became a candidate for United States Senator in 1944, when he was elected and reelected in 1950.

As Congressman and as Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON has actively supported every piece of liberal and public interest legislation. He was one of the first supporters of legislation to develop the Columbia River Valley. He has consistently supported the appropriations for the urgently needed projects. He has opposed the Eisenhower administration's attempts to cripple, slow down, or destroy those valuable public improvements.

Senator MAGNUSON has supported the farmers' ideas of farm relief legislation. He believes it is impossible to have real prosperity with the farmers receiving less and less each year for the products they sell. Prosperity should be for all.

The Senator has stood foursquare in the fight for adequate aid to the schools. He was the original sponsor of the National Science Foundation—an institution devoted to bringing about the training of more scientists, so sorely needed in this fast developing scientific age. He sponsored the bill for the National Cancer Institute which has grown into the National Institutes of Health with extensive research facilities.

Senator MAGNUSON has supported labor unions in their efforts to secure favorable labor relations laws. He vigorously opposed the Taft-Hartley Act and did all he could to prevent the inclusion of section 14–b, giving States the right to enact the so-called right-to-work laws.

The Senator has been a good friend of the railroad workers throughout his legislative career. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce he is in a powerful position to make his desires effective. He supported the 1951 amendments to the Railway Labor Act. He has worked hard for the several amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. He is coauthor of S. 3654 amendments to the Retirement Act providing for 15-percent increase in annuities and deduction of retirement taxes from the Federal income tax. He is the author of S. 2420 reducing the limitation of the hours of service to 14 hours with 10 hours off duty.

The Senator's record in behalf of the people and in behalf of the workers in labor unions is such that I could go on for considerable time in giving detail accounts of his services to you and to the other workers of your State and of the Nation. I am fearful of the Republican candidate opposing Senator MAGNUSON. That candidate would support the Eisenhower administration in its efforts against adequate farm supports, in its efforts to crush labor unions, through appointments of antilabor members of the National Labor Relations Board, in its efforts to curtail, slowdown, and destroy the public-power programs of developing our natural-water resources. The workers throughout the Nation are hopefully watching what you in Washington, and you in Oregon do on election day—in keeping the militant, progressive Senators in office.

Keep the splendid teams of MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and MAGNUSON and JACKSON, of Washington, in the Nation's Capital. They would serve your interests.

In the State of Washington you also have Congressman at Large DON MAGNUSON—with an excellent record. Send him back to Washington, D. C., where he can help WARREN MAGNUSON and HENRY JACKSON.

It's great to be living in democratic America where we have the right to vote. It's a right we should always exercise. We should realize how valuable that vote of ours can be to us, if we will use it in our own behalf. I am happy to inform that Grand President Mary Gorman, of the ladies auxiliary, cooperates fully with the brotherhood in our legislative and political activities. I am sorry she could not be with us on this joyous occasion. It is good that we could have Vice President Margaret Donahue with us, in her district and also as representing Sister Gorman.

In the State of Washington you have another big fight—the enemies of union labor are taking advantage of section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act. Their cleverly devised scheme is officially known as initiative No. 198. It has been advertised as the right-to-work amendment. Do not vote for it—vote against it. The proposed amendment does not give anyone a right to work—it is only a device to cripple the effectiveness of labor unions in your State.

It is important that all of you become qualified voters—register—if that is necessary—have all members of your family to also register—urge your friends to do the same. Then each and every one of you—vote—vote against initiative No. 198. Keep the labor unions of Washington strong and militant. Strong labor unions are the surest guaranties of keeping our Nation free from all vestiges of communism and totalitarianism.

A strong, alert Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is the best assurance train service and bus employees can have. Prepare now for the primary election September 11 and for the general election November 6. The best preparation you can make—for yourselves and for your brotherhood's future is in support of Senator WARREN MAGNUSON and those who will stand with him.

Really it will give you a glorious feeling to exercise your right to participate in your Government by voting in the elections and then you can join all those who do in singing God Bless America.

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 5 years and for the fourth time since the depression the Federal budget will be in balance when the Government's fiscal year ends this coming June 30, 1956.

Tax rates since the Eisenhower administration came into power have been cut substantially, but due to higher individual incomes and business prosperity generally the Federal revenue has been larger.

There is reason to believe the Federal surplus will amount to $1.8 billion or perhaps even $2 billion, and if there is continued prosperity and no great changes in the international situation the 1957 surplus ought to exceed the 1956 figure.

I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, if this situation justified a tax cut this year or perhaps if rather than risk a preelection tax reduction bill it might not be wiser to delay consideration until next January.

As the Representative of the congressional district which has the highest ratio of organized union labor in the United States, I submitted a questionnaire to union leaders on this subject. Some of the replies mentioned the opinion expressed was of the individual officer of the union. A few responses indicated the question had been submitted to the membership before answering.

A tabulation of viewpoint showed a divided opinion:

Sixteen labor leaders favored immediate tax reduction, and eight of them took special pains to write in that it should be for low-income groups.

Nine labor leaders favored waiting until the President's recommendation after the next election. Two of these nine wrote in a specification that any relief at that time should be for low-income individuals.

Seventeen labor leaders answered in support of reducing the national debt.

The questionnaires returned are from the officials of unions representing, I would estimate, about 20 percent of the population of my district, and I rather imagine the thinking of these replies reflects pretty closely the views of the union membership.

Incidentally, to clarify the previous statistical statement, this is the way I phrased the inquiry in a personal letter to each union official:

DEAR ———: I would greatly appreciate your views on an important Federal policy affecting the members of your organization.

As you know, there is every indication that the United States Treasury for the fiscal year ending this coming June 30 will show a $2 billion budget surplus, and also a cash surplus for the first time in several years.

Mr. David Lawrence, writing in U. S. News & World Report, advises:

"Politicians will be seeking to give away that surplus to those in low-income brackets on the mistaken theory that this will be of

real benefit to them. Yet this would be the very group hit by inflation.

"What would be of more benefit to more people would be to reduce the national debt by $2 billion."

My questions have to do with your views on tax reduction. Would you mark them in the proper spaces below, and return this to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope?

Thanking you for your favor, I am

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

------ I favor tax reduction now.
------ I favor delay until President's recommendations in 1957.
------ I favor reduction of national debt.
Comments: ----------

In a few instances I wrote officers of international unions with headquarters either here in the Nation's Capital or outside of my district. Of the 9 responses from this group, 6 favored immediate tax reduction, of which 4 wrote in that it should be for low-income groups. One favored a delay and two supported reduction of national debt.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the greatest contribution of the Eisenhower administration and in which I share some pride, is the halting of inflation which had been destroying the buying power of the working man's wages. In one 6-month period in 1950, according to a statement of the present majority leader made to the House on February 26, 1953, the consumers of this country suffered a loss of more than $16 billion. Food prices alone rose 11½ percent. And that comes from a Member of the party in control of Congress at the time.

As a member of the Eisenhower team during 1953 and 1954 when the Republicans controlled the Congress, I sat and listened to various Democratic Members attacking our program. The then minority Members fought our attempts to hold the line to a moderate spending program. I remember one instance when a supplementary appropriation was before the House; the statement was made that certain requested funds were included in the bill although it was believed more money could not be spent before June 30 and there would be an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year. Nevertheless, the minority party insisted on increasing the amount of that appropriation. Every means was used to embarrass and thwart the endeavors of the Republicans to control expenditures.

Meanwhile we were continually charged with failing to keep our preelection promises to work toward a balanced budget. We were called fiscally irresponsible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear no more of such charges. We do not hear, either, about the depression which the Democrats tried to talk the country into just prior to the 1954 election.

The present 1956 Federal budget surplus has quieted a great deal of partisan shouting and demagoguery.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I frankly get much satisfaction from being associated with a sound program and with, for example, a man like the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey knows what the problem is and what policies are needed to protect the finances of the country. He believes in fiscal responsibility and practices it.

We Republicans, I admit, are not inclined to be politically expedient. For example, right now certain Democrats from the Pacific Northwest are trying to label the Republicans as a giveaway party. In that connection, when President Eisenhower and his administration recommended against a tax cut in an election year in the face of a budget surplus, it certainly does not reflect a policy of political expediency or fiscal irresponsibility.

A prime example of "giveaway" was on May 24 in a House vote on the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit in the Missouri River Basin project. It was typical of political expediency.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said in explaining why the Republican conferees did not sign the conference report:

It was a political vote, pure and simple. I understand the Indians vote in Montana. They carry some political weight and many groups back them.

Under this legislation, it was proposed to buy, except for the mineral and recreational rights which the Indians would retain, less than 6,000 acres. The Department of Interior estimated the value of this land at $36,000. The Democratic House committee agreed to $1,500,000, which the House in turn voted. The Democratic-controlled Senate changed this to $5 million.

The Democratic members of the conference committee did not offer any resistance to the Senate figure of $5 million. There was no effort to compromise the difference between the $1.5 million and $5 million.

One excuse given the House was that the funds came from existing appropriations for the project and are reimbursable from the sale of power.

I do not think there is any difference whether this Democratic giveaway of $5 million eventually comes from future power revenues or from the general government revenues; it is the peoples' money.

Only one Democrat voted with 125 Republicans against this giveaway. In campaign years the Democratic Party may lack funds, but it does not lack resourcefulness in using Federal appropriations for campaign purposes.

This is only one example of the free-spending political party that has tried to falsely lable its opposition with its own crime. I mention this giveaway in the interest of accuracy in order that the record may be clear as to which political party is fiscally responsible with the taxpayers' money.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say President Eisenhower's slogan is the one to follow. He says, "Doing the right thing is good politics."

Personally I believe with the President that the right thing today is to refrain from the temptation of trying to write a tax reduction just before the election. If Democratic political enthusiasm runs away, like its inflation and giveaway programs in the past have run away, it would be unfortunate for the citizens of this country. There will be ample opportunity to reduce rates next January. And then, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, as union leadership obviously has not forgotten, that low-income groups need relief from present high taxes. I suggest low-income family groups in particular.

Meanwhile, all due credit and praise to the Republican leadership for this fiscal program which has produced a Federal surplus.

C. Ray Miller: Man of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world has been vitally interested in the development of the Salk polio vaccine that is proving to be a marvelous deterrent for one of the scourges of mankind.

Our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has made continuing studies on this important subject. One of these studies included a trip to Indianapolis where a visit was made to the Eli Lilly & Co. plant where most of this famous vaccine is being produced.

Many individuals have contributed to the development and production of this product. One of these men, Mr. C. Ray Miller, recently was honored as the man of the year by the Alpha Pi Chapter of Kappa Sigma, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. I had the privilege of being in college and in the fraternity with Ray Miller.

For these reasons, under unanimous consent, I include a news story from the Kappa Sigma Caveman of May 15, 1956, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

C. RAY MILLER: MAN OF YEAR

C. Ray Miller, 1921, has been voted Alpha Pi's man of the year for 1956.

Brother Miller, 57, achieved national distinction last year in the supervision of the production of the Salk polio vaccine at Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, where he is vice president in charge of production. Eli Lilly was the only major company producing the vaccine constantly, never having taken it off the market during governmental checking.

A native of Crawfordsville, Brother Miller was a junior Phi Beta Kappa at Wabash, as well as serving on the Glee Club and Bachelor staff. He served as G. M. of Alpha Pi during his senior year.

After graduation, he studied chemistry with an assistantship at Cornell. He passed the Indiana Pharmacy Board examinations in 1922, and became manager of a Hook's drugstore in Indianapolis. He went to work for Eli Lilly in 1923 as a medical service representative.

In 1938, he was promoted to manager of the merchandise development and control department, and during World War II he assisted the Armed Forces in developing a package for blood plasma.

He has served as Lilly's director of production since 1944. He was named vice president of the production component (which employs 40 percent of Lilly's force)

in 1948, and has increased unit production to record levels in 1955. Last year he was named to the board of directors of Eli Lilly & Co.

Two nephews are members of the Alpha Pi alumni group. W. R. Kirtley, M. D., 1936 is also associated with the Lilly Co., and J. M. Kirtley, M. D., 1932 is alumnus adviser of Alpha Pi.

Antarctic Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolutions 207, 209, and 245 were introduced by myself and others calling upon the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House with information in his possession respecting Antarctic, both physical, historical, and legal. In view of the very large sums spent and being spent by the United States in this region, it is deemed prudent to have such information readily available. Notwithstanding, the Secretary has not viewed these measures with favor. The following letter to the editor appearing in a recent edition of the Christian Science Monitor indicates why the objectives of these House Resolutions should be attained:

ANTARCTIC CLAIMS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Reference is made to an article, Teams Map Grahamland, British Push Survey of Antarctic Sector by Air, by one of your staff in London, in your March 5 issue.

This article contains numerous references to Antarctic place names and territorial claims not recognized by the Government of the United States. Since your staff correspondent may not have realized this, the following information is supplied.

Teams Map Grahamland (headline).

According to the United States Board on Geographical Names (BGN), which determines the names to be used in official United States documents and maps, this area is properly called the Palmer Peninsula after its discoverer, the American sealing captain, Nathan Palmer.

"Slices radiating from the South Pole are carved up between Australia, New Zealand, Norway, France, and Great Britain."

The fact that the United Kingdom does not recognize the claims of Argentina and Chile (which conflict with those of the United Kingdom) should not cause the names of these countries to be eliminated from a list of claimants.

"With a large unclaimed slice to which American exploration might give the United States prior claim should she care to accept it."

The only exploration in the unclaimed area is by Americans. But United States nationals have originally explored (i. e., seen for the first time) more of the areas claimed by other countries than the nationals of all the other countries added together.

"New claims are being staked to these southern polar regions."

This office knows of no such new claims.

"Although many photographs have been taken by previous explorers in the Antarctic, these have been mostly obliques snapped at random."

The United States Navy Operation High Jump took 75,000 trimetrogon reconnaissance mapping air photos on one expedition, more than all the air photos of Antarctica made by all nations on all previous expeditions. The American Ronne expedition took another 14,000 such air photos. Thousands of vertical photos were made on other United States expeditions.

"The Hunting Air Survey is the first attempt ever to give three-dimensional coverage over so large an area in the Antarctic."

United States air photos of a single expedition a decade ago produced many times more three-dimensional coverage of Antarctica than the Hunting Air Survey will.

JOHN H. ROSCOE,
Scientific Adviser, United States Antarctic Programs.

WASHINGTON.

Mystic and Magic Numbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial, Mystic and Magic Numbers, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1956:

MYSTIC AND MAGIC NUMBERS

To the ancients, 7 and 5 were mystic numbers and legend tells us quite persuasively of their powers. Even nowadays there is some magic about them; the Supreme Court the other day backed up a Federal Communications Commission ruling and endowed 7 and 5 with legal power.

The FCC has a rule which says that it is perfectly all right for an individual or a company to own 7 standard radio stations, 7 FM stations and 5 TV stations. To own more than that, the FCC says, would do injury to the public interest. Thus the Storer Broadcasting Co., which already owns 5 TV stations, was denied a hearing on its application to acquire a sixth. The case went to the Supreme Court and the Justices said Storer should have had a hearing but that the FCC had a right to choose any numbers it wanted to anyway.

Now we aren't disposed to quarrel with the FCC's position that the public interest could be affected by what goes on in the broadcasting business. Five TV stations owned by one man certainly could adversely affect that interest. But it would not be the act of ownership that affected the public interest; it would be the activities of the five TV stations. That same man could damage the public interest if he owned only one station—except, of course, that there are already sufficient laws and FCC rules governing the conduct of broadcasting stations.

Radio and TV stations differ in size, location, financial assets and influence all over the country. Even if all were exactly alike in those respects, it would be difficult to understand how the FCC chose the particular number it uses. If ownership of 7 standard and 7 FM stations is acceptable, why not also 7 TV stations? Why not seven TV stations and nothing else?

There is, indeed, something mystical about this choice of magic numbers—7 and 5 serve the public interest; 8 and 6 do not—and we are as mystified as the next person.

Even the Supreme Court didn't try to explain why some numbers are good numbers and other numbers are bad numbers. In fact we doubt if it can be explained except, maybe, by a seventh son of a seventh son.

Our Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon have before us for consideration the Mutual Security Agency appropriation bill which, in more understandable terms to the public, means our foreign aid spending program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries since the inception of this program has reached staggering proportions. It seems appropriate that we reexamine our commitments thus far and attempt to arrive at the correct position in regard to a continuance of these expenditures.

The aid which this Government has extended to all countries and international organizations for the period covering World War II and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955, amounts to $108,847,779,000. This total does not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, $635 million, and the International Monetary Fund, $2,750 million.

Summary of aid

Lend-lease, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	$48,767,777,000
Grants in aid, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	43,459,158,000
Net loans, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The foreign aid program began with the lend-lease shipments on July 1, 1940. In the postwar years, one appropriation after another has followed in rapid succession.

The extension of these huge sums during World War II in foreign aid is understandable. We were engaged in an all-out war, and we felt the need of winning it at any cost. But let us look at the aid extended since the close of the war.

Between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1955, the United States disbursed gross foreign aid in the amount of $60,719,482,000. It is difficult for the average individual to understand the impact upon our economy of such huge sums. If we were to spread this postwar cost over the householders of the Nation, it would be found this program will cost every householder of the Nation $1,277.

There is a general impression that the corporations and the rich pay the bulk of these expenditures. This, however, is not the case. The President in his budget for 1957 gives the following estimate of receipts:

[In billions]

Individual income taxes	$35.1
Corporation income taxes	20.3
Excise taxes	9.9
Other taxes	2.1
Miscellaneous receipts	2.8
Refund of receipts	—3.9

Does not the average family play an important part in the support of our financial structure? The answer is

"Yes." The working men and women, as well as the corporations, carry this burdensome load. In the budget estimates listed above, it is seen that the individual income taxes account for more than half of our total tax collections. There are 50 million Federal taxpayers whose net yearly incomes are below $5,000. This large group pays about 60 percent of the total income taxes collected by the Federal Treasury. There are only 2 million Federal taxpayers whose net incomes are above $5,000.

Our income-tax rates run from 22 percent in the lowest bracket to 92 percent in the highest bracket. If we should confiscate all incomes over $10,000 by levying a 100-percent tax, it would not raise enough money to run the Government for more than 2 months. So, in spite of the fact that we are "soaking the rich" for about all we can get, the brunt of support for this spending spree is falling upon the individual with a salary under $5,000.

It should be remembered, too, that a considerable sum is collected in hidden taxes. Taxes upon about every purchase made: Theater tickets, transportation, purses, jewelry, alarm clocks, hand lotions, and many other articles. Telephone companies have calculated that taxes on each telephone installed in the home amount to more than $3 per telephone. Yes, we meet these taxes at every turn, and it is time the working men and women become conscious of the inroads of taxes upon their economy.

The belief held by some that our foreign-aid spending program is solely for the purpose of rebuilding the free nations of Europe, and assisting them to rearm with modern weapons is erroneous. The fact of the matter is our foreign-aid program has encompassed most of the nations of the world. It is believed that the taxpayers have a right to know where their money has gone, and, with this in mind, the following information has been gathered from authoritative sources.

Lend-lease, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955

Brazil	$3,616,000
Colombia	11,000
Dominican Republic	3,000
Guatemala	1,347,000
Mexico	553,000
Paraguay	2,000
Peru	237,000
Belgium	59,480,000
United Kingdom	341,462,000
Australia	12,300,000
India	3,000,000
New Zealand	2,300,000
China (Formosa)	729,418,000
Czechoslovakia	2,000
France	372,441,000
Greece	5,956,000
Iran	750,000
Italy (civilian supplies)	134,444,000
Netherlands	64,344,000
Poland	92,000
Saudi Arabia	1,591,000
U. S. S. R	277,254,000
Yugoslavia	76,000
Unspecified	29,364,000
Total	2,039,490,000

Grants in aid, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955

Argentina	$198,000
Bolivia	30,833,000
Brazil	17,432,000
Chile	9,499,000
Colombia	6,105,000
Costa Rica	5,953,000
Cuba	1,249,000
Dominican Republic	1,675,000
Ecuador	7,547,000
El Salvador	3,708,000
Guatemala	7,364,000
Haiti	9,367,000
Honduras	4,569,000
Mexico	104,105,000
Nicaragua	2,896,000
Panama	5,216,000
Paraguay	7,243,000
Peru	13,157,000
Uruguay	1,892,000
Venezuela	2,069,000
Unspecified Latin America	288,792,000
Afghanistan	2,909,000
Albania	20,444,000
Austria	1,054,315,000
Belgium	521,863,000
United Kingdom	3,396,096,000
Australia	239,000
North Borneo	43,000
British Guiana	75,000
British Honduras	80,000
Leeward and Windward Islands	101,000
Canada	3,964,000
Ceylon	107,000
Federation of Malaya	354,000
Federation of Rhodesia	1,000
Gold Coast	10,000
Hong Kong	1,808,000
India	128,459,000
Jamaica	3,000
Malta	331,000
Nigeria	8,000
Pakistan	121,639,000
Sierra Leone	1,000
Singapore	9,000
Burma	20,505,000
China	1,209,077,000
Czechoslovakia	185,825,000
Denmark	247,524,000
Egypt	21,451,000
Ethiopia	6,932,000
Finland	2,544,000
France	3,746,883,000
Algeria	107,000
French Morocco	552,000
Tunisia	274,000
Germany, East	17,351,000
Germany, Federal Republic	3,753,147,000
Greece	1,627,954,000
Hungary	5,856,000
Iceland	29,571,000
Indochina	305,246,000
Indonesia	109,218,000
Iran	157,134,000
Iraq	5,945,000
Ireland	18,346,000
Israel	231,363,000
Italy-Trieste	2,421,889,000
Japan and Ryukyu	2,537,675,000
Jordan	21,038,000
Korea	1,166,632,000
Lebanon	11,926,000
Liberia	5,609,000
Libya	15,370,000
Nepal	2,216,000
Netherlands and Surin	846,020,000
Norway	234,541,000
Palestine	175,000
Philippines	745,462,000
Poland	364,886,000
Portugal	15,833,000
Saudi Arabia	2,792,000
Spain	37,548,000
Sweden	87,143,000
Switzerland	1,803,000
Syria	$949,000
Tangier	17,000
Thailand	26,103,000
Turkey	421,748,000
U. S. S. R	188,180,000
Yugoslavia	688,288,000
Trust Territories in Pacific	4,444,000
International organizations	1,072,154,000
Unspecified areas:	
Asia and Pacific	2,467,417,000
Europe	9,495,196,000
Near East and Africa	1,356,547,000
South Asia	15,094,000
Other	317,165,000
Total	42,059,148,000

In addition to the above, authorized loans and credits have been granted in a substantial amount. These loans and credits granted to nations all over the globe amounted to $16,620,844,000 during the period beginning July 1, 1940 and ending June 30, 1955.

No one would challenge for one moment the motives behind this giveaway program. The nations of Europe had been devastated by the ravages of war. Their industrial potential had been largely destroyed. In the rebuilding process, our aid was badly needed. However, this program began, 1948, supposedly, for a 5-year period, but it has continued in force until the present day—notwithstanding the fact that many of the original recipients of aid have been balancing their budgets and reducing taxes. This situation has occurred in recent years when our own budget was running a deficit.

During these years, we have piled upon our people a taxload about equal to that of the free nations of the world combined, and a Federal debt almost twice as great as the other nations of the free world put together. For many years, we have indulged in an unsound fiscal policy. During that time, we have piled up a Federal debt of approximately $275 billion—the greatest debt load that any nation has been called upon to bear since the dawn of history. We have seen the purchasing power of our dollar decline to a little more than 50 percent of its prewar value.

This decline of the American dollar has had a great impact upon the lives and fortunes of the American people. The value of life-insurance policies, time deposits, E, F, and G savings bonds has just about been cut in half. The misery caused the old-age pensioner and those, who with thrift, had saved something for their declining years is sad to relate. The question today is, Will the United States adopt a policy consistent with its resources and taxing power, or will it continue to distribute its largess to the entire world?

In the light of facts here presented, it seems that, in addition to our efforts to make our Nation secure, we must make certain that we keep our economy strong and our currency sound. Would it not be better to think more of the homefront for awhile and take a vacation from foreign-aid grants? We may be surprised how well other nations can get along without us.

The chances of a third world war are very remote. With the nuclear weapons now available, no nation could expect to win in a world struggle. There would be devastation no end. Russia understands this situation and has no intention of starting a world conflagration.

When one is trying to reach a decision relative to his vote on the mutual-security-aid legislation, he is faced with many crosscurrents of opinion. Just about everyone feels there are nations in the world which deserve our assistance. This program, however, is just about all-inclusive. We have extended help to many nations which are in better fiscal position than we are. Not only that, we have extended help to nations which have never aided us in a military conflict and which have profited from our own involvement. Examples in this category are Brazil, which has received $381,686,000, and Sweden, $116,220,000.

An analysis of our foreign aid spending program reveals that through our lend-lease program from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, 62 nations and territories were assisted by this program. In the years that followed, July 1, 1945, to July 30, 1955, 24 nations participated in our lend-lease program. The grants-in-aid during this postwar period reached a total of 88 nations and territories.

It should be noted that not all of these nations are friendly. The following countries which are certainly not allies have benefited by our mutual security program:

China	$2,861,376,000
Czechoslovakia	1,211,837,000
Yugoslavia	750,730,000
Russia	11,241,614,000

Most of the aid received by Yugoslavia has been extended during recent years while that country has been under a Communist dictatorship. The aid extended to Yugoslavia amounts to more than $44 for every man, woman, and child in that country.

The mutual security bill is an omnibus measure. When it reaches the House, the Congress will be asked to pass upon an additional appropriation of approximately $3½ billion. No one knows where all of this money will eventually be spent. One cannot support a program of this nature—although there are certain countries of the world he would like to assist. It is believed that the foreign aid spending program is wasteful and most unfair to the taxpayers who have to shoulder this burden.

Calling the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit the following editorial, which appeared in one of the largest weeklies in our district, the Lynden Tribune.

Dairy farmers in the Lynden, Wash., area have supported the self-help dairy plan which I introduced, from the beginning. The editorial from the Tribune reveals that Minnesota dairymen are now beginning to see the merits of the self-help plan. As this editorial points out, the farmer will receive no real relief until the whistle is blown on the political maneuvering and the dairyman has a chance to run his own business. The text of the editorial is as follows:

A DAIRY'S VIEW ON SUPPORTS

In one of the recent issues of the Tribune, an editorial appeared condemning politicians' regular routine of campaigning for office by kicking around the farm program. We stated that if the three major farm organizations, the Grange, Farmers Union, and Farm Bureau would pull together and not buck each other, that a workable stable price program could be established faster and much more easily.

In support of this, the editorial from May edition of the Land O' Lakes News, published monthly by the Land O' Lakes Creameries in Minneapolis, Minn., is reprinted as follows:

"Let's get this off of the football field.

"More and more it should become evident to all dairymen that the only way they will be able to have a stable price-support program is to get it out of politics and have their own self-help program.

"Each 4 years the dairy prices become a political football. This causes instability and uncertainty for the dairyman.

"Congress included in the farm bill support prices for manufacturing milk at $3.25. The bill has been vetoed. However, through presidential order it has been provided that manufacturing milk shall be supported at $3.25. This is good.

"However, the dairy industry certainly would be in a much better position over the long pull if it were running its own self-help program and did not have to depend on the changing ideas and tides of government.

"Dairy farmers should do all possible to get Congress to pass enabling legislation making it possible for farmers to operate their own self-help program."

The Drum Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Syracuse, N. Y., Post Standard entitled "The Drum Controversy." I think this editorial sets forth clearly some of the tortured reasoning employed by the Army these days:

Next month some 78,000 National Guardsmen and Army Reservists will begin training at Camp Drum, using facilities at the best all purpose Army installation in the Northeast.

But after the summer training the camp will be silent and deserted, because the Army refuses to place it on permanent status.

Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker has given Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, of Malone, a detailed explanation of why Camp Drum is on a standby basis. It adds nothing to reasons already given, most of which are questionable.

The fact that Exercise Snowdrop had to be postponed 6 weeks in 1948 because of insufficient snow means nothing in the long-range weather picture.

The statement that high maintenance costs are no factor because "depreciation occurs whether an installation is active or inactive" needs clarifying. Depreciation is much more rapid on the latter basis.

Mr. Brucker say that the area "offers no outstanding or peculiar terrain or weather conditions which require its use for specialized training." Then why was it chosen in the first place?

As for the denied saving on transportation costs by keeping the camp open all year comparative figures should be presented. Camp Drum is undeniably near large centers of population in the northeast.

The practice of building huge military installations and then abandoning or maintaining them on a costly semi-active basis requires a better defense than Secretary Brucker has presented.

Patents and Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an address delivered by me on May 24, 1956, in New York City, before the New York Patent Law Association entitled "Patents and Monopoly":

I was particularly pleased to receive and accept the kind invitation to appear before you at this annual dinner meeting for at least two reasons. To begin with, my official duties serve as a constant reminder of the vital relationship between the patent laws which have their fountainhead in the Constitution itself and the antitrust laws which are likewise fundamental to the American way of industrial and business life.

The House Committee on the Judiciary has a subcommittee with special jurisdiction over patents, trademarks, and copyrights, as well as appropriate revision of the law in this area. As you know, this subcommittee has had occasion in the past to consider important patent measures including the comparatively recent codification of the patent law, in connection with which able witnesses have appeared on behalf of your association. Legislation that is referred to our patent subcommittee must next, of course, go to the full Judiciary Committee where it receives further careful consideration before action is taken which helps determine whether or not it will finally appear on the statute books.

To deal with monopoly problems, the House Judiciary Committee established a special committee concerned exclusively with antitrust matters and the concentration of economic power. The Antitrust Subcommittee during this Congress has conducted extensive hearings into current antitrust problems facing the country and is presently engaged in an inquiry involving key industries which fall within the jurisdiction of Federal regulatory agencies.

This brings me to the other reason why I particularly welcome the opportunity to address you tonight. I have in mind a brand of dire and alarmist statements concerning patent-antitrust problems that have cur-

rently come to the fore. For example, one distinguished lawyer and friend, for whose ability I have great admiration, said this to you at your annual dinner last year:

"The judicial assaults on the patent system in the late thirties and forties are reminiscent of the hurricanes that pounded the eastern seaboard early last fall. * * * By injecting into the general patent law antitrust principles in the guise of unclean hands, by expanding the concept of patent misuse, by eliminating the estoppel between patentee and licensee where the license agreement contains a price-fixing stipulation, by invalidating customary license restrictions, and by obliterating the remedy of contributory infringement, the courts effected radical changes in doctrine, leaving this branch of the law in a state of turmoil." [1]

Another distinguished patent practitioner makes these even more sweeping allegations—and I quote:

"During the last 30 years an antipatent movement has developed in the United States. It is clearly depicted in events that have occurred in all three branches of the Government, and never more noticeably than in several legal decisions and legislative proposals that have been made in recent months. Principally by means of the antitrust laws, which were not originally intended for this purpose, our patent system is being deliberately emasculated. Large corporations have, in effect, been put on notice that their research laboratories can be raided." [2]

On the basis of this diagnosis, what remedy do these critics advance? Some would stop at nothing short of making patents wholly exempt from the antitrust laws, and restricting defenses in patent suits solely to traditional questions of validity and infringement.[3]

As one who sincerely believes in and appreciates the vital role that a healthy patent system must play in our economy, I challenge the interpretation of these gentlemen. If there has been such a nefarious scheme afoot—a plot to destroy the patent system by means of the antitrust laws—it has certainly escaped my attention during my 33 years of legislative service in Washington.

Could it be that these distinguished gentlemen simply long for a return to the good old days of the 1920's when the inhibitions on patent antitrust abuses were few?

What is the true meaning of the proposal to completely exempt patents from the application of the antitrust laws? As you well know, patents when legitimately used raise no question of antitrust infringement. Trouble begins only when they are subverted to accomplish purposes which our lawmakers never intended to sanction.

I take it that what the proposal really contemplates is antitrust immunity for the patentee no matter what his course of conduct in utilizing his patents. Frankly, I find the suggestion shocking. It would seriously confuse and impair antitrust enforcement; it would open a veritable Pandora's box for the revival of a great many evils that we have fought hard over the years to wipe out, even the participation of American concerns in international cartels. Large industrial organizations would be free to use the patent grant as a means for engaging in activities that would otherwise be illegal. In short, it would permit patents to be used as a device to restrain competition and perpetuate monopoly.[4]

Even apart from the costly lessons that the great depression and the last war have taught us, the vastly changed world in which we now live makes it not only undesirable but impossible to turn back the pages of time. Instead, the patent system must be adapted and accommodated to our altered industrial structure in an age that has now harnessed the atom and the H-bomb.

Footnotes at end of speech.

I know that as patent practitioners you have had frequent occasion to appraise the relationship between the patent laws and the antitrust laws. Let me make clear my own philosophy on this score. I share the view of those who believe that there is no basic conflict or incompatability between the patent and the antitrust laws. I think it is a fair generalization to say, as one analyst does, that "so long as a patent owner stays within his patent grant he has no antitrust problems and when he goes outside the terms of his grant, he has no patent protection. The many so-called patent antitrust cases do not resolve or decide conflicts between the patent laws and the antitrust laws but rather define the line at which one steps outside the protection of the patent laws into the prohibitions of the antitrust laws." [5]

I think you will agree that many of the so-called patent-antitrust cases illustrate attempts to use a patent to accomplish a result for which the patent is not adapted. Familiar examples come to mind, such as patents on salt-dispensing machines being used to monopolize salt [6] or a patent on a domestic heating system used to monopolize switches.[7] Condemnation by the courts of such practices does not by the same token restrict the patent right and raises no conflict between patent law and antitrust law. Rather, the so-called patent-antitrust decisions serve to delineate the two laws and keep each in its proper sphere.

I would hazard the opinion that the majority of patent owners throughout the United States find it both possible and profitable to handle their affairs in a way that is completely consistent with the objectives of both the patent laws and the antitrust laws. These law-abiding citizens and corporations have every right to expect that their associates and rivals in the industrial world will likewise abide by the rules of the game.

As good lawyers, watchful over your clients' interests, you know that no matter how valuable the patent may be, its value may be jeopardized if it is abused or made the basis for an antitrust violation. You will, therefore, wish to guide your clients in such a way that they may enjoy the full benefit of their patent assets and exploit them in a manner consistent with the antitrust and other laws enacted in the public interest.

This makes good legal sense and it makes good business sense. As the law now stands—and there have been some notable decisions over the past two decades that have contributed to this development—it is well for the patent-owning corporation to heed the practical admonition that its patents are less likely to be tested for validity or to be infringed by others if it abides by the antitrust laws. It is the violator that runs a greater risk of having its patents either tested and declared invalid or infringed with impunity. The net result is that patents lose their legal effectiveness when used in violation of antitrust laws.[8]

Beyond these practical considerations, I believe that as good citizens we should oppose the use of patents in ways that Congress never intended that they be used, where the effect is to imperil the competitive and free enterprise system to which this country is dedicated. Indeed, it might be well to take a moment at this point to epitomize the basic objective of our antitrust laws. The goal is the preservation of a system in which economic activity is controlled so far as possible by the market and not by men. Those who enacted our antitrust laws strove to safeguard and preserve the freedom to compete effectively so that prices, output, wages, and other rewards depend not on the decisions of a few but result from the day-to-day actions of rival business firms, independently motivated. This decentralized kind of decision-making insures a maximum not only of individual opportunity, but of political liberty.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Familiar hallmarks of monopoly are the power to control prices and the power to determine who enters into or remains in an industry.

Turning to the nature of the patent grant, it secures to the patent owner the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the patented invention for the limited 17-year period.[9] There was nothing in the common law to prevent the appropriation of another's designs or inventions. The creator of a better mousetrap might see his competitor copy it, detail for detail, and have no remedy. Thus the patent grant from the Congress constitutes a special instrument of public purpose to promote the progress of science and useful arts in furtherance of the constitutional authorization (contained in art. 1, sec. 8). Important public policy is at stake: to provide incentive to inventors, reward them for their contributions, and stimulate further effort. The inventive genius of Americans has responded well.

In a sense, a patent may be considered as the translation of a specific, physical invention into a precise legal document. Exactness, particularity, and distinctness are essential characteristics of a patent so that the patentee, licensees, competitors, and the public may know with certainty the extent of the patentee's right to exclude.[10] While these characteristics are limitations on a patent, they are also among its greatest virtues. So long as a patent is confined to its proper sphere, the integrity of the patent system is maintained and antitrust involvements are avoided.

Why do many of us differ with the critics who view with alarm legal developments in the patent-antitrust field over the past 25 or 30 years. I am persuaded that the evolution of the case law demonstrates a natural and normal response to the problems posed by a changing industrial environment. Here again we find a reassuring evidence of the dynamic capacity of our legal system to respond to the demands of the modern age. A very brief historical sketch provides a useful frame of reference for this point of view. In looking back, it is well to bear in mind the fact that the vast majority of antitrust problems have arisen when the patent owner sought to exploit his patent by licensing others.

For about a half century after passage of the Sherman Act in 1890, relatively few cases involving patent-antitrust questions reached the Supreme Court. Since many of these cases were infringement or contract suits between private litigants, decided on specific and limited facts, the economic effects of various patent practices went largely unnoticed. In the first Supreme Court decision forbidding the tying of unpatented supplies to the use of a patented machine, the Court found the practice illegal because "the patent laws furnish no warrant for such a practice." While reference was made to "the cost, inconvenience and annoyance to the public" of the practice and the decision contains general references to the public interest," there is no indication that the Court had more than a vague appreciation of the economic consequences of the practice on competition.[11]

In this bygone era of comparative simplicity, inventions usually consisted of self-contained complete articles, which were ordinarily exploited by the inventor himself with the result that a new industry might be developed. This happened when someone thought of putting an eraser on a pencil.[12]

When a specific situation was considered apart from its economic consequences, the courts were prone to uphold restrictions based upon patents on the theory that if the patentee could prevent infringement entirely, he could impose any condition he wished in a license. For almost 30 years, after passage of the Sherman Act, even tying con-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tracts were legal and patentees were permitted to control unpatented articles. Thus there was little appreciation of the relative functions of the patent system and the antitrust laws in the national economy.

In this favorable climate, restrictive patent practices multiplied and by the 1930's whole industries were regimented under patent license agreements. This regimentation was not only national in scope, it was perhaps even more widespread and more complete in international trade. As business competition expanded geographically, patents were sometimes used by industrial giants to divide world markets into exclusive trade areas.[13]

It was not enough that patent restrictions increased in number and scope, ingenious counsel sought ways to overcome the effects of the few decisions which limited the patentee's right to restrict. For example, while the law clearly prohibited fixing the resale price of patented products, prices were fixed by the manufacturer at the retail level by securing patent coverage at the retail as well as the manufacturing level; restrictive practices were continued after the patents supporting the restriction had expired; or licensors and licensees met to impose license restrictions for the benefit of all.[14]

When the Temporary National Economic Committee was set up in 1937 to investigate factors bearing on the great depression of the early thirties, the patent sytsem and patent practices formed one of its major fields of inquiry. This was the first time that there had been a thorough and comprehensive investigation of the nature and extent of restrictive patent practices and their effect on the national economy. The facts developed in the TNEC studies [15] led to the investigations which resulted in numerous antitrust suits brought by the Department of Justice in the late thirties and in the forties.

By this time, of course, the industrial pattern had undergone radical change in contrast to its appearance at the turn of the century. Inventions now consisted of narrow improvements on existing devices, or a single element in a complicated machine not usable except in connection with an existing device. Usually, too, the vast number of patents on these inventions found their way into the corporate portfolio, since they were the product of technicians working in well staffed research laboratories. As someone has said, patents were removed by assignment from the inventors' world to the executives' world. They become a part of the corporate assets to be exploited in the manner that best suited the corporations' interest. As you know, this might or might not involve use of the invention or the licensing of the invention to others for use.

It is, of course, impossible to explore this evening all of the various avenues of improper patent use which have resulted in unwarranted elimination of competition. I am sure that you are familiar with these practices and how the pendulum has swung in the course of the Court decisions, which now generally condemn them as illegal. Consider, for example, the judicial narrowing of the scope of restraint which may be imposed upon the licensee. For many years the courts interpreted license agreements primarily from the standpoint of the historic right of the patentee to grant a license with restrictions on the making, using and selling of his inventions. Licenses that limited the method of sales and the price of former competitors were approved in 1926 in the General Electric decision.[16] In that case the Supreme Court held that provisions in the license agreement whereby the licensor controlled prices at which the licensee sold light bulbs manufactured under the license, did not violate the Sherman Act. This authorization gave rise to patent licensing arrangements which served as a device for achieving uniformity and avoiding price competition in entire industries. Since licensing could thus be used as an instrument of coercive control, efforts were made to prevail upon Congress to amend the antitrust laws so that manufacturing licensees could no longer be legally required to observe certain price restrictions.

But it was not until 1948 that the Supreme Court in the Line Material case[17] cast doubt upon the General Electric doctrine, and seriously undermined its authority. The Court, after dividing 4 to 4 on the question of whether to flatly overrule the General Electric Co. doctrine, held, in any event, that the owners of separate patents may not by cross-licensing fix the price to be charged by themselves and their licensees.[18]

I have had frequent occasion to differ with the views expressed by the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws and I fear that in some respects the patent-antitrust section of the report is no exception. The Committee recommends a reaffirmance of the General Electric doctrine and would give the patentee the green light to fix his licensee's selling price.[19] The recommendation apparently contemplates situations where multiple as well as single licenses are involved. It is my view that price fixing clauses in patent licenses should be forbidden by the antitrust laws under any circumstances.

I am persuaded by the logic of the dissenting member who said that it "has never been shown that this dangerous power must be added to the other benefits of a patent in order to provide adequate incentives for invention, disclosure or licensing. A patentee obtains the exact value of his lawful monopoly on the invention when he exacts all the traffic will bear in the way of royalties, or by exercising his privilege to be the sole maker or seller. * * * there is no justification for depriving the public of the benefits of competition in * * * other aspects of production and distribution merely because the patentee is entitled to a protected price for his inventive contribution." [20]

In another area, the law today is clear-cut in prohibiting the use of tying clauses to give the owner of the patent a competitive advantage in the sale of unpatented products. The rule of thumb is that any attempt by agreement or course of conduct to use a patent to restrain or monopolize parts, materials, or supplies not covered by the patent is illegal per se and subjects the patentee to civil and criminal liability.[21] Here again it was not until 1944 that the Supreme Court made it unmistakably clear in the Mercoid case that a patent cannot be used to extend monopoly control over products not covered by the patent as such. This case involved an attempt to use a combination patent to control the sale of switches. It is significant that it would have made no difference in the outcome of the case if the switch itself had been patented. Whatever might have been done to monopolize the sale of switches under a switch patent could not be done under a patent to a combination including the switch.[22]

Contrast this state of affairs with the doctrine of the Leeds and Catlin case, decided in 1909, where the Supreme Court held that the owner of a patent on a phonograph, of which the record was an element of the combination, could require licensees to use only records furnished by the patentee.[23] While this decision was circumscribed by the Court itself in a 1931 case,[24] the law on the subject was not finally reversed until the High Court handed down the Mercoid decision some 13 years later.

The majority of the Attorney General's Committee does not approve the trend of Supreme Court opinions in the so-called tying cases. The Committee recommends instead that "where the tying product is patented, the patentee should be permitted to show that in the entire factual setting, including the scope of the patent in relation to other patented or unpatented products, the patent does not create the market power requisite to illegality of the tying clause." [25]

Again I must take sharp issue with the report. The recommendation on this score is based on the premise advanced by the Committee that "a tying clause in a patent contract is like a tying clause in any other contract." As one critic has pointed out, this overlooks economic and business realities.[26] Disregard of a tying restriction would also involve the issue of infringement. The mere threat of a costly infringement suit by the patentee may be enough to prevent the purchaser from questioning the tying arrangement. This form of coercive control would not be available to the patentee if any other type of contract were involved.

Before concluding, I want to return to the charge that is being made in some quarters that antitrust enforcement imperils our patent system with the result that large and powerful corporations have become fearful. They are threatened, we are told, with raids on their research laboratories and disruption of their entire patent pattern. We are warned that if this trend continues, it will "dam up the steady stream of progress" [27] and that the rate of technological advance in this country will be slowed down.[28] These are serious assertions ineed when the role of the United States in world politics demands that we preserve our industrial vitality and military defense posture.

Exponents of this position are particularly concerned about the developments like the recent consent decree settling the Government's antitrust action in the case against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiary, the Western Electric Co. The A. T. & T. has allegedly been stripped of its patent rights with all of its existing and future patents thrown open.[29] A closer examination of the patent effects of the decree will show, I believe, that the lament on behalf of this dominant firm in the communications field consists of crocodile tears.

The story of how American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has utilized patents to maintain its dominance and leadership in key areas of the communications field has been well documented.[30] This organization with the aid of its subsidiaries controls the manufacture of equipment and research. It has always maintained a controlling patent position in long distance telephone service. By reason of its patent position, it has a virtual monopoly in furnishing transmission service for national radio programs. Not only this, but A. T. & T. has acquired important patents in other fields of communication. For example, its ownership of important patents on the teletypewriter gives it substantial control over Western Union, its chief rival. In addition it furnishes the wire facilities to which this machine is attached; and a subsidiary of A. T. & T. is the principal manufacturer of this device. In short, by amassing thousands of patents cutting across the whole field of communication, A. T. & T. not only dominates the telephone but also controls the exploitation of potentially competitive and emerging forms of communication.[31] Would-be rivals may enter and remain as licensees only under restrictive conditions.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about my position, let me make it clear that aside from patents, I regard the consent decree as falling dismally short of what the Government sought in filing its original action. And by immunizing American Telephone from further antitrust action, the decree serves to perpetuate rather than

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

destroy its monopoly. However, these antitrust aspects are the subject of another evening's discussion.

With respect to the patent relief contained in the decree, A. T. & T. and Western Electric Co. are required to license some 8,600 patents on a royalty-free basis. It is well known that a requirement to license seldom, if ever, places the licensee on an equal footing with the licensor in the sale of the patented product. By having been the first in the field, the licensor generally has such a head start on the licensees that he retains a commercial advantage despite any judgment provision requiring him to license others.

Aside from this, corporation officials have admitted that any loss of royalties will not have a significant effect on the company's future revenues. Moreover, under the decree, licensees may still be charged for know-how and technical information, costs that could be equivalent to royalty charges.

Finally, with respect to that part of the consent decree that calls for compulsory licensing of future patents on a reasonable royalty basis, some large concerns have deliberately adopted licensing systems which contemplate both the exploitation of patents by the manufacture of the patented product and the collection of royalties from licensees who are making the same products.[32]

I am sure that counsel for American Telephone had many of these considerations in mind [33] when they agreed to accept the patent relief provisions of the consent decree instead of standing trial, and that the business world is neither genuinely alarmed nor disturbed by the consequences.

Our present framework of law provides adequate means for correcting patent abuses and renewing competitive opportunity in industry. To the extent that it is successful in so doing, both the patent system and our free economy benefit.

---

[1] Antitrust Bulletin, vol. 1, No. 3, June 1955, p. 157.

[2] Harvard Business Review, vol. 34, No. 3, May–June 1956, p. 21.

[3] Ibid, p. 32.

[4] Advocates of this school of thought would apparently not only wipe out such defenses as patent misuse, but would even go so far as to legalize deliberate, planned monopolization of patents in its most naked form. As the law now stands, patents like any other form of property, may be monopolized; and a monopolization of patents is as illegal as any other form.

Most patent antitrust cases have arisen under sec. 1 of the Sherman Act, which forbids contracts in restraint of trade; however, a patent monopolization action would invoke sec. 2 of the act which prohibits monopoly. In *United States* v. *Vehicular Parking, Ltd.* (No. 61 USPG 102), deliberate planned acts in acquiring by purchase and otherwise, substantially all of the parking meter patents, were held to result in an illegal monopoly of patents. In *Kobe, Inc.* v. *Dempsey Pump Co.* (97 F Supp. 342), the court found that the acquisition of substantially all of the patents on deep-well pumps had been with the purpose and intent of illegal monopolization.

[5] Bartholomew Diggins, The Patent-Antitrust Problem, Michigan Law Review, June 1955, vol. 53, No. 8, p. 1093.

[6] *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (332 U. S. 392, 68 S. Ct. 12 (1947)); *Morton Salt Co.* v. *G. S. Suppiger Co.* (314 U. S. 495, 62 S. Ct. 402 (1942)).

[7] *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid-Continent Investment Co.* (320 U. S. 661, 64 S. Ct. 268 (1944)).

[8] Floyd L. Vaughan, The United States Patent System (Norman, 1956) See: *Leitch Mfg. Co.* v. *Barber Co.* (302 U. S. 458 (1938)), holding that where patents were used in violation of the Sherman Act relief against infringement may be denied until the effects of this misuse are removed; *United States* v. *Gypsum Co.* (333 U. S. 364 (1948)), holding that the Department of Justice may attack the validity of a patent in an antitrust proceeding; and *Sola Electric Co.* v. *Jefferson Electric Co.* (317 U. S. 173 (1942)), holding that the validity of a patent may be challenged by a licensee if his contract, unsupported by valid patents, would be illegal.

[9] 35 U. S. C. 154.

[10] 35 U. S. C. 112, 121; *Morton Salt Co.* v. *C. S. Suppiger* (314 U. S. 488 (1942)); *General Electric Co.* v. *Wabash Appliance Corp.* (304 U. S. 364 (1938)).

[11] *Motion Picture Patents Co.* v. *Universal Film Mfg. Co.* (243 U. S. 502 (1917)).

[12] *Rubber Tip Pencil Co.* v. *Howards* (87 U. S. 498 (1874)).

[13] E. g., *United States* v. *National Lead Co.* (63 F. Supp. 513, 332 U. S. 319).

[14] *United States* v. *Univis Lens Co.* (316 U. S. 241 (1942)); *Ethyl Gasoline Corp.* v. *United States* (309 U. S. 346 (1940)); *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476 (1926)); *United States* v. *U. S. Gypsum Co.* (353 U. S. 364 (1948)).

[15] Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power, hearings before Temporary National Economic Committee on Public Resolution 113, parts 2 and 3 (patents) and part 25 (cartels), 75th Cong.

[16] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476).

[17] *United States* v. *Line Material Co.* (333 U. S. 287).

[18] The Court indicated also that licensees, as distinguished from patent owners, may infringe the antitrust laws if they have knowledge of the overall agreement and are aware that price competition between themselves will be eliminated.

[19] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, p. 233. Various members of the committee testified at length last year before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. See hearings on current antitrust problems, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary (84th Cong., 1st sess.)

[20] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, pp. 235–236.

[21] *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid Continent Investment Co.* (320 U. S. 661 (1944)); *Mercoid Corp* v. *Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.* (320 U. S. 680 (1944)); *United States* v. *International Salt Co.* (332 U. S. 392 (1947)).

[22] The doctrine of the tie-in cases applies whether the tying-in is accomplished by express contracts or by implication from the sale by the patentee of a material or part used in the patented combination or process. *Leitch Mfg. Co.* v. *Barber Co.* (302 U. S. 458 (1938)).

[23] *Leeds and Catlin Co.* v. *Victor Talking Machine Co.* (213 U. S. 325 (1909)). This decision was inconsistent with *Morgan Envelope Co.* v. *Albany Paper Co.* (152 U. S. 425 (1894)).

[24] *Carbice Co. of America* v. *American Patent Development Co.* (283 U. S. 27 (1931)).

[25] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, p. 238.

[26] Michigan Law Review, ibid., p. 1103.

[27] Editorial, The Wall Street Journal, April 26, 1956.

[28] Harvard Business Review, ibid., p. 21.

[29] The Wall Street Journal, April 10, 1956.

[30] Investigation of the Telephone Industry in the United States, 76th Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. No. 340.

[31] Id.

[32] It has been the policy of the Bell System Co. since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose.

[33] It should be pointed out, too, that Radio Corporation of America has the unrestricted right to sublicense, retain royalties, and sue for infringement on a substantial number of these patents. These are rights that remain unaffected by the consent decree. Also, an RCA package license would be required before a licensee could manufacture and sell FM and TV commercial broadcast transmitters or receivers, manufactured under patents affected by the decree.

Be Not Deceived by the Russian Smile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, within recent months the self-styled leaders of the Soviet Union have turned disarming smiles on the free world.

They would have us believe that all evil has ceased to exist in the communistic form of government; they would have us believe that they are rapidly striding with firm steps of faith toward that high-sounding goal of peaceful coexistence. They would have us believe they mean no harm, and they would give us the false impression that the dove of peace is permanently billeted in Moscow.

There is no one more desirous of a true and lasting peace than I. Like many Americans, I know the horrors of war from experience. I know, too, the bitter, tense struggle of the cold war has stretched the nerves of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world to the breaking point. And having two small children of my own, I would spare them the awful catastrophe of a third world conflict.

Yet, we must never, in our urge for peace, be lulled into a dangerous sense of false security. We must not turn our back on the fact that the Red spider of communism continues to creep across the world. We must not be taken in by the smiles and smirks of the Soviet Russia leaders.

Communism has but one goal, that of world conquest, and it has ever been so. And when we gaze upon the face of the smiling Russian, we should remember that time and time again the Communists have warned us of the course they have charted.

Marx, Lenin, and Stalin have warned of the dangers we face from communism. The present Russian leaders even lost their smile long enough recently to thunder, on foreign soil, "Never shake your fist at a Russian."

Lenin said, and we would do well to recall his words:

> The existence of the Soviet Republic, side by side with imperialist states, for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end; and before that end * * * a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the capitalistic states will be inevitable.

And Stalin said:

> A great deal of our success depends in delaying war with the capitalistic countries. The object of peaceful relations is obligatory to us all * * * until the people of the capitalistic states arise to help us conquer.

So the Communist goal is easily determined. It has been stated over and over by their leaders. By one way or another they seek world conquest, and God help us the day we forget it.

In keeping with these words, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Right or Wrong," appearing in the May 13 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, a religious publication edited by Francis A. Fisk and published in Huntington, Ind.

The article follows:

RIGHT OR WRONG—THE KISS OF DEATH

"The visit of Khruschev and Bulganin in England is transparently a venture in experimental psychology"—thus the National Review; "can the Western World be acclimated by the technique of injecting slightly larger quantities of toxin over a considerable period, to normal social intercourse with slavemasters?

"There is no other reason for the trip. Discussions bout disarmament, or about hydrogen bomb tests, or about strife in the Middle East could far more easily have taken place in neutral, and concededly amoral chancelleries, such as the United Nations. In any case, they need not, to minimize the chances of success, have been held in Chequers, or Windsor Castle. Nor can any serious person suggest that social contact will soften obdurate hearts. The hand that clasped the hand of Elibazeth (or did they kiss her hand? As they might have done that of her great-aunt, the Czarina Alexandra?) had shaken the hand of Stalin more vigorously, and the hand of Roosevelt just as ingratiatingly.

"The leaders of East and West have not met to settle affairs of state, but to test the temper of the people. If the people can be calloused to the physical presence of the leaders of communism, does it not follow that they can be calloused to communism itself? And if so, could the leaders of the West (assuming they were disposed to do so) ever succeed in mobilizing the people to heroic efforts to resist communism? This, we suggest, is what Khrushchev and Bulganin will talk about, on their return, at their first meeting with the Politburo. No one will think to ask, it is our guess, what was decided about arms to Egypt, or anything else so relatively trivial."

It would seem that America is losing its capacity for indignation. That is what so puzzles men like Bishop O'Gara, Bishop Lane, Father Rigney, and the many others with firsthand experience of Communist barbarism. Let a child fall down a well in California, let a miner be trapped by a landfall in Kentucky, and hourly bulletins are flashed over the radio.

Yet Bishop O'Gara steps out on a platform and recounts his observations in China: American boys held captive and tortured by the Communists and the audience remains numb, apathetic.

The greatest danger confronting the world today is peaceful coexistence: Acceptance of the Communist murderers on their own terms, the fatalistic recognition of slavery for half of mankind as an accomplished fact about which nothing can be done, the blinking of Red kidnaping, armtwisting, starvation, treason, treachery, fraud, slavery, and murder as the normal ethos of other peoples, its dismissal with a shrug of the shoulders as though, mysteriously, it were part of a philosophy which one does not understand but which one must nonetheless tolerate.

One foresees an armed truce, lasting possibly for decades, just as the 16th century wars of religion worked themselves out. Protestants and Catholics passed through a period of a deadly and bloody enmity. Then certain areas were roped off which were safe exclusively for Protestants or Catholics. Then came tolerance.

The Russians are in quest of just such a lull. We would stop trying to stir up revolution behind their borders. We would provide them many pictures of their leaders having tea at Buckingham Palace and in the White House so that they could show them to their slaves as proof that there is no sympathy nor hope of help for them in the West. They would have a decade or so in which to digest and assimilate the fruits of our bungling at Yalta, to raise up a new generation of fanatics with no knowledge of civilization as we know it, to build their steel mills and strengthen their government. All the while, in this era of good feeling, they would be more free to chew out by espionage the foundations of the free governments in the West.

Such is the real meaning of peaceful coexistence. It is an abomination.

Northeast Offers More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article that appeared on the editorial page of the May 21 issue of the Bangor Daily News, a daily newspaper in my congressional district:

NORTHEAST OFFERS MORE

A committee representing New England's congressional delegation is preparing a statement urging the Civil Aeronautics Board to approve Northeast Airlines' petition for a New York-Florida route. The committee will have no trouble in presenting what should be a convincing case. Commonsense and fair play are on the side of Northeast.

The issue is not simply a matter of which airline should be given a chance to share the business of this busy and profitable seaboard air haul. Also involved is the matter of tieing in New England with the South by direct plane service. Further, award of the route to Northeast would give New England better regional service, which is something Northeast cannot provide while limited to unprofitable short-haul flights.

CAB Examiner Thomas Wrenn, who has recommended that the South's Delta Airlines get the extra seaboard route overlooks New England's legitimate desire for improved air service. Delta would simply get another money making long-haul franchise. New England would be no better off than before.

Wrenn goes out of his way in an unfair attempt to belittle Northeast Airlines in his report. He observed that awarding the route to Northeast would be "almost the same as commissioning a new carrier to enter the highly competitive market."

New carrier? Northeast for 23 years has battled New England's rugged winters and coastal fogs. It has been forced to operate with a minimum of airport facilities and navigational aids. Yet it has done so successfully and with an enviable safety record.

During World War II the able fliers of Northeast extended themselves and their equipment beyond ordinary endurance in order to establish for the Allies the vital North Atlantic air route.

Northeast last year carried 500,000 passengers and probably will carry 750,000 this year, although its flights are confined to regional operation north of New York.

How can an airline with such accomplishments be looked upon as a "new carrier"?

What the issue boils down to is this: As far as the New York-Florida route is concerned, Northeast would provide the extra service as well as any other bidding airline. In addition, it alone would give New England the improved service it deserves.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to submit herewith for the RECORD the speech, "Bill of Rights," by Miss Alicia Jacobus, of the Vero Beach High School in Vero Beach, Fla. Miss Jacobus won the public speaking contest sponsored by the Vero Beach Exchange Club, and I feel that her speech is a good example of the interest of the young people today in their country and what it means to be an American.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Imagine yourself to be an average citizen, sitting in your livingroom at 111 Any Street in Normal American City. Suddenly there is a knock at the door and your heart leaps in expectation; maybe it's sister's boy friend calling for a date, perhaps it is the mailman with a special delivery package, or maybe even an income tax return for father. Whatever that knock heralds, friend, relatives, or business acquaintances, we are waiting for the happy surprise of finding what lies beyond the door.

Now, move yourself a few thousand miles into the livingroom of 111 Any Street in normal Yugoslavian, Russian, Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, or countless other cities, and hear that same knock at the door. Not only your heart but your whole being fills with dread and fear. Hands and tongues stop, eyes dart from one to another of the people in the room; each is wondering if that knock means that this is the last time this group will be together. Will the house be ransacked for seemingly no reason? Will one of the family be taken away without any visible wrong being done? Who will be the next to go? Or another possibility, will a few soldiers move in?

In those countries there is no bill of rights to protect the people from anything that the government wants to force upon them.

The Bill of Rights is one of the shortest, yet one of the most powerful, of all the foundations upon which our Nation is built. The Bill of Rights is close to us all, for the 10 freedoms that it gives to us are used every day by every citizen.

Have you today said that you do not agree with the way President Eisenhower is handling our foreign policy? Have you said that one of the Democratic candidates is really all wet with his ideas on parity for the Middle West farmer? The fact that you are still sitting in this room attests to the proof that the first amendment in our Bill of Rights is still working. Because of the wisdom of men who lived almost 200 years ago, you are saying what you please to say today. You are learning what your teachers please to teach you.

The American has the opportunity to see both sides of the story if he cares to look.

And he should care.

If any one of several boys or men I know were deprived of their right to hunt over the weekend, I am sure that they would let their small world know of it. That subject touches some men in the spot closest to their hearts. Yet in some European countries it is worth your life to own a gun. Again the Bill of Rights gives us not only a right but a pleasure that is taken for granted by many sportsmen—the right to keep and bear arms.

I would like to repeat a few lines I hear frequently from various people. In childhood one might say, "I hate Mommy, she isn't fair. Gee whiz, she never lets me do anything I want to do." You progress a few years (in age anyway) and then some are heard to say, "Golly, this school is gettin' just like a prison—you gotta have passes to go any place. And they say Lincoln freed the slaves."

We really don't know what it is to be slaved and oppressed, and I hope that we never do. I am sure that all of you hope the same thing. And, as Thomas Paine said, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it."

You know, the Constitution was written many years ago by men who fought for their country. So, too, was the Declaration of Independence, and in the same line were the amendments added to the Constitution. All these things were given to us by those who have gone before. Now what are we going to give? Criticism, only, of some of these things? Speeches of what they mean to us? No. We must show in our living what they mean to us, and carry on the great work done by the past citizens of the United States. Especially let us fatigue ourselves by supporting the Bill of Rights. By exercising the first amendment to the Constitution, we will strengthen it. Freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and petition. I put the freedom, privilege, and duty of the vote in with these also. The vote is the strongest weapon of the people. If you don't like what some form of your Government is doing, get out and vote at election time and let the leaders know that you do not agree with the things they are doing. Or, on the other hand, if you do concur, back them up at voting time to show them that they have the full support of the people. If you are under 21 and a student, your duty is to learn about the Government so that when you are old enough to vote you will know what you are voting for. The students of today are the citizens, Senators, Representatives, governors, and Presidents of tomorrow.

Here, in America, you can form opinions yourself and in the way you see fit. You are not told that the President is superhuman, can do no wrong, and that what the teacher says is always right. The leaders of this country are only human and they make mistakes, too. But the majority of the people thought that they would make the least mistakes, that should be why they were voted into office. Not because the wife or husband of the voter liked the way the candidate tied his tie, or because their next door neighbor liked his looks.

I know we all know the Ten Commandments. Our Bill of Rights is the Ten Commandments of the law of a good land just as the Ten Commandments in the Bible are the law of a good life. One of the laws of a good and just land should always be the right of a trial by an impartial jury. We have 3 amendments in the 10 that compose the Bill of Rights that give us that opportunity to speak in our defense. Contrary to the theories in many other countries, here you are innocent until proven guilty. In America you may face your accusers and have a chance to witness against them. You and everyone else may know all the facts and accusations in your case. No undercover, sneaky witnesses here; witnesses that the State pays to say something and that you never see. There is protection for us from the days when we were ruled by others and the Government was too absolute. And yet we have people in the United States who use their rights as something dirty, and degrade them by taking these, the protection of the common citizen, and using them to tie up illegal or illicit affairs.

If we abuse our privileges we can't expect to keep them. Yearly so many people seek entrance in our country because of the very thing that many of us take for granted, and some abuse. I do not want to say that all take for granted our freedoms. That is not so. There are many wonderful people who are good citizens, but—to keep our Nation as strong as it must be in these troubled times it is necessary to have a great love for your country. A strong, abiding faith and love in your country are the ingredients for a wonderful thing that many have lost—patriotism.

Do you recall the saying, "Faith can work wonders"? Faith in God is first and foremost, but with that go faith in your country, and faith in your fellow man. Faith—that makes the power of our country grow; faith—that keeps our country a friend to all, and faith—to hold fast to your ideals for you and your land.

One ideal of Americans is the sovereignty of the people. Because the people are sovereign, they are given every opportunity to voice their opinions. A safeguard to keep the people sovereign is the ninth amendment to the Constitution, which assures us that we shall always keep the rights, written and unwritten, which have been our unless we want them changed. We are protected from the danger of the Federal Government becoming too powerful because the Federal Government is not one being. It is compased of 48 State. Each State is an important part of all the rest and each contributes something. We work on the adage that "In unity there is strength." That is why there are amendments protecting the rights of the States separately. In reality, not only the nondelegated powers, but all the powers are given to the people because it is the people's representatives that make up the Federal Government. We, you and I, are those people whose business it is to elect the representatives. So, become well acquainted with your Government—how it works, and especially who is in it and what they are doing. Don't be like the girl who, when asked what she thought the Democratic Party was, said:

"One where the girls let the boys do the kissing."

Each of us has a responsibility to ourselves and our country. Let's be intelligent enough to assume it.

Our country is a free country, a strong country, and it's a wonderful country. It's up to every one of us to keep it that way by living within, and protecting the Bill of Rights and every other document in our legacy of freedom.

Texas' Man Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of May 7, 1956:

TEXAS' MAN JOHNSON

Now, more than ever, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, stacks up as a major factor in the Democratic presidential convention to be held in Chicago in August.

Senator JOHNSON'S decisive victory over Gov. Allan Shivers—hitherto undefeated—in Saturday's Democratic precinct conventions promises him control of the big Texas delegation at the national convention.

He now is almost certain to be a favorite-son candidate, and whether or not he becomes a serious contender for the presidential nomination he will be in a position of strong influence on the convention's decisions—both as to the choice of a candidate and the writing of the platform.

LYNDON JOHNSON, as majority leader in the Senate and as a force in the Democratic Party, not only is a skilled politician but consistently has been an exponent of moderation—in contrast to some of the extremists (in both directions) who have sought to dominate the party.

The Senator's victory in his home state vastly enhances the outlook for the moderate policies he symbolizes.

Our National Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Our National Reclamation Program," delivered by United States Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer, before the 23d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D. C., May 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL RECLAMATION PROGRAM

(Address by United States Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer before the 43d Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 11, 1956)

It is an honor and a privilege to address this gathering this afternoon. There is a great community of interest between the reclamation work in the Western States and the larger geographic area represented in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The overriding interest of all of us, of course, is the control and use of water. We can all benefit from an exchange of ideas and a clearer understanding of the purposes behind the various water policies enunciated by the Congress. My purpose this afternoon will be to give you a brief explanation of the reclamation phases of national water law and what we are accomplishing within that framework.

There has developed in the last decade a great national awareness of the importance of water in our daily lives. No longer are people taking the wonder of our great municipal supply systems for granted. Industries are looking first to an available water supply in locating new or expanded opera-

tions. And farmers the Nation over are seeking means of supplying by irrigation that 2 or 3 inches of additional moisture at critical times which is more often than not the difference between crop success and failure.

The whole national emphasis now more and more is on conservation and use. Of course, there is concern over protective measures, such as flood control, as there always has been. But more and more thinking people are asking how we can best establish control and at the same time multiple use of our rivers and streams. How can we put them to full use as well as maintain protective control?

The positive philosophy of conservation and use has been long established in the Western States. From the time the first pioneering settlers established themselves in the valleys of the western mountains the availability of water has been a decisive factor in their economic lives and, indeed, in their actual survival.

That is why most western water law is based on the theory of prior appropriative right for beneficial use. In the West a man must use his water in order to establish a right. With rare exceptions he cannot establish a riparian right merely to insure the flow of a stream past his door. He must put it to use. Once the right is established it becomes more precious than gold and silver. With it, farmland becomes rich and productive and a continuing source of wealth. Without it, the land more often than not is valueless. With it, cities and industries can grow and prosper. Without an assured water supply the parade of progress will pass them by.

Putting water to use has become an involved process. The first diversion and irrigation works which the early settlers in the West developed by themselves were comparatively simple. However, the supply which could be developed in that manner was small and uncertain since it was dependent on fluctuating streamflows. Too often a late summer drought left irrigation systems dry even though early summer floods often inundated farmlands. The obvious answer was storage works which would catch the floods and use them in the late summer when the average western stream dropped to a comparative trickle. I might explain that our floods in the West come principally from melting snow in the spring and early summer. Rarely is there sufficient summer precipitation to cause a flood of more than local consequence.

The construction of storage works and distribution systems became an expensive proposition. It was more costly than many farmers or groups of farmers could manage, yet it was clearly in the public interest to put that water to work. There was a need, too, for engineering services in this field to design and construct the involved water-control structures which would be necessary.

Out of these needs was born the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 and subsequent legislation under which the Bureau of Reclamation operates today. Our program has been developed on a showing of need for the water and a clear demonstration of economic benefit and ability to repay the reimbursable costs.

This reimbursability extends to more than 91.6 percent of our total program, exclusive of the Missouri River Basin development where we are on a cooperative basis with the Corps of Engineers. In the early days, a wholly unrealistic repayment period of 10 years was adopted. This has been gradually extended until now most farmer water-users have 40 years to repay, after a 10-year maximum development period when their expenses in bringing new land under irrigation are necessarily rather high. I am happy to say we have less than one-tenth of 1 percent delinquency in wateruser repayments.

That portion of Federal money used for the irrigation phases of our projects is interest free, the farmer users simply repaying the principal through their organized water districts.

More than half of our present appropriations comes from the reclamation fund. This fund has been built up over the years from the sale of public lands, mineral royalties, revenue from federally constructed hydroelectric plants, and other sources. Virtually all of it comes from the 17 Western States.

Thus the people of the west look upon the use of this fund as simply a return of monies which have been accumulated by the Federal Government from its interests in the public land States.

All other reimbursable funds, such as those expended for the construction of hydroelectric facilities and for municipal and industrial water, are repaid with interest. As I have mentioned, we have a minimum of funds for those phases of multipurpose development which, as a matter of national policy, has been declared nonreimbursable.

It is within this policy that the Bureau of Reclamation during the last 54 years has been able to construct facilities which are currently capable of supplying water to over 7 million acres of land in the Western States. Even this is only about one-fourth of the irrigated lands in the Western States. Private enterprise has accounted for the remainder.

We have sufficient storage capacity in reclamation reservoirs for 90.7 million acre-feet of water. If the District of Columbia could be turned into a giant water tank, it would require a wall 2,040 feet high, over one-third of a mile, to hold this amount of water.

Beneficial consumptive use of water has always been the primary purpose of reclamation project construction. But in the process of multipurpose planning and operation, other benefits have been realized which are making a distinct contribution to the welfare and economic well-being of our Nation.

For instance, in the process of building multipurpose reclamation reservoirs, we have brought the restless energy of white water under control with hydro-electric plants having a total capacity of 4.9 million kilowatts. The sale of power is repaying not only project costs chargeable to power but is also helping to repay irrigation costs.

A minimum of project costs is charged to flood control. We operate many of our structures cooperatively for flood control with the Corps of Engineers. The benefits, when the need for flood control develops, are very real indeed. A most recent example was in the central valley of California. In December, a combination of a record heavy snow pack and a spell of warm rain started the streams draining into the valley to flowing in unprecedented volume.

Anticipating the heavy runoff sometime during the winter, the principal storage reservoirs in the valley, Shasta and Millerton Lakes, had been drawn down. Folsom Reservoir, which had just been completed by the Corps of Engineers and which is being integrated into the Central Valley project system, was also nearly empty.

When the peak flows hit just before Christmas, these three reservoirs completely controlled the three principal streams in the valley, the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and American Rivers. Other reservoirs, both publicly and privately owned, controlled some of the lesser streams, but the Yuba and Feather Rivers, with no control to speak of, poured out death and destruction in the vicinity of their outlets from the mountains and put much of the delta region under water. It was a sad Christmas for thousands in the path of the uncontrolled floods.

The floods were critical even as they were. However, there is little question but that Sacramento and other major cities of the delta region would have been inundated were it not for the reservoirs operating as flood control structures. At the same time those reservoirs are now brimful in anticipation of the summer growing season when rain is a rarity in the Central Valley. That is multiple-purpose use in its best sense.

Then there are other benefits which reserve more credit and attention than they are getting under present reclamation law. Principal ones are navigation, municipal water, pollution control, and fish and wildlife and other recreation aspects. Within the last several months, leading sportsmen's periodicals have contained stories of the great increase in game fish and wildlife resources which have resulted from the construction of such structures as Shasta Dam on the Central Valley project, Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia, Owyhee Dam in eastern Oregon, and Arrowrock and Anderson Ranch Dams on the Boise project in Idaho. We have approximately 9.5 million sportsmen, tourists, and other recreation seekers visiting our facilities annually.

Yet, almost without exception, construction of these structures has been opposed by outdoor groups who are fearful of them destroying some fish and wildlife or other outdoor values. There is no question that construction of reclamation reservoirs sometimes alters these values, although Bureau of Reclamation planners investigate all possible means of development carefully. We recommend the plan with maximum total benefits for all purposes.

There is also no question but that the pressures of an increasing population and expanding economy are going to result in further Reclamation development. The reasonable approach is to recognize these inevitable changes. Those who oppose for opposition's sake would be better advised to join in exploring the numerous possibilities for future development. They would thus insure that there will be a minimum of damage to existing resources and a maximum of potential benefits. This has been and will continue to be the policy of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation experienced a dearth of authorizations for new projects during the decade between 1945 and 1954. This was understandable in the light of a constantly recurring series of national emergencies which made unprecedented drains on the Nation's treasury. At the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation was kept busy completing work on several major projects which had been previously authorized. However, a further delay in new authorizations this year would have meant a serious slowdown in the orderly process of reclaiming our western land and water resources.

I am pleased to be able to report to you that this has not happened. The present Congress has accepted the challenge of the future in authorizing seven new projects for future construction. Funds were appropriated for the current fiscal year to initiate work on 4 new projects, 2 new units of the Missouri River Basin project, and 4 new divisions of other existing projects. The 1957 fiscal year budget contains fund requests to start 5 new projects and 1 new feature of an existing project.

Notable among the several new projects which have been authorized by action of this Congress is the Colorado River storage project which was signed into law by President Eisenhower only a month ago. This is a monumental authorization which will rank with the Missouri River Basin project in importance to the area and to the Nation.

It will permit the economic expansion of sections of four States in an area of rich resources which is now virtually untapped. Coupled with the existing development in

the lower Colorado River Basin, it will have established the most complete control and utilization of the water resources of any major river basin in America, and quite possibly of the world.

The Colorado River has a long record as a bad actor. Back just after the turn of the century it burst its bounds and flooded into the Imperial Valley of California. For 16 months the farmers, highway officials, and railroad staged a running battle with the elements of nature before they got it turned back into its channel to the sea.

Today, with the construction of Hoover Dam and other river-control structures which are designed primarily to put the river to use, these floods have been completely controlled. The upper basin plan is a further refinement which will permit the upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico to use their share of water. The development of the Colorado River is a true basin-wide approach for maximum beneficial use.

In the growing pressures of civilization, man is having to push farther and farther afield for his water supply. Many metropolitan areas are going hundreds of miles for their domestic water supply. The same holds true of irrigated farming areas in the West. The All-American and Coachella Canals take water from the Colorado River at Imperial Dam and transport it, in river-size quantities, more than 200 miles.

The same is true on the Columbia Basin project where great pumps lift the water 280 feet out of the Columbia River to start it on a 100-mile journey to irrigate several hundred thousand acres of land. On the Colorado-Big Thompson project we have even gone so far as to dig a 13-mile tunnel under the Continental Divide to divert water from the Pacific to the Atlantic watershed.

This transbasin diversion of water is also the principal feature of a new addition which we are starting this year in California. Congress has authorized the construction of works which will divert water from the Trinity coastal basin into the Central Valley. One of the participating irrigation units of the Colorado River project will permit the diversion of water out of the Colorado River Basin into the Great Salt Lake Basin.

I mention these projects in order to show you the extraordinary steps which are being taken in the West to keep the water supply ahead of the demand. There are literally no possible means of supply which are not being investigated.

There is within the Deparment of the Interior a unit which is spearheading an investigation to reclaim salt and brackish water for domestic and possibly irrigation use.

As you know, there is a Government committee investigating the ins and outs of cloud seeding and other schemes to induce precipitation artificially. If they are successful our problems will be eased somewhat although success in this field will put even greater emphasis on control structures to put water to use, regardless of how it reaches the earth.

In the light of these constant needs and the extraordinary measures which are obviously ncessary to satisfy them, there is a place of leadership in water resources development for men of vision. We are fortunate to have such leadership in the Congress and in the White House.

They have seen the future. They are aware of the crisis we are heading into if we do not maintain an orderly process of water development. They have been undeterred by false arguments and distorted statistics. They have not delayed action while knotty problems of national water policy are completely resolved. They have fitted the need for authorization to the existing framework or they have enlarged or modified that framework where necessary to meet changing circumstances.

Future generations will have cause to be grateful to the men of vision for projects which the Bureau of Reclamation and others are now undertaking. We look to the future as years of positive accomplishment in reclamation, conservation, and maximum beneficial use of our water.

Shaping the Democratic Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1956:

SHAPING THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In the wake of the recent Texas voting the two national tickets most frequently mentioned by many Democratic leaders are:

Adlai Stevenson for President and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, for Vice President.

Or Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, for President, and Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, for Vice President.

The increasing frequency with which these possible tickets come into the political conversation is not surprising. It is the direct result of the significant Texas balloting. Its impact on every aspect of the Democratic convention will be very great.

The fact that Texas Democrats voted overwhelmingly to reject Gov. Allan Shivers as the chairman and key figure of the 56-vote Texas delegation and to put Senator JOHNSON in his place means three things.

It means an immeasurable increase in the strength of all the middle-road forces within the Democratic Party.

It means that Senator JOHNSON, the party's most acceptable mediator and moderator, has been given new authority and new prestige to bring about a platform and a nomination acceptable to both the nonbolting southern conservatives and the northern New Dealers.

It means that Senator JOHNSON, his standing already high as the skillful Democratic leader of the upper House, will very likely become the most poweful single voice at the Chicago convention.

There are two reasons why the Texas voting enhances the cause of the middle-road Democrats.

It puts the leadership of the moderates in the hands of a Democrat of unquestioned party loyalty and party regularity. There could be no secure bridge between the southern conservatives and the northern New Dealers as long as men like Governor Shivers held over the convention the threat of a bolt to the Republican Party.

The convention leadership of Senator JOHNSON, trusted alike by Democratic liberals such as Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and by Democratic conservatives such as Senators HARRY BYRD and WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, can rally the maximum resistance to the more leftwing presidential aspirants, such as Governor Harriman, of New York, and Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

When you combine these two factors you can see how the beneficiaries inevitably become Mr. Stevenson and Mr. SYMINGTON.

Unless Mr. Stevenson is defeated by Senator KEFAUVER in the Florida and California primaries, he will, it seems to me, remain the front-running Democratic candidate, the men who will have to be defeated before anybody else is nominated.

Mr. Stevenson may or may not be Senator JOHNSON's first choice, but he is not unacceptable to Senator JOHNSON—as he would have been to Governor Shivers. The danger that his nomination would lead to a serious States rights revolt in the parity is vastly reduced.

If Mr. Stevenson is defeated in Florida and California, the prospect of nomination of any Democrat to the left of Mr. Stevenson is decreased. If anyone can marshal enough middle-road Democrats to deflect Governor Harriman and Senator KEFAUVER it is LYNDON JOHNSON, whose influence will be at its peak at Chicago and whose second choice, under these circumstances, would certainly be Senator SYMINGTON.

I am not at all suggesting that it is not the right and even the conscientious duty of men like Governor Shivers to support the Republican nominee instead of the Democratic nominee if that is their personal convictim. I am simply saying that the Democrats of Texas have voted overwhelmingly against having their party in their State led by a Democrat who puts an advance price tag on his party loyalty. They are prepared to accept government by majority in the party as well as government by majority in the Nation.

Actually, as I see it, Senator JOHNSON is going to serve the middle-road Democratic viewpoint more effectively because he is putting no price tag on his party loyalty.

Obviously, Senator JOHNSON will not alone decide the Democratic nomination, but he is on the way to being the most influential single force. Every political reporter at Chicago who wants to know what's going to happen before it happens will want to be in touch with the Senate majority leader.

The 20th Year of Nationwide Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The 20th Year of Nationwide Flood Control, delivered by Lt. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D. C., May 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 20TH YEAR OF NATIONWIDE FLOOD CONTROL

(Address by Lt. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 11, 1956)

Year before last, when I had the pleasant experience of addressing the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I emphasized in my report to you the status of our navigation projects and their ever-growing importance in the national economy. Last year I especially brought to your attention the serious situation facing the Nation with respect to

water supplies for all purposes—agriculture, industry, domestic consumption, and the like. Since it is impossible for me to cover all fields in the limited amount of time to which I am privileged, it seems to me that this year I should concentrate on the problems of flood control. I believe this subject is particularly appropos because of the two great disasters which have occurred within the past year, one on each coast—just about as far apart as they could be. The occurrence of those floods was, in my opinion, the outstanding event of the past year in the field of water resources, and one which had a most important impact upon the Corps of Engineers' civil-works program. Furthermore, it helped to make the people of the United States aware of the national flood danger. Many of our people appeared to be surprised to learn that despite the progress of the past 20 years, most of our major river basins still lack adequate protection.

It was in 1936, just 2 decades ago, that the Federal Government assumed national responsibility for flood control. Prior to then, as you know, it had exercised only limited responsibility in the Sacramento and Mississippi River Valleys, for flood control was generally considered to be a responsibility of local and private agencies. The shift from local to Federal responsibility marked the acceptance of the comprehensive river-basin approach to flood control and related problems—a new concept in our history if not that of the world. It is appropriate that we should now take stock of our experience to date under this concept.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated that the potential average annual flood damage for the main river valleys of the country, if there were no Federal flood-control program at all, would approach a billion dollars. Work completed or under construction will prevent, it is estimated, only about half of that potential flood damage.

However, the flood problem is still a most urgent matter and minimum adequate protection is not yet available in many areas. The Corps of Engineers' program for the alluvial valley of the Mississippi is dollarwise about two-thirds complete. By contrast, our program for New England is less than a quarter complete. That region has been tragically awakened to the need for flood control, and it is likely that progress there will be faster henceforward. The Ohio River Basin's program is about one-third complete and the situation there is still dangerous. The high degree of industrial and urban development on the riverbanks, and the proven tendency of the Ohio River to amass terrible floods, make it imperative, in my opinion, to intensify the flood-control program in that valley. The program for the Central Valley of California is something over a third complete. That area, too, has received one of nature's merciless lessons and as a result is pushing flood-control programs with renewed vigor on both Federal and State levels. In the Columbia Basin little of significance has been done in the flood control field since the disaster of 1948, while the area has been developing and potential damage increasing. If anything, we have gone backward in that region, for much of the flood-control storage envisaged by the control plan set forth in 1948 in House document 531 now appears improbable of realization. That plan had provided approximately 27 million acre-feet of usable storage, but alternate schemes subsequently advanced, seem likely to reduce the storage to 14 million acre-feet. Yet even as we meet, an extremely heavy snowpack hangs over that basin, and whether or not it will be scourged by a disastrous flood depends entirely upon the suddenness of the melt. The predicted threat of unusually high water was sufficiently serious that, as an emergency matter, I have authorized advanced flood fight work of a temporary nature as feasible and warranted to strengthen flood control structures. This work was undertaken upon request by responsible local interests in each case, and was designed to supplement their resources and capabilities.

Yet where flood-control works have been constructed they have abundantly proven their worth. It is well known that there has been no major flood disaster in the Mississippi Valley since the launching of the alluvial valley project in 1927. With the completion of Fort Randall, Garrison, and Gavins Point Dams, a flood like that of 1952 could never again cause as much damage on the Missouri. Last winter the city of Sacramento was saved, and much damage was prevented, by such works as had been completed in the California plan. Two years ago rainfall associated with Hurricane Hazel struck the upper Ohio Valley with relatively little effect, because the main force of the storm fortunately occurred in areas where protective works had been built, although the overall Ohio program is less than 40 percent complete leaving that valley still subject to a disaster. Many, many other instances of similar kind could be cited to prove that our plans are sound and our structures are well fulfilling their intended tasks.

In short, the principal lesson learned during the past 20 years of Federal flood control is this: The main trouble with the program is that not enough of it has been translated into finished work. We have learned that our major valleys can be protected from disaster-type floods. But we have not yet provided adequate protection in any major valley—not even the Mississippi.

How long will it be before such protection can be provided? At the rate of $223 million a year, which is the amount appropriated for flood-control construction in the current fiscal year 1956, it would take about 25 years to complete the present program. But long before the 25 years have passed the requirements will have expanded with our accelerating population and economy. Flood control is a field geared directly into the dynamics of national economic expansion. The constant general increase in the value of river-valley improvements continually augments the justification for flood-control work brings more projects over the margin of feasibility, and increases the urgency of projects already feasible. Hence every omnibus river and harbor bill passed by Congress adds to the Federal flood-control program. The last such bill, in 1954, authorized an additional $300 million worth of new flood-control projects, and since then, we have had the major floods of 1955 to stimulate the demand for still more protection. So we may safely assume that the present Federal flood-control program, with its $5 billion active backlog of authorized unperformed construction, represents but a tentative goal. The ultimate goal will be greater and take longer, but I do not believe anyone now can foresee its limits.

Though our flood-protection systems are far from complete, there is, I believe, a real danger that benefits achieved thus far may tempt us into a sense of false security, and lead us either to slacken the rate of construction of protective works, or to take unwarranted chances in building in areas still subject to inundation. Let me remind you that only last winter, at Yuba City, Calif., we had a tragic demonstration of the faulty and unreliable protection provided by a development which is only half finished. The levees there looked strong and imposing when the river was low. But those levees had been designed as part of a system for operation in connection with Oroville Dam, and Oroville Dam had not yet been built. Hence, when the Feather River went on a rampage, more water was hurled against the levees than they had been built to withstand, and they gave way, not by overtopping but by erosion due to velocity, with tragic loss of life and property.

Many other rich and populous areas are similarly living under concealed hazard—lulled by the sight of some imposing levee or floodwall into forgetting that that barrier is itself not adequately protected.

I believe the matter of false security must also be borne in mind in considering flood-insurance proposals. If a practical way to establish flood insurance can be found, we of the Corps of Engineers favor it as a means of helping spread the impact of flood losses while flood-control programs remain incomplete—always bearing in mind that the construction of adequate flood-control systems is the only real and permanent form of flood insurance. But we believe that any insurance program should be accompanied by safeguards to prevent people from feeling encouraged to build in unsafe areas, or from feeling that further construction is unnecessary.

Flood control is a tremendous job, a long-haul job, and necessarily an expensive job, for it deals with mighty natural forces and is aimed at eliminating vast and widespread losses. It is all too easy to seek ways of lightening the task or to find excuses for believing that parts of it may not be necessary, after all. If we succumb to such temptations nature will punish us heavily. There will, and should, be changes and improvements in the Federal flood-control program. In particular, I believe there should be a constant improvement in the coordination between flood control and other programs aimed at conserving, controlling, and using our water resources. But innovations must be carefully scrutinized and constructively built as parts of integrated and tested programs, in such a way as to further our progress toward our long-range goal of comprehensive flood protection.

Since flood-control and navigation are so closely linked in many river valleys, it is appropriate, even in a talk devoted mainly to flood control, briefly to review the status and progress of Federal waterway programs. The rapid progress of recent years has continued and gathered impetus. The long-needed modernization of the Ohio River waterway has at last been begun. Construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is proceeding, and deepening of the connecting channels between the lakes has been authorized. The closure of Gavins Point Dam provides a substantial measure of control over the stability of stream flow on the lower Missouri—a necessary prelude to the further development of navigation on that important stream. Ground has been broken for the vital Calumet-Sag channel, which will link the Mississippi River navigation system with the Great Lakes. The completion of Algiers Lock and Canal provides a better link between the Mississippi and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, at the other end of our midcontinental system. The dedication of Demopolis Dam marked another important step forward on the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway. The great dredge *Essayons* has been brought temporarily from the east coast to the west to help speed up the work of dredging the troublesome bar at the mouth of the Columbia. Thus, in all parts of the country our waterways are being improved to carry the vastly increased traffic that is being brought to them, and connected to form a more closely interwoven, money-saving network.

The small-projects program begun last year deserves especial mention. Under this program the Corps was given about $4½ million to use on projects which can be completed for less than $150,000—virtually all of them navigation projects. Within the past fiscal year we have been able to complete some 60 small harbor projects ranging in cost from $5,000 to $147,000, and geographically from Maine to Alaska. This year $2 million more have been requested for this

work in the President's budget—a sum which would go a long way toward enabling us to get rid of our authorized backlog of these small projects.

Yet in our navigation program, like our flood-control program, enormous amounts of work remain to be done. Dollarwise the active backlog of authorized navigation projects is not quite as large as the backlog of flood-control projects—$4 billion as against $5 billion—but percentagewise it is about the same. The navigation program is about 40 percent complete while the flood-control program is almost 45 percent complete.

Naturally not all our needed projects can be built at once. It is not my intention today to try to analyze all the many factors outside the Corps' scope of responsibility which affect the progress of our programs. Within the Corps we are doing everything possible to make the process of transforming authorizations into completed projects as swift, smooth, efficient, and economical as possible.

But we are constantly hampered by operating problems beyond our control, the foremost of which is the shortage of skilled personnel. In fiscal year 1955 each of our civil-works employees had on the average five times as big a load of program to handle, measured by expenditures, as he did in 1946; and in fiscal 1956 the load per man will be more than six times as great as in 1946. Our staff is good, but I doubt that it is six times as good as it was in 1946. The problem of even maintaining efficiency—let alone increasing it—under such circumstances is thus all but insuperable. For instance, one of the critical stages in the process of transforming projects from report state to reality is the stage of planning and review surveys. This stage threatens to become a bottleneck. Yet we could not speed up this process, no matter how much more planning money we were given—because we do not have, and at the present Government schedules of grades and salaries cannot procure, enough trained personnel to carry a bigger planning program than we now have. Let me add that it is most important that our planning work does not fall below the present level. Anything less would impose a drag in our race to meet the Nation's flood-control, navigation, and other water-resource needs.

Outside the corps, I believe the greatest present handicap to orderly water-resource development is dissention and selfish conflict among various groups affected by water-resource programs. Once local interests become well entangled in disputes, serious and indefinite delay is inevitable.

Many important programs throughout the Nation are being held up because of local disunity or apathy. To a considerable degree, it was this factor which left the New England area exposed to last year's floods. Right now it is halting progress in the Columbia Basin. In addition to the perennial arguments over power, we now have disputes over fish and wildlife values blocking important flood-control and multiple-purpose reservoirs—this in valleys where the 1954 count showed only 9,000 salmon and steelhead combined coming up the river all year, and where despite all the talk of elk, helicopter searches have failed to reveal a single specimen. The old argument between upstream and downstream interests continues to blight developments for either group and to leave rich and populous areas vulnerable to the death and destruction of disastrous floods. Whatever the merits of these disputes, insofar as they prolong stalemates which prevent the construction of anything for anybody, they are destructive in their effects.

Hence in my opinion, the reconciliation of local interests is one of the most appropriate and important tasks to which the associations represented at this Congress can devote themselves. Unity is literally as important as money and comes ahead of money in the project process. The flood menace will continue to hang over our heads, and navigation and water supply and other important benefits will continue to go unrealized, as long as our programs remain incomplete. The advancement of those programs requires not only continued work and expenditure at all levels, but a continuous effort to remove obstacles. I submit that the latter task is as important as the former, and deserves equal consideration by this Congress.

Man's Power To Destroy Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is my notion of reading that should go on everyone's "must" list. It is an editorialized news story by Edwin A. Lahey, chief of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Daily News. Eddie Lahey, as usual, pulls no punches. If man hankers to wipe himself out of existence, all he has to do is to go ahead. Nobody except man himself and a little commonsense can stop him.

Here is Mr. Lahey's article from the Chicago Daily News of May 26, 1956:

HONOLULU, T. H.—Guess I'm a little slow on the draw in the presence of unfolding history.

I watched the detonation of the air-dropped hydrogen bomb at Bikini Atoll, but it was at least 18 hours before I did a double take, at which time I sat bolt upright in my bunk in the U. S. S. *Mount McKinley*.

"My God," shrieked my slow-working brain, "this thing is for dropping on people."

It is futile to try to describe the fullness of the bomb's voracious orbit.

The newspaper charts showing how much metropolitan area would be devastated by an H-bomb of given megaton yield simply do not give the picture.

TOO HORRIBLE FOR CHARTS

How can you draw a chart or paint a word picture of a fleeting instant in which millions of men and women and children would die, with their lungs, their veins, their ear drums, their intestines exploding, even while their bodies become coated with carbon made from their own flesh?

If we passed laws authorizing local police to pull out the fingernails of suspects while questioning them, it could seem no more inhuman than the thought of civilized people stacking up thermonuclear weapons to be used against one another.

And surely if enough people on both sides of the Iron Curtain could see a hydrogen bomb light up the predawn sky in an unholy luminescence, the pressure on all political leaders for peace would be most compulsive.

The President of the United States had better not witness one of these detonations. He alone must make the decision if we ever drop the H-bomb on people and his decision would certainly be "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought" if he could see hydrogen isotopes release their energy in thermonuclear fusion.

STORY FOR PRESS: WE MUST DO IT

The hydrogen bomb drop at Bikini, which a few newspapermen were permitted to witness, was an international political story, rather than a science report.

The most important political fact in the world today is that we have a B–52 jet bomber that can go anyplace in the world at speeds close to that of sound, with a hydrogen weapon neatly tucked in its belly.

In addition to helping our officials rattle the hydrogen bomb, the newspapermen on the trip were also urged to point out that the United States had no choice but to continue development and research in the art of total destruction so long as the Soviet Union drags its feet on disarmament proposals.

ASIANS REMEMBERER FIRST BOMB

A more subtle and difficult political aspect of the 1956 nuclear tests at the Pacific proving ground is the job of mollifying the apprehensions of the peoples of Asia.

The United States Information Service had two men at the tests, Joe Evans from the embassy in Tokyo and Mark Lewis, a reporter for the Voice of America.

They could, in all honesty, report the great care we exercised to see that the people of the Marshall Islands were protected against fallout, and to make sure that no Japanese tuna boats wandered into the danger zone, as one did in 1954.

Despite our best efforts to soothe the fears of Asians, there is still a recollection in the Far East that the first nuclear weapon ever dropped in combat was deposited on Asians. It might help if we announced that if ever another nuclear bomb is dropped in anger, it would be directed against other Caucasians, but this would hardly be practical.

New Jersey Observes 50th Anniversary of Food and Drug Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation Gov. Robert B. Meyner declared the week of January 20–26, 1956, as New Jersey Food and Drug Law Week to commemorate the enactment of the Federal pure food and drug law of 1906 as well as the complementary New Jersey Pure Food Act.

The abiding concern of New Jersey with pure food and drugs and its leadership in this field has been a constant source of encouragement to officials of other States in this matter as well as to the Federal Government. I am very interested in this myself and wish to take this occasion to commend the officials of my State for the fine work they are doing.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, serious consideration is being given at this time to the problem of affording the consumer the same protection against bad poultry which he has had against bad beef and pork for the past 50 years. Charges have been made that in some areas diseased, filthy, or rotten poultry is being shipped to market and that the present voluntary controls are inadequate. At this time poultry is the only major meat item which does not have compulsory inspection. It is kept clean by voluntary methods, and all evidence supports the conclusion that 99 percent of poultry reaching the consumer today is perfectly wholesome. It is the remaining 1 percent that is giving the trouble. Even

this 1 percent is a large factor, because the processing and sale of chickens and turkeys has grown into a vast industry involving about 1 billion birds a year.

A number of New Jerseyites testified on this matter before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate on May 10, 1956, along with other witnesses. These New Jersey spokesmen were Dr. Aaron H. Haskin, health officer, department of health, Newark; Joseph Hurl, chief meat inspector, meat inspection service, Newark Department of Health; and Dr. Oscar Sussman, for the New Jersey Health Officers Association. These leaders pointed out that over a quarter of a million pounds of poultry has been rejected as unfit for human consumption during the past 2 years.

Dr. Sussman made the telling point that when the consumer has confidence in the product, and is confident that it is not diseased or poisoned, then he will buy it in ever larger amounts.

The Newark area services not only Newark but all of the surrounding district, within a 25-mile radius, and along the Jersey coast, and even into New York State. This includes several millions of consumers who are protected by the inspection which New Jersey enforces.

The Department of Agriculture agrees that compulsory inspection of poultry is a major need and a Hoover Commission task force recommended compulsory inspection last year.

Excellent legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative J. PERCY PRIEST—H. R. 8599—and by Representative DON HAYWORTH—H. R. 9006—to protect the consumer, and to provide the needed inspection.

Testifying in support of the companion measure in the Senate, S. 3176, introduced by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, in addition to the New Jersey spokesmen mentioned earlier, were spokesmen for some two dozen major national consumer, women, health, and labor organizations. These groups included the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, the AFL–CIO, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, the American Nurses Association, the National Board, YWCA, and the Association of State Public Health Veterinarians.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Dick Preston, of the Washington Daily News, and the proclamation by Gov. Robert B. Meyner marking the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal pure food and drug law:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 18, 1956]

CONGRESS IS IN STEW OVER DISEASED POULTRY

A drive is on in Congress to give you the same protection against polluted chickens that you've had against bad beef and pork for 50 years.

It may succeed in bringing a compulsory inspection system—if Congress can settle a squabble over which agency should do the job.

The drive is sparked by charges that in some areas diseased, filthy, or rotten birds are being shipped to market, and that present voluntary controls are inadequate.

As of now, poultry is the only major meat item which does not have compulsory protection. It is kept clean by voluntary methods—and all evidence is that 99 percent of poultry today is perfectly wholesome.

TESTIMONY

But testimony just completed before a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee by members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, which wants the inspection, showed such happenings in some markets as these:

Workers in processing plants who had to handle sick birds, which were dressed and sold.

Filthy conditions, birds not fully cleaned, primitive sanitary facilities.

Poultry workers and consumers killed or made ill by psittacosis and other poultry ailments.

"One-third of all reported cases of food poisoning are traced each year to poultry or poultry dishes," Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, pointed out.

"We have a new saying around here: 'Give us this day our daily poison'."

EXAGGERATED

The Agriculture Department says such charges are exaggerated. Even so, Agriculture, along with health officials, consumer groups and a large part of the poultry industry, now agree that compulsory inspection is a major need. A Hoover Commission task force recommended it last year.

All point out that processing and sale of chickens and turkeys, once a farm-to-user operation, has now reached 1 billion birds a year.

On the ticklish question of who does the job, there's no such agreement.

The Labor Subcommittee's bill would assign inspection to the Food and Drug Administration on grounds the basic problem is one of health. The association of State and territorial public-health officers has endorsed this plan. But Food and Drug says it doesn't want the job.

DECIDE

A second bill would give it to the Agriculture Department and let the Secretary decide how to enforce the rules. He'd probably put the work in the hands of the Agricultural Marketing Service, which now handles the voluntary program used by one-fourth of processors.

Opponents say this would be a blow to consumers. The Agricultural Marketing Service, they say, is primarily an agency designed to promote the sale of farm goods, and works closely with producers.

Both sides agree that one division of Agriculture could do a satisfactory job. That is the Agriculture Research Service, which already checks all red meat moving in interstate commerce.

If a compromise can be reached, that is probably where the safeguarding of your chickens will be done.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal pure food and drug law; and the splendid achievements of the American food processing industry under that law are to be celebrated nationally and by the peoples of each State; and

Whereas throughout the past 5 decades the canners and other food processors of New Jersey, with the guidance of the Department of Health of the State of New Jersey, have played an important role in the development of higher food standards in the interest of the cunsumers; and

Whereas, there will be held during the week of January 20th to 26th, 1956, at Atlantic City in this State, the 49th annual convention of the National Canners Association, the organization that originally sponsored the enactment of the Federal pure food and drug law of 1906, as well as the complementary New Jersey Pure Food Act:

Now therefore, I, Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the week of January 20 to 26, 1956 as New Jersey Food and Drug Law Week, and I direct that the Department of Health of the State of New Jersey and other State agencies join with the National Canners Association and all other professional, scientific, industrial, agricultural, labor, and civic organizations in the commemoration of the enactment of the Federal pure food and drug law, and of the achievements of the food processing industry of this State and all other States in the development of the present high levels of safety and quality of all processed foods.

Given, under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Jersey, this 16th day of January in the year of Our Lord, 1956, and in the Independence of the United States the 180th.

By the governor:

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.
EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Secretary of State.

Importation of Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who frequently have voiced the concern we all feel over the undersupply of scientists that is coming from our universities will be interested in the following article in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of May 27, 1956:

ZENITH GOING TO EUROPE FOR ITS SCIENTISTS—ADS IN LONDON FOLLOW SUCCESS ABROAD

The search for technical help has been expanded overseas by Zenith Radio corporation.

This came to light yesterday with a news dispatch from London that big advertisements offering jobs to British scientists had appeared in two national newspapers.

The ads required that applicants be willing to consider American citizenship, for which Zenith was prepared to sponsor them. They invited job applications from graduate physicists, physical chemists, and physical metallurgists.

Zenith officials in Chicago said yesterday the ads were part of a program including Holland, France, and Belgium.

HOLLAND FIRST SUGGESTED

Dr. Alexander Ellett, Zenith vice president of research, said the program really started 2 years ago with a suggestion that the company consider Holland as a source for the scarce supply of scientists.

Ads were run in Holland, and as a result, 10 engineers, physicists, or chemists were brought to Zenith, 8 from Holland, 1 from France, and 1 from Belgium.

"They have worked out very well," Ellett said. "Their education and training was equal to that in the United States. With scientists in such short supply, it's not unusual that we should try overseas sources again."

Asked about the American citizenship requirement, he said Zenith was not interested in paying the transportation to America of someone who may be coming over just to look around for a year or so.

REPLIES ARE ATTRACTED

A second set of ads has appeared in Holland recently, and brought a number of replies. He said Zenith interviewers will go to that country this summer to question applicants.

Yesterday's British ads followed a warning Friday by Robert S. T. Chorley, a baron, secretary of the Association of University Teachers, of a serious drain on Britains' supply of scientists. He said if England is not "very careful a large part of the cream [of scientists] will be skimmed off and deposited in America."

A factor is the salary difference. American salaries start at about $5,000 annually. A young British scientist can expect the equivalent of $2,800 if he starts industrial work.

Washington, D. C., Has Unique Opportunity To Obtain an Art Gallery and Preserve Historic Lafayette Park Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Nation's Capital have a unique opportunity at this very moment to obtain a great art gallery intimately associated with the early life of their city, and, at the same time, to preserve the character of historic Lafayette Park unchanged.

Washington, unless its citizens move decisively now, will lose a venerable landmark if Congress dooms the old Court of Claims Building at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., and the present character of Lafayette Park may be lost forever.

The old red brick Renaissance-style building with brownstone facings and ornaments adjacent to the Blair House and Lafayette Park, and across from the White House and the Old State Department Building, was built by William W. Corcoran as an art gallery and he deeded it to the city of Washington in 1869. Architect of the original Corcoran Gallery was James Renwick, one of the country's foremost architects of that time, who also designed the Smithsonian Institute Building.

Washington architects say the building is well worth preserving for its intrinsic value as an example of early building and that it represents a phase of development of American architecture.

Extremely interesting is the fact that the building was constructed "for the perpetual establishment and encouragement of painting, sculpture, and the fine arts generally." Mr. Corcoran desired his trustees always to show special interest in the productions of American artists. Down through the years, the best examples of the work of native painters and sculptors were displayed in the old gallery.

Under legislation pending before the Senate and House Public Works Committees the Architect of the Capitol would be empowered to construct a modern building on the present site of the Court of Claims Building. Tentative plans call for a five-story building with the exterior of limestone. Many people feel that if the Old Court of Claims Building is razed and a modern building put in its place it will be only a matter of time until the present character of Lafayette Park is changed beyond recognition.

New York City, rich beyond all other American cities in cultural facilities, obtained its great civic center almost free because of tax delinquency on the part of its previous owners. The citizens of the Nation's Capital have a similar, unique, once-in-a-lifetime, opportunity to obtain a great art center almost without cost. I hope they will have the courage and the vision to seize this opportunity in the same way that any other community would.

I include here an address I gave to the Federal City Council on May 24, 1956, in which I discussed this and related matters:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OPENING THE SPRING MEETING OF THE FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, MAY 24, 5 P. M., SOUTH AMERICAN ROOM, STATLER HOTEL

Ambassador Garrett, Chairman Addison, and distinguished members and guests of the Federal City Council, I'm delighted to have an opportunity to talk with you this afternoon and to think out loud with you about the future of Washington as the cultural center of our Nation and of the world. It's a subject which, in my opinion, has received far too little attention in our Capital City although it is just as important from a community development standpoint as the economic and civic problems with which all of us here work so closely.

I am especially glad to be able to discuss this subject at this time and before this group. As the name of your organization indicates, you are particularly concerned with Washington as the Federal City—a concept which, as I shall presently show, our Founding Fathers intended to be synonomous with that of a cultural capital. And the indispensable role played by your group and your president, George Garrett, in such projects as the Southwest redevelopment plan for beautifying our Nation's Capital demonstrates that you are well qualified to play a leading role in moulding Washington's cultural future. It is my deep conviction that Washington can attain its place in the sun as a leading cultural center of the world only through the active and close cooperation of the Congress, local government officials, and of civic organizations such as the Federal City Council and the Washington Board of Trade.

WHAT IS HONORED IN A COUNTRY IS CULTIVATED THERE

This is why I shall take as my text for this afternoon Plato's well-known statement in the Republic that "What is honored in a country is cultivated there." Cultivation of anything, be it a corn or wheatfield, or a cultural center, involves active participation and hard work.

THE FEDERAL CITY AS A CULTURAL CENTER

But first, let's consider for a moment the artistic heritage of our Nation's Capital. It is one which goes back to our Founding Fathers, who intended the Capital City to be a focal point for learning and the cultivation of the fine arts.

Washington and Jefferson and others knew the purpose of the liberal and fine arts is to mould capable and cultivated human beings and, therefore, to help build better citizens and better communities. The desire to make the Nation's Capital a great center of art and learning was evidenced by our first President, George Washington, in many ways and he worked hard to translate this vision into reality. He provided funds in his will for a national university in the District of Columbia "to which the youth might be sent for the completion of their education in all the branches of polite literature, in arts and sciences, in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government." Such an education, he maintained, "would have the tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising empire, thereby to do away local attachments and State prejudices, as far as the nature of things would, or indeed ought to admit, from our national councils."

JEFFERSON'S BILL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF FINE ARTS

Jefferson, a renaissance man as Albert Schweitzer is today, was a brilliant statesman, author, architect, and musician. As third President Jefferson became, by virtue of his office, a manager and chief superintendent charged with the construction and completion of the United States Capitol Building. He brought to this task a well-equipped mind, architecture having formed a portion of his education. Like Washington, Jefferson considered the fine arts to be as necessary as the other disciplines to a knowledge of the State. Consequently, his bill for a system of public education provided for a public art gallery and a Department of Fine Arts.

WASHINGTON'S CULTURE IMPORTED AND "PASTED ON," SAYS KIPLINGER

All this was, you'll agree, a good beginning for the National Capital which, in the course of time, as the Washington Star predicted in 1852, was "destined to be the most powerful and brilliant capital in the world." Despite the best intentions in the world, however, we still have a long way to go—after 157 years—before these dreams are realized. Powerful our Capital City certainly is, but how far we have yet to go before it may be held to be brilliant may be clear from a statement by one of your own council members, W. M. Kiplinger, who said in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, that "despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on."

OUR COUNTRY HOLDS CREATIVE ARTISTS IN LOW ESTEEM, SAYS KENNAN

If this is a correct analysis, we must ask ourselves the question, Why has Washington failed to develop into the breeding place for the arts that our Founding Fathers obviously intended it to be? A second question might be, Why is it that after 157 years a shrewd world traveler like my constituent, Former Russian Ambassador George F. Kennan, can say with truth that "I can think of few countries in the world where the artist, the writer, the composer, or the thinker is held in such general low esteem as he is here in our country."

CULTURAL LEADERS LACK THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF BUSINESSMEN

I am convinced that the answer does not lie in any lack of interest or ability among the citizens at large. Rather, it is simply

that we lack on the art front of American life the aggressiveness and the habit of attack and success we have so brilliantly cultivated in our commercial, industrial, and financial levels of action. Certainly mere civic pride in imported cultural events—which Washington has plenty of—is not enough. What counts in cultural matters, as in all other kinds of progress, is civic action at the grass roots—the kind of well-coordinated, hard-hitting action which can break through lethargy on a dozen fronts and make and keep Washington a truly dynamic city. In particular, it is the work done by organizations such as the Federal City Council, the American Institute of Architects, the National Symphony Orchestra, and, surprisingly, the District of Columbia Recreation Department, which is developing music and fine arts programs that are attracting national attention, which keeps the fires of community progress burning brightly here.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS FOR WASHINGTON'S CULTURAL BACKWARDNESS

As I indicated earlier, the responsibility for improving Washington as a cultural city is three-pronged. It must be shouldered by Congress, by the District government, and by civic groups such as your own. I need hardly elaborate for the members of this council, who know the facts of political life here better than most, the critical role played by Congress in our Capital City. The citizens of Washington are deprived of virtually all voice or representation in local or national government, and the District Commissioners are appointed by the President. Washington can't build a sewer, collect garbage, or put a dog in the pound without a prior O. K. by the Congress.

A BALANCED RECREATION PROGRAM INCLUDES ARTS AND SPORTS

This is why it is up to Congress, in its role as the City Council of Washington—which is what the District Committees of the House and Senate are—to sympathetically consider the needs of the residents of the Federal city for creative art programs in which they can participate. It is extremely encouraging that the Recreation Department of the District of Columbia has begun to move in this direction. Their National Music Week observance, with Sherman Adams and Robert E. McLaughlin as honorary chairman and vice chairman, respectively, which included the distinguished production of an opera in the classic tradition is to be highly commended. Music and the arts cost money, however, just like playgrounds and sports, and must be included in any balanced recreation program. Your support and encouragement is absolutely vital to Milo Christiansen and his fine staff at District of Columbia Recreation.

THE 1935 ACT OF CONGRESS TO PRESERVE HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The revived interest of Congress in Washington's cultural status is taking a variety of forms, of course. There is recognition, for example, that progress can be made sometimes by holding tightly to our cultural heritage. I made a determined effort to keep the Civil Service Building here from being destroyed and, as a result, am happy to be able to say that the General Services Administration and the National Park Service have just this week established review procedures pursuant to a 1935 act of the Congress which will prevent the thoughtless razing of any structure of national significance.

The rate of destruction of notable buildings in this country is so dangerously high that many are concerned lest we be largely despoiled of the structures which identify the historic achievements of our people. In establishing the review procedures we are at long last joining the ranks of the great nations of Europe which have maintained national lists of sites, buildings, and objects which are declared a part of the national treasure and are designated for careful preservation.

But if Washington is to become the cultural center of light and learning envisioned by Washington and Jefferson we must not only jealously guard and preserve our cultural heritage, we have a most solemn obligation to add to it and to blaze new trails. Bold ideas are required, and legislative action to carry some of them out is essential.

BIPARTISAN POLICY ESSENTIAL IN THE ARTS AS WELL AS FOREIGN POLICY

There is a growing realization at the highest levels of government, just in time it turns out, of the importance of the arts both at home and in our foreign policy.

Upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower the Congress in 1954 and again in 1955 appropriated $5 million to send our leading orchestras, plays, performing artists, and athletes abroad. This fund, known as the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, also covers trade fairs, and in both these fields the Communist bloc is spending enormous sums and devoting much effort—$38 million for trade fairs alone last year.

The bipartisan interest of Congress in the fine arts does not arise because the Communist leaders charge us before the world with being cultureless materialists. The interest is broader and deeper than that, and members of both parties are sponsors of legislative proposals of great importance to the arts and our cultural status as a nation.

THE PRESIDENT URGED CONGRESS TO ENACT ART LEGISLATION

You will recall that the President in his 1955 message on the state of the Union told the Congress that "in the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

This statement has had a terrific impact throughout our country in cultural circles. It is a great statement on the arts regardless of the fact that the President as an amateur artist is about on a par with former President Truman as a musician.

With this foreword, I would like to talk briefly about a very ambitious project which is underway in the Nation's Capital, one for which I solicit the active and enthusistic support of every member of your council.

SMITHSONIAN GALLERY OF ART LONG OVERDUE

This project, authorized by Public Law 128, 84th Congress, calls for the formulation of plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center. As I testified at the hearings on this legislation last year, the fine arts section of my H. R. 21, which some 15 of my colleagues from both parties joined me in sponsoring, referred to the Smithsonian Gallery of Art authorized by the Congress in 1938 to house the $10 million National Collection of Fine Arts.

TEN MILLION DOLLARS NATIONAL COLLECTION BADLY HOUSED

In its 1953 report to President Eisenhower on art and Government the Commission of Fine Arts headed by David E. Finley strongly recommended the early establishment of this gallery. And Dr. Carmichael, brilliant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, advises me that this great gallery has the very highest priority, ranking besides the air museum and the Museum of History and Technology.

With some help from an administration which clearly is aware of the value of the fine arts, and with hard-hitting support of community-action groups such as yours, the music and fine arts center could soon become a reality.

COURT OF CLAIMS BUILDING URGED AS MUNICIPAL ART GALLERY

In this connection I would like to suggest that the Court of Claims Building at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., near the White House, Lafayette Park, the old State Department Building, and adjacent to the Blair House, be used either as a temporary home for the national collection or as a municipal gallery. The Court of Claims Building was the original Corcoran Gallery of Art—as the Washington Star told us recently in a moving article entitled "Few Can Spare a Tear for Venerable Landmark." This old gallery, its contents, the ground, and the endowment were valued at $1,600,000 in 1869 when William W. Corcoran gave them all to Washington. New York City got its great civic center almost free because of tax delinquency. The residents of the Nation's Capitol have a similar unique once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to obtain a great art center—and one intimately connected with the early life of Washington—almost without cost. I hope they will have the courage and the vision to seize this opportunity in the same way that any other community would.

FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL COMPARABLE TO ALLEGHENY CONFERENCE

I would like to urge you to make the establishment of the proposed civic and cultural center a council project along with those other important civic undertakings in which you are engaged.

Individually, many of your distinguished members are already making great contributions to Washington's cultural renascence. You now have the opportunity to support such important cultural projects as the proposed stadium and the civic and cultural center, and to take the same vital part in the reawakening of Washington as the Allegheny Conference is taking in the growth of Pittsburgh.

Remembering Plato's classic dictum that "what is honored in a country is cultivated there," you can and you must, I think, demonstrate to freemen everywhere that nowhere else in the world are learning and the fine arts more highly honored than in the Capital of the free world. Let us work together, then, to complete the task so ably begun by our Founding Fathers.

This spring meeting, with its distinguished representation from the legislative, administrative, and civic elements of our city is ample proof that you are ready to accept this basic challenge. Working together we can bring the unique heritage of the Federal city as a center of art and learning to triumphant realization.

Memorial Day, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, May 30, is Memorial Day. On this day in 1956, the guns of war are silent and the battlefields are still. But even as the soft winds caress the hallowed ground where the poppies grow and our American heroes sleep, we cannot forget the agonizing hours of yesterday. No,

it would be a shallow thing indeed, if we were to forget that the comforts and pleasures that we enjoy today were gained only through the supreme sacrifice of those who fought and died to protect and preserve this great Republic. Our brightest, and yet our saddest pages of history are those that tell of the deeds of our men and women who fought and died for the liberty of this country. When we join hands in paying tribute to the memory of those great Americans, let us truly honor them by resolving to continually work for that which they fought, a permanent peace.

I wish to place into the RECORD several Memorial Day editorials which appeared in South Dakota newspapers this past week:

[From the De Smet (S. Dak.) News]

MEMORIAL DAY AN OCCASION "TO HERE DEDICATE * * *" FOR A BETTER COMMUNITY AND WORLD

(By Aubrey S. Sherwood)

We have a date—each of us. The day is Wednesday, May 30—Memorial Day. The place is any public service of memorial to our Nation's honored dead, if at all possible for us to attend. For the veterans and the one not called upon to give his or her service to our country, there is the remembrance of those we knew, whose lives, like ours, were young and hopeful but to whom came the call of death in uniform while on duty. These men we must never forget.

As customary, on May 30, we will pause to honor the war dead of our Nation, make the occasion also a memorial to our own loved ones who have left this earth. As Lincoln said: "It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this," though each one to whom we pay honor with his or her death hallowed the ground in which they sleep far more than we who live can do for them.

And so, continuing with the thought of this great leader of our Nation, it is for us the living to consecrate ourselves to the unfinished work they left behind them, to the personal tasks, the community, State, and Nation, yes, and now even the world.

Those tasks are all about us, good works, in word and in deed. As the greatest of all leaders taught, they are tasks of service: "He that would be the greatest among you, let him be the servant of others." It was He who showed simple, common folk how to be great through service—showing, teaching, scolding at times—to leave a lesson for all future generations of men.

So Memorial Day is more than occasion to present ourselves at a public gathering, to decorate graves, to bow our heads in prayer, and in some solemnity to reflect upon life and death and shed a tear for those who have gone before. More than these, we may make it a day of review of our own lives, still given us, a rededication of our lives—our time, our thought, our service, our money—to the end that we may build for ourselves that which we both take with us and leave behind, the honor of those who remain.

The day is Wednesday and all over America, those who do not forget the sacrifices made by our war dead will gather in groups, large and small, at cemeteries in country, town, and city, for that observance.

[From the Miner County Pioneer, Howard, S. Dak.]

(By Imogene E. Davison)

Memorial Day next Wednesday; a day that calls us not only in reverence to the shrine of the dead, but in enthusiasm to the service of our country. We are the sharers of a great glory. Let us renew again our resolution by the graves of fallen comrades, that this Nation owes an eternal debt to all soldiers, sailors, and other defenders of its shores.

[From the Hamlin County Republican, Castlewood, S. Dak.]

(By Jack Dorman)

Wednesday will give us a chance to pay tribute to the men who gave their lives and services to their country during the wars in which our great country has participated. It shouldn't be asking too much for us to take off a few hours to attend the services at the school and at the cemetery. After all the men we will be honoring either paid with their lives, or gave important years of their lives to help keep our country free. The least we can do for them it to help pay tribute at these services.

[From the Clear Lake (S. Dak.) Courier]

(By T. R. Burges)

Next Wednesday is Memorial Day and the local post of the American Legion has again gone to a good deal of effort in preparing a fitting program for the occasion. It is so easy to make the day a Roman holiday, to be used for everything except its purpose, and I think the Legion here is to be commended for their continual efforts every year to bring to our people a fitting meaning of the day. Picnics, fishing, and other activities are all good but at the same time everyone should reserve part of their day to pay respects for those who have gone on, those who gave their lives that we might and do enjoy the many blessings which are ours today. We cannot begin to do the honor so richly deserved by those who today lie asleep but we can remember. Attend the exercises here next Wednesday forenoon, or at some other program, and you will feel better for it.

Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among the thousands of visitors to Washington today are three outstanding young men from Kalispell, Mont.

They are Mr. Richard M. Nelson, science teacher at the Flathead County High School, and two of his students, Everett O'Hare and Gerald Miller.

Mr. Nelson has just been designated teacher of the year by McCall's magazine.

The article in the current issue of McCall's begins with this quotation from President Eisenhower:

It is undeniable * * * that with science assuming a role of ever-increasing importance in our lives, the science teacher of today exercises an extraordinary influence.

Tomorrow President Eisenhower will get to meet one of the outstanding science teachers in the United States. He will receive gifts from the students. O'Hare is bringing a solar-powered transistor radio which he made himself. Miller has a decision meter for the President.

Today they visited the Smithsonian Institution and the Bureau of Standards. They had lunch with Senator MURRAY, Senator MANSFIELD, and me. Our guests also included Miss Barbara Lyman, of Montana, queen of this year's Washington Cherry Blossom Festival.

Selection of Mr. Nelson as McCall's fifth teacher of the year is particularly timely. It comes when government and industry are calling for more qualified science teachers to insure our continued national safety and industrial strength.

Montana is proud of this recognition of our teachers and schools—especially since the McCall honor roll of teachers includes Mr. Russell Bay, of Corvallis, Mont. The McCall's article follows:

MCCALL'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Not long ago, when 300 high school seniors, chosen most likely to succeed as research scientists of the future, were asked to name "the one person most influential in the development of my career," almost two-thirds of them answered, "My science teacher."

The significance of that fact is worth marking in a period of education that has been termed "the cold war of the science classrooms." In naming Richard M. Nelson, of Kalispell, Mont., as teacher of the year, McCall's proudly pays tribute to the science-teaching profession and its vital contributions to our national welfare and growth—present, past, and future.

Mr. Nelson, a bachelor of 30, has dynamically demonstrated that his responsibilities toward his students are governed by his responsibilities toward society as a whole. It is his conviction that to teach is to make a subject a current experience, one that a teen-ager can become intensely interested in and develop an affection for.

As a high school student in Denver, Richard Nelson had decided to major in drama when he entered the University of Denver, but he was guided to a love for science by his father, Dr. Alfred C. Nelson, a professor of chemical engineering at the university. As far as Flathead County, Mont., is concerned, Richard became a science evangelist as well.

Mr. Nelson practically writes his own laboratory manuals for a new Flathead County High School course in Earth Science, photographing local examples of geological and geographical phenomena from an airplane piloted by a friend.

Some of the science department's expansion has been due to the increase in total enrollment in the school, but much of it, it is presently felt by the faculty, is due to a newly generated student interest in science subjects. A rewarding number of recently graduated science students from F. C. H. S. have gone on to prepare for chemical, mining and civil engineering, medical, dental and laboratory careers. Mr. Nelson is well aware that industry is at present pouring money into science scholarships and is searching for students with scientific leanings.

The flourishing Science Club, sponsored by Mr. Nelson, has organized and presented an annual local science fair for the past 3 years. The first fair was held in the physics laboratory at the high school, and 800 citizens crowded in to look with astonishment upon the 60-odd creations of their teen-agers. In the spring of 1955, 15 student projects were selected for exhibition at the 4-State Inland Empire Science Fair held in Spokane, Wash. The projects varied from handmade "geometric" jewelry to a hand-built jet engine. The first grand prize was awarded to one of Mr. Nelson's students, Everett O'Hare. O'Hare's project, one of 360 competing, was a working model illus-

trating the principles of microwave communications. This year the overgrown science project will exhibit first at the Montana Science Fair, the first ever to be held. Mr. Nelson will serve as district chairman.

Mr. Nelson's classroom technique preserves discipline with humor, invites informal but controlled discussion among his students. A forthright individual himself, Mr. Nelson enjoys being challenged. "He is a teacher who tempers a bawling-out with a word of encouragement after class," says Principal Kenneth A. Rawson. "The students like him and have confidence in him."

The community which supplies Mr. Nelson with students is fully conscious of his high value as a teacher. When it was learned that Mr. Nelson had been named by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mary M. Condon, as a Montana nominee for Teacher of the Year, parents volunteered by the dozens to provide testimonials in his behalf. "His work," wrote one admiring father of a Nelson student, "has brought to the attention of this agricultural and lumbering community the world of science." The townspeople loyally credit Mr. Nelson's thorough instruction, enthusiasm, patience, and assistance for the high ratings the Flathead exhibits have received at the science fairs. Community-wise, Mr. Nelson enjoys the prestige that in another scholastic climate a successful football coach would enjoy.

Mr. Nelson is conscientious in keeping abreast of the need for scientists in industry. No textbook theorist, he has worked summers for the Bureau of Reclamation at Hungry Horse Reservoir, as an instrument man for a civil engineer, and in construction work at a nearby Anaconda Aluminum plant. A man who earns $4,120 a year as a teacher, he constantly points out to his science students the shortages, needs, and opportunities in scientific and engineering vocations. As for his personal ambition, he wants only to continue teaching science students on the high-school level.

"The primary objective of a high-school physics course," asserts Mr. Nelson, "is to lay the foundation for the eventual understanding of the atomic era by the layman."

Men like Richard Nelson, who deny themselves extra material comforts that could be had for the asking outside the teaching profession, are the unsung national heroes. Often they have to fight apathetic communities and backward school systems for the admission of science courses into the curriculum. Last year, as Mr. Nelson knows, the Soviet Union, which can compel its youth to enter scientific careers, graduated twice as many engineers as did the United States.

According to David Sarnoff of the Radio Corporation of America, "a lack of qualified teachers has developed at grade levels for subjects like physics, chemistry, and mathematics * * *. Our safety and our industrial strength rest upon our success in expanding the Nation's reservoir of physicists and scientists, trained engineers and technicians * * *. Science and technology are the very hallmarks of American civilization."

Mr. Sarnoff's plea for more students and teachers imbued with the inquiring mind and the love of facts is, in its way, a fitting salute to Richard M. Nelson.

McCall's Honor Roll of Teachers

These teachers earned special mention in 1956 for their significant contributions to the improvement of national teaching standards:

Mr. Russell Bay, Corvallis School, Corvallis, Mont. His eighth-grade pupils learn the satisfactions of citizenship through community participation: taking the village census and public-opinion polls, constructing a model house, writing editorials for their class newspaper and working on a 160-acre conservation project.

Miss Anne Gibbs, Churchill County High School, Fallon Nev. Her warm and sound relationships with the students in her English classes have encouraged a number of them to become teachers. School-community understanding has been fostered through her class news items.

Mrs. Maude A. Hudson, Greenwood High School, Greenwood, S. C. An energetic, resourceful teacher, mother, citizen and church leader, her distributive-education classes aim toward adjusting the future of her students, most of whom will not attend college.

Miss Frances L. Johnson, Windom High School, Windom, Minn. Her enthusiasm enhances her students' respect for English as a living language. She works consistently for professional improvement and teacher welfare, and she sets high standards of scholarship for her pupils.

Mrs. Kathryn Stagge Marr, Goshen Elementary School, Goshen, Ohio. She brings to young elementary teachers a helpful variety of lively, challenging practices of good teaching. Her immediate rewards are the affection and respect of pupils, parents and fellow teachers.

Miss Velora Reed, Mesilla School, Las Cruces, N. Mex. Her pre-first-grade boys and girls, who come from Spanish-speaking homes, sense her unusual sympathy, understanding, patience and affection as they learn their first English words along with the three R's.

Mr. John P. Shaw, Concord Senior High School, Concord, N. H. His dedication to the total welfare of high-school youth has expanded his role of outstanding social studies teacher and debate coach to that of guidance counselor. He promoted a statewide social studies program.

How We Found the Teacher of the Year

Mr. Nelson was selected by McCall's from teachers nominated by state departments of education in all parts of the Nation at the invitation of Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, and Dr. Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers. Representatives approved by the Office of Education and McCall's studied and observed the nominees at work over a period of several months. From the recommendations, the editors selected Mr. Nelson, who is the fifth cited in McCall's annual project honoring teachers.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Work of the United States Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared indicating the importance of the work of the United States Information Agency in carrying on the fight for freedom in the world today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Last year I offered an amendment in the Senate to the Interstate Oil Compact when it was before the Senate. Article V of the compact states:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

My amendment to the Interstate Oil Compact merely asked that the Justice Department make a study and annual report to the Congress as to whether or not the clear purpose of the compact, as stated by the compact States themselves in article V was being carried out.

The reason for my amendment was simple. The Constitution of the United States says:

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

Therefore, Mr. President, the Interstate Oil Compact, could only come about and exist by the express permission of the Congress of the United States. The right for States to organize in a compact is that of Congress to grant or withhold, and there is no issue of States rights involved.

The interstate oil compact allows the States to get together to set production levels and prices, etc., for the express purpose of conserving gas and oil. This is an unusual grant of power and one which neither States nor businesses enjoy except where specifically sanctioned by Congress. Article V of the compact itself states that the setting of prices and the limiting of production, etc., shall be done for no other purpose than for conservation. All my amendment did was to ask the Justice Department to make a yearly report as to whether or not the clear language of article V, agreed to by the States themselves, was being carried out. Without my amendment, Congress has no check or any yearly report on the activities of the compact in this respect.

When the Justice Department submitted its request this year, it asked for $763,090 and for 147 additional positions to carry out the purposes of my amendment. The House committee passed this amount. The Senate committee, however, recognized that this was an absurd request and that the Justice Department had no real grounds, either in the legislative intent or the job to be done, to justify such a request. As it was my amendment to the oil compact, and as my remarks in the Senate make up the only substantive legislative record, I want to say that I concur with the committee's feeling. I believe the Justice Department's request was an attempt to reduce the real purpose of my amendment to absurdity and to kill any effort to carry out the reasonable intent of the amendment.

I wrote to Senator JOHNSON to this effect on May 18, but I believe that the bill had been marked up before he or his committee had an opportunity to consider my letter.

The committee cut the amount from $763,090 to $25,000. I believe that if the Department really carries out the intent of Congress and goes about this task in a reasonable way, that the $25,000 granted by the committee is quite adequate for the job. This amount is enough to insure that the Justice Department can have no excuse whatsoever to get on with their clear duty and responsibility under the law and under the clear language and intent of my amendment to the oil compact.

The original Justice Department request was ridiculous. When pressed before the Senate committee to support the amount, they fell back on the legislative intent of Congress. I believe I know as much about that as anyone else, and I can say that there certainly is nothing in the history of the amendment in the Senate to justify $763,090.

It is a clear principle of Government, that the Congress and the legislative branch should be able to secure, as a matter of right, that the spirit of the acts of the executive are suffused with the clear purposes and intents of the Congress. In this case the Justice Department is trying to kill the amendment to the oil compact by asking for an absurd amount. I want them to have no excuse for failing to carry out the clear intent of the Congress and I believe that as the author of the original amendment I can say that the amount the committee has given them is enough to do a workmanlike job and to carry out the legislative intent of the Congress.

I ask that a letter which I sent to the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Justice Department Appropriations, and addressed to its chairman, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I wish to say that this letter probably arrived too late for the committee to consider it before this bill was marked up, and that I ask that it be included in the RECORD because it could not be included in the hearings, and because it is self-explanatory.

I attach hereto the complete contents of the letter from the Department of Justice to the Honorable PERCY PRIEST commenting on my amendment when it was before the House committee last year and which I quote in my letter to Senator JOHNSON be included in the RECORD at this point.

This latter insertion especially shows very clearly that from the beginning the Justice Department has been less than reasonable in their attitude toward this amendment.

I am happy that the Senate committee saw through their request and has acted as it has. Further, I want to say that I expect, and I believe the Congress has a right to expect, that the Justice Department get on with its job and stop trying to kill or make ridiculous the amendment to the oil compact. The first report, if the Justice Department has done its job, shoud be ready very soon.

MAY 18, 1956.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Justice Department Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATON JOHNSON: My attention has been called to the request of the Department of Justice for $700,000 to carry out the legislative intent of the amendment to the Interstate Oil Compact which I introduced and which was carried in the Senate during the last sesison. I understand that the Justice Department contemplates hiring something like 110 investigators, opening 3 new offices, and increasing the Antitrust Division by something like 25 percent in order to carry out the legislative intent of my amendment.

May I say that this request by the Justice Department is absurd. I can only think it was done in an attempt to reduce the real purpose of my amendment to absurdity and to kill any effort to carry out the reasonable intent of the amendment. I am convinced that a staff of 2 to 4 competent economists, 1 to 2 lawyers, and perhaps 1 to 2 investigators, at most, would be adequate to carry out the legislative intent of my amendment. I am at a loss to find anything in the legislative record of my amendment from which the Department could possibly request the sum of money and the new staff it has asked for. As it was my amendment, and as my statement was the only statement of substance about the amendment in the Senate, I believe that I am in a position to state the legislative intent.

The purpose of my amendment was simple. The Constitution of the United States says:

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

Therefore, the Interstate Oil Compact, like other compacts, can only come about and exist by the express permission of the Congress of the United States. There is no issue of States' rights involved, for the right is that of Congress to grant or withhold.

Article V of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas is worded as follows:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

My purpose in offering the amendment was to make certain that the clear intent of the States entering the compact under article V was being carried out. The Congress makes the grant of power to the States involved in the compact but until my amendment, there was no agency of the Congress or Federal Government which reported to the Congress whether or not the clear language of the compact was adhered to.

The interstate oil compact meets only occasionally. I am reasonably certain that the records of the compact are kept where they are accessible. Further, the compact invited a representative of the Antitrust Division to attend one of its recent meetings. For some reason, the Justice Department did not even send a representative. I must say that the Department of Justice has acted in a most curious way in this as in other situations affecting my amendment.

After the compact was agreed to by the Senate, it went to the House committee. The House asked the Department of Justice for its opinion on my amendment. The reply received by the Justice Department was an amazing one—it was signed by Deputy Attorney General Rogers. I shall quote the relevant part:

"The general purpose of this provision seems unobjectionable. However, the investigation into the operation of the compact contemplated under the provision would apparently involve, among other matters, questions in the field of economics. Such functions do not properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice which is the chief litigating arm of the Government. It is believed, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to be designated to perform such functions."

This quotation is the entire substance of any reference in the Justice Department's letter concerning my amendment.

At a later date, I questioned the head of the Antitrust Division, Judge Barnes, concerning this letter. He admitted before the Banking and Currency Committee that the Antitrust Division did hire numerous economists, that it did have an economics division or section, that this was a legitimate function of the Antitrust Division, and that the subjects of limiting production, stabilizing or fixing prices, creating or perpetuating a monopoly, etc., were ones they dealt with regularly in the normal course of events. Thus, the statement that questitons in the field of economics are not functions which properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice is one which does not bear examination. When the Assistant Attorney General, by any clear meaning of his own words, admitted that the Justice Department's contention was ridiculous, I think it is clear that the provision was unobjectionable to them.

We all know that for conservation purposes, the compact is allowed to set prices, limit production, etc. As this is an unusual grant to any group, private or public, Congress should have a regular report on such activities. The compact itself, I understand, has given the Justice Department every cooperation. Thus, I am convinced that the Attorney General, in making his request, is attempting to reduce what is a simple and straightforward amendment, requiring the use of a small group of competent people and the writing of a yearly report, to absudity.

I sincerely hope that the Appropriations Committee will appropriate funds in the amount necessary to carry out the simple provisions of the amendment. It is difficult to make an exact estimate of the amount needed but it would probably be in the neighborhood of $100,000, which would be enough to pay the salaries of a half dozen competent lawyers and economists and the secretarial help and printing costs, etc., which such a staff would need. Certainly, no new offices or 100 investigators are needed.

I wish to state again that I can find no evidence whatsoever in the legislative history of my amendment to support the Justice Department's request, and I believe that as it was my amendment, I am as competent to interpret the legislative intent as anyone.

I hope that this letter will be useful to the committee and if the committee so desires, I see no reason why it should not be made a part of the RECORD.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your requests for the views of the Department of Justice concerning House Joint Resolution 143 and Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas was originally executed at Dallas, Tex. on February 16, 1935, by representatives of the oil-producing States (Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico), with recommendations to other States for ratification. The States of Kansas, Illinois and Colorado subsequently ratified the original compact. House Joint Resolution 407 was introduced in the 74th Congress for the purpose of giving consent to the compact under the provisions of article I, section 10 of the Constitution. It was passed on August 27, 1935 (Public Res. 64, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 939). The approval was for a period of two years, expiring September 1, 1937. The compact has continued in effect since that time through periodic enactments by the Congress similar to House Joint Resolution 407 of the 74th Congress. The last enactment (Public Law 128, 82d Cong., Aug. 28, 1951) continued Congressional consent to the compact until September 1, 1955. The joint resolutions would give Congressional consent to a further extension and renewal of the compact until September 1, 1959.

Whether the proposd extension and renewal of the compact should be approved involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers to make no recommendation. However, there is one provision of Senate Joint Resolution 38, as passed by the Senate, which this Department deems objectionable. Section 2 of that joint resolution reads:

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall, within one year from September 1, 1955, and annually thereafter for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, make a report to the Congress as to whether or not in his opinion the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact (1) have remained within the purpose of such compact as set out in article V thereof, and (2) have resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation or perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production or sale of oil or gas, with the understanding that conservation and the protection of the small producer are the paramount purposes of any rules and regulations issued under the compact."

The general purpose of this provision seems unobjectionable. However, the investigation into the operation of the compact contemplated under the provision would apparently involve, among other matters, questions in the field of economics. Such functions do not properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice which is the chief litigating arm of the Government. It is believed, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to be designated to perform such functions.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

Memorial Day Address by Woodley Carr, Department Commander, the American Legion of Mississippi

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an address by Mr. Woodley Carr, of Moorhead, Miss., in tribute to the valiant men who have given their lives in defense of our beloved country. Mr. Carr was State commander of the American Legion when he delivered this address on Memorial Day, 1955:

Memorial Day, which we are observing throughout our beloved land as a day of remembrance, must be far more than that. It should be a day of rededication. A rededication of our hearts and lives to God and country, for which the brave men we honor this Memorial Day have given their all.

Flags and flowers speak more eloquently than any words we may recite. The valiant little flags that appear on these patriot's graves are the symbol of the freedom they gave their lives to defend and preserve. The flowers strewn upon the final resting place of their mortal remains are the symbol of spring, the season of life and fulfillment.

For God and country, these men lived and gave up lifetimes of living; but are they dead? It has been said that "they that die for a good cause are redeemed from death." Do not the lives they offered on the altar of liberty prove the unreality of death? They "hover as a cloud of witnesses above this Nation."

Today the dead speak to us and say: "Is this world better for our sacrifice?" They speak to us, but do we hear? Have we kept faith with them?

It was their sacrifice that made this Nation great. They have gone to their God. Let us not forsake them or Him.

It was at the dedication of the national cemetery at Gettysburg that Abraham Lincoln uttered these immortal words:

"The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

We of the American Legion believe that many of our Nation's wars were unnecessary

and that many of our war dead were sacrificed by our Nation's unpreparedness.

Since George Washington's days America has suffered from the perpetual disease of fighting its wars with untrained men. Unpreparedness in this respect has levied a heavy toll upon our national life. The tragic results of this disease are visible in every cemetery where lie the remains of our soldier dead, in every hospital where the maimed and the sick are suffering from battle-caused afflictions; and even in our streets where the crippled and the handicapped depict the casualties of war. We know that many of these casualties could have been prevented by adequate training.

Since World War I the American Legion has kept the torch burning for peace through strength. We have been called militaristic by the pacifist and subversive elements of our country, but we have not faltered in our efforts to provide for the common defense. We are proud that in all of our 36 years of demanding adequate protection for our country, we have never been wrong in any of our major recommendations.

Whence came the inspiration of Memorial Day? And how many know the significance of the spirit of unity and love of our fellowmen that brought it into being? Was it Lincoln's deathless Gettysburg address? Or was it perhaps a too little known and far too little appreciated expression of love demonstrated by a group of southern women in the middays of the War Between the States?

On an April morning in 1863, a small group of compassionate women in Columbus, Miss., went together to lay spring flowers upon the graves of their soldier dead. The war already had been raging for 2 devastating years, but love and sorrow were in the hearts of those ladies, and their tears washed away any bitterness toward even the enemy who had fallen.

Their flowers of remembrance were placed by those devoted women on the graves of their own dead and on the resting places of two Union soldiers who lay in the same burial ground with their own husbands, sons, brothers, and fathers.

Each following April through the remaining years of the War Between the States and thereafter, these Mississippi women repeated the ceremony, laying garlands of remembrance on the graves of northern and southern heroes alike.

Soon other communities followed the example set in Columbus and selected their day in spring upon which the citizens would gather and go to the cemeteries for the purpose of honoring those from their communities who had fallen in battle.

By the passage of law, Memorial Day has been made official. May 30 is the legal date in most States. In a number of Southern States some other date is official; April 26 in some, May 10 in others, and June 3 in a few. But though there is a difference in dates, there is no difference in the spirit of the day, nor in the hearts of those who commemorate it.

The bitterness of civil strife, first washed out of the hearts of the gracious women in Columbus, Miss., now has gone from the hearts of all. There is no North or South today, thank God. "Under the laurel the blue. Under the willow the gray. Love and tears for the blue. Tears and love for the gray."

Through divine love and faith in God's guidance, our Nation is more closely united than it has ever been since it was founded upon the principles of providence.

This Memorial Day, therefore, we consecrate to the memory of those known and unknown dead of all wars; those who met their destiny in battle on land, on the seas, and under the seas, and in the flaming skies.

Our heroic fallen have emblazoned upon the pages of everlasting history such names as Concord, Bunker Hill, and Valley Forge. Fort McHenry and the Battle of New Orleans. Of the Alamo, Monterey, and the Little Bighorn. Bull Run, Shiloh, and Gettysburg. Of Manila Bay and San Juan Hill. The Philippines and the Boxer Rebellion. Of the Marne, Chateau Thierry, Belleau Wood, and the Argonne. Of Pearl Harbor and Wake Island, Bataan and Corregidor, Guadalcanal and the Coral Sea, Saipan and Iwo Jima. Of Kassarine Pass and Salerno, Omaha Beach and Bastogne, of bomb-shattered Tokyo, and the subpens of Bremerhaven and finally of Porkchop Hill, Heartbreak Ridge, and Old Baldy.

Great and imposing monuments have been built to many of those fateful moments. Others will rise in years to come. Granite, marble, and bronze have been fashioned into memorials for armies and divisions and regiments, fleets and squadrons. But the flowers strewn on Memorial Day are our tribute to the individual men and women who have helped through those brilliant chapters of American history to keep forever burning the enternal torch of freedom.

These brave men and women sleep in their final resting place and we should let them know that we come here today not alone to weep in mourning, but to prove to them that we shall keep the faith.

The inscription on the Confederate memorial in Arlington Cemetery behind the great mansion that was once Robert E. Lee's might well have been written for the dead of all American wars:

> "Not for fame or reward
> Not for place or for rank
> Not lured by ambition
> Or goaded by necessity
> But in simple obedience to duty
> As they understood it
> These men suffered all
> Sacrified all, dared all,
> And died."

Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, at the Civil Air Patrol congressional dinner of May 24 in Washington, a very fine speech was given by Cadet Edwin V. Hord, of Concord, N. C. Cadet Hord told how high-school students feel about strengthening our defenses through airpower. I was so impressed with his address that I felt it should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where others might benefit from his excellent remarks.

Cadet Hord was selected by Col. James L. Hamilton, Civil Air Patrol wing commander for North Carolina, to represent our State as 1 of the 52 cadets who were honored at the dinner this year. Further honor was bestowed upon Cadet Hord when he was selected, from the group of 52, to be 1 of 2 cadets to deliver speeches at the dinner.

With its 2,594 units located in 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, the CAP is teaching basic aviation to thousands of young high-school students and adults. They help the civil defense programs, air rescue, and disaster missions.

The indoctrination of the vast number of men and women who later enter the Air Force to become pilots, navigators, observers, and crew members, is a boon to national defense.

CAP is a group of voluntary auxiliary USAF members, 90,000 strong, who are assisted in their training by active-duty Air Force personnel. These groups, working together for our security through airpower, deserve our support and commendation for the work they are doing.

Cadet Hord's full speech at the congressional dinner May 24 follows:

Some of the young people all over America—perhaps someone who goes to high school with me—will be leaders of the free world a few years from now.

Some boy now in a high school graduating class will be sworn in at the White House in 40 years. Another boy will take over as Air Force Chief of Staff—in less than 40 years.

I hope things will have changed a lot by then. I hope the biggest problems these classmates of mine will face will be the everyday problems of our country's housekeeping * * * roads, schools, and airports.

I hope their day-to-day decisions do not constantly involve crises and emergencies * * * and treading the difficult path between war and peace * * * with honor.

I hope all this changes, as I said, but I have no way of knowing it will.

But even if things have changed by then * * * and war is not a constant threat always within range of enemy bombers or missiles * * * even then these same classmates of mine will have to furnish leadership for most difficult and challenging times. They will be taking an important part in our national life.

They'll be flying our newest aircraft as pilots, or building them as craftsmen, or paying for them as taxpayers.

What I want to emphasize is that no matter what kind of suit or uniform they wear, they'll be up to their necks in the age of aviation. They'll have to be qualified to know both the airplane and the opportunities of the air age * * * and how to use them well. Our national survival and well-being depend on it.

Since I feel it's so important for these young people—who are my friends—to learn to think in terms of airpower both for defense and for peace, I'm glad we have an organization like the Civil Air Patrol.

I'm glad we have it and I'm glad I have the opportunity of being a part of it.

Certainly I'm no expert on either airpower or world strategy, but Sir Winston Churchill—whose qualifications command respect—has said today's world peace depends on American dominance in the field of atomic weapons * * * along with our ability to deliver these weapons across the air ocean around us.

If this is true today—if America's strength is freedom's guaranty of survival, then we must continue to remain strong. And that strength must be in the air.

That means CAP's primary mission—the training of youth to meet their oportunities and responsibilities in the air age—is important to my classmates and me.

Because of the decisions which these same classmates of mine will make in the years ahead, this mission of CAP's is also very important to our country.

Civil Air Patrol pilots last year flew more than 50,000 hours giving flight orientation rides to young people * * * to teach them in the air about the air age.

The work these pilots did was a highly important part of air education.

In addition, those who are CAP cadets have had an opportunity to participate in

summer encampments at Air Force bases * * * to enter drill teams in CAP competition * * * to compete for a chance to take part in CAP's renowned International Cadet Exchange * * * and to benefit—with other high-school students—from the results of Civil Air Patrol's summer workshops for teachers of aviation education in high schools.

This air education is a highly important part of America's long-range security. It must go forward.

The people I know in high school back in Carolina live in the State where the airplane was born * * * a State where more than a hundred years earlier men stood up for freedom * * * even if it meant the king's men shot at them. My friends are also used to plain, hometown talk. But they understand about freedom, no matter how it's stated.

I think my classmates—all over America—understand what a group of men—who signed this country's Declaration of Independence—meant when they declared they stood for liberty * * * and in support of their stand said:

"We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

This also is America's pledge today * * * our lives, our fortunes, and our honor—for freedom.

If—in the years which lie ahead—our freedom again is threatened by aggression, then this pledge will be redeemed * * * by these classmates of mine.

I promise you that.

And the work of the Civil Air Patrol—today and in the years ahead—will continue to be a vital contributor to the strength which guards freedom in the world.

Thank you.

Tree Farm Dedication at Council, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a few days ago I had the honor of witnessing a tree farm dedication at Council, Idaho, a little hamlet near where I was born. There I saw many individual farmers dedicating portions of their land in order to assure a growth of timber in the future. It was a very wholesome occasion. I saw America at work in helping to preserve a natural resource for the future.

One of the important speeches made at that dedication ceremony was delivered by a dear friend of mine, Mr. Warren H. Brown, of McCall, Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY WARREN H. BROWN AT COUNCIL, IDAHO, TREE FARM DEDICATION, MAY 16, 1956

Representatives of the Western Pine Association, members of the Grange, Commissioners, and distinguished guests, it is a real pleasure to appear before you on behalf of the Southern Idaho Forestry Association and as an individual operator. It is a wonderful opportunity to geet old friends and neighbors and, at the same time, to be a part of a new forestry venture in this area. Everyone here, I am sure, understands how satisfying an experience it is to participate in modern methods of conservation and to help nature create new and better resources for our use. By the operation of these so-called tree farms, we can and do enhance that which is already actually or potentially there. It has been said that you can't improve on nature, but we have proven that you can and proof of it can be seen in many places and in a reasonably short time the proof can be seen here. We are and will be building better trees by proper pruning, by proper cutting and by improved methods of logging. The timber will not only be improved but the land, too, will be made more productive and better forage and feed for livestock will result. Modern logging methods and a better knowledge of erosion control will ultimately give us control of a situation that has been costly and somewhat ineffective in the past. We will prevent the shifting of valuable soils and we will prevent flood damage and the uncontrolled wasting of one of our most precious assets—water.

Frankly, it is very satisfying to see the small woodlot owners become a part of this program—not because it adds to the number of dots on a map showing where such farms are located—nor because it increases the number of pretty signs saying that a given area is a dedicated and certified tree farm—but because it will sooner or later make that person and his neighbors aware of the fact that timber is an asset and that where he has always visualized lands free of trees, planted to grain or hay, the picture can be replaced by one of fast growing trees that will, with proper planning and care, return more revenue dollar for dollar, than would the crops from the area cleared. Further, he will have the land during the years before timber harvesting begins, to use as a lucrative feed area or for other purposes. Timber is a crop and the growth each year, converted to board feet and therefore dollars, would amaze many of those who now think of it only as something to be cut and cleared from the land so that they can raise annual crops where the product is a little more tangible and the profits, if any, can be pocketed each year.

It is not too unreasonable to assume that an outfit like the Circle "C" Ranch, one of the really large livestock raisers of the country, can make as much net profit from timber on their extensive acreage as they can from the raising of livestock. Too, the important thing about that is that they can still raise as many or more cows on the improved forage area. In actuality then, two industries thrive where only one and a part of another existed before. It is worthy of thought and action.

When you view the trees that are around you in the light of economics—past, present, and future—you can hardly help but be struck with the tremendous impact they have on our lives. Each tree, to most observers, is simply a fibrous growth consisting of roots, trunk, branches, and leaves. Looking at it through the average persons eyes, it becomes something which, when cut up, will provide boards for the building of their homes or will provide heat for the home after it is built. Some, but not all, will see it as the pulp that is used to provide them with a daily newspaper.

In actuality its use starts a long way ahead of most peoples' concept and its usefulness practically never ends. Consider the shelter it may have provided some trapper or freighter, or the fuel its fallen branches provided for someone's fire, or the seeds it produced to create other trees in other areas. Think of the vast quantities of wood that was used by the pioneers in establishing the great country which now produces for us an economic way of life second to none. Even more, consider the part that each tree has in your life today. It still provides you with shelter, it gives you the material for your home, it is the substance from which your newspaper is made. A small part of each tree may be a part of the production of most of the things that you consider necessary for your existence, including a part of the synthetics that you wear.

In a larger measure, consider the number of people whose income is dependent on a tree. We all know of the foresters, the loggers, and the mill men. We know that they are well-paid, well-adjusted members of their communities, and that they add considerable to the purchasing power within their towns, and that this in turn enhances the success of the merchants, the bankers, and other tradesmen of the area. But beyond this, consider the transportation people, railroads, trucks, airlines, and even the ships at sea, the equipment industry that provides the tools with which we work, the remanufacturers, the brokers, the real-estate people, and even the professional people. All of these and more derive a part of their income from some part of these trees. Think of the countless products that are made from wood and think of the great industries that have been built upon or from the timber industry. From the day you are born and all through your life you will enjoy benefits of living that can be traced back, in a large part, to the timber around you. And then when you die you will be placed in a casket made of wood.

I am certainly glad to be a part of an industry that for so little effort to create the basic product, provides so many benefits for so many people. In better utilization and awareness through tree farms, we simply put forth a little more effort to make much better products for more and more people. At the same time better grazing lands are produced, the possibility of damage by floods and erosion are lessened, considerable waste is eliminated, and the future economy of the country is made more secure by assuring a better supply of natural resources.

Hog Farmers Seen Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, some interesting facts and figures on what happened to farmers during the hog-price slump are revealed in an article by Alfred D. Stedman in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of May 27, 1956.

Because this story has great significance for every Member of the House interested in the problems facing farm families, I include it under leave to extend my remarks:

DEALERS POCKET HOG-SLUMP CASH
(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Midwest hog farmers were taken for a multimillion-dollar buggyride by middlemen who cashed in on the biggest swine-price slump in history.

That's the gist of a United States Department of Agriculture report entitled "Who Gets the Money?" which was being received Saturday in South St. Paul and other meat-industry centers.

Instead of all of last fall's record-breaking hog-price slump going fully to consumers to induce a speedup in consumption of pork, a substantial part amounting to about $1.50 a hundredweight was going as an increased charge into the pockets of meat handlers, processors, and sellers, the Government report stated.

No Federal total was given as to this increased middleman's take at the expense of hog farmers. But, on the large volume of hogs sold during the autumn and winter price slump, unofficial figures ran into the hundred-million-dollar category.

Meat packers and retailers, however, blamed increasing wage, transportation, fuel, and material costs. Meatpackers said net profits, while in some instances improved over earlier low returns, have a long-run record that's the lowest among farm processing industries, averaging after taxes only four-fifths of a cent per dollar of sales.

The United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, contrasted a $50 million increase in packinghouse wages with a $700 million drop in farmers' cash receipts from sales of livestock including hogs, from 1954 to 1955, and declared Secretary Benson's Department all wet in blaming the farmers' loss on labor.

The Government's story on who got the money came out in the May Agricultural Situation, issued by the Agricultural Marketing Service. In it the Government doesn't pin the blame specifically on anybody, and competing groups tend in a competitive system to get what they can. But as to the $9 a hundredweight slump in live hog prices, down nearly to a $10 level from last June to December, it finds:

1. That $2.50 of that $9 slump was accounted for "by failure of retail pork prices to fall as rapidly as farm prices of hogs."

2. That during the record hog price drop, marketing charges jumped from 2.5 to 25.8 cents a pound on pork at retail, a record high.

3. That a little less than half of the increase in middlemen's costs was accounted for by the packer and wholesaler, and a little more than half at the retail level.

4. That since the margin usually widens about $1 in the heavy marketing season, the margin during the slump "widened approximately $1.50 more per hundred pounds of live weight from the second to the fourth quarter than would usually be expected."

5. The hog price slump that hit farmers late in 1955 was "about 50 percent greater than would usually be expected with a 12-percent increase in marketings."

While not getting full benefit of the price drops, consumers did get substantial benefits, the Government said. It gave as an example a 14-cent drop in New York retail pork prices, in the year ending in March 1955, while producer prices were going down 16 cents and marketing charges were increasing from 18.2 to 18.9 cents. In percentages of the consumer's pork dollar, the shares going to each group changed this way:

	Percent	
	March 1954	March 1955
Hog farmer	68.7	56
Packer-wholesaler	18.7	28.6
Retailer	11.9	15.5
Selling and shipping	.7	.9

Thus lower hog prices were associated with and, in part, caused by widening market margins in that period, the report indicates.

However, with the spectacular recovery which recently has sent live hog prices back up to above $19 a hundredweight, indications are that marketing margins are now taking a trend toward normal.

Remarks of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on Receiving Philip Murray Award of the NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks I made on receiving the Philip Murray award of the NAACP at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Thursday, May 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON RECEIVING PHILIP MURRAY AWARD OF THE NAACP AT THE STARLIGHT ROOF OF THE WALDORF IN NEW YORK CITY ON MAY 17, 1956

I accept your award which I shall always treasure among the most cherished honors I have received. I am deeply grateful for the distinction which you have conferred on me. I ask that the proceeds of the check which you were good enough to hand to me be given to the North Side Center for Child Development whose fine work has, I know, made a great contribution to the community.

I accept the award with pride in the name of all who work and strive this day, as in the past, for that goal which has beckoned mankind since the first glint of consciousness began to light up the mind of man—the goal of brotherhood and equality of all, under law.

It makes me very proud to receive an award in the name of the late, great, beloved Philip Murray, a man whose deep human compassion was united with an unshakable resolve to achieve justice for all, and especially for those to whom social and economic justice was denied in whole or in part.

The life of Philip Murray was an illuminating life. He was a man gifted above all with the power for leadership, for inspiring confidence in his fellows, for instilling courage, for finding hope, and for holding faith.

The story of Philip Murray, the immigrant who arrived in this country at the age of 16 and who became one of the most influential figures in the United States, cannot be told too often. He was 25 years old before he became a naturalized American citizen, but he embraced the country of his adoption with such zeal and dedicated himself to the cause of labor with such fervor that he became one of the first citizens of America and a power for good to be reckoned with throughout the length and breadth of this land.

But the success story that was Philip Murray's is not the one on which I shall dwell tonight. There is a deeper and richer aspect of Philip Murray's life which is more pertinent to this occasion. I speak, of course, of Philip Murray's devotion to the cause of human rights.

In a true sense, Philip Murray's mature life was dedicated primarily to the struggle for human rights. In this struggle his battlefield expanded with his horizon, beginning with his local union and spreading out in ever-widening sweeps until it embraced all America and even the world.

The stamp of his ideology is clearly marked today on the great united labor organization—the AFL-CIO. And that organization is today one of the principal forces in the continuing battle for justice and equality, under law, for all Americans.

That organization, too, has its problem with its southern membership and with those whom it seeks to organize in the South. Within the councils of that organization, too, are heard the voices of those who plead for delay in grappling with the problem of equal rights for all citizens alike, regardless of race or color or creed.

And as within the councils of the Democratic Party, for instance, and in the inner councils of the Senate and the Congress itself, reasons are cited in justification of the plea for postponement of the issue, on the plea of concentration on other problems and in the name of so-called unity.

As far as organized labor is concerned, I am sure that the ideological heritage of Philip Murray has served to strengthen the resolve of the present leadership of the AFL-CIO in setting a course of determined advance toward the goal of equality, and of determined resistance to the forces of discrimination and nullification.

So must we do, in the Democratic Party, in the Republican Party, and in the Nation.

For this is no partisan matter, although it necessarily is and should be a political issue. It is an issue above party, but it is an issue on which candidates for public office should be tested, and it is an issue on which the people should be asked for their mandate.

I believe that in this year of 1956, whether some like it or not, or whether some wish it or not, the question of equal rights and of the abolition of legally-sanctioned second-class citizenship based on race or color, is the great issue which dominates all others.

It is not only the issue of this day and hour. It is the issue of this generation, which has come into critical focus in 1956.

Even if we would, we could not escape it. It is foolish to try to do so.

Let us rather grapple with it, admitting its difficulties, its vast complexities, and its obviously great delicacy. Let us move upon it with deliberate restraint but with unqualified determination and unflagging zeal.

Our tempo must be that defined by the Supreme Court as deliberate speed. An understanding of the complexity of the problem does not require that we postpone for even a moment any single thing that can and must be done to speed its solution.

There has been on the part of some, including, I regret to say, the top leadership of our Government, a regrettable tendency to identify themselves as a kind of third force in the area of struggle. They seem to consider themselves as neutralists in the cold war over civil rights.

Speaking certainly only for myself, but hopefully also for the majority of the American people, I cannot either be or pretend to be a neutral in this struggle.

This is not a battle between two equal and opposite forces in our country. This is a struggle against oppression. It is a struggle to uphold not only the letter of the Constitution, but its spirit, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence as well. And what is even more, the spirit of America.

How can I be a neutral in this situation? How can any who hold a role of public leadership be neutral in the face of oppression of some of our citizens and nullification of the law?

I identify myself with the victims of oppression and with the upholders of the law. Is that an extremist position? I do not think so.

The NAACP has come to be unfairly considered in some quarters—and I am thinking of responsible quarters which should know better—as the spokesman of an extremist viewpoint. In my judgment, this is a false depiction and I am glad to brand it so. In my judgment, the NAACP is the spokesman for a truly moderate viewpoint. And it is, above all, a responsible champion of the law,

an amicus curiae in the truest sense of that classic Latin phrase.

The NAACP does not speak only for Negroes. It speaks also for that vast number of white people in our country, both north and south of the so-called Mason and Dixon's line, who advocate no more and no less than equal justice under law for all Americans.

It is important that this be understood. It is important that the victims of oppression know that they are not being left to their own devices of struggle, that they are not isolated and alone.

It is important, vitally important, that the struggle for justice be carried on, not primarily by the victims of injustice, but on their behalf.

Let us each and all remember the classic dictum that when we struggle for the rights of others, we struggle to maintain our own rights as well.

I have been talking about struggle, and about the necessity of championing the rights of the victims of discrimination and segregation. In carrying on this struggle—and again, I speak only for myself, but hopefully for the majority of the American people as well—I believe that we must bear constantly and considerately in mind the problems of the oppressors as well as the oppressed.

Many, if not most of them, are, in my judgment, unwilling oppressors. Consciously or unconsciously, most of them will, I believe, rejoice when freed from their end of the chains.

Identifying myself with the victims of segregation does not preclude me, and should not preclude the rest of us, from sympathizing with and trying to understand the problems and points of view of those on the other side of the wall.

They carry a heavy burden, too. They must be helped to free themselves of it, and as Dr. King, that young and inspiring spiritual leader of Montgomery, has so movingly said on so many occasions, they must be loved.

Hate will not accomplish our ends. Love and the spirit of brotherhood—even for erring brothers—will.

There are many in the South—I do not know how many, but I believe very, very many—who are men of truly good will. They do not know how to extricate themselves from their present dilemma. Let us help show them the way.

Firmness in our resolve, enlightenment in our approach, certainly in our cause, and dedication to our purposes, will help us through the difficult months ahead and will enable us to meet the present crisis.

It is unnecessary to magnify the crisis. Nor is it wise, or possible, to minimize it.

We move in what we hope and believe to be God's way, to solve one of the fundamental problems of human existence—the problem of achieving brotherhood in the midst of conflict.

If we have faith, we will have strength and courage. With strength and courage, born of faith, we will not fail.

Building a Prosperous Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota recently had a distinguished visitor, who came to visit our people fresh from the International Disarmament Conference in London to give them a stirring message of hope for continued peace. That visitor was the Honorable Harold Stassen, Special Assistant to the President, who spoke before the fundraising dinner of the Brown County Republican organization in Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Mr. Stassen outlined the successes enjoyed by the Eisenhower administration in the field of foreign policy. He presented the picture of domestic prosperity, and he predicted a safe and sound future for our country under the continuing leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I ask permission to have this splendid speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A PROSPEROUS PEACE

Our Republican Party should be humbly thankful for the privilege of being the vehicle through which President Dwight David Eisenhower serves all of the people of America.

In this regard our party has a special responsibility to so conduct itself during the coming campaign so as to help and not to hinder his brilliant leadership of the Nation and in the world.

I know full well that our party will face a very heavy barrage from the opposition. Certainly the attacks now being made will not recede in the next months. It is plainly evident that we should be prepared for mounting oratorical onslaughts, unmistakably designed to becloud issues, distort facts, and by the deliberate route of feeding cynicism and fear, do all that can be done to attempt to bury beneath an avalanche of demogogery the most brilliant record of constructive accomplishment since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

The Republican Party, through the dedicated and earnest efforts of the men and women who uphold its banner across the length and breadth of America, will furnish the effective answer, not by responding in kind but, instead, by conducting a campaign that is comprehensive, continuous, and constructive—a campaign that is so skillfully organized and so enthusiastically carried on as to assure that the outstanding record that is manifest in our message will successfully penetrate the opposition cacophony, to be heard in every home and to reach every voter in the Nation.

It will be necessary to explain again and again to the people that the prosperous peace which they now enjoy and acknowledge is not an effortless and automatic happenchance. Without engaging in divisive name calling and narrow bitterness, let us carry the President's program and principles to the people with a clarifying description of the alert and intelligent action taken week after week, month after month, to bring about the most prosperous age in our entire history.

For example, the opposition, in a desperate and unavailing search for solid criticism, has again resurrected the dusty diatribe that our party favors Big Business. A few undisputed facts, taken directly from the official statistics, clearly repudiates this malicious charge.

Labor has actually gained more than business under the Eisenhower administration. This can be proven in many different ways by an objective analysis of the facts. The official statistics will show, for example, that in the 3 Eisenhower years the average wage of factory workers has increased 30 percent over the 7 Truman years. In other words, every workingman, on the average, has received 30 cents more on each dollar of wages compared to the 7 Truman years.

Corporation profits, on the average, have also increased, but their increase in the 3 Eisenhower years has been just 6 percent compared to the average corporation profits in the 7 Truman years.

The details are as follows: The average weekly earnings for factory workers in the 7 Truman years was $56.41. The average weekly earnings for factory workers in the 3 Eisenhower years is $74.35.

The total labor income of all the workers in America averaged $147.2 billion in the 7 Truman years. It averaged $207.2 billion in the 3 Eisenhower years. This is an increase of 40 percent.

The total corporate profits after taxes in the 7 Truman years averaged $17.8 billion. The total corporate profits after taxes in the 3 Eisenhower years averaged $18.8 billion.

Despite these incontrovertible figures, the opposition smoothly endeavors to spin a network of falsehood around the dangerous claim to workingmen that profits should be held down and wages should be pushed up.

The gross infirmity of such an attitude is self-evident. The worker and the businessman and the farmer alike, know that continued growth of our country requires that each interdependent ingredient—wages, profits, and farm income, must climb together.

The President has at no time minimized the magnitude of the problems which confronted this administration. For example, he has never misleadingly declared that the objective of 100-percent parity for agriculture in the market place could be achieved overnight.

May I also urge that in considering this exceedingly difficult problem, a fair analysis of these 3 years under President Eisenhower, be brought to the people. In this regard, it should never be forgotten that in the last 3 years before World War II, under the opposition party, the years 1938, 1939, and 1940, agricultural prices were 78 percent, 77 percent, and 81 percent of parity, in contrast to these 3 Eisenhower years of peace in which the prices were 92 percent, 89 percent, and 82 percent of parity.

It is my view that agriculture has now leveled off from its decline, and that agricultural income will increase significantly next year if the President's program is adopted, even as employment and wages, notwithstanding the prophets of doom, moved upward in late 1954, after successfully completing their post-Korean war adjustment.

In foreign affairs, the President has considered just one preeminent goal—the supreme objective of an honorable, just and safe peace. The administration is dedicated to work for such a peace day after day, week after week, year after year. No one knows better than President Eisenhower that such a peaceful and secure world will not be found in wishful thinking, in timid stances, or in recoiling from realities of the thermonuclear age.

These 3 Eisenhower years stand out in bold relief as an era in which a foreign policy worthy of the great country it represents was established.

Again, the results speak eloquently for themselves. No other statesman in history has been more firmly dedicated to the great aspiration for peace. No other leader on the contemporary scene has given more earnest, more painstaking and more constructive efforts to the achievement of this goal.

A summary of significant developments would include this list:

1. A worldwide movement for and rising appreciation of the peaceful uses of atomic energy was successfully initiated, scientists of 72 nations conferred at Geneva, and an International Atomic Energy Agency was approved without a dissenting vote in the United Nations General Assembly.

2. The people of Guatemala in this hemisphere removed a Communist dominated

government and established new leadership opposed to communism and friendly to the United States.

3. The Korean war was brought to a close on an honorable basis and the Republic of Korea was assisted in rebuilding its economy and strengthening its own defenses.

4. A rapprochement was achieved between the Republic of France and the German Federal Republic through which a Western European Union was established and Germany was admitted to NATO.

5. The Trieste issue was settled between Italy and Yugoslavia, and economic and cultural relationships were resumed between these Mediterranean neighbors.

6. An agreement was reached with Spain for mutual cooperation which includes valuable base rights for the United States in a strategic position.

7. The complete sovereignty of Austria was restored, the Red Army and United States troops were withdrawn, and a solvent, democratic, happy nation emerged in the center of Europe.

8. The 8-year Indochina war was ended, sovereign states of Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam moved forward in independence and were strengthened economically and militarily, thus checking the Communist Southeast Asia drive at the border of North Vietnam, which was taken over by the Communists in the settlement.

9. The ruling leaders of the Soviet Union were told directly and plainly at the Summit Conference that the objective of the United States was and would continue to be a just and lasting peace, a dramatic and sound proposal for exchange of military information and aerial reconnaissance was made, and increased contacts between East and West were initiated.

10. The people of Iran installed a new government to take the place of the instable former government and the Communist infiltration of this important Near East nation was cleared up.

11. More than 40 nations were assisted in advancing their economic well-being to a record high point.

12. We are now living through the 21st consecutive month, the longest period in a generation, in which no wars were being waged anywhere in the world.

I would not undervalue the enormous task which lies ahead. The world is still an uneasy place in which to live, because the shadow of thermonuclear devastation still hovers menacingly over us, even as the prospects for peace have been brightened.

In dealing with the question of safeguarded disarmament, the President has expressed his determination to continue to seek solutions founded on the most effective inspection and enforcement measures presently known to assure that the possibility of surprise attack is eliminated.

In this regard, no effort will be spared to find such methods as are mutually agreeable, and mutually advantageous to every participant.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Americans want to see this record preserved and advanced. I am equally convinced that 1956 will become the midmark of Eisenhower leadership, and the Republican Party can look forward to a majority in Congress and an increased number of Governorships throughout the 48 States.

I say this because election victories in 1956 will presage 10 years of growth and prosperity for the American people and because I am certain that the Republican Party—in the lasting imprint of President Eisenhower—will clearly demonstrate once again, that it is worthy of the President's confidence and of the people's support for the good of America.

Farm Income and Prices—GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a radio broadcast dealing with the farm situation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1956

Farm prices are being made in Washington this week. Congress has strengthened price supports. It has told the Secretary of Agriculture to get busy—find a sensible way to figure parity. Now it will be up to the President to take the bill Congress sent him and sign it—or veto the farm bill a second time. If he does, it will be the first time since Calvin Coolidge that a President has vetoed two farm bills.

You city folks may wonder what this has to do with your take-home pay—with the money you earn. That's why we've had the editors of U. S. News tell you about the unrest they found in the farm States. When cash registers don't ring, that's a farm depression on Main Street. When 150,000 auto workers are out of jobs, that's a farm depression in Detroit. What the U. S. News reported on May 18, should help city folks understand what farmers are up against, and should help you understand what good farm laws mean, not only to farmers, but to the Nation. Here is what one farmer said about politics: "I think $1.50 corn is a political price for farmers in an election year," says Harold Kennedy. He's a young tenant farmer in Livingston County in the rich, black loam country of Illinois. "What happens next year when there isn't an election?" he wants to know. "Do they let some of it come out of the bins to force prices down like they did this winter?" In southwestern Indiana, the farmers in traditionally Democratic Dubois County are ready, in the language of one farmer, "to go back to a proper way of thinking."

"Shrinking of farm income has hit Main Streets in this area, just as it has in many others," the magazine says. Here's the answer of a Dodge-Plymouth salesman when asked by U. S. News if farmers are buying as many new cars: "Are you kidding? We usually do about 50 percent of our business with farmers, but we've sold only one new car that went to the country so far this year. At this time last year, we'd sold 8 or 10." In the little town of Ferdinand, Ind., a Ford dealer is just as unhappy. He has sold only one 1956 model to a farmer. "This whole town's dead," he says, waving a hand at the Main Street. "First 3 days of this week, you could have sprayed that street with a machine gun and not hurt a soul."

The U. S. News reporters got the same story from other merchants on the street. Only one businessman, an appliance dealer, reports sales holding even with 1955. Strings are being tightened on farm purses all over the Midwest. A farmer in Kossuth County, northwestern Iowa, broke a tine on his manure fork. He went to buy a new fork. He found the price of a fork had gone up to $4.50. Still brooding over the money he'd lost in the recent slump of hog prices, he stalked out of the store, muttering that he would go right on using his broken fork. In southwestern Iowa, few farmers drive new cars. Harry Coulter, a veteran dealer in that area, estimates that sales of new cars have fallen off 40 percent from a year ago. If there's anything in the political axiom that people with declining incomes are prone to vote against the party in power, then Republicans have reason to be alarmed over the outcome of the polling next November.

The editors of U. S. News report some businessmen who lean heavily on trade with farmers are outspoken in their criticism of the Eisenhower administration. "'I'm for 90 percent of parity for farmers. If they don't make money, we don't make money.' That blunt statement is by Harold Thomas. He runs a farm-machinery business that employs 15 men in Lincoln, Ill. Right now, he says, 'our trouble is that when a farmer takes a load of hogs or cattle to town he lacks a corn planter or a disc of getting what he should for them.' Nobody questions but what farm income is down sharply in nearly every area of the Midwest," says U. S. News. "Account books kept by the better-than-average farmers under the direction of State agricultural colleges reveal how severe the income drops are. In eastern Iowa, where records were kept on 156 farms, net income per farm sagged from $9,303 in 1954, to $2,967 in 1955. These are bigger, more efficient farms than the average. Net income on the average commercial farm in Iowa, according to the estimates by economists at Iowa State College, dropped from $4,720 in 1954, to around $2,000 in 1955—a 58-percent reduction.

"It is this big cut in take-home pay felt by farmers throughout the Midwest, that is cutting down the flow of money from farmers' bank accounts to the merchants in farm communities. Business hummed right along in 1955, as farmers kept spending for machinery, tools, and the supplies that they used to produce. But, when they totted up their records for the year, they got a jolt. Now, with a bearish outlook for farm prices they are cutting back—some because they have to, others because they are afraid to risk high production costs for the return from an uncertain market. To sum it up, farm-income troubles are cutting deep into the six States covered by the survey.

"Although some farm communities seem little affected, in many cases it is found that shrinking farm income is hurting farmers, and merchants, who depend upon farmers' buying power. Most farmers are found to be uneasy about the present—bearish about the future. Farmers are frustrated by their failure to share in the Nation's prosperity." The editors of U. S. News let a Minnesota farmer sum up the case in these words: 'Sometimes at night, I check everything over," he told them. "I've kept my land up, fertilized well, kept improving my cattle, looked after my machinery—done everything I know is right. Then I count the money that is coming in and think: 'Gee-whiz, Joe, you're not very sharp. You ought to be doing better than this. Something's wrong.' Something, definitely is wrong. Few of them, however, know exactly what's to be done about it."

That's what the editors of U. S. News, who visited farmers and people on Main Street in these six Midwest farm States, believe. However, as they say, few of these folks know "exactly what's to be done about it."

Maybe so. That may be true in some parts of the country. But we're sure you people on Main Street know that here at GTA and in the Farmers Union, we are trying to do something about it. We're fighting for better farm prices all the time. Thanks for listening.

Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cathedral of the Pines," written by Norman M. Lobsenz, and published in the Sunday picture magazine, Parade, of May 27, 1956.

The article describes the Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge, N. H., which was established by its founder, Mr. Douglas Sloane, as a memorial to his son, Sanderson Sloane, who was killed in action during World War II. Within the Cathedral of the Pines is located the Altar of the Nation, which has been dedicated to all the war dead of this country. I have introduced a bill, S. 3063, which would recognize the Altar of the Nation as a national shrine.

I believe the article will be of interest not only to Members of Congress, but to the American public as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ALL AMERICANS ON MEMORIAL DAY: CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES

(By Norman M. Lobsenz)

RINDGE, N. H.—Next Wednesday, rain or shine, more than 25,000 people from all over the United States will make a Memorial Day pilgrimage to a pine-shaded knoll near this small New Hampshire town. There, in America's most unusual place of worship, each in his own way will pay tribute to the country's war dead. Indirectly, they also will be honoring the memory of the young man whose death was responsible for the creation of the Cathedral of the Pines.

His name was Sanderson Sloane. He died 12 years ago, when his bomber crashed in Germany. Before going overseas, Sandy Sloane had chosen this knoll as the site of the home he and his wife planned to build. Originally, giant pines pressed close upon the trail that led to the brow of the hill. Then the great hurricane of 1938 toppled most of them.

But one spring afternoon, Sandy and his father climbed the trail again. With the trees gone, they could look out across the valley and its glistening necklace of lakes to Mt. Monadnock, miles away, and the whole brilliant, rolling Wachusett Divide. It was, Sandy said, "the most beautiful view God ever put together."

After their son's death, Douglas and Sibyl Sloane often visited "Sandy's knoll"; eventually they were moved to build a modest memorial to him. Boughs and rock were cleared away, and a cross of New Hampshire granite erected. But the first small memorial service awakened such a widespread response that the Sloanes felt perhaps the Cathedral of the Pines could become a symbol of the sacrifice made by all—women as well as men—who gave their lives in America's battles. And so it has.

First, an altar of the Nation was built; then a lectern, a pulpit, a baptismal font; and Hilltop House, a retreat for visiting clergymen. Uniquely, each structure is built of stones contributed from all over the world, many from famous personalities.

President Eisenhower, for example, sent 2 stones: 1 from the Normandy beach where United States forces landed on D-Day, and 1 from his Kansas home. General MacArthur's stone comes from Japan's Atsugi airfield, where he landed to occupy that country; Adm. William Halsey sent coral from the Pacific Islands his forces reconquered.

FROM THE PARTHENON—AND HIROSHIMA

There are bits of soil or rock from Jerusalem's Mount Zion; from Lincoln's birthplace; from Valley Forge, Plymouth Rock, the Parthenon in Athens, ground zero at Hiroshima—from historic sites in every American State and virtually every country in the world.

By 1946 a few pastors were asking to hold special services at the Cathedral. The Sloanes, who by now had set up a trust to oversee their efforts, installed benches, a small organ, a public-address system, a parking area.

Soon, on Sundays, and special holy days, various religions were holding services in this outdoor cathedral. All told, 35 different denominations have conducted over 600 ceremonies in the past decade. In addition countless civic, fraternal, patriotic, and youth organizations have held religious and patriotic services there. The Cathedral, incidentally, is maintained entirely by voluntary donations.

Today it is not unusual for as many as 60,000 people to make the pilgrimage to the Cathedral of the Pines on a single weekend. Many come to worship; but even those who come just as tourists leave with a new sense of reverence for things spiritual.

"Outdoor churches," says Douglas Sloane, "exert a subtly different sort of influence. Many who come to the cathedral are nonchurchgoers who are troubled because they cannot find a real faith. For many of them, a few services at the Cathedral of the Pines are a steppingstone to new religious inspriration."

One couple who came merely to sightsee agree.

"My husband and I aren't formally religious," the young wife says. "But we walked through the arches of pines, and heard the delicate organ music, and then suddenly we came to the brow of the hill and saw the cross hanging in what seemed like midair, surrounded only by the sky, and the mountains in the distance. My husband and I looked at each other, and we both had tears in our eyes.

"It was as close to Heaven as we'll ever get in this life."

The Cathedral, says Adm. Chester Nimitz, is "truly a memorial to all those who gave their lives in the service of our country." And by next Memorial Day this may be a literal as well as spiritual fact. New Hampshire's Senator H. STYLES BRIDGES and Representative PERKINS BASS have introduced a resolution in Congress to have the cathedral designated as a national shrine. The legislation is now in committee.

Meanwhile, the Cathedral of the Pines remains a spiritual haven for every American.

The Sorry Story of Pine Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Sorry Story of Pine Ridge," written by Josephine Ripley, and published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SORRY STORY OF PINE RIDGE—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—With smoke from the explosions at Pearl Harbor still spiraling into the sky, the War Department in 1941 rushed to locate suitable land for gunnery ranges and other military training purposes.

For an aerial gunnery range, the Department selected a strip of land 45 miles long and 14 miles wide in the middle of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

Living on that territory were 125 Indian families of the Sioux tribe. They were ranchers. They kept cattle, poultry, and raised crops. Some of them lived in substantial homes and had considerable money invested in farm buildings and equipment. Others lived in dilapidated buildings and had little in the way of property.

All received the same 10-day notice to evacuate; all received small compensation for their confiscated property; all suffered losses in livestock and belongings in the ensuing panic.

Some moved in with relatives on other parts of the reservation where there was already hardly enough from the land to support former occupants. Others pitched tents wherever they could find room. Poultry strayed away in the scramble; some fell prey to coyotes, and rattlesnakes were a constant menace.

The story has been told many times to Congress and repeated in recent weeks. For these Indian families as a result of their misfortunes are still in want. They still feel that the Government compensated them inadequately for their possessions. They still feel the Government should make good.

The story of their enforced flight is an almost incredible one, looking back on it. There is no doubt that they were given extremely strong encouragement to move, as one official put it. According to the Indians, they were told that the Japanese were just over the hill ready to shoot them if they didn't get a move on.

One family of 14 moved into a small 1-room log cabin. Only a week after this evacuation, the eldest son was called into the Army. Two months later the second son went into uniform. Five months after this the third eldest son enlisted, and 8 months later the fourth boy went into the Navy.

Mrs. Ellen Janis, here to testify before the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, observed: "Six of our boys have served their country. For what? Our home was taken away from us. We are now landless and homeless because we cooperated with the War Department only to be let down."

Jake Herman with his wife and four children pitched a tent on the banks of a creek where he finally built a small log cabin. He killed over 100 rattlers in the vicinity. His eldest son was called into the Army about a year later. The boy was killed in action in Holland. A second son went into the Navy and their youngest boy fought on Heartbreak Ridge in Korea.

These are some of the stories of what happened on a "Heartbreak Ridge" right here in the United States. The Indians were told then that they would get their land back after the war. The site is still being used for aerial gunnery practice, and with the development of jet fighters an even longer strip of land is needed for the swift target sweeps, according to Army authorities.

"Today," Congress has been told by tribal spokesmen, "almost 14 years since the taking, most of our families are homeless; some are destitute."

The Justice Department says that the property was acquired by the Government in full compliance with the law. Compensation was determined by the court, and additional compensation now would establish an undesirable precedent. It would, they claim, open up the prospect of all kinds of new damage suits against the Government.

The Army contends that, as far as it is concerned, all action was taken with legal propriety and the question of what is done for the Indians now is a matter of Federal, not military policy.

The Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior supports the proposal for a compensatory payment to these Indian families for loss of income while moving and for the cost of this enforced relocation. It does not endorse the proposal for a $13 million rehabilitation program—not because it disapproves such activity, but because the program proposed is not specific or detailed enough in form.

As a result, the bill just reported out by the subcommittee includes only the provision for the $3,500 per family compensation. The rehabilitation program, which would have applied not only to the evacuated Indians, but to the whole Pine Ridge Indian population, was dropped.

It was thought by the subcommittee that the questions raised by the broader program might block the whole measure and that it would be better to have a small amount for the distressed families than nothing at all.

The bill now comes before the full committee. This is the third try for aid in this special case, and there is hope it will not fail.

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if one desires to learn about the problems of highway safety, there is no better source of information than bus and truck drivers. A letter I received recently from an Oregon bus driver illustrates exactly what I mean. The writer presents several acute problems and offers specific remedies.

In writing to this driver, I commended him for his constructive approach to the safety problem, his forthrightness, and his sense of responsibility toward the public, reflected by his letter.

Manufacturers, bus companies, and trucking firms, which should be equally dedicated to the problem of improving highway safety, would be well advised to heed the counsel of these drivers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have my constituent's letter reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to call to your attention a situation I feel should be rectified.

I am a bus driver employed by the Pacific Greyhound Lines, and have driven buses for a period of 17 years and also trucks for a period of 3 years.

As you are probably aware the United States Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction over buses and trucks operated in interstate commerce. There seems to me to be a lack of interest in this body pertaining to the safety of operation, or else the ICC does not have sufficient authority to enforce its rules.

I do not believe any bus or truck under ICC jurisdiction should be permitted to operate under conditions of ice or snow unless it is equipped with a modern sanding device. This should be particularly true of a bus hauling passengers for hire.

Greyhound has had two accidents in this area this past winter where a bus has gone out of control due to icy pavement. In both cases the bus turned over and resulted in serious injuries to passengers. Both of these accidents could have been prevented had the bus been equipped with a sanding device.

I have brought this matter up in our safety meetings and the only valid argument the company has regarding the installation of sanders is that they cost too much. If the various companies operating in interstate commerce refuse to install necessary safety devices voluntarily then I think they should be compelled by law to do so. This can be done by granting the ICC similar authority that Civil Aeronautics Authority has over the aviation industry.

I would like to call to your attention 1 accident Pacific Greyhound has had in which damage claims of over $200,000 were paid. A like sum would have purchased a lot of sanders.

Also I believe all heavy trucks and buses should have two separate and independent braking systems. In the course of 20 years of driving I have had 3 cases where the brakes on a bus have failed. While the modern airbrake is very reliable, it is like anything mechanical, subject to failure. There should be a separate and independent braking system in event of failure of airbrakes. I would like to suggest a hydraulic brake with the fluid under pressure from an engine driven pump or an electric brake through the use of electric solenoids. While these types of brakes might be severe at least the vehicle would be brought to a safe stop. The average hand or emergency brake on a truck or a bus is practically useless and cannot be depended upon to stop the vehicle.

I would like to remind you of a recent accident in San Francisco where the airbrakes on a truck failed and the truck plunged down a hill killing several people. A secondary braking system would have prevented this.

With traffic conditions as they are nowadays every possible safety device should be employed. I would also like to call to your attention the deliberate violation of ICC rule No. 192.6 (schedules to conform to speed limits) by the various bus companies.

If you have ever followed a Greyhound bus or rode one you are probably aware that it was traveling faster than the posted speed limits (55 miles per hour for buses in Oregon and California). This is particularly true of our express buses. When this is called to the attention of our company they tell us competition demands these fast schedules. I don't believe competition should be used as an excuse to deliberately violate the law. With traffic conditions as they now exist it is impossible to maintain these schedules and still obey the speed laws. While the company periodically puts out bulletins that we drive within the speed limits, they have various ways and means to see that we maintain these schedules.

I would like to suggest that any time a truck or bus driver receives a speeding ticket that a report be made to the ICC and give the ICC power to fine the company hiring the driver a like amount. I believe if such action be taken that it wouldn't be very long until we had some realistic schedules. This can be done as I would like to point out that in case of an accident in which the company is deemed at fault both the driver and the company are cited to appear in court and in case of payment of a claim it is always the company that pays the claim and not the driver.

I would appreciate your serious consideration of this matter.

Claude L. Draper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hard Job To Fill," from the Denver Post for May 6, 1956. This editorial pays a well-deserved tribute to the Honorable Claude L. Draper, whose long, able, and honorable service on the Federal Power Commission is nearing an end, and it properly emphasizes the urgent need for the appointment of a competent successor who, like Commissioner Draper, will be consumer or public minded. Consumers across the country will be hoping that the White House will keep this good editorial advice in mind in selecting the new Commissioner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD JOBS TO FILL

Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, is retiring next month after a long and distinguished career as a member of the Federal Power Commission. He has asked that he not be considered for reappointment by the President.

Mr. Draper is the last of the thoroughly experienced members of the FPC, the agency which is supposed to protect the public interest in matters relating to the regulation of the electric and natural gas businesses in interstate commerce. He will be sorely missed.

During his service, Mr. Draper has seen the Commission undergo philosophical changes. Zeal to provide the lowest possible rates for consumers has been replaced in recent years by a point of view more favorable to the companies that come under FPC jurisdiction.

In the gas field in particular this has resulted in numerous actions raising gas charges to consumers by hundreds of millions of dollars. Illustrative of this new attitude of the Commission was the decision of a few months ago in the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. case, in which the FPC abandoned traditional regulatory methods and sought to give the company a "fair field price" for gas without even waiting for the legal authorization for a field price as contained in the Harris-Fulbright bill.

Commissioner Draper was a dissenter in the Panhandle Eastern case and objected to the abandonment of standard regulatory methods. We hope the President in selecting a successor for Mr. Draper will take cognizance of the fact that the Commission is now well packed with business-minded members. It would seem appropriate to have at least one consumer-minded member on a Commission which is supported to determine the public interest.

We also believe the new Commissioner should be from the Rocky Mountain region. It has been customary to have geographical representation on the Commission. The four remaining Commissioners are from

Connecticut, Louisiana, Missouri, and Washington State.

Unless Mr. Draper is succeeded by an appointee from the Mountain States this will be the only important consuming and producing area without a representative on FPC.

The Recently Passed Agricultural Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Pendleton East Oregonian of May 24, 1956, I read a news story by the paper's Heppner correspondent, reporting a grass roots farm meeting, addressed by Floyd Root and Kenneth Fridley of the Oregon Wheat League. This news story makes reference to so many significant events, from the latest model farm bill to the export market for wheat being cultivated in Japan, that it impressed me as being of more than passing interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this news story printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FARM BILL CRITICIZED BY WHEATGROWERS' VEEP

HEPPNER.—The new agricultural bill which passed Friday in the United States Senate does not contain substantial benefits to wheat farmers and the soil bank would be of little financial help to Pacific Northwest wheat growers, according to Floyd Root, vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers and Sherman County wheat rancher, who spoke at the anual spring meeting of the Morrow County Wheat Growers association Tuesday night at the Lexington Grange hall.

Root, who has been in Washington, D. C., since January representing the State and national wheatgrowers, stated that Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, has announced that wheat production should be cut from the present 55 million acres to from 12½ to 15 million acres.

Pendleton should become the soil and water research center for the Pacific Northwest with Federal appropriations of between $75,000 and $100,000 allocated for soil and water research in Oregon for the next fiscal year, Kenneth Fridley, president of the OWGL, Wasco, reported. In addition the funds should make available more pilot farms, similar to those functioning in Umatilla county, throughout the State and a soils and water research man at the Moro Experiment station.

Fridley announced that the league is working on improved facilities for unloading barges at wheat terminals in an effort to keep barge rates down.

The educational program for wheat disposal in Japan handled solely by the OWGL was discussed by Fridley who pointed out that if the program was a success the League may receive other similar responsibilities from funds appropriated by Federal law 480. Richard Baum, executive secretary and Joe Spiruta, market analyst of the League, are now in Japan working on the wheat disposal program.

Oscar Peterson, Ione, was selected by the Morrow County group as a candidate for the Oregon wheat commission vacancy effective July 1 when the term of Marion Weatherford, Arlington, expires.

Appointment will be made by the Governor from a list of county selections.

Committee reports were given by Kenneth Peck, Lexington, chairman of wheat disposal and market development, who announced that action was being taken by the League to alleviate a boxcar shortage at harvest time which is expected to be worse this year than ever before.

The Crop Insurance program will be returned to local agricultural and stabilization committee offices in counties requesting the change, Max Barclay, Lexington, Federal agricultural programs chairman, reported. Private insurance companies were delegated to handle the insurance in 1953.

Approval of the domestic parity plan for wheat which would allow 100 percent subsidy for wheat used for food and the remainder competing in the open market, was approved by the county group.

Application for the distribution of two new wheats, Omar and Columbia, will be taken until June 30 at the county agent's office, Milton Morgan, Ione, production and land use committee, reported.

Elderly, Perhaps, but Not Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on Friday, May 25, there appeared a very excellent editorial, entitled "Elderly, Perhaps, but Not Old," in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELDERLY, PERHAPS, BUT NOT OLD

"The skills, wisdom, and experience of our older citizens are traits which our country needs fully as much as the energy and boldness of youth."

These recent words by President Eisenhower are important for two reasons:

Because they are true. And because their truth is still not fully recognized.

The President made the observation in a letter to Congressman HOSMER, of California, sponsor of various measures designed to help elderly folks find employment and otherwise improve their lot.

Older people should not be relegated to the rocking chair while they are still able and desirous of doing productive work. Yet many find themselves sidelined and unable to find new jobs, even part-time ones.

One of the principal handicaps faced by job-hunting elderly people is the habit of arbitrarily judging a person to be old on the basis of his years of life. The age of 60, for example, is very commonly considered the milestone at which a person suddenly becomes old. Yet many people are still young at 80, some even at 90.

Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, is active on Capitol Hill at 88. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, at 78, is about to quit the Senate and take on a new task as United States Ambassador to NATO. Similar examples can be found in all fields of endeavor. Doctors, lawyers, farmers, old salts on the seacoast, and businessmen, in considerable numbers, are alert and active in their seventies and eighties. Why, then, think of the rank-and-file of elderly people as old and therefore not useful?

A vast reservoir of skills, wisdom, and experience lies idle and stagnating because of a national attitude. Once we realize that people live longer these days and have additional years of usefulness, ways will be found to tap the reservoir. And this will benefit both the elderly people and the Nation.

Low Blows at High Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article entitled "Low Blows at High Dams," written by Raymond Moley and published in the May 21, 1956, issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOW BLOWS AT HIGH DAMS

(By Raymond Moley)

In August 1951 I presented in this space my first article about the Hells Canyon controversy. I have commented on the subject from time to time since. Meanwhile, Congress has repeatedly refused to authorize the Federal dam proposed by public-power zealots; the Eisenhower administration has withdrawn its objections to the alternative plan of the Idaho Power Co.; and the Federal Power Commission has decided against the Federal dam and has given Idaho Power license to proceed. For nearly 6 months the company has been at work in the canyon. Nevertheless, Senator MORSE and others are pressing for a bill which would upset the commission's decision and would authorize the Federal dam.

Messrs. Truman, Stevenson, Kefauver, and Harriman insist upon making this a major issue in the 1956 campaign. Therefore, in various versions they recklessly charge (a) that President Eisenhower has given away something, (b) that the Idaho Power dams will foreclose the proper developemnt of the Snake River, (c) that the Idaho Power plan will produce inadequate power at a high price.

I am foreclosed by the time and patience of readers from matching words and statistics with the torrential effusions of Senators like MORSE in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For details I refer any inquiring reader to an analysis of the issue published by the American Enterprise Association, 1912 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Here, however, are factual answers to the main charges:

1. Mr. Eisenhower gave away nothing. His Interior Department merely abandoned the dog-in-the-manger policy of blocking a judicial hearing of the matter by the body properly constituted for such a purpose, the Federal Power Commission. The Commissioner's examiner began hearings in July 1953 and continued for an entire year. Then the examiner spent nearly another year considering the case and rendered his opinion favorable to the application of Idaho Power a year ago. The Commission itself pondered the case for 3 months more, and rendered its decision in August 1955.

2. The three dams of the Idaho Power Co. will not be midgets. The lowest is twice as high as Bonneville. The next is higher than Niagara Falls. The third, 107 feet higher than the Capitol dome in Washington. The Idaho Power dams will not foreclose the last good hydro site in the United States or even on the Snake River. The authoritative plan of the Army engineers for the Columbia Basin shows 3 more good sites downstream from Hells Canyon and 3 more authorized sites still farther down. It was the conclusion of the FPC examiner and the Commission that the Idaho Power dams, with smaller dams on the two main tributaries of the Snake, would so regulate the flow of the entire river as to provide just as much power and flood control at all the dams, built and unbuilt, as the Federal high dam.

3. The FPC found that the Idaho Power dams would produce directly 783,400 kilowatts initially, and that provision could be made for 391,700 more. The high Federal dam would produce 800,000 initially and 100,000 additional. The absurdity in the argument about cost per kilowatt is that the Idaho Power dams would cost one-third of the high Federal dam. Unless there were a hidden subsidy by the Government in the latter (which there no doubt would be), the cost per kilowatt should be much less.

The cost of the high Federal dam was estimated by the examiner at about $388.6 million, and the Idaho Power dams about $191 million. The Nation's taxpayers would pay the Federal dam figure. Private investors would pay for the Idaho Power dams.

The high Federal dam would pay back, in lieu of taxes, $97 million over a period of 50 years. Idaho Power would pay in actual cash to the various taxing units of government, at present rates, $490 million in 50 years. The high Federal dam would take much longer to build.

This issue, blown up by false statements and inferences, is a pretty poor stick with which to beat the President.

Cleveland Cap Screw Company's Boltmaker Is World's Largest Cold-Forging Machine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of Congress to the installation of the world's largest cold-forging machine, a boltmaker, now being built for the Cleveland Cap Screw Co. in my district.

The following article in the Garfield Heights Leader on May 24, 1956, fully describes this modern equipment:

CLEVELAND CAP SCREW CO.'S BOLTMAKER IS WORLD'S LARGEST COLD-FORGING MACHINE

The world's largest boltmaker, the biggest cold-forging machine ever designed, is being built for the Cleveland Cap Screw Co.

A 196-ton monster standing twice as high as a man, the boltmaker will draw raw stock 1 7/16-inch hot rolled steel rod, down to size and produce giant cap screws 1¼ inches in diameter, 10 inches long, at rates up to 40 a minute. The screws will weigh about 5 pounds each.

Cleveland Cap, which developed the Kaufman double extrusion process, frequently used in the operation of the boltmaker, said the big cap screws will be the largest product ever made automatically by the cold-forging method.

The largest boltmaker now is a ¾ inch machine, weighing only about one-fourth as much as the new giant. The big machine will consume a ton of steel every 10 minutes.

Delivery of the mammoth boltmaker, whose length exclusive of feed parts, is 22 feet, is expected before the end of the year. It will be housed in Cleveland Cap's $4,500,000 showplace plant now being pushed to completion in southeast Cleveland.

While the machine is rated to make cap screws 1¼ inches in diameter, it may be tooled up to produce screws of even larger diameters, Cleveland Cap said. The company is a specialist in the manufacture of cap screws in the big sizes.

The new boltmaker—to cost over $400,000—will permit Cleveland Cap to turn out large finished sizes of better quality than by the hot-heading method now used on screws above ¾ of an inch in diameter.

The new machine, the company said, will probably be used in the cold-forging—for the first time—of many large-size special products, in addition to fasteners.

Drawing the steel rod to size, the big boltmaker cuts off the stock in proper lengths, extrudes the blank, heads, trims the head, points the end and rolls the threads on—all automatically.

It marks the first time since 1940 that increased size capacity has been designed.

Boltmakers, which are made only by National Machinery Co., date but from 1935. Between then and 1940, the following sizes were designed and built—3/16 inch, ¼, 5/16, ⅜, ½, ⅝, and ¾.

And now, after 16 years, a jump to a 1¼-inch boltmaker. The jump has been a tremendous one, imposing—as is always true in a first of anything—many design and construction problems. The machine has 1,800 parts. There is no precedent for such a machine as this.

In operation, the boltmaker will be tended by three men at as many control positions—one at the wire-drawing end, where 2,800-pound coils of 1 7/16-inch steel rod will be fed, a second at the conventional mid-machine post, and the third at the thread-rolling end.

The machine will have specially designed electronic variable-speed controls, the first ever to be installed on a boltmaker. The machine will have a special 150-horsepower electric motor and its own automatic lubricating and cutting-oil systems.

The Power of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Memorial Day tomorrow and honor those brave men who fought and died to save our country and our liberties, let us not forget to honor also those equally brave men who fought and lived—many of whom will bear throughout their lives the scars of battle. In many cases we can do nothing more for those who died, except to decorate their graves and remember them with grateful hearts. But for the living we can do much, and perhaps it is by what we do for them that we can best honor those who died.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the following article by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale entitled "The Power of Memorial Day," which expresses very beautifully our debt to all of those who have fought for our country. This article appeared in the Pineville (W. Va.) Independent-Herald for Friday, May 25, 1956, and is as follows:

THE POWER OF MEMORIAL DAY
(By Dr. Norman Vincent Peale)

I had the privilege of growing up in small Ohio communities in the early part of this century, and one of my most inspirational memories centers around Memorial Day and the old soldiers of the Civil War.

To me, Memorial Day was one of the most moving of all the national holidays, I was stirred by the speeches and martial music from the bandstand or cemetery on what we called Decoration Day. There was something about the newness of life that the spring had brought; soft sunshine falling on the fresh green grass of early summer, the misty hills in the distance, the sound of stirring national songs, and above all, the softly flapping flag in the gentle breeze as the speaker told us of our country, the deep devotion of its heroes, and recounted once more the stirring episodes of our heroic past.

And many a lazy summer afternoon, I sat on the coping around the old courthouse listening to the veterans of the Civil War tell of their experiences in the epic struggle between the States. A boy's imagination quickly sent him off behind long columns of blue or gray, and to him, such names as Antietam, the Wilderness, Shiloh, and Gettysburg became very real and meaningful.

Those old soldiers used to talk gratefully of Lincoln's insistence that those who had borne the heat of the battle and the burden of the struggle, the widow and the orphan, were to be given not charity, but their rightful due as the dependents of those brave men who had fought to preserve liberty and to keep the Union intact. It was regarded as a sacred duty of the Nation, and the Nation kept faith with its veterans.

In those days, as now, were many who had been disabled by the struggle. Their ability to compete in life had been reduced by wounds suffered in battle. Even as a boy I remember hearing how it seemed they were thought of only on such days as Memorial Day, when orators, fervent in their patriotism, remembered, if only for a day, the long, continuing sacrifice made not by those who had died in battle, but by the disabled who were to live for many years following the great struggle.

The heroes of World War I and World War II and the Korean war are, of course, men who, with no concern for themselves, gave their lives that freedom might live. We can never do them adequate honor. And, we must never forget them. They died in their young life, forsaking the opportunities of the years that the rest of us might live and develop our highest hopes and dreams.

However, there are other living heroes who deprived themselves of either physical, emotional, or mental health for us and for their fellow countrymen. It would be as wrong for us to neglect or forget them as their buddies who today sleep on some Pacific Island or in a European cemetery. A hero dead or a hero maimed and disabled are both due our equal gratitude and our unceasing devotion.

We must never forget that the most effective way of honoring those who have died is to remember the living disabled, that their lives may be rich and full. They are a great asset to our country as the living embodiment of devotion to freedom. A country is recreant indeed which does not everlastingly keep alive grateful appreciation to those who

suffered disability to perpetuate everything that we Americans hold dear.

There could be no better time than on Memorial Day to resolve that we shall gratefully support the honored men and women who have suffered disability from the wars of the United States.

Government Programs and Agricultural Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, recently delivered an address at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., before the Sixth National Institute of Animal Agriculture. Because of the importance of what he said and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of that address:

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

(Address by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture, before Sixth National Institute of Animal Agriculture, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., April 19, 1956)

This is a land of abundance. All about us in this great midwestern breadbasket, we see evidence of the productive strength of American agriculture.

It's good to have a land of plenty. But in the case of some of our farm products, we seem to have too much plenty. We have abundance over and beyond all reasonable current needs. Indeed, abundance has become one of our major problems in agriculture.

Yet it must be said that, burdensome and price depressing as our farm surplus may be, it is far more pleasant to wrestle with the problem of surplus than with the problem of not enough. Tonight over one-half of the world's population will go to bed undernourished, many of them downright hungry. How fortunate we are that in the United States we have an agriculture so productive and so versatile that no American need go to bed hungry or need even fear hunger in the foreseeable future. For this all America must be eternally grateful.

Although our problems of farm surplus are perplexing and complex, they are far more welcome than the problems of chronic shortage, undernourishment, hunger, and starvation.

From our early Colonial history to the present moment, Government has encouraged increased agricultural production. This has been true of both Federal and State Governments. This encouragement has ranged all the way from free seeds to public supported research and to price guaranties at incentive levels.

From time to time Government has attempted to discourage farm production through various types of acreage and marketing controls. At the very time such attempts were being made to discourage production on the one hand, our long-time efforts to increase output on the other hand continued unabated—often at an accelerated rate. Indeed, many of the schemes to curtail output have transferred additional quick liquid resources into agriculture, and have themselves resulted in increased output both in the short-run and in the long-run. In this respect they were self-defeating.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION INCREASE OUTPUT

The United States Department of Agriculture was created in 1862, the same year in which President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act establishing the land-grant colleges. A primary purpose of both of these actions was to increase the production of food and fiber. In the words of an early Secretary of Agriculture, their job was "to make 2 blades of grass grow where 1 grew before." That continues to be a primary goal of both USDA and the State agricultural-experiment stations.

We must ever strive, through research and education, to increase production per unit of input, to reduce costs, to expand efficiency, and through proper pricing and effective promotion, to translate these benefits into expanded markets.

On the whole, the impact of these governmental programs on agriculture has been good. American agriculture is now feeding our growing population on science and technology.

We have increased our total agricultural output in the decade and one-half since the beginning of World War II by some 35 percent, on roughly the same acres we had previously, and with substantially fewer workers.

Production per man-hour in agriculture has more than doubled in the last 2 decades. A part of this increase in efficiency came from the substitution of mechanical power for horses, and the release of substantial acreages for net production for sale. The bulk of the expansion, however, and the increase in efficiency resulted from the rapid adoption of new technological and scientific developments. These took the form of new varieties, disease control, antibiotics, mechanization, plant food practices, nutritive developments, and a whole host of other advances.

An important effect of these developments was to make acres of land, in and of themselves, a relatively less important factor of production year after year. Indeed, in recent years it has been possible increasingly to substitute capital for labor and for land.

This has had two results. In the first place, guaranteed unit prices at incentive levels called forth greater production responses than had been indicated by historical production records. In the second place, efforts to curb production by acreage limitation had less than the anticipated effect because acres in themselves were no longer the most important single factor of production. Indeed, under the new technologies, when cash payments were transferred to agriculture in return for acreage limitation on specific crops, those cash transfers were often used to increase inputs of science and technology on the remaining acres, with the result that total production increased even in the short-run. In the long-run, it almost always increased.

PRICE SUPPORTS AND PRODUCTION CONTROLS

Price fixing, particularly at minimum levels, is not new in America. The principle is as old as the colonies themselves; only the form and the extent are new. The Virginia Colony, as early as the first half of the 1600's, experienced such English mercantilistic practices as tariffs and rebates, subsidies, price regulation, and in the case of tobacco, even production control.

We learned under the OPA of World War II that whenever we set the price of any commodity very far below its competitive level, we must also put controls on the demand side of the market. The result is rationing of goods to consumers. By the same token, whenever we fix the price too high, we must control on the supply side of the market. The result is subsidy to producers. This is inevitable.

Artificially high prices and rigid controls are the Siamese twins of agricultural policy. They cannot be separated, except in time of war, when an insatiable demand sops up surpluses that accumulate between war periods.

Unfortunately, our war-free intervals of the last 20 years have been so brief that many of our people have not learned this important lesson very well. Even in the five years since the Korean war, the Commodity Credit Corporation has absorbed some $9 billion of this problem and has partially camouflaged the lesson that otherwise would have been taught.

CONTROLS GO WITH HIGH SUPPORTS

High support prices develop "surpluses" on two counts: they discourage consumption and they encourage increased production. Output is then curtailed in an effort to "balance" supply with demand. Controls become part of an intricate system to allocate production quotas to individual farmers on designated crops and livestock. More rigid marketing quotas follow when acreage allotments fail to do the job. When this situation occurs, there can be no voluntary compliance. Everything must be compulsory. Witness marketing quotas today in connection with tobacco, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts. These controls are not mere "production adjustments." They have teeth in them!

Effective curbs on production raise a myriad of questions. Shall efficient farmers be held back so as to provide a market at higher prices for the less efficient? Shall excess resources be retained in agriculture, when ample opportunity for their effective use is available outside agriculture? Shall top grade land be held idle while second grade land is given a production base? Can a central planning agency in Government, with its broad and uniform directives, get more efficient use of farm resources than would be true if well informed individual farmers made their own decisions? How do you provide for desirable geographic shifts in production areas for a particular crop? How can a beginning farmer acquire his base without taking over from Dad, or perhaps acquiring it with his bride, herself a daughter of a base owner?

What can be done to prevent supported prices from being capitalized into the value of the land itself? In many tobacco producing areas today, for example, 1 acre of tobacco base sells from $1,500 to $2,000. In this case, the higher land price is a cost to the new operator rather than a gain.

PRICE FIXING HINDERS EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES

If rigid price supports at incentive levels persist over any length of time, the resulting rigidity in relative prices will bring lowered effectiveness in the use of our resources. Technology is always changing in a dynamic economy, but at different rates for different products. Such changes cannot be predicted accurately.

Fixed prices, whether ceiling prices or support prices, are essentially backward looking in their operation. Price levels are nearly always fixed with reference to a historical base. Hence, it is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the flexibility in fixed prices necessary to permit desirable adjustments to changing technology and shifting demands. This nearly always means less efficient utilization of resources than would occur under a system with less governmental control.

If price manipulations and production controls are of relatively short duration, the resulting maluse of our resources will not be serious. However, if they are maintained for more than a couple of years, they must be constantly restudied and readjusted so as to recognize changes in technology and demand. Otherwise, general production patterns will

develop, or will be maintained, which will not best utilize the real capabilities of our economy to produce goods and services most needed and desired by consumers.

NO SELF-CORRECTING ERRORS UNDER PRICE FIXING

When some three million commercial farmers in the United States plan their production and marketing programs on the basis of their individual price forecasts, some make wise decisions and some do not. But these errors tend to be compensating. The bulk of them make approximately the right decision, in line with what consumers desire most.

Aggregate errors in production judgments tend to be self-correcting, as economic ratios change and dictate such corrections. If the price of hogs is high relative to corn, for example, farmers produce more hogs. As hog production and marketings increase, the ratio between hog and corn prices narrows, inducing farmers to shift to other kinds of livestock.

If prices of hogs and corn are effectively fixed by a governmental agency, the farmer must try to forecast changes in Government edicts affecting relative prices of the two commodities, rather than to forecast economic changes in consumer demand and cost relationships. The former is much more difficult to predict than the latter.

At the time a price is fixed, it may be at such a level as to call for the proper amount of production. But economic relationships don't stay put. Administrative rulings are not as flexible as the marketplace. The price administrator moves slowly, and discovers belatedly that the support level is wrong. It takes still longer to admit the error and correct it.

LIVESTOCK IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED

The way in which historical rigidities of this kind adversely affect economic production and consumption may be illustrated by comparing animal products with our major crops. In any realistic comparison of productivity per man-hour in crops and livestock, it is apparent that crops have forged steadily ahead of livestock. Crop production per man-hour of farm labor has more than doubled in the last two decades, while livestock production per man-hour of farm labor has increased only about 70 percent. Moreover, there are substantial differences within commodities which are particularly significant. Because of widespread mechanization, among other reasons, wheat, feed grains, and cotton, among the crops, and broiler production among livestock, have shown the greatest increase in productivity. Forage-consuming livestock have tended to lag behind.

It is at once apparent that commodities which have experienced the greatest expansion in productive efficiency are in best position to meet competitive price pressures. Thus if Government, through rigid price supporting techniques on a historical base, attempts to maintain historical price ratios between livestock and crops, we soon discover that the competitive position of animal products is adversely affected and of crops favorably affected.

This is a potent reason why the Government now either owns or has loans on over 1 billion bushels of wheat, over 1 billion bushels of corn, and nearly 14 million bales of cotton. Government price manipulation has placed a premium on excessive production of such commodities because the rigid support mechanism did not take into account relative changes which had occurred in productive efficiency and demand. By the same token, in the case of feed grains and to the lesser extent in the case of wheat, these products were channeled into Government warehouses rather than into animal products primarily because of the substantial lag in the adjustment of price ratios inherent in governmental price fixing.

About three-fourths of the total CCC investment of some $9 billion centers in 3 commodities—cotton, wheat, and corn. In the case of each of these commodities, we have experienced phenomenal increases in production per man-hour in the last couple of decades. A price-support system at incentive levels, based on price relationships four decades old, even with the modest adjustment provided by modernized parity, is unable to cope effectively with relative changes among commodities in cost relationships and demand conditions that occur with amazing rapidity.

ACREAGE CONTROLS MERELY SHIFT THE PROBLEM

Stringent acreage controls on cotton and wheat—our two crops in most chronic surplus—have not brought the surplus situation under control. Indeed, in 1955 our total stocks in both cotton and wheat have increased, although cotton acreage had been reduced from 25.2 million acres in 1953 to 17.5 million acres in 1955, and wheat had been reduced from 78.8 million acres in 1953 to 58 million acres in 1955.

But more than that, the acres taken out of cotton and wheat, in the main, did not remain idle. They were shifted to other crops, and entered into competition with other long-established production areas. In the main, these acres went either into grass or feed grains. This shift accounted in large part for the increase in total feed-grain production, and contributed substantially to the surplus of corn now in Government hands. The resultant low price of corn and feed grains no doubt encouraged added livestock production, which helped to bring on last winter's low prices for hogs and feed cattle.

This illustration of how the cotton and wheat problems were shifted, in part at least, to feed grains and thence to hog producers clear outside the Cotton and Wheat Belts, demonstrates the interlocking nature of American agriculture. It is difficult, if not impossible, to impose an artificial adjustment on one sector of American agriculture without its ultimate impact showing up elsewhere in completely unexpected places.

There are other important and undesirable consequences of this system of uneconomic price manipulation which we should note. It stimulated excess production abroad as well as at home. It encouraged substitute products to rob our markets both in this country and in other lands. It helped destroy our export outlets, as expanded production abroad robbed us of traditional markets. It even attracted foreign production to our shores to compete with domestic output. These things together brought upon our farmers the most stringent of production and marketing controls in the history of American agriculture.

These controls are unpalatable to us in Government, just as they are to the men who operate our farms and our marketing institutions. They are the undesirable product of an uneconomic system of price manipulation.

These irritating and uneconomic controls are the inevitable aftermath of a price-support system conceived in short-run politics. They portray the futility of seeking solution in expediency rather than in integrity.

Producers of our basic crops have been cut back on production quotas to the point that many of them are nearly forced out of business.

Midwestern corngrowers, if they were to comply with their acreage allotments in 1956, would in many cases find it difficult to have sufficient volume to operate efficiently. In 1955, for example, only about 40 percent of the corn grown in commercial areas was within acreage allotments and was therefore eligible for price support. With the corn carryover in excess of 1 billion bushels, existing law has forced a further cut of 15 percent in acreage allotments for 1956. With so unattractive a prospect, compliance in 1956 probably will be low.

Most Corn Belt farmers have voted with their corn planters that they do not want acreage allotments for their corn crop. They foresee the futility of pursuing further a price support and control program which would lead them ever closer to forced liquidation.

On the other hand, producers of other basic crops with compulsory controls, as is true of cotton, tobacco, wheat, and rice, have so small an allotment that many of them find it difficult to meet operating and living costs with production so curtailed.

A cotton farmer with a 3-acre allotment, a tobacco farmer with his 1-acre allotment, or a wheat farmer with an allotment only 60 percent of what he used to grow, needs something besides 90 percent of parity. One hundred percent of parity would not solve his problem. There isn't much that any kind of price-support program can do for him. His crying need is for an opportunity to expand his production.

When a commodity gets itself into the fix of producing for the Government rather than producing for a growing market, it almost inevitably finds a ceiling placed on opportunity.

Burley tobacco provides an excellent illustration of where you ultimately get with production controls. The Congress has established five-tenths acre as a minimum allotment for any individual burley tobacco farm. When acreage reductions were called for, the cut fell most heavily on larger farms. No farm is reduced below five-tenths acre.

TOWARD A NATION OF PEASANT FARMERS

But it is impossible to make any kind of decent living for self and family on five-tenths acre of tobacco. Indeed, it is very difficult even to be an efficient producer on an allotment that size.

Yet last year, of a total of 317,000 burley tobacco farms in the United States, more than 60 percent of them were at the minimum level.

This means that your Department of Agriculture is now in the business of rationing poverty among burley tobacco producers.

The same trend is taking place, although to a less marked extent, among flue-cured tobacco producers in the Southeast. Interestingly enough, just in the last couple of years, the world's largest market for flue-cured tobacco moved from Wilson, N. C., to Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. We have no control over Southern Rhodesia producers, who are moving into the European markets our farmers once supplied. And while this takes place, American farmers are being severely curtailed by Government in their opportunity to exercise their God-given right of initiative, imagination, and production in a healthy atmosphere of economic freedom.

There is no Government program that can provide a decent living for a family with a cotton allotment of 4 acres, a tobacco allotment of less than 1 acre, a wheat allotment so small that necessary equipment can't be used efficiently, or a corn allotment cut down to the size that the rigid price-support program would impose upon your midwestern farmers.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS ARE BACKWARD LOOKING

Few if any agricultural commodity groups have ever expanded after accepting the favor of Government high-price supports, and the necessary production and marketing controls which follow. On the contrary, the production of many price-supported commodities has shrunk in recent years. When the benevolent hand of Government is called upon to control prices and direct the flow of goods, opportunity to produce and market is usually rationed among producers. The farmers are limited to a percentage of some historic base of what they have produced in the past.

Government production and marketing controls are essentially backward looking—not forward looking. Under these circumstances, producers with above average managerial capacity and ambition are severely limited in what they can do. They suffer, consumers suffer, and all America suffers.

HORSESENSE IN THE HOG LOT

The method in which farmers make their own adjustments is clearly illustrated with what is happening in the hog production and marketing situation. Hogs have been in the political news in recent months. Last winter there was much politically inspired pressure for the Government to place a price floor under live hogs. Some groups pressed for a price floor of $20, others $18, and still others $15. There was no question that something needed to be done to improve the hog situation. The question revolved around the kind of program that should be undertaken.

The Government chose the route that would bring temporary relief and at the same time work toward sound long-time solution.

It participated actively in the extensive pork promotional campaign. This paid off. In recent months our people have been eating pork at the rate of nearly 80 pounds per person per year. This compares with 66 pounds in 1955, 60 pounds in 1954, and 56 pounds in the 5 years before the war.

We purchased more than 197 million pounds of pork and lard since mid-November. These items are in full distribution to our school lunch program in sufficient quantity to provide an average of three meals of pork per week. Distribution is also underway to institutions and to needy persons here at home.

In excess of 100 million pounds of lard have been sold to foreign countries for foreign currency. We are pressing for still more such sales. Commercial export sales of lard are running about 100 million pounds ahead of last year.

As you know, hog prices have been fluctuating at a level of about $4 above the January low, and have shown continued strength.

I think you will be interested to know that the average farm price of all hogs was 90 cents per hundredweight higher during the first 3 years of the Eisenhower administration than it was during the last 3 years of the Truman administration. And there was not a Korean war during the Eisenhower administration to boost high prices either.

Last winter and spring we received much mail and many telegrams from hog farmers, farm organization leaders, and other people interested in agriculture urging us not to place a price floor under live hogs. These people were aware that any such action would result in production and marketing controls that would be contrary to the best interests of hog producers.

The hog production and marketing situation is already adjusting. Four months ago it was indicated that farmers' intention to breed for spring farrow this year was 2 percent below a year ago. A recent report from 9 Cornbelt States indicates a reduction of about 7 percent. This means, therefore, that marketings should drop below last year's levels during this summer, and prices will begin the upward phase of the price cycle. Producers who "know their stuff" and are efficient will be free to plan hog production on their individual farms in keeping with sound management and good husbandry. No Government planner will tell them how many sows they may breed, how heavy they can make their hogs, or when or where they must market their hogs.

And yet there are those who would perpetuate the present system of farm controls still further, with the obvious thought that the hope of continued high price supports would be popular among producers, even though they are being gradually squeezed out of business.

AGRICULTURE IN THE POLITICAL AUCTION RING

This is a political year. It is a season when hungry politicians feed on unrest. Promises are made which defy performance. Legislation passes Congress which defies effective administration.

In the months immediately ahead, frequent attempts will be made to place agriculture on the political auction block. This is unfortunate. American agriculture is not for sale to irresponsible bidders in the political auction ring. American agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat, and its welfare must not be sacrificed on the altar of partisan politics.

The answers to our farm problems must be sought more in the company of statesmen than in the arena of the politicians.

We must chart an economically sound course of action, even though it doesn't promise any white rabbits out of a hat, any nostrums, any patent medicine panaceas.

We must recognize that the combination of incentive price and production control program we have been following leads only to further imbalance between production and consumption, to uneconomic patterns of production, to vanishing markets, to still further production restrictions, to the politics of equal shares among producers, and toward a peasant agriculture.

This is not the road that will lead our great agricultural industry toward increasing prosperity, progress, and freedom for millions of Americans who choose to live in close communion with the soil.

Home Rule for Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of my first acts as a Member of Congress was to sign a petition to provide for the discharge of a bill establishing home rule in the District of Columbia.

I will never feel that we are living up to our constant profession of freedom and liberty until all of our citizens have the right to vote. When hundreds of thousands do not enjoy that privilege and live in the Nation's Capital, it is extremely poor propaganda for the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including editorial statements from some of the Nation's largest and most influential newspapers supporting home rule for the District of Columbia:

[From the Washington Post of May 28, 1956]

NATION'S PAPERS URGE HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON—EDITORIALS DEMAND HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT OUT BILL PASSED BY SENATE

Some of the Nation's largest and most influential newspapers have lent their editorial support recently to the District's long effort to gain home rule and the right to vote.

Among the words they used to describe the plight of the Nation's Capital and its citizens are ridiculous, grotesque, senseless, ignoble, undesirable, and absurd.

The bill has been gathering dust in a House District Committee pigeonhole since its passage by a vote of 59 to 15 last year in the Senate. The measure has been endorsed, with some proposed changes, by President Eisenhower.

The most widely circulated newspaper in the country, the New York Daily News, with a circulation of more than 2,100,000, is among papers backing home rule and supporting a House petition by Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Democrat, of West Virginia, to pry the measure loose from the District Committee.

Describing the end of home rule in 1874 as a temporary measure, the News continues: "Congress is still running Washington—and very badly—with Members of Congress doubling in brass as aldermen. The whole business is grotesque."

A Texas newspaper, the Houston Post, calls the home-rule bill a good cause. Continues the Post: "The right to vote is a great American privilege. The citizens of Washington are denied it. Aside from the tragic aspects of their political situation, there are many absurdities."

The evening newspaper in the capital of Kansas, the Topeka State Journal, poses a question: "Will you imagine what it would be like if Topeka * * * were governed not by a municipal administration of its own choice, but by the State legislature? * * * Then you can imagine the feelings of the people of voteless Washington, D. C., whose municipal affairs—weed cutting and all—are managed by the Congress of the United States, no less."

Home rule, observes the State Journal, is being blocked by a "stubborn, contrary little clique" on the District Committee.

The New York Herald Tribune says the recent primary election is a noteworthy event, but adds that the privilege of voting should be extended. "Now, more than ever," says the Herald Tribune, "it is time for Congress to give up its powers over the District, which it does not employ too well anyway, and allow Washingtonians the rights enjoyed by all other Americans."

The New York Times notes: "It isn't pleasant to say it, but one of the main reasons why a modern home-rule bill has never seen the light of day in the House is the unreasoning fear that Washington's large Negro population might control local government in case suffrage were granted. That is an unworthy as well as an ill-founded one."

More than 75 favorable editorials were collected by the Washington Home Rule Committee. More excerpts follow:

Cleveland Plain Dealer: "It seems to us only fair that the whole House have the right to vote on the measure, and that Washington citizens have their right to vote on whether they want the charter in force should the bill be enacted. This is the democratic way of doing things."

Seattle Times: "The American Colonies fought the War of the Revolution to escape the burdens of taxation without representation. Almost 2 centuries later, residents of the District of Columbia are in that undesirable situation."

Christian Science Monitor (Boston): "If there is anything more ridiculous in the structure of American Government than the provision current laws make or fail to make for governing the city of Washington, it would be difficult to find it."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Few bills in Congress are more thoroughly meritorious than the one to give home rule to the District of Columbia."

San Francisco Chronicle: "The present system whereby Congress serves as a city council for the National Capital is an affront to the 850,000 residents of Washington; it is a needless expense to the payers of Federal taxes, and it imposes time-consuming duties and responsibilities upon Members of Congress."

Chicago Daily News: "We hope every Illinois Congressman will sign this petition and help to obtain justice for the hapless Washingtonians."

Philadelphia Inquirer: "The people who live in the heart city of the world's number one democracy do not themselves possess the basic privilege of democracy. * * * Like odd customs of other lands, this one is founded neither in logic nor political commonsense."

Hartford Courant: "This (pigeonholing of the home-rule bill) is a ridiculous demonstration of democracy, and one that the House leadership, Democrat and Republican, ought to take special pride in upsetting."

The National Small Business Men's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the attached letter from Mr. Paul A. Heideke, who is answering the response of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], to my remarks of April 30 on the political program supported by small-business men:

THE WASHINGTON PLANOGRAPH CO., INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1956.
Hon. DEWITT S. HYDE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1956 (p. 6865) that Congressman ROOSEVELT in response to your remarks in the RECORD of April 30, 1956 (p. 6540) had attacked the legislative program of the National Small Business Men's Association, of which I am a member, as being a front for big business.

I recognize that Mr. ROOSEVELT's disparagement of our program is merely the familiar and worn political gambit of trying to create an artificial breach between large and small business, but his remarks include some misstatements that require comment.

The program of the NSBMA need no defense except to the extent that it has been misrepresented by Mr. ROOSEVELT. We are in favor of fair tax treatment. We believe that the small business man is entitled to grow by accumulation of earnings. We have supported the recommendations for reasonable curbs on the life-or-death power of labor unions, against the abuse of which small business cannot survive. We are in favor of economy in Government, and a sound currency. We are opposed to random expansion of Government control and to socialistic efforts of big Government to reduce all men to a common level.

Mr. ROOSEVELT calls this anarchy. According to Mr. ROOSEVELT, it is in order to complain about the antitrust abuses of big business, but not about the misuse of power by the unions. We are not against the unions, and we have not made any recommendation that means destruction of or undue constriction of any organizations or institutions whatsoever.

Let us not be deceived by political sham. This is a big and prosperous Nation, made big by the American spirit of independence, by opportunity and incentive, by individual initiative and integrity. If we continue to prosper, it is imperative that we safeguard the processes by which we have become what we are. There has never been any likelihood that the people of this country would subscribe to the false doctrines of communism, but there is a very real danger that the American drive can be stifled by big government, by regulation, by redtape, and by subsidies and other forms of paternalistic socialism.

Mr. ROOSEVELT has made a big point of the fact that 24 large companies are members of the Small Business Economic Foundation. I have been a member of the National Small Business Men's Association for many years, and I know as a matter of fact that the National Small Business Men's Association and the Small Business Economic Foundation are two separate, distinct entities having no financial connection.

Let's not kid ourselves. Business is the economic backbone of the Nation—small business and big business; the two are indivisible. Mr. ROOSEVELT implies that business morality is dependent on size. The fact is that morality in business, labor, or government, is the morality of the individual.

Let us face the facts. Our prosperity and our national security require big business and big government, and human nature being what it is, we also have to have ground rules that apply to everybody—business, labor, and government. Ours is a complicated society, and it may be difficult to maintain balance and perspective, but all we have to do is to keep a steady hand on the helm and not be deluded by the Roosevelt refrain about class distinctions and feudal barons long since expired.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. HEIDEKE.

My Country's Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the attached poems My Country's Flag and Requiem. These poems were written by Mr. Charles R. Stump, of Marion, Ind.

In keeping with the spirit of Memorial Day and those we honor, I feel that it is most appropriate to include these poems that so aptly express the thoughts of millions of Americans at this time:

MY COUNTRY'S FLAG

My country's flag!
Long may it wave on high,
Emblem of freedom's mighty cause,
Born on the wings of time,
Holding sacred our precious destiny,
Our love and our loyalty.

My country's flag!
May it in eternal glory shine
As the stars in the firmament.
And all its living hours blend
The beauty of the sun
Till time's calendar is done.

My country's flag!
And may its colors rich and true,
The red, the white, the blue,
Be lifted high on wings of peace
Till all strife and warfare cease,
And blest is all humanity.

—Charles R. Stump.

MARION, IND.

REQUIEM

Let muffled drums be beating,
As feet are softly treading
And memory pauses with host
Where poppies are blooming.

The bugle calls to them in vain,
The martial strains now flowing,
As colors wave across the main
And heads are reverently bowing.

In Flander's Field sleep the brave,
The ground with ashes hallowing;
On land, in sea, on foreign strands
Our valiant sons are resting.

The world, full of dire distress,
Its need they went heeding;
With high courage gave their all;
No coward's cause were pleading.

Should they today be waking,
This army host be rising.
Would they not pray with one accord
For peace and understanding?

—Charles R. Stump.

Giveaway to Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Newsweek magazine there is an article by Raymond Moley entitled "Giveaway to Whom?"

I have asked leave to extend my remarks and include the same in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe it fairly and squarely answers some current attacks on the Eisenhower administration:

A thin, shrill complaining theme runs through most of the political discourse opposed to the Eisenhower administration. It is the accusation that this administration is giving away the great natural resources, minerals, timber, waterpower—the heritage of the people—to certain people who because they are in business are therefore rascals. The assets involved are thus lost to the people foever. A conservative administration, it is asserted, does not conserve. It dissipates and destroys.

This political routine is an effort to raise the ghosts of long ago, when there were real rascals and when our resources were truly wasted and given away. Government then was not only wayward but wayless.

CONSERVE, NOT HOARD

Back there, at the turn of the century, the conservation movement was born, and Theodore Roosevelt became its major exponent. The presentation of the public domain became a major concern of the Federal Government. Over the years hundreds of laws were made to regulate the use of our resources by private persons and agencies who sought ligitmately to develop them. The conservation movement was not designed to keep these resources in sterile hoarding, with an expensive bureaucrracy to guard them. Nor did anyone then propose that the Government itself go into the mining, electric-power, timber, or grazing businesses.

The rewards for Government through regulated private use are very considerable. There are the prices paid in the form of royalties or other forms of compensation. There are the vacant spots in the vast domain to be occupied by farmers, workers, industries, towns, and cities. There is the

property created and the people drawn to the region on which the various governments, local, State, and Federal, levy taxes.

However, for two decades after the great depression politicians made business and businessmen the objects of derision and attack. Many members of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations and their supporters in Congress leaned toward Federal collectivism. Notable among these were men such as Harold Ickes and Henry Wallace, who occupied key positions in the administration of natural resources. Under them there grew up a bureaucracy impregnated with the Ickes-Wallace philosophy. Despite the change of party control in 1953 and the declaration in the new, Eisenhower philosophy that the cold war between business and government should end, the old bureaucracy held over. Many members of that bureaucracy have found common cause with collectivist, public-ownership politicians in Congress, and a number of "giveaway" charges have emerged which are being actively exploited by the various aspirants for the Democratic nomination and by former President Truman.

In a number of previous articles in this space I have indicated in some detail the frivolous nature of these charges. In the Hells Canyon case Congress had repeatedly refused to build a Federal dam, and after a year and a half of hearings the Federal Power Commission granted a license to the Idaho Power Co. to build three dams, the cost to go to private investors. The Al Sarena case has apparently blown up on the face of the Senate subcommittee which investigated it. In the case of the tidelands, the Federal Government never had title to give away. Congress, under the initiative and strong support of Democrats, merely clarified the title of the States, which the Supreme Court had temporarily clouded.

AN INDEFENSIBLE CHARGE

The indefensible character of the "giveaway" charge is easy to see. It does not openly assert, but it is intended to convey the absurd idea that there should be no private development of natural resources, even with legally prescribed regulation. It also insinuates, without proof from any source, that there has been some lack of integrity on the part of the policymaking officials responsible for the administration of those resources. In short, that the Eisenhower administration, because it has sought and obtained the services of successful men of business, is a false trustee and a crooked guardian of property belonging to the American people.

The Altar of the Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an Associated Press story carried in the Keene (N. H.) Evening Sentinel on May 19 of this year, telling of the Memorial Day activities to take place at the famed Altar of the Nation located at the Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge, N. H. National recognition is shown almost daily to this well-known nonsectarian memorial. Bills have been introduced by Senator BRIDGES, S. 3063, which is cosponsored by 22 other distinguished Senators from both sides of the aisle, and myself, H. R. 8826, to make the Altar of the Nation a national shrine. I hope the Congress this year will place its stamp of approval on this already national memorial to all who have served their country:

PRESIDENT WILL SEND WREATH TO CATHEDRAL
(By John B. Knox)

RINDGE.—On Memorial Day, May 30, the wreath of the President of the United States will be placed in the Cathedral of the Pines before the Altar of the Nation dedicated to God as a memorial for all American war dead—fighting men, nurses, and workers killed in industry.

In thus sending a wreath for the fourth consecutive year, President Eisenhower joins with the governors of all 48 States, the national commanders and patriotic organizations and the national leaders of civic, service and fraternal societies in tribute to all who died for their country in all wars. Clergy of different faiths will participate.

Gov. Lane Dwinell, of New Hampshire, will officiate at this ceremony in a hilltop grove of tall pines overlooking a great sweep of mountain, forest, and lake scenery.

This outdoor cathedral was dedicated to the glory of God and in loving and grateful memory of Sanderson Sloane by his parents, Douglas and Sybil Sloane. The son, a World War II pilot, was killed on a mission over Germany. Three years later the little son he never saw also died.

The spot they gave for this religious shrine—for people of all faiths—was the site their son had chosen for the home he was never to build. Some 2 million persons have come to the majestic place of worship on a lonely New Hampshire hill.

With the conducting of services by the Polish National Catholic Church in the cathedral, the number of denominations who have used this outdoor cathedral rose this spring to 36.

STARTS AT 3 P. M.

The Memorial Day ceremony will begin with an organ prelude at 3 p. m., followed by a salute to the colors by the local American Legion post. Then will follow a rollcall of the States and a reading of the Memorial Day tributes by the governors of all the States of the Nation.

As Eisenhower's wreath is placed at the altar, composed of stones sent here from all over the world, a soloist will sing The Star Spangled Banner.

The sacrifices of women in war will be commemorated by Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, will recall those men and women who in laboratories, shipyards, munitions, and aviation plants, shops, and factories lost their lives while providing the Nation with the sinews of war.

Supreme Knight Luke E. Hart, of the Knights of Columbus, will have the Knights of Columbus tribute placed at the altar.

Col. Ralph T. Miller, provincial commander of the Salvation Army, and former New Hampshire Gov. Robert Blood, representing the National YMCA, again will place wreaths in tribute. E. Roland Harriman, national chairman of the Red Cross, will again have a wreath laid in tribute to all Red Cross men and women whose lives were sacrificed on war service.

FATE DEPENDS UPON FAITH

Significant are the words in the message of the national commander of the American Legion, J. Addington Wagner, to be read as his wreath is placed: "The fate of America will depend on the faith of America."

Representatives of the Voice of America will record the tribute for broadcast to people behind the Iron Curtain.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address:

Dr. Dudley, Father Steiner, and distinguished guests, it is indeed a pleasure to be here today with your splendid group, which represents many faiths and geographic areas and dedicated to the program caption "This Nation Under God."

It is most appropriate that the Pilgrimage meets here in the Nation's Capital, so that recognition of an almighty god guiding the destiny of our country might be brought to bear in a forceful and lasting manner.

Far too many people today are guilty of what, for want of a better name, we will label "intellectual arrogance." They have ceased to depend on prayer, charity, or good works in accomplishing their desired ends. They rely strictly on knowledge gleaned from the printed work. Man has succeeded in constructing machinery that will do his bidding to a degree that staggers the imagination. He has planes that fly higher and farther and faster than ever before. Many automobiles now have 300 horsepower. Diseases are being eradicated with new miracle drugs. According to insurance statistics, improved diets are increasing the life span. Man has come a long way from the stone age. Unfortunately, he too often forgets he did not travel his long path alone.

A divine hand has led man, step by step, year by year, up the hill of human achievement—until he stands today with the capabilities of blowing himself from the face of the earth. The intellectual progress has been steady; unfortunately, the spiritual and moral progress has not kept pace. Where does mankind go from here?

Nations, like men, also quite often feel everything they are is a direct result of clever diplomacy, capable generals, or possibly a strategic geographic location. Any thinking person knows better. How many times have nations been saved from destruction by an absolute miracle? How many times have nations or cities been under siege, only to have the enemy depart just when those within the walls could no longer defend their positions? How many times in the history of our own country have we had circumstances similar to those just described? A question vexing military leaders for the past 15 years is "Why did not the Japanese move into Hawaii as they did the Philippines?" It could have been theirs for the taking, and World War II might easily have been prolonged by 5 years—with possible destruction of our west coast. Why didn't the Japanese move in? Was it because we were strongly entrenched? The islands were quite defenseless and the majority of the world knew it. God only knows. It's just that fundamental. You may search the records and review the tactics and intelligence reports of all nations concerned and you cannot find a logical military excuse for sparing Hawaii. Maybe that's because there are no records of the prayers offered in those hectic days by a terribly frightened people.

Probably every one of us here can think of a situation similar to that of Hawaii. "Why did not Hitler invade Britain at the time of Dunkirk? Why did not the Japanese take Australia?" We have seen many incidents such as these in our short life span that bear out my point.

Certainly, we have seen countless manifestations that this Nation is particularly blessed and watched over. "This Nation under God." The United States is unique; its citizens for almost two centuries have enjoyed freedoms that even today are still strangers to the majority of the world. We have stores of natural resources that appear inexhaustible. We have been able to draw on the cultures of the whole world to create what is known as the American scene.

Even from its very inception, this Nation has obviously been under the protecting hand of God. Just imagine—in a population originally only 4 million on the frontier of the world—the very cream of liberal thinking was assembled to construct the foundation of the finest government the world has ever known. It never fails to amaze me, as I sit in Congress, how many daily extenuating circumstances of government were anticipated by the Founding Fathers. These men were intelligent and educated, but one cannot help feeling that the safeguards placed in the Constitution of the United States go beyond the limits of human foresight. I like to feel that God had seen enough of brutality and despotism, and decided to let the world see how one nation could live and prosper under the auspices of Christian principles and teachings.

A most singular feature of the bountiful American way of life is the fact that despite the admission of almost everyone that our Government is based on religion and Christian teachings, there are many who do not want religion even mentioned insofar as government is concerned.

How many otherwise sensible people object to the morning reading of the Bible in public school classrooms? How many people do you know that object to a prayer opening a legislative day in the State legislatures or Congress? These people will tell you that religion does not belong in the proceedings of a democratic government.

Such a statement is ridiculous. Almost every step of governmental progress in history has been brought about through the gentling effect of religion. Did not the Christian missionaries tame the savage tribes that roamed the world for centuries? Was not the code of chivalry a direct result of the teachings of the church? Courtesy to ladies, treating others as you would have them treat you, Thou Shalt Not Kill—from these church teachings eventually came organized government. True government is but a gathering of people who desire to live and work together peacably for their common good. Is religion antagonistic to this purpose?

In this connection—prompted by a desire to make our citizens and the world conscious of the value of prayer—I introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to use the words "Pray For Peace" on mail cancellation dies. Certainly, we have tried every other method to avert a war which no one can win. Why not turn to prayer? Imagine the good that can be done as thousands of people here and abroad are reminded daily of the only way to achieve a just and lasting peace. This bill passed without objection in the House of Representatives; however, it has been held up in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Post Office Department has filed an objection to this measure, claiming the expenditure of $250,000 is not justified for an endeavor of this sort. This is a mighty small amount when compared with what we are spending against the possibility of a war. For a change, this spending would be in the interest of peace. A cancellation die of this type would go far to show the rest of the world that we are not completely engrossed in the material things of life and yearn as earnestly as they for a cessation of war—hot or cold. This would be an appeal from the first of the sister nations of the world.

In closing, I would again like to congratulate your dedicated group, many of whom have traveled a great distance to be here today. You are a symbol of the moral strength of which our great Nation is capable. In addition, you are a working application of tolerance that should stand as an inspiration and challenge to all those who feel their way is the only way. The symbols of various faiths on display here is ample proof that uniformity is not demanded; rather, the intention is to show appreciation and respect for the religious faith of everyone. Let us hope that the trust and good will evidenced here today will spread to the far corners of our country and remove the needless mistrust that sometimes exists among the various denominations.

Thank you and God bless you.

Congress and the OTC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the failure of H. R. 5550, the OTC bill, to move beyond the Ways and Means Committee is a tribute to the integrity of Congress. The bill represents no more than a concealed stratgem to confirm the State Department in its ambition to raise its field of acitivity, i. e., international relations, to an overriding level of priority wherever it comes into conflict with domestic interests.

In the pursuit of such ambitions the Constitution is an obsolete document or at best meaningless; any expedient obesance to it is reduced to twisting it, humoring it where otherwise offense might be given, and in its essence stultifying it by playing fast and loose with its principles.

We have the instance of the Department's support of the submission of OTC to Congress on the grounds, as expressed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Finance Committee, that submission of the "organizational features" of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—in the form of the OTC legislation, is a matter of "propriety" rather than an obligation under the Constitution. In other words, the submission of the OTC to Congress was above and beyond the call of duty. Presumably the Congress should vote the Congressional Medal of Honor to the Secretary for such an act of selflessness. In the meantime the substance of the issue, namely GATT, is carefully withheld from Congress. The State Department is willing to entrust Congress with the shell—OTC—but not the core—GATT.

When we reflect upon what is really at stake, namely the regulation of the foreign commerce of this country, the authority over which lies exclusively with Congress under the Constitution, it becomes clear that behind all the words, the shifts of position and the bravado of the State Department, what we really behold is a desperate struggle to dislodge Congress and, the Constitution notwithstanding, replacing the elected representatives of the people by the State Department.

Admission of this is stoutly denied by the State Department, for admission of it would point to the need of a constitutional amendment to accomplish the purpose. The State Department well knows that an amendment transferring the power to regulate foreign commerce from Congress to the executive would have no chance. That explains all the inverted logic, the topsy-turvy allegations, the denials of the obvious and the proclamation of the improbable to which the State Department has been reduced in its sorry stratagem.

The end that it cannot gain by an open and aboveboard approach it seeks one way or another by hook or crook to obtain in any event. It is to the great credit of Congress that it has shown itself not only wary and skeptical but firmly set against such unworthy strategy.

There are those who deplore what they call the "jealousy" of Congress over its authority. The word "jealousy" itself is an epithet designed to water down the integrity of Congress. I want to emphasize that unless Congress looks after its authority, a duty to which each Member is sworn as he takes an oath to uphold the Constitution—unless Congress is true to its responsibility to the voters who elect it and who rightly look to it to reflect the will of the electorate, there is little that will stand against the encroachment from the executive power. If "jealousy" is the right word for a proper concern over the division of powers then I say we should be jealous of our responsibility.

In this connection, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, a letter in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 23 that expresses the concern of numerous industries, producers and labor groups in this country over the threat of the OTC to the powers of Congress. The substance of the letter is in point with what I have said and develops some aspects that are worth keeping in mind:

STRACKBEIN CITES DULLES' STATEMENT

To the EDITOR:

Your editorial entitled "Furor Over OTC" in the May 9 issue was a masterpiece in its reflection of the differences between the pros and cons of the question. You aline yourself frankly with those in support of the OTC (i. e., for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation). Your views as expressed in the editorial fully confirm this frank alinement.

Ahe OTC you say is merely "an administrative arm" of GATT. "It is to be endowed with no supranational powers whatever," you continue.

DULLES' STATEMENT CHANGED

May I point out (with malice toward none) that Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State, in oral testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on March 1, 1956, changed his prepared text from a statement that OTC "is entirely administrative" to one saying that "it is essentially administrative" and that this marks an important difference; in fact it confirms the fear expressed by the opponents.

They fear the loss by Congress of its authority to regulate foreign commerce and its transfer to OTC–GATT if H. R. 5550 were passed. The safeguarding amendments adopted by the Ways and Means Committee would not apply to GATT itself but only to the OTC.

Therefore, GATT would remain free to amend itself, with our own acceptance of such amendments left to the State Department rather than the Congress. This is at the bottom of the fear.

To you this fear is something strange and you refer to it at once as tragic and ridicule it as something highly exaggerated. Moreover it is sinister since this fear is used by the protectionists as an appeal "to the worst nature of Congress—that is, to its jealousy of the powers of the executive branch."

CAUTION HELD JUSTIFIED

As one who has consistently called attention to this very aspect of the OTC I will say that not only is the caution justified—it is entirely commendable that Congress should be jealous of its constitutional authority, just as the press should be jealous of its freedom.

I do not believe that the point needs arguing. Hitler not only suppressed the freedom of the newspaper but he closed the legislature. Both stood in his way, one as formidable an obstacle as the other. Perhaps you are yourself jealous of the freedom of the press.

Let us hope so. If so, you should not berate those who for equally sound reasons are jealous of the functions of Congress. It would be just as easy to laugh at your concern for freedom of the press as the other way around. Neither is a laughing matter.

You say that this congressional jealousy of the Executive ignores the ominous changes that have swept the world since 1945. This raises the question whether there can be a dateline on the preservation of the integrity of the legislative branch. Both the freedom of the press and the preservation of the powers of Congress are as important since 1945 as before.

OPPOSES CURBING CONGRESS

If Congress is to be brushed aside every time a so-called emergency arises or is to be put to sleep for the duration of the cold war it cannot be worth much. Why not curb the press on the same pretext? Or is the press worth something to the preservation of freedom? If so, I do not believe that you can set Congress on a lower rung without courting consequences as disastrous as would follow suppression of the press.

If you will credit those of us who oppose the OTC with at least average sincerity you will better understand that there is much more at issue in the OTC legislation than meets the eye at first blush. That you are not sensitive to this imminent threat is no more surprising than the relative indifference of mere readers of newspapers to a particular threat to freedom of the press that to newspaper editors and publishers may be very real and vital.

The Constitution, like rules of a game, is invoked in nearly all instances by those whose interests would be injured by a breach. Those whose interests are not directly affected or who might even gain from such an infraction usually remain remarkably cool to an imminent threat or may even abet it.

The executive department, because of the vast powers at its disposal, is under constant temptation to enlarge its sway on the grounds that execution of laws requires wide discretion. On this theory the legislative branch would soon be out of business. The OTC is a perfect example.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

Bulldozer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days of huge expenditures for foreign aid by the United States, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to discover for myself, and to report to the Congress on a splendid example of generosity on the part of the citizens of metropolitan Detroit.

A missionary, the Reverend Donald L. Hessler, has been ministering to the needs of the people of Yucatan in Mexico for some time. He was aware that the climate and jungle growth were such that the people armed with the primitive agricultural implements of the area, were unable to clear their land and to protect against the encroachments of the ever-advancing jungle. He was further aware that his peoples' great unanswered physical needs were such that their spiritual development was retarded.

He made his first appeal about 6 weeks ago to the people of Detroit and its environs for assistance in purchasing a small bulldozer to clear sufficient land for not only the road building needs of the area, but also to help his people have enough land under cultivation to care for their own immediate needs.

I was delighted to find last week that the fund now substantially exceeds $18,000 and is still climbing.

Father Hessler is a Catholic priest, but all religious groups, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish have helped. Business and professional people have donated as well as womens' and veterans' groups. I am proud to say that my own council of the Knights of Columbus, St. Paul Council No. 2269, has had an important part. Prominent citizens and ordinary folks have made their contribution.

We know the result will be a wonderful thing for the people of Yucatan and for Father Hessler. I know it will bring satisfaction to all who participate, and will result in improved living conditions for many impoverished people in an undeveloped land. This is charity and foreign aid in its finest and purest form, coming from the hearts of many good people.

It is to the eternal credit of the Detroit Times, a civic minded newspaper in my own city of Detroit, Mich., that it has stimulated and fostered this worthwhile project through editorials and news coverage in a way which has made the early fruition of Father Hessler's dream possible. I pay tribute to that fine newspaper and to Mr. John Gariepy, who has done most of the reporting on the project, for the unselfish manner in which they have carried out the program to bring this before the people.

I insert into the RECORD here one of the Detroit Times' most recent articles from the issue of May 20, 1956, showing the progress of the drive:

DOZER DRIVE OVER THE HUMP
(By John Gariepy)

With funds now totaling $18,424, the "Bulldozer for Peace" campaign Saturday was over the hump grinding its way to a finish as more and more public response is evinced by the donations received at the campaign office.

A drive is on to complete the campaign by June 1 and to do this $6,576 is needed in donations in the next 2 weeks.

The drive can end June 1 if more persons enlist themselves as "lay missioners at home" by aiding the Reverend Father Donald L. Hessler, former Lake Orion resident, now laboring among native Indians in Mexico.

Father Hessler sought the help of The Detroit Times to purchase an 8-ton bulldozer, completely equipped, and costing about $25,000, to promote efficient agricultural methods among a race starving for over 1,000 years.

MOTHER'S DAY GIFT

Mrs. Catherine Tinek, 8060 Molena, wrote the campaign office:

"Enclosed please find $5, money I received from my husband for Mother's Day. I wish to donate it toward the bulldozer that Father Hessler is so badly in need of. I hope and pray that he will soon reach his quota."

A housewife from Walled Lake wrote:

"I have been reading the daily articles in the Detroit Times of the progress of the 'Bulldozer for Peace' campaign, wishing I could help. I enclosed $5 which was given to me for baby sitting and I hope it brings you a little closer to your goal. May you reap a rich harvest in the Lord's vineyard."

SPLENDID CAUSE

State Senator Harold M. Ryan wrote:

"Enclosed find check in the sum of $25 to add to the 'Bulldozer for Peace' fund. You and the Detroit Times are certainly to be commended in taking these efforts for such a worthwhile charitable cause.

"Actions like this go a long way toward helping bring peace to this world. I am encouraging my fellow lawyers to also make contributions to this splendid cause."

Mrs. Marie Kushner sent $15 in the name of the Ladies Social Gatherings of West Dearborn. First contributions were received from Ann Arbor, $2, and Ferndale, $10. Other recent contributions included James S. Holden, $50, Fred E. Harris, $25, and James L. Conlin, general manager, BOP assembly division, GM, $10.

Send contributions to Bulldozer, the Chancery, 1234 Washington Boulevard, Detroit 26. All gifts are tax deductible and will be acknowledged. The campaign office phone number is Woodward 1–2470.

Miss Carrie L. Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Department of the Air Force held its fourth annual honor awards ceremony honoring certain civilian employees of the Air Force for their distinguished service.

I am very pleased and proud that a constituent of mine, Miss Carrie L. Allen, from Ashland, Clay County, employed in the Office of Legislative Liaison for the

Air Force, was granted an award for outstanding performance for her work. I know that many Members of this House and their offices, like myself and my office, have received very competent, prompt, and courteous assistance from Miss Allen on many occasions. In this day, when so much happens so quickly, it is very gratifying to know that time is being taken to give recognition to an individual for outstanding work.

I extend my congratulations and appreciation to Miss Allen for her very fine work for the Air Force and in behalf of Congress.

The Inland Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the May 22, 1956, issue of the Panama City Herald, Panama City, Fla., entitled "The Inland Waterway." This fine editorial points out the tremendous increase in waterway traffic and its importance to many industries and cities along its route:

Before Panama City's doorstep passes ever-increasing water traffic making use of the inland waterway, a route of commerce reaching as far west as Brownsville, Tex. Commercial traffic on the Nation's 28,996 miles of navigation channels will break all records this year, although the barges moved a record 87.5 billion tons of freight last year.

Use of inland waterways as a means of transportation of goods is a big business throughout the Nation.

Transshipping between the ships of sea and inland waterway freight carriers, in such ports as New York, New Orleans, Houston, Brownsville, Portland, Corpus Christi, and Mobile, is increasing.

Last year barges handled 45 percent of the waterborne commerce in the port of New Orleans and 23 percent in Houston. In New York, the inland traffic is usually equal to the total foreign and coastwise commerce.

In the inland north, barge traffic along their canals has increased the capacities of waterside steel mills, iron furnaces, electric generating plants, and grain elevators. It has contributed almost wholly to the revival of the bituminous coal industry along the waterways and enabled business to form hundreds of new waterside industries which receive their fuel or raw products by barge or ship their products by water.

In other areas, the aluminum, petroleum, and chemical industries along the navigation canals have been expanded and the fertilizer industry has received a big boost by locating in areas served by barge traffic.

East to west, the inland waterway extends from Florida to the middle of Texas, and at several points intersects with barge canals to almost every point in the Nation.

The port of Apalachicola, long lying somnolent at the mouth of a navigable waterway, has become a beehive of activity and is preparing to become the funnel for barge and gulf traffic to eastern areas.

The route of commerce, flowing past Bay County's doorstep is a sign of rapid progress.

The Lesson at Princeton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of Monday, May 21, reveals that when Alger Hiss spoke at Princeton University he followed the current party line. The article has other important lessons which can be learned by a thorough reading of it.

The article follows:

THE LESSON AT PRINCETON

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Must a child burn himself severely to know the danger of fire? asks Counterattack in this article, reprinted here with special permission, commenting on the appearance of Alger Hiss on a Princeton University lecture platform.)

Even if inadvertently, Princeton University never more sharply fulfilled the functions of education than it did this month when one of its undergraduate debating societies invited Alger Hiss to speak to its membership. The lesson it taught was about the morality of the day and was summed up in the persons and performances of three persons involved in the Hiss incident.

First, of course, there is Alger Hiss. He is not a controversial figure. He is, instead, a clearly cut figure of contemporary history. He stands identified without successful contention as a collaborator with a Soviet espionage apparatus. And he has spent time in a Federal penitentiary for having lied in his testimony regarding that Soviet espionage apparatus. Nothing in his entire career, which included high but not publicly distinguished Government service, even begins to cast a shadow as long as his involvement with a betrayal of the security of the United States. Thus there could have been no question as to the nature of the man the Princeton undergraduates invited—or his chief qualification.

Next is the figure of Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University. He was asked, both by public officials and by a general array of Princeton alumni, to cancel the undergraduate invitation to Alger Hiss. He was, in short, asked to exercise exactly the same responsibility he would be expected to exercise had the undergraduates invited a notorious narcotics peddler to address the students—even if the peddler were to confine his talk merely to a description of poppy gardening.

Dr. Dodds made his position immediately, even if amazingly clear: The responsibility for such matters rests not with the men in whose hands the affairs of the university have been placed. Instead, as Dr. Dodds said, the responsibility rests with the students themselves. He issued a public statement summing up his version of the function of a university this way: "Education includes the freedom to make mistakes and to learn to accept responsibility for them. * * * It is often not enough to tell a child that fire is hot. To learn the personal significance of fire, the child must sometimes burn himself."

Extend to include Princeton's admirable premedical courses, of course this would suggest that a someday surgeon need not be told that accidental slicing of the jugular vein is to be earnestly eschewed. He should cut 1 or 2 and learn it that way.

The third figure in what is virtually a latter-day morality play at Princeton is a Roman Catholic priest, Rev. Hugh Halton, chaplain for Princeton's Catholic students and director of the Aquinas Foundation, Catholic undergraduate group at Princeton. Father Halton has spoken out frequently in the past calling on the university to return to its traditional basis of Christianity and scholarship.

This time Father Halton spoke to an assembly of Princeton undergraduates before Hiss' appearance. Although some of the students applauded, others booed, indicating that Dr. Dodds' willingness to have his students make mistakes about the situation in which they had become involved bore just the fruit that logically could have been expected: That is, that many students would come to look upon Hiss as an admirable symbol of resistance to morality and manners. This is what, in part, Father Halton had to say about the Hiss appearance at Princeton:

"The Hiss affair is simply a dramatic expression of a spiritual crisis within the university. The decision of the trustees supporting the administration, confers on uniformed minds and unseasoned characters the right to undermine the common good of the academic community, if they choose to do so. The Hiss decision called for a kind of knowledge, not to speak of an experience and mature judgment, which the undergraduates—with all the defects of their virtues—cannot have * * * Where will all this end? The administration and trustees have exchanged freedom for license. * * * I can understand why Alger Hiss needs Princeton; but I cannot for the life of me understand why Princeton needs Alger Hiss. In their report the trustees have found no subversion in this place and they are complacent. I believe there is a kind of spiritual and moral subversion which in the long run will do a greater disservice to Princeton and America than some of the threats the administration and trustees now consider more immediate. Freedom, divorced from authority and discipline, is a frightening thing."

The actual appearance of Hiss, a majority of covering newspapers pointed out, was anticlimactic. Hiss spoke about the Geneva conference. The newspapers said he was dull. Even supposedly sharp ears apparently were lulled to hear only a dull address. In the New York World-Telegram and Sun, that paper's staffer assigned to cover communism, Frederick Woltman, could write only that Hiss was very proper, very dignified, very dull, and that certainly none of the listening students was "brainwashed." The net effect was a mild, cooled-down Alger Hiss far removed from thoughts of Soviet espionage, betrayal, and the struggle between Marxist and Christian civilization.

Yet, what did Hiss say? He said that cold war and militaristic talk is "the tone of yesterday." He said that Geneva opened the door to an end of East-West hostilities. He quoted the Irish Communist playwright Sean O'Casey on the subject of nuclear warfare's menacing forcing peace upon the world. He said that the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Britain was an important step forward. He said that he thought the Soviet had given up ideas of communizing the world by all-out war.

It is perhaps the most pointed comment of all on the Hiss appearance that the things he said have become, apparently, so glibly acceptable that it was not even pointed out that the Hiss speech hewed to the coexistence line of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Also, that he made no reference at all to the moral differences between the nations of the free world and the Soviet.

The Hiss speech really wasn't dull. It was just familiar. Even persons never connected with communism have been making similar ones lately.

And, in the symbols of the persons involved, the entire structure of the incident

also was familiar: A known collaborator with the Communist cause; a "liberal" spokesman to intercede on the collaborator's behalf; a voice of conscience speaking in objection and not being heeded.

PRINCETON POSTSCRIPT

As pointed out here, Princeton's defense of the Hiss appearance was firmly based on inability to deny the undergraduates a chance to hear a "controversial" figure. The students, it was pointed out, must have the freedom to make mistakes in their choice of speakers.

In October 1955 another of Princeton's undergraduate debating societies, the Princeton Senate, wanted to schedule as speaker the same Father Halton who so vigorously resisted the Hiss appearance.

The Princeton administration was firm in that case, too. It withheld permission for Father Halton's appearance for 6 solid months. Finally, in March 1956 the undergraduates went ahead and held their planned meeting anyway. There was only one change in the agenda. Father Halton wasn't present, apparently still too "controversial" for the Princeton administration.

Uneasy Quiet Along the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was printed in the very esteemed newspaper the Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal.

It is my opinion that this editorial portrays the situation as it exists in Washington. It demonstrates the fact that the issue of segregation is still not settled even though the advocates of integration would have you believe that everything is going smoothly in this movement. I have been told on good authority that many of the public schools are operating daily with members of the Metropolitan Police in the corridors and on the school grounds. I cannot believe that such forced integration can do anything except to promote an unhealthy atmosphere on the part of the students in public schools. Surely no one can point with certainty to any voluntary integration in the District of Columbia. It is another unhappy picture brought about by the ill considered May 17, 1954, decision of the Supreme Court and it will, in my opinion, cause trouble and heartache for many years to come.

The editorial follows:

UNEASY QUIET ALONG THE POTOMAC

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Nation's Capital, sprawled along the mudflats of the Potomac River, is not as complacent about integration of the races as propagandists would have you believe.

Instead, the white citizens of Washington are seriously disturbed over a gradual process of subservience to Federal fiat which is turning the Capital City into a Negro community.

Already the population rate is estimated by many to be 65-35 Negro, and the remaining white residents, not liking the picture, are leaving in droves. Some say that as many as 13,000 white families moved out of Washington last year alone.

Questioned about these things, people on the streets and in stores, taxicab drivers and Government workers are quick to voice resentment of the transition now under way.

Although they will talk freely when questioned on an off-hand basis, they quickly fall silent when asked for names and addresses, in explanation that facts are being sought for publication in a southern newspaper.

Each has an excuse, but all are based upon the factor of fear of retaliation. Federal workers fear the wrath of Government, clerks fear discharge by employers who might lose Negro trade, and taxi drivers won't talk for publication because of the expectation of being dismissed in the event of a possible boycott.

Perhaps it is this spectre of fear which induces Washington newspapers to remain so busy pointing accusing fingers at the South that they never get around to observing their own doorstep and presenting a true picture of the racial situation in the Capital to the Nation as a whole.

But it is safe to say that a majority of the white residents of Washington does resent integration and would like to see a reversal of the current trend.

Possibly this resentment is keenest among those familiar with falling standards of public education since the schools were integrated on a mass basis. Parents of white children in schools integrated on substantial scales report that individual pupil progress has slowed and that there is a lessening of interest in attendance. Various reasons are cited, but they are all factors stemming from integration.

There also is a great deal of resentment among property owners over steady losses in investment values. Incidences are cited on good authority, even among Members of the Congress, where whole blocks of residential properties have suffered declines of as much as 50 percent within the period of only a comparatively few months.

Under an organized and carefully directed program of encroachment, once-white residential areas are being invaded and swallowed up in great gulps as declining values hasten the tide of invasion.

Possibly even more significant is the attitude of leaders of various activities beyond the threat of legal action on charges of racial discrimination, which are dependent mainly upon voluntary public donations.

A pertinent case in point is offered by a recent statement from the president of the Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia. This club, sponsored by Washington police as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency, operates on a segregated basis and intends to continue that basis because it cannot hope to continue attracting public support from white donors otherwise.

Thomas G. Carney, president of the organization, presented the case plainly in a public statement when forced to a showdown on the racial issue.

Among other things, he said:

"The Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia, is now conducting its annual solicitation of adult memberships to finance its operations during the coming year. The basic purpose of this organization has been and is to provide facilities for athletic activities and other wholesome diversions for the boys of this community to lessen their opportunities or inclination to become juvenile delinquents. The club, now in its 23d year of operation, has received nationwide recognition as an effective deterrent to juvenile delinquency.

"For the past several years the various clubs have maintained an average membership of 22,000 boys. Membership is, of course, voluntary and no fee of any kind is payable. At the present time 14,000 boys are enrolled as active members of the clubs operated for the benefit of colored boys of the District. Four clubhouses are available for their use.

"Eight thousand boys are enrolled as members of the clubs operated for white boys. While there are 5 separate club units for white boys, clubhouse facilities are now available for only 3 of these units. All of the clubhouses are used in the nature of community centers, since the boys invite their girl friends and parents to club-sponsored dances, movies, and other social activities.

"The annual cost of operations of the Boys' Club has been averaging $340,000 in the past few years. The administrative costs have averaged $28,000. All the rest goes for the benefit of the boys. The citizens of this community evidently have felt that the work of the Boys' Club is well worth the cost, since no campaign in the past has ever failed. Failure to support the present campaign can only result in the closing of some of the clubs, which would affect adversely not only the colored and white boys thus put on the streets, but the community as a whole.

"The Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police does not actually collect cash contributions. Citizens are invited to become adult members of the organization and the dues paid for such memberships constitute the finances for operation. All adult members receive a membership card. There are relatively few anonymous donors. Approximately 160,000 citizens pay such dues."

"The above facts have been stated because the Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police has been unjustly charged with practicing racial discrimination. The operation of club units exclusively for colored boys and exclusively for white boys has not been, and is not now, the result of a studied, premeditated policy of the Boys' Club to accomplish or practice segregation as an end in itself. The clubs were organized in a mutually exclusive racial basis over 22 years ago. The object then, as now, was to minimize a boy's, any boy's, chances of becoming a juvenile law breaker. The organization accommodated its operations to the local pattern of that time.

"That times have changed and will continue to change is admitted. It is not the mission of this organization, however, to retard or advance one side or the other of an issue that has no direct, material, or relevant bearing on the successful accomplishments of its sole function, an issue that is fundamental to some, emotional to many, the concern of everyone. To some people it is a moral issue; to others it is not. To say that this issue has been legally settled by court decision insofar as an organization of the character of the Police Boys' Club is concerned is just not correct.

"The 170 members of the board of directors of the Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia, are of one mind in their desire to achieve first what they consider their first objective; namely, curbing juvenile delinquency; giving all boys a chance to reach manhood with a wholesome regard for law and order. These same members can be, and probably are, of many minds on the best solution to the social problem arising from racial differences.

"They know, however, that the Boys' Club does good as presently operated. Maybe it would do better if integrated. Maybe it would do worse. Many white members state they will not support an integrated organization. They give various reasons for their position. The records from past campaigns disclose that dues paid by white members constitute over 97 percent of the total amount collected. A substantial lessening of this financial support would result in the closing of the clubs. Both colored and white boys would then suffer.

"The boys who enjoy the clubs are not asking that their welfare be risked on a decision that would not add a jot or tittle to their

enjoyment of the pleasure the club now affords them. There is no discrimination in their club, real or fancied. Their club is their haven from the streets and alleys. Life is still not perfect for them, but the club makes it some better, in many cases a lot better, the difference, perhaps, between a good life and a bad life.

"Until certain that a change in its methods of operations will not risk the loss of these havens in any degree it has been the judgment of the directors of the Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia, that no change should be made at this time. Let the Police Boys' Club continue to render its services to the boys of Washington. Let the issue of segregation be decided in other areas where children will not necessarily lose what little they have on the outcome," President Carnley concluded.

Here, then, is a typical example of integration on a voluntary basis as compared with that prevailing under the forces of fear and law, and the Boys' Club president has been quoted liberally in order that none may say only the high points were touched.

It seems evident that his statement proves beyond all doubt that the white citizens of Washington will be integrated only by one force or another, and that gives reason to believe that if all is quiet along the Potomac tonight, it is an uneasy quiet, at best.

Pastor Riedel Retiring at 78 After 53-Year Ministry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the life of Pastor Frederick R. Riedel, of Emanuel Evangelical United Brethren Church in Union City, N. J., has been one of unselfish service to God, community, and country. The citizens of the 14th District realize his retirement after 53 years of devoted duty is well deserved. Their joy at his well-deserved respite from the ordeal of continuous service however, is tinged with the sadness that we all feel when a faithful friend leaves his accustomed post. The Hudson Dispatch hails him in the following editorial.

As representative of a large group of the people he served I take this opportunity to record forever in the records of the Nation the gratitude of his neighbors for his outstanding example of living Americanism. The editorial follows:

PASTOR RIEDEL RETIRING AT 78 AFTER 53-YEAR MINISTRY

Three years ago on May 14 in these columns we had occasion to write about the golden anniversary in the ministry of Rev. Frederick R. Riedel, pastor of Emanuel Evangelical United Brethren Church, Union City, at which time we contrasted the granting of pensions in the prime of life to members of the Armed Forces and to police and firemen after 20 and 25 years respectively, with the observation that "it is remarkable to observe wearers of the cloth still active in the service of the Lord after a half century in Christ's ministry."

Now at the age of 78, the German-born clergyman, who has been in the United States since 1893, and who has been a minister since 1903, is about to relinquish the Union City pastorate he has held for the past 21 years and finally "retire." We place the quotes around "retire" intentionally, because, if we know Pastor Riedel, he'll be just like our other good friend, Rev. Charles K. Fegley, pastor emeritus of Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, Weehawken, he simply won't be able to stay inactive. We are certain it won't be long before he'll be accepting all kinds of emergency calls for his services.

Pastor Riedel says that, according to the regulations of his denomination, he should have retired 10 years ago but he was asked to remain active due to the fact that services at the Union City church are conducted both in German and English. We think it was most fortunate for Emanuel Church and the community that he could give the additional decade of indefatigable and devoted service.

Evidently figuring that Rev. Mr. Riedel at long last deserved his delayed retirement, Atlantic Conference of United Brethren Church, which last week held its 81st annual conference at Queens Village, Long Island, requested the Union City pastor to submit his retirement application. Typically, Pastor Riedel told Hudson Dispatch he hadn't been "figuring on retiring."

After arriving in America 63 years ago, Pastor Riedel did missionary work in Duluth, Minn., and answered the call to the ministry from there. He prepared for his life's work at North Central College in Illinois. His first pastorates were in Minnesota. Pastor Riedel looks back to those early days when one of the "high points" of his ministry was a Sunday when he received 92 members into church fellowship and baptized 48 persons.

He came east in 1927 and served in churches in Baltimore and Brooklyn before he was called to Emanuel Evangelical in 1935. In Union City, Pastor Riedel has proven himself a zealous builder of the church's temporal holdings as well as a saver of souls and a promoter of increased membership. During his pastorates, 2 churches and 3 parsonages were built and 3 churches were enlarged and renovated. Emanuel Church, which will observe its centennial in 1963, has been completely refurbished under his guidance.

Active in community affairs, Pastor Riedel is a past president of North Hudson Ministerial Association. Recently he has devoted much attention to ministering to the rapidly growing Spanish-speaking population of this area.

Rev. William Leier, pastor of Salem Evangelical United Brethren Church, Brooklyn, will succeed Pastor Riedel on July 1.

The A. T. & T. Antitrust Consent Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address I made before the Private Communications Association at the Hotel McAlpin in New York City, on May 28, 1956:

THE A. T. & T. ANTITRUST CONSENT DECREE

This evening I should like to discuss with you a matter which is of great concern to your industry and your organization. I am referring specifically to the Government's disposition of its antitrust suit against American Telephone & Telegraph and its subsidiary the Western Electric Co.

As you know, on January 24 of this year the Government's much-touted antitrust suit against American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came to a halt. After years of preparation and after exhaustive examination of thousands of documents, the Government's prosecution terminated in an innocuous, albeit much publicized, decree.

This decree, agreed to by both sides to avoid trial, represents one of the worst antitrust dispositions I have ever seen. In fact, it is worse than nothing at all. It not only fails to accomplish what the Government set out to do when it filed suit 7 years ago, but it goes further by prejudicing future administrations in any subsequent efforts to mitigate the effects of A. T. & T.'s monopoly.

The only conclusion I am able to draw from the facts is that the Attorney General has given A. T. & T. singularly preferential treatment.

Let us compare the chief provisions of the complaint filed by the Department of Justice in 1949 with the consent decree that the Department agreed to in 1956.

This complaint, carefully prepared following years of investigation, charged that the Western Electric Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of A. T. & T., manufactures and sells more than 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States and that a substantial part of the remaining 10 percent is produced under the control of Western Electric. It also alleged that A. T. & T. controls about 85 percent of local telephone service in the United States.

The complaint further charged that Western Electric and A. T. & T. combined with each other to monopolize the United States telephone manufacturing and telephone service industries. To correct this monopoly, the complaint requested the court to force A. T. & T. to sell all of its interest in Western Electric so that the business of manufacturing telephones would be divorced from the business of operating telephone service.

This was the heart of the suit—to break up the combination of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Yet the consent decree does nothing to carry out this most important objective. The corporate structure of this combination not only remains unchanged but is fused even closer together. The manufacturing and telephone service monopoly is still concentrated in the same hands.

The complaint also asked that Western Electric be split into three separate companies to diversify the manufacturing of telephone equipment and to create competition where none existed before. The consent decree makes no effort to divide up Western Electric.

The complaint asked that Western Electric be required to sell to A. T. & T. its 50-percent ownership of Bell Laboratories so that research and experimentation by other manufacturers would be encouraged. The decree requires no transfer of ownership in Bell Laboratories.

When the complaint was filed, the Department of Justice had evidence that A. T. & T. required its many operating companies throughout the country to buy equipment and supplies only from Western Electric. The Government, therefore, requested that these contracts be declared void and that A. T. & T. be forbidden from entering into similar contracts in the future. The consent decree ignores this problem.

The complaint prayed that A. T. & T. and the Bell System companies be required to purchase their equipment by competitive bidding so as to inject competition in the manufacturing industry and to protect telephone users by insuring that the telephone companies paid no more than a fair price. The decree does nothing about this.

The complaint refers to existing agreements between Western Electric and other manufacturers of communications equipment, including, for example, Radio Corporation of America, General Electric, and Westinghouse. It charged that these agreements restrain competition and requests that they

be adjudged illegal and void. The decree fails so to do.

Why is there such great disparity between the relief sought originally and the relief finally obtained? Representatives of the Department of Justice could say only that the terms of the consent decree were the best the Government could get and that in their opinion there was insufficient evidence to justify the court's dissolution of the A. T. & T.–Western Electric combine.

The fact is, however, that the head of the Antitrust Division admits that A. T. & T. owns and controls 85 percent of all local telephone service in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. has practically a 100-percent monopoly on long distance service.

He admits that Western Electric manufactures and sells between 80 and 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. requires its operating companies and its own Long Lines Department to buy virtually all of their telephone equipment from Western Electric.

He admits that A. T. & T. and Western Electric bought up or otherwise eliminated competing manufacturers of telephone equipment.

If these facts do not establish such a violation of the antitrust laws as warrant a court decision on the necessity for dissolution, then no facts would.

In the Government's antitrust case against the Pullman Co. the Court ordered a separation of Pullman's unregulated monopoly of the manufacture and sale of sleeping cars from its regulated monopoly of sleeping-car service. Since the Court did break up the Pullman monopoly why did the Department of Justice believe that the Court could not similarly break up the A. T. & T. monopoly?

The head of the Antitrust Division has asserted that although the decree did not accomplish what the Government had originally asked the Court to do, it did protect the public interest in alternative ways. Let us look more closely at the decree and see if it does. There are four main things that the decree purports to do.

First, instead of preventing A. T. & T. from requiring that its many operating companies buy only from Western Electric, it prohibits A. T. & T. from requiring independent companies to buy from Western Electric. From a practical standpoint this provision affects none of the long-distance telephone service in the United States and no more than 15 percent of the local telephone service in the country.

Second, instead of forcing Bell companies to buy all equipment by competitive bidding to protect competing manufacturers, the decree provides only that Western Electric must set up a generally acceptable accounting system subject to inspection by the Department of Justice. According to the Department, this will better enable appropriate governmental regulatory bodies to determine whether A. T. & T. is being charged fair and reasonable prices for equipment it buys from Western Electric. Presumably the appropriate regulatory body would be better able by this accounting provision to determine whether equipment costs incurred by A. T. & T. for Western Electric equipment are unreasonable and should be disallowed in the establishment of Bell company rates. Not only is this provision so vague and general as to be practically unenforceable the Department is even unaware whether the decree will require any changes in Western Electric's present accounting methods.

Third, the decree requires A. T. & T. to license, royalty free, any or all of its existing 8,600 patents to anyone who asks for a license with certain minor exceptions and also requires that future patents be licensed for reasonable royalties. This the Department regards as the heart of the decree. The Attorney General stated that the decree makes available to any citizen all inventions and know-how of the Bell System. It sounds good but what does it mean? In the light of the following facts, I think you will agree that it means very little:

(1) Although royalty free licensing is required for existing patents, the decree permits A. T. & T. to charge for the know-how necessary to use the patents. It is common knowledge that in most cases patents are useless without know-how. I understand that the charges for know-how and technical information connected with these patents could be as much as the royalty would have been before the decree.

(2) It is of little or no value for an independent manufacturer of telephone equipment to get a license from A. T. & T. to make, use, and sell such equipment if he has no market for his equipment. And under the decree there is little possibility that the independent's market will be broadened.

(3) A large number of the patents involved are valueless unless the licensee can obtain additional patents owned solely by RCA. At the present time RCA issues a package license which includes its own and many of A. T. & T.'s patents. Consequently a prospective licensee might well prefer an RCA package license which includes A. T. & T.'s patents rather than get an A. T. & T. license and then still have to get the RCA package license.

(4) A substantial number of the 8,600 patents involved in this decree have expired.

(5) Although the decree requires A. T. & T. to license any or all of its patents, existing or future, the company has had a standing policy since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose. Therefore, the decree makes little change in A. T. & T.'s licensing policy.

In the light of these circumstances, the fact is that the benefits of the patent provisions of the decree are largely illusory.

Finally, we come to the part of the decree that purportedly was designed to help small business, the part that supposedly limits the Bell System companies to common-carrier operations and supposedly requires Bell companies to get out of the private nonregulated communications field. If this in fact were the result of the decree, one of the effects of A. T. & T.'s monopoly on your industry would have been mitigated to some extent at least.

Unfortunately, the decree in practical operation has not required A. T. & T. to get out of the private communications field. It is true that under the decree, A. T. & T., Western Electric, and their subsidiaries are forbidden to engage in any business other than the furnishing of common carrier communications services, but the decree defines that term so loosely that the small-business man in the private communications field will be given little comfort.

Under the decree common carrier communications services include any communications service and facility (other than message telegram service), the charges for which are or become subject to regulation under existing or future laws of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. It also includes services and facilities, the charges for which are subject to regulation under the Federal Communications Act or would be subject to such regulation if they were furnished in interstate commerce. Thus, despite the decree, A. T. & T. and Western Electric can still engage in manufacturing, selling, and leasing of any and all private communications equipment and services, provided only that the charges made are subject to regulation under State law.

Just 1 week after the entry of this decree a bulletin of the Bell Laboratories announced that the telephone companies whose private communications services were not then subject to regulation were going to file tariffs with the appropriate regulatory authorities to bring them within regulation and so exempt these operations from the prohibitions of the decree. Accordingly, 2 months later, the Bell Co. in California filed tariffs for its private communications services. At about the same time the President of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co. announced to the stockholders that the company expected to look into the possibility of doing the same thing.

I have no doubt that this strategy will be followed throughout the United States. If it is, the Attorney General's consent decree will afford the private communications industry of America little protection indeed.

These are not the only loopholes in this decree. There are many more, but time does not permit listing them now.

The loopholes I have discussed, however, show that despite the Attorney General's claims that the A. T. & T. monopoly has been dissipated by the consent decree, the converse is true. Moreover, its monopoly position has been given the seal of Government approval. The facts with regard to this decree must be brought to the attention of the American people. Perhaps in the future there can be undone some of the harm that this decree has caused to competitive conditions in the communications industry.

The Federal Employee Health Program Discriminates Against the Field Service, Report by Interagency Committee Shows

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a Federal interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and physicians, submitted a report published by the Civil Service Commission which shows that—

Although adequate employee health services are available in many Federal establishments, inadequate services or no service at all are available to a substantial number of employees. In general, the departmental service provides sufficient health services, but in the field service, except where medical services are already available for other purposes such as in Veterans' Administration hospitals and military establishments, employee health services seldom exist.

It is believed that some heads of agencies neither fully realize the value of such health programs nor realize the extent to which they exist in private employment. There is need for additional means for showing top management the worth of health programs.

All I can say on this is that it seems to me to be simply further evidence of the well-documented viewpoint of the present administration regarding employees; be they Federal employees or employees in private industry. This viewpoint has been summarized for us most ably by Charles "Bird Dog" Wilson and Howard Pyle, both high officials in the Federal Government, who are leading exponents of the joy-of-suffering school of economics.

The recently published report of the Civil Service Commission states that—

Mr. Mac Henry Schafer, Director of Personnel, Department of Agriculture, and formerly vice-president and director of em-

ployee relations, Northern Trust Co., Chicago, Ill., states:

"As a relative newcomer to Federal service from private business, I was shocked at the little attention paid to emotional and mental disturbances in people. Practically no organized program exists to care for such human needs among Federal workers. Psychiatric aid is rarely available and trained psychological counseling is almost nonexistent. The Public Health Service is restricted to 'fitness for duty' examinations. No therapy for cases of emotional maladjustment is available. The few private clinics are overloaded and can handle little but emergency and extreme cases.

"Even in a brief experience, an outsider can see the evidences of the need. Insecurity and frustration in the worker is not confined to the ranks of big busines. Big government has the same problems—and has taken little leadership in doing something about it. In any serious attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal service, much work remains to be done in providing guidance and competent leadership in this area. The cost would be repaid manyfold in more productive employees."

The interagency committee agreed, as a result of their study, that the costs to the Federal Government for employee casualties are less in those agencies having good health-service programs. This is not an inconsiderable factor, because the total cost for compensation in all Federal establishments rose from $23,371,749 in 1952 to $25,842,889 in 1953. This represents a per capita increase from $9.09 in 1952 to $10.42 in 1953. It can be readily seen that if compensation costs can be reduced only a small percentage through employee health programs, as well as through customary safety measures and safety education, substantial cash savings to the Government will result.

I include as part of my remarks a list of the members of the interagency committee together with the recommendations which they submitted:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION—A REPORT BY A COMMITTEE OF THE INTERAGENCY ADVISORY GROUP

Those who served as committee members and alternate members are named below. In addition to these committee members, scores of other medical officers and personnel officers contributed valuable advice and assistance in the preparation of this report.

Verne K. Harvey, M. D. (chairman), Civil Service Commission.

Roy Albert, M. D., Atomic Energy Commission.

Harry O. Carr, Department of the Air Force.

Barry Casper, Atomic Energy Commission.

Wilton H. Dickerson, Civil Service Commission.

Lt. Col. Gordon F. Fisher, USAF, MC, Department of the Air Force.

George H. Hieronymus, Department of the Army.

S. Preston Hipsley, Government Printing Office.

Col. B. Dixon Holland, USA, MC, Department of the Army.

Howard Jackson, Veterans' Administration.

Melvin T. Johnson, M. D., Department of Agriculture.

Edward Landry, Post Office Department.

Maurice Odoroff, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Denton H. Reed, Veterans' Administration.

MacHenry Schafer, Department of Agriculture.

Capt. Lloyd B. Shone, USN, MC, Department of the Navy.

Donald W. Smith, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Josef J. Weisskopf, M. D., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INTRODUCTION

This interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and physicians, has been considering ways and means for determining the value of Federal employee health programs developed in accordance with provisions of Public Law 658, 79th Congress, 2d session. A draft of this report has been reviewed by Federal field personnel councils throughout the Nation and strengthened as a result of their many suggestions.

The Federal employees' health service programs have two major objectives:

1. To serve the Federal employee, by assisting him to maintain optimal health while on the job.

2. To serve the Federal Government, by increasing work capacity through maintenance of optimum health.

Public Law 658 specifically states that authorization is given to establish health service programs for Federal employees "for the purpose of promoting the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government."

These services shall be limited to:

1. Treatment of on-the-job illness and dental conditions requiring emergency attention.

2. Preemployment and other examinations.

3. Referral to private physicians and dentists.

4. Preventive programs relating to health.

This law provides that "services will be provided, by contract or otherwise," and "health service programs shall be established only after consultation with the Public Health Service and consideration of its recommendations." The Federal Employee Health Branch, Division of Hospitals, is providing both functions of the program, consultative and operational.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to work out practical means for ascertaining and interpreting the results of the Federal employees health program and to provide agencies of the Federal Government as a whole with feasible guides for evaluation of these programs.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is sufficient evidence to indicate a need for further development of Federal employee health programs. On the basis of well-established facts in the experience of private industry, there is ample proof that employee health services have been a valuable asset in the promotion and maintenance of the physical and mental fitness of employees under numerous and varied circumstances. This committee, therefore, recommends strengthening of existing health activities and establishment of additional health services in locations where there are a sufficient number of Federal employees to warrant it.

The committee believes that the long-range benefits in decreased absenteeism, lowered accident rates and compensation costs, increased morale, and higher work efficiency by far outweigh the cost of initiating and maintaining appropriate Federal employee health programs which are already authorized by law.

2. Agencies should designate in their budget estimates the amount of money needed for their employee health programs.

3. More adequate provisions should be made for early detection and referral of mental health problems.

4. Maximum utilization should be made of arrangements whereby groups of one agency's employees who are separated from its medical facilities are attached for health services to medical facilities of other Federal agencies if practicable.

5. In establishing and operating their employee health services, agencies should study and follow the United States Public Health Service publication entitled "Health Services for Federal Employees: A Suggested Plan for a Preventive Medical Program in a Federal Employee's Health Service."

6. This committee believes in utilizing available objective techniques as far as possible to evaluate the worth of health programs; at the same time it recognizes the limitations of current techniques for this purpose. It is necessary, therefore, to supplement statistical analyses now available with informed judgment. An agency which does not have an employee health program, but contemplates establishing one, may gain an approximation of the potential of such a program from other agencies' evaluation reports. Likewise, an agency which has not yet directly evaluated its health program may get some indirect idea of its probable value by studying the returns reported by agencies with similar programs.

7. Agencies should evaluate their employee health programs annually. Central offices should require reports on health programs from all of their component bureaus, offices, and establishments. The format provided in this report may be used as a guide for that purpose. Data from other agencies may be useful for comparisons with other programs. New valid criteria for health program evaluation should be used in the future as they are developed.

8. Provisions should be made for annual reports by each agency to a central agency which in turn should incorporate them into a comprehensive report on Federal employee health programs. This summary report should be prepared in a manner to provide optimum assistance to agencies in comparing their health programs with those of other agencies.

9. One Federal agency should be given the responsibility for conducting a scientific study to develop objective criteria for the evaluation of Federal employee health programs.

The Other Side of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present herewith copy of a letter from a constituent, the widow of a veteran who was killed in action in World War II. In my opinion, she has written one of the most forceful replies to the recent recommendations announced by President Eisenhower's Commission on Veterans Benefits that I have read anywhere.

As she states in her letter, she has most dramatically and yet without emotion presented "the other side of the story to which the Commission on Veterans' Benefits has apparently turned its blind eye."

I believe that all members, particularly those members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, will enjoy reading this fine letter:

POPLAR BLUFF, MO., *May 23, 1956.*
Congressman PAUL C. JONES,
Missouri 10th Congressional District,
New House of Representatives
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter has reference to the recent recommendation by President Eisenhower's Commission on Veterans' Benefits to gradually eliminate benefits to veterans and widows and children of veterans. It is proposed to tie in many of these benefits with Social Security payments. In other instances the receipt of pensions would be contingent upon the actual need therefor, and pensions to widows and children of veterans would be based upon need or disability.

I am the widow of a veteran who was killed in action in World War II. I wish to emphatically state that I am not a mercenary, grasping individual; in fact, about 18 months elapsed before I would accept a pension from the Veterans Administration, thereby losing approximately $1,000 in benefits to myself and my son who was only 1 year old when his father was killed.

I would like to present the other side of the story to which the Commission on Veterans' Benefits has apparently turned its blind eye. This is only my story but I'm certain thousands of others have similar ones. As I recall, the Veterans Administration began paying benefits to my son and me, totaling $65 monthly. (The monthly pension has now been increased to a total of $121.) It is, no doubt, possible to live on that amount of income, but it would be only a hand-to-mouth existence. Therefore, it was necessary that I seek employment in order to maintain a normal living for us and to provide for my son's future education to which he has every right and which, doubtless, he would have had if his father had lived. By combining my income from employment and from the Government, my total income approximates that which a man could provide for his family.

My son has been deprived of a father, and, because of the necessity that I accept employment, he has also been deprived of a full-time mother. He is now 13 years old, and, except in rare instances, there has never been a time since he became school age that I could be at home when he left for or returned from school. He has never had the benefit of a normal home life to which every child is entitled. In addition, since July 1944, I have been deprived of a husband whom I loved very much. These are only a few of the many ways in which our loss is evident.

All this may seem unimportant to the Commission on Veterans' Benefits but it is a serious matter to those of us who have been unwillingly placed in this position.

The pension from the Veterans' Administration in no wise restores our normal home life but it does help supply some of the material things which we badly need. If it were possible for President Eisenhower's Commission on Veterans' Benefits to return my husband to me, I would be more than glad to voluntarily relinquish my pension, and I seriously doubt that there is a widow who feels otherwise. But, since the Commission is not endowed with the ability to return the dead, it seems only fair that those of us who have lost so much should be entitled to some repayment, however small.

I am aware there may be some veterans who are unjustly receiving benefits, but it is unfair to withdraw benefits from those people who deserve them. If our Government fails to properly acknowledge those who gave limb, sight, or life for their country, it may find itself in the unenviable position of having fewer patriots.

The article relating to the findings of President Eisenhower's Commission on Veterans' Benefits was carried on the front page of a recent issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. It was ironic to note that the headline of that same issue read, "Senators Assail Jet Fiasco as $265 Million Total Loss." Would it not be better for our Government to stop some of this really needless spending? Such a sum of money would go a long way toward helping veterans and widows and children of veterans—or some other worthwhile project.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. RUTH M. STEWART.

Small Business Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed the other day when I read an editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 24, 1956, entitled "Small Business Statesmanship" because this is a phrase which should be used early and often when we consider the problems of small business. We should ban emotionalism from these considerations and look at such problems from a practical and realistic viewpoint.

Certainly we do not desire to destroy our larger business concerns under the guise of helping our smaller concerns. We want a healthy business economy with a fair opportunity for our smaller concerns to grow and expand. We all, I know, desire a tax structure which will aid our smaller businesses to improve their financial positions in order to achieve this necessary growth. But, in accomplishing this purpose, we should not penalize those business institutions which are necessary to a vital, dynamic and expanding business economy.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS STATEMANSHIP

The idea that the way to help small business is to pull the props from under larger companies got a well-deserved rebuke from small business spokesmen recently.

Since a small sized firm in a big industry may be a big company in an industry in which the general scale of operations is larger, the so-called small business relief plans which hit at size may fall quite unevenly. And, of course, many small businesses have hopes of getting to be bigger; hence self-interest, as well as business statesmanship, suggests that they may do best to seek relief in ways which are not puntive to other sectors.

All of which seems relatively platitudinous, except that some proponents of relief measures for the small business sector seem unable to disassociate their plans from measures to cripple larger concerns. Since such plans can only slow the progress in developing well-covered measures, it is heartening that small business itself sees the wisdom of repudiating such tactics.

That this is so is suggested by a mix-up which seems to have grown out of a meeting of small business groups in Washington recently. It is not entirely clear how the mix-up came about, but following the Washington sessions the report was made that 12 small business organiaztions at the meeting had gone on record as unanimously supporting H. R. 9067.

This is a bill which would reduce tax rates for small business companies. It is aside from the point that the relatively larger tax reductions under its graduated rate schedule would not accrue for the very smallest companies. What is relevant is that this bill would step up the rates for bigger companies sharply, with an increase of some 28 percent at the top.

The bill's sponsor, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, thinks that trustbusting can be combined with small business relief, for he claims that the rates in his bill will lead large companies to find it advantageous to work out their own dissolution plans. While this is, no doubt, an ingenious way to save antitrust enforcement funds, the plan clearly goes beyond the needs of small business relief.

In any case, a statement to the effect that the 12 organizations at the Washington meeting had wholeheartedly thrown their support behind H. R. 9067 was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the various organizations identified.

In no time at all, however, a protest came back that at least one of the organizations listed had not even been present. But the meat of the protest was that this small business group wanted emphatically to disassociate itself from such a tax plan. The point was made that, while others at the meeting were known to favor early Congressional relief to small business, "we know of none who wish to impose inequities on any group of other corporations to accomplish this purpose."

So far from indorsing the bill's plan to graduate rates steeply for the bigger businesses, this organization claimed that "rates above 55 percent approach the levels of confiscation and hence pose a threat to the entire economy." And while this organization claimed that it had not been represented at the Washington meeting, the protesting small business spokesman expressed doubt that the membership of the organizations which were present embraced the theory of "near-confiscatory rates on the large concerns."

However this mixup about the Washington sessions came about, it is salutary to hear so vehement a disclaimer by small business itself of the theory that small business stands to gain by hurting other business groups.

What small business wants and needs is well-conceived plans to meet its problems. We happen to be among those who recognize that there is a very real small business problem. But solutions must be sought in the context of a healthy economic environment, not in the form of measures which seek to shift maladjustments from one group to another.

Tribute to Hon. William Thomas Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the loss of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, was indeed a great shock to all of us, and particularly to those of us from Pennsylvania who are privileged to serve in this House.

We knew Mr. GRANAHAN for his devoted and tireless service to his congressional district, to his State, and to the Nation. His work as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is a

record for all present and future members of that great committee to emulate. His widespread interests, including veterans' affairs, and the construction industry, as well as his long and varied service in positions of public trust, attest to his qualities as a leader and as a citizen.

Our hearts go out to Mrs. Granahan in her hour of bereavement. Her loss is shared by all of us.

Alger Hiss at Princeton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repetition, I include another article from the Catholic Universe Bulletin. The columnist Joseph Breig is well known for his profundity. The article is as follows:

ALGER HISS AT PRINCETON
(By Joseph Breig)

Our indignation over the appearance of Alger Hiss as a speaker at Princeton University will not be as intelligent—and perhaps not as strong—as it ought to be unless we give due consideration to certain factors.

Hiss was convicted of perjury after a fair trial in which he was represented by the ablest of attorneys and protected by all the safeguards which American jurisprudence erects against injustice to the innocent.

His perjury consisted in false denials that he had handed over American security secrets to a foreign spy ring. The jury, in other words, judged that Hiss had betrayed his country in the gravest of matters.

This is the man who was invited to Princeton.

Hiss was invited by students who did not consult university authorities, as they should have done.

That students should have neglected this courtesy, this act of fair play—indeed, this serious duty—is perhaps understandable. But that Hiss should have ignored it is entirely inexcusable.

We easily forgive young people for being thoughtless and inconsiderate. College men are not always distinguished for their maturity or delicacy.

The most elementary good manners, however, should have suggested to Hiss that before accepting the invitation, he ascertain whether he was welcome.

Hiss cannot be so obtuse that he did not realize that his presence on the campus might be acutely embarrassing to Princeton. And even if we suppose that he is really as dense as all that, the newspapers soon enough disclosed the situation.

The politeness that we expect even of the least cultured of men surely required that Hiss send his regrets, and thus avoid inflicting a gross discourtesy on Princeton.

Hiss, then, did a highly ungentlemanly thing; and we need not discuss here whether ungentlemanliness is more frowned upon in some quarters than is betrayal of one's country.

The behavior of Hiss was completely inexcusable.

In contrast, the guilt of the students who extended the invitation is modified by several considerations.

College men are not entirely grown up. And these particular students were mere boys at the time Hiss was convicted. Obviously they did not read up on the newspaper files before acting.

Obviously, too, there has been a serious failure on the part of Princeton to educate its students to know what communism is, and what communism does.

In view of the gravity of communism's menace to everything that Americans hold dear, this is clearly a most culpable omission. Princeton surely stands indicted on that count.

Collegians do tend to be thoughtless; but surely Princeton men would not have invited Hiss as a guest speaker had they realized the enormity of communism's wrongs and his wrongs.

Nor can Princeton be absolved even in the light of the fact that the students who issued the invitation were members of what is grandiloquently called the Whig-Cliosophic debating society.

Whig-Cliosophics, we may assume, live in the most ivory of all possible adolescent ivory towers. But even Whig-Cliosophics, did Princeton educate them properly, would not be entirely ignorant about communism and about Hiss.

Hiss, then, was guilty of callous ungentlemanliness, and the Whig-C's must be held responsible for more thoughtlessness than we need feel called upon to excuse.

But what of the university administration?

The administration shrugged its shoulders and remarked that it believed in letting students work their own way out of the messes they create. The administration kept hands off.

This is simply total abdication of the responsibility which the administration is dutybound to discharge. This is making students the goats for the administration's dereliction in office.

What is Princeton doing? Is it sending into the world young men so irresponsible that they will commit great institutions—banks and corporations, say—to impossible positions without consulting their superiors?—young men who will expect authority to shrug off their gross errors with a tolerant smile?

We cannot help wondering what view Princeton's alumni will take of this preposterous incident.

The Hazard of Drunks on Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial which recently appeared in the Richmond Times Dispatch, entitled "The Hazard of Drunks on Airlines."

Long prior to the publication of this editorial I had become increasingly concerned with the problems which have arisen from the service of liquor on board commercial airlines. I had informed the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of my interest in the legislation to prohibit the sale and dispensing of alcoholic beverages on commercial planes. Therefore, I was particularly pleased when a newspaper in my home city of Richmond published the attached ediorial, calling public attention to the situation. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

THE HAZARD OF DRUNKS ON AIRLINES

Legislation banning service of liquor on board commercial airlines in the United States is in the public interest. Six bills banning such service are now pending in Congress.

Thousands of people are killed annually by automobiles because drivers have had too much to drink, and hundreds of thousands are injured. Automobiles can't be controlled by legislation in the manner that commercial airlines can, so legislation of the type being considered for airlines is not the answer for cars, of course. But there is no reason why the traveling public should be jeopardized by the serving of liquor on board commercial planes.

Only six domestic airlines serve liquor now, and they don't serve it on all flights. They seem to think it is necessary to meet competition, but if all six agreed to stop, the problem would be solved for everybody. If they won't agree to do so, they should be compelled by law. The Civil Aeronautics Board could halt the practice, but it hasn't acted. It says that evidence of danger from drinking on planes has not been forthcoming.

The danger is fairly clear on its face, without specific testimony that some drunk has threatened a pilot in flight, or tried to throw a stewardess through a window.

Rowland K. Quinn, president of the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, is strongly opposed to the serving of liquor on planes, and so is Clarence N. Sayen, president of the Air Line Pilots Association. Godfrey N. Sperling, Jr., writing in the Christian Science Monitor, says:

"Mr. Quinn, together with numerous stewardesses and pilots, can cite lists of incidents that mount up to a mighty indictment on safety grounds of those responsible for the serving of liquor on planes. There are pilots who have had to land to get rid of drunks; drunks who have locked themselves in lavatories where they easily could start a fire; and drunks who have gone beserk among the passengers. (Just recently a drunk drew a switch-blade knife on his seat mate.)"

The foregoing indicates to us that intoxicated persons on airplanes imperil not only themselves but everybody else on board. A plane is remarkably safe when in the hands of a competent crew and if the passengers are sober. But get just one drunk charging around and wanting to fight somebody, and 50 lives may be seriously endangered.

If the airlines won't cut out the drinks by agreement, and the CAA won't order them to cut them out, Congress should enact mandatory legislation. This situation shouldn't be permitted to drift any longer.

This Year's Crop of Graduates Has Brightest Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, of May 27, 1956:

THIS YEAR'S CROP OF GRADUATES HAS BRIGHTEST FUTURE

Within a few days, a new class of Americans will have completed high school work. Graduation time is a serious period in our Nation, for the course of the world will be determined one day by the boys and girls now emerging from childhood.

In the last generation, education in the United States may not have improved in quality, but it has broadened in scope and in coverage. There are courses undreamed of in 1915. Today, almost all boys and girls enter high school although, unfortunately, not all remain through the 4-year course.

Schooling through the 12 grades has become wholly democratic. There is little illiteracy, and there should be none. Possession of a high school diploma is almost taken for granted. Its acquisition is painless. Gone is the era of the rickety old school building, dark and poorly heated. Gone also is the necessity of wading through snow or mud to attend classes.

Today's schoolroom is bright and cheerful. The laboratories and libraries are well equipped. For students who live some distance from school, there are buses to provide transportation.

All this is a part of modern living—and education.

PURPOSE NO. 1

Schools were never intended to be charitable institutions. The public schools are supported by tax money, a great deal of it. Private schools are supported by tuition, endowments or funds from sponsoring organizations. The private school may concentrate its efforts upon the especial needs of the student. The public schools must be operated primarily to turn the student into a useful citizen.

Private education preceded public education and prepared the way for it. Long before the American Revolution, however, some of the colonial assemblies in New England enacted laws providing that elementary and secondary schools be established. Six years after its founding, Connecticut enacted such a law, requiring that each community of 50 or more families have a school for the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and that each county have at least one school offering more advanced courses, the old-time Latin school. Each family head was directed to see that his children and servants attended school.

The purpose was clearly stated. The founders realized that self-government must depend upon a literate citizenry. Thus public education became mandatory.

Even before the Constitution, the American Congress took steps to extend educational advantages to the frontier. The ordinance of 1787 by which the great Middle West east of the Mississippi was governed, this included Illinois, set aside a section of land in each township for educational purposes.

Some communities sold the land and used the money to erect school facilities. Frequently the money never found its way into the school channels. Had all the school land been kept, its revenues would today go a long way toward support of the public school system.

The public school system originated in the necessity of a people who would remain forever free to have citizens with minds trained sufficiently to enable them to establish and maintain an organized society and a stable government.

That purpose has not changed. It remains the primary reason for the vast system of public education.

AS WE GREW

Many things were added through the years as our needs increased and as life grew in complexity.

Originally, the theory was that with the bare essentials of learning, one should be able to make his way. The country was young and opportunities were numerous. Pioneers were little interested in schools. Quincy's early school system followed settlement of the community by several years, and the first schools were crude affairs.

Public affairs, too, were simple then as compared to those of today. Just as government has broadened its interests, so has the school.

Schools are operated for the public good, but today public good includes also the opportunity of the individual to be able to make a living, and to contribute a skill to society. So schooling has progressed from interest only in insuring literacy to looking after the economic future of the student.

LOOKING AHEAD

Today's high school graduate should be immeasurably better fitted to cope with life than was his grandfather. But he will be in stiffer competition, for there are more trained persons today and higher demands of training in a multitude of new fields.

Only a scattering of the high school graduates went on to college at the turn of the century. Of today's high school classes, perhaps one-third will continue. Some will attend technical schools. Many will not complete college courses, but the percentage is rising each year.

Some hold that by giving higher education to so many, we are robbing the manual trades of personnel. But the reward from the manual skills now matches that of the professions and business. The carpenter and plumber can afford an education.

Mass education has raised the standards of life in America. But it cannot guarantee success, either at high school or college level. The old rules for success have not been changed. They never can be if progress is to continue.

School at any level can provide no more than an outline of knowledge and instill in students habits of orderly thought. These and the fundamentals are the most the school system can give the millions of students each year. Equipped with these, the boy or girl should face the world unafraid.

There is one other essential. It is willingness to learn and to work. Schooling must not be the end of education. The successful person will learn something almost every day of his life. Each experience is an addition to one's total of wisdom.

Schooling will not guarantee success, but it will give one a better opportunity to try for success. It will put the individual a little way on the road to usefulness.

Nothing worth while is likely to be attained easily. Hard work is as necessary today as ever. We are building marvelous machines to do the work that hands once did. But there must be people to design and build the machines, and other people to operate them. Work today takes a different form, but it still demands physical and mental energy, earnestness and devotion.

John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, truly notable events in history and the great leaders primarily responsible for their outcome have often been temporarily obscured by occurrences of more spectacular but less basic nature. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, when it is possible to view with better perspective, they tend to assume their due stature.

One such episode in American history was the 1906 decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake and lock-type canal at Panama—a major decision brought about mainly under the vision and leadership of chief engineer, John F. Stevens, of the Isthmian Canal Commission. The year 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of that momentous choice.

It was my privilege, on May 12, 1956, to have been the principal speaker for the 21st annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., held at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in this city, when the great work of John F. Stevens for the Panama Canal was commemorated.

In the preparation of my address, I have had access to a wealth of information on Panama Canal history, published in recent years. Not only that; I had the additional advantage of having my manuscript checked by John F. Stevens, Jr.

As a principal collector of his father's papers and student of Isthmian history, the young Stevens was exceptionally well-informed on the canal chapter and other portions of his father's career. He made a number of valuable suggestions as to facts of which he had direct personal knowledge which I used.

The officers of the society, 1955–56, were Col. George S. Brady, president; Alexander E. McClure, vice president; and Col. David R. Wolverton, secretary-treasurer. The committee on arrangements consisted of Roger S. Erdman, chairman; and Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher and Joseph A. Cheeseman, members. The arrangements included a delightful musical program.

The toastmaster was the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, former Member of Congress, Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving more than 3 years during peak construction, 1910 to 1913. He is also past president and honorary life president of the society.

In the course of the program Toastmaster Thatcher described the society as follows:

The Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., is made up chiefly of those who as officials and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission rendered service in and about the building of the canal. The ranks of surviving members of that splendid band of Americans is fast diminishing. Our society was founded 21 years ago, under the suggestion and aid of Ben Jenkins, whose absence today because of another engagement we regret. He served on the Isthmus as Chief Clerk of the Atlantic Division, the head of which was Gen. Wm. L. Sibert, in construction days, Colonel Sibert. In our annual society meetings we have especially honored various leaders in the great Isthmian undertaking; and now we strive to pay a just measure of appreciation to another—an always earnest friend of old-timers—who is all deserving—John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–07.

In addition to former officials and employees of the construction era, the society also includes those who have served the Panama Canal organization since the canal was opened to traffic in 1914, and members of the Armed Forces

who have served on the isthmus. Thus, its membership is representative of various professions, businesses, and skilled trades in these connections. Other Panama Canal societies are located in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Seattle; Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia.

The event was outstanding, and, indeed, of historic character. Hence, I believe that an account of the principal features of the proceedings merits a place in the annals of the Congress. This should constitute an enduring record of the high honors and recognition paid to John F. Stevens by those whose labors were joined with his own in building the canal and those who remained to maintain and operate it.

To make this stirring chapter of American history available to scholars and historians of the future, as well as members of the legislative and executive departments of the Federal Government, especially cognizant committees of the Congress and their staffs, under leave granted by the House, I include the principal features of the program, including my address.

Called to order by President Brady, the 21st annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., opened with the following invocation by Rev. John J. Heenan, S. J., of Georgetown University:

INVOCATION

Almighty God who, in the beginning didst gather together into one place the waters that are under the firmament—and didst make the dry land to emerge therefrom—who didst bestow upon man the genius to conceive and the courage to effect the junction of the eastern and western oceans—by a wondrous water stairway upraised between two continents—and didst give to him the indomitable will to level the mountains, to fill up the valleys—and to overcome the malevolence of pest and plague—we praise and thank Thee for this signal triumph of human enterprise for the benefit of mankind—and we beg Thee to bless those who have gathered here to celebrate in grateful memory the accomplishments of one of Thy chosen instruments in this design. May this blessing descend upon all of us through Christ our Lord. Amen.

After the pledge of allegiance to the flag led by Andrew W. Dowling, past president of the society, an enumeration of deceased members of the society during the past year by Roger S. Erdman, honorary life member, and brief opening remarks, President Brady turned over the program to the toastmaster, Governor Thatcher.

Among his first comments, the toastmaster expressed appreciation of the beautifully worded invocatory prayer offered by Father John J. Heenan at the opening of the program, and introduced me as the principal speaker with appropriate remarks outlining my career.

At the conclusion of my remarks, Toastmaster Thatcher said:

Congressman FLOOD, we are deeply appreciative for your brilliant historical address and fine tribute to one who performed such outstanding service in the construction of the Panama Canal. You are a busy man, indeed, and you have greatly honored us in coming before us and speaking of matters that occurred 50 years ago, and bringing them into striking historical focus.

REMARKS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER, INTRODUCING MR. EARL HARDING

Some time back, when this program was being planned, the society most appropriately invited John Frank Stevens, Jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., to respond to our principal speaker on this occasion. He accepted and had arranged to arrive here this morning.

Last week, on Tuesday, May 1, 1956, we were shocked to learn of his sudden death at his church in Brooklyn—an irreparable loss to his family, a multitude of friends, his community, and to his country.

I have known him as a sturdy, outstanding, American citizen, possessed of the highest attributes of patriotic zeal and character. His death tends to cast a shadow over our proceedings today, but I know that he would wish us to carry on in the cheerful mood so characteristic of him.

Fortunately, in arranging for this event, Mr. Stevens wrote a brief response to Congressman FLOOD's address, which had been furnished him. His widow, Harriette Stover Stevens, has requested that it be read to this gathering by Mr. Earl Harding, of New York.

A retired business executive with the background of a distinguished career in journalism, Mr. Harding, early in life, was thrust into the Panama Canal situation and other problems affecting Latin American nations. He has made detailed studies of the diplomatic history of the Panama Revolution of 1903; in Panama, in Colombia, and in Europe, as well as in the United States. He has written extensively, on this subject and on Panama Canal problems.

In the course of his Isthmain studies, he long ago developed a great admiration of the vastly important work of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens for the Panama Canal. As a consequence, he became a close friend of his son, John F. Stevens, Jr., with whom he enjoyed a common interest in canal history.

It is signally appropriate that Mrs. Stevens chose Mr. Harding to deliver the last address, and I may add, the last public utterance of her husband. May I present Mr. Earl Harding.

RESPONSE OF JOHN F. STEVENS, JR., READ BY EARL HARDING

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 5, 1956.*

Mr. EARL HARDING,
New York.

DEAR MR. HARDING: It is my sad duty to transmit a brief response to Congressman FLOOD's address, which my late husband had planned to make on May 12 before the Panama Canal Society of Washington.

As I understand that you will attend that meeting I shall be grateful if you will read it.

Please assure the society and those participating in its program of my deep gratitude for the honor they are paying to my husband's father.

Sincerely,

HARRIETTE S. STEVENS.
(Mrs. John F. Stevens, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, today's program honoring my father, soon after his birthday, is a great occasion for our family on this 50th anniversary of the momentous decision as to the type of canal to be built at Panama.

In June 1906 father was in Washington at our home, and I was home from school. He learned from the press that a decision had been reached on the recommendations of the International Board of Engineers appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, and that it was decided to build a sea-level canal.

When father read this news he telephoned the White House and asked for an appointment with the President for that very evening, which was given him for 8 o'clock.

When he returned home and came through the hall, he tossed his hat over on the table and said: "Well, that's settled. There will be no sea-level canal built at Panama."

A few days later, President Roosevelt insisted in the Congress on a lock canal, which was then designed, built, and has been operating for 40 years.

Speaking for our family, please accept our heartfelt thanks for this occasion and especially for Governor Thatcher's tribute in verse, which follows the splendid address of Congressman FLOOD. Thank you sincerely.

Called upon by the toastmaster, the Honorable George H. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Panama Canal Company, spoke briefly. He expressed appreciation for Mrs. Roderick and himself for the society's invitation to be present and of the pleasure which was theirs. He brought greetings from the Panama Canal organization to the gathering and expressed his deep interest in the history of the Panama Canal, as revealed in the course of the program.

Secretary Roderick also spoke of his own official tasks in dealing with current problems of the Panama Canal, and of his trips to the isthmus in this connection. He referred particularly to the flight of Mrs. Roderick and himself to and from the Canal Zone in late March 1954 with Senator and Mrs. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, as well as Governor and Mrs. Thatcher—all making the trip to attend the dedication of the memorial at Balboa to Gen. George W. Goethals on March 31, 1954.

At the luncheon the toastmaster introduced those at the speaker's table in addition to Secretary and Mrs. Roderick, Mr. Earl Harding, and myself, as follows:

Mrs. Maurice H. Thatcher and Mrs. Aileen Gorgas Wrightson, past presidents of the ladies auxiliary of the society.

Mrs. George S. Brady.

Rev. John J. Heenan, S. J., of Georgetown University.

Mrs. Lyle Prather, whose husband was a former manager of the Panama Railroad.

Andrew W. Dewling, former president of the society.

Mrs. Charles G. Holle, whose husband is Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army and a former engineer of maintenance, Panama Canal.

Roger S. Erdman.

Col. Pierre Gaillard, son of Col. David D. Gaillard of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Distinguished personages in the audience, noted by the toastmaster, were:

Capt. Charles Bittinger, well-known artist and naval camouflage expert.

Dr. Robert W. Bruere, editor and writer.

Chalkey DuVal, chief engineer of the city of Richmond, Va.

Col. Eugene D. Hegarty, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Carroll Kenworthy, foreign editor, United Press.

Capt. E. John Long, writer and editor.

Comdr. E. S. Moale, secretary of the United States Naval Historical Foundation.

Mrs. Ruth Shipley, longtime Chief of the Passport Division, Department of State, and a resident on the isthmus during construction.

Col. Joseph F. Siler, president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.

Prof. Ben. Williams, for many years superintendent of schools of the Canal Zone.

The toastmaster also introduced other past presidents of the society as follows:

Wm. R. McCann, of Hopewell, Va., distinguished engineer, who started his career on canal construction;

Walter G. Ross, business executive, who was a quartermaster during the construction era; and

Col. David R. Wolverton, lawyer, formerly with the sanitary department during construction.

In closing the formal program Governor Thatcher made some remarks of general character, from which highly pertinent quotations are given, as follows:

The future of the Panama Canal must be determined by the Congress of the United States. Let us hope that when it comes to act it may be fully informed, and do that which is best for the public interest.

* * * * *

There are those who wish to see the Panama Canal internationalized; taken from the hands of the United States and turned over to an international or world organization, which would very likely team up with the world at large, and use it in such a way as to greatly harm this Nation. Our people taxed themselves to build this, the greatest industrial enterprise of history; and our Government has maintained and operated it with great success ever since its completion. American lives, American leadership and skill, and American treasure went into the successful American effort. The work was effected under American treaty rights and arrangements which the world recognizes as valid. Speaking for myself, and voicing, I believe, the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, I would oppose the indicated suggestion or movement as one of monumental stupidity and evil.

Our Nation has used the canal for the good of mankind; and in times of war for the cause of freedom. It will be a sad day, indeed, that on which this great ocean link is taken from the jurisdiction, control, and operation of the United States and turned over to any other organization or power. Not only would our own land greatly suffer thereby but at some time of crisis perhaps with fatal effect, and the cause of free nations and free peoples would everywhere be imperiled. There is no other country in all the earth today which, if it had built the canal as we have built it, would surrender its right to own, control, and operate it.

Yet there are those in our midst at this hour, at this time of grave danger to the freedom to the entire human race, who, through impractical idealism or sinister design, would yield up all of these precious and dearly earned rights which are ours. With these rights responsibilities have come, and we have discharged them well.

Our country's conduct and attitude in the past constitute assurance of what may come. Our action has served every worthy cause and end. The canal has enabled us to make the critical contribution to defeat in war the tyrannies of despotism; and in peace to serve the free shipping and commerce of the world. We have thus benefited not only ourselves but all mankind. Our abandonment of the control of this great waterway—beneficent and strategic—would be, indeed, an act of stupendous criminal folly.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FLOOD

Fifty years ago, the Government of the United States was faced with the grave responsibility of deciding the type of canal to be constructed at Panama. In a memorable struggle in the Congress in 1906 between advocates of a canal formed by elevated lakes and those for one at sea level, later described as the "Battle of the Levels," victory went to the high-level-lake and lock type. That was the key decision in building the Panama Canal.

How were these results accomplished? The full answer is a long and complicated story. However, when reduced to its essentials, the explanation is relatively brief and simple. It revolves about one sturdy man—chief engineer John F. Stevens of the Canal Commission. Who was he and what was the path that led him to become associated with the famous project? The answers form an important section of American history.

A native of Maine, after a try at teaching, he decided, despite his lack of formal technical training, to become an engineer. In 1874, at the age of 21, he moved to Minneapolis where his uncle, Jesse Stevens, was an engineer, and began as an assistant engineer for the city—a rodman.

At that time railway building in North America was booming. Finding municipal engineering too limited, Stevens, in 1876, shifted to railroading with a position as section hand in Texas. Serving as axman, rodman, instrument man, surveyor, location engineer and construction superintendent, he rose rapidly step by step to executive positions. Eventually attracting the attention of the great railroad-empire builder, James J. Hill, he made an enduring friendship based upon their great common interest in transportation.

Sent by Hill to locate a route for the Great Northern Railway across the Rockies, Stevens, in 1889 made the dramatic discovery of Marais Pass in Montana, through which the road was constructed. For this extraordinary feat, the engineer-explorer was honored during his lifetime by the erection of a heroic bronze statue near the tracks at Summit, Mont., showing him as he appeared at the time of the discovery. Replicas of this statue are in the State library of Maine and at the New York headquarters of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

In 1890, Stevens was assigned the task of locating the best line for a railroad from western Montana to Puget Sound. This involved the choice of a crossing of the Columbia River, which in turn depended upon location of a pass in the Cascade Range.

Again Stevens found a suitable pass near the Wenatchee River, which is now called the Stevens Pass. Today, this important region of the Northwest is served by the railroad through this pass and the Stevens Pass Highway.

Ever alert to great undertakings in other parts of the world, he naturally became interested in the even more challenging problem of building a canal at Panama.

Meanwhile, events that would profoundly effect his career and Isthmian history were occurring. These included the dramatic voyage of the U. S. S. *Oregon* in 1898 around Cape Horn, which focused public attention on the necessity for the Isthmian Canal; the vast interoceanic canal explorations by the Isthmian Canal Commission under Adm. John G. Walker, 1899–1902, which finally recommended Panama; the choice by the Congress and President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902 of the Panama route in preference to Nicaragua, after a scorching debate known as the battle of the routes; the Panama Revolution of 1903, which sealed the choice of the Panama location; acquisition in 1904 of the French Panama Canal Co.'s holdings and the Canal Zone; and finally, assumption by the United States also in 1904 of the vast task of completing the canal under the direction of an Isthmian Canal Commission for construction, of which Admiral Walker was the first chairman. He was succeeded April 1, 1905, by Theodore P. Shonts, president of the Clover Leaf Railroad.

Though not then expecting ever to be actively connected with the great enterprise, Stevens had followed the unfolding of isthmian events with increasing understanding. The grave problems likely to be encountered in constructing a navigation channel across a mountainous undeveloped region of heavy trropical rainfall appealed to him as offering an extraordinary challenge.

However, he had accepted an appointment with the Phillippine Commission to head its railroad building program and, in June 1905, was in Chicago preparing to accompany Secretary Taft's Commission to the Islands. It looked as if he had been definitely diverted from any association with the Panama Canal.

But ominous events on the isthmus of many months duration had culminated in a yellow fever epidemic followed by the unexpected resignation on June 26, 1905, of the first chief engineer, John F. Wallace. The Canal Zone promptly became a scene of chaos and hysteria, for a time threatening the security of the canal program, which was then still in the experimental and development stage.

President Roosevelt, who had watched the crisis growing over those trying months, became deeply concerned and sought a solution. Turning to leaders in the railroad world for assistance, he consulted James J. Hill, who told the President of Stevens' ability and record of achievements. The President became interested in appointing him as chief engineer of the Commission.

Stevens, when advised of this opening at Panama, because of his involvement in the Philippine situation, appears to have been rather hesitant and wished time to consider. He mentioned the matter to his wife who, since their marriage in Texas in 1877, had accompanied him during many travels on the frontiers and shared the hardships of his upward climb as well as its compensations. Mrs. Stevens knew her husband's capacity and never hesitated to encouraged him to greater tasks. She promptly replied: "Ever since you left Maine in 1874 you have been training yourself for this, the greatest engineering project in the world, and now it is offered to you. Please telephone at once and tell the President you will accept."

This ended his hesitancy and the President, on June 30, appointed Stevens as Chief Engineer of the Canal Commission, effective July 1, 1905.

Before departing for Panama, the new Chief Engineer visited Oyster Bay to see the President, who described affairs on the isthmus as being in a "devil of a mess." Stevens understood the difficulties likely to be encountered, but felt thoroughly competent to handle them. However, to avoid any possibility of later misunderstanding, he outlined to Roosevelt the conditions of his acceptance; that he was to have a "free hand in all matters;" that he was not to be hampered by any authority, high or low, and that he would remain with the project until, in his own judgment, its "success or failure" was determined.

The President approved these terms and directed Stevens to communicate about the project directly with him rather than through routine channels. When Stevens pointed out that this procedure might result in conflict with the War Department, the President waved his point aside, stating that everyone there knew his views.

Then, to impress his desire for action, President Roosevelt told the story of the man of sudden wealth speaking to his newly employed butler: "I don't know in the least what you are to do—but one thing I do know, you get busy and buttle like hell."

Arriving with Chairman Shonts at Colon on July 25, 1905, Chief Engineer Stevens found a dangerous psychological situation, with employees "scared out of their boots, afraid of yellow fever and afraid of everything." The only thing that had kept many on the isthmus was lack of transportation to

go home. In fact, more employees returned on the steamer that carried Stevens to the isthmus than had been brought down by it.

At a conference of high officials the same evening on the spacious veranda of Gov. Charles R. Magoon's home in Ancon at the Pacific end of the canal, attended by Col. Wm. C. Gorgas and the Governor, Chairman Shonts and Chief Engineer Stevens correctly estimated the urgent needs of situation; housing and feeding of employees, sanitation and health, recreation and morale, and an adequate and revitalized organization.

Within the short period of 1 week Stevens decided what to do; double track the Panama Railroad, which he then described as a "phantom railroad;" establish commissaries for all employees; build a hotel, the Tivoli, as a temporary measure; place all available labor on houses and sanitary work; design proper track levels in Culebra Cut and a rail transportation system for mass excavation; and organize the forces for construction. His extensive observations in comparable situations enabled Stevens to form sound and discerning judgments quickly.

Stopping all unnecessary canal construction activities, he sent excess men to the United States with instructions that they would be notified when to return. Others were placed on immediate necessities. Having previously accepted the mosquito theory of disease propagation, he became an ardent supporter of Colonel Gorgas in health and sanitation matters.

A man of imposing stature and commanding personality, Chief Engineer Stevens tramped the entire length of the canal viewing the various works. Walking with energy, he radiated the confidence of a natural leader. Often speaking to employees, he told them that there were only three diseases on the isthmus: Yellow fever, malaria, and cold feet; and the greatest of these was cold feet.

Prior to the appointment of Stevens, President Roosevelt had designated an International Board of Consulting Engineers to consider the type of canal. Until that question was resolved, Stevens was seriously handicapped. Nevertheless, he went ahead with excavation of Culebra Cut, which work would be useful no matter what the decision; and on alternate canal plans, which would be ready in anticipation of whatever verdict the Government might reach.

Reporting to the President on January 10, 1906, this Board split. Eight members, including five Europeans, voting for the "sea-level" type; and the five remaining members—all Americans—for the high-level lake and lock type. The minority report, which reflected the views of Chief Engineer Stevens, was prepared by Alfred Noble, an American member of the Board.

Meanwhile, in the Canal Zone, Stevens thoughtfully examined all significant angles of the problem. Though initially inclined toward the popular idea of a "sea-level" canal, when coming to the Isthmus, he approached the solution of the problem objectively. Interpreting the topography in the light of operational and navigational needs as well as engineering and construction, he decided on the high-level-lake plan with the Atlantic terminal dams and locks at Gatun and the Pacific dams and locks in one group at Aguadulce—a hill south of Miraflores. This was essentially the plan originally presented in 1879 by the French engineer, Godin de Lepinay, the originating genius of the basic plan for the Panama Canal as actually constructed.

Forwarding the engineering board's report to the Congress on February 19, 1906, President Roosevelt summarized its main points but strongly supported the high-level-lake plan. He invited especial attention to the fact "that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright; is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project."

When testifying in Washington in January 1906, Stevens had advocated the high-level plan with a conviction that no one could shake and voiced his determined opposition to the "sea-level" idea. But one appearance of the engineering leader was not enough.

In June he was again in Washington leading in the historic debate. Testifying before committees of Congress, preparing refutations of "sea-level" advocates, and drafting addresses for Senator Philander C. Knox, Chief Engineer Stevens faced the great crisis of his canal career.

He went to the President for assistance but discovered that he had become "lukewarm" in his stand. As one who believed in vigorous handling of superiors as well as subordinates, Stevens talked to him "like a Dutch uncle." Roosevelt was again convinced and stood behind him "like a brick."

In the end, with the strong support of the President, Secretary of War Taft, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the plans of Chief Engineer Stevens prevailed. In an act approved June 29, 1906, the Congress adopted the high-level lake and lock plan as proposed by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers. That was the great decision in building the Panama Canal.

Whatever may have been urged at the time of the decision as to the merits of the so-called sea-level design, it is a matter of history that the existing canal was constructed substantially according to the plan strongly recommended by Chief Engineer Stevens, approved and accepted by the Congress and the President. Moreover, it has proved an eminent success, with the transit since 1914 of more than 250,000 vessels of various classes of all nations, commercial and military, with toll rates measurably reflecting the costs of construction, maintenance, and operation.

The day after approving the act of Congress, June 30, 1906, President Roosevelt showed his confidence in Stevens by appointing him as a member of the Canal Commission in addition to his position as Chief Engineer. His star was in the ascendant.

Unfortunately, the minority report provided for constructing the Pacific locks in two groups, separated by a small intermediate-level lake. Instinctively recognizing this division of locks as a serious error in functional design, Stevens, early in 1906, had recommended to Chairman Shonts in Washington the combination of all Pacific locks at one location as a desirable change in the approved plans. But he did not present this well-founded proposal with the detailed operational justification required to secure the attention it merited. Nor had there been any ship-transit experience in the canal upon which to base such justification, and no action was taken.

Promptly returning to the isthmus on July 4, 1906, Stevens resumed studies of the Pacific lock situation. Eventually, on August 3, 1906, he approved a plan for placing all Pacific locks in 1 group of 3 lifts south of Miraflores with the terminal dam and locks between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce, on the west side of the sea-level section of the canal, and Cerro de Puente, on the east. This location would have provided the same lock arrangement at both ends of the canal, avoided creating a traffic choke at Pedro Miguel, enabled uninterrupted summit-lake navigation from the Atlantic locks to the Pacific, and supplied a lake-level traffic mobilization anchorage at the Pacific end to match that at the Atlantic—a plan identical with the original conception of De Lepinay.

At this time, however, Stevens was under great pressure to start construction. Opponents of any canal at all were seeking some means to delay the enterprise. Advocates of the sea-level idea, stung to the quick by their defeat in the Congress, were set, ready to strike at any change in the approved program as indicating weakness in the high-level plan of Stevens. These two forces together represented a political and economic power that he could not safely ignore.

It is indeed regrettable that Stevens' foundation studies for the Pacific locks, which were necessarily made in great haste, proved unsatisfactory. He did not dare to jeopardize the project by further delay. Still confident, however, that this important question would come up again, 20 days later, on August 23, 1906, he voided his plan, marking it, "not to be destroyed but kept in this office," and proceeded with the plan for separating the Pacific locks as approved by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers.

Many years later, in 1943, as a result of critical traffic problems in World War II, Capt. Miles P. DuVal, then captain of the port, Balboa, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the canal, developed what proved to be the first comprehensive plan for the canal's operational improvement, known as the Terminal Lake Plan.

Submitted by him to higher canal authority, it received immediate attention. Later, in 1945, it was approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal when testifying before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the event of completion of the Third Locks project, which, by the way, had been suspended in 1942. Published as a technical thesis in leading engineering journals, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal, because of its inherent logic and "comparatively low cost," has had a wide appeal as the proper form of modernization for the Panama Canal. Moreover, it is being strongly supported in the Congress.

Let us return to events of 1906. President Roosevelt, after the decision as to type had been made, was free to visit the Isthmus as he had long wished to do. Under an itinerary prepared by Chief Engineer Stevens, Roosevelt's visitation to the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, November 14–17, 1906, marks a highlight in Isthmian history—the first time any President of the United States had set foot on foreign soil.

In January 1907, in the midst of a crisis over contracts, Chairman Shonts, after receiving an offer to head a large transportation merger in New York, resigned effective March 4, 1907. News of this produced a sensation on the Isthmus. All eyes promptly turned to Stevens as their man of destiny. But even he had been hard pressed for many months protecting the interests of the canal.

Accustomed to doing great things in an unhampered way, he had grown tired of Government redtape and frustrations and, on January 30, 1907, wrote his own resignation directly to the President, expressing his desire to return to the railroads. To his close associates, however, he revealed his disgust and irritation at Washington officialdom.

The President promptly acquiesced. He had had two civilian chief engineers. The first had left after 1 year and now the 2nd was planning to leave after 2 years. The canal could not be satisfactorily built with such frequent changes in engineering leadership.

By 1907 the major decisions had been made, success had become a certainty, and problems less acute. Roosevelt determined to secure continuity in management in construction: "I propose now to put it in charge of men who will stay on the job till I get tired of having them there, or till I say they may abandon it."

He selected Maj. George W. Goethals, an outstanding engineer officer of the Army as Stevens' successor and again reorganized the commission. The other engineering members were Majs. William L. Sibert and David D. Gaillard, and Rear Adm. Harry H. Rousseau, a former chief of the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks. Col. William C. Gorgas, the great sanitarian, who had come to the

Isthmus in 1904, and had been appointed a member of the commission on recommendation of Stevens, was also named. The two civilian members were Jackson Smith, succeeded by Col. H. F. Hodges; and Hon. J. C. S. Blackburn, who was succeeded by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, afterward a Member of Congress. It is noteworthy that neither this commission nor its predecessor included members experienced in navagational operations.

Stevens did not leave the Isthmus until April 7, when employees arranged a farewell reception at Colon attended by many throughout the Canal Zone and from the Republic of Panama. In addressing the throng, he gave generous credit to his predecessor, John F. Wallace, for the organization he had inherited and had modified. He revealed that 2 years previously, on taking charge, he was almost as overwhelmed by the vastness of the preparatory work to be done as was the President. He added that "until Colonel Gorgas had lifted the dark cloud which the unsanitary conditions placed over the work," he was doubtful of success.

Appealing to the men, as a friend, to take their "little differences and complaints" to Chief Engineer Goethals and not to Washington, Stevens predicted that the canal would be open to traffic by January 1, 1915.

As evidence of the esteem in which he was held, canal employees presented him with two bound volumes of 10,000 signatures of a petition in which they had requested him to reconsider his resignation and remain, a gold watch, diamond ring, and a silver table set. The last included a tray with an engraving showing the completed canal.

Stevens was visibly moved by the exceptional demonstration. He knew that it marked the end of an outstanding chapter in his career. With its passing went forever his hope of becoming the builder of the Panama Canal.

The next day was Sunday. Many had remained in Colon overnight. Long before departure of the S. S. *Panama*, the largest crowd since United States occupation of the Canal Zone, gathered on the pier. At noon the Isthmian Canal Commission Band, which he had established in 1905, played Auld Lang Syne. The *Panama* slowly left her dock and headed toward the sea, amid cheers of the spectators and whistles on ships in the bay. Stevens, standing at the rail with his young son, John F., Jr., looked on, pale and sad.

After returning to the United States, Mr. Stevens continued his upward climb in the railroad industry, becoming one of the best known railroad officials in the country. In 1917, after declaration of war against Germany, he went to President Wilson in search of an active assignment in the war. As Russia was then an ally and in urgent need of a competent railroad man in connection with its war transport problems, the availability of Stevens was timely. Appointed as Minister Plenipotentiary and Head of the United States Railway Mission to Russia, he undertook the difficult tasks involved in operating and improving its rail systems. Later, from 1919 to 1923, he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board supervising the Siberian railways.

In these positions, he observed the start and early years of the Communist revolution. Accurately assessing the tremendous scope of that world conspiracy, he was among the first observers to alert responsible leaders in the United States as to its dangers.

Returning home in 1923, he later became president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and received many other honors, including the John Fritz medal for great achievements. He died at Southern Pines, N. C., in 1943, at the age of 90 years, keen in mind to the end.

The significance of Stevens' canal contributions, though substantially obscured for a time, has gained stature with the years. He rescued the project from possible disaster; assembled a major part of the plant and organized the forces for construction; planned the main features of the waterway and brought about the great decision for the high-level lake and lock plan; launched the enterprise into the era of construction and guided the work until its success was a certainty. Not only that, Stevens clearly foresaw the necessity for major changes in the Pacific lock arrangement, for which he developed a plan but was unable to secure its adoption. Subsequent studies of canal operations have established that this plan would have supplied the best operational canal practicable of economic attainment—striking evidence of the high quality of his insight.

A man of eminent vision whose great gifts were harnessed to practicality, Stevens made no major mistakes, either of engineering or policy. His great constructive contributions for the Panama Canal have now emerged into historical perspective. The facts increasingly demonstrate that he was the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

I deem it appropriate to close my remarks by reading the fine tribute in verse paid by Governor Thatcher to the distinguished man whom we now honor. It epitomizes in compact and enduring form the splendid character and achievements of John F. Stevens.

"JOHN FOSTER STEVENS: A TRIBUTE

"Amongst all those whose labors cleft the land
To blend, as one, the seas at Panama—
There was none greater than John Stevens; and
The passing years bear witness. He foresaw—
More clearly than the others had foreseen—
The value of the plan for lock and lake,
And led Authority—in doubt between
Diverse designs—the wiser choice to make.
Possessed of genius rare, with skills supreme
And ripened knowledge gained from ventures vast—
He shaped the molds to vitalize the Dream
Which had so long persisted in the past.
His all he gave to serve the Isthmian task:
What more could men demand, or duty ask?"

—*Maurice H. Thatcher.*

Kings Point: The Annapolis of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, USMS, Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, before the Propeller Club, port of Newport News, on the commemoration of Maritime Day, at Newport News on May 21, 1956:

KINGS POINT: THE ANNAPOLIS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Address by Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, USMS, Superintendent, U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, before the Propeller Club, port of Newport News, on the commemoration of Maritime Day, at Newport News on May 21, 1956)

Thank you, Mr. Blewett, thank you very much.

Mr. Sorenson, members and guests of the Propeller Club, port of Newport News, ladies and gentlemen, I am deely honored at having been invited to address you, the Propeller Club, port of Newport News, on your commemoration of Maritime Day. I want to thank your president, Mr. Sorenson, and also Mr. William Blewett, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., and former president of your club. As a member of the board of governors of the Propeller Club, port of New York, I bring you especial greetings.

Maritime Day any year is a proud day for a man of the sea—especially for the American, who finds it the day to reflect upon the inspirational tradition of the American merchant marine, to take measure of maritime America as it stands today, and finally to feel hopeful of the maritime future of our great country.

We have heard much in recent months about the encouraging Government-industry partnership for a sound and continuous development of our merchant marine. A partnership, which in its optimistic promise, is remindful of the inevitable martial status question which faced a young lady applicant in filling out her employment forms; she read the question, she meditated a moment, then answered simply, hopeful.

But hopeful is not sufficient to describe Maritime Day 1956. We are already making progress, important progress, to help materialize the hopes we all hold.

National Maritime Day 1956 is making a valuable contribution to this end, thanks to the public relations policies of the industry, thanks to the dynamic and objective policy of our Government in encouraging public understanding of the matter, and thanks to the Congressional interest in things maritime.

National organizations like your own have made a splendid contribution in letting the American people "in" on what's going on in their merchant marine and reappraising their stake in a dependable commercial fleet. The Propeller Club of the United States is to be congratulated for this outstanding program on a national scale.

The Maritime Day poster campaign, in the inaugural of which I was privileged to participate with a selection of Kings Point cadets in Washington earlier this month, is a fine example of cooperation between Government and industry in bringing these things to the attention of the public. Now the plans for a film on our merchant marine seem to be materializing. Your interest in the 50–50 hearings, and, close to our hearts up North, your support of the Kings Point permanency legislation also exemplify your forceful, productive concern over such matters.

In short, Maritime Day 1956 marks more than the historic occasion of the Savannah's famous crossing. It marks the real progress which is being made toward giving America the merchant marine we need.

Up at Kings Point, we too are looking toward the future. The progressive outlook of the Maritime Administration includes, in addition to its tonnage replacement construction program, the development of the academy program to keep pace with the needs of the industry.

The first time I came to Newport News was in 1919, when I was serving as a cadet in the steamer *Wentworth*. We loaded a cargo of coal for Italy and were only in port for about 2 days. In those times the cadets were required to stand the night watches in port so that overtime payments to the crew could be avoided. However, we did get an opportunity to see the city for a few hours and to buy an ice cream soda. It was the best ice cream soda I have ever had. Eight years later while serving as chief officer in the steamer *Charles E. Harwood*, we had discharged in Norfolk and were outward bound for Tampico, Mexico, by way of Jacksonville,

Fla., when, having dropped the pilot off Cape Henry, the captain became seriously ill, and had to go below. When we arrived at Jacksonville I had an ambulance waiting on the dock for him and thus I have an affection for these parts, having sailed from here on a voyage which was to give me my first command.

My most recent visits have been on memorable occasions, the launching of the queen of the seas, the flagship *United States*, her trial trip and her delivery trip. This ship is a magnificent tribute to the people of Newport News and to the skill and craftsmanship of the employees and staff of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., and to the leadership and ability of its president, Mr. William Blewett, known to his friends as Bill Blewett. This ship really put America back on the seas in a big way, recapturing the Blue Riband of the western ocean after it had been held by our competitors for 100 years. Perhaps one of the greatest compliments paid to the ship was the enthusiasm with which she was greeted upon her arrival, after her maiden crossing, by the British who might have been forgiven some chagrin after having held the Atlantic trophy for so many years, but who lined the banks of the Solent by the thousands, to cheer her arrival.

Materiel is of no use without personnel, however, and first-class ships must have first-class seamen to run them. Of the officers on the bridge and in the engine room of the *United States* on that memorable maiden voyage, over two-thirds were Kings Pointers, graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, which was established in 1942 for just such a purpose, the manning of the ships of our merchant marine with well-trained officers, possessed of a high degree of professional competence, and a well-rounded education.

Actually, the need for a national system of training for merchant officers was recognized by a Government Industry Committee as early as 1932, and brought into particular focus by the *Morro Castle* and *Mohawk* disasters which occurred in 1934 and 1935, respectively, and which brought to the attention of the public and the Congress the sorry state into which our merchant marine had fallen in between wars. As a result the Congress made a thorough study of the maritime picture, both materiel and personnel, congressional committees consulted experts in the shipping world and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was drawn up. This became the magna carta of the modern American merchant marine, and as enacted, and subsequently amended, it directed that the United States Maritime Commission, predecessor of the United States Maritime Administration, educate American citizens to become officers of our merchant marine, to the end that the United States might have a "merchant marine of the best equipped, safest and most most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel." This was the initial step as a Federal venture to develop a body of highly qualified merchant marine officers. From this Kings Point was born.

The Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was established in 1938 and a permanent site selected for the Federal Academy in 1941, at Kings Point, N. Y., on the north shore of Long Island. It is a splendid site, with a deepwater basin and fine facilities for sailing, and it is interesting to note that it was purchased from the estate of the late Walter P. Chrysler for the nominal sum of $100,000. Excellent modern buildings, comfortable barracks, classrooms, shops, laboratories, library, and so forth, were built, and the whole first-rate, modern plant, geared to train and educate a thousand young men was constructed at less than the cost of a single destroyer.

The first prize established for a graduation award at the new academy was the Bailey Memorial Award, in memory of Mr. Charles F. Bailey, for 16 years engineering director of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. The apprentice training school at the yard is well and favorably known throughout the world and the company has always shown a continuing interest in our training at Kings Point. President Ferguson, President Woodward, and President Blewett, as successive presidents of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers have reviewed our regiment on Naval Architects Day, and additionally, have shown a very real and practical interest in the academy, in many ways.

To return to the establishment of the academy. With the coming of World War II we actually had on board, at our maximum, 2,600 young men in training to be ships' officers. As you in Newport News well remember the losses of ships and men were very great and there was a pressing need for replacements. I think it is a proud part of our history that you were able to supply those ships and that we had some part in supplying well trained officers to man them. We have on our war memorial the names of 212 Kings Pointers who gave their lives, while serving in those ships, as a result of enemy action.

I think it not inappropriate at this location to mention the immense achievement of the shipyards of this Nation in building in an incredibly short time, the 60 million tons of merchant shipping which undoubtedly gave us the victory. We all remember the wolf packs which operated just off our coast here, notably at Torpedo Junction, by which Hitler hoped to cut the supply line, but which, thanks to our shipyards and our sailors, was constantly replenished, and the supplies went through.

At the Merchant Marine Academy, after the conclusion of the war, we immediately cut back and we now have a peacetime complement of 700 cadets on board, together with a class in training at sea, which gives us approximately 100 deck officer graduates a year, and 100 engineer officers.

I think you may be interested in knowing something of the present course at Kings Point. It is a full 4-year course on a college level and our aim is to educate the prospective officer in all phases of his profession as well as in the liberal arts so that when he is finished, he is technically highly proficient in the most modern methods, and trained for leadership, hardened to responsibility, and competent to give orders because he has learned to obey. In reality, the course is actually a 5-year one, since the 3 years of study ashore are 11-month years, and in semester hours total more than the average 4-year college course. The course is not easy one and over 30 percent of the men fall by the wayside, but those who graduate can really congratulate themselves on a job well done.

We have one of the best electronics departments, in its particular field, in the country, with courses in applied electronics as related to modern aids to navigation. I am glad to say we have a very fine engineering department, a department of nautical science, formerly known as the department of seamanship and navigation, a department of mathematics and science, a department of ship management, and a department of history and languages, as well as a department of naval science, and, of course, a department of athletics. At the end of all this the cadet has earned a bachelor of science degree, and a license as either a third officer or a third engineer depending on which course of study he has elected to pursue, and a commission as an ensign in the Naval Reserve. Most important, I think, is that his character has also been trained so that he is physically, mentally, and morally equipped to do credit to himself and to his ship and to rise in his profession as the years go by.

A part of this character training which has proved to be very valuable is the year which the cadet spends at sea on board a variety of ships learning, under the ship's officers, some of the many facets of his calling, and continuing his studies to meet the required standards of his instructors at the Academy to whom he submits his sea project papers for marking. The sea year is the second of his 4 years and it serves the dual purpose of practical study and of weeding out a student who may not be cut out for a seagoing life.

The question is sometimes asked, "How many of the graduates remain at sea?", and I should like to answer by quoting my answer to the Payne committee questionnaire on maritime training recently published:

"In reaching conclusions relative to the number of graduates pursuing their profession only the postwar classes, i. e., only those classes which graduated from and including 1949 to the present should be used for the following reasons:

"1. In 1949 the Academy's first 4-year career class was graduated.

"2. With the outbreak of World War II, career objectives were largely forgotten by the young men of our country who hastened to volunteer for the Armed Forces or for the merchant marine for the purpose of defending their country and winning the war. At its peak, wartime shipping tonnage totaled 60 million tons, which could not be maintained in peacetime, and provide employment for war-trained merchant officers. Similarly, the 11 million men in the Armed Forces could not have remained in the Army, Navy, or Air Force after the war had they desired to. Those who entered Kings Point in or subsequent to 1945, and graduated in 1949, presumably entered with the objective of making the sea their career.

"3. According to statistics prepared by the Maritime Administration through the year 1953, from actual checks of graduates, 62 percent of the graduates of the year 1949 are still following their profession, 52 percent of them actually at sea in the merchant service or on active duty with the Navy. Of the 10 percent who are in steamship companies ashore and allied industries no doubt a large number have reached the top of their profession at sea and then been promoted to shore positions in their respective companies, such as port captains, engineers, marine superintendents, vice presidents, et cetera. The percentage of graduates still following their profession increases, of course, annually, from 1949 to the present."

I believe this record will stand up very well with the percentages of graduates from the other Federal academies who remain on active duty.

I am glad to say that our graduates are making a good record and that, for example, of the 16 ships in the Farrell Lines, 11 are commanded by Kings Point graduates. These are all young men in their early 30's and the recently appointed marine superintendent is also a Kings Point graduate, age 30, who has several years in command behind him. We have also a Kings Point graduate who is vice president of the Mississippi Steamship Co., and a port captain in the American President Lines, and we have a number of chief engineers, some in the largest tankers afloat. Kings Pointers are to be found on most bridges and in most enginerooms under the American flag.

As to the future we are greatly encouraged by having been made permanent and we already have courses in nuclear physics and are keeping abreast, and in fact anticipating the needs of the ship's officer of the future. We recently had on loan from the Newport News shipyard an exhibit depicting the man-

ner in which they would propose to install a nuclear plant in a mariner ship conversion which was very informative and of great interest to us all at the academy. Mr. Blewett has, I am glad to say, been a stalwart supporter of Kings Point and a frequent visitor, and I should like to extend an invitation to Mr. Sorenson, your president, and to each of you personally, to "come up and see us some time" and I believe you would be pleased with the caliber of the young men, of the curriculum, and of the whole program underway so vigorously at the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

We have of course a large student port of the Propeller Club, the Port of Kings Point.

We at Kings Point feel an unusually large measure of pride in Maritime Day 1956, for this day marks the first national maritime day that the United States of America, and particularly the American merchant marine, can boast of a permanent United States Merchant Marine Academy, a big step forward in the continuous progress being recorded to help assure maritime America of its rightful place as a world maritime leader.

It has been a pleasure to come and visit you tonight and I am greatly indebted to you for inviting me and for receiving me so graciously and hospitably this evening.

Disabled Are Valuable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, "I'm wearing two hats, one as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and the other as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans," said Gen. Melvin J. Maas during the opening meeting, Thursday, May 17, 1956, of the annual meeting of the representatives of some 300 organizations affiliated with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Then he was speaking in the departmental auditorium, in Washington, D. C., and continued:

I'm going to step aside, while Maj. Omer W. Clark, national legislative director of the DAV, turns over to DICK NIXON, our country's Vice President, the prize winning checks, from the national headquarters of the DAV, which the Vice President will then present to the five national essay contest winners, whose traveling expenses to Washington, D. C., and back home were also paid for by the DAV.

The 5 DAV checks having been presented to Vice President NIXON, he in turn presented them to the 5 national essay contest winners: Alaire Dickson, Gooding, Idaho; Kaye Ray, Tucson, Ariz.; Theresa Drzal, Johnstown, Pa.; Sharon Berg, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Rodney Nicholson, El Dorado, Ark.

The Vice President casually remarked that he was glad that there was at least one young man among the essay contest winners.

The Vice President also presented a beautiful plaque—the President's trophy—made by handicapped persons being trained by the National Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City, to the Outstanding Handicapped Person of the Year, Dr. Arthur S. Abramson, of New York City, himself a wheelchair veteran of World War II, in appreciation of him, notwithstanding a paralysis of the lower portion of his body by reason of gunshot wounds, making very outstanding contributions toward the physical rehabilitation of disabled veterans and other handicapped persons during the last several years.

The theme of the 2-day session, and of the panel discussions, was that "Disabled Are Valuable"—dependable, appreciative, valuable. The session included discussions as to how to surmount the various road blocks toward facilitating the employment of the physically handicapped, both civilians and veterans.

Changing from one hat to the other, as chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and as national commander of the DAV, "Mel" Maas—as he is known to his friends—has, in both capacities, taken advantage of every opportunity to point out the advantages to employers of employing handicapped employables in suitable useful jobs, matching the man to the job by utilizing his remaining abilities. Surveys, he asserts, indicate that, generally speaking, handicapped employees lose less time because of accidents, absenteeism, or indisposition, and are generally more productive than able-bodied employees.

No better investment can be made by the Nation, resulting in greater financial and humanitarian dividends, than the relatively small cost involved in effectuating the physical and vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons—thus enabling them to be converted from tax-consuming to tax-paying citizens.

Though now totally blind, General Maas sees in many ways better than those who have eyesight. A veteran of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, rising from the rank of private and then corporal in the Marine Corps during World War I, General Maas has made many contributions to society; but he considers his present two positions as of paramount importance, in this country, and in effect throughout the world, because he says human dignity, independence for human beings, can be obtained only by enabling them to become useful and self-sustaining.

"Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans" is the printed message on an attractive Independence Hall 1956 calendar card which, several months ago, was distributed to some 300,000 employers, under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, designed to focus their attention upon the advantages of employing America's disabled defenders. This special calendar card indicates "printing costs paid by the Irving J. Phillipson rehabilitation fund of the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation."

These facts I know, by what I have read in our newspapers, and because a long-time friend of mine, Miles H. Draper of Tampa, Fla., is president and chairman of the board of trustees of the DAV Service Foundation. Serving with him are Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Daniel W. Bell, and Maple T. Harl, of Washington, D. C.; Gen. George C. Kenney, Lewis L. Clarke, Francis Buono, and Arthur W. Procter, of New York City; John L. Golob and James L. Monahan, of Minnesota; Laurence Curtis, of Boston, Mass.; Boniface R. Maile, of Detroit, Mich.; and Floyd L. Ming, of Bakersfield, Calif.

A past national commander of the DAV and former national service director, Millard W. Rice is the foundation's executive secretary and full-time executive director, with offices at 631 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, D. C.

I am told that the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation was created by the DAV in 1931, as an incorporated trustee under the laws of the State of Ohio, to give assurance to donors of a continuity of policy as to funds raised; and that it has been responsible, during the 1948-55 period for appropriating the aggregate sum of $2,490,000 to the congressionally chartered 36-year-old service-giving Disabled American Veterans—DAV—in addition to smaller amounts to DAV departments and units by reason of localized fund-raising projects.

Its continuity of policy is assured by its method of electing its trustees, 10 of whom each serve for a 5-year period, with 2 expiring each succeeding year, whereas the remaining 3 consist of the incumbent national commander and chairman of the National Finance Committee of the DAV and 1 other elected for a 1-year term.

Most of its net funds have been raised by the DAV Service Foundation by conducting annual puzzle contests, but almost immediately after proving the success of such formula, many other organizations decided to do likewise, which has thus been responsible for diminishing returns in successive contests.

Other effective methods for raising substantial funds therefore need to be developed. Several recent bequests in wills have given encouragement to the distribution of a lawyers advisory committee folder among lawyers who specialize in probate work. I am advised that up to 20 percent of an individual's taxable income, and somewhat less of a corporation's taxable income, may be deducted for Federal income tax purposes, when donated to this foundation; and thus the Federal Government shares in the cost of making donations to such Treasury-recognized organizations as the DAV Service Foundation and the service-giving Disabled American Veterans.

The welfare of America's disabled defenders is inevitably linked with our country's future welfare and security, because our country's potential future war veterans will naturally be impressed by the fact that our Nation enables its disabled war veterans to become useful civilians.

Unfortunately, too many of my fellow-Americans erroneously assume that governmental benefits to disabled veterans are automatically awarded. They fail to realize that more claims are denied by the United States Veterans' Administration than are allowed. Ordinarily,

it is much more difficult for a disabled veteran to prove his case factually and technically than it is for an able-bodied veteran to prove his entitlement to benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights.

The burden of proof to establish his claim for service-connection of his disability rests upon the disabled veteran himself, if official records fail to substantiate his claim. Thus proving service connection may necessitate detailed specific fact-giving, affidavit evidence, which because of the death or disappearance of buddies and others who know the pertinent facts, may be exceedingly difficult to obtain.

Because of such technical difficulties, the DAV has long maintained the largest veteran staff of full-time, paid, expert national service officers located in all of the regional offices of the United States Veterans' Administration—where they have access to the claimant's official records—to advise and assist distressed, disabled veterans, and their dependents, how to establish service-connection and entitlement to disability compensation for their handicapping disabilities, plus needed physical and vocational rehabilitation, and finally placement into useful self-sustaining employment.

Thousands of discouraged disabled veterans are each year thus converted from community liabilities into community assets. Each claim is different from every other one, just as the problem of every handicapped person is different from every other one. In extending much needed service to disheartened, disabled veterans, the DAV not only benefits scores of thousands of disabled veterans, and their dependents, each year, but also benefits their respective communities, and, in the final analysis, our country. The extensiveness and effectiveness of their personalized, helping-hand services to America's disabled war veterans is only in part indicated by the statistical résumé of their activities for the last fiscal year, as follows:

Service connections established	7,231
Attendant's allowances procured	188
Death compensation awards	4,281
Burial allowances processed	1,571
Public Law 346 benefits obtained	2,601
VA claim files reviewed	299,096
Increased compensation obtained	18,193
Non-service pensions proven	6,860
Insurance benefit adjustments	1,208
Public Law 16 benefits obtained	2,596
Retirement benefits secured	63
Appearances before rating agencies	134,915

The nationwide service setup of the DAV is under the jurisdiction of Capt. Cicero F. Hogan. As national director of claims, he has his offices at the Disabled American Veterans national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW, Washington, D. C.

Also located at such national service headquarters is the DAV national legislative director, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and his assistant legislative director, Elmer M. Freudenberger, former Chief of Claims of the United States Veterans' Administration. Major Clark is also chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

A very important part of the services extended by the DAV comes under its national director of employment, John W. Burris, who is also its national civil service officer—also at the same address.

The administrative activities of its national service headquarters are coordinated by the DAV's able assistant national adjutant, Roland A. Jensen.

The overall administrative activities of the DAV come under the jurisdiction of its long-time National Adjutant, Vivian D. Colby—a wounded Marine of World War I—located at the DAV National Headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Under his jurisdiction also comes the DAV's chief fundraising project—sending out miniature automobile license tags to automobile owners, by reason of which about 125,000 sets of lost keys are each year returned to their owners, without regard to whether they had previously made any donation therefor.

Unfortunately, only about 20 percent of the recipients of such key-insurance Idento Tags do send back donations to the DAV, but those who do so, fortunately, have enabled the DAV to maintain its some 200 full-time National Service officers, and about 600 employees at its Idento Tag plant in Cincinnati—mostly disabled veterans, their dependents, and other handicapped persons—owned and operated entirely by the DAV itself.

Every automobile owner who receives an Idento Tag ought to attach same to his key-ring. He is assured that his keys will probably be returned to him if lost, if the finder deposits them in some Post Office box. Prior to the DAV's adoption of this Idento Tag project in 1941, it had been conducted commercially, and, on an ordered basis, a charge of at least $1.00 was made therefor. If all the recipients of the DAV's Idento Tags were to make a $1.00 contribution, then, together with those who are more generous, the DAV would show a profit on such project of several hundred percent, which would enable it to accomplish its long time objective of establishing full-time national contact officers in all of the some 166 hospitals maintained by the United States Veterans' Administration throughout the country. Bed patients in these hospitals are greatly in need of such personalized contacts from trained service officers, to advise, counsel, and assist them as to their rights and how to prove entitlement to same, under the some one thousand laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

No charitable donation brings greater dividend returns, from a financial and humanitarian standpoint, than those donations which make it possible for the DAV to extend its helping-hand services to scores of thousands of distressed disabled defenders, and their dependents, which they so sorely need.

Direct donations to the DAV are greatly needed if it is to be enabled to continue to maintain its invaluable, personalized services. Many Americans may wish to make more substantial donations by designation of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation as a beneficiary in trust agreements, wills, insurance policies, assignment of stocks and bonds, and other properties.

Incidentally, I am myself a member of the DAV, and sincerely believe its service activities, locally through its some 2,000 local chapters, and nationally through its some 200 full-time national service officers, to be of paramount importance to America's disabled veterans, and to their local communities and for the future security of America itself.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful to America's disabled defenders for their sacrifices of parts of their bodies or of their health will generously support the vitally important rehabilitation service program so effectively maintained by the 36-year-old congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans—DAV—as sponsored and supported by its incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

On Every Dollar Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it is well for all of us to become better acquainted with the spiritual and historical lessons left with us for guidance and inspiration by the founders of our Republic. One of many is found on the back of our $1 bill, but I dare say, many of us have given little thought to the reasoning behind the symbols there found.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine explanation from the Christopher News Notes, No. 75, of May 1956:

ON EVERY DOLLAR BILL

There's a powerful lesson on every dollar bill. Take a look at the back of one—the green side—i. e., the "greenback." The two circles represent both sides of the Great Seal of the United States.

Do you know what the circular symbol on the left means? Ask a few friends if they understand the significance of the pyramid shown there, and the eye above it.

We made many tests and found that not one person in a hundred could explain the meaning behind these symbols, even though they are on every one of the billion and a half $1 bills now in circulation.

RAY BOLGER HELPS

So we decided to dig up the facts for one of our weekly Christopher television films. Hollywood star Ray Bolger appeared in the program and explained in a fascinating way the spiritual and historical lesson symbolized on the back of every dollar bill. We have already received so many requests from all over the country for a detailed explanation that we thought it well to summarize it here in the News Notes.

ORIGIN OF SYMBOLS

The founders of our country thought it so important to express the basic truths of our Nation in the great seal that the matter was brought before Congress on the very afternoon of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

Three great leaders, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams were appointed as a committee of three to prepare the seal. Six years later, on June 20, 1782, after exhaustive study and largely through

the efforts of William Barton and Charles Thomson, Congress passed a resolution approving the final design of the great seal.

DETAILS WITH A MEANING

Here are some of the significant details we found through our research:

1. Pyramid: First of all, note the pyramid in the left hand circle. It represents the material strength of our country. In the words of William Barton, who played such an important part in designing it, it stands for strength and duration.

2. Eye: Directly above the pyramid is the Eye of God which, though separate, completes the pyramid. It emphasizes the importance of putting the spiritual welfare of our country above its material prosperity. Our Founding Fathers [1] firmly believed that our strength was rooted in God and that our progress must always be under the watchful eye of Providence.

3. Under God: The words "Annuit Coeptis" circling the top of the seal are once again a significant proof of the faith of the Founding Fathers and this Nation's dependence on God. These words mean: "He (God) has favored our undertakings."

4. New order: Now look at the three Latin words directly under the pyramid—"Novus Ordo Seclorum" which means "A new order of ages." They signify that this new republic, which had just been founded, introduced a new age in the life and freedom of the people of the world * * * that it ushered in a new era in which the people themselves would be able to exercise their God-given rights to self-government.

5. Started in 1776: The roman numerals—MDCCLXXVI—at the base of the pyramid add up to 1776—the beginning of the United States as an independent Nation.

THE CIRCLE AT THE RIGHT

Now take a look at the right-hand circle on the back of the dollar bill.

1. Eagle: It first became our national emblem in 1782 when it was chosen for the Great Seal as a symbol of strength and victory.

2. States rights: The shield on the eagle's breast signifies self-reliance. It contains 13 stripes as a reminder that each individual State, with its basic rights and responsibilities, was expected to help protect the freedom of all the States.

3. The role of Congress: The bar across the top of the shield stands for Congress—as the unifying and binding force between the States. The colors of the bar and stripes are red, white, and blue in the seal itself. Red signifies hardiness and valor; white, purity, and innocence; and blue, vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

4. Peace comes first: In the right talon or claw of the eagle, you will note an olive branch and if you examine it closely, you will see that it has 13 olive leaves. In the eagle's left talon is a bundle of 13 arrows. Symbolizing the power of peace and war, the olive branch and the arrows are a reminder to the 13 States of their obligation first to work for peace and against war.

5. Ring of light: Finally, above the eagle's head is a ring of light in gold, surrounding 13 stars of silver on a blue field. The stars denote "a new State taking its place and rank among other sovereign powers."

So you can see how important the great seal of the United States really is. In its design our Founding Fathers drew a lesson that was meant to be handed down for generations to come.

It may interest you to know that the great seal is used on official documents, medals, currency, official stationery and publications, and in several other ways under the supervision of the Secretary of State, who is custodian of the seal.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

If you take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with these facts about the great seal, you'll be in a position to do a little missionary work in passing them on to others. Here are a few suggestions:

1. Take a dollar bill and explain the meaningful details to members of your own family, your friends and fellow workers.

2. Tell teachers to explain these symbols in every classroom.

3. Remind your local newspapers, radio and television stations that they can perform a public service by bringing these facts to the attention of the public as part of the great American heritage that each and all have a right to know.

IF YOU WON'T, WHO WILL?

In these days when there is widespread criticism of how little is known about the high ideals on which our Nation is founded, it is up to those who believe in God to use every opportunity to keep all Americans ever conscious of the fact that our whole concept of liberty is rooted in divine truth.

If you won't, who will?

By doing nothing, you may be aiding those who slowly but surely are striving to despiritualize every phase of public and private life. Their chief strength is the failure of the average good citizen to make his voice heard.

Here is an opportunity for you to spread far and wide a few simple facts. Doing something positive and constructive like this is far more effective than merely complaining about what's wrong with your country—and your world.

Don't forget for one moment what you, personally and individually, can do. If you are tempted to do nothing, recall the solemn warning of Jesus Christ: "He that is not with me, is against me" (Matt. 12: 30).

[1] (In the book, The History of the Seal of the United States, by Gaillard Hunt, published by the State Department in 1909, it states on page 12 that Jefferson, Franklin and Adams explicitly approved the inclusion of the eye of providence in the seal. Then on page 42, Mr. Hunt quotes: "The pyramid signifies strength and duration. The eye over it and the motto allude to the many signal interpositions of Providence in favor of the American cause." * * * In the Encyclopedia Britannica under the topic, "Seal of the United States," it states that Benjamin Franklin first suggested the "eye of Providence in a radiant triangle.")

Let's Extend and Logically Terminate GI Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10469, a bill to provide for a 3-year extension of the GI home loan program. This measure provides for a gradual termination allowing a 1-month extension for every 2 months of active service for World War II veterans. It further provides that all veterans disabled during World War II shall receive a full 3-year extension from the July 25, 1957, termination date.

Action in the United States Senate Thursday, May 24, recognizes the need for an extension of the GI home loan program. The Senate has not, however, given consideration to the need for a gradual termination nor has it recognized the adverse effects that an abrupt termination will have upon our overall economy. Their action reminds me of the doctor who, after examining his patient—who was sorely in need of glasses—prescribed merely an aspirin.

The entire American public, particularly the veteran and American businessman who are affected by this program, are entitled to fair consideration. This consideration can be and should be extended now in the form of positive and final action in this session of the Congress.

The Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday, May 25, 1956, quoted Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks as terming the economy "very spotty today." He and Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey pointed to existing soft spots in our economy. It behooves us as Members of this Congress to enact an extension of the GI home loan program and uphold the all-important home building and related industries. An extension with a gradual termination will prevent further softening in these fields.

Since April 12, 1956, the date I introduced this measure, 32 bills calling for an extension of this program have been introduced by my colleagues in the House. Positive recognition of the need was further evidenced as I previously noted by the United States Senate in their affirmative action in calling for an extension last Thursday.

During the 6½ weeks since I introduced this legislation, endorsements have been received from DAV, AMVETS, home builders, Mortgage Bankers Association, savings and loan associations, realtors, electrical appliance dealers, and labor organizations. In addition to this, the American Legion, VFW, and other veteran organizations have urged Congress to enact an extension of this program during this session. I have yet to receive or hear of any well-founded opposition to an extension of this worthy program.

At this time I would like to call my colleagues' attention to several more of the numerous letters of endorsement which I have received:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: The United States Savings and Loan League, the nationwide trade association representing the savings and loan institutions of America, and its 4,300 member savings and loan associations and cooperative banks have gone on record in favor of a reasonable extension of the GI home-loan program.

In this connection the United States Savings and Loan League is pleased to endorse your bill, H. R. 10469, which extends the program and calls for an orderly and gradual termination between now and 1960. The philosophy of your measure promises a logical and equitable solution to the problem of orderly terminating a program which has been of invaluable assistance to the veterans of our country and the Nation as a whole.

In a recent survey conducted by the Department of Commerce, it was noted that the percentage of American families who own their own homes has now reached 59 percent. Undoubtedly, the GI home loan program contributed significantly toward making us a nation of which the majority of families own their own homes. The savings and loan

industry of America takes pride in this record of home ownership and is doing everything within its power to encourage home ownership and thrift.

This bill, H. R. 10469, is definitely in keeping with our philosophy and we heartily congratulate you on your efforts in this regard. I feel certain that the savings and loan business will wholeheartedly support you in this important endeavor."

Sincerely,

STEPHEN SLIPHER,
Staff Vice President,
United States Savings and Loan League.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: The Dade County Central Labor Union wants you to know how much it appreciates your work in our Nation's Capital in behalf of good government and the welfare of all the people. We are especially grateful for your efforts in behalf of low-cost housing. So many of our people still do not have decent places to live and this is the only way that they ever will get them.

We have gone on record in approval and commendation of your work and accomplishments.

Very truly yours,

EDGAR CHAMBERS,
Secretary, Dade County Central Labor Union.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: We very much appreciate the reprint enclosed with your letter under date of April 27 showing the very able manner in which you presented this bill to extend the GI home-loan program to the House.

We believe that you have a practical solution to a serious problem, and hope that the Congress will agree with you to the extent that they will pass your measure without any unnecessary delay.

If there is anything we can do to assist, please advise. Again thanking you for your very fine cooperation, we are,

Sincerely,
FLORIDA BUILDING INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
H. SIMPSON, *Secretary.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: The board of governors of this association has read with interest and approval your speech of April 21, 1956. It is in entire agreement with your suggestion and has asked me to send to you the enclosed copy of the resolution adopted today.

With kindest regards.

Very cordially yours,
MORTGAGE BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MIAMI,
CHARLES CONTOPOULO,
Secreary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, made a noteworthy speech in the House of Representatives on April 12, 1956, in which he strongly recommended the extension of the GI home-loan program, a copy of which speech is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which speech has been studied by the undersigned organization; and

Whereas this organization likewise strongly recommends the extension of the said GI home-loan program, believing such extension to be in the public interest, as well as in the interest of all mortgage lenders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mortgage Bankers' Association of Greater Miami, That Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL be commended for his forthright position with reference to the proposed extension of the GI home-loan program; and be it further

Resolved, That this association strongly favors, and urges the adoption of, appropriate legislation and action to etxend the GI home-loan program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL and a copy thereof spread upon the records of this association.

Adopted at Miami, Fla., this 21st day of May 1956.

MORTGAGE BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MIAMI.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Received your copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you presented your speech for the extension of the GI home loan program. We all feel that this is a wonderful thing. I do not know whether you sent a copy to other brokers in this area or not. In the event you haven't, I will be glad to do that for you.

Yours truly,

WALTER A. STADNIK,
Realtor, Miami Springs Realty.

DEAR DANTE: We are writing in reference to the speech you made on the extension of the GI home loan program, Thursday, April 12, 1956.

We would like to go on record and state that we agree with everything you have brought forth to the 84th Congress, second session.

We, who deal in the building and financing of GI houses can greatly see the need for the extension of this program. We know this need will not only affect the mortgage men, the builders and the GI's but will also affect the prosperity and the economy of this country if such termination is allowed to come to an abrupt ending on July 25, 1957, which is the termination of said legislation now of record.

Yours very truly,

REID BUILDERS, INC.,
WARREN G. REID,
Secretary-Treasurer.

DEAR DANTE: Just a line to tell you that I think your bill providing for gradual termination of the VA program in an orderly manner is an exceptionally sound and well conceived piece of legislation.

I certainly hope it will be enacted and believe that it would work to the best interests of the veterans, the public and the Nation as a whole.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. WALKER,
Executive Vice President, First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Miami.

DEAR SIR: As an active builder, realtor, and mortgage loan correspondent in the northern Virginia area, I have recently reviewed the type of client that have been purchasing our homes and brokerage properties, and for your information, they fall in the following categories: 8 percent conventional, 4 percent FHA, 88 percent GI.

As you readily evaluate, the curtailing of the GI program would hit this area with a terrific impact. Therefore, we request that you eagerly pursue the approval of Representative FASCELL's bill to extend the Virginia home guaranty program for an additional 3 years, in order that an abrupt termination of this program does not create an unhealthy and inflationary effect on the entire Nation's economy.

If we can be of any further assistance in developing other necessary statistics for you, please call on this firm.

ARTHUR POMPONIO,
M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc., Builders,

DEAR DANTE: You are to be commended for your bill, H. R. 10469, as the veterans sure need some aid.

If I can do anything to help at any time, let me know.

Your friend,

W. C. JOHNSON,
Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: The members of local union No. 359, IBEW, who number 1,150, wish for me to convey to you their feelings in regard to the extension of the GI home loan program.

At the last regular business meeting of local 359, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the extension of the GI home loan program was fully discussed and it is the wishes of the members of this local to inform you that we are in full support of extension of the GI home loan program.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD W. SPRING,
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

It is obvious from the endorsements from organizations representing millions of Americans that definite steps and final action to extend this program must be taken. It is extremely important that the veteran home buyers, the home builders and the thousands of others that produce materials for this industry be given advance notice as to what to expect in the way of legislation in this field.

Any action calling for an abrupt termination will have adverse economic effects on our economy. The only logical way to terminate the program is through a gradual process based on length of service. A committee study of this proposal could effect the proper solution to a gradual termination.

Let us extend the GI home loan program and provide for a gradual termination.

Quiet Heroism Leads Above and Beyond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention an act of heroism on the part of William Kennedy, AD2, a mechanic on a Navy bomber operating out of Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla. A crash landing of an 80,000 pound P2V Neptune bomber was averted there last week through the ingenuity and courage of Mr. Kennedy. When the plane was being landed, it was discovered that the nose wheel would not drop and lock in position through any normal procedure. Thereupon, Kennedy tied a rope around his waist and climbed down into the nose wheel well and released the locks by hand. The wheel still did not drop far enough and Kennedy made a second descent and finally successfully locked the wheel in a safe position. Because of the tight quarters Kennedy had to do all of the work without a parachute. Kennedy is a native of East Bradford, R. I.,

but has now become a real hero in Jacksonville. A fitting tribute was paid to him by an editorial in the Florida Times-Union dated May 25, as follows:

QUIET HEROISM LEADS ABOVE AND BEYOND

It was action "above and beyond the call of duty" by William E. Kennedy, local airman, that prevented the crash landing of a Neptune bomber here. He climbed into the nose wheel well at great risk to himself to release a locked landing gear.

Not all people are capable of such action. Many are incapable of facing the physical dangers of such a deed, but there are many more who are simply incapable of doing anything other than taking care of themselves. The idea of going beyond the call of duty just does not occur to them.

Shylock in The Merchant of Venice, is the classic literary example of the character who takes the last pound of flesh in everything he does. At the other extreme in life are those who are constantly giving something more than what is required—whether it is in daring, or devotion, or dedication to one's daily tasks.

This attitude above and beyond the call of duty is well dramatized in the work of military personnel, but it is by no means restricted to the military sphere. In every walk of life we find people who realize that you get what you give, and who therefore do not limit their efforts to a minimum.

Thoreau once said "the mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation." But to the extent this is true, it is also true that many of them lead lives of quiet heroism, for they do not yield to desperation. Hard as life may be, they continue to seek to do more than merely what is enough to get them by.

Often their excellence earns little recognition. It may win for them the gratitude of those who benefit from it, or in cases where it is exhibited in work it may win for them a degree of employment security. But fame is not necessarily the reward of those who give, even if they give much:

"Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife
Their sober wishes never learned to stray;
Along the cool sequestered vale of life
They kept the noiseless tenor of their way."

What they have is not the applause of listening senates, but the knowledge that they have been true to themselves by doing more than just getting by. There are thousands who though humble and nameless react heroically and rise above and beyond the call of duty to make this a better world. Their reward is of the sort which Vachel Lindsay described in the Eagle That Is Forgotten:

"To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name,
To live in mankind, far far more than to live in a name."

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter addressed to President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Bulganin by Mr. Clifford R. Johnson, 106 Campus Road, Staten Island 1, N. Y., on the subject of world peace.

Mr. Johnson's letter follows:

STATEN ISLAND,
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., *March 26, 1956.*

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House.

Prime Minister NIKOLAI A. BULGANIN,
The Kremlin.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND MR. PRIME MINISTER: The unusual depth of sincerity in behalf of world peace as expressed by both of you during the past year, inspires and persuades me that the time has come to send this communication.

I am writing to you as the author of an atomic age peace proposal which has been deservingly described as the political formula for constructing the spiritual equivalent of the H-bomb for preventing wars of aggression .

Needless to say, I have taken full cognizance of your views as expressed in the published accounts of your exchange of letters (starting September 19, 1955, to March 1, 1956).

Your comments upon the issues discussed make a lot of sense to me.

But let us be quite frank. Both countries are getting nowhere. There is very definitely a need for a new approach. This letter has the answer if you will forgive me for being so confident.

As you both well know, the fear of sudden and surprise attack is the root of the tensions and armament race now gripping both nations. The reason for this fear, and you must be profoundly aware of it, is the simple fact that at the present time a comparatively few men in both countries have an influential voice in making the decision for peace or war. Peacemaking by the few is as outdated and unworkable in this atomic age as would be bows and arrows in a struggle against nuclear weapons. Peacemaking by all is the amazingly simple answer. Its proof rests on the following statement. That the common people of all countries are definitely opposed to war, is universally recognized and acknowledged. Hence, it follows very logically if they had something to say about it, there would be no global wars.

Peacemaking by all would be on the road to becoming an effective reality if both the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. would sign an agreement for the adoption of the following proposal:

I. Each country would allow all its qualified voters to participate in a national referendum or plebiscite to decide the issue of starting armed aggression against any nation.

II. No referendum to be held if the nation is attacked by armed invasion or if the United Nations asks each member nation to supply its quota of men for a police action.

III. This agreement would only go into effect when provisions I and II would be incorporated into the written constitution of both countries and the United Nations Charter.

Such a political formula (or its equivalent) for registering accurately public opinion, is the atomic age answer for preventing world war III.

It is almost impossible to imagine a majority of the voters of either the United States of America or the U. S. S. R. voting in favor of attacking the other, in view of their record of historic friendship. After this system has been in use for some time, there will be such a great sense of confidence developed that it will be relatively simple to work out the problems of disarmament. The problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons would evaporate.

And could there be any better warning system devised, than a nation debating and then voting on a question of committing armed aggression?

Very obviously my proposal would effectively correct or neutralize the limitations of your ground inspection and aerial photography plans. Leaving the warmaking power in the hands of a few men who secretly make the decision is the real cause of the fear of sudden and surprise attack. This universal practice needs to be replaced with the referendum process as soon as possible so that the common people can enjoy the maximum benefits of the atomic age.

It is so appropriate to recall that both East and West have spoken a lot about the subject of free elections and peace-loving states.

The Constitutions of both countries are exactly alike when it comes to ignoring the electoral process with respect to a declaration of war based on popular will. And to capture the will of the majority is of course the heart of my proposal. The world would benefit enormously from the example of both countries in extending and strengthening the electoral process which is the basis of so many problems, including elections in Germany. My proposal could be applied to Germany and so remove the threat of German militarism.

My proposal would of course abolish or neutralize the effects of the indispensible leader type of government which so largely caused World War II.

Peacemaking by all represents rule by the majority which is the most precious principle of good government. Bad government produces today's tensions. It is as simple as that.

The reason peaceful coexistence is so shaky at present is because it rests on such a small base (peacemaking by the few). Peacemaking by all represents the very largest base for building the most endurable structure of peaceful coexistence. It is an accepted engineering principle that the bigger the base, the more stable the structure.

My proposal could be made a part of your proposed friendship treaty (or any other tension-reducing agreement) as a starter and later it could be incorporated as an amendment in the U. N. Charter by using it as a definition for a peace-loving state.

Such an amendment would transform the U. N. into an effective atomic-age organization which would eliminate the need for all the existing little U. N.'s on both sides. You are both in agreement as to the need for a stronger U. N. A treaty is always in danger of becoming "a scrap of paper" unless it is written into a nation's constitution. If both countries adopt my proposal its acceptance by the U. N. would almost be automatic.

I am in full agreement with both of you when you speak about the need for deeds and not just words as the best prerequisite for establishing a basis for peace. This all boils down to the need for honesty. My proposal would enable a maximum of honesty on the part of all people to be effectively utilized to prevent war.

It is sheer folly to think that either country would be willing to really weaken its position in any way with respect to the other under existing conditions.

Here is where my proposal could break the logjam. Can you just imagine the effect on public opinion in both countries if you would make a simultaneous appeal to start the ball rolling with respect to the principle embodied in my proposal? Such a daring display of honesty of intentions would be an unsurpassable expression of dynamic deeds at the very top levels of both governments. Such an appeal would immediately receive the enthusiastic support of peace-loving peoples throughout the world because they would clearly realize that their desire for peace could be effectively harnessed for the first time in history.

No two other persons in the world today can do so much with such little effort to help establish the right conditions for a sound and lasting peace.

I humbly and prayerfully ask both of you to peruse this letter so that the understanding of all peoples may be effectively used to

prevent wars of aggression and thus establish the best political climate for a workable disarmament in our time and so speed the day when your children's grandchildren or generations yet unborn will no longer be required to study the art of war.

With sincere best wishes,

Yours for peacemaking by all,

CLIFFORD R. JOHNSON.

French-American Friendship Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, at the first annual dinner held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on Sunday, April 29, 1956, under the auspices of the newly organized French-American National Friendship Committee, a group of American citizens of French descent and American friends of France.

I include also a brief press report of the event.

ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, OF MICHIGAN, AT FIRST ANNUAL FRENCH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, APRIL 29, 1956

The Frenchman and the American alike regard liberty as being of the very essence of a happy, meaningful life. Equality before the law has become a firmly entrenched goal for us and has also come to mean freedom from discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin. Fraternity is understood as encompassing brotherhood and a respect for the dignity of one another in social relationships.

We Americans have not yet achieved in the full the three-part goal of democracy. We sometimes tread on civil rights and thus infringe upon the concept of liberty. We have a long way to go before our racial and ethnic groups can agree that equality and fraternity are indeed a part of the American way of life. But our goals clearly stand before us, their signal beacons undiminished by the momentary clouds of social conflict.

The French have not achieved liberty, equality, and fraternity in full measure, either. France of today, even discounting fully the exaggerations we so commonly hear, is a land of cross-currents of enormous problems.

But France enjoys much the same democratic heritage that we do. This great heritage is one that will prevail over transitory issues of the day, no matter how serious or insoluble these issues may appear at the moment of conflict. This tradition of democracy is our best assurance that France will remain a free, democratic nation; that she will solve her problems within the noble framework which her tradition has afforded her, and that she will continue on into the far distant future as one of the genuine leaders of the free world.

In these days the free world is being threatened by a vast totalitarian monster, centering around international communism. It is therefore more urgent than ever that the two citadels of freedom, France and the United States, stand together in strength and harmony.

Of late I have been disturbed by reference to what our present United States Ambassador to France has called "an increasing misunderstanding" between our two countries, with regard to some of our common problems.

It is natural that all men will not agree on all things. But I would ask, does not this so-called "misunderstanding" come in no small part from the fact that we have permitted barriers to be erected between our countries, which have impeded the normal flow of free trade, and the normal exchange of ideas between us?

Close understanding comes not only from common historical interests. It grows also out of economic and cultural exchange.

Free trade is the firm basis on which Frenchmen and Americans must continue their long friendship. Every year, our two countries exchange more than a half-billion dollars in goods, not even counting our trade with French areas outside Europe.

"Trade not aid" sounds good as a slogan—but like other slogans it is meaningless, and even harmful, if not lived up to in practice.

Not to allow our allies to obtain a deservedly larger share of our growing market in this time of great American prosperity is dangerous to all of us. At the best, it makes us look like people who do not practice what we preach. At the worst, it provides Soviet agents with a ready-made tool, of deadly potency, to be used for the purpose of turning our friends against us with false promises of economic assistance which can only ensnare free peoples in the mesh of Communist control.

When tariffs are irresponsibly raised, quotas set up, and complicated customs and banking regulations established, the slogan "trade not aid" becomes a dangerous mockery. How can other countries accept our promises of economic aid, when we are raising tariffs on everything from bicycles to watches, and imposing banking restrictions which make healthy economic relationships impossible?

Prosperous and happy citizens in other free countries are the only good insurance against the inroads of communism. If the farmers and factory workers of France benefit from better wages and better prices—which only increased American trade can give them—then both we and they are the gainers. Then, and only then, will we be able to allay these "misunderstandings" of which the present American Ambassador to France spoke the other day. The only shame is, that by shortsighted policies we should have permitted such problems to arise in the first place.

PRESS REPORT

The first annual French-American friendship dinner was held Sunday, April 29, at the Waldorf-Astoria, under the sponsorship of the French-American National Friendship Committee, a new organization founded by American citizens of French descent and American friends of France. Over 300 guests were present.

Guest of honor was Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, who underlined the necessity of French-American understanding and emphasized that France will always remain the traditional ally of the United States.

Other speakers included Comte Jean Vyaud De Lagarde, Consul General of France; Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of the State of New York; and Dr. Albert Simard, chairman of the dinner committee and past president of the French-speaking societies of New York.

Also, Michael Cieplinski, commissioner of nationalities relations, New York City, and Jean Hesse, president of the Comite Central des Societies Francaises de New York and French War Veterans.

AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, Rhode Island, the only American Congressman of French descent, served as dinner chairman and Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, was honorary chairman of the sponsoring committee.

Rev. Jean Maynard, Father Armand Morissettee, and Rabbi Samuel M. Silver represented the major religions present.

Guest artists included Miss Hope Hampton, Mildah Polia, Louis Quilico, Arnita Ferguson, and the Groupe Folkloric Breton.

A committee of young women in French costume distributed French roses and small bottles of French cognac to the dinner guests.

Both Governor Williams and Secretary De Sapio laid strong emphasis upon the need for encouraging free trade between the United States and France and called for the removal of economic barriers impeding the exchange of goods between the two countries.

Communism and Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, professor of political science at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., entitled "Communism and Airpower: A Survey of Possible Communist Air Strategies":

COMMUNISM AND AIRPOWER: A SURVEY OF POSSIBLE COMMUNIST AIR STRATEGIES

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony)

Marx and Engels died before the advent of aviation. Lenin did not show much interest in military airpower. Stalin's pronouncements on the subject are rather negative and highly reminiscent of the somewhat prejudiced statements made in the United States by World War I generals and admirals to the congressional committees investigating military aviation in the 1920's. It is therefore quite true that there is no such thing as a Communist doctrine on airpower and that Communist military experts have shown little interest in, or understanding of, the problems of aerial warfare. Not surprisingly, many military analysts in the West have concluded that Soviet military leaders do not ascribe as much significance to strategic air warfare as do American and British strategists.

We should not be too hasty with such deductions. Soviet strategy is not necessarily planned in strict accordance with the obiter dicta of late Communist redemptors or their living apostles. There may be many reasons, including security and deception, why Soviet military writers do not want to talk about nuclear air war or are content with plagiarizing statements by Western preatomic soldiers. Rather than deal with Soviet doctrinal writings, we should look at what the Soviets actually have been doing. Two important facts stand out:

1. Since the early twenties Soviet military leaders, including the celebrated Marshal Tukhachevsky, have shown great interest in airpower. If they did not succeed in building strong strategic air forces before 1945, it was not for want of trying but for lack of industrial and technological resources.

2. Since the end of World War II, and particularly since the emergence of a truly productive aeronautical industry in Russia, the Soviets have made great strides in the development of their air forces. Never be-

fore in history has an air force developed so fast and on so vast a scale. It is also probably true that, relatively speaking, the Soviet Union is devoting more resources to airpower than any other major nation. There is a possibility that even in absolute terms their investments in airpower are currently the largest in the world. The growth of the Red air forces has been particularly rapid in the last 3 or 4 years, during which time they have acquired modern jet aircraft in all combat categories. It is inconceivable that the Soviets would have undertaken their gigantic aerial program if they did not believe in the overriding future importance of airpower.

Regardless of the dogmas of the dead, the Soviet strategic position has undergone a profound change since 1945. Until the defeat of Germany and perhaps until the Communist conquest of China, the primary mission of the Soviet armed forces was to prepare for operations on the Eurasian land mass. Surface operations in Europe and Asia still are a most important Soviet security interest, and ground forces must continue to play a key role in their military thinking.

But since 1945 or 1946 Soviet leaders have chosen to consider the United States as their main opponent. Accordingly they must develop a weapons system with which they can prevent the United States from threatening the Soviet Union with nuclear air attack. It is a fact that the United States could exert exceptionally strong military pressure against the vital centers of the Soviet Union. Therefore unless the U. S. S. R. develops a weapons system that presents an equally strong threat against the vital centers of American strength, it would be in a significantly inferior strategic position. In fact the Communists would be allowing the United States to threaten them with unilateral atomic warfare. As long as the United States is able to destroy Baku or Sverdlovsk, the Russians must be able to destroy Pittsburgh or Houston.

Even the most ardent believer in surface force must realize that there is no practical way for the U. S. S. R. to put real pressure on the United States and at the same time extricate itself from a dangerous threat to its international aspirations, except by creating intercontinental airpower. Moreover, distances, the size of American cities and industrial installations, and the firepower requirements to destroy such targets render nuclear weapons indispensable. Without them the Soviet Union can present no real military threat against the United States. The development of intercontinental nuclear airpower is thus an ineluctable necessity for the U. S. S. R.

It is certain that the Kremlin has analyzed its strategic problem in these or similar terms. That it has is borne out by the manner in which the U. S. S. R. has been developing military aviation. But this does not necessarily mean that the Soviets must adopt strategic airpower as their one and only weapons system or that they must emulate American air strategy. The Soviets have great faith in the efficacy of their traditional conflict technique. They have gone on record time and again that combined weapons systems are far more powerful than any single "master weapon," however devastating. A large nation does not build a weapons system by beginning from scratch but integrates the new arm with existing forces and techniques. This must be particularly true in the case of the Soviets who, in their combined military and nonmilitary weapons systems, possess a unique conflict tool, the value of which they have never doubted. We can deduce, therefore, that they will make every attempt to integrate their new aerial weapons with their existing Communist conflict machine, both to increase the power of air operations and to improve the effectiveness of their older capabilities of conflict and conquest.

WAR OF COEXTERMINATION

It seems inevitable that the Soviet leaders have decided, first, to go all out for the development of nuclear airpower and, second, to combine their aerial weapons system with their other organizations for conflict, particularly with the international Communist apparatus. But having made these two decisions, a third problem must loom large in their minds. Since the United States now operates under a policy of avoiding war, the Soviet Union has the capability of launching the initial strike. In the nuclear age the belligerent who attacks first holds an overwhelming strategic advantage, far superior to the frequently decisive advantages which surprise aggressors possessed in past wars. The nuclear aggressor stands an excellent chance of reducing his opponent's capability to counterattack or retaliate.

But the same power of atomic weapons which confers on the aggressor this dividend in strength paradoxically may vitiate his strategy of nuclear blitz. If only a fraction of a retaliatory force can strike back at him, devastation could be large enough to destroy the cohesion of his social fabric. The advantages gained from surprise initiation of the conflict through massive atomic attack thus may prove quite illusory, irrespective of the possibility that the destruction in the attacked country might exceed the devastation in the aggressor nation. This is particularly true in a hypothetical war between the Soviet Union and the United States. By and large, Soviet industrial targets are more vulnerable than targets in the United States, and the Soviet Government is far less assured of popular support than the United States Government.

Accordingly the Soviets cannot adopt a strategy which would lead to a nuclear duel, nor any strategy in which they would be the recipients of a substantial number of atomic weapons. Whether 500 or 5,000 nuclear bombs would be required to terminate the life of the Communist dictatorship is immaterial. Soviet leaders must consider the grave risk that the survival chance of their regime would be diminished if Russia were subjected to nuclear bombardment on any significant scale. They cannot hope to fight a war without loss or risk; however, since the destruction of the United States is not an objective in itself but merely the most important step toward their goal of world conquest, they must try to wage war in such a manner that Communist power will be increased rather than diminished in relation to that of third nations. The mutual extermination of the United States and the Soviet Union may leave the military power of other nations intact—including some which today are considered weak. Regardless of the political and material fate of the United States, the strength of many surviving or neutral nations could then be adequate to overcome whatever Communist power might remain in the ruins of Soviet Russia. Hence the Communist strategists cannot accept a war concept which would entail the destruction of the primary base of the world revolution. The question arises: how can the Soviet Union defeat the United States without being destroyed even in victory?

SOVIET STRATEGIC CONCEPTS

To a Western mind the problem of victory with survival may seem like the traditional one of squaring the circle, but to Communist conflict thinkers, with their long experience in revolutionary operations, the problem is hardly novel. For many generations Communists have grappled with the task of overthrowing a government vastly superior in power to their revolutionary organizations. While fighting its more powerful foe, the Communist Party had to make every effort to avoid destruction at the hand of a government which had it only willed, could have exterminated the revolutionaries.

Logic and experience have indicated that successful revolution is the result of three distinct factors:

1. Freedom of action: A strong and determined government, especially of the autocratic or dictatorial type, can suppress any significant revolutionary activities. Against such a government sustained subversive operations are possible only in the form of propaganda from exile, that is, only in preparatory efforts. The establishment of effective revolutionary forces and the acquisition of revolutionary striking power can occur only after oppositional and revolutionary activities have been legalized and when the bulk of these activities is being protected by political and constitutional means against repression. Hence the first requirement of the revolutionary is the acquisition of freedom of action.

2. Simultaneous pressure: The gradual growth of revolutionary strength within the framework of a state granting political freedom does not by itself enable the revolutionaries to seize the government. It is conceivable that by evolutionary means revolutionaries may acquire ever more influence on the state and society and ultimately send their representatives into the government. The danger of relying exclusively on such a process of gradual advance and frequent stops, however, is that it lasts too long. The cohesion and resolve of the revolutionary movement may falter; its motivation may fall out of tune with the times. As revolutionaries reach cabinet status, their fervor abates—it happened to the Socialists of the Second International—while the rank and file revolutionaries grow old and contented and become opposed to strife and risk. While building up their organizations and strongholds revolutionaries must at the same time exert pressure, submit to counterpressure, precipitate events, and ultimately seize the government and smash it—as Lenin told them. The existing order must be destroyed, not merely modified or usurped. But before the revolution gets to that point, the state machinery, and in a broader sense the entire social structure, must be fatally weakened and disintegrated, either through inner decay or by termite tactics.

Moreover, both as a result and as a cause of social disintegration, deep-seated dissatisfaction and widespread disaffection must exist among the populace of the nation. This disaffection must manifest itself in such rebellious activities as mass strikes, large-scale passive resistance, disobedience, desertion among the military, and during the last phases of the process of decay, in the appearance of large rebellious crowds and insurrectional and terror bands in the streets. Until rebellious movements assume a truly mass character and while the government is still able to put down rebellions and uprisings, the state has not yet been disintegrated. In a truly revolutionary situation either the government no longer dares to use its security forces, or else the security forces themselves have become utterly undependable. Also in a revolutionary situation the rebellious masses no longer fear repression but continue to demonstrate, rise, and attack, regardless of casualties.

The emergence of such a situation is the condition sine qua non of a revolutionary seizure of power. Communists have succeeded often in gaining freedom of action, setting up "class warfare organizations," and equipping subversive forces. But in most instances those forces fall short in their insurrectional undertakings simply because the government attacked had not been paralyzed and disintegrated before the rising. Experience has shown that economic or routine political crises, such as a world depression

of the 1932 magnitude or even the runaway inflation in Germany during 1923 (when currency fell to one-trillionth of its value) are not "disintegrators" of sufficient effectiveness to produce genuine revolutionary situations. Such situations can come about only as a result of war, with its incident heavy devastations and casualties, and, more specifically, as a result of a resounding military defeat.

The Russian revolution is a child of military defeat. The Chinese revolution resulted from many years of dislocating wars and numerous piecemeal defeats. Accordingly the Communists have recently preferred, unless in exceptional cases, to forgo the classical 19th century strategy of revolutionary insurrection and to gain power primarily through military and paramilitary means. This does not suggest that they do not employ other means as well. Diplomatic pressure, propaganda, evolutionary buildup of strength, and insurrections will be used where opportunity permits. It does mean that these short-of-military-pressure techniques have become subsidiary weapons designed to enhance the effectiveness of the main, the military, weapons system. The Communists do not expect to defeat major opponents except with maximum power and violence, regardless of cheaper and easier strategies which might occasionally be successful against weaker enemies.

Since the Soviets consider the United States the chief obstacle on their road to world dominion, they must be considering ways and means to remove this formidable roadblock. Unquestionably the United States can be harmed by many tricks and techniques, but the point is to paralyze and dominate its total power. Such an ambitious objective can be reached only through a decisive military defeat, presumably on American soil, or through a completely successful Communist revolution. In Communist thinking war and revolution are closely linked in the sense that revolution can take the place of war or that revolution follows a war which has produced a revolutionary situation. Since it is very unlikely that the United States will fall victim to a revolutionary situation brought about by crises short of war, this means that America must be subjected to war, devastation, and defeat if it is to be eliminated. If revolution in the United States can be counted on at all, it can be conceived only as a terminal phase in a major military conflict, as a short cut to physical and forceful occupation but not as a substitute for a Communist military victory. It does not require much imagination to see that atomic weapons could be the greatest "dislocators," and hence producers of revolutionary situations, that history has ever known. The atomic weapon thus fits in closely with the Communist conflict doctrine.

Third. Exploitation. Once a revolutionary situation has arisen, it can be exploited by actual seizure of power in the conventional organized insurrection or, in the more modern version, by gradual political conquest culminating in a coalition government[1] which can be transformed step by step into a Communist dictatorship, or, perhaps in a future conflict, by means of airborne military forces supported by native revolutionaries.

UNILATERAL NUCLEAR WAR

This, then, is the established Communist conflict doctrine. We must suppose that it applies to a situation wherein nuclear air forces have become the main force of the revolution. If so, we may deduce that to prepare revolutionary conquests in the nuclear age the Soviets first must seek to bring about situations in which their nuclear air forces enjoy freedom of action. Secondly, they must exploit this freedom to create revolutionary situations which, in the third phase of the process, will allow them to seize state power. Their single most important task is to achieve nuclear freedom of action against the massive nuclear strength of the United States.

To express this problem in another way: the purpose of Soviet strategy must be to create a condition in which they can drop nuclear weapons on American targets but in which the United States has been deprived of its capability to employ its own nuclear weapons. The purpose of such a unilateral nuclear war would be to produce a revolutionary situation or perhaps destroy this country altogether. At the same time the United States would be inhibited from creating revolutionary situations within the Soviet orbit.

There are several conceivable methods by which a situation of unilateral nuclear war could be set up. One easy method would be to induce the United States and its allies to disarm and to destroy their atomic stockpiles, on the strength of Soviet promises, which would not be kept, to do likewise. As a variant the Soviets might agree to accept some kind of mutual control to keep the United States disarmed and, through secret methods which would escape the attention of the Western Powers, continue to produce their own atomic weapons. As another variant the Soviets might concentrate their propaganda proposals not on nuclear weapons but on delivery vehicles and try to accomplish aerial disarmament, perhaps by means of pressures operating against the American budget-making structure. There are some who think this disarmment scheme is too naive and that the Soviets would not be able to get away with it. The fact remains that they have been untiring in their efforts to induce American disarmament by diplomatic maneuvers in the United Nations, by the creation of a strong peace movement, and by psychological efforts against nations allied with the United States. But let us assume that these efforts will fail. The problem still would be to achieve unilateral war, despite the fact that the United States will have retained its arsenal.

DEVELOPING NUCLEAR FREEDOM

There are essentially four methods which a revolutionary aggressor has at his disposal to create the prerequisites of unilateral nuclear war:

Create technical superiority: For the first 10 years or so of the nuclear age the United States possessed a technological unilateral war capability against the Soviet Union. In the future such a capability may emerge in the form of a monopoly possession of an atomic delivery system which the opponent cannot stop or of an attack system which strikes so rapidly that the defender will be crippled before he is able to retaliate. Technical superiority also could be achieved through an aerial defense system which is so effective that the opponent cannot carry out his retaliatory attacks as intended. In short a technological imbalance would be developed, allowing the aggressor to deliver his atomic stockpile while inhibiting the defender from doing likewise.

Achieve tactical surprise: A second method of fighting unilateral atomic war would be to achieve full tactical surprise, especially with respect to the timing of the initial blow, the direction and targets of the strike, and the tactical procedures adopted for the operation. History has shown that tactical surprises have more often succeeded than failed, provided they were undertaken by a resourceful military leader acting with the support of an aggressively resolute government. If tactical surprise were successful, it too would mean that the attacking forces cannot be halted and that they can cripple the opponent's capability for counterattack before the retaliatory blow is struck.

Paralyze retaliatory forces: Another method would be to incapacitate the retaliatory forces on the ground by sabotage and infiltration or by an open, violent assault by insurrectional forces timed so that the retaliatory forces will be paralyzed temporarily—at the very moment when they are needed most.

Expand power orbit: A fourth method would consist in the continued and rapid buildup of Russia's industrial and technological strengths, the acquisition of key geographical positions, especially in the Arctic, the development of an integrated political and military orbit strength, and the open or camouflaged absorption of many uncommitted nations. Expansion of the Communist power orbit would be accompanied by attempts to isolate the United States and weaken it from within. The purpose of this two-pronged operation would be to create a substantial superiority of military, industrial, psychological, and political power wherein an American victory may seem to be impossible of achievement, with the result that the United States might hesitate too long before ordering the atomic forces into battle. While the effectiveness of each method employed singly may be questionable, a four-barreled undertaking along these lines could be quite effective.

[1] In Communist parlance this is a government in which Communists and crypto-Communists hold cabinet rank—usually controlling propaganda and at least a portion of the security forces—and in which the placing of militant Communists in key positions is allowed throughout the nation's administrative, military, economic, and social structure.

More Information on Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carries an excellent article by Mr. Anthony Leviero regarding the missile program. It is a thoughtful contribution to this important and challenging subject.

The article follows:

DEFENSE AIDES BACK NIKE, CALL NEW ONE PHENOMENAL

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, May 28.—The Army's Nike antiaircraft missile system received the unqualified backing of high Defense Department officials today. Civilian officials at a level above the feuding Army and Air Force said that Nike I not only is being improved, but also had a successor, Nike B, that would be a phenomenal destroyer of aircraft.

Anonymous sources indicated during the Nike shooting tests at White Sands, N. Mex., last week that Nike B would have an atomic bomb for a warhead, but Washington officials declined comment on this today.

In the interservice disputes aired last week, Air Force sources condemned the Nike missile as unsuitable for the antiaircraft defense of this country's cities.

These new facts on the Nike system were disclosed today:

The warhead of Nike I, now guarding 18 major cities and industrial centers, is being improved to reduce its margin of error.

Nike B will have a warhead four times larger than Nike I, and it will have twice the range and considerably more altitude. The range of Nike I is said to be 25 or 30 miles. It was said that Nike B would have the power to break up whole fleets of enemy aircraft.

Studies have begun on Nike II, one of the deepest secrets of the Pentagon. This would

be an antimissile missile capable of destroying intercontinental ballistics missiles. The Defense Department, however, has not yet decided to let the Army go ahead with the development of Nike II.

The Army has invested about $1 billion in the Nike. The Nike is the only supersonic antiaircraft missile that is operational rather than experimental.

The new facts on the Nike system, coming from neutral sources, tended to support the claims of Army leaders that the Nike is the best possible system yet devised for close-in antiaircraft defense.

These sources also disclosed some tactical characteristics of the Air Force's competing Talos missile and of the Bomarc. From this it was apparent that air defenses will improve enormously in about 2 years.

How the Army and the Air Force were thrown into competition in the so-called "point defense" or inner protection of home targets also became clearer.

Nike is the weapon for last-ditch defense to shoot down enemy bombers that escape fighter intercepters and missiles deployed far from the continental United States. Its margin of error—circular probability of error—is secret, but is measured in feet. Some marked improvements in the power of Nike's burst have been devised and these are now being incorporated in all the Nike warheads now being produced. Thus the circular probability of error between Nike and its target will be substantially reduced.

SIZE OF WARHEAD DISCLOSED

In order to give an idea of the size of Nike I's warhead, Lt. Gen. Stanley R. Mickelsen disclosed last week that it was 6 times larger than a 90-millimeter antiaircraft shell and about 4 times larger than a 120-millimeter shell.

The 90-millimeter shell is equal to 3⅝ inches and the 120-millimeter shell to 4⅘. These conventional antiaircraft artillery shells were the best the Nation had to down aircraft until the development of the Nike was started in 1945.

General Mickelsen disclosed that the warhead of Nike I contains preformed steel slugs. This warhead has considerable weight that is still secret. The kill probability of Nike I is being improved with novel devices that do not alter the size of its warhead.

It is in the warhead of Nike B that revolutionary new techniques and components are being incorporated. Officials will only whisper indirect clues to its capabilities, but it was obvious it is designed to cope with whole fleets of aircraft as well as with individual bombers that escape the interceptors.

Although Nike B has been test-fired frequently, it will not be in general use for about 2 years. But the disclosures today answered one of the most serious points of criticism made by the Air Force, which was that a virtually new fire control and launching system would have to replace present equipment in order to accommodate Nike B.

"UNIVERSAL SYSTEM" SET

It was learned that most battery emplacements now armed with Nike I already include at least one launcher that can fire Nike B when it is available and that the radar and fire-control equipment has been modified to handle the more powerful successor missile.

Moreover, a new "universal system" is now being manufactured for all new batteries. These will be able to fire both Nike I and Nike B.

The high level officials said there was much truth in the Air Force contention on replacement of equipment, at least as to cost. First estimates were that the modification of Nike I equipment would cost 25 percent additional, but this is now running 75 percent higher. A present Nike battery costs about $2,500,000.

The officials said, however, the added cost was a worthwhile investment. They viewed Nike as a weapon that has provided a great measure of security since it became operational a few years ago and regarded the changes as improvements that all modern weapons undergo in a period of years as they become obsolescent.

The White Sands reports of an atomic warhead for Nike B appear to agree with reports in other quarters that the missile would destroy whole groups of planes. Officials willing to speculate on this acknowledged that the radioactive fallout from the comparatively small warhead would not be serious enough to endanger the American public. An atomic warhead would be used only at extreme altitudes, probably well above 30,000 feet.

SUPERMISSILE PLANNED

Nike II, when it comes, may have an entirely different name, but that is the way scientists and engineers refer to the missile they hope will kill other missiles.

This antimissile missile would be planned specifically to kill existing missiles like the Air Force Navaho and Snark, both long-range missiles. It would also be designed to intercept the intercontinental ballistic missile, now in development both in the Soviet Union and the United States, which could flash at a speed of 15,000 to 17,000 miles an hour with a hydrogen bomb warhead. It would be designed to cope with these missiles at altitudes of 70,000 to 80,000 feet.

While the Army has Nike II in the "study" stage, the Defense Department is pondering whether to give the Army the go-ahead or whether this particular mission should be assigned to another service. Meanwhile, however, no time is being lost in its preliminary research.

Also answered today by the Defense Department officials was the Air Force criticism that Nike does not have a "seeker" or homing device. A homing device enables a missile, after it is in the air, to "tune in" electronically on its target and drive into it.

Nike is equipped with what is called a command guidance system—that is, it is controlled entirely by an electric-brain computer and by two sets of radar in its battery emplacements. Officials declared today this command guidance equipment was the best possible for a weapon using a 50- to 70-mile line-of-sight range.

Moreover, they said it was extremely improbable that a Nike in flight could be "jammed" electronically by the enemy, whereas any missile with a homing device might be jammed. It is possible, however, to jam the Nike control equipment on the ground, but the enemy would have to come rather close for this, it was said.

BRUCKER LAUDS NIKE

DETROIT, May 28.—Wilber M. Brucker, the Secretary of the Army, expressed confidence today in the controversial Nike weapon for defense against hostile aircraft.

Reduce Production of Certain Agricultural Surpluses Put Into Effect by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1956, I introduced H. R. 8549, a bill to prohibit the use of real property owned by the United States for the production of agricultural commodities which are to be disposed of by sale. It seemed ridiculous to me that we have had a policy of renting farmland that is owned by our Federal Government to people, who in turn, produce the very crops that are in surplus.

The Federal Government had been following a policy of buying this property, constructing the needed projects, and then leasing thousands of acres, in many instances, back to the previous owner who puts the land into production of crops we now consider surplus and for which we are now paying the farmers for not growing. To me this is a silly procedure. After many conferences with the Defense Department, a decision was reached whereby this program could be put on a sound and logical basis simply by a Presidential directive. I am happy to advise, the President made a public release, and I quote from that release:

The President today by memorandum requested the heads of all executive departments and agencies to place in effect specified policies designed to limit the leasing of federally owned farmlands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply. The President's action was taken to make the leasing of farmlands owned by the Federal Government consistent with the administration's program to reduce price-depressing surpluses and to bring agricultural production into line with markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the President's executive memorandum to all executive departments and agencies:

1. Except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 4 hereof, leases of farmlands made by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum shall prohibit the cultivation of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

2. In the case of acquisitions of farmlands by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum, if price-supported crops in surplus supply are growing on such lands at the time of acquisition, the harvesting of such crops may be permitted.

This directive, Mr. Speaker, by the President establishes a policy that is in accord with the administration's program to reduce depressing surpluses and would bring agricultural production into line with market demands. I am highly pleased that this policy, that has been adopted, will accomplish the objective of the bill I introduced, H. R. 8549, and will assure fair and equitable treatment to the farmers that are leasing Government-owned real property for agricultural purposes.

What Government Ownership Does to Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the great accomplishments of this administration has been to get the Gov-

ernment out of many of the businesses with which it had occupied itself in competition with free enterprise. There are those in this country who will disagree with that effort. They are the ones who believe the Federal Government can perform our economic chores better than can free enterprise.

For such people I advocate a careful reading of an article entitled "What Government Ownership Does to Workers," published in U. S. News & World Report of May 25, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP DOES TO WORKERS—MINES LOSE MONEY, 1,000 WELSH MINERS THROWN OUT OF JOBS

GWAUN-CAE-GURWEN, WALES.—This village of 4,000 in the coalfields of South Wales is doomed because of its failure to cooperate with the managers of Britain's socialized coal industry.

The National Coal Board over in London, the agency which runs Britain's coal mines, has anounced that on May 26 it will close down for good two mines that lie on the outskirts of this hillside town. The board says that the frequency of strikes and slowdowns at the two mines makes it impossible to run them on anywhere near an economic basis.

When the mines are closed, the machinery dismantled and taken away, more than 1,000 miners will be out of jobs. For all practical purposes, the village of Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen will cease to exist economically.

Seventy-five percent of the miners who work at the condemned East and Steer collieries live in this village. When the mines close down, these families will have to go elsewhere. There is nothing for the men to do here if they can't mine coal.

CRITICISM OF MINERS

Except in Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen itself you find little sympathy for the miners.

The coal board condemns what it calls the miners' lack of cooperation and their refusal to keep output high enough to justify continued operation of the two mines.

The miners' union—the National Union of Mineworkers—finds fault with the men for striking without union authorization.

But, if you walk the streets of Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen or talk with people at random near the mines, you come up with a story of trouble in labor relations—a story that stretches back to January 1, 1947—the day Britain nationalized her coal mines—and back into the days when the mines were privately owned.

"The men just don't seem to have any confidence in the coal board," said a village official. "Most of this trouble has come since nationalization. The men think it's a lot harder to get anywhere with the officials now than it used to be. The trouble in the pits is certainly a lot worse now."

The anger felt by the workers toward the coal board and its local representatives was expressed by one miner in these words. "Why pick on us? There are worse troubles at other pits in Wales and England, but they don't close them."

There is the complaint, too, that everything is "too top heavy" in the coal board's operations. It doesn't do any good to talk to officials at the mine, one miner said, "because they have to go all the way to London to find out what they can do."

TOO MUCH DISEASE?

You also hear complaints about the narrow seams of anthracite and how hard they are to work, and about the incidence of silicosis and pneumoconiosis, which are lung diseases caused by habitual inhaling of such impurities as coal dust. If you remind the miners that the incidence of pneumoconiosis has fallen 60 percent in 2 years because of improved methods of dust control, you get this answer:

"You look at a miner's face when he comes up. It's black with dust. His lungs have got to be the same way because he's breathing that dust all day at the coal face."

At the East and Steer pits you hear the coal board called "spiteful" because it has refused to open the brick bathhouses it constructed for the men to use when they come up from the pits.

These bathhouses are the most modern structures at the mines. One was built at a cost of $84,000; the other cost twice as much. They stand out in contrast to the dinginess of the other mine buildings. The board keeps them closed because it says it would have to spend $28,000 a year to maintain them and the expense cannot be justified in view of the heavy losses incurred in operating the East and Steer pits.

Some people here have a feeling that the coal board will back down and keep the mines open; that it cannot afford to lose this anthracite. The miners at a meeting last week endorsed a union resolution urging them to work harder in order to prove to the board that it would be worthwhile to keep the mines open.

The board, however, remains adamant. It says that it is not bluffing; that the mines will close down.

STRIKES AND SLOWDOWNS

The board says it is losing the equivalent of more than a million dollars a year by operating the East and Steer pits. There were 47 strikes and slowdowns at the 2 mines in 1955. So far this year there have been 11.

The board maintains it lost during 1955 about $900 for every man employed at the East pit and $1,100 for each man working at Steer. It claims that output per man-shift—the measuring stick for economic operation of British mines—is only 7.4 hundredweights at Steer and 9.2 at East, as against an average of 19 for the South Wales division as a whole.

Actually there have been 249 strikes and slowdowns—all unofficial, unauthorized by the union—since these two mines were nationalized in 1947. The advent of government ownership at the East and Steer pits brought an immediate increase in labor troubles, rather than any improvement.

In 1948, 1 year after the government took over the mines, both East and Steer pits were closed by the coal board on the charge that the miners engaged in too many restrictive practices. Later on, Steer pit was closed for a year and a half. The board reopened both mines after it got a promise of cooperation from the miners.

In May of last year the board dismissed 149 miners at the two pits because, it said, output was too low. Output averaged 4,000 tons a week, but the board said it should have been 6,000 tons.

The current complaint against the miners at Steer and East pits, as seen by the coal board, is based on "the continued restriction of effort, lack of cooperation by the workmen, and low productivity resulting in serious financial loss." The board complains that the miners failed to keep their promises to "cooperate with the management and carry out their allotted tasks."

The coal board also says: "The men at the pits have not honored agreements made on their behalf nor have they followed the advice of their union. They have not made use of the conciliation machinery."

After "repeated trials over a period of nearly 10 years," the coal board says, the officials see no signs of improvement at Steer and East pits.

All the troubles came to a head this month when both pits went out on strike for 2 weeks because 2 men were fired for slowing down on the job. Ten other pits in the area, with a total of 3,800 miners, went out in sympathy with East and Steer. The other mines went back to work after a union decision urging them to do so. The men at East and Steer remained out 3 days longer.

This history of labor trouble at these two mines results from what the Times of London calls "a process of mutual exasperation" between the miners and the coal board.

As you talk with them, you deduce that the miners at East and Steer pits are not satisfied that government ownership of the mines is the best way to bring good labor relations.

MINERS STILL VOTE "LEFT"

But, although the miners at Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen voice nothing but scorn for the National Coal Board, they vote solidly for the Labor Party in national elections.

You hear that quite a few of the miners are Communists. The president of the south Wales area of the National Miners Union, Will Paynter, is an avowed Communist. Paynter, however, is one of the most caustic critics of the miners' conduct at East and Steer pits.

The anthracite fields in south Wales are Britain's only source of hard coal except for limited supplies in Scotland. The coal that comes out of the East and Steer pits—locally called "the best coal in the world"—is valuable to the British economy as a source of dollar income from Canada.

Yet the anthracite fields are operated under nationalization at heavy losses. The coal board showed a loss of 3.7 million pounds sterling for its southwestern division in 1955 compared with a loss of 1.8 million pounds in 1954. Operations in the anthracite fields of south Wales accounted for 3.4 million pounds of the 1955 loss.

Most of the loss stems from the inability of the board to keep the miners digging enough coal.

PROFITS TO LOSSES

In 1939, under private ownership, output of the south Wales coalfields stood at 273 tons per man per year. The owners that year realized profits of 1.5 million pounds.

In 1955, output per man per year had dropped to 230 tons, and the nationalized mines were operating at heavy losses.

As one observer puts it, "The Welsh miners said that with profits taken away and sacking the owners you would get more coal and cheaper coal and that they would be happy doing it." So far, it hasn't worked out that way.

In Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen, you don't hear much discussion of statistics like those. There is no other employment in the village. The families here are absolutely dependent on the two mines.

The coal board is sinking a new shaft a few miles away, and it hopes to tap the seams mined at the East and Steer pits from this new mine. But it will be 2 or 3 years before the new mine is ready for full operation.

Meanwhile, if the East and Steer pits close, some of the miners hope to find work in the steel mills at Port Talbot, down on the seacoast. Others expect to go to England, where industrial jobs can be had for the asking.

The coal board says that it is not blacklisting these men, although other mines in the area won't be able to absorb half of them.

A GROWING FEAR

In the gray rows of miners' homes along the streets of Gwaun-Cae-Gurwen, you can find an atmosphere of rising fears that this time the coal board means what it says, of fears that families will have to be uprooted and moved away.

Out at the mines you sense frustration and bitterness in the remarks of the miners, when they talk about the National Coal

Board. For these miners—whether they are at fault or not—the fact that the Government is their boss has not so far meant a sense of participation and belonging. This was among the things they were trying to achieve when they threw out the private owners and nationalized the mines.

Revision of Government Appropriation, Budgeting, and Accounting Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation which I believe is a necessary step and long overdue to place our governmental accounting and budgeting processes on a more realistic and orderly basis. As I am sure most Members realize, we have a backlog of unexpended authorizations in the amount of almost $80 billion and I think all of us realize the lack of control that this situation brings about. I had been working on provisions to incorporate in legislation to present to the House for consideration when a bill was introduced in the Senate, being S. 3897, which incorporates proposals to bring about some necessary reforms as suggested by the Second Hoover Commission and which has strong bipartisan support in the Senate. I have introduced a companion bill to the Senate bill today.

It is estimated by the Second Hoover Commission that the reforms suggested and as set forth in this legislation could effect savings in the amount of almost $4 billion. This figure is perhaps hard to fully substantiate but at least it gives a very dramatic evidence of the great savings that can be effected in our Government by the enactment of this legislation.

It is my strong feeling that the House should consider this legislation at the earliest possible time and I am respectfully asking for a hearing before the House Government Operations Committee on the provisions of this measure which I believe are sound and should be enacted by the Congress.

This measure proposes changes in executive branch accounting and formulation of budget requests for appropriations, and it proposes changes in congressional authorization of the expenditure of money on Federal programs. It would place the entire governmental financial structure on an annual accrued expenditures basis, as opposed to the obligations system now in operation. It would permit a much closer supervision by Congress over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government and would provide for the top management of the executive branch a more complete and more meaningful understanding of the financial operations of the Government. Almost all major private corporations have adopted this system of budgetary control, and the Hoover Commission's report indicates that this system can profitably and effectively be adopted by the Federal Government.

The changes which are proposed are generally stated in "where and as practicable" terms. They are not of as much consequence to agencies which spend money primarily for administrative and operating purposes such as employee services, travel, rents, utilities bills; and which now are granted appropriations that remain available for incurring obligations only during a specified fiscal year. The changes are more substantial for agencies that are engaged in construction or purchase of equipment in large volume, and which require appropriations to be available for obligation over a period that is longer than 1 fiscal year.

For the latter sort of Department or agency, the bill would introduce practices that are essentially different from those now followed. Money would be provided by Congress only for 1 year's accrued expenditures; contracts for work in excess of 1 year would be authorized, but the money would not be provided for more than 1 year at a time. At the present, the contract authorization is little used, and money is appropriated for incurring obligations not only in 1 year but over a greater period the duration of which may be either definite—multiple-year—or indefinite—no-year.

Two differences are to be noted: a proposed one-year-at-a-time appropriation, contrasted with multiple or indefinite years; and appropriation for accrued expenditures rather than obligations. As implied in the remarks of an earlier paragraph, accrued expenditures and obligations incurred do not differ for some important objects, such as employees' services, travel, and communication, utilities bills, rents, interest, pensions, claims, investments. But accrued expenditures do differ from obligations incurred for lands and structures, equipment, supplies and materials, grants, subsidies and contributions. Expenditures accrue when goods and services are received, or generally, when title passes to the Government. Accrual includes the occasions when performance on a contract is accepted for the purpose of progress payments that are made before the completion of the entire job. Obligations are incurred, on the other hand, when orders are placed and contracts are awarded. The accrual of expenditures differs from the incurral of obligations, when it differs at all, in coming at a later point in the process of the Government's procurement.

The significance of the difference between expenditures and obligations is this: If appropriations are limited to the year's accrued expenditures rather than to authority to obligate—whether or not obligations are incurred—then the Congress keeps much shorter the time that elapses between its authorization of the expenditure of funds and the actual expenditure of the funds. The process of review of accomplishments is made more immediate.

The bill requires that appropriation requests be in terms of accrued expenditures. It requires also that requests be built up from accounts of costs, and that measurements of performance be shown. These requirements are consistent with making appropriations in terms of accrued expenditures, but costs may diverge from expenditures. If the costs incurred in the year, rather than the obligations incurred, are summarized in building up appropriation requests, accounts of such assets as inventories and of fixed properties will be needed. These assets may be used and so become costs in years additional to, or other than, that in which they are purchased. The actual cost of getting the benefits of the Government's programs can be ascertained only if cost accounts which reflect changes in inventories, depreciation, and so on are developed.

Question for Mr. Nixon—The Murray M. Chotiner-White House Influence Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch referring to a high public officer. Let us not forget that this high public officer is now the Vice President of the United States and the heir presumptive to the office of the Presidency itself.

Let us not forget that this official, having "charted his course," is now running for the Vice Presidency again with the blessings of General Eisenhower.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I offer the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

QUESTION FOR MR. NIXON

Senate investigators are resuming their inquiry into the Washington affairs of Murray M. Chotiner, who was Vice President NIXON'S campaign manager. They are especially interested in the fact that a convicted jury tamperer got Mr. Chotiner four clients who were involved in cases with the Government.

And there we have said it again. Mr. Chotiner was Mr. NIXON'S campaign manager. Is this "guilt by association"? Mr. NIXON'S defenders are asking. Mr. Chotiner managed the Nixon campaigns, of course, but he also managed campaigns for Earl Warren, now Chief Justice, and others. Why pick on Mr. NIXON?

The answer is plain and the Nixon ranks surely know it. By taking a high moral position on influence cases in one party and keeping remarkably silent on a similar case closer to home, the knight errant of 1951 has assumed the position of a sitting duck.

For example, in 1951 William M. Boyle denied that he had used his influence with the Democratic National Committee to introduce private clients to the RFC. Senator NIXON said then: "The very fact that the introduction comes from the National Committee * * * constitutes influence."

That same year Senator NIXON was highly dissatisfied with the Boyle investigation and said: "This inquiry has too many loose ends to call it closed, and I think we'll have to resume hearings."

The statements which Senator NIXON made then are exactly applicable to the Chotiner case today. For Mr. Chotiner also stands high in his party's leadership and also arranged contacts (through White House as-

sistants) for private clients with a Federal agency. Does that very fact constitute influence? Does this inquiry have too many loose ends? Vice President NIXON does not say. It takes no great sense of public ethics to recognize that influence peddling would be just as bad in Republican as in Democratic ranks. The crusade which Senator NIXON helped to lead needs to be brought up to date, and Vice President NIXON is just the man to do it.

B'nai B'rith's Triennial Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following part of the proceedings of the triennial convention of B'nai B'rith which was held in Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, May 8, 1956:

Mr. PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK (president of B'nai B'rith). Ladies and gentlemen, under ordinary conditions a happy and proud moment in the life of a B'nai B'rith president occurs when he presents the B'nai B'rith president's medal for humanitarianism to a distinguished member. I am delighted that but a few months ago it was my privilege to do so, in presenting it to the Honorable Simon Sobeloff who sits at our festive board tonight. It is not an honor that is given lightly. It is the highest award B'nai B'rith bestows. But it is always insignificant in comparison to the achievements and magnanimity of the person who receives it. Every effort is made to select men from time to time whose attributes emphasize one or another aspect of humanitarian endeavor. More then a year ago one such person was selected. The award was to be made, but was necessarily deferred due to his inability to be present in person at the place and at the time fixed. Tonight he was to receive it, but he is no longer with us. So it is that the pride in presenting this medal is mingled with feelings of sorrow. This is the first time that I have had the experience of presenting it through another to one who has passed away. It is not, I assure you, an easy thing to do. The deep feeling of pride remains. I am proud that Joseph Cherner was one of us, a member of B'nai B'rith. I am proud that men of his ability and nobility issue from the ranks of the Jewish people. I am proud that our country still offers persons with his ability and energy the opportunity to rise in the world. But I cannot still the grief that Joseph Cherner is not here to receive the award. Our only solace is that he knew that this event was planned, that he thereby realized to some extent the depth of our affection and esteem for him.

Joseph Cherner came to this land as a penniless youth at the age of 13. He was grateful to this country for the opportunities it gave him, but equally warm was his attachment to the people from whom he sprung, wherever they were. I need not tell those of you who are a part of the Jewish community in this city the extent of his benefactions. All shared in his generosity. The Hebrew Home for the Aged, the Hebrew Academy, the greater Washington Community Chest Federation, the Jewish Community Center, and numerous other causes. Recently he donated a large sum to the building fund for the new Tifereth Israel Congregation, which will include an auditorium to bear his name.

Joseph Cherner was a man whose greatness of spirit and humanitarianism surpassed his acknowledged commercial ability. He gave a generous amount each year to the UJA and in times of greatest stress, 5 years ago, and again this year he doubled it. He was a supporter as well of our own B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation, the Albert Einstein Medical College of the Yeshiva University and Brandeis University. The welfare of Israel was a passion with him. In the miracle of its birth he found constant inspiration and pride. He expressed it in striking fashion by purchasing State of Israel bonds. He became the largest single bondowner in the United States. He was a lavish donor to the Weitzman Institute of Science and to the Hebrew University, desiring that Israel should become more than a viable and secure state. He wanted it to play its new role in the expansion of science and learning.

These among others were the tangible expressions of his warm and outgoing spirit, of his deeply felt humility, of his sympathy for all who were oppressed. By his acts and deeds he encourged faith, learning, good citizenship, and he strengthened the little fledgling but so important State of Israel. He was the image of American opportunity and the embodiment of one of the great attributes of Jewish living, tzodokah, not charity but justice. In a sense he was one of the striking symbols in his own inimitable way of B'nai B'rith itself. May I ask that his lifelong friend, Mr. A. S. Kay, accompany Mrs. Cherner to this podium.

So in pride and in sorrow I now present this award to Mrs. Ruth Cherner, the worthy helpmate in all of his endeavors.

Now, too—approaching the conclusion, I'll call on an old friend, president of the board of trustees of Bandeis University, an active and distinguished citizen, president of the Development Corporation for Israel, Mr. Abraham Feinberg, to make a presentation.

Mr. ABRAHAM FEINBERG. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I knew that Phil Klutznick had very many talents, but I did not know that included amongst them was the art of being an impressario. Weren't those children wonderful tonight? Of course, you know that the loudest and proudest voice among them was Mrs. Klutznick's son, Tom. I have a very great feeling of personal satisfaction in performing my function tonight because I am a member of this great organization. That feeling is buttressed by the fact that in a small town in South Carolina called Rock Hill where there are no more than 25 or 30 Jewish families there is a B'nai B'rith lodge named in memory of my father. I have, of course, an official feeling of satisfaction that B'nai B'rith is being rewarded for the great services which it has rendered to the Development Corporation for Israel. I would be remiss if I did not read to you one sentence from a letter which I received from Philip Klutznick when he heard that this award was to be made. It reads: "I know of no greater happiness that one can have than to have done that which was responsive to the heart's yearning and still receive gratitude for having done it."

I think that if tonight, instead of over 100 years ago, the B'nai B'rith were just being formed, that this sentence would make it a great organization. It is refreshing to see how it as an organization, the largest representative organization in American Jewish life, and indeed in world Jewry, responds and reacts to the feelings and the hopes and the sentiments of all of the Jews of this country. And though you are to be commended tonight for your work in relation to the Israel bond drive, the whole Israel program of B'nai B'rith is to be commended. For it has engaged in every facet of work for Israel in the earnest hope that in the promotion and promulgation of this work, Israel would meet its destiny and would grow to be the great democracy which all of us know it will be. In contrast how revolting it was to have listened to the destructive rumblings of a few frightened Jews in Chicago under the aegis of the American Council for Judaism, how revolting it was to sense their own insecurity and their distrust of their fellow Americans and of their Government. And how wonderful it is to hear the constructive articulation of an organization like B'nai B'rith. You do not speak for the Jews, they tell us. That's true. Five-and-a-half million Jews in this country speak for the Jews and they speak for themselves and through their organizations. And they tell us that Israel cannot look to Dachau, Auschwitz or Bergenpelsen for sustenance, that it must look to us, the living, the virile, the active, representatives of a great democracy, a Government without which Israel could never have existed. Of course they look to us and of course we as Jews and we as Americans will not be denied the right to speak, the right to protest, to activate in all respect and at all times. And in that context I know that I speak for you when I say that there was much that was encouraging in the remarks of the Secretary of State tonight, and in the headlines which we saw in the papers, which indicate that Israel at long last will have some method of acquiring some defensive equipment. I know I also speak for you when I express the fervent hope that the day is not far from us when this great country of ours will join its allies in providing such equipment for a very great sister democracy whose survival means so much to this world and whose elimination might bring such chaos to this world. Mr. Klutznick, it is with a great deal of pleasure and a great sense of responsibility to the work which you and your organization have done that I present to you this plaque from the Development Corporation of Israel.

May I read the inscription? "To the membership of B'nai B'rith in recognition of its outstanding efforts in securing Israel's future through the sale and purchase of State of Israel Bonds. State of Israel Bond Organization." Congratulations.

Mr. PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time of the night and after Abe Feinberg has already read my acceptance and commented upon it so graciously, all that I can possibly say is that I am but a vehicle or messenger through which this is being received on behalf of the thousands of men who responded with full heart to a great cause, and made an investment which, God willing, will pay dividends not alone to them, but when peace comes, and it must come, I am certain that with the aid and assistance and guidance of our honored guests tonight, it may be facilitated; that when it comes we may yet see the day when the great things for which Israel was born may come to pass—an end to military discussions and the beginning of the spirit and the faith and the culture that must flow from that holy land.

Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Crusade is under way and reports

reaching me indicate that thousands of Americans have already written to Mao Tse-Tung, Peking, China, to ask him to keep his word and release the 13 innocent American citizens who are languishing in Communist Chinese jails.

Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling that the people of America will take the leadership with respect to the plight of these 13 American citizens and that they are impatient because the Government has not been able to bring about the release of these innocent people.

As my colleagues know, I have been doing all that I can to keep this problem before our Government and before Congress.

Recently the Reverend Harold Rigney, who was a prisoner of the Chinese Communists for 4 years, came to Washington and told me and several of our colleagues of his terrible experiences while in Communist prison.

Now Father Rigney has organized the Freedom Crusade and is devoting all of his energy to help the Americans who are still in jail.

Every American can join the Freedom Crusade and I ask my colleagues to particularly participate and to urge their constituents to join in this great movement to bring about the release of our American prisoners.

Thousands of people in the State of Connecticut and particularly in my own congressional district have already written Freedom Crusade letters.

Here are the facts about the Freedom Crusade:

FREEDOM CRUSADE

Question. What is it?

Answer. The Freedom Crusade is a nationwide letter-writing campaign to Chairman Mao Tse-tung head of Red China's Government, politely petitioning the release of 13 Americans still held prisoners by the Chinese Reds. This crusade has been launched by Father Rigney and is being conducted with the cooperation of the Back of the Yards Council, Chicago.

Question. Who is Father Rigney?

Answer. Very Rev. Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., is a Divine Word Missionary whose 10-year prison sentence in Red China was cut down to 4 years and 2 months by prayer, publicity, and letter-writing.

Question. Will it work?

Answer. The letter-writing campaign will work because the Red regime of China is very sensitive to publicity. Moreover, the communistic rulers of China will be more influenced by letters from laborers, farmers, and labor unions than by requests from our industrialists and politicians. Letters of children will also exert a great influence.

Question. Where was it conceived?

Answer. The campaign was conceived "in those dreadful prisons in China" by Father Rigney who felt that just such a campaign was needed to free him and all other Americans rotting in Red prisons.

Question. What is the address?

Answer. The address is simply: Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, China. There is no need to give your return address.

Question. What do I say?

Answer. Your letter should contain three points:

1. Give your name, your occupation (this is most important), the name of your union, if any, and—if married—state the number of children, if any.

2. Then courteously remind Mao Tse-tung that his government promised in September of 1955 to free the 13 American prisoners still held in China. Say that you would like to see him carry out this promise. And if you have time, list the 13 prisoners.

3. Conclude by saying you hope to see Mao Tse-tung demonstrate the policy of leniency which he professes toward violators of the law, by applying leniency in full to these 13 American prisoners.

Question. Why use air mail?

Answer. The misinformed Chinese will be astonished to see that American laborers can afford air mail. In Red China a carpenter must work several hours to purchase an air mail stamp. Air mail postage to Red China is 25 cents per half ounce. Ten-cent air letters and 8-cent letters via ordinary mail can be used but are less effective.

Question. Will a count be kept?

Answer. Keeping tally of the number of letters sent to Mao Tse-tung is most important for publicity reasons on a national and international basis. Individuals and groups should immediately report the number of letters they have written by sending a post card to: Father Rigney, Chicago, Ill. The tabulating will be done by a Chicago's Back of the Yards Council.

Question. Who are the 13 prisoners?

Answer. They are businessmen and missionaries, Protestant and Catholic: Rev. John William Clifford, Jesuit, San Francisco, Calif.; John Thomas Downey, New Britain, Conn.; Richard George Fecteau, Lynn, Mass.; Rev. Fulgence Gross, Franciscan, Omaha, Nebr.; Rev. John Alexander Houle, Jesuit, Glendale, Calif.; Rev. Paul J. Mackensen, Jr., Lutheran missionary, Baltimore, Md.; Robert E. McCann, Altadena, Calif.; Rev. Charles Joseph McCarthy, Jesuit, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Joseph Patrick McCormack, Maryknoll, Palmyra, N. Y.; Rev. Thomas Leonard Phillips, Jesuit, Butte, Mont.; Bishop Ambrose Henry Pinger, Franciscan, Lindsay, Nebr.; Hugh Francis Redmond, Yonkers, N. Y., and Rev. Cyril John Wagner, Franciscan, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Question. Give a sample letter.

Answer. The envelope address: Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, China.

The letter:

"DEAR CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG: I am John A. Brown, a carpenter, a member of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters. I am married and have five children.

"In September of 1955 your government promised to release all Americans, and today 13 are still in prison. I would like to see you carry out your promise. The names of the prisoners are (here insert the names if you have time):

"I have heard of the policy of leniency which you profess toward violators of the law. It is my fond wish that you carry out this policy of leniency by applying it in full to these 13 American prisoners, releasing them from prison and helping them to leave China and return to their homes.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOHN A. BROWN."

Question. Are more circulars available?

Answer. More of these circulars can be obtained by sending your address and stamps to cover return postage to: Father Rigney, Chicago, Ill.

FELLOW AMERICANS: I know what prison life is like in Red China, a veritable hell of mental and physical tortures. I am sure these 13 prisoners are going through the same or similar tortures I endured. If your letter helps reduce even to a small extent the imprisonment of these fellow Americans, it will be well worthwhile and they will be eternally grateful to you as I am to the tens of thousands who wrote letters in my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

FATHER HAROLD RIGNEY, S. V. D.

The Hiss Hour at Princeton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Budenz, himself a former Communist but now repentant and cooperating with the United States Government in exposing the Communist conspiracy, has some enlightening remarks on the Hiss appearance at Princeton. The article follows:

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin of May 11, 1956]

THE HISS HOUR AT PRINCETON

(By Louis Budenz)

The appearance of Alger Hiss on the Princeton University campus is a symptom of the disintegration of American morale, at least in part, before the Khrushchev "new look" line of the Communists.

The Daily Worker reflected this when it ran a great heading over a special correspondent's story: "Princeton University Students Boo Enemy of Free Speech."

This enemy was Father Hugh Halton, Catholic chaplain on the campus, who said that the appearance of Hiss represented "Princeton's darkest hour."

"Free speech" was thus expanded by the Communists—they who defend the denial of all rights in Soviet Russia—to cover the honoring of any person who may have given aid to the Communist cause.

Free speech was not the issue in the Hiss case at Princeton. Alger Hiss is a convicted perjurer, and his perjury had to do with alleged pro-Soviet activities.

The Americans for Democratic Action, an organization often accused of left-wing tendencies, understood that much at Swarthmore College and prevented the junior ADA from having Hiss speak.

That some students, who were only 8 or 10 years old when Hiss was at Yalta, should be confused is understandable. But that the trustees of a great university would permit this distinction to be given to one with the reputation and record of Hiss is an index of how far we have gone in an unguarded attitude toward the Communist cause.

Representative T. JAMES TUMULTY, of Jersey City, summed it up when he said that "you might as well have asked Bulganin to speak on the meaning of Geneva." But in acquiescence to the new Communist line, Bulganin has already been a visitor in England by invitation and there is talk of his being invited to the United States.

The Hiss incident serves to pictorialize the carelessness prevalent in many important circles at the moment when we should be particularly alert against the atmosphere which Soviet Russia and the Communists are now creating.

Hiss defended the indefensible Yalta agreement. The cries of the Chinese and Polish peoples, betrayed at Yalta, remind us how false is this judgment and how much we were deceived on that occasion.

A new incident in the current Khrushchev line recalls how alert we should be at the present hour. It is the notice of the alleged dissolution of the Cominform, or the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties, created in 1947 to continue the work of the Communist international.

The last issue of the weekly organ of the Cominform, "For a Lasting Peace, For a Peoples Democracy" carries the announce-

ment of the dissolution. But in a huge article accompanying this announcement we get a glimpse of the deceit involved.

The article is boldly entitled "For the Further Development and Strengthening of the of the International Communist Movement." In other words, while the headline-reading public and the non-Soviet world in general are led to believe that the dissolution of the Cominform will lead to some sort of a check on Red seditious activities, the article tells the Communists that these activities will be increased. The article says:

"The Communist and Workers Parties will find new forms of relations and contacts which are suitable to the present situations. This will strengthen their spirit of mutual cooperation, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism and further unite and rally them in the common struggle for the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism."

We can see before our very eyes the complete Moscow control of the Communist Parties of the world which this declaration promises. It is registered in the response of each one of them to the new Khrushchev line.

We have also had a warning out of the past concerning the deception involved in this whole device of alleged dissolution of a Communist international agency. It was given us in the dissolution of the Communist International during World War II.

Then, many of our unthinking commentators represented this move as a relaxation of sedition on an international scale by Moscow. But the Communists themselves were tipped off then that the dissolution was a hoax, designed to win American lend-lease and to prepare the road for our debacles at Yalta and Potsdam.

Then it was that Gerhart Eisler, under the name of Hans Berger, and other Red theoreticians, told the American comrades that proletarian internationalism would be advanced by the move. Are we ever to learn from experience?

H. R. 9566

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at the request of the Brotherhood of Shoe and Allied Craftsmen in Brockton, Mass., the following resolution in support of H. R. 9566:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9566

Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Brotherhood of Shoe and Allied Craftsmen and its 6,000 members favors immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel post size and weight limits. It is respectfully requested that Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that he request the chairman of the Post Office Committee to schedule hearings now on parcel post size and weights so that the citizens of Brockton, Mass. may have relief from the present law before the current legislative session is concluded.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate and the encouragement of young students of American government, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the oration entitled "Let We Forget," by Gabriel G. Kajeckas, a senior at Gonzaga High School in Washington, delivered in the 19th Annual High School Oratorical Contest sponsored by the American Legion. Winner of the District of Columbia and regional finals, young Mr. Kajeckas' address was 1 of the top 12 entries in the Nation. The contrast he points out so vividly between the system symbolized by the plow and the hammer and sickle must be especially poignant to him as the son of the counselor of the Legation of Lithuania, a courageous country temporarily under the yoke of Communist tyranny. His parents and all of us can be justly proud of his moving oration.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET

(Address by Gabriel G. Kajeckas, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C., in the nineteenth annual American Legion high school oratorical contest)

Ladies and gentlemen, in the world today, there are two great governments, and only two. And these governments mold this earth of ours into its daily patterns of politics, preparations, and prayers. These two governments are motivated by and take their purpose from two forces, or spirits.

And today, these 2 great spirits or forces can be summed up by 2 material symbols. At first, an impossible task. Maybe. But listen to what I have to say, and then judge for yourselves.

The first symbol that I want to consider is—a plow. And the plow of which I speak is the symbol of peaceful production—the symbol of a pioneering spirit—the symbol of hope, courage, sacrifice, and faith. And this plow that I'm talking about prepared the soil of a new land for its harvest of liberty, dependent on its people. Yes, the plow of which I speak planted faith in the hearts of a people.

And then, what about the other of the two symbols? That other one is the hammer and sickle. The hammer—symbol of the might which forged chains of steel—chains of slavery—and crushed the seeds of freedom. And the sickle, which cut the heart out of a people.

And what about the men who live governed by these symbols? One man is reaping the fruits of a harvest that his fathers dreamed of—living in a nation—free and indivisible, with liberty and justice for all men. Living in a land where he has the right to worship as he pleases, to work at whatever profession he chooses—where he has the right to live as he wishes.

And what about the other man, living in the shadow of the hammer, which might crush him at any time, as it crushed his freedom? What about that man, who has no freedoms, who is taught that he must not think—that the state will think for him?

It is here, ladies and gentlemen, that we immediately see the initial contrast between the two forms of government—the United States and Russia—one founded on freedom—the other on might. This, in the present day and age, is the great antithesis of existence freedom or might—freedom or suppression—two forces completely different, two forces diametrically opposed. And this is our world.

Ladies and gentlemen, 180 years ago, a deserted plow stood in a field. And it is this solitary picture that to me symbolizes the beginning of our long and brilliant history. That plow stood alone. The man who had been using it but a minute before was now fighting. The handle of the plow was still warm from his grasp—but now, he was holding another piece of wood and steel—fighting for the right to use that plow unoppressed and in freedom. And it was this minute man, willing to fight for everything he held dear, that fired "The Shot Heard 'Round the World." And because of their love for the right and the performance of their duty as God gave them the light to see it, 180 years ago, in 1776, with a firm reliance on divine providence, men pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

While in Russia, in the middle of our roaring twenties, 5 million Russian Kulak farmers were murdered in cold blood because there had been a Communist revolution. A revolution of men who said that there wasn't any divine providence—that henceforth no man had a fortune of his own, that sacred honor was not a reality. And because of these principles men's lives were pledged to the state—and in this pledge, men were no longer men, but pieces of machinery, to be molded and twisted and shaped by the desires of the state, by a hammer and sickle.

But because these American farmers, on the other hand, were willing to die fighting for the liberty which they prized as life itself—because they were men and not pieces of machinery, on a warm summer day in 1776, a man put the finishing touches on a 1-page document—a man who had sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man. And this man, Thomas Jefferson, drew up the Declaration of Independence, and as the final signature was added to this document, the United States had become a reality.

Several days later, the time that it took for the news to cross the Atlantic, King George of England choked on his dinner—because a small group of men somewhere far across the sea had dared to cry out to heaven and earth that "these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states."

We all know what happened then. A long and bitter war followed, in which men suffered, bled, and died—for freedom—for guaranteed freedom—for a way of life—and ultimately, for a Constitution. And slowly, through the lives of the valiant, like Nathan Hale, through the heroic sacrifice of the patriots, like Robert Morris, and through the eternal devotion of the great, like George Washington, the war came to an end and with the end of that war came the birth of a nation—a nation destined to become the hope of all enslaved and oppressed peoples everywhere—a land where all men have free-

dom to vote, freedom to worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. We enjoy this manner of living for one reason—because it is our recognized right, inalienable, and unconquerable. And the reason that we have this right is because of an old and worn piece of paper which today rests behind a pane of glass in an official building in Washington. That piece of paper is the Constitution of the United States of America—and it was this piece of paper that established our Government as a government of laws and not of men—for our Founding Fathers believed that "give a man power and he will tend to abuse it" —and this Constitution established our country as a place where men have ideas and exchange them freely, where men have abiding faith in the future of their land, where men have hope, where courage is not a sometime thing, where men are men and not machinery, where men can use a plow and not be chained to it.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, this is your Constitution—for you, by you, and of you. It is yours, it is the voice of the people.

But halfway around the world, in Soviet Russia, people have no voice. Their creed is the Communist Manifesto, which manifests nothing more than blood, greed, and destruction. These people have no interchange of ideas—they have their quota to fill, and they must fill it—and thus, life for the Russian people becomes a continuing nightmare of terrors, because they always know that Ivan is watching them.

Thus, my friends, of the two governments greatest in size, yours is the one truly great, for yours is the one in which all men are equal—as God created them. Yours is the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

In this brotherhood, take hold the handle of the plow of liberty, dig a furrow of freedom into the future, plant the seeds of liberty deep in your hearts and spirits, thus preserving our Constitution, so that our land, under one government, may cry out with one soul, "This is my land, this is your land, this is the future of the world."

This future is your Constitution; love it, and live it. Vote according to it and serve it, support and defend it. Remember everything that makes up our American way of life—yes, remember everything—for who will remember if we forget?

Address by Hon. Pat McNamara, of Michigan, to the United Automobile Workers at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] made a very important address in Detroit. In his address he emphasized some of the real problems regarding unemployment in the automobile industry. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, AT DODGE LOCAL NO. 3 HALL, UAW, SUNDAY, MAY 27, 1956, DETROIT, MICH.

I want to thank Pat Quinn for inviting me here. I always like to speak to my friends, but it makes me very unhappy when my friends are out of work.

If there was some way I could stand here and tell you not to worry—that everything is going to be all right—I would do it in an instant. But I'll make no false promises to you. You people have been through this before—too often before—and you realize there is no quick answer.

You auto workers apparently are becoming the forgotten men in this period of great prosperity you hear so much about.

There's something about this prosperity picture that strikes me as a bit odd. According to some sources you get a picture of people singing and dancing in the streets and lighting their cigarettes with $10 bills. But when you look a little closer, it reminds you of a movie set. All the buildings are beautiful, but when you get around behind them, you find they are only attractive fronts held up by some shakey props.

That's why I think what we have now is something like a false-front prosperity. The surface looks good, the high-sounding figures are impressive—but some of the props are giving way—and these are important props such as the auto industry, the farmers, and independent business.

I get the feeling that some of the prosperity boosters wish you people would sort of disappear. They'd like to sweep you under the rug and out of sight—but I can tell you that that rug is getting pretty lumpy and it's going to be uncomfortable walking for the prosperity boosters.

Why are you down here this morning—instead of at home enjoying a comfortable Sunday, assured that your regular paycheck is coming in every week? There are a number of reasons.

One big one perhaps is that the auto industry may have gotten a bit greedy last year and gobbled up too much of its market. Sales races between the giants were more important than maintaining an orderly market. And you boys build such good cars that it's hard to convince someone that his 1955 model really isn't any good and that he should buy a 1956.

Another reason is the tight-money policy of the Eisenhower administration. You know what tight money is. That means it's hard to come by—and harder to hold onto when you get some.

No less an expert than Mr. Harlow Curtice, who operates a small business hereabouts, has been complaining about that. He says the credit policies of the Federal Reserve Board are very restrictive. When Mr. Curtice said that, I welcomed his comments, and I said I hoped his conversion would have some weight with his friends in the White House.

At the same time Mr. Curtice made his remarks, he lowered his estimate of the year's auto production. He said the industry would produce not more than 5,800,000 cars, compared with his original estimate of 6½ million. I don't think that's news to any of you.

It may have taken some courage for Mr. Curtice to take issue with the Government's economic policy. It was almost like biting the hand that feeds him. After all, the present administration has done a lot for his General Motors, dedicated as it is not only to preserving giantism, but to making it even bigger.

(I don't mean to concentrate on General Motors here, but a lot of the GM people aren't getting regular paychecks, either.)

This giantism is having severe effects on independent business—or small business—as it is frequently called. Something like 10,000 firms went out of business last year, while corporation profits went up nearly $10 billion. The farmers, meanwhile, were losing a billion dollars in income.

Now the reason I have been talking about the farmers and the independent business troubles in conjunction with your own current difficulties is that all this goes together.

When you auto workers aren't getting paid, you sure as the devil aren't going to buy any of these stockpiled cars, or a lot of things that other manufacturers make, either. Neither are the farmers, and this kind of situation hits the independent businessman long before it hits the big boys. But it will hit them eventually.

In other words, when you take away some of the props of this so-called prosperity, it puts a big strain on the others—and you face the threat of the whole thing tumbling down.

It doesn't need to tumble down. We can have solid prosperity built on solid foundations of good judgment and forward-looking planning.

I don't get any joy out of hard times just because it might make a good campaign issue. What we need is a realistic economic policy by the Government—one that spends less effort making the big outfits bigger—and spends more time creating the greatest good for the greatest number.

In your own case, a realistic production policy is needed—one that doesn't try to slug the public into buying more cars than it can absorb solely to back up advertising slogans.

As I said, it seems the present administration wishes you people wouldn't cloud up the prosperity picture they're bragging so much about.

On top of that, we continue to get that callous big-business attitude toward the plight of the unemployed workers. You all remember when Charlie Wilson made his crack about bird dogs and kennel dogs in reference to the laidoff autoworkers in 1954.

Just the other day, we had another example when Howard Pyle, assistant to President Eisenhower, described—right here in Detroit—the right to suffer as one of the joys of a free economy. Well, I don't think any of us will agree that the right to suffer is part of our Bill of Rights—as I said in the Senate at the time.

Even when he apologized—which he did in an awful hurry—Mr. Pyle put his other foot in his mouth when he said your current trouble was seasonable. Apparently he hasn't been conferring with Mr. Curtice.

Unfortunately, we in Congress can't just pass a law and make everything rosy. But one of the things I have done is to personally request of Defense Secretary Wilson that more defense work be channeled into our idle plants here to help keep you people working. This isn't a permanent answer, I know, but it could mean the difference between pay lines and breadlines.

Labor and the Next Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Victor Riesel's eyes may have been closed forever by the vicious attack on him which left him blind, but his keen insight into and knowledge of the political aspirations of certain leaders of labor continue to warn the American people of this growing political monopoly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating article entitled "Inside Labor," written by Mr. Riesel, and published by the Hall Syndicate, Inc., on May 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

The Republican elephant is not rolling over and playing dead in the middle of the race for the votes of millions of rank and file union members this November. The GOP has set in motion a nationwide labor operation to go over the heads of union chiefs tied to the Democrats and to coordinate the activities of Republican unionists.

They are matching the Democrats, technique by technique, and will have Republican labor committees on State levels as well as a top-flight national labor advisory committee. And, like the Democrats, the GOP has set up a labor section within their national organization with a full-time director.

Heading this vital section is a man named Roy James, formerly administrative assistant to the Senate Labor Committee. James was pushed for the post by Labor Secretary James Mitchell, who has vigorously proposed a course by the Republicans that would steer away from a head-on clash with powerful union leaders. Mitchell and his associates are in the GOP group that prefers to placate labor as against the Goldwater-Jenner-Curtis wing of the party which believes in a tougher approach.

The State committees of the GOP will be matched by those of the Democrats, who have set up a national labor division run by Thomas R. Byrne, a former consultant to the United States Labor Department and a man with wide contacts among labor leaders.

Byrne's first step in whipping labor into line for the Democrats will be the formation of a 15-man national labor advisory committee. Ten of the fifteen who will serve have already accepted and within a week the names of the full group will be announced. George Harrison, head of the powerful Railway Clerks Union, will be chairman of this committee. Harrison has long been identified with the Democrats and some years back was offered the ambassadorship to France by Harry Truman. Harrison preferred to stay with his union.

Interestingly enough, Harrison has been pushing for the nomination of Frank Clement, 36-year-old Governor of Tennessee, as vice president on the Democratic ticket. If Clement is nominated it means that an older candidate, from a northern State, will probably be the presidential nominee.

Harrison's 15-man committee will have as its primary job the formulation of a proposed labor platform for the Democrats. The bulk of their proposals will undoubtedly be incorporated into the final plank submitted to the convention, for these men talk for the most powerful force within the Democratic Party.

These influential unionists have hammered together a giant vote-gathering machine across the country complete with precinct workers, ladies' auxiliaries, plant and shop committees and huge amounts of ready cash to be used either as outright campaign contributions or for printing of literature or for radio and TV programs featuring Democratic candidates.

In addition, they will walk into the Chicago nominating convention with an important chunk of delegates from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and California.

It's a cinch, too, that any presidential candidate will be cleared with these men who control the money and manpower so vital to an effective election campaign.

The union chiefs will also have an impressive record of performance behind them—not just in past elections but in the recent fight for control of the regular Democratic Party machinery in Texas.

Labor was anxious to defeat the faction of the Democratic Party led by Gov. Allan Shivers. They wanted the SAM RAYBURN-LYNDON JOHNSON wing of the Texas party to gain control. They tossed cash and precinct workers into the fight—and they succeeded. Shivers lost.

The unionists—especially the political strategists of Walter Reuther's UAW and other old CIO unions—have their eyes on more than Texas, with its upwards of 500,000 union members. They are looking ahead to making inroads in the entire Southwest, an area where labor has never before played an influential political role, but where union membership is mounting.

So, the donkey and the elephant are approaching the starting gate for the big race in 1956—and the stakes are high.

A Tribute to Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on May 24 a great labor statesman of our times, W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, was the principal speaker at the annual banquet of LaGrande Lodge, No. 315, held in LaGrande, Oreg.

The members of the Railroad Brotherhood Association on that occasion were privileged to hear an extremely able address. During the course of his remarks President Kennedy paid high tribute to my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I have been deeply moved by the very glowing sentiments expressed concerning Senator MORSE.

In my opinion, the recitation of Senator MORSE's outstanding record in the Senate merits an even wider audience. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kennedy's address be insterted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF W. P. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN, BEFORE THE ANNUAL BANQUET, LAGRANDE LODGE, NO. 315, LAGRANDE, OREG., MAY 24, 1956

It is really grand to be in LaGrande again. This is my first visit here as president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. While serving as vice president I had the pleasure of visiting with you on a previous occasion.

You may be sure that I welcomed the invitation from Brother Harrison, who advised the purpose of the annual meeting was presentation of veteran emblems to the members holding continuous membership.

The sturdy forthright progressiveness of the brotherhood throughout the 73 years of our existence has had a wholesome influenee on our members in keeping their memberships intact.

LaGrande Lodge, No. 315, is certainly no exception, for we have already issued 188 continuous membership emblems to your members, who have held 10 years or more continuous membership. Twenty-five emblems will be awarded tonight. Of those, 5 will be for 35 years. That means for 35 years these loyal members have paid their dues regularly each month.

It is a tribute to each of them. It is a fine testimony to our great brotherhood for its services to the members.

Our collective efforts within the brotherhood have brought forth untold amounts of good to all of us. The applicant initiated into membership this month or in any month is provided with protection and services seldom equaled and never surpassed by any other organization.

It is always good to hold annual festivities honoring those who have qualified for our veteran emblems. While it is rewarding to them, it is also encouraging to the younger members.

From my own experiences I know how it feels to get the coveted emblems. I proudly wear the 45 and look eagerly forward for the 50. I am sure other members share that same pride in receiving their continuous membership emblems.

It is always invigorating and encouraging to visit the officers and members of lodges, general grievance committees, State legislative boards, field supervisors, and the attorneys of our legal aid department as I travel throughout the United States and Canada in the service of our brotherhood.

Oftentimes I am required to be in Washington, the Nation's Capital. That city is the nerve center of our great country and a citizen going to the District of Columbia for the first time or for the hundredth time, has a right to anticipate his visit with some feeling, a feeling of confidence that in the Nation's Capital are the men and the women who make the world's greatest democracy run well in behalf of all of us.

Lately, however, there is something that doesn't ring out quite so clear and so sharp as I feel it should. The impressive marbled halls and wide avenues seem to be shrouded in an atmosphere that seems seriously disturbing from one who was raised in the Western States. I have that feeling and I think you would, too, if you visited Washington now. It's rather difficult to describe. There is bridled caution everywhere you turn, a fear of moving forward positively with a sound program for all the people. Perhaps it's this businessman's—big businessman's—administration in Washington. The dollar sign seems to loom as the most almighty product for consideration. It has been said that these people know the price of everything and the value of nothing.

Of course, this is not the story carried out of Washington and read in the Oregon newspapers. These are not the words that they speak. Instead the impression is cleverly given that from the President on down, the administration is as deeply devoted to the general welfare of all the people as were Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Far beneath the slick and cleverly contrived rhetoric which has successfully sold toothpaste in the past, the American people are now sold the idea that this is a progressive administration, committed to far-reaching programs for the betterment of the little people. I say this is not so. I say that the true facts have been covered, layer upon layer, with the slickest advertising copy that Madison Avenue, New York, ever produced. Slowly but surely, more and more citizens are being alerted to this great advertising crusade of confusion. They know that words are cheap—disgustingly cheap—and that only a positive, courageous program carried out successfully, is what matters.

The truth and facts are not being resurrected by accident. There are many fearless and decent people who are doing their bit to unearth them. Some are from Oregon, such as United States Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN. In the labor movement we have determined not to be fooled again.

Were I to select one man today who has done more to bring the true facts, the real story as it affects us, out into the glaring and revealing light of day it would be your senior Senator, WAYNE MORSE. Senator MORSE, with his sharp intelligence, honesty, and integrity is the faithful sentinel of the United States Senate. We all agree that this is not the age of the indispensable man but as a citizen, and as a trade unionist I view WAYNE MORSE as more closely approaching this role in the United States Senate than any other individual—and there are many worthy, devoted individuals who occupy those other 95 seats of trust in the Senate.

A United States Senate without WAYNE MORSE would be a far less hopeful part of Government. No one else could so effectively lash out in defense of you and me, or so artfully manipulate the pinpricks of conscience on those who play the dubious role as spokesmen of mighty, vested interests. When Senator MORSE takes the floor of the Senate, his opponents, who are our opponents, immediately put their guard up. They know that the unparalleled sharpness of this man will uncover their half-truths, their untruths, and expose them for the whole Nation to witness. If only the Nation's press would serve the people one-quarter as well as this courageous Senator they would report his skilled handiwork and far more people would be alerted to the shams foisted upon them.

I say to you as Oregonians, you have a debt to your country. You should return WAYNE MORSE to Washington. Neither you nor the citizens of the other 47 States can afford not to have him in the Senate. But you men and women of Oregon are the only ones who have the opportunity to vote for him. The responsibility is yours.

I sometimes wonder whether the men and women of Oregon, even those in the labor movement, fully appreciate the esteem and devotion and unbounded respect those of us, from other States, have for your senior Senator.

One indication of this deep belief in the man was shown several months ago when Senator MORSE was given one of the most coveted awards presented by the labor movement, the Sidney Hillman Foundation Meritorious Public Service Award for 1955 by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The text of the citation of the award sums up much of our respect for the man.

"Throughout his public life, as a public member of the National War Labor Board and in his 12 years in the United States Senate, WAYNE MORSE has placed the welfare of the people above all other considerations.

"With unusual energy, intelligence, and courage, he has fought for the public interest in many areas, including an enlightened foreign policy, the preservation of our natural resources, the protection of civil liberties and the extension of economic security to all citizens. In pursuit of these goals, Senator MORSE has demonstrated knowledge, determination, and an unusual ability to articulate the issues, to become one of the most effective Members of the United States Senate. In the process he has done much to stimulate an enlightened and informed public opinion.

"Senator MORSE follows in the great tradition of other liberals from the West, such as George Norris and Robert LaFollette, in his independence of private and partisan interests and in his defense of the public welfare. He is bound to no man or party, but seeks only to disclose the truth and to uphold the just, regardless of the odds or the opposition. We honor Senator WAYNE MORSE as a living symbol of the wise, honest, and courageous servant of the people."

That was a richly deserved tribute to WAYNE MORSE.

None of us should be allowed to forget MORSE's almost singlehanded battle against the Tidelands Oil giveaway—in April 1953, when he set a record by holding the floor of the Senate continuously for 22 hours and 26 minutes. He was not only fighting against one of the giant giveaways in American history; this was also a fight to provide funds for the education of our children. The Anderson-Hill bill, referred to as oil for lamps of education, would have turned royalties received by four States—California, Texas, Florida, and Louisiana—to the education of the children from all the 48 States. It involved some $67 billion. Oregon's stake in all this amounted to more than $80,700,000. Knowing full well the odds against stopping the Tidelands giveaway were insurmountable, MORSE still had no hesitation in giving all of his great energy to opposing it. The bill passed but the educational job done for the American people cannot be calculated in dollar-and-cents terms. It played a major part in stopping another giveaway, the Dixon-Yates contract to cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, a pet of President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Interior, which the Chief Executive, himself, had to disavow. And the administration has not been quite so blatant in its giveaways since that clever scheme was defeated.

In 1954 we saw WAYNE MORSE play another heroic role in conjunction with several other Senators. The administration was trying to push through the Atomic Energy Act without any debate whatsoever. It was apparent that the bill provided little or no protection of the public interest and it appeared that this priceless new energy, which was developed at a cost of over $10 billion to American taxpayers, would be turned over largely to powerful corporations for private profit. The day the bill was filed the administration tried to rush it through. Senator MORSE and several colleagues went to work. For 3 days and 3 nights they held forth on the floor of the Senate demanding major revisions of the important legislation. MORSE, himself, spoke 8 hours one night, 10 the next, and 12 hours the third night—all on the graveyard shift. Finally the Republican majority cracked and key amendments were agreed to which provided public-preference clauses and other changes that gave some safeguards to the public interest.

More recently, only last month, your good Senator held forth on the floor of the Senate for 5 solid hours and presented a most devastating attack on the Eisenhower National Labor Relations Board. Careful documentation and details offered conclusive proof that the Eisenhower Board is solidly stacked against organized labor. A few weeks after this historic speech the Federal court of appeals upheld Senator MORSE's contention on one case when it unanimously overruled the NLRB. A three judge panel ruled that pickets cannot lose their right to reinstatement and back pay because of strike violence in which they did not participate.

Those of us on the railroads have had occasion to remember Senator MORSE and his hard work in behalf of railroad labor. I recall, particularly, how he actually saved important amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act in the dying hours of the 83d Congress in 1954. When it seemed that technical difficulties in the windup of the session would completely destroy hope for the amendments, MORSE went into action. Through parliamentary procedural moves he coordinated action between the Senate and the House. The bill passed both Houses, one of the few bills in those last hours, and it was finally approved by the President.

Let me tell you this WAYNE MORSE is not beholden to organized labor or to any other group in this country. He stands squarely on his own feet, makes his own decisions on what he has found to be just and right. We've had our differences. One I can name, was on an appointment to head the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection. Our differences were fundamental there. But overall, on most major issues, MORSE and organized labor stand together in their support of the public interest. If anyone tries to tell you that WAYNE MORSE is labor's lackey, or anyone else's lackey, tell them how completely wrong they are. He takes a back seat to no one in unparalleled integrity and in making his own decisions. He is his own man. And that is what he should be.

It took rare political courage for WAYNE MORSE to turn his back on the Republican Party when he found President Eisenhower had become a captive of big-business interests and compromised fundamental issues. MORSE found that his own outlook was more closely alined with that of the western and northern Democrats, so he joined them. But here, again,, he refused to compromise with his principles although his record of support of the Democrats is one of the highest in the Congress. He was one of a small band which fought giving President Eisenhower a blank check to make war at will over the Formosa, Quemoy, and Matsu Islands.

When we say you should return WAYNE MORSE to Washington we're not asking for a rubber stamp, because he will never be that. We do want a man in whom we have great confidence, a man who carefully weighs his actions in light of the welfare of this Nation and of all the people in it. Oregonians want all this, but they also want a man who can represent his State and serve the interests of its people. In WAYNE MORSE you have such a man. When WAYNE MORSE steers key pieces of legislation through Congress bearing his name, some of it may be of interest only to Oregon, but most of it is of interest to Oregon because it is of interest to all of the people.

That was true of the Employment Act of 1946, which was cosponsored when he was a freshman Senator in the 79th Congress. That was also true of the Housing Act of 1949 which was passed in the 81st Congress.

In 11½ years Senator MORSE's name has been on 54 bills which were enacted into law. His name has appeared on a total of 547 bills. That is a record in which any legislator could take pride.

The work and constant pressure applied by the Senator helped secure funds for vital projects in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Last year Congress broke the deadlock imposed by the administration's no-new-starts policy by providing funds for 107 unbudgeted projects and by increasing funds for many projects in the President's budget to more realistic and adequate amounts.

Oregon and the Pacific Northwest gained new construction starts on Cougar, Hills Creek and Ice Harbor Dams, on planning funds for John Day and Green Peter Dams, the Talent project and important navigation projects at the mouth of the Columbia, Tillamook Bay and Bar and Charleston Boat Harbor. These are only slight steps forward but they have been won, in a great part, by the persistence of both WAYNE MORSE and his colleague Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER.

Even more, these Senators have not relented on the biggest sellout the Northwest has ever experienced—the attempt to undermine the Hells Canyon Dam project. If President Eisenhower and his former Secretary of the Interior are successful in allowing the Idaho Power Co., controlled by interests in Maine, to construct their smaller dams it will prove to be one of the cruelest acts against the people of the Northwest ever supported by an administration in Washington. You have full right to complain to high heaven the powerful Eastern interests are moving into this area, on an entirely self-seeking basis as carpetbaggers of old, and denying the people the rights to their great natural resources. You will feel this sellout in many ways in addition to higher power rates.

The man who helped to sponsor this influx of carpetbagger capital, the former Secretary of Interior, is amazingly, the man who is

trying to become a United States Senator. I've been in many States, and supported many candidates in campaigns, but I have never seen a race for public office where the choice, as far as the people are concerned, was as clear cut as the choice between WAYNE MORSE and Douglas McKay.

Recently, Life magazine carried a picture of Douglas McKay in a 1901 Hupmobile. I don't know of anything that could be more appropirate than this picture—unless, perhaps, he was sitting in an ox cart. For McKay's policies, whether in the field of natural resources or in labor legislation, belong in a period no later than 1900.

I followed with some horror his dealings with the mechanics employed at his automobile firm in Salem. The demands that he made upon his workers, organized within the International Association of Machinists, could be construed in no other way than that he was out to completely crush the union. Although he had majority of the stock and controlled the company he tried to place the blame for his miserable role on others, notably his son-in-law. Now we are told that he has sold his interest to that son-in-law but whatever action he takes now we have a clearly drawn diagram of what labor relations, McKay style, means. How could we possibly have more of a contrast when we compare McKay's record to that of WAYNE MORSE and his deep concern for the American worker?

My attention has been called to an article in the Oregon Statesman of last December, of an interview with Douglas McKay. Back in his home State for the holidays, he was reported to have said that after nearly 2 years in office he can ignore generally political criticism but that he was still trying to get his wife to adopt his philosophy. He is quoted as saying: "I tell her that when she goes to bed she should say her prayers, tell everybody to go to hell, and then go to sleep as I do."

My only comment is that McKay can tell the good people of Oregon to go to hell if he wants to but that the good people of Oregon will not go to hell, neither will they send McKay to the Senate of the United States.

I did not come to Oregon to tell you how to vote. I have come to discuss some of the important issues with you as a citizen of another State and as a fellow unionist. There are some things which you might want to give careful consideration. I could not tell you how to vote. That is a decision that you must make with your own conscience and act upon in the voting booth. No union officer can deliver any vote but his own and that is the way it should be in a democracy. I do hope you will all vote.

All the evidence shows that Oregonians are aware of the issues. For the first time in memory there are more registered Democrats than Republicans in Oregon. My personal observation is that many of these people left the Republican Party because it had fallen into the hands of men who live in a 19th century world. The farsighted Republicans such as the late Senator McNary are no longer on the scene. And others such as WAYNE MORSE have left the party because it was no longer a home for liberalism and was no longer devoted to the welfare of all the people.

These are some of the thoughts you might keep in mind between now and November. Oregonians, for the first time in years, can justly take pride in their senatorial team in Washington, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER. There isn't a better team in the Nation. Millions of Americans are counting upon you to keep them in Washington where they can continue to fight for us, the people.

It has been good to be with you again. Your tribute to the members of continuous membership is worthy of note. It is a splendid example to our new members, for within a few years they will become the veterans of tomorrow.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary are traditionally liberal, militant people, who love the good life of freedom and abundance for all. We believe in democratic government, free enterprise, with the dignity and importance of human rights, freedoms, and needs over all else. We can never hope to obtain economic, social, and political perfection. It must necessarily be a struggle for survival. The constant alertness and care will keep us in readiness for any fate. We cannot stand still. We do not want to go backward. We must move forward. We will go forward as long as we keep strong militant labor unions, ready and willing to battle for economic, social, and political justice.

In Oregon this year you have a great challenge before you. The forces of reaction are threatening the very thresholds of liberal government and militant unionism. The lines are acutely drawn—there can be no doubt. The workers, the farmers, the common folks everywhere who believe in good government will work for and vote for WAYNE MORSE for United States Senator and for those who stand firmly with him. It is a challenge to you—I am sure you will not fail to meet it courageously.

Supreme Court Decision on Indian Lands and Direct Income Therefrom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Decision No. 134, October term of the Supreme Court, concerning a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the case of Clark Squire, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington vs. Horton Capoeman and Emma Capoeman, with the opinion delivered April 23, 1956.

This appears to be an epochal decision by the United States Supreme Court in the matter of taxing allotted Indian lands or the direct income therefrom. Basically, the court holds that not merely the trust but income derived directly therefrom is not taxable. It also protects the proceeds against attachment for debts contracted prior to the issuance of a fee patent.

This decision will be of interest to a great many people throughout the United States and should be readily available for reference by the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, No. 134, OCTOBER TERM, 1955.—CLARK SQUIRE, COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, PETITIONER v. HORTON CAPOEMAN AND EMMA CAPOEMAN, HIS WIFE—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—APRIL 23, 1956

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

The question presented is whether the proceeds of the sale by the United States Government of standing timber on allotted lands on the Quinaielt Indian Reservation may be made subject to capital gains tax, consistently with applicable treaty and statutory provisions and the Government's role as respondents' trustee and guardian.

When white men first came to the Olympic Peninsula, in what is now the State of Washington, they found the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians and their neighboring allied tribes occupying a tract of country lying between the coast range and the Pacific Ocean. This vast tract, with the exception of a small portion reserved for their exclusive use, was ceded by the Quinaielts and their neighbors to the United States in exchange for protection and tutelage by the treaty of July 1, 1855, and January 25, 1856, 12 Stat. 971. According to this treaty, the Quinaielts were to have exclusive use of their reservation "and no white man shall be permitted to reside thereon without permission of the tribe." Article II. Years later, Congress passed the General Allotment Act of 1887.[1] Thereunder, Indians were to be allotted lands on their reservations not to exceed 160 acres of grazing land or 80 acres of agricultural land,[2] and 25 years after allotment the allottees were to receive the lands discharged of the trust under which the United States had theretofore held them, and to obtain a patent "in fee discharged of said trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever,"[3] though the President might extend the period.[4]

Respondents, husband and wife, were born on the reservation, and are described by the Government as fullblood, noncompetent Quinaielt Indians. They have lived on the reservation all their lives with the exception of the time served by respondent husband in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II.

Pursuant to the treaty and under the General Allotment Act of 1887, respondent husband was allotted from the treaty-guaranteed reservation 93.25 acres and received a trust patent[5] therefor dated October 1, 1907.[6] During the tax year here in question the fee title to this land was still held by the United States in trust for him, and was not subject to alienation or encumbrance by him, except with the consent of the United States Government, which consent had never been given. The land was forest land, covered by coniferous trees from 100 years to several hundred years old. It was not adaptable to agricultural purposes, and was of little value after the timber was cut.

In the year 1943 the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States Department of the Interior entered into a contract of sale for the standing timber on respondent's allotted land for the total price of $15,080.80. The Government received the sum of $8,418.28 on behalf of respondent in that year.[7]

Upon demand of petitioner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington, respondents filed a joint income-tax return on October 10, 1947, for the tax year 1943, reporting long-term capital gain from the sale of the timber in that year. Simultaneously, they paid the taxes shown due. Thereafter, they filed a timely claim for refund of the taxes paid and contended that the proceeds from the sale of timber from the allotted land were not subject to Federal income taxation because such taxation would be in violation of the provisions of the Quinaielt Treaty, the trust patent, and the General Allotment Act. The claim for refund was denied, and this action was instituted. The district court found that the tax had been unlawfully collected and ordered the refund. 110 F. Supp. 924. The Court of Appeals, agreeing with the district court but recognizing a conflict between this case and the decision of the 10th circuit in the case of *Jones* v. *Taunah* (186 F. 2d 445, affirmed). 220 F. 2d 349. Because of the apparent conflict, we granted certiorari. 350 U. S. 816.

The Government urges us to view this case as an ordinary tax case without regard to the

Footnotes at end of speech.

treaty, relevant statutes, congressional policy concerning Indians, or the guardian-ward relationship between the United States and these particular Indians. It argues:

"As citizens of the United States they are taxable under the broad provisions of sections 11 and 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which imposes a tax on the net income of every individual, derived from any source whatever. There is no exemption from tax in the Quinaielt Treaty, the General Allotment Act, the taxing statute, or in any other legislation dealing with taxpayers' affairs. * * *

"Even if it be assumed that the United States would be prohibited from imposing a direct tax on the allotted land held in trust for the taxpayers, there would, nevertheless, be no prohibition against a Federal tax on the income derived from the land, since a tax on such income is not the same as a tax on the source of the income, the land."[8]

We agree with the Government that Indians are citizens and that in ordinary affairs of life, not governed by treaties or remedial legislation, they are subject to the payment of income taxes as are other citizens. We also agree that to be valid, exemptions to tax laws should be clearly expressed. But we cannot agree that taxability of petitioners in these circumstances is unaffected by the treaty, the trust patent, or the Allotment Act.

The courts below held that imposition of the tax here in question is inconsistent with the Government's promise to transfer the fee "free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever." Although this statutory provision is not expressly couched in terms of nontaxability, this Court has said that:

"Doubtful expressions are to be resolved in favor of the weak and defenseless people who are the wards of the Nation, dependent upon its protection and good faith. Hence, in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, 'The language used in treaties with the Indians should never be construed to their prejudice. If words be made use of, which are susceptible of a more extended meaning than their plain import, as connected with the tenor of the treaty, they should be considered as used only in the latter sense.' *Worcester* v. *The State of Georgia* (6 Pet 515, 582)." *Carpenter* v. *Shaw* (280 U. S. 363, 367)

Thus, the general words "charge or incumbrance" might well be sufficient to include taxation. But Congress, in an amendment to the General Allotment Act, gave additional force to respondents' position. Section 6 of that act was amended to include a proviso—

"That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, and he is authorized, whenever he shall be satisfied that any Indian allottee is competent and capable of managing his or her affairs at any time to cause to be issued to such allottee a patent in fee simple, and thereafter all restrictions as to sale, incumbrance, or taxation of said land shall be removed and said land shall not be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to the issuing of such patent. * * *"[9]

The Government argues that this amendment was directed solely at permitting State and local taxation after a transfer in fee, but there is no indication in the legislative history of the amendment that it was to be so limited.[10] The fact that this amendment antedated the Federal income tax by 10 years also seems irrelevant. The literal language of the proviso evinces a congressional intent to subject an Indian allotment to all taxes only after a patent in fee is issued to the allottee. This, in turn, implies that, until such time as the patent is issued, the allotment shall be free from all taxes, both those in being and those which might in the future be enacted.[11]

Footnotes at end of speech.

The first opinion of an attorney general touching on this question seemed to construe the language of the amendment to section 6 as exempting from the income tax income derived from restricted allotments.[12] And even without such a clear statutory basis for exemption, a later attorney general advised that he was—

"Unable, by implication, to impute to Congress under the broad language of our Internal Revenue Acts an intent to impose a tax for the benefit of the Federal Government on income derived from the restricted property of these wards of the Nation; property the management and control of which rests largely in the hands of officers of the Government charged by law with the responsibility and duty of protecting the interests and welfare of these dependent people. In other words, it is not lightly to be assumed that Congress intended to tax the ward for the benefit of the guardian."[13]

Two of these opinions were published as Treasury Decisions.[14] On the basis of these opinions and decisions, and a series of district and circuit court decisions, it was said by Felix S. Cohen, an acknowledged expert in Indian law, that "It is clear that the exemption accorded tribal and restricted Indian lands extends to the income derived directly therefrom."[15] These relatively contemporaneous official and unofficial writings are entitled to consideration. The Government makes much of a subsequent Attorney General's opinion,[16] which expressly overruled an earlier opinion,[17] on the authority of *Superintendent of Five Civilized Tribes* v. *Commission* (295 U. S. 418).

This case is distinguishable from the case at hand. It involved what the court characterized as "income derived from investment of surplus income from land,"[18] or income on income, which Cohen termed "reinvestment income." The purpose of the allotment system was to protect the Indians' interest and "to prepare the Indians to take their place as independent, qualified members of the modern body politic." *Board of Commissioners* v. *Seber* (318 U. S. 705, 715). To this end, it is necessary to preserve the trust and income derived directly therefrom, but it is not necessary to exempt reinvestment income from tax burdens. It is noteworthy that the Superintendent case did not involve an attempt to tax the land "surplus."[19]

The wisdom of the congressional exemption from tax embodied in section 6 of the General Allotment Act is manifested by the facts of the instant case. Respondent's timber constitutes the major value of his alloted land. The Government determines the conditions under which the cutting is made.[20] Once logged off, the land is of little value.[21] The land no longer serves the purpose for which it was by treaty set aside to his ancestors, and for which it was allotted to him. It can no longer be adequate to his needs and serve the purpose of bringing him finally to a state of competency and independence. Unless the proceeds of the timber sale are preserved for respondent, he cannot go forward when declared competent with the necessary chance of economic survival in competition with others. This chance is guaranteed by the tax exemption afforded by the General Allotment Act, and the solemn undertaking in the patent. It is unreasonable to infer that in enacting the income tax law, Congress intended to limit or undermine the Government's undertaking. To tax respondent under these circumstances would, in the words of the court below, be "at the least, a sorry breach of faith with these Indians."[22]

The judgment of the court of appeals is affirmed.

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting.

My view is that the sale price of the timber in excess of its market value on

Footnotes at end of speech.

March 1, 1913, was a capital gain, subject to Federal income tax. *Jones* v. *Taunahi* (186 F. 2d 445). *Cf. Choteau* v. *Burnet* (283 U. S. 691); *Superintendent* v. *Commissioner* (295 U. S. 418). The gain is taxable income like the value of annual crops.

Mr. Justice Harlan took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

---

[1] 24 Stat. 388, 25 U. S. C., sec. 331, et seq.

[2] 25 U. S. C., sec. 331.

[3] Id., sec. 348.

[4] Ibid. The trust period here involved has regularly been extended by executive order. See note following 25 U. S. C., sec. 848, and see 25 U. S. C., sec. 462, which provides: "The existing periods of trust placed upon any Indian lands and any restriction on alienation thereof are extended and continued until otherwise directed by Congress."

[5] The term "patent" inadequately describes respondents' interest. "Congress * * * was careful to avoid investing the allottee with the title in the first instance, and directed that there should be issued to him what * * * is in reality an allotment certificate * * *." *Monson* v. *Simonson* (231 U. S. 341, 345).

[6] In pertinent part, the patent provides: "Now know ye, That the United States of America, in consideration of the premises, has allotted, and by these presents does allot, unto the said Horton Capoeman, the land above described, and hereby declares that it does and will hold the land thus allotted (subject to all statutory provisions and restrictions) for the period of 25 years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the said Indian, and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, in fee, discharged of said trust and free of all charge or encumbrance whatsoever * * *."

[7] This sale seems to have followed a pattern generally adopted by the Government in selling timber from Indian allotments. Huge areas of forest are put up for competitive bids by lumber companies. These tracts include the tribal forest lands and individual allotments, with the consent of tribal councils and individual allottees. The successful bidder is required to make an immediate advance payment of a large proportion of the estimated value of the lumber in the tract. Since as much as 640 million board feet have been sold at one time, this requirement makes it economically infeasible for any but the largest companies to submit bids. The uncertainties of such large-scale operations, which are to be carried on over 25- or 30-year periods, coupled with local quality and accessibility variables, has resulted in substantially lower than prevailing market bids. In some instances, the return to other sellers of comparable timber was 2 or 3 times that received by the Indians. See transcript of Nov. 28, 1955, Joint Hearting of Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight Function of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations, 2151–2217, and passim.

[8] Brief for Petitioner, pp. 7–8.

[9] 25 U. S. C. sec. 349.

[10] See S. Rept. No. 1998, 59th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Rept. No. 1558, 59th Cong. 1st sess.

[11] This provision was relied upon by Chief Judge Phillips, dissenting in *Jones* v. *Taunah* (186 F. 2d 445, 449).

[12] 34 Op. Atty. Gen. 275, 281 (1924). And see id., 302 (1924).

[13] Id., 439, 445 (1925). This ruling was followed in 35 Op. Atty. Gen. 1 (1925). And cf. id., 107 (1926).

[14] T. D. 3570, III–1 Cum. Bull. 85 (1924); T. D. 3754, IV–2 Cum. Bull. 37 (1925).

[15] Cohen, Handbook of Federal Indian Law, 265. He distinguished cases permitting the imposition of income taxes upon income derived from unrestricted lands, and upon reinvestment income Id., at 265–266. Mr.

Cohen was Chairman of the Department of Interior Board of Appeals, and Assistant Solicitor of the Department. The handbook has a foreword by Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, and was printed by the United States Government Printing Office.

[36] 39 Op. Atty. Gen. 107 (1937).

[37] 34 id., 439.

[38] 295 U. S., at 421.

[39] The Government also relies upon *Choteau* v. *Burnet* (283 U. S. 691), but that case also is not controlling, since it held only that a competent Indian, who had unrestricted control over lands and income therefrom, was not exempt from income tax solely because of his status as an Indian. Such a tax is specifically authorized by section 6 of the General Allotment Act.

[40] See *United States* v. *Eastman* (118 F. 2d 421).

[41] See 220 F. 2d, at 350. In its answer filed in the District Court, the Government admitted that the lands "are generally unsuitable for agricultural purposes * * *." R. 31.

[42] 220 F. 2d 350.

Statement of Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, Professor of Soviet Economics, Georgetown University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 14, it was reported in the New York Times, under the caption "Soviet Plans End of Prison Camps," that Moscow is planning to abolish within the next 18 months all internment camps. However, a careful reading of this report discloses the fact that Moscow has no intention of eliminating "corrective labor colonies," whether near the homes of political prisoners or at far distances, and that "in cases of extremely serious political crimes" deportations to Siberia would still be likely.

We must not be deceived by the information reported to have been given by a MVD official to a group of French Socialists, - led by Marceau Pivert. Whether forced-labor camps are near the homes of prisoners or not, the very existence of such camps deserves the strongest censure of free world opinion. Moreover, the political crimes referred to are almost entirely the patriotic acts of Ukrainians, Poles, Lithuanians, Byeloruthenians, Latvians, Estonians, Armenians, Georgians, and others to regain their national independence and freedom. Such acts cannot but receive our total sympathy and support.

The recent testimony given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on Forced Labor in Ukraine and Moscow's New Look, reveals the bases of our sound skepticism of such reports emanating from Moscow. This testimony supports Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor. A careful reading of it will convince one that the apparent measures of so-called liberalization taken by Moscow do not strike the core of the issue and are designed to deceive the West by the supposed reasonableness of the present oligarchical dictatorship. Under unanimous consent, I present this testimony for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as you no doubt know, is a national organization of Americans of Ukrainian background. There are approximately 1½ million such Americans here in this country and the objectives of the organization are informational, educational, and largely in the area of foreign policy.

We attempt to disseminate as much information as we can on the basis of the experiences of not only Ukrainians, but all other non-Russian nationals within the Soviet Union.

I am very grateful for the invitation extended me by this committee to submit testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 117 which provides for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor.

It was my equal privilege to testify in 1950 before the McMahon Committee on the Genocide Convention which presented the opportunity to offer evidence on the close relationship existing between forced-labor camps in the Soviet Union and the heinous crime of genocide. At the time, many in this country viewed the evidence with doubt and disbelief, but just recently, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, even the Russian Communist leaders admitted to its veracity and truth. had we wisely ratified the Genocide Convention, we would today be in the strongest moral and legal position to do something in the court of world opinion about the genocidal acts of mass murder, purges and famine which the present oligarchical dictatorship vainly ascribes to Stalin.

Forced labor in itself is not genocide, but it bears its criminal features as an institutional instrument and means for the consummate act of genocide as practiced in the Soviet Union. Again, and more seriously at this time, we would be missing the boat should we fail to pass Senate Joint Resolution 117 and allow the opportunity of exercising our leadership in the International Labor Organization toward the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes slip by us.

In the limited time allottted me here I should like to develop the essentials that presently constitute the picture of Moscow's application of the instrument of forced labor to Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and the European orbit of the Russian Communist Empire. These essentials may be appropriately attuned to Mr. Khrushchev's latest revealing and bluff-like outburst, "Never shake your fist at a Russian"—AP, April 23, England.

Indeed, founded on extensive source material, they will serve to explain, especially in the field of forced labor, why Ukrainian patriots always shake their fists at imperialist Russian Moscow without fear or trepidation in the face of Russian threats or bluff. Whether at Vorkuta in the north or Krupkoy in the south, Kamenets-Podolsk in the west or Magadan in the east, forced Ukrainian labor, in rhythym with the captive Ukrainian people generally, keeps shaking its fist at the colonial Russian imperialists through widespread strikes, resistance and a network of planned political operation.

Since World War II mounting evidence on the extent, nature, conditions and composition of the Russian Communist concentration-camp system has been overwhelming.

There is little excuse today for displayed ignorance on the existence and horrible realities of this forced labor system. Undirected tours by Westerners into the forced labor camps are prohibited, but intellect-appealing facts about them are abundantly accessible.

The work of the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, which carefully studied the documented testimonies of scores of former Ukrainian and other inmates of these camps, is monumental in scope and content, despite limitations of time and resources in assembling all the data that are still available. Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U. S. S. R., 83d Congress, Washington, 1954; also, Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, Special Report No. 4, 1955.

Countless Ukrainian refugees who experienced the most dreadful life in these camps and were fortunate to escape the scissors of forced repatriation, have yet to relate their individual forced labor experiences. The realistic and compatible testimonies given by German, Hungarian, Spanish, Austrian, and Japanese prisoners who mingled and slaved with Ukrainian and other nationals in these camps, have provided us with a wealth of the most recent information.

This authoritative work that I have in my hand here, Mr. Chairman, on The Black Deeds of the Kremlin, published by the Basilian Press in Canada, consists of vivid personal accounts given by former Ukrainian inmates of camps in the Solovetsky Islands, Kolyma, and other distant places of the empire known as the Soviet Union. I wish to submit it for extracted use at the discretion of the committee in the preparation of its publication of these proceedings.

I wish also to have the permission of the committee to submit subsequently and within reason additional factual data which base my general observations on forced labor in Ukraine and of its people.

As in the case of agricultural collectivization, to construe forced labor in the Soviet Union in purely economic terms is a grave mistake that only leads to a distorted picture of the situation. Similar to the phenomenon of forced saving, there is forced labor among the ostensibly "free labor" which is inherently associated with the very mechanism of a planned economy in a totalitarian social framework. Aimed at curbing labor turnover, this type of forced labor ranks far below the type dwelled on here from the viewpoints of human costs and the brutal violation of political and moral principles and rights. It patently belies the Soviet Code of Laws on Labor which, like the Soviet Constitution, is a paper of theory with scarcely the remotest relationship to practice. However, unquestionably of prime concern to free men everywhere is the forced labor in what Moscow paints as "the corrective labor camps."

Several years ago the British delegate to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, Mr. Corley Smith, sized up these camps well when he stated, "If, as we believe, a high proportion of the population of the Soviet Union is in fact working in forced labor camps and colonies, this can mean either that the Soviet system has produced an infinitely higher proportion of criminals than any other social system, or else that the regime is unpopular and is only maintained by force or the mass imprisonment of its opponents." Forced Labor in Russia, International Survey, London, No. 60, August 1950, page 31.

All parts of this statement are true, but it is the latter causal explanation that is powerfully buttressed by fact. The vast majority in these forced labor camps is made up of political prisoners, and only a small percentage of criminals has been witnessed

among the approximately 15 million imprisoned in them.

Furthermore, not only does the determining fact of forced labor for political reasons stand out in connection with the worst type of such labor in the Soviet Union, but also, and perhaps more significant, is the prominent fact that the composition of this labor clearly demonstrates the nature of these political reasons. It is not simply opposition to a dictatorial regime but one far deeper than this.

The conspicuous Ukrainian and generally non-Russian composition of the inmates shows that the nature of these political reasons is one of the continuous and unrelenting struggle of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union against the traditional colonialism and imperialism of totalitarian Russia, be it White or Red. Whoever fails to grasp this basic political reason for forced labor in the Soviet Union today, not only fails to perceive the significance of presented facts but also fails to understand the foremost anti-Communist and centrifugal force at work in this colonial empire.

As so many other fundamental institutional facets of the Soviet Union, the institution of forced labor has its firm historical roots in totalitarian Russian history and scarcely any in the foundations of ideologic communism. Political prisoners sent into Siberian exile and forced labor was, lest it be forgotten, a prominent feature of the Czarist Russian Empire and its furtherance of the colonial movement. See M. Mirsky, Russia, page 231.

Like the Iron Curtain, the police state, and colonialism and imperialism, this institution of Czarist Russian totalitarianism was carried over wholesale into the present period of Russian Communist totalitarianism and, with considerable technologic innovation, developed into a major instrument of authoritarian control and genocidal liquidation. Thus, with regard to the largest single national group in the forced labor camps of the Soviet Union—the Ukrainians—the concrete content of the political reasons for their imprisonment in hard circumstances of forced labor consists of their fearless and patriotic resistance and opposition to denationalization and Russification since the late twenties, to the mass collectivization measures in the early thirties, to the successive purges of the thirties and the late forties, to the current deportation program under the guise of land development in central Asia, and to many singular aspects of slow genocide of the Ukrainian nation itself.

The Russian leader, Khrushchev, knows these events well inasmuch as he formed his criminal record in Ukraine for his quick ascent to power.

The ultimate meaning of the forced labor of Ukrainians and other non-Russian captive nations in the Soviet Union cannot, therefore, be properly understood unless this fact is fully observed within the ruling context of political realities in the Soviet Union. A succinct description of this context is given by David Lawrence in a remarkable article on "200,000,000 Slaves":

"Inside the Soviet Union are more than a score of major nationalities. There are only about 80 million Russians. The other nationalities—around 120 million persons—have little feeling of patriotism about anything Russian. The so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a paper description of a loose federation held together only by the iron hand of the dictatorship group." (U. S. News & World Report, Washington, February 18, 1955.)

Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestanians, Azerbaijani and others have a patriotism only to their respective native countries. For the sin of bourgeois nationalism, which every patriotic American understands as one's love of God and native land, these non-Russian patriots are committed to forced labor and, in countless instances, through it to death.

Two paramount general facts appear in respect to the composition and conditions of the forced labor camps in the Soviet Union. One is the predominant numbers of Ukrainian political prisoners which observers conservatively estimate at 45 percent of total composition.

Two, the leadership of opposition and resistance to armed authorities has been undertaken in the main by patriotic Ukrainian nationalists who belong to the thriving network of the far-flung Ukrainian underground.

The striking importance of these basic general facts for our leadership today in taking constructive and effective steps to abolish forced labor will become manifest once we review some of the evidence supporting these facts.

In the informative work on Forced Labor in Soviet Russia—D. J. Dallin and B. I. Nicolaevsky, Yale University Press, 1947—the testimony of Prof. Ernst Tallgren, himself a former prisoner in the early forties, emphasizes that the bulk of labor prisoners in the Russian Communist concentration system consists of political offenders and of these "the most numerous * * * are Ukrainian farmers" as well as "those condemned for their religious beliefs, particularly Catholics and members of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church."

In the thirties, as well as in the forties, in occupied western Ukraine, the sturdy Ukrainian peasantry fought the collectivization program not only for economic reasons but also the political one of centralized Moscow control for colonial exploitation and abetted Russification. Countless were deported to the slave labor camps, which doubtlessly contributed, in a comparison of the 1926 and 1939 official census figures for Ukraine, to a decrease of 16.8 percent of Ukrainians in their native country.

For the record, at this point, I should like to submit an article on I Was In Siberia written by the author of the book One of the 15,000,000, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1952.

Mr. Nicholas Prychodko, who now resides in Canada, gives a pertinent and vivid account of his experiences in this general period of mass deportations to the slave labor camps.

Others who have recently furnished striking evidence from their personal experiences include, to mention only a few, John H. Noble, William E. R. Piddington, numerous released German prisoners, Dr. Joseph Scholmer, Maria Varkony, Dr. Fedor Varkony, and Japanese and other former prisoners heard by the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices.

To a question posed on the basis of his slave labor experiences in Vorkuta, "What nationality were the prisoners at Vorkuta?" Mr. Noble answered, "Most of them were Soviets, but not Russians. Most of them, I'd say, were Ukrainians." Vorkuta has been a tremendous center in the Russian slave labor camp chain, and Mr. Noble in his writings clearly stresses this significant compositional fact which accounted for the serious strikes there; but the Reader's Digest recently saw fit to delete references to Ukrainians in one of these articles.

Concerning Vorkuta, Mr. William E. R. Piddington, a British subject, relates his experiences of as late as 1953–54, after Stalin's death, and shows the activities of the Ukrainian majority led by members of the UPA, the Ukrainian underground, in his work titled "Russian Frenzy"—London, 1955.

Interrogating released German prisoners, the U. S. News & World Report asked, "Where have you been working?", to which they answered, "Many of us have been working on the Volga-Don Canal during the last few years. It has been built by 60,000 slave workers of all nationalities. The largest groups were Ukrainians and Georgians." (October 30, 1953.)

Interviews with hundreds of these released prisoners have been conducted by a leading Ukrainian organization in Western Europe and disclose the Ukrainian percentage in the camps covered to range at about 60 percent.

The testimony of Dr. Joseph Scholmer as presented in his classic work, Vorkuta, is perhaps unsurpassed for methodical observation and accuracy. His description of the first mass strike ever staged in the Soviet Union is conclusive in many ways, and certainly in regard to the establishment of the general facts advanced here. He witnessed them being organized by Ukrainian and Lithuanian resistance groups and himself participated in them. The impact of Dr. Scholmer's authoritative disclosures, with relevant passages from his work, on the unrealistic thinking of many Russian experts in the West is cogently shown in this brief memorandum submitted to me by a member of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, which is the foreign representation of the Ukrainian underground.

Among other things, it bears on Mr. George Sokolsky's comments on the apparent silent boycott against the work in the American market. I request that it be included as part of my statement.

For the period of the supposedly reasonable collective leadership, the testimonies of Maria Varkony and Dr. Fedor Varkony, former Hungarian prisoners in the Russian slave-labor camps, should cause us to pause and carefully analyze the deceptive propaganda maneuvers being staged by Moscow.

Maria Varkony, who spent 10 years in the camps, relates how the Tayshet-Lena railroad in Siberia has been built on the bones of slave women laborers, many of them perishing in the bitter climate. As she describes it, "The majority of the women were unable to fulfill the work norm (in heavy construction) and, therefore, received penalty rations consisting of 1 pound of bread. Many women died of exhaustion."

In the testimony of Dr. Varkony, recently broadcast to the Soviet Union, one finds mass murder under Khrushchev's collective leadership, staged in June 1954 in the Kingir camps of Karaganda. In the strike held at this camp, over 500 Ukrainian women were crushed to death by Russian Communist tanks of the T–34 make. The details of this glaring act of genocide, committed in a forced-labor camp under the present oligarchical dictatorship, I wish to insert here as part of my testimony.

The evidence assembled by the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices from released Japanese and German prisoners substantiates further the Ukrainian composition and leadership in the Russian Communist slave labor camps.

In a report on The Strike Mechanism In Soviet Concentration Camps the writer devotes a section to the patriotic Ukrainian partisans and states:

"In several places, these partisans were among the chief strike organizers. At Norilsk and Taichet, for example, it was they who prepared and led the action." (Monthly Information Bulletin 4, August-November 1955, pp. 19–27.)

In a succeeding article on The 96-Day Strike In the Norilsk Camps, it is observed that "As in most of the other political camps around there, the largest national group was the Ukrainians." (Monthly Information Bulletin 4, August-November 1955, pp. 28–35.)

Another instructive report on Modifications of the Regime in the Tayshet Camps from the Spring of 1953 to November 1954 strikes upon a very important note when in respect to Ukrainian leadership, it states: "Their example of boldness and self-respect—and even more important, that they could

get away with it—stirred the Camp 13 prisoners deeply." (Monthly Information Bulletin 5, December 1955, pp. 23–27.)

The psychological and spiritual effect of such leadership in the ghastly circumstances of a typical forced labor camp cannot be too strongly emphasized. Similar leadership on our part, pointing to the complete abolition of such forced labor, likewise cannot be taken lightly. Because of their solid contribution to the general picture of forced labor in Ukraine and of Ukrainians, I ask for the full incorporation of these three reports in this hearing.

This general analysis of Russian Communist forced labor in Ukraine and of Ukrainians establishes the following points of conclusion:

1. That for political offenses the largest single national group in the forced labor camps is the Ukrainians, who with courage, fearlessness and the cooperation of other non-Russian patriots have formed a leadership in these camps as part of the greater struggle for human dignity and national self-determination and independence.

2. That the opposition to the colonial and imperialist regime of Moscow is not, as some mistakenly think, latent or potential but, instead, very much active; and the great unrest, strikes, and resistance in the forced labor camps, to which large and heavy economic projects are assigned, constituted a major contributing factor to the party's change in maneuvers at the recent 20th Congress.

3. That if our many resolutions and official statements on liberation of the captive nations, national self-determination, freedom with justice, and close international collaboration are to mean anything, we should speedily pass this measure on abolishing forced labor which in the Soviet Union is inextricably bound up with Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism, political tyranny, and genocide.

4. That with all the wealth of evidence and data at our disposal we should entertain no fear of any participation of Moscow in the International Labor Organization and with greater activity and cooperation with other free nations exercise our leadership in the formulation of an international convention which will conduce to the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes.

5. That by even taking this step we shall, notably in these days of clever Moscow tactics, be creating a great pressure of freedom aimed at the oligarchical dictatorship and great hope and comfort to the millions rotting away in the forced labor camps of the Soviet Union and for whom the amnesty ukase of September 17, 1955, has no application.

To permit relatively minor considerations to obstruct such necessary participation and leadership by us in the ILO can only cause one to wonder about our keen awareness of the struggle in which we are engaged. We have a moral responsibility toward those in captivity as well as to ourselves in freedom and its preservation. This responsibility is more than ever before emphasized by the fact that we stand today in the direct path of the Russian Communist ambition for world domination.

As one of our Department of State officials, Mr. Francis B. Stevens, has been quoted to say, "The imperialistic urges of the Tsars—urges which were translated into efforts to penetrate the Near East, the Far East, and Eastern Europe—did not die with the Tsars. The history of the past 20 years is replete with examples of the anxiety of the Soviet leaders to give expression to this historic imperialism." (Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1953.)

The strikes and rebellions by the unassisted captives of this Russian totalitarian drive are, whether we are aware of it or not, an integral part of our struggle for freedom. The excellent editorial in the New York Times this past Monday on Murder in Tiflis, which parallels in part my own analysis submitted earlier this month to the House Un-American Activities Committee, asks, "And why should not Georgians rebel? Why should Georgia—or the Ukraine, or Armenia, or Poland, or any of the captive sovietized areas—be denied free self-determination in an era when Moscow hypocritically preaches freedom to what remains of the colonial world?"

I therefore request that this fitting editorial be appended to my testimony because similar and definitely related quetsions may be pointedly raised in the International Labor Organization by our delegates, seeking freedom of labor for our indisputable allies in the colonial empire of Moscow.

Consumer Credit: The Thirty-Six Billion Dollar Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Arthur O. Dietz, president, CIT Financial Corp.:

CONSUMER CREDIT: THE THIRTY-SIX BILLION DOLLAR QUESTION

(Address by Arthur O. Dietz, president, CIT Financial Corp., before the Commonwealth Club of California, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco, April 6, 1956)

Gentlemen, I feel especially honored to be the guest of the Commonwealth Club today and to visit, once again, one of my favorite cities. Your organization enjoys an outstanding reputation throughout the country and your membership is a most distinguished one. You were very kind to invite me here.

My topic, which refers to consumer credit as a $36 billion question facing our Nation today, is one that requires an answer—or a series of answers. People are asking, is consumer credit sound? Is there too much of it? What will its future be?

I come before you as a businessman who is going to talk about his business. To a certain extent I am at a disadvantage, just as many other businessmen would be. The case of the automobile industry will explain my point. Today it is hardly possible to pick up a newspaper without reading some criticism of the way the auto industry is conducted—yet I remind you that in the past 10 years this same industry has been responsible for the greatest peacetime industrial feat of all time.

The auto industry—our No. 1 industrial force—led this Nation out of the wartime economy which prevailed from 1940 to 1945 and did it with such tremendous energy and skill that we completely avoided the postwar depression everyone feared. It has produced 64 million cars and trucks in a decade, making possible the suburbanization wave that has revolutionized our way of life. It has poured at least $10 billion into our economy for new plants and better machinery and equipment. It has fooled all the Gloomy Gusses who from year to year have predicted that a Detroit-born depression was just around the corner.

Or take television. No matter where you go you read or hear criticism of television programing. Yet in 10 years this industry has been responsible for a second revolution. It has placed this remarkable instrument for entertainment and education in practically every American home. It offers us more cost-free amusement and excitement in a month than we could have enjoyed in a lifetime in an earlier day. Last year, for example, Mary Martin played Peter Pan to 125 million viewers, surpassing as a great dramatic and communications achievement all previous theatrical, motion picture, and even written presentations of this immortal story. Only a few weeks ago, more than 50 million people saw Shakespeare's Richard III on a Sunday afternoon—more people than had seen this play previously in the thousands of times it has been performed in the last three and a half centuries.

MASS CREDIT ESSENTIAL

It is the same with my business—installment credit. Now I am willing—in fact I am here—to debate the views of those who have misgivings about our affairs. But I would like to get in on the record, at the outset, that the American economy as we know it today would never have come into being if mass financing—time buying—did not exist.

A short time ago, the New York Times published a story by its Moscow correspondent on the new Russian effort to overcome the western nations on the economic, rather than the military, front. Here is an excerpt from that story: "It is not unlikely that the Soviet diagnosis of the world capitalist economy is now based on the premise that a major depression is about to break out again in the United States and spread throughout the free world. Soviet writers are emphasizing that such a depression did not occur last year only because of the great growth of consumer credit in the United States, a factor they believe has just about exhausted its force."

I suspect it may not be too long before the Russians announce they also invented installment credit.

Actually, there is no consumer credit in Russia. They have a long record of failure to meet the material needs of their people and create a standard of living for the ordinary citizen that would be regarded as adequate over here. If the worker, the producer, is not given a fair opportunity to share in the fruits of production—and to aspire to an ever-larger and more-satisfying portion of life's good things—a dynamic, self-feeding economy cannot exist. Human ingenuity and industry, particularly in this country, have demonstrated that it is possible to provide almost the entire population with more attractive and more comfortable homes; access to the most exciting entertainment events by way of television and radio; finer, safer motorcars, and household appliances that have eliminated most of the drudgery and much of the waste and inconvenience of housework. Produce these we can; but it is consumer credit, and only consumer credit, that makes them available to the average American and his family.

A few weeks ago a very significant cartoon appeared on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal. The cartoon showed a man and his wife living in squalor, sitting on furniture made of orange crates, wearing patched clothes, and with an antique radio as their only visible luxury. In the caption they were pompously explaining to visitors that they always pay cash for everything they buy.

An exaggerated cartoon very often spotlights the truth. This particular cartoon, published by the Nation's most influential business newspaper, demonstrates—in a more effective way than anything I can say—that installment credit has won general recognition as a mainspring of our consumer economy.

The importance of consumer credit was recognized also in President Eisenhower's re-

cent economic message to Congress. As you know, he said the development of consumer installment credit has been highly beneficial to the Nation's economy, and he recommended that a study be made of this form of credit, with consideration given to the possibility of legislation to authorize Federal controls on a standby basis over its terms.

It is in this atmosphere that I come to speak to you today. There is now general agreement—from such varied authorities as the economists of the Soviet Union, the Wall Street Journal, and the President of the United States—that consumer installment credit, for better or worse, is an essential element in the American economic system. In less than two generations it has become widely used in the marketing of durable goods of all kinds. The amount of consumer debt outstanding at the end of 1955 was $36,225,000,000, after a climb of more than $6 billion in the previous 12 months.

Approximately $5.5 billion of that $36 billion represents charge accounts and service loans. This is not really consumer term debt at all but simply a billing convenience. It represents the bills we all regularly pay each month to stores, to the doctor, dentist, utilities, and so forth. Another $2.8 billion are single payment loans which banks make to business people and investors and which, in my opinion, have few characteristics of consumer credit. The remaining $28 billion, properly called installment credit, is divided among automobiles, $14.3 billion; other durables, $6.4 billion; repair and modernization loans, $1.6 billion; and personal loans, $5.5 billion.

AUTOMOBILE TERMS

As we look at the recent record it must be pointed out that, in the past 2 years, there has been a significant liberalization of terms in the most important sector of installment financing—automobile credit. During the 12 months between June 1954 and June 1955, banks and finance companies began accepting downpayments on new cars of as low as 25 percent (with some lower) and maturities running to 36 months. Previously, standard downpayments were 33⅓ percent and normal maximum maturities were 30 months.

I do not condone loose terms nor to try to tell you that they are nothing to be concerned about. By any tested standards we have known in the past, 25 percent down and 36 months to pay are pretty liberal terms. A few years ago we would have thought them very loose indeed.

However, I am not particularly alarmed by what happened last year. In the first place, the situation has stabilized. There has been no further drift toward longer maturities and lower downpayments for at least 6 months. Maybe there's been a little stiffening—just a little. The industry has proved it can check itself when it wants to and there is nothing to indicate that any further liberalization is in prospect.

You see, as in almost every other phase of our American business system, checks and balances—inbuilt stabilizers—exist. The pocketbook nerve is the best disciplinarian there is. If credit is granted on terms that are too loose, losses begin to increase in frequency. When any sensible businessman finds he is running into losses because of some practice or policy for which he is responsible, he does not hesitate very long—he mends his ways just as fast as he can. Year after year I have seen that whenever someone gets too close to the fire of loose terms, he soon is singed and draws back. That is what protects our economy, the great mass of consumers, and the consumer credit industry itself from serious losses—that and the good judgment of the consumer himself.

Nevertheless, as I have already reminded you, in good times and bad there have always been those who viewed the people's credit with misgivings. Leading bankers and industrialists deplored it in the twenties. Roger Babson wrote of the "Folly of Installment Buying" in the 1930's and he was not alone in his views.

However, up to the present, these warnings have never been right. The bankers of the Twenties who prophesied that we in the finance business would eventually go broke because, in a depression, our customers would not pay their debts, were proved 100 percent wrong by the events of 1929–35. The 1937 forecasts of Mr. Babson have never materialized to the effect that:

"If courage did not fail me, I should show that the instalment industry may lead to America's downfall. The desire for ease, which the instalment industry is stimulating, is increasing in the cities and lowering the birth rates. The curse of instalment buying will be eliminated only as the desires of the people are controlled and directed along sane lines."

GROUNDLESS FEARS

As I prepared these remarks, I had before me a collection of stories from leading American business publications. My file goes back only to the early months of 1953 but in the past 3 years there have appeared hundreds of stories in the vein "The business boom is dangerously inflated by credit buying of wage earners who live from one payday to the next." Yet the facts are that the debts of 1953, which were of such concern then, have all been paid—and none of the difficulties which were feared have come to pass. Instead, these same 1953–54 obligations have been met with a delinquency and loss record that is the best on record.

Those who have these grave concerns about instalment debt never emphasize today's experience, and they concede the excellence of the record in the past. Instead, the practice is to cite some suppositious danger in the future—something that might happen—but never has. Their criticisms clearly reflect mistrust of the individual consumer's right to decide simple personal questions for himself. There have always been those who cannot trust the ordinary fellow. In the 18th and 19th centuries, for example, there were the intellectual or economic aristocrats who were sure average men could not be trusted with the right to select their own rulers.

Today the anxiety of this type of individual is now focused on economic issues and particularly on questions of consumption, because consumption is calling the turn in our economy. The critic assumes that he or someone like him knows better than the consumer how much of the consumer's income should be spent for one commodity or service (including credit) as against another, and what is really best for Mr. and Mrs. John Jones.

It would be patronizing and downright undemocratic for anyone to express this attitude openly, so it is usually rationalized in terms of the economic health of the Nation, or the future of automobile or other durable goods sales, or the level of consumer debt.

The historic prejudices against going into debt for personal purchases were widely held when I went into the finance business in 1916. I know, because I shared them. These prejudices were hamstringing the young automobile industry, for automobiles were costly and only the wealthy could buy them for cash.

But as cars improved mechanically, more and more Americans realized their potential for pleasure and profit and wanted to own them. The pressure for credit arrangements began to grow, starting here on the west coast where the motoring season was longer. The problem of paying the manufacturer before delivery and tying up large amounts of cash for long periods was an insurmountable one for most dealers. The banks were unwilling to carry this load. Into this vacuum moved the first sales finance companies. They set up and handled the credit mechanism so obviously needed to help this new industry grow.

In 1919, my first assignment from our founder, the late Henry Ittleson, was to call on manufacturers and dealers and try to interest them in our financing service. Most of the manufacturers I met were polite but unenthusiastic about the suggestion of selling cars on time. Some were even outraged. I recall vividly one president who told me indignantly that his company would stop making cars before he would sell on the installment plan. The company, incidentally, is still in business selling cars under his name and it has been selling most of its cars on time for more than 25 years.

It didn't take long for the manufacturers and dealers to realize that to achieve mass production and mass consumption, a third mechanism—mass financing—would be necessary. By 1923, installment financing had gained a firm foothold in the automobile field. Two years later, the number or installment sales of automobiles exceeded the number of cash sales for the first time.

During the next few years the motor industry pioneered in this new concept of mass financing. Millions of American consumers tried, for the first time, the idea of buying out of current income. Meanwhile, the manufacturers of other durable goods—refrigerators, radios, washing machines, and so forth—observed the success of the automobile industry and they, in turn, sought the help of finance companies.

But the critics were hardly convinced. They warned that while installment credit might get by in prosperous times, it would meet disaster in event of a business downturn. Let's examine that record.

The record shows that after the crash of 1929, the portfolios of installment credit companies proved to be sounder than any other type of investments except United States Government obligations. Three of the principal sales finance companies, including C. I. T., ended the year 1929 with retail automobile outstandings aggregating $941 million. In the eventual liquidation of this paper, losses were loss than $6 million—or less than two-thirds of 1 percent.

THE DEPRESSION RECORD

At December 31, 1929, these same receivables had an average maturity of 6½ months. They were more than 90 percent liquidated by the end of 1930. This answers the argument that installment credit causes people to pay in bad times for the "dead horses" they purchased when times were good. At the end of 1930, when all the pre-1930 obligations had been liquidated, the Great Depression was scarcely beginning. Actually, 1930, was not a bad year for business and none of the debt which originated in 1929 spilled over into 1932 or 1933 to deepen the depression. Any installment credit which comes into being after the start of a recession or depression is not deflationary. Instead this actually primes the pump for recovery because it is a net addition to purchasing power at a time when such additions are desperately needed. The FHA program, for example, was an installment credit device started in the depth of the depression to provide new customers for the construction industry.

During all those years, while the arguments flew back and forth, the consumer was quietly chalking up an excellent record of honesty, integrity, and commonsense. We have learned, as have all financing institutions, that the American consumer is the best credit manager in the world. He has proved this time and time again—not only during the depression of the Thirties but under every other conceivable economic condition. Consumer credit has provided—year after year, through good times and

bad—an essential prop to the Nation's economy. So much for the history of consumer credit. How do we stand today?

The present concern over today's debt boils down to this: In 1955, installment credit outstanding increased $5.4 billion, from $22.5 billion to $27.9 billion—a rise of 24 percent. This increase reflects, primarily, credit extended for the great increase in automobile sales. It represents the aggregate decision of millions of consumers to spend on automobile purchases 6.3 percent of their year's income after taxes, instead of 4.7 percent as in 1954. This increase in consumption did not have an inflationary result, for every economic indicator has held steady. But it did help in making 1955 the most prosperous year in our history. Incidentally, last year an average of less than one in a hundred of our automobile financing customers was delinquent 30 days or more and, as always, our total losses were well below 1 percent.

WHOSE DEBT?

Some persons fear this rate of increase in consumer debt may be dangerous. They want to take steps to prevent such irregular growth of installment credit, possibly by the use of direct controls. Since this credit is the servant of the average wage or salary earner, it is also a charge against the same group of people. And when anyone attempts to determine whether there is too much indebtedness today, he should first consider who owes the money.

According to a study by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, published by the Federal Reserve Board for 1955, consumer debt is centered in the middle-income group earning from $3,000 to $7,500 a year. This income group, incidentally, has doubled in size since 1935 and now makes up more than one-half the total population. Specifically, the Michigan study shows that this debt is most heavily concentrated among younger families, who need and use installment credit to establish early a standard of living they can acquire in no other way. There are few signs of "whim buying" or "credit sprees" in the behavior of this group. For them, the use of credit is not a device for "keeping up with the Joneses" but is simply part of a life-cycle investment program; something they do to create a decent home and manner of living. They also are the group who are best able to carry it because of their incomes, their long-term prospects, and their valid expectations for the future. Within the middle-income group, incidentally, it is shown that 86 percent have either no debt at all or are making debt repayments that total less than 20 percent of their incomes.

Moreover, for these people, installment buying is a method of building personal capital. Of the 53 million passenger cars owned by United States consumers at the end of 1955, an estimated 40 million worth conservatively $40 billion were owned free and clear of debt. Some two-thirds of these cars were originally purchased on time but now are completely paid for. In 1955, about 10 million people made their final automobile payments and this year, an estimated 9,200,000 will do so. These people are the prospects for new cars this year and next and many of them will surely buy.

I hope you will agree with me that installment credit, as it is employed today, is serving a most essential social and economic purpose and that it represents obligations by people who intend to pay their debts and who have long since demonstrated their capacity to do so.

This leaves the final question: Is there too much of it?

Usually, the experts try to answer this question—either pro or con—by referring to certain ratios based on Federal Reserve estimates of the amount of credit outstanding. The points often made include:

1. That the ratio of outstanding consumer debt to disposable personal income is today 13 percent, compared with a range immediately before World War II—often called a "normal" period—of 9.8 to 10.6 percent.

2. That the ratio of installment debt to savings and to so-called "discretionary" income (the money left over after food, shelter, and clothing are provided in accordance with prewar standards) is significantly lower than it ever was prewar.

3. That any measure of the growth of new consumer debt to other economic indicators in the past year shows consumer obligations gaining at a rapid rate.

And so on. There are many of these conclusions, some of which seem to make the debt picture look very bright and some which on the surface appear rather disturbing.

In my opinion, none of these relationships is at all conclusive and no one can say with any certainty where the too high mark belongs. The chief reason is that all such ratios are based on prewar comparisons and it is absolutely unreasonable to compare today's use of consumer credit with that of any previous period—because several sweeping and fundamental changes have occurred.

There is the great revolution in income distribution. Over half our families now qualify as members of the middle-income group and have the means and the desire to employ installment credit, which we have already seen is peculiarly a middle-income tool.

THE BIG CHANGE

A second big change has been the new reliance which American family life places on durable goods. The family which in 1929 or 1935 was spending so much per week for the iceman, so much for public transportation and so much for the laundry, was paying for these services by the use of time payments—a bill every week or an outlay every day. But now the iceman has become a refrigerator, the bus or train a family car and the laundryman or washwoman a washing machine. As a result, the substitute expenditures for preserving food, keeping clean or getting to work, by way of monthly payments, became installment credit and are duly reported by the Federal Reserve Board. Many a family spends a smaller share of its income on these necessities of life today, in a mechanized household, than it did when human effort and a daily cash outlay were involved. But the change does inflate today's installment credit totals, in comparison with the past.

A final social change is in the community attitude toward the use of installment credit. Today time buying is widely accepted and no longer bears any stigma whatever—as compared with past periods when there was considerable social or moral disapproval.

To summarize, this is the case for consumer credit:

It made possible the great mass-production automobile and appliance industries, is responsible for millions of jobs and has brought enormous material blessings to the American public.

In the great depression, it made a splendid record for soundness, did not measurably contribute to the decline in consumer purchases and established the American time buyer as the best of credit managers. In the post-World War II period, it has served the growing middle-income-class well by making possible much of the increase in their living standards; it has made a tremendous contribution as we shifted most successfully from a war footing to the world's most productive and prosperous peacetime economy.

Delinquency rates and losses by financing agencies and consumers have remained remarkably—and normally—low.

Durable articles bought on installment credit swell the current statistics on the use of credit, as has the modern social preference for buying valuable durables out of income instead of using one's savings.

It is in this atmosphere of social change and universal recognition of the important place of consumer installment credit in our economy that the Federal Reserve Board, at the request of President Eisenhower, will undertake a full-scale study of the subject. I feel sure the study has already begun as an intensification of the long and continuing investigation of this form of credit which has engaged the Board's staff for years.

FULL-SCALE STUDY

I believe much that is good will come from this study. Our industry is not perfect and the employment of personal credit undoubtedly remains imperfectly meshed into the economy, as is normal in a free and dynamic society. We need better statistics and better reporting and I hope we will get them. We need to know a great deal more about the consumer and what makes him tick as he and his wife make decisions as to the allocations of the past, present, and future incomes. Surely, everyone will agree that we need to know all we can about the consumer because he is the only reliance for keeping our plants and markets humming during the next decade when our economy achieves the goal, which it undoubtedly will, of producing $500 billion worth of goods and services annually, 25 percent more than we now have.

The true function of installment credit is made crystal clear by comparing its place in the economies of the United States and England today. With limited natural resources and insufficient productivity, England is a nation that must produce and export all it can to survive.

England today is stringently limiting the use of installment credit, for this is a very effective way to knock Englishmen out of the market for cars and household appliances, thus conserving steel, gasoline, power, and other vital commodities that are either needed for export or must be imported. If you must force your people to consume less, must deliberately depress their living standards, then, indeed, you should do what the British have been forced to do.

However, with our own unlimited natural resources and productive capacity, the last thing anyone in his right mind wants is to reduce the number of car buyers, household appliance buyers, and so on over here.

The United States economy needs more domestic customers and more domestic consumption, not less. The obvious solution is to let the powerful stimulant of installment credit function freely to increase our living standards, our material satisfactions, and our levels of employment and prosperity.

A KEYNOTE

In closing, I want to read this very recent declaration by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board:

"Time was when a man who financed luxury expenditures on credit was considered stupid and unreliable; but now one who refuses to capitalize on his potential and confines himself to financial actuality is the unusual case.

"The typical instalment borrower today is not an improvident man with small income. He is chiefly an urban or suburban dweller, is generally above 25 years of age, is married and has children to support, has an average income of about $5,000, and often has sizable financial assets.

"He has committed himself to a regimen of small monthly payments for the purpose of acquiring an equity. To him these payments are essentially savings. And when you stop to think about it, what more sensible use of savings is there than their purposeful application to an improved standard of living for the saver himself and his

family? This is an investment in life itself."

That is the clear answer to the $36 billion question. Consumer credit today is part of the very fabric of our national life. It is the tool we have forged in this favored land to build and equip our homes, to enable us to live in comfort, cleanliness, ease, and safety beyond the dreams of the aristocracies of past generations. It brings us entertainment, transportation, and self-expression which have given the experience of living several new dimensions.

Consumer credit has grown with our growing population. It has risen with our standard of living. It has prospered as our Nation has prospered. It has made our economy a truly democratic one.

We who are entrusted with the administration of this splendid and vital tool have a deep obligation to all our fellow Americans. It is unthinkable that consumer credit shall not continue to grow in usefulness, guided by those principles of fairness, competitive enterprise and vigorous initiative which are and must ever continue to be the mainsprings of the American business system.

Address by Gen. Earle E. Partridge on Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in a very fine address delivered by Gen. Earle E. Partridge, commander in chief, Continental Air Defense Command, on Armed Forces Day, May 17. General Partridge was speaking before the Press and Union League Club in San Francisco, and calls our attention to some of the threatening advances the Soviets have made in offensive airpower.

The headquarters of the Continental Air Defense Command is located in Colorado Springs. General Partridge has a very important assignment, which is to defend the United States against air attack. I am sure that those of you who have visited this headquarters have been very much impressed, as I was, with the importance of this installation.

Whenever General Partridge speaks his remarks are given great weight, as he speaks with knowledge and authority of our air problems. I am happy that I can include in my remarks this challenging address, as follows:

Gentlemen, I am especially happy to be in San Francisco today to assist in marketing the passage of another Armed Forces Day.

Armed Forces Day, 1956, falls in a period of particular significance insofar as our international relations are concerned. This significance is highlighted by the events which took place recently in England. Two Soviet Union emissaries arrived in England last month aboard one of the world's most modern jet transports. They brought smiles, but they also brought ominous words about hydrogen bombs and ballistic missiles.

I am sure that you will agree with me that in an international situation in which the conduct of one of the world's great nations is in the hands of this type of leadership, anything might happen. I am sure you will agree also that on Armed Forces Day, 1956, we find our country exposed to the threat of direct Soviet attack.

Today, I should like to explain the nature of the threat which this country faces, describe the Continental Air Defense Command which has been established to meet the possibility of hostile air attack, give you some indication of the philosophy under which we operate the Continental Air Defense Command, and finally, leave with you a general impression of the magnitude of the effort which the country is going to have to exert in the years to come not only in support of the Continental Air Defense Command itself, but also in support of the Armed Forces of the Nation.

Let us turn directly to the threat of hostile air attack against this Nation. In this country, since World War II, we have repeatedly made the mistake of underestimating the technical and operational capabilities of the Soviets. When they started to copy our B–29 aircraft and produce a long-range air army, we said that their industry was incapable of the task and that they would have difficulty in the fields of training and operations. We were wrong. The Soviets produced a very large strategic air force equipped with B–29's and they still have hundreds of these aircraft in their inventory.

In 1949 the Soviets exploded their first atomic device, some 1 to 3 years earlier than forecast by our experts.

In 1954 and 1955, the Soviets showed us the early models of a high quality, high speed, long-range jet and turbo-jet bomber force. They now have hundreds of these modern aircraft in their operational units. This accomplishment also came as a shock to our technical experts and recent indications demonstrate that the Soviets are in fact producing heavy bombers faster than we are in this country.

Lastly, the Soviets have produced thermonuclear devices employing very advanced scientific principles, and, here again, they confounded our forecasters.

We might as well face it. The Soviets have a long-range strategic air arm comprised in part of aircraft as good as ours and undoubtedly equipped with mass destruction weapons. The Soviets could, if they wished, launch a devastating attack against this country at any time of their choosing.

Thus, we find that we in the United States now face a situation which has never seriously concerned us before. Never before in our history have we been directly exposed to the threat of a catastrophic attack.

The seriousness of this situation lends tremendous emphasis to the importance of the command of which I happen to be the commander in chief. This is the Continental Air Defense Command, an organization composed of Army, Navy, and Air Force units. It is a joint command with Headquarters in Colorado Springs and elements spread over practically the entire United States and in the adjacent waters.

The mission of the Continental Air Defense Command is very simply stated in a 7 word sentence: Defend the United States against air attack.

In carrying out this mission, we really have 4 basic actions to carry on. We must find out who is flying in the airspace over and around our country; we must identify these aircraft; or third, if we are unable to identify them, we must go up to intercept them with fighter airplanes. If we should chance to discover a hostile intruder in the airspace which we are supposed to control, it then becomes our function to proceed to the destruction phase of our activities. So basically the work which Continental Air Defense Command carries out using Army, Navy, and Air Force elements is the fourfold job of detection identification, interception, and destruction.

For detection purposes, the Continental Air Defense Command relies primarily on radar. Some of this is land based as, for example, the station on the top of Mount Tamalpais at the north end of the Golden Gate Bridge. Some of the radar is water based—we have Navy radar picket ships operating off both our coasts—and some of our radar is airborne. At McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif., and at Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod in Massachusetts we have squadrons of Lockheed Constellation aircraft equipped with radar and the necessary control and communications equipment so that these aircraft can carry out in the air the same functions of detection and control that land-based and sea-based radar stations perform.

Our radar net extends over a very large portion of the United States and into the southern part of Canada. The coverage is being extended by installation of more units and by technical advances in the equipment itself. At the present time our low altitude coverage is not as good as we would like to see it and for that reason we are retaining within the system on an operational basis a good portion of the Ground Observer Corps and its complex of 73 filter centers.

Once we have detected aircraft flying over the country, it is necessary to identify them in one way or another. To carry out this function we rely primarily on the Air Defense Identification Zones and the assistance of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. When you stop to think that there are over 30,000 flights of aircraft in the United States daily and several hundred additional aircraft coming in from overseas terminals, you must realize that regardless of the amount of radar we might have, we would have difficulty in keeping track of each individual flight. However, with the assistance of the Air Defense Identification Zones and the CAA, we are able to reduce the number of unknown tracks appearing in the system to a small figure and this number is still further reduced by the use of interceptor aircraft which are dispatched to take a look at any aircraft which may be unidentified or wandering off its proper path. The interception exercise is the third function which we carry out, and I might say that we do this on a 24-hour-a-day, and 365-days-of-the-year basis. For this purpose, we have armed fighters on alert throughout the country prepared to be dispatched for intercept purposes on a few minutes' notice.

In the event that we should find in our system an aircraft which is acting in a hostile manner, we then must proceed to bring to bear upon it the weapons provided the Continental Air Defense Command for destruction purposes. These range from antiaircraft guns of World War II vintage to more modern guns of postwar manufacture, the NIKE missiles which you may have seen on their stations here in the San Francisco area, and a large number of Air Force fighters. Naturally, there is a good deal of glamor connected with the operation of the guided missiles and fighters, but I should like to point out to you that the entire establishment for detection, identification, interception, and destruction operates as an entity, a single integrated system. The portion which is on the ground or which provides the radar coverage and the machinery for controlling the fighters is generally referred to as the ground environment. It is a nationwide hookup, extensive and complicated.

At the present time we are operating what is known as a manual control system. In other words, men sit at radar scopes about 15 inches in diameter, they observe the blips,

they make use of china marking pencils, scales, and good judgment, plus wire and radio communications to direct the fighters so it is possible for them to make an intercept on any unknown track. This system is cumbersome, requires too much in judgment and mental capacity of the people who operate it, and is in the final analysis completely dependent on the employment of voice radio.

I assume that many of you here have flown the airways in recent years and have observed the tremendous congestion which exists on practically any radio channel to which you might listen. The same is true in the air-defense system and we must go to an automatic data transmission arrangement by which ground controllers can give specific and detailed instructions to the pilots in the air without the possibility of interference.

Such a system is being constructed and when installed it will increase the capacity of our air defense system manyfold. You perhaps have seen references in the press to the semiautomatic ground environment system generally referred to as SAGE. The first installations of this type are now being put in on the east coast of the United States and I will not take time to describe them to you except to say that the heart of the system is a hugh electronic computer which has electronic memory and by means of which all the information pertaining to the air defense problem can be used. Information is put into the electronic computer both by automatic data transmission and by manual means. The information is retained and can be called up selectively or as a whole for review and employment by the fighter director.

Naturally, whether we have a manual system or the semiautomatic ground environment system, there is an extremely expensive communications system tying the entire Continental Air Defense Command together.

The system for Continental Air Defense was originally set up to counteract the TU-4 or B-29-type bomber being built in postwar years by the Soviet Union. The system is now being improved to take care of the high speed, high altitude jet and turboprop bombers, and eventually we must be prepared to cope with the intercontinental ballistic missile.

So far as the philosophy of air defense is concerned, we in the Continental Air Defense Command are convinced that the best defense the country can possibly have is a good offense. We believe implicitly in the requirement for a strong strategic air arm, and one of our principal missions in air defense is to provide for the protection of that air arm.

We are not, however, dedicated to the school which believes that we should have a long-range striking arm solely and that we should devote no resources to air defense. The mere existence of an air defense system in this country forces the enemy to adopt many measures which he would otherwise be able to avoid. As examples, if he knows that we have fighters, he must burden his attacking aircraft with defensive guns; if he knows that we are prepared to operate effectively against him in good weather, he must adopt the expedient of making his attack at night or in bad weather thus accepting severe penalties from navigational and bombing standpoints. Even more important, in order to get just a few of his bombers to their targets, the existence of an Air Defense Command forces him to employ large striking forces which may have the capability of saturating our defenses.

But most of all, we want to have an air defense which will deter the enemy from deciding to initiate an air attack. This is the real objective of the present Continental Air Defense Command system.

Before leaving the subject of the philosophy of operation of the continental air defense system, let me say that we believe it mandatory for the security of the Nation that we have a strong air defense system which is constantly on the alert and constantly being exercised so that if the enemy does decide to strike us, we will exact a heavy toll from his striking force. One of the major returns which we get from the air defense system is early warning of any approaching hostile force. It is imperative that we have this type of warning not only to alert the air defenses and to warn the population of the country, but even more important, to provide time so that the Strategic Air Command may be dispatched for retaliatory strikes.

The system which I have described to you in very broad terms is immensely complicated and geographically widespread. The time has long since passed when we could consider that our continental air defenses extended only to our borders and to the adjacent waters. As you are well aware from recent press releases, a warning line is being built across the middle part of Canada and another across northern Canada and Alaska. Our system of providing early warning and control for the weapons involved is immensely more complicated than it was even a year ago and the amount of our national resources required to support the continental air defense system is rising sharply. I am convinced in my own mind that so long as the present international tensions continue, the expenditures not only for air defense but for the Nation's military services as a whole will continue to rise. I am equally convinced that regardless of the amount which the Nation is required to spend on national security, the cost is minute when compared to the damage which we might suffer if a successful hostile air attack involving atomic and thermonuclear weapons were made on this country.

Thank you.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and sudden death of our dear colleague, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, came as a great shock to me. I had come to know him well through serving with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I shall miss him very much and am saddened by his death.

BILL GRANAHAN was conscientious, devoted to duty, and rendered outstanding service to his constituents and his State and Nation. He was a great American, a fine gentleman, and true friend. He was noted for his kindliness, his courtesy, and other splendid qualities which endeared him to all who knew him.

The people of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania have lost an able Legislator who labored diligently in their behalf. His loss will be keenly felt by Members of this House, for he had the respect and devotion of his colleagues.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his fine wife and the other members of his family.

Key to Progress—The Uncommon Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Key to Progress—The Uncommon Man," delivered by Crawford H. Greenewalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., before the 43d anniversary dinner of the Bureau of Advertising, American Newspaper Publishers Association, in New York City, on April 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEY TO PROGRESS—THE UNCOMMON MAN

(By Crawford H. Greenewalt)

In the world of wonders created on earth, there are few so remarkable as the modern phenomenon of speechmaking. I don't suppose there is a meal at which 10 or more people gather that is not blessed, or otherwise, by an address of some sort. In fact, one might say that the after-dinner speech has become one of the occupational hazards of modern times, and I leave it to you to decide whether the hazard is more severe for the speaker or for his audience.

The art of speechmaking is as yet untouched by technology or automation, and still remains in the do-it-yourself realm of man's affairs. This archaic situation may not last much longer for I am told that a group of scientists is busily engaged in teaching electronic computers the art of speech. That seems to me a most dubious objective. The flood of words to which the average citizen is subjected is already quite sufficiently torrential.

On the other hand, a talking electronic brain suggests interesting speculations. I can imagine, for example, Mr. Maier (Irwin Maier, dinner committee chairman) at some future date suggesting to his associates that they get the Du Pont "Univac" for their next banquet. He might, I suppose, point out that it had been given a brandnew set of transistors, had split the sides of those attending the Amalgamated Gimmick Manufacturer's convention, had clarified knotty points on the nature of the universe at the last American Physical Society meeting, and had provided thoughtful uplift at a recent Salvation Army banquet.

PERSONAL IDENTITY

Unfortunately for me, all of this is considerably in the future, and so I have had to nudge my own old and feeble mental transistors to put together a set of words that would be neither too long nor too inarticulate for this distinguished audience.

The guides to public speaking all seem to suggest that the subject be tailored to the audience, which means, I suppose, that I should deliver myself of some well-chosen remarks on the art of newspaper publishing. Frankly, this is something for which I have neither the capacity nor the courage. And so, pushing my circuitry back into its own domain, I thought I would try to give you some thoughts on the world of large industrial enterprise as viewed from the inside out—this simply to create a contrast, hopefully favorable, between the all too frequent gloomy glimpses that seem to be given from the outside in.

Any discussion of this sort requires perspective and, hence, some point of past reference. Since the only available time machine seems to have been preempted by Alley Oop, I thought I had better, and perhaps more appropriately, turn to the newspaper files. And for that exercise I selected the year 1902, which happens, not entirely by coincidence, to be the year in which I was born. I did find in my searches some fascinating trivia, such as a sale of gold-headed canes, a report on bargains in the mouth-organ industry, an ad for red flannel undershirts, an announcement of a starter set for home blacksmithing, and a note on the popularity of a new game called Ping-pong. I regret to report that there was no headline announcing the arrival of a young Greenewalt.

My principal finding and, in fact, the one I was looking for, was that names really meant news in 1902. Businesses were identified with their principal officers or proprietors; newspapers were the personal voices of their editors and publishers; a college was intimately associated with the name of its president—Dr. Eliot, of Harvard, for example, and Dr. Wilson, whom some of you may be old enough to remember, at Princeton before his sojourn with a somewhat larger institution. The great scientific and chemical developments of that day were recognized as the prodigies of individual inventors.

ANONYMITY OF THE GROUP

Standard Oil was John D. Rockefeller. The Morgan bank was J. P. Morgan. The Louisville Courier was Henry Watterson just as the New York World was Joseph Pulitzer. The largest newspaper chain of the day was William Randolph Hearst. The electric light was Thomas Edison; the telephone, Alexander Graham Bell; and the Ford car was Henry, Sr., himself.

Today, the emphasis has passed from these colorful, personable, and somewhat rugged individuals to the relatively quiet anonymity of the group. Standard Oil has become a large company managed by many people. The large newspaper now sees itself as an institution, no longer engaged in the rough-and-tumble of personal journalism. Universities have become large-scale purveyors of education. Developments in science are only rarely attributable to one person, and come into commercial being through the synthesis of a great number of individual contributions.

GROUP CARICATURE

What has been happening for the last 50 years has been a gradual replacement of the individual by the group. This is a natural, even an inevitable development as our economy and its component parts have grown in size and stature. Only what we now call small businesses can be encompassed and directed by a single mind. As our enterprises grow, delegation of authority becomes more and more essential to successful operation, with the result that there remain very few large-scale activities that can be clearly identified with a single individual.

In spite of all this, we seem to continue the practice of substituting for the individual a kind of stereotype in caricature associated with any given vocation. There is, for example, the absent-minded professor, with the implication that academic life attracts absent-minded people or causes people to become absent-minded. We have, if you will forgive me, the inebriated reporter, the libelous inference being that newspaper work holds a lure for alcoholics, or that there is something about newspaper work that drives men to drink. The long-haired musician or scientist, the bluff and hearty salesman are types that I am sure you will recognize.

The businessman, according to this dictionary of typical specimens, is materialistic, selfish, irritable with his employees, indifferent to his wife, contemptuous of the fine arts, and insatiable in his pursuit of money. To businessmen as individuals, this typecasting is, at worst, irritating and, at best, wryly amusing. But I am afraid, nevertheless, that it has made its mark and has created in the minds of the average person the myth that the public welfare is in some way in danger, that society needs protection from these businessmen in caricature.

FROM THE SAME MELTING POT

If I can insert here a personal note, I might record the fact that I started my career many years ago as a scientist—hence, at that time, was presumably long-haired, and doubly so since I was also an amateur musician. Imagine how disconcerting it was, some years after having made the transition from the laboratory to the business office, to find myself characterized by no less an agency than the Department of Justice as a "monopolist by marriage," and by the Daily Worker as a bloodless capitalist. Time, Inc., was kinder—calling me merely "graying, hawk-nosed," a term my children adopted with some glee.

The fact is, of course, that any generalization about the practitioners of business or of any other profession is utter nonsense. Business, as an institution, recruits its people from the same melting pot which supplies the human raw material for any other trade or vocation. You would be as hard pressed to find a typical businessman as you would a typical sportswriter, professor, or musician. Business, like all other professions, is made up of people with all kinds of backgrounds, all kinds of motivations, all kinds of habits of behavior.

Business, in short, does not attract a particular type, neither the morally weak, nor the wickedly inclined, nor the knights in shining armor. It is, on the other hand, comprised of perfectly normal, reasonable human beings, subject to whatever frailties and limitations characterize man on this earth. They represent a cross-section of society—the brilliant and the dull, the generous and grasping, the expansive and the petty, the good and the bad. Here are ordinary human beings grouped together in organizations designed to complement the weakness of one with the strength of the other, to temper the exuberance of the young with the maturity, and wisdom of the old. Whatever individual dispositions may be present, it is the average, the composite, that governs.

JUDGMENT IN BLACK AND WHITE

So, if we can concede that people in the main have decent and honorable instincts, I believe it must necessarily follow that those in the business world will average out at about the same moral level.

Business, unfortunately, is too often judged in black and white. Errors have been made by businessmen in the past and, in an imperfect world, will certainly continue to be made in the future. Such errors must, of course, be identified and corrected promptly. But emphasis on things which are wrong must not be allowed to obscure the things which are right. For it is an unassailable fact that economic progress of the most monumental kind has come about through the business process.

Much has been said in recent years of the "new type of businessmen," as if, by some process of sexless eugenics, the bull terriers and bloodhounds of the business past had been crossbred to produce a race of intelligent and kindly poodles. I have never been able to accept this concept. It seems to me that men will always reflect the society in which they live, will respond to its pressures, its ideals, and its customs. As society as a whole develops and grows both spiritually and materially, the individuals comprising it will, on the average, grow and develop with it. In business endeavor, there is an added pressure for conformity to the public interest, arising simply out of the numbers of people involved in any given management decision.

EMPHASIS ON CONTINUITY

The change over the years from the responsible individual to the responsible group has greatly increased emphasis on continuity of a given enterprise. Fifty years ago, a man was disposed to look upon his business as ending with his lifetime, and his policy decisions were, accordingly, geared to a relatively short span of years. Today, business enterprises have accumulated, so to speak, a life span of their own, starting in some cases in the remote past and going on into the unforeseeable future. Its managers have become torchbearers, accepting the responsibility passed on to them by their predecessors and aspiring to pass on a healthy and dynamic entity to their successors.

The Du Pont Co. is an outstanding example of the point I wish to make. We are an old enterprise, and have what I think is a proud record of fruitful contribution to the American scene over a period of more than 150 years. I can assure you that the traditions of the past, the ethics and high performance of the many men who have participated in our enterprise have become an almost palpable force in their influence on those of us who, for a brief span, have the responsibility for carrying the enterprise forward.

THE FORCE OF SOCIETY

It seems to me almost axiomatic that, over the long stretch of corporate life, no business can prosper unless it serves the public interest in all of its many facets. And, as a business develops and its policymaking decisions are delegated to an ever-increasing number of people, business conduct will in itself reflect the public interest as it may exist in a particular setting and at a particular time.

The question of the size of our business enterprises is frequently mentioned with concern. Of course, there is no doubt that the size of the industrial units essential to a strong economy has increased very substantially in the past 50 years and will increase even more substantially in the future. The reason for this growth is too well known and too well accepted to be open to debate. Business units, whether concerned with nylon or news, must be large enough to support the scale of activity to which they are dedicated, and that scale is never static, but increases continually with technological growth and improved living standards.

Modern society, leaning so heavily on technology, simply cannot exist without many large units. As our technological horizons broaden and increase in complexity, the demand will be for increasing rather than decreasing aggregations of talent, manpower, and resources.

MORE POTENT THAN LAW

I view this with satisfaction, not with alarm, for the pressures of society will inevitably produce their own controls and stabilizers. These pressures for the preservation of a particular moral code are great indeed, particularly in the area that has been called "obedience to the unenforceable"—the things we do, not because they are required, but because they are right. This strength is much more potent and compelling than the law. The law is essentially negative and prohibitive. Ethical principles are vibrantly and affirmatively alive. The segment of humanity concerned with business will be no less responsive to these pressures than any other group.

This averaging process can have its bad side, of course, as well as its good. If the organization of modern society can hold a scoundrel in check, we run the risk, at the same time, that it can stifle the creative individual by submerging him into the common denominator. Society, indeed, sometimes seems intent upon inclining us in that direction. We see the constellation rather

than the star; we applaud the ensemble rather than the brilliant soloist.

The trend can be seen, as I have indicated, in the inevitable and quite essential growth of our organizations. Science and production and administration have become necessarily dependent upon team effort. Our trade and labor unions almost by definition are dedicated to the sublimation of the individual to the general level. Our taxing methods have the present effect of leveling the rewards of individual performance and, for the future, the often frightening prospect of curbing the will toward individual accomplishment.

THE INDISPENSABLE MAN

Even the folklore admonishes us with pious phrases to put our trust in mass rather than man, as in the tired, old doctrine that no man is indispensable. It seems to me that this country and the world have been enriched and invigorated most conspicuously by indispensable men, for the right man with the right idea at the right vortex of history has always been the indispensable man. Think of Newton, Lavoisier, Franklin, Archimedes, Gutenberg, and a host of others. Certainly the world could ill afford to dispense with their discoveries.

Despite these trends, we seem thus far to have gotten by; it is the future about which we must think. Future developments may be expected in the next generation that will, in my opinion, prove at least as startling as those of the past 50 years. I am afraid I shall have to disappoint the pie-in-the-sky department by noting that I have nothing to offer as to the exact nature of these developments. If you would take note of the form book on past prophets—even the intelligent ones—you will find that they have always missed out by falling far short of the actuality The reason is a simple one. The future invariably takes its specific form from new principles that cannot be visualized by the forecaster. In 1800, no one could have guessed at the revolution in transportation and its effect on human affairs.

In 1850 no one could have foreseen the universal use of electricity and the uplift it gave to the public weal. In 1900 flight was something restricted to angels and birds. In 1925 the atom was only an unlocked Pandora's box. In every age there have been new principles just around the corner, and that corner is still ahead of us today. The future is bright—of that we may be sure. What difference to us does it make now what the precise source of its brilliance may be?

Just when we will realize this promise of the future and how far the new developments will take us depends on how well we are able to recognize and encourage individual achievement. We cannot move very rapidly if we shut the door on our ablest people by absorbing them in the lifeless tomb of mediocrity.

UNCOMMON MAN

If I were faced with a choice between a society that sublimated the good with the bad, I think I would rather take my chances with the scoundrels than risk losing the creative force represented by the gifted individual, or what we might call the uncommon man. I am sure the country's long-term balance would sustain me here. To play Mark Antony in reverse, it seems to me that the evil that men can do survives them only a short time, whereas the good, far from being interred with their bones, goes on and on forever. And the good that all men accomplish can be no more than the sum of their individual accomplishments.

Try as we will, we can create no synthetic genius, no composite leader. Men are not interchangeable parts like so many pinion gears or carburetors; genius, as John Adams said, is bestowed imperiously by nature upon an individual. And behind every advance of the human race is a germ of creation growing in the mind of some lone individual, as individual whose dreams waken him in the night while others lie contentedly asleep.

DEVELOP CREATIVE GENIUS

We need those dreams, for today's dreams represent tomorrow's realities. Yet, in the very nature of our mass effort, there lies this grave danger—not that the individual may circumvent the public will but that he will himself be conformed and shaped to the general pattern, with the loss of his unique, original contributions. The group nature of business enterprise itself will provide adequate safeguards against public affront. The great problem, the great question, is to develop within the framework of the group the creative genius of the individual.

It is a problem for management, for public education, for government, for the church, for the press, for everyone. The stake is both the material one of preserving our most productive source of progress and the spiritual one of insuring to each individual the human dignity which is his birthright.

I know of no problem so pressing, of no issue so vital. For unless we can guarantee the encouragement and fruitfulness of the uncommon man, the future will lose for all men its virtue, its brightness, and its promise.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my grief and shock at the passing of my good friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN.

BILL was a man of ability, modesty, and integrity, who was admired and respected by all who knew and served with him. His devotion to the needs and desires of the people of his district, State, and Nation has always been in the highest tradition of service in the House of Representatives. BILL GRANAHAN has left behind him a distinguished record of accomplishment in the cause of liberalism. His sincerity of purpose and his faithful service in behalf of the average American were an inspiration to his fellow Pennsylvanians.

We have lost a true servant of the people and a great American who will be long remembered for his outstanding record in the House. To his widow I express my heartfelt sympathy in her bereavement.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*..
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, ———, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, and Cramer.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Oliver 2-3263

Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — North 7-8109

David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Emerson 2-0544

Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Emerson 3-6267

George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Adams 2-6327

John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — District 7-4704

Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700

Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_

Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____

Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Healey, James C., *N. Y*_____.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Free Markets or International Commodity Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the final session of the 41st annual convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents was devoted to a panel discussion of "Materials and Energy Supplies of the Future." I have already referred to the excellent article in the Journal of Commerce by its editor, H. E. Luedicke, which covers this session.

On this panel, Adam K. Stricker, Jr., of the business research staff of General Motors Corp., discussed the history of commodity agreements. His review of these agreements, which attempt to interfere with free competition, covered a period starting in the 1920's and extended through recent years. His paper reveals the steps which have been taken within the United Nations to establish such agreements.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Stricker's statement to the National Association of Purchasing Agents be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADAM K. STRICKER, JR., BUSINESS RESEARCH STAFF, GENERAL MOTORS CORP., DETROIT, MICH., BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PURCHASING AGENTS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 23, 1956

No group in our society is more aware of the function performed by a free price system in directing our competitive economy. You purchase the vast array of materials necessary to operate our industries. Unconsciously you determine and are influenced by the supply-demand relationships of all the many products you buy.

To take one current example, you know that when the price of copper continues to rise at a greater rate than the price of aluminum it signifies a basic change in the relative supply and demand of these two materials. You proceed to find ways to use aluminum as a substitute for copper and thus preserve copper for the more essential uses. This tends to bring the demand of the two materials more nearly in balance. The relatively higher price for copper serves to increase the available supply. Thus an equilibrium is produced.

As long as we maintain a free price mechanism, you, the purchasing agents of America, will guide the economy by the countless transactions which you initiate every day. Your actions maximize the use of available resources.

For many years there have been groups in other countries who have advocated government schemes to control the production and the prices of basic materials. I need only remind you that in the 1920's the export of rubber from the Malay States, the Straits Settlements, nd Ceylon was under strict control by the British under the Stevenson plan. The price rose from 15 cents per pound in August 1922 to $1.01 per pound in November 1925.

Opposition to the Stevenson plan became marked in the United States under the enormously high prices of 1925. Among other things some consideration was given to the possibility of promoting rubber production in tropical areas in the Western Hemisphere. More important was the renewed use of reclaimed rubber. The use of reclaimed rubber had amounted to more than one-half that of new crude rubber in the United States in 1917 but had dropped to less than 20 percent in 1922. In 1927 and 1928, its use once more equalled 50 percent that of crude rubber in the United States and almost one-third of world new crude rubber consumption.

The British Colonial Secretary announced the decision to abandon restriction on November 1, 1928. He said this decision was made because it was difficult to influence prices with a reduced proportion of output under British control and the prospect of losing a still larger part of the market to the Netherlands Indies, where planting had been stimulated and where producers not only had lower costs than in restriction areas but also every inducement to use new developments such as seed selection and budgrafting. He also reported opposition to the scheme in Ceylon; smuggling and the corruption of native staffs.

Another control scheme which also failed to stabilize production or price was the Brazilian coffee valorization plan. The controls broke down and instead of stabibilizing prices the price was lower than ever. The most spectacular development in Brazilian policy regarding coffee was the burning of enormous amounts; from 1931 to 1938 Brazil destroyed 65 million bags, or 8,600 million pounds, the equivalent of total United States imports for 5 years.

We are sympathetic with the problems of countries whose national income and well being are involved with the markets for a few basic commodities. Indonesia and Bolivia depend on exports of tin, Brazil of coffee, Chile of copper for necessary foreign exchange. There are numerous other examples that readily come to mind. Experience, however, does not hold any promise that these countries will prosper from Government-control schemes. If we can maintain a high level of gross national product in our own economy, we assist the underdeveloped countries by our demands on the world markets for primary commodities. This is our greatest opportunity to help others while helping ourselves.

Our Government today is trying to assist underdeveloped countries to diversify their own economies, thus making them less vulnerable to fluctuations in the demand for any commodity. We do this through economic aid, bilateral technical assistance, and we also support the United Nations technical-assistance programs.

During the course of World War II, a group within the State Department drafted proposals to guide the world economy during the postwar period. The results of their work were embodied in a document known as Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment, which was issued by the State Department in November 1945. One of the proposals provided for intergovernmental commodity agreements designed to meet the recurrent problem of stabilizing the prices of raw materials. This proposal was sponsored by our Government to aid countries such as those we have just mentioned.

The State Department believed that they had improved upon the earlier control schemes by providing for governmental representation from countries with important consuming interests on the intergovernmental control boards of any commodity. This was an improvement over the earlier plans such as the Stevenson Rubber Act. However, I need hardly tell this group that a conference of governmental representatives sitting down around the table is quite different from a free market in which buyers and sellers adjust the supply-demand relationships through the operation of the price mechanism. Any such scheme of necessity implies governmental controls over price and production.

As mentioned by the previous speaker, the United States proposals were referred to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The Economic Council, at its first session, approved a resolution on February 18, 1946, to establish a Preparatory Committee to draft an agreement embodying the proposals suggested by our Government for submission to an international conference. This committee first met in London in the fall of 1946. It subsequently held meetings in Geneva and in New York. A draft convention was submitted to the International Conference on Trade and Employment which convened at Havana, Cuba, in November 1947.

When the Habana conference disbanded in the spring of 1948, it produced a convention often referred to as the Habana Charter to establish an International Trade Organization, otherwise called the ITO. Chapter IV of the Habana Charter, the chapter dealing with tariffs and commercial policies, was the basis for GATT, a subject which has just been reviewed by the preceding speaker. Chapter V provided for world antitrust laws dealing with restrictive business practices which were to be administered by the United Nations. Chapter VI established the ground rules for intergovernmental commodity agreements, which were to deal with the price and production of basic commodities.

As you have already heard, the Habana Charter was submitted to the Congress by former President Truman in 1949. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings during the spring of 1950, but failed to report the resolution requested by President Truman. The socialistic overtones throughout the document killed it in committee. In December, the Department of State announced that it would not ask the new Congress, which had just been elected, to consider the Habana Charter again.

In the meantime, steps were being taken within the United Nations to establish the charter chapter by chapter. As the previous speaker has already told you, chapter IV became GATT.

The study of chapter V, the chapter dealing with restrictive business practices, or world antitrust laws, was turned over to an ad hoc committee established by the United Nations Economic and Social Council in 1951. The United States Government sponsored the resolution to form this committee. The committee's report was finally tabled by the Economic and Social Council at its meeting in New York in the spring of 1955. That's too long a story to include here.

Chapter VI, dealing with commodity agreements, the subject of my remarks this afternoon, was implemented within the United Nations by an organization known as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements. This is referred to in the United Nations terminology as ICCICA. The word "interim" in the title for this group referred to the period before the ratification of the charter when the ITO would take over its functions. The first report of ICCICA was issued in November 1947 while the delegates were still meeting in Habana. The charter is dead, but the interim continues.

All the thinking on commodity agreements up to 1950 was directed toward the problem of surpluses and the stabilization of prices. When the Korean War came upon us, we were confronted by a new set of problems involving shortages.

This resulted in the birth of an extracurricular organization, namely, the International Materials Conference. It had the power to make recommendations to governments on the allocation of critical materials. This organization, sponsored largely by our own State Department, was established outside of the United Nations structure in view of the difficulties involved in operating an organization with such powers if Russia and her satellites had a voice in all its decisions during the Korean conflict.

The International Materials Conference actually allocated copper, nickel, sulfur, cobalt, tungsten, molybdenum, zinc, and newsprint to all the nations of the free world in accordance with what it called a country's 'entitlement for consumption.' The allocations were implemented in the United States by using the Defense Production Act with its material and price controls. As the IMC began to hamper seriously many industries in the United States, Congress made its own examination of this organization and amended the Defense Production Act in 1952 restricting the powers of the IMC over our economy, and in addition, it provided that no funds appropriated to the State Department could be used to pay any of the expenses of operating the IMC. This organization was completely disbanded in 1953.

In the meantime, another effort was made by countries largely dependent upon the production of raw materials to establish another group within the United Nations with greater powers than ICCICA to deal with commodity problems. The United Nations General Assembly, at its seventh session at New York, on December 21, 1952, adopted Resolution No. 623, which provided for a special group to study commodity problems. The study group appointed by the Secretary-General, produced a report released in November 1953 entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development." This report, in turn, became the basis for a resolution submitted to the Economic and Social Council in the spring of 1954 providing for the establishment of a Commission on International Commodity Trade.

The United States Representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council opposed the establishment of this Commission, particularly in view of its very broad terms of reference. They included provisions to establish 'just and equitable' relations between the price of raw materials and manufactured goods. The United States Representative voiced our unalterable opposition to any such proposal involving complete regimentation of the world's economy.

In the brief moments accorded me on this program I could not begin to review all the implications inherent in these innocent sounding words. Suffice it to say that in the United Nations debates, suggestions were made that controls should be exercised presumably by this Commission over the production of new synthetic materials which displace natural products. They were, of course, thinking of the market problems arising from the competition of synthetic fibers with cotton and wool and synthetic rubber with the natural product. I need not tell this group what would happen to free markets if such controls were in effect.

In spite of United States opposition, the Commission was established in 1954. Our Government was elected to a seat on this Commission which we declined to accept. At the 20th meeting of the Economic and Social Council held at Geneva last summer, the United States Representative formally requested that another country be elected to our place on the Commission.

The Commission has produced a number of statistical studies, but it has been unable to do anything more in view of the fact that the United States has not participated in its work.

Most of the countries sponsoring the Commission approached the problem of price stability on the premise that the secular trend in the price of primary commodities relative to manufactured goods will be downward. Now, if we are at all successful in advancing the living standards of the present underdeveloped countries as we are trying to do with both bilateral and multilateral programs, we certainly will convert these countries from primitive agricultural economies to industrialized societies. This means that their per capita consumption of the basic industrial raw materials will rise and, unless we begin to think of improving our technology and our abilities to produce materials for an expanding world economy, we may well end up with shortages rather than surpluses. Those who advocate government planning may once again, as with the IMC, suggest allocating scarce materials rather than stabilizing their prices.

At the present time, our Government is a party to two international commodity agreements, the International Wheat Agreement and the International Sugar Agreement, both established many years ago. We are not a party to the International Tin Agreement, and we are not participating in a proposed new coffee agreement. It gives me great pleasure to appear on this panel with the next speaker, Secretary Wormser, who played an important part in establishing the policy of our Government with respect to the tin agreement.

Certainly our experience with wartime price and allocation controls within the United States, with the rubber and coffee schemes I have described, with our efforts to stabilize domestic agricultural incomes, and with the International Materials Conference, does not give us a basis to expect Government controls to be superior to free markets.

No one can foretell the future. However, in my opinion, the free play of competitive forces set in motion by your day-by-day decisions over the long run will be more successful in insuring that the world's resources are put to their most productive use than the decisions of well-meaning bureaucrats. The truth of the matter is that none of us is smart enough to plan a regimented world economy.

Third House of Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress have been greatly concerned over a number of decisions of the Federal courts, particularly the Supreme Court, in the past few years.

These decisions have seriously hampered the work of the committee and its ability to do the job imposed upon it by the Congress. It is known that some judges have strong personal feelings as to the necessity and advisability for investigations by the Congress into the Communist conspiracy. It is becoming increasingly apparent that they are attempting to impose their ideas through decisions which are more legislative than judicial.

While the President, his Cabinet, the Members of Congress, and the county sheriff are freely criticized, we have consistently hesitated to take the courts to task. Over the years we have been taught, and properly so, that the court is an institution to be respected. Out of this has grown a feeling that individual judges can do no wrong—that they must be free from criticism and that the motives behind decisions should not be questioned.

Some judges, appointed for life, have gradually arrogated unto themselves executive and legislative powers. Because of the general timidity on the part of the people to criticize the courts, these judges are becoming bolder, and more and more by judicial decision are attempting to run the Government in accordance with their own philosophies. These philosophies are not always sound because, as FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, has pointed out, these judges often live in Ivory Towers, apart from reality, with blinds drawn.

It should not be inferred that my remarks are a general indictment of the Federal bench, because the great majority are like the capable, fearless, Federal judge and fine American we have in Cincinnati.

The Los Angeles Herald-Express in its lead editorial of May 15, 1956, entitled "The Third House of Congress?" discusses one phase of this issue much better than I, and therefore, I am including it as part of my observations:

THIRD HOUSE OF CONGRESS?

The constitutional question before the American people, since Earl Warren has become Chief Justice of the United States, is whether the Supreme Court is a third house of Congress legislating on its own.

The Constitution clearly defines the functions of Congress and the procedures concerning the passage of legislation.

The Constitution does not with similar clarity define the functions of the Supreme Court.

Chief Justice John Marshall, however, by a series of basic decisions, determined the supremacy of the Court in matters constitutional. But nowhere has it been asserted that the Supreme Court is a legislative body.

Nevertheless in the case involving the United Mine Workers District 50 against the Arkansas Oak Flooring Co., the Supreme Court does legislate. No question of constitutionality is raised. The Court makes new law.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, officers of a union are required to file an oath to the effect that they are not Communists.

This John L. Lewis has refused to do for no better reason than that he will not do it.

His choice is to disregard the law which was also the choice once upon a time of Al Capone and others who believed that the Volstead Act was all wrong and that they would not abide by it.

The National Labor Relations Board, obeying the law, has required union officials to take this oath before they would be certified for collective-bargaining purposes. Now along comes the Court and upholds the right of a union official, if he chooses, to violate the law.

By taking this position, the Supreme Court reopens the entire labor field for infiltration by Communists, many of whom have been forced out of labor unions by this provision of the Taft-Hartley law.

Actually a number of labor unions were expelled from their national organizations because of Communist affiliations.

In effect, this Supreme Court decision requires an employer to bargain with a labor union even if all its officers are known Communists and therefore agents of Soviet Russia.

The Supreme Court does not declare the Taft-Hartley law unconstitutional.

It simply makes it optional for a labor leader to obey the law or to ignore it, and it requires an employer and the NLRB to abide by whatever decision the individual labor leader makes as to whether he will be law-abiding or not.

Such a decision is encouragement for disobedience of the law and could be used as a precedent for all sorts of evasions.

There is, for instance, a tax law. Why should not each individual American citizen, following the reasoning of the Supreme Court, decide for himself whether he chooses to obey the law, file a return, and pay the income tax?

Using the language of this decision, failure to file could not be regarded as a confession of guilt, but rather the choice of the individual as to whether he would make certain information public. If it is good law for John L. Lewis, why not for any gander?

Something curious has crept into the Supreme Court and it has become very disturbing to the American people.

It is difficult quite to analyze what has happened, but the same judges were not legislating before Earl Warren became Chief Justice.

Maybe he has given a new tone to the Court, the tone not of a high judicial body but of a third house of Congress.

Resolution Adopted by National Society of New England Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the 43d Annual Congress of the National Society of New England Women:

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF
NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,
Glen Ridge, N. J., May 29, 1956.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Enclosed is a copy of the resolutions adopted by the 43d annual congress of the national society of New England Women, May 16, New Ocean House, Swampscott, Mass.

The society urges the Congress to reject membership in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation, to examine the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and to resume its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce. New England industries such as textile, china, watch, etc., have, as you well know, been hard hit and must wait 6 to 9 months under escape clause provisions for a hearing with the result then in doubt.

The society also urges a reappraisement of foreign aid in terms of money spent and benefit to the United States received.

The national society of New England women is comprised of members whose forebears dwelt in New England prior to the signing of the Constitution of the United States. There are 82 colonies in 22 States.

We wonder if you would be so good as to place these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,
FLORENCE A. BEEKER (Mrs. Wm. A.),
President General.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN, RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONGRESS, MAY 16, 1956, NEW OCEAN HOUSE, SWAMPSCOTT, MASS.

I. DEDICATION

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women rededicates itself to patriotic service for the maintenance of the sovereignty and the preservation of this Republic under the Constitution of the United States.

II. LOYALTY TO THE CONSTITUTION

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women opposes the so-called strengthening of the United Nations or any international organization, agency or plan that would abolish or limit any of the rights, privileges or immunities provided by the Constitution of the United States, as steps toward a Socialist-Communist dominated world government and the extinction of the United States.

III. OPPOSITION TO ATLANTIC UNION

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to the Atlantic Union resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) that asks for an exploratory convention to discuss surrender of United States sovereignty in a permanent political, economic and military union of the North Atlantic Pact countries.

IV. OPPOSITION TO GENOCIDE, HUMAN RIGHTS AND UNESCO

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to interference by the United Nations and its agencies in the domestic affairs of the United States and especially by the proposed (1) Covenant of Human Rights, proposed (2) genocide convention and (3) United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and urges the Congress of the United States to withhold financial support from these projects that would hasten the triumph of world socialism for world citizenship and world government.

V. ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations and urges the introduction of a joint resolution in the Congress of the United States to abrogate the treaty by which the United States became a member of the United Nations if Red China is admitted.

VI. NULLIFICATION OF THE STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to the North Atlantic Treaty status of forces agreement and urges the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation by joint resolution to nullify that part of the treaty that deprives American soldiers of trial rights under the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

VII. ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION (OTC)

Whereas United States membership in a new international administrative Organization for Trade Cooperation is now before Congress, in which the United States would be outvoted, its resources dissipated for the one Socialist economic world; and

Whereas the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) would administer has never been approved by Congress and its decisions made in Geneva have weakened and are threatening New England textile, glass, chemical, watch, bicycle, and other industries vital to survival of the free enterprise system and a sound national defense; and

Whereas approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) would be regarded as indirect approval of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women urges the Congress of the United States to reject membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, to carefully examine the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and to resume its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce.

VIII. SUPPORT OF THE M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its support of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act against repeal or crippling amendments.

IX. REFUGEE LAW

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to circumventing the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act by liberalizing the 1953 Refugee Relief Act to facilitate the influx of additional immigrants.

X. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the Natonal Society of New England Women reaffirms its position against Federal aid to education as leading inevitably to Federal control of education and a step toward the autocratic state.

XI. PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the Natonal Society of New England Women supports the principles of the following proposed constitutional amendments designed to redefine and recapture constitutional government:

1. Bricker amendment to prevent overriding of our Constitution and our domestic law by means of the treaty power.

2. Reed-Dirksen amendment to eliminate to a large extent the heavy progressive rate feature from our income-tax system without

impairing the power of Congress to raise revenue. This amendment limits the top rate of income taxes, but permits Congress to exceed the limit by a three-fourths vote.

3. Byrd-Bridges amendment to require annual budget balancing by limiting congressional appropriations in any fiscal year to the estimate of receipts of the Government for that fiscal year, except in times of dire emergency to be determined by a three-fourths vote of Congress.

4. Mundt-Coudert amendment or a reform of the electoral college along these lines, designed to take away the excessive power now exercised by minority groups in larger cities under the present electoral-college system.

5. Reed-Walter amendment to give the States the full power to originate amendments to the Constitution.

We have the choice of continuing every year to write our Congressmen to get them to do what they should do, or restore the permanent contract—the Constitution. With the contract signed, limiting the powers of Congress to tax and spend, we could feel secure. With such limitation we will improve government because we will reduce the amount of it. States have everything to gain and nothing to lose by adopting these proposed amendments. Call them to the attention of State legislators.

XII. FOREIGN AID

Whereas it is proposed to expand the foreign-aid program, the chief cause of our heavy tax burden, unbalanced budget, and growing socialism at home; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women reaffirms its opposition to continued foreign aid and urges the Congress of the United States to reappraise the foreign-aid program in terms of money spent and United States' benefit received.

XIII. ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Whereas the States comprising New England were among the Thirteen Original Colonies whose representatives, with Alexander Hamilton, established the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas Alexander Hamilton is one of our great historical figures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 43d annual congress of the National Society of New England Women calls upon its colonies to take an appropriate part in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the National Guardsman, in its June 1956 issue, has as its guest editor the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. His subject is "As We See It." This editorial deserves the attention of all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT—I AM THE GUARD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Guest editorialist for this issue of the National Guardsman is Delaware's United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, JR. He writes a weekly commentary for his constituents, and has granted permission to reprint one which, while intended primarily for Military Reserve Week, has applicability every week.)

As many of you know, the 7-day period from April 22 to 28 has been designated as "Military Reserve Week." The purpose of this activity is to stimulate increased interest and participation in the Reserve components of our Armed Forces and thus help strengthen the national security. I am happy to devote this statement to Military Reserve Week because it provides an opportunity for me to express publicly and proudly a few words of support and encouragement for the National Guard of Delaware and of the Nation as a whole.

The guard is easily one of America's most famous military institutions. From the earliest beginnings of our Nation, the guard has functioned in an important and vital roles as a partner with other units of our national defense. Known as civilians in peace and soldiers in war, the National Guard has established itself both as a State organization and as a federalized adjunct of the country's overall military system.

From time to time as our military planners review and revise the organization of our Armed Forces, mention is made of the future role which the National Guard may take in the overall defense picture. One hears rumors from time to time that the necessity for the existence of the National Guard is not as great as heretofore and that in fact the guard, as a separate organization, can be replaced.

However, those who advocate either replacing or integrating the guard with the Regular Reserve Forces of the Nation fail to take into account its importance as a unit of the State as much as it is an arm of the National Government: It should be remembered that the National Guard has provided the bulk of our fighting troops at the beginning of almost every national emergency, that is, war. In addition, in times of disaster or internal upheaval of a civilian nature, troops of the National Guard are available and ready for service to their respective States and communities. In Delaware our National Guard organization stands as one of the finest anywhere in the United States. Units of our National Guard, particularly its ground forces, have a long history of prideful accomplishments.

During the current observances of Military Reserve Week, the Army National Guard will undertake a drive for volunteers for the Army 6 months training program and for the enlistment of men who have had previous military service in any of the Armed Forces.

The Air National Guard is seeking enlistment of prior servicemen and young men between 17 and 18½ years without prior service. Members of the National Guard have emphasized to me that young men of Delaware can fulfill their military training and service obligation through membership in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard. Interested young men in the State may find it of value to discuss the question of new or added military service with members of our National Guard during the present week.

While I am happy to note the recruitment possibilities for the National Guard which are currently being highlighted, I want most of all in this brief message to emphasize the importance of having the National Guard's identity retained by our defense planners. Delawareans who are familiar with my general views on the relationship of the Federal Government to the several States, will know of my inherent belief that the power of our democracy lies in the authority of the States themselves as 48 separate entities working for the common welfare. As I see it, the National Guard through its long history has been developed to meet the varying requirements which arise from time to time in the States themselves. Secondly, it functions under the Federal Government in time of national crisis.

A significant description of this famous American institution has been prepared against a pictorial background of its many functions over years past. In our office here in Washington we have a framed copy of this declaration which is entitled, "I Am the Guard." In concluding these remarks I want to quote directly from its closing lines:

"Wherever a strong arm and valiant spirit must defend the Nation, in peace or war, wherever a child cries or a woman weeps in times of disaster, there I stand * * * I am the Guard. For three centuries a soldier in war, a civilian in peace—of security and honor, I am the custodian, now and forever * * * I am the Guard."

For Freer Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, H. E. Luedicke, the editor of the New York Journal of Commerce, on Thursday, May 24, reviewed the final session of the meeting of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, held in Cleveland on Wednesday, May 23.

This session was devoted to a panel discussion of the subject "Materials and Energy Supplies of the Future; Problems That Can Bite You; Availability, Costs, and Controls." The participants in this discussion were Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior; Fred G. Singer, manager, tariff division, development department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., Wilmington, Del.; and Adam K. Stricker, Jr., business research staff, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Luedicke's review of this session is of great interest. It shows the desire on the part of both business and government under this administration to maintain a free, competitive capitalism unencumbered by international commodity agreements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Luedicke's review of this meeting printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of May 24, 1956]

FOR FREER COMPETITION: UNSHACKLED MARKETS URGED BY PURCHASERS

(By H. E. Luedicke)

CLEVELAND, May 23.—A strong plea for restoration and maintenance of the free competitive market system featured the closing session of this year's convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents.

Here are the highlights of the session:

A strong endorsement of free competitive capitalism as the key to President Eisenhower's economic philosophy was given by Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for

Mineral Resources, Department of the Interior.

A broadside against the use of international commodity agreements was fired by Adam K. Stricker, Jr., of the business research staff of General Motors Corp.

A most careful screening of all proposed international economic treaties before their acceptance was urged by Fred G. Singer, manager of the tariff division, in the development department of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., of Wilmington, Del.

FREER MARKETS NEEDED

"Freer markets are essential if world trade is to flourish and make its contribution to free-world economic development," Secretary Wormser declared.

"Experience indicates that the Federal Government invited problems which are difficult to handle whenever it takes action to disturb supply-demand relationships. It is quite a trick to employ man-made economic devices without diluting or destroying the competitive influence that generally can be relied upon to cut production or use down to size.

"Furthermore, it has been my observation that any movement to initiate one type of Government intervention in commodity markets, if successful, leads inevitably to another."

GIVES ADVICE

"My advice to any businessman who would seek to solve an immediate production on marketing problem by asking for some kind of direct Government assistance is simply this. Think twice before you offer to sell any portion of your economic birthright for a mess of Government pottage.

"Give Washington a particularly wide berth when markets apparently misbehave.

Secretary Wormser did not deny that Government, in a modern economy, has an important economic role to play, but he stressed time and again, that the trick is to do so "without stifling individual initiative or without using Government power to favor one group or another."

UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES

Adams K. Stricker, Jr., asserted that "the free play of competitive forces set in motion by businessmen's day-to-day decisions over the long run will be more successful in insuring that the world's resources are put to the most productive use than the decisions of well-meaning bureaucrats.

"The truth of the matter is that none of us is smart enough to plan regimented world economy."

BLASTS AGREEMENTS

Mr. Stricker dealt at length with the problems involved in the use of international commodity agreements.

Said he: "We are sympathetic with the problems of countries whose national income and well-being are involved with the markets for a few basic commodities."

Experience does not hold any promise, however, that these countries will prosper from Government-controlled schemes.

If we can maintain a high level of gross national product in our own economy, we assist the underedeveloped countries by our demands in the world markets for primary commodities. This is our greatest opportunity to help others while helping ourselves.

SCORES U. N. PROPOSALS

Any attempts to regulate raw material will sooner or later lead to proposals to extend such controls on synthetic products in the same fields as well. Mr. Stricker scored these as particularly vicious attacks on free markets.

"In recent United Nations debates, suggestions have been made that controls should be exercised, presumably by the Commission on International Commodity Trade, over the production of new synthetic materials which displace natural products. They were, of course, thinking of the market problems arising from the competition of synthetic fibers with cotton and wool and synthetic rubber with the natural product. I need not tell this group what would happen to free markets if such controls were in effect."

ROOTS FROM ITO

"Our experience with wartime price and allocation controls within the United States, with previous rubber and coffee schemes, with our efforts to stabilize domestic agricultural incomes, and with the national materials conference, does not give us a basis to expect Government controls to be superior to free markets."

Du Pont's Fred G. Singer devoted his analysis to the role to be played by intergovernmental agreements rather than specific commodity agreements.

"I am in favor of cooperation, but I have serious reservations when it comes to merging our American way of life into a single world picture."

He was critical of the attempts now being made to salvage some parts of the International Trade Organization under the Habana Charter, despite the fact that Congress considered it as contrary to the American concept of private enterprise.

"You may think that meant the end of ITO," Mr. Singer said, "but that would be to ignore the extraordinary patience and persistence of international bureaucracy.

"In letting the main plan die we did not kill all the roots. Three little roots survived. One of these had sprouted by 1950 and started an independent life. The other two roots were kept more or less hidden in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The roots, which are only now showing above ground, are the interim Commission for an International Trade Organization and the interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements."

It is these roots, Mr. Singer claims, must be watched very carefully unless they'll be coming around one of these days to bite you.

Texas Nominee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald of May 8, 1956, concerning the recent Democratic precinct conventions in Texas, which strongly endorsed Senator LYNDON JOHNSON to head our State delegation to the national convention:

TEXAS IS EXPRESSING PREFERENCE FOR MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD NOMINEE

The victory of the Johnson-Rayburn forces in the precinct conventions Saturday means that Texas is certain to have a strong voice in the choice of a Democratic nomination for President.

Speaker RAYBURN has already been chosen for permanent chairman of the national gathering, and it is now certain that the delegation sent up from Texas will be seated. This is important, for a delegation must necessarily be accepted before it can take part in the proceedings.

This Texas development increases the chances that a moderate candidate for President will be nominated by the Democrats. Speaker RAYBURN has never been among the liberal extremists. He is by nature a conservative. And Senator JOHNSON is a middle-of-the-roader.

Many factors account for the RAYBURN-JOHNSON victory, but one of them, outstanding in its importance, was the appeal that both JOHNSON and RAYBURN have to the thousands of rural and smalltown Democrats who are neither extremely liberal nor extremely conservative. JOHNSON's fine record in Congress won him designation as favorite son.

Texas, by naming its own favorite son, and by sending a middle-of-the-road delegation to the national convention, will say in effect that it favors nomination of a moderate candidate.

The defeat of Shivers does not mean that Texas is repudiating the doctrine of States' rights. The average Texas Democrat is still opposed to Federal encroachment upon State sovereignty and the centralization of government in Washington. JOHNSON and RAYBURN have been among the leading champions of States rights. They are moderates in their views and they are concerned about all the numerous problems faced by the Nation. They have faith in the Democratic Party, and their influence in the national convention will be for the kind of presidential nominee that middle-of-the-road Texas Democrats can conscientiously support.

The reuniting of the plain Democrats of the rural areas of Texas and the conservative elements in the big urban centers will have a wholesome effect on the future of this State.

Nineteenth Anniversary of I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 20, 1956, marked the 19th anniversary of I Am An American Day.

As national cochairman of the Helois Foundation and I Am An American Day Committee, I should like to pay tribute to Mrs. Paul d'Otrenge Seghers, founder of I Am An American Day for her untiring work in awakening true Americanism among the citizens of our great country.

The celebration this year drew over 500 distinguished guests to the estate of Mr. and Mrs. Seghers at Sunnyhill Farm, Huntington, Long Island, where they assembled to renew their faith in the ideals upon which our country has been built and to become still more devout disciples of the American way of life.

The theme of this 19th annual celebration was "Peace with Freedom for All" and was dedicated to the Latin American Republics and the Dominion of Canada, whom we joined in paying homage and tribute to the people of the capitive European Nations.

I quote below a few of the many testimonials received from distinguished citizens of our country:

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, United States Senator from Kentucky:

" 'Peace with freedom for all' is a completely appropriate theme for the annual I Am an American Day program.

"A peace that would mean enslavement of the bodies and souls of freedom-loving peoples of the world would be a living death. As we work toward peace in the world, we must even be on the alert to guarantee that the rights of all people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of their own happiness shall be safeguarded."

Hon. IRVING M. IVES, United States Senator from New York:

"On this significant day, when each of us expresses his gratitude for the Divine fortune which has made him an American and has blessed America, our thoughts turn with compassion to others less fortunate. We think particularly of the millions of silenced and oppressed human beings behind the Iron Curtain.

"I am most pleased that the sponsors of the 'I Am An American Day' celebration for 1956 chose as their theme 'Peace with freedom for all.' On this day, when Americans give thanks that they have peace and freedom, we pray that the people behind the Iron Curtain may likewise soon enjoy those blessings.

"In addition to our prayers, we send those people our sympathy for their plight and our encouragement for their efforts to shake off their bondage."

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, United States Senator from Washington:

"It is only fitting on this 19th 'I Am an American Day' that our theme should be 'Peace with freedom for all.'

"We need to remind ourselves today and every day that there are vast areas of the world where people are not free.

"This is especially true at a moment when the new turn in Soviet foreign policy is in danger of obscuring the fact that 100 million freedom-loving peoples are still captive behind the Iron Curtain.

"We say to the world: If the Soviet Union really wants to show good faith, it can return to these peoples the freedom that once was theirs. This is an important message to tell the world. But this alone is not enough.

"Equally important, we must continue to protect and strengthen our freedoms at home as a symbol of hope for captive peoples everywhere. And we must pledge our untiring efforts to help free them from their bondage."

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, United States Senator from California:

"The whole world recognizes the courage and tribulations of the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The free world joins with them in prayer that once again soon they will see the light of liberty and freedom from fear.

"Our generation continues making progress in determining and overcoming those modern dangers to the cause of our freedom. The basic hazards of Communist aggression and intrigue is not one for the people of the United States alone. They are the concern of all free peoples, and it will be in concert with them that we shall continue to oppose the Communist ideology. Each succeeding American generation has preserved American freedom, and has resolutely clung to the same self-evident truths which the patriots laid down 170 years ago. Ours has been a history of progress and we mean, under the providence of God, to continue that progress in the years and generations which lie ahead."

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator from Washington:

"More people than many of us realize in today's world cherish the words, 'I am an American'—perhaps even more than some of us who obtain that right at birth.

"In this respect, it is significant that many who utter the words, 'I am an American' at the 1956 observance will be members of naturalization classes to whom the words 'liberty' and 'freedom' have a vastly deeper feeling because of actual background experiences on foreign soil.

"This individual can also add the word 'tolerance' and really means it because in his mind it is synonymous with the phrase, 'I am an American.'

"America looks to the persecuted and the oppressed for its very founding. Since that time, much of its greatest achievements have come from men and women—the Dr. Einsteins—who teach us the true meaning 'I am an American' by living the words in addition to speaking them."

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS, United States Senator from Florida:

"On this 19th I Am An American Day, it is fitting that we in the United States extend our prayers to those behind the Iron Curtain who live in bondage and who have lost, or never known, the rights of free men accorded in our own country.

"While we enjoy—and sometimes take for granted—our individual sanctity under the Constitution, we must not forget that the flame of liberty has been extinguished in many parts of the world. No nation is an island unto itself, and when the bell tolls for a free people abroad, it tolls for us in America too.

"'Peace with freedom for all'—this theme of the 19th I Am An American Day sums up the ideal for which we stand firm. I know that the observance will achieve success equal to last year's drive by the Helios Foundation for unity in the Western Hemisphere."

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, United States Senator from New Jersey:

"I am happy to send these words of greeting to the Helios Foundation on the occasion of the 19th I Am An American Day.

"It is with special gratification that I note this year's theme, Peace With Freedom For All, and the tribute your group is paying to the millions of captive people behind the Iron Curtain.

"We must never cease our peaceful efforts to restore to those people the freedom, independence and self-determination they once enjoyed before their subjection to Communist totalitarianism."

Hon. Thomas B. Stanley, Governor of Virginia:

"The annual observance of I Am An American Day affords the opportunity of rededicating ourselves to the underlying principles of free citizenship and of bringing to the attention of our neighbors of the Americas, as well as people throughout the world, the great contribution we can make with them to safeguard individual liberty and national integrity.

"I am glad to join with the sponsors of this celebration in reemphasizing the imperishable values we enjoy as Americans and I invite the people of Virginia to take the occasion to reaffirm their adherence to the basic tenets of government and freedom which are responsible for our status as a bastion of liberty today."

Hon. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Member of Congress from New York:

"As usual it is a pleasure to send the message to you and the wonderful people doing the work of the Helios Foundation.

"I can think of no greater message than to report to you the sentiments of a young 11-year-old lad who won Suffolk County's Americanism contest.

"He said:

"'Of all the many things for which America stands, that which means most to me is liberty.

"'At the age of 11 I am not too familiar with the deeper meanings of personal liberty. But I do know from a study of my history books that men have been fighting and dying for it since the beginning of history.

"'Now that I am reading current events and newspapers reporting from all over the world, I have been surprised and saddened to learn that peoples in the other countries do not enjoy the same personal freedom that I take so much for granted. To think that there are lands where men may not travel without police cards, may not worship God as they choose and may not be governed by officials of their own election is enough to prove to me that personal property is America's greatest blessing.

"'I am proud to pledge allegiance and ask God's guidance on the great system of government that promises each of us so much.'

"Doesn't this accurately report our mutual feelings in this great matter of Americanism?"

Hon. Carmine G. De Sapio, Secretary of State of New York, Speaks Before a Dinner of the National Council of Business and Professional Men, New York, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 16, 1956, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of State of New York, and New York State Democratic Committeeman from New York, spoke before a dinner meeting of the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc., in the New York Times Building, in New York City. Because of the talk and its eloquent understanding of the true place of an alert citizenry in a representative government, I wish to extend, under leave, my remarks and insert both the address of Mr. De Sapio and the introductory statement of Mr. Irving V. Gellis, New York public relations counsel and chairman of its public relations committee, as well as chairman of this dinner committee:

Mr. GELLIS. Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc., is a nonpartisan organization, composed of progressive, patriotic, civic-minded citizens, dedicated to the advancement of the welfare of our Nation, State and city. Its recommendations are articulately heard in the Nation's Capital, in the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives, as well as in the council of the city of New York, legislatures of the several States, and in capitals throughout the world.

The eminence of our guest speaker and his importance on the current political scene is sufficiently attested by the record attendance here tonight. Because you are all aware of the role he has played in giving new dignity to the meaning of representative government, I feel it superfluous for me to say anything further. It is, therefore, with a great deal of pleasure that I give you our guest speaker, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio.

Mr. DE SAPIO. Mr. Levy, Mr. Bayern, Mr. Gellis, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to meet this evening with the members and friends of the National Council of Business and Professional Men. I know of your work and your purpose and I am very grateful for this opportunity to exchange views with one of the most alert and civic-conscious groups in our community.

And yet, when I think of the millions of men and women in our country who are affiliated with organizations such as yours, I often find myself wondering whether, in our earnestness to uphold and to advance our great democratic philosophy of the rights and the opportunities of the individual, we do not sometimes tend to overlook the equally great importance of mutual assistance and cooperative action to the strengthening and perpetuation of our American way of life.

This is a question about which I have very firm personal convictions and which, I believe, has not received the attention which its seriousness demands.

As a practical politician—as a man whose daily professional activities bring him into close and constant working association with the problems of community life—I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of public participation in the governmental—and, therefore, in the political—affairs which influence and which often determine the course of social progress.

And I believe, my friends, that only through intelligently distributing and sharing the burdens and the responsibilities of community affairs, can we effectively advance the public welfare and improve the social and economic atmosphere in which we live.

It is, therefore, the duty—and the very great privilege—of every individual citizen to bring his particular talents and abilities into play in the formulation and implementation of a constructive public approach to the daily problems which form so vital a part of our contemporary social system.

A disturbingly large number of our fellow Americans remain unaware of, or insensitive, to the basic facts of political life. Many of these people cling to the outmoded belief that politics is a mysterious branch of human endeavor, shut off from the normal stream of social activity and presided over by a strange, unapproachable group of men and women who meet in secret conclave to perform strange rites which bring forth the public policies which guide the destinies of their countrymen.

We know better, of course, but it is sometimes very convenient to forget what we know—to substitute inaction for effort—and to permit ourselves the luxury of unawareness in order to avoid the necessity for fulfilling our obligations to our fellow citizens.

I am, quite frankly, very much disturbed by the apparent indifference which some of our most prominent business leaders display toward the facts and the realities of political life.

My friends, I have actually heard successful business men and women declare with apparent sincerity that they simply have no time for politics, that they cannot afford to be bothered with the problems of community life, that the urgency of their business concerns and activities must take primary importance in their lives, to the exclusion of virtually all other considerations.

It is evidently the belief of these people that it is enough for them to have complete faith in the ability of government to get along without their assistance.

Such people may, indeed, have great faith in the efficiency of the governmental agencies which have been developed through the years to protect their rights and their interests as American citizens. But, what they lack—tragically—is faith in themselves.

And if that may seem to be a very strong statement of the case * * * then it is also a fair measure of the serious damage to our national philosophy which is represented by so negative an approach to the fundamentals of citizenship.

For if the businessman may reject his obligations as a member of the community in which he lives and works and raises his family, then the businessman's employee—by the same token—has as much right to disclaim all but the most superficial attachment to the company which employs him.

Imagine, my friends, the staggering effect upon our business economy, if our commercial enterprises were obliged to operate under such conditions * * * if the average employee functioned in a state of economic anarchy, without accepting the moral and ethical implications of his employment.

Imagine, if you will, the chaos which would result if millions of salaried workers were to disregard the executive directives of their employers; if they were to pay no attention to sales orders and shipping instructions; if they were to brush aside the mechanics of production * * * for no better reason than that they had complete faith in the ability of commerce and industry, of their employers, to get along without their assistance.

Yet this absurd theoretical situation, which our business leaders could not conceivably tolerate in their professional activities, is very much the same as that in which some of these same business leaders place themselves with regard to their own civic responsibilities.

You and I know that it is not possible to reconcile such behavior with the physical facts of contemporary American life.

In many respects, it is astonishing that we have succeeded, as a Nation, in building the greatest, the most productive and the most efficient industrial and commercial national community the world has ever seen * * * and that we have managed to develop a system of government which provides for the continued growth and expansion—and for the protection—of our economic society.

To any serious student of present-day political, social, and economic life and custom, there can be only two possible explanations for this phenomenon.

The first is that we have succeeded through divine guidance alone * * * that we have enjoyed the benign protection of a Creator who is disposed to overlook and to excuse our insensitivity to our obligations as members of a communal society.

The second is that we have had the great fortune of calling upon the services of a relatively small, but very dedicated, group of men and women who, in their realization of the immense importance of safeguarding our democratic way of life, have been willing to shoulder the burdens of community responsibility for the rest of the Nation.

Actually, our success is attributable, I believe, to a virtually exclusive combination of these factors. Thus far, we have not materially suffered for having permitted such a situation to perpetuate itself. Each successive generation has brought forth a new reserve of capable public servants upon whom we have been able to depend for the maintenance and the preservation of the ideals and the philosophy of Americanism.

But can this state of affairs be allowed to continue indefinitely? Have we the moral right to permit a handful of our neighbors and associates to go on doing our work for us?

My friends, I submit to you that no American has the right—or can find any valid justification—to accept the advantages and the privileges of citizenship without accepting as well—both in spirit and in practical application—the responsibilities of citizenship * * * no more than he has the right to accept employment and wages without performing the services which are the basic condition of his employment and for which wages are paid.

Each of you, as a substantial and respected member of your community, has the opportunity to serve as a liaison officer between business and government.

And, as leaders in the economic affairs of your communities, you have yet another responsibility, that of lending your talents, your abilities and your awareness of the significance of the complex social and cultural elements which contribute to our country's well-being, to the improvement of all phases of community relations.

As leaders of commerce, you have the opportunity to serve, too, as major contributors to social progress, as the business advisors to our political—to our American—way of life.

Through your vigorous and forward-looking championship of the ideals of free and purposeful business enterprise, you are also preparing for the future—for the time when new generations of Americans may take their places at these very meetings, in the same spirit of good fellowship and good citizenship which pervades this room today.

And through active, civic vigilance, you can, in a very real and measurable sense, help to secure the rights of your children to the same, and, in many instances, to greater, opportunities which you have enjoyed as American business and professional men, and you can help as well, to carry the message, the ideals and the working spirit of America to all of your fellow human beings who subscribe to the principles and to the realities of democracy.

In the final analysis, my friends, you can insure the ability of your fellow citizens to look forward to a future in which all men may live and work and raise their families in an atmosphere of peace and good will, with decency and with integrity, and in a spirit of hope and fulfillment.

Thank you very much.

Radio Union Opposes H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following news item appeared in the May 25, 1956, issue of the Seafarers Log, the official organ of the Seafarers International Union. It indicates that the Radio Officers Union recognizes that H. R. 4090 is bad legislation:

ROU RAPS BILL FOR NEW SHIP RADIO CALL GADGET

WASHINGTON.—A bill pending in the House of Representatives calling for installation of automatic radio-telegraph call selectors in United States cargo ships has met considerable opposition from both union and shipowner sources.

The purpose of the device is to service ships with less than two radio operators. It would make it possible for a shore station to get in touch with a ship at all hours by sending out the ship's call signal. The automatic call selector would respond only to the signal of the ship it is installed on and would sound a bell, waking the radio operator.

The Radio Officers' Union, an affiliate of the Maritime Trades Department, is on record against the device as offering no advantages over the present automatic alarm systems. Automatic alarms, which are required by Government regulations, are keyed to respond to the international distress signal whether from ship or shore station.

An ROU spokesman explained that the automatic call selector would be of little advantage in an emergency because a shore station would have to know the specific call numbers of all vessels that happened to be in the area. Most shore stations would not be in a position to know which ships were in a given vicinity.

NOT PERFECTED

The ROU also felt that the equipment was not perfected as yet. One steamship company, Moore-McCormack, had installed some of the call selectors, but subsequently testified against their adoption.

As far as ROU is concerned, the proposed installation "is one more piece of complex equipment aboard and another headache for the radio operator."

Youth Appreciation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 27, 1956, was observed in Charlotte, N. C., as Youth Appreciation Day. Similar recognition was given youth in a number of other North Carolina cities, in five other States, and in a Province of Canada.

The idea of designating a special day for adults to pay tribute to youth was originated by T. Earl Yarborough, a fine public-spirited citizen of Charlotte. Mr. Yarborough thought up this idea last year when he served as director of Optimist Club boys work in North Carolina. He thought it would be appropriate to use a date for Youth Appreciation Day between the dates designated as Mother's Day and Father's Day in order to focus attention upon the importance of home and family relationships.

The Yarborough proposal was endorsed by the Charlotte Association of Civic Clubs. Harold Smoak, another outstanding civic leader of Charlotte and president of the Charlotte Optimist Club, was designated as chairman of a committee to inaugurate the program in Mecklenburg County. Mr. Yarborough served as State chairman and devoted his attention to selling the idea to other communities in our State.

The observance of Youth Appreciation Day in Charlotte in 1955 was so successful that it attracted the attention of Optimist International. The officers of that fine civic organization were so impressed by the possibilities for good in such a movement that they decided to throw the great weight and influence of Optimist International behind it. The Optimists do not plan to claim this program as an exclusive promotion but are inviting support from all other interested groups in their efforts to expand the observance of Youth Appreciation Day throughout the country and abroad.

Governor Hodges of North Carolina has endorsed the idea and issued a proclamation calling upon all parents to "rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of parenthood and urging all citizens to join in the celebration, to become aware of youth as earnest, helpful citizens, to recognize their accomplishments, and to credit them with friendly confidence."

Earl Yarborough explains the idea behind Youth Appreciation Day as an effort to encourage adults to express their faith in youth. He points out that 95 percent of our youths are not delinquent and that it is not fair for this great majority to be denied the recognition due them because of the dramatization of the problems created by the other 5 percent. "There is a need to dramatize decency instead of delinquency," Mr. Yarborough says, and then proceeds to take positive action to inaugurate a movement to do just that—a movement I predict will spread across the entire country."

This movement will spread because we have long needed a Youth Appreciation Day—a day on which we can take time out of our busy lives to tell our boys and girls how much they mean to us and to our country's future.

Many adults think that stern discipline is the only answer to the problem of juvenile delinquency. I do not discount the importance of discipline but am inclined to believe that it should be mixed with a generous portion of understanding and confidence. A little praise occasionally for a job well done might also pay dividends.

"As the twig is bent so is the tree inclined." As the youth of this great country of ours develop into wholesome and disciplined strength, so will our national safety be assured and thus will our country prosper.

A salute to T. Earl Yarborough and his associates who had the imagination to think up this idea in the first place and the initiative to put it into effect.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an interesting and provocative book, The Right To Know, by an old friend, Kent Cooper, executive director and former general manager of the Associated Press. At any time and under any circumstances, anything from Mr. Cooper on the subject of news gathering and dissemination would be worth while. At this time, when the United States is struggling painfully with the difficult dilemma of reconciling the necessity of keeping news of strategic value from potential enemies with the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and the necessity of having an informed and intelligent electorate, this book is most timely.

It is of vital importance that all responsible Government officials should continue to actively concern themselves with the problem of releasing legitimate news of the Government business to the greatest extent possible to the people by press and radio. As Cooper so dramatically points out, the surest way to destroy free government is by suppression and tainting of news sources.

While I do not agree with all of the conclusions and comments contained in this interesting and readable book, I do commend it wholeheartedly to readers interested in this vital subject.

What Inspiration Can Do for You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with the sermon by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale of the Marble Collegiate Church on the subject What Inspiration Can Do for You, in which he makes reference to Dr. Edward R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, and pastor of our President.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT INSPIRATION CAN DO FOR YOU

(Sermon by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale)

(Scripture: Acts 17: 28)

How is your supply of inspiration? Do you have lots of it? Are you filled with joy and eagerness and dynamism? Ore are you lethargic, apathetic, dull? Has your inspiration, your enthusiasm, run down?

Your answer may indicate how well you are, how dynamic, how vital. For inspiration is a healthy thing. A minister told me of a very interesting case. A doctor telephoned him that he was sending a patient to see him, a man who claimed he just didn't feel good, had no zest or enthusiasm. The doctor's tests and examination had shown no particular reason for the man's condition, so he said to the minister, "I haven't any medicine for him; surgery isn't indicated. But you and I both know that a man can get sick in his spirit and it will manifest itself in his body."

And he made to this minister a wise suggestion. "Give this patient a good shot of inspiration," he said. "Give him an injection of the spirit. Get his soul toned up."

The minister, over a period of time, did just that. As the man's spirits rose, so did his enthusiasm and sense of well-being. He went back and reported to the doctor that he felt fine.

You must remember that before we are flesh and blood we are spirit. There are thousands of people crawling through life on their hands and knees, as it were; half dead, half asleep. And they are of all ages. They haven't that dynamic desire for vital living that Almighty God put in them. What they may very well need is a big shot of inspiration. And how to get this is explained in a passage from the Scriptures: "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

We are created by God; you can never get away from that. And when you cut yourself off from God you cut yourself off from life, because only in Him do we have vitality. In Him we move, have energy, have dynamism. In Him we come to the full completion of our being. It is a great text. And one thing it teaches us is that we must keep in contact with the life force which is spiritual inspiration. That keeps us alive all our lives.

A few months ago I stood on Mars Hill in Athens where Paul made the speech including this passage. This great rock in the middle of Athens, just below the Acropolis,

was apparently a gathering place in those days for the philosophers and scholars. They were smart, sophisticated men, and they thought to have sport with this man who was preaching to them. But he was smarter than they were, and he was very much alive. From within him came an emanation of life that transmitted itself to them. Paul was not a healthy man, physically. We do not exactly know what that "thorn in the flesh" was of which he spoke. He had been beaten; he had gone through all manner of physical peril; he had been shipwrecked and imprisoned. Yet when he stood there that day, overlooking a marvelous panorama of sea and sky, there came from him a flow of life force which those men felt. And this speech of his on Mars Hill goes down in history as one of the greatest speeches ever delivered. Paul told those people that if you keep in contact with God through the mind and soul, you can overcome the deterioration of the body, you can keep very much alive.

Just a few months ago my father died. He was 85 years old. I never knew anyone who loved life more than he did or got more out of living. Shortly after his death I received a letter from an old friend of the family, a retired physician who now lives in California, but who once practiced in New York. His name is Dr. Clarence C. Lieb and, 20 years ago, I had taken my father to him because of his critical physical condition.

"I am saddened," the doctor wrote, "by the news of your father's death. He lived much longer than his physical condition of 20 years ago promised. I am confident that it was his fine mind and superb spirit which added greatly to his longevity. It was a privilege to have served him professionally. I bless his memory."

Charles Clifford Peale was not only a minister, he was also a physician. His intellectual curiosity and his mental vitality were tremendous. He read prodigiously and was able to master and explain books which other people, including his son, had great difficulty in comprehending. Fulton Oursler once told me that it had taken him four readings to write his condensation of duNuey's Human Destiny for Reader's Digest. Of course, Fulton did a masterful job as always. He said that my father helped him greatly, as he had mastered the difficult book so thoroughly that his explanations were amazingly clear.

My father didn't give up very easily, and he didn't permit his sons to give up. He always told us, "The Peales never quit." When I was writing my book, A Guide to Confident Living, I became discouraged with my work and literally threw it away. He rescued the manuscript and found a publisher for it.

He loved to speculate about the world and everything in it, the stars, and man, and God. He reveled in philosophy. He loved all of nature and, strangely enough, became one of the greatest amateur authorities on snakes. Even after arthritis crippled him so that he could hardly use his hands, and a series of strokes confined him to a wheelchair, he could always think, and think he did. He became interested in astronomy and studied the heavens from his chair. He was one of the finest conversationalists I ever knew and discussed the greatest questions with charming wit and inspiration. People loved to sit at his feet and listen. He put the touch of glory on everything he handled intellectually.

Finally, the day came when a new stroke took away his speech and he could no longer form words. The last thing he ever said to me, and I had to get right down with my ear to his mouth to hear it, was: "I am studying heaven. Scientists say, 'It's in the Milky Way * * *' Tonight look at the Wilky Way."

When he died the doctor came from the room and said, "The light of reason was in his eyes until I closed them." How my father would like that statement.

Charles Clifford Peale lifted himself above his physical difficulties by a mighty upthrust of courage and spirit and mental alertness and faith. And it was that which kept him alive 20 years past his time. Crippling limitations and pain could not dim the happiness that welled up in him in each of those 20 new years that followed his first desperate illness. He lived in the mind and spirit and in the soul, and so life never lost its fascination for him.

A distinguished English physician once said, "There is no tissue in the body that is not governed to one degree or another by spirit." That is why the body that contains an active and a curious mind and a spirit that is in touch with spirtual greatness is not—and cannot be—defeated by disease or illness.

You will pardon me, I am sure, for talking about my father in this way, but I had a deep filial affection for him, and have the profoundest admiration for that spirit in him which somehow kept in touch with the life force. He was an actual demonstration of the great words, "For in him we live, and move, and have our being."

That inspiration I am trying to drive into my own consciousness. We do not need to give way under the burdens of this world, if we keep alive in the mind. That is where we live and move and have our being—in our thoughts. Don't go around telling yourself how badly you feel, how hard are the troubles you see ahead, what difficulties. Pull yourself up in your mind. Don't let yourself down. Remember that in Him you live and move and have your being.

How do we do that, you ask? The answer is very simple. Feed yourself inspiration. We feed our bodies food, don't we? Our bodies want food. They need to have it three or more times a day. How, then, can we expect to have inspiration unless we feed our spirit which also requires sustenance?

How do you feed your spirit? One way is to go out into the country and commune with God in His natural beauty. One day last autumn I rode from Syracuse to Elmira, N. Y. through the Tully Valley. In Switzerland a few weeks earlier I had said to my wife, "This makes the scenery in the United States look pretty tame." Well, in a way it seemed to me that it did, for outside the High Sierras in California or the Rocky Mountains in Colorado we haven't such magnificence. But I asked the Lord to forgive me for that statement as I rode through the beautiful Tully Valley that glorious sun-kissed fall afternoon.

I used to live in the old David Harum country in New York State. There the green valleys stretch between verdant hills. In autumn the Lord bedecks them with marvelous coloring. This recent sight of that valley filled my heart with inspiration, for life was so radiant, so beautiful. I was feeding my soul on the beauty of God's world.

But, you say, you live in New York City or some other city and there aren't any such valleys to be found. Not as such, to be sure, but did you see last night? Before I went to bed I looked out across Central Park. The stars were brilliant. Great ships of the air were passing overhead, coming in and out from the airport, their lights gleaming like diamonds against the night sky. There were long streamers of light from the cars passing along the avenue and through the park. The silvery light of the moon bathed the city in glory. There is mystery and romance and beauty in a great city at night. There is beauty everywhere, if you look for it. Feed your soul upon beauty.

My honored friend, Dr. Edward R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, D. C., is the trusted pastor of the President of the United States. He tells how the President feeds his soul on inspiration. "He has a serene faith." Dr. Elson says, "and he loves to come to church, I looked down at him one Sunday during the singing of a hymn. He had his glasses on and was peering into the hymnal in that characteristic way of his. There was that wonderful serenity on his face and he was singing:

"'Cumbered with a load of care?
Blessed Saviour, still our refuge
Take it to the Lord in prayer.'

He, the most heavily burdened man in the world, was feeding his soul on inspiration."

In some ways this is a neurotic generation. And the reason is that so many need inspiration, but have not learned to have their spiritual life renewed. The inspiration that makes life normal, healthy, and strong comes from God. Every day of the world feed your soul on God and Christ.

"Inspiration" means to put spirit into. When the mind is full of courage, the soul of strength, then, no matter what difficulties we have to face, we have the spirit with which to do it. There is no getting away from the fact that life is difficult. It rains discouragement down upon us. We are given all sorts of blows. But, if you have been inspired, then really it doesn't make any difference what happens. With the Lord's help in keeping your spirit high you have sufficient strength to meet anything.

The people who have to overcome the most—yes, even those who seem to win the least—are the real victors in this life. It isn't what you accomplished, how high you rise, how much you get. It is your ability to stick, to see things through that counts. And that is what inspiration does for you. It in-spirits you.

The other day I heard the inspiring story of a boy named Ike Skelton. He had infantile paralysis when he was quite young, and it completely paralyzed his legs and his arms. After a while he regained the use of his legs, but not his arms. They flapped at his side, absolutely useless. In preparatory school, he knew he could not play football, or baseball, or tennis but, as he watched the boys running around the track, he decided that he could be a track man. He talked to the coach about it and, while he was kindly, he tried to discourage him. But Ike insisted, "Let me come down and try anyway."

The coach put his arm around him and said, "O. K., Ike. You come down and run all you want to." So Ike ran all through his freshman year and never made the team, of course, but he kept at it. He plodded around the track all his sophomore year and again didn't make the team. All during his junior year it was the same story. He kept plodding around the track, arms hanging loosely by his side, but he didn't make the team.

And finally came the spring of his senior year and the day of the big meet. Ike went to the coach and said, "Coach, let me run in the meet, won't you?"

The coach loved this boy and said to him, "All right, I will let you run." They took his arms and pinned them to his sides to keep them from flapping. "You can never run without your arms, Ike," people said.

They shot the gun and the runners were off, but the crowd had eyes for only one person, Ike Shelton. As the finish of the race came they all stood and a mighty cheer went up as Ike Shelton crossed the finish line. And the students surged down out of the grandstand, picked him up, put him on their shoulders, and carried him across the campus.

Did Ike come in first? No. Did he come in second? No. He came in last. But he came in, and they say that there was never such a finish in that school as was made by this boy who had inspiration, who was inspirited by a faith that couldn't be defeated. He inspired the whole school just as his life has inspired many since.

The secret of victorious living is in that text, "For in him we live, and move, and have our being." That is where we must go for inspiration, to the Lord. If we live in Him, the life force which flows from God

comes to us, and from us into the world. Inspiration can put power, meaning, and joy into life for you and for me. Inspiration channeled through us can bless people everywhere.

Prayer: Our Heavenly Father, we ask Thy blessing upon all of us. Grant that we may so completely open ourselves to Thee that we may feel a new surge of life in soul and mind and body. This we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Retirement for Professions and Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the excellent piece entitled "British Lead Way in Providing Tax Break for Self-Employed" in the U. S. News & World Report of May 11. We who have been urging our colleagues to approve the bills by Mr. JENKINS and myself along the lines of the British proposals are anxious that there be no further delays in granting our self-employed taxpayers a similar type of relief on saving for old age. Why should the self-employed in the United States be denied tax equity with the employed in the matter of pensions when Britain is in the process of granting such equity? The article calls attention to the similarity between the British proposal and the bills by Mr. JENKINS and myself. A perusal of the financial bill now before the House of Commons will indicate that the similarities are even greater.

The article follows:

BRITISH LEAD WAY IN PROVIDING TAX BREAK FOR SELF-EMPLOYED

LONDON.—Self-employed business and professional people in the United States will find in the new British budget a plan that they have been trying to get for years. It is a program to give self-employed individuals—and many others—a grant of tax freedom on some of the income they set aside for retirement.

American businessmen and professional workers—doctors, lawyers, others—have petitioned Congress for this privilege for a long time. A plan actually was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee last year, just before adjournment intervened, but no action has been taken so far this year.

Now, self-employed Britons are to get this privilege first. As a part of the British Government's new budget program, the plan is all but certain to receive quick approval.

TAX-FREE INCOME

The plan to help self-employed people save for old age is an extremely simple one.

Britons will be permitted to lay aside up to one-tenth of their annual income to build a personal fund for retirement. Income saved under the system will be tax-free. Money put aside in this way will be used to purchase special annuities from insurance firms, or can be put into retirement funds created by business or professional associations.

The American plan includes these same rules, but with a difference. For Britons, the annual limit on income to be made tax-exempt in this way will be $1,400. In the United States plan, the annual limit would be $5,000—with a lifetime maximum of $100,000.

Older self-employed persons in England, moreover, apparently are to be denied a special favor that has been talked about for Americans. Starting on a retirement plan late in life, Britain's older self-employed persons will have less time to salt away tax-free income under the annual limit. And no easing of the $1,400 maximum is planned for Britons.

In the United States, if the plan goes through, individuals already approaching retirement age will be permitted to put aside more than 10 percent of income, and more than $5,000 a year. A self-employed doctor who is age 65 when the plan begins, for example, will be allowed to save 20 percent of earnings, up to $10,000 a year, on a tax-exempt basis.

The United States program would enable self-employed people to buy substantial annuities with their tax-free income, assuming they were able to save. Annuities would be taxed when they paid off. But, in retirement, most individuals expect to be in lower tax brackets.

Effect of the United States plan, its supporters explain, would be to put the self-employed person on a par with millions of other employees. These are employees who already receive tax-free income in the form of contributions that their employers make each year to company pension funds. Self-employed people have enjoyed no comparable opportunity.

Both plans—British and American—include specific rules as to what a self-employed person can do with his tax-free income.

Whether the exempted income goes into personal annuity policies, or into group retirement funds, the money will be tied up until the individual retires, or until he dies or is disabled.

On this point, however, the British plan has one advantage. Britons probably will be able to get their payoff at age 60 if they like. Americans would have to wait till age 65.

The British plan will also grant the tax freedom to those British employees—in addition to self-employed persons—who have no company pension plan.

This means that, in Britain, some 10.5 to 11 million individuals—about 1.5 million of them self-employed—are in line for the new program.

An obvious result of the program is to be a tremendous spurt in the annuity business of British insurance firms. It's hard to say how many people will save how much tax-exempt income under the plan. But Britain's tax system offers a clue.

At $5,600 of taxable income, the British tax rate is 52.5 percent. Britain, thus, takes more than half of an income over this level. And the rates rise so steeply that Government takes 92.5 percent of all taxable income over the $56,000 level. Individuals keep 7.5 cents of each dollar they earn above that figure.

With such rates, a grant of tax freedom for saving offers a powerful incentive to lay aside income for old age. This incentive is to be heightened by a new plan to give insurance firms a tax exemption for income earned by invested annuity premiums.

The British decision to grant this new retirement program for the self-employed is bound to create renewed demand—and hope—for a similar plan in America. The self-employed in United States now are likely to be telling Congress: "If Britain's Government can do this so can ours."

Statement of Dr. Howard A. Rusk on the Proposed Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1956, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, of New York University, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at hearings on the proposed mutual security program. He addressed himself that day to the great possibilities inherent in the international field of rehabilitation of the disabled.

Many of you know Dr. Rusk as the associate editor of the New York Times and the author of the column on medical health which is regularly carried in that newspaper. I should like to point out, however, that in addition to those accomplishments Dr. Rusk is recognized as one of the world leaders in the field of rehabilitation—an area in which he has devoted most of his professional life.

As consultant in rehabilitation to the United Nations and as president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, he is in a unique position to observe the impact and effect of sound rehabilitation programs on world thinking. His address before the Senate committee emphasized his belief that—

Rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach the minds and the hearts of men.

With this statement I certainly concur and I hope that the doctor's recommendations fall on fertile soil for I am convinced that any effort this country makes toward the better health of the world will do more to help us attain eventual peace than any program that has yet been tried or suggested.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of Dr. Rusk has so impressed me that I thought it should be brought to the attention of every Member of this body. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

FORMAL STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1956

My name is Howard A. Rusk. I am a physician and chairman, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; associate editor, the New York Times; Consultant in Rehabilitation to the United Nations; and president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. I am appearing before you today as a private citizen whose primary interest is the rehabilitation of the disabled.

It is my belief that rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach

the minds and the hearts of men. It is natural for all of us to take improved agriculture, industry and utilities for granted but men often regard these developments as somewhat remote from their immediate problems. Rehabilitation, however, makes a personal and significant impact not only upon the disabled person himself and his family but on those with whom he comes in contact. This as well as all international activities in the field of health are one aspect of our foreign assistance program which meets all yardsticks of economic soundness, simple humanitarianism and political expediency.

In his report to the Congress on our mutual security program covering July-December 1955, John Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, wrote: "The people of the United States recognize the value—economic, social and moral—of health and the fact that health is a common need. We are also coming to recognize the vital relationship of health programs to any hopes we may have of helping to create conditions of economic progress, political stability and democratic social development in the many areas of the world outside the United States, where our future national security is deeply involved."

Mr. Hollister then cited estimates from competent authorities that until recently the economic loss from malaria alone in India was $224 million a year, from bilharziasis in Egypt $57 million a year, from malaria and tuberculosis in the Philippines $660 million a year. Also, that we in the United States pay a hidden 5 percent additional cost for our imports from malarious countries because of disease-affection production.

It is, therefore, surprising that our contributions to bilateral health programs were reduced from $43 million in the 1955 fiscal year to $33,767,000 in fiscal year 1956, and that of this amount less than $50,000 was spent on all types of rehabilitation services throughout the world.

From the economic aspects alone, it would seem logical that our investment in international health would be increased rather than decreased. Over and beyond the economic implications, there are great social, moral, and political values in our support of international health activities.

These values are well illustrated by international activities in the field of rehabilitation. In this country and in the other developed parts of the world we have seen a remarkable growth of interest in rehabilitation in the last decade. This interest has not been prompted by humanitarian motives alone. It has resulted from the growing incidence of physical disability resulting from prolongation of the life span, increased public assistance costs because of disability, and our need for manpower in our expanding economy.

But what lies behind the interest of Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, India, Burma, and Thailand in the provision of rehabilitation services for their handicapped? It is not the need for manpower, for these nations have far more manpower than they can profitably utilize in their present stage of industrial development. It is not to reduce public assistance costs, for few of these nations have any social schemes whereby the disabled become a responsibility of the state. It is not to reduce demands for medical, hospitalization, and social services, for the chronically ill and disabled in most of these nations are wards of their families rather than of the state.

The real reason is that many of these nations, particularly those of the Africa-Asia area, have, after years of colonization, recently achieved the long-sought dream of political independence. Now they are desperately looking for ways of proving to the world, and more importantly to themselves, that they have the political and social maturity to justify their political independence.

Long before the Government became concerned with international health projects, the Rockefeller Foundation, W. B. Kellogg Foundation, China Medical Board, and other private groups had years of experience in the administration of such programs. As a result, we have more know-how in the conduct of international health projects than in some other forms of technical assistance and are able to administer such projects more effectively.

Health projects are welcomed by the nations in which they are undertaken, for such projects are initiated only at the request of host countries. They are cooperative projects involving both joint planning and administration.

Host countries furnish a part, frequently the major part, of the funds for such projects. The $6 million contributed in 1955 to joint health projects in Latin America by the United States was expanded by $19 million.

Since our Federal technical cooperation health programs, known popularly as point 4 projects, began more than 13 years ago, they have cost our citizens less than a penny a month a person.

It is reported that last year Russia graduated 27,000 physicians from their medical schools and 20,000 the previous year. At the present time we are graduating slightly more than 7,000 in the United States per year. It is granted that the level of education of these physicians is far below that of our physicians, but even so the health services they are providing to the country are so superior to those ever before available to the people, to them it is considered a miracle.

It has also been reported that at the present time there are more doctors than can be readily absorbed in the health services of Russia and the physicians are being used for the kind of job that we would ordinarly assign to nurses and technicians. If the production continues and the excess increase, it is rather obvious what the physicians will do. They will carry the skills they have learned along with the concepts of communism to the backward parts of the world. We must meet this challenge, and we can for our physicians are better trained. By using total professional personnel, therapists, sanitary engineers, public health administrators and educators, we can do a better job. But time is running out.

Here is one example of what could be done. The Veterans' Administration has, since 1946, conducted an extensive artificial-limb research program which is carried out by nonprofit contracts with universities. The Army and Navy cooperate by supporting prosthetic research laboratories within their medical services. Work in the universities and armed services has been coordinated by the Prosthetics Research Board (formerly the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs) of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council under a contract between the Veterans' Administration and the Academy.

The need for a research program in artificial limbs became apparent early in 1945 when, at the request of the Surgeon General of the Army, the National Research Council brought together a group of scientists, engineers, surgeons and prosthetists for the purpose of establishing standards for procurement of prostheses. At this meeting it was soon learned that the development of artificial limbs had proceeded through the years without the benefit of a scientific approach, whereupon it was recommended that the Government support a research program in this field.

As the result of this program our own disabled veterans have prosthetic devices far superior to those found anywhere else in the world.

Just as we are interested in sharing the technical advances in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the rest of the world, we could make a significant contribution to the effective understanding of American ideals of democracy and the value we place on human worth and dignity, if through an appropriation of $1 million or $2 million a year we could share our advances in artificial limbs with the world. Through demonstration centers, consultations, mobile clinics, and the training of foreign personnel in the United States, a magificent program could be established. With the sum of $1 million a year for 2 years both the administrative and professional overhead cost of such a project could be met; highly qualified American consultants could visit all parts of the world and survey what is available and what is needed; 4 completely equipped mobile prosthetic shops, each staffed by a qualified American prosthetic technician and physical therapist, could be sent to southeast Asia, the Near East, north Africa, and South America to spend 4 to 8 weeks in a given community rendering direct patient services in fitting prosthetics and training wearers in their use; permanent demonstration prosthetic shops and training centers could be established in key parts of the world; and the components to provide modern artificial limbs could be made available to over 40,000 amputees; over 100 trainees could be brought to the United States for training in prosthetics; and all of the available technical literature and visual aids in prosthetics here in the United States could be translated and published in various languages for international distribution.

These prosthetic trainees would then join the 400 health workers receiving advanced trained by the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. They and hundreds of others trained under the auspices of private foundations, their own governments and their own resources, are permanent ambassadors of our democratic ideals. Such persons make particularly effective proponents for democracy because as professional people they work intimately with their handicapped patients and have their confidence and trust.

Somewhere within the spectrum ranging from direct relief to long-range economic projects there is a need for significant, tangible, short-range projects that can be seen and easily understood. The Russians produced such a project when they paved the main street of Kabul in Afghanistan. Our foreign-aid projects there have been of economic importance, but their impact on the daily lives of the people will not be felt for many years. In contrast, several times each day the residents of Kabul have reason to be grateful to Russia.

This is the kind of an imaginative, constructive project which can be easily seen and understood. There are many hundreds and thousands of disabled persons throughout the world, each of whom could also become a living, dynamic example of American democracy. To illustrate their potential contributions I should like to tell you the story of a little Bolivian boy, age 10. He was born without arms and legs, with four little, sensitive fingers coming out of each shoulder, and 2 normal feet coming from the hip joint, but with no bony connection. When he was a year old he was abandoned by his father who then deserted the family, and has not been heard of since. The boy spent the next 8 years of his life in an American mission in La Paz, where he had love and kindness, but could not walk. To get from one place to another he rolled like a little ball. He was seen there by a young physician from the United States, who called me and said he had met this little boy, who was exceedingly bright, and who, if he had a chance, he felt, could be a great force in the world. Pictures and case reports were sent, and by coincidence seen by the Secretary of one of our distinguished citizens. She made possible his trip to the United States.

Two weeks before he arrived I had the Vice President of Bolivia and the Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations for luncheon. They knew all about Juanito and were excited about his coming. In the middle of the meal I said to them, "You know, if we bring Juan here, it is going to cost you a very large fee."

In consternation, they said, "How much?" I said, "The fee is this. First, that when he returns, you must promise him the best education your country affords, and second, if we can demonstrate in the most severely disabled child you will ever see what can be done, you will establish a national rehabilitation program in Bolivia."

Without hesitation, the Vice President said, "You take the boy; we pay the fee."

When he arrived, he spoke no English. Within a month, he had a vocabulary of more than 300 words. Special prostheses were designed and he now is walking. He has "grown" more than twice his height. He is doing well in school and one day soon will be ready to go back and take his place in his own country.

Several months after he was in the United States, the story was published in a national magazine. A few weeks later, a letter came to the editors which read as follows:

"Congratulations on a brilliant piece of reporting. Am referring to your (February 21) on Juanito Yepez, the congenital quadruple amputee from Bolivia. * * * For those of us who are in and out of Central and South America we found your article on Juanito gained us more friends (and respect) than all the millions our Government is pouring into these countries. We noted no sudden pro-United States of America feeling in Brazil as a result of the $75 million donation (given Brazil by the United States), but we were pleasantly surprised with the many compliments for what the United States of America is doing for Juanito. I do not know what your circulation is in Latin America but can tell you the peons in the backwoods knew all about Juanito within 24 hours after the issue was on the streets."

"E. E. BUTLER,
"Master, S/T Adrias.
"TAMPICO, MEXICO."

What we need in the United States are friends like Juanito Yepez all over the world, with the recognition that in the United States we believe in the dignity of the individual and because of that belief want to share the things that we have learned in our country. We are not doing this to make friends—we are doing this to give service. If the service and the spirit are there, then we can't help but have their friendship.

Into the Daylight of New Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I should like to include an article by John Herling from the Washington Daily News for Tuesday, May 29, 1956, entitled, "Into the Daylight of New Living." This article deals with the dedication of 10 memorial hospitals in the mining areas of West Virginia, Virginia and Kentucky, which have been built and financed and will be operated by the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund for the benefit of miners and their families, and also of others in the community. These hospitals, along with so many other benefits, are the product of the inspired leadership of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America for the past 37 years. At the time of dedication of these splendid hospitals, this coming weekend, I should like to add my word of praise and good wishes for the great organization that they represent. The article is as follows:

NEW LEWIS EFFORT FOR MINERS: MEMORIAL HOSPITALS—INTO THE DAYLIGHT OF NEW LIVING

(By John Herling)

This is a Decoration Day story with a slight difference.

Once upon a time, the American coal miner thought he was the loneliest, hungriest, and most exploited man alive. He would look at his wornout, hard-worked wife, his constantly growing family, his wretched shack of a house, and he would think dark thoughts. He believed himself so forgotten that nobody cared whether he was dead or alive.

Every once in awhile, the miner would have to prove he was actually alive. He would stand on his hind legs and yell for dear life. Then stories would come storming out, telling of uproar and strikes in places like Harlan, Ky., and Williamson, and Beckley, W. Va., and scores of other places, like Cabin Creek, Man, and Hazard—all with names which were allegories of his plight.

The miners were sure enough raisin' hell. Sometimes their demands were not too clear or even misrepresented. The miners didn't much care. There were so many things to protest against, they didn't bother which particular thing it happened to be.

DISASTERS

Sometimes, indeed, the rest of America would be swept by a great sense of guilt and pity: Mine disasters.

The picture of grief became almost a fixture of the American social scene; this recurring tragedy piled on the endless misery of the miners' way of life. But men or miners could not live on the cake of compassion. They needed more than a relief basket or a brisk flurry of Red Cross activity.

So, on and off for 66 years now, the United Mine Workers have been talking up for the coal miners. Unless you can understand this background of the miners union, you can't grasp why the miners union was a marching, often growling crusade, sometimes singing, always fighting, maneuvering, and punching. You have to remember this to grasp the meaning of the power and the influence of a man like John L. Lewis.

STANDARDS

President of the miners for the past 37 years, John L. Lewis has yearly, year-in, year-out, directed massive will and supple intelligence to one chief end: the raising of the living and working standards of the coal miners and their families. He has led them out of the shadow of isolation into daylight of community living.

Recently, Dave Dubinsky, president of the Ladies Garment Workers Union, who is quick to point to the geologic faults in the Lewis personality, told me he considers Mr. Lewis the greatest and most creative labor leader of the past quarter century, not merely the most colorful.

Considering Mr. Dubinsky's own major achievements, this was a generous estimate of another leader. But this coming week end, Mr. Dubinsky could add something more spectacular to the Lewis list.

In honor of unnumbered miners who suffered and died before this era, many thousands of coal miners and their families are gathering at Beckley, W. Va., to dedicate officially a series of 10 "memorial hospitals," built, financed, and staffed through the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund.

There will be hospitals in Harlan, in Williamson, in Beckley, in Pikeville and McDowell, in Middleboro, Man, Hazard, Whitesburg, and Wise—coal towns stretching over three States—Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky, a distance of 300 miles, connected by winding mountain roads, once separated from the world outside.

These 10 hospitals are being financed out of the 40 cents every coal operator has to pay for ever ton mined in a unionized mine. Ten years ago, they paid a nickel. Mr. Lewis raised it to 40 cents.

In an area once witheringly described as a "hospital wasteland," these 10 hospitals will be the most complete, scientific establishments in the medical field. Although the first responsibility will be toward the 400,000 miners and families in that area, the hospital will become community centers, available even to those whose families never dug coal.

Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there is growing up today in the South a strong resentment to the so-called civil rights proposals which are being pressured upon the Congress during this time. Few issues in our history have ever brought forth as much debate, confusion, and discord as have been created by the Supreme Court decision on school segregation and the civil rights bills.

Typical of this resentment is a letter prepared for the Richmond Times Dispatch by Mr. Walter F. Ford, attorney at law at Emporia, Va., which I would like to include herein with my remarks.

I want to commend Mr. Ford for setting forth in brief and explicit terms the whole issue involved in the civil rights proposals as viewed by our people. I commend this for the reading of the Members of this body.

Mr. Ford's letter follows:

EMPORIA, VA., *May 22, 1956.*
EDITOR RICHMOND TIMES DISPATCH.

SIR: The Republican administration, at the instance of the NAACP has introduced and is now attempting to get a so-called civil rights bill through Congress.

This nefarious legislation, prompted and approved by the President of the United States, is just another attempt to put the South under carpetbagger rule, and fill our States with Federal snoopers, turn our courts into tribunals of inquisition, harrass, intimidate, and humiliate the people of the Southern States, and disrupt and destroy southern traditions and take from the States their constitutional rights to regulate their own affairs.

The motivation behind this proposed legislation, and its primary purpose is the same that prompted the scalawags and carpetbaggers to disfranchise southern people and divide the South into military districts, after the Civil War, in order to put over the 14th amendment to the United States Constitu-

tion, which had been rejected by Southern States.

The NAACP has gone punch drunk since they figure they have backing of the Supreme Court by its unconstitutional decisions, and the present Republican administration. My prediction is that they are riding to a fall.

My advice to our southern Senators and Representatives in Congress is to fight this ill conceived civil rights bill, so-called, to the last ditch, and if necessary tie up all legislation indefinitely until this attempt by the Republican Party and its allies is killed.

We, of the South do not want, nor do we need a Federal Gestapo to manage our local affairs. The Federal Government has already infringed upon States rights with the assistance of a New Deal packed Supreme Court, and if this policy is continued there will be no States rights, we will have a dictator, and a centralized government.

This is supposed to be a government by the people, and for the people, not for office holders, bureaucrats, and dictators, and it is time the people of these United States woke up and demand their constitutional rights.

The southern people have always managed their own affairs, including the race question, and there would have been no race question in the South but for interference by outside agitators. The southern people and the Negro have always understood each other, and worked together for the benefit of both races, but there are some people in the world who are never satisfied unless they are disparaging someone else or undertaking to meddle in affairs that do not concern them.

The Republican Party and the northern Democratic Party appear to be of the same stripe in their aims and purposes in relation to the South, and unless a candidate sympathetic to southern ideals and traditions is nominated, I see no alternative but the formation of a third party by the southern people and others opposed to unconstitutional encroachments upon their rights and traditions.

Yours very truly,

WALTER F. FORD.

Mutual Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as we are about to consider the Mutual Security Act for this year, I think the views of Mr. George Sokolsky upon this important question are worthy of note. Accordingly, I include, herewith, a recent column of his:

To the taxpayer, foreign aid is his contribution to national defense year after year, limiting his prospects of establishing a family reservoir of savings. Therefore, foreign aid has to justify itself by what it accomplishes in terms of the national defense. Its charitable phases have not been stressed by those who favor the program.

There are those who argue that foreign aid has some higher and nobler motive such as the redistribution of wealth from the richest Nation on earth, meaning the United States, to the weak and backward countries that have accomplished little with whatever advantages they may have. This noble cause is highly commendable as long as we have the money but for nearly a decade now, under such titles as the Marshall plan, mutual security, economic development, point IV, defense support, etc., etc., we have been spending tremendous sums of money and the question arises, what have we got for it?

By the end of the fiscal year 1956, the economic and military aid, contributed by the American taxpayer, will amount to approximately $55,800,000,000, according to the investigations of the Hoover Commission. Thirty-four agencies of the Government are directly or indirectly engaged in or related to foreign aid.

This goes far beyond the conception of most Americans, few of whom realize that the amount is so gigantic. The Hoover Commission found that 115,250 persons were employed in the distribution of this money of whom 84,569 were not Americans. The aid goes to 55 countries and involves about 2,000 projects.

EVEN MORE PROPOSED

Although there is considerable opposition to the continuance of aid of this enormous scale, the administration actually proposes increases which they justify as competition with Soviet Russia. Heretofore, Soviet Russia only aided its own satellite countries, but since Khrushchev has taken over, Soviet Russia is engaged on a salesmanship of aid, seeking to outdo the United States.

While Soviet Russia gives the impression that it engages in these financial enterprises with no strings attached, it actually has worked out an unusually ingenious method of utilizing experts as propagandists and while appearing to apply a doctrine of noninterference in the domestic affairs of a country, it uses the native Communist Party for exactly the purpose of taking control of a country's affairs.

The Hoover Commission strongly advises against "making loans to countries to support their defense, which they cannot repay."

The Hoover Commission also recommended that when grants or loans are made "an inspection service to insure complete adherence to the policies, objectives, and programs for each country" should be established. One of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission is bound to upset many of our representatives abroad who play at being bigshots. The recommendation is:

"That the overseas nonmilitary personnel of United States agencies be subject to the line authority and direction of the United States Chief of Diplomatic Mission in each country."

HOOVER CLAMPS LISTED

Certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission are of tremendous importance, as, for instance:

"That as all the countries in the original North Atlantic Treaty Organization have the highest degree of technical proficiency, the technical assistance by American personnel in these countries should cease.

"That as the original North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries are well able to send technical staffs to the United States at their own expense, the United States should cease to pay for this service.

"That no economic aid should be granted for projects or undertakings where private investment capital is available for such projects.

"That, as recommended in our Surplus Property Report, we emphase the desirability of using excess and surplus property in connection with our foreign assistance programs."

It is interesting to note that all but one member of the Task Force on Overseas Economic Operations of the Hoover Commission had had some direct relationship to this problem and therefore any suggestion that their studies were theoretical and their recommendations impractical does not bear the test of study and investigation.

Private Versus Public Utilities—An Essay by Janice Ehegartner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for several years to attend the annual party sponsored by the Lake Shore Republican Club in my district. Each year they have offered three prizes to students in the North Syracuse High School for the best essay written by them on current issues. This year I was honored by being permitted to award the prizes and listen to the reading of the papers. The first prize winner was Janice Ehegartner. Her subject was Private Versus Public Utilities. I was much impressed with this student's knowledge of the subject and therefore wish to include her essay as part of my remarks:

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC UTILITIES

(By Janice Ehegartner)

Fear and mistrust of Communist principles have made free people all over the United States suspicious of socialistic advances in our own country and in the entire world.

Often it is not easy to recognize such undesirable influences in a democracy such as ours. And, for this very reason, citizens of our Nation are unable to detect the creeping socialism present in the practice of Government ownership of various power utilities throughout the country.

Public versus private power has been a main subject of debate in Congress for many years. It is a problem which is vital to the future well-being of the American people. It affects every community in the United States, for people all over the Nation enjoy widespread, economical electric service.

A recent survey in 1936 showed that 95 percent of the total power supply in the country was maintained by private utilities. Therefore, it is obvious that nationwide furnishing of electric power was overwhelmingly due to private enterprise. Today, a much smaller percentage of power comes directly from privately operated companies. The cause of this somewhat abrupt change is traceable to Government management of many powerplants in the United States.

Forty years ago agitation for Government ownership was centered on the railroads. Meanwhile, power utilities were raised to a high degree of efficiency, but the railroads were beset with many perplexing problems. Therefore, advocates of public ownership were in favor of having the Government take over some industry already raised to a high degree of efficiency by private management, and claim that efficiency a result of Government operation. This, of course, led to the Government's establishment of various powerplants throughout the United States.

The Dixon-Yates controversy in 1955 revealed old arguments concerning public and private power. The center of these arguments was the TVA, the oldest of the Government's large power development projects. In 1933 the TVA was planned to develop industry, agriculture, and navigation and to prevent floods. The power from these operations was sold to the people in the Tennessee Valley at low rates. However, this organization was attacked by leading Republicans

and Democrats as a form of socialism. They maintained that private enterprise was successful in such power developments and would be capable of handling the Tennessee Valley problem.

Dixon-Yates proposed taking over power operations in the Tennessee Valley at the discretion of the Atomic Energy Commission. However, many Congressmen and officials of the Government opposed this project. They claimed that taxes would be increased and the destruction of TVA would be threatened. Mr. Dixon replied that there naturally would be a small increase in taxes. Private utilities have to pay taxes but public utilities such at TVA do not.

How can this be justice? Why should our great Nation be socialized by the evils of Government ownership and operation of electric utilities? The utilities business has been singled out for such an attack because it is both sound and prosperous, and because it would be a great step toward the socialization of our industries. It is true that the Government can afford power at low rates, but there is no tax on their operations. This is not fair to the American people's future.

The Federal Government has been successful in its power projects. However, there are many defects in these operations. The Columbia River power development is so far away from a large market for power that it is a burden to the taxpayer. Nevertheless, these Government establishments have supplied economical power to the people in their respective surrounding areas. They are situated all over the United States, ready to supply our military needs when the time comes for action.

Will we be in the tide of socialism—the basis of Communist rule—when the call is sounded? We must stop this creeping socialism before it attacks our entire country. It is doubtful that President Eisenhower's concept of a public-private, local-Federal partnership will prosper. We must, therefore, preserve our democracy by keeping strong hold of the democratic principles under which our great Nation was founded.

Consequently, it is extremely necessary to prevent the growth of Government ownership of public utilities and encourage the rise of private enterprise to save our great democracy.

Recognition of Organizations of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which would amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This is a companion bill to the one introduced by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, and would extend to any national employee organization representing postal or other Federal employees, the right to present in behalf of such members any grievances to the department or agency concerned.

In my opinion, passage of the union recognition bill would do much to boost the morale of our Government workers, and, in addition, would permit them to discuss, through their representatives, the policies affecting their working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force.

Employees of the Federal Government as well as those in private industry are entitled to job protection, and I believe that this will be a step in the right direction.

I urge the members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which the legislation has been referred, to give it prompt and serious consideration at this time, with a view toward reporting it out in the near future.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 5, sec. 652), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The right of officers or representatives of national employee organizations or local officers of such national organizations representing employees of a department or agency or subdivision of such department or agency, to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized.

"(2) (A) Within 6 months after the effective date of this act, the head of each department and agency shall, after giving officers or representatives of employee organizations having members in such department or agency an opportunity to present their views, promulgate regulations specifying that administrative officers shall at the request of officers or representatives of the employees' organizations confer, either in person or through duly designated representatives, with such officers or representatives on matters of policy affecting working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force. Such regulations shall recognize the right of such officers or representatives to carry on any lawful activity, without intimidation, coercion, interference, or reprisal.

"(B) Disputes resulting from disagreement between employee organizations and departments or agencies on the policies enumerated in subsection (e) (2) (A) shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of one representative of the department or agency, one representative of the employee organization, and one representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor who shall serve as chairman. The findings of the board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) Charges involving a violation of this subsection shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of three members, one to be selected by the organization making the charge, one to be selected by the head of the department or agency involved, and the third, who shall act as chairman, to be designated by the Civil Service Commission. The findings of this board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive as to the fact of violation and the head of the department or agency involved shall take such action as may be necessary to cause the suspension, demotion, or removal of any administrative official found by the board of arbitration to have violated this subsection.

"(4) This subsection shall not apply to the Central Intelligence Agency or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Twelve Guides for Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we continue our work in the home stretch of the very busy and fruitful 84th Congress, a remarkably well done set of guides for businessmen who are actively interested in legislation has come to my attention.

This list of guides was compiled by the Beaumont, Tex., Chamber of Commerce and is being widely distributed by the chamber's governmental affairs committee.

A great deal of our time and effort here is devoted to securing more efficiency in government; and every successful businessman is vitally concerned with the efficiency of his own business as well as the Government. This splendid set of guides, I believe, would help both the businessmen and Members of Congress to do a better job in understanding mutual problems. In following these general principles, the businessman would communicate more effectively with his Congressman, and in turn, the Congressman would have a better opportunity to know and work with the businessmen of his district.

I feel sure every Member of the House will be interested in looking over Twelve Guides for Businessmen and I would ask consent of the Members that it be included in today's RECORD:

TWELVE GUIDES FOR BUSINESSMEN

Don't look down on government and politics. They have their faults but so has business. A disdainful attitude is an expensive luxury these days.

Be understanding. Put yourself in a legislator's place. Try to understand his problems, his outlook, and his aims. Then you are more likely to persuade him to do the same in understanding business.

Be friendly. Don't contact your legislator only when you want his vote. Invite him to visit your place of business. Invite him to be a guest at your business organization functions. Take pains to keep in touch with him throughout the year.

Be reasonable. Recognize that there are legitimate differences of opinion. Never indulge in threats nor recriminations. These are confessions of your own weakness.

Be thoughtful. Commend the right things which your legislator does. That's the way you'd like to be treated.

Don't be a busybody. Legislators don't like to be pestered or scolded or preached to. Neither do you.

Be cooperative. If your legislator makes a reasonable request, try to comply with it. Don't back away for fear that it's a deal or that you're getting into politics.

Be realistic. Remember that most controversial legislation is the result of compromise. It always has been so and it always will be so in a democracy. Don't ex-

pect that everything will go your way, and don't be too critical when it doesn't.

Present accurate facts and good arguments. The mere fact that you want or do not want a piece of legislation to go through isn't enough. If an issue goes against you, don't rush to blame the legislature for failing to do what you wanted. The failure may be yours. Make certain first that you did a good job in presenting your case.

Give credit where it is due. If an issue goes the way you wanted, remember that legislators always deserve first credit, for their votes decided the issue. And remember also that on all the big issues, many organizations and individuals participated on your side. Do your part to make certain that credit is shared by all of them.

Learn to evaluate the issues. The introduction of a legislative bill doesn't mean that it will become law. Whether you're for it or against it, don't get excited about it until you learn the who, what, and why of it. And don't use a cannon to kill a fly. An absurd bill generally kills itself. It's not wise to attract too much attention to it.

Support your legislator actively, if he's running for reelection and if you believe he deserves it. Don't become aloof at the time when he needs help the most.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the death of BILL GRANAHAN this House has lost a Member, who for 10 years has distinguished himself as an able, conscientious legislator, who discharged his duties scrupulously and who worked tirelessly for the best interests of his country and the constituency that sent him to us.

It was my privilege to have known BILL GRANAHAN for more than 20 years. For more than 10 years I served with him here in the Congress. I knew him socially. I met him in the furore of political campaigns. I worked with him on this floor, in committees and in conferences and at all times and in all places he impressed me, as he did all the Members of this body to whom I have spoken, as a man of character, determination and ability. He will, indeed, be missed by all of us.

BILL GRANAHAN was a pleasant, affable man and a very wise and discerning student of his fellowman. In the many, many years that I have known him I doubt that he ever made an enemy. His gentle manner will linger with his friends always and yet he could fight for the right with the best of them. BILL GRANAHAN just got along with everybody and stirred up no animosities. He was friendliness personified, a quiet, engaging gentleman. I deeply regret the loss of so fine a friend. The Nation, the Members on both sides of the aisle and particularly the West Philadelphia area are poorer for his passing. To his devoted wife, Katherine, and to the other members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts, at Dedication of Billerica, Mass., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by myself at the dedication of the new high school at Billerica, Mass., on May 30, 1956:

Mr. Hines, Commander Walker, Mr. O'Brien, veterans and other distinguished guests, students of the Billerica High School, and other schools, ladies and gentlemen:

It is always a very great pleasure for me to come to Billerica and visit with all of you who have been such wonderfully fine and loyal friends over so many years. This is indeed a great occasion both for this community and for me. It is extremely thrilling for me to contemplate the full meaning, if that is possible, of the event we are celebrating here this afternoon. To be invited to address you on this significant and unusual occasion is for me a great honor—an honor which I shall always remember.

In the complex social and economic structure of our country there is no unit of that structure more important and more basic than the family unit. Upon the development and strength of the family unit depends the strength and future of America. As fathers and mothers you are concerned and anxious to have your children receive the very best preparation, the best possible education for the responsibilities they must eventually assume and the leadership they must provide. Your children are concerned too and are anxious to obtain the very best preparation for that future time when they must be the leaders and shoulder the responsibilities of not only this community but also those controlling our Nation's destiny.

Just as it has been in the past, it is more a fact today that superior leadership is very scarce. As our country continues to grow and develop, as life and conditions continue to change, the need becomes greater and greater for persons well trained in their respective professions and possessing excellent judgment, able to make the right decisions and able to initiate and originate new methods and new solutions, for the complex problems of our civilization. Basic and fundamental education is now, more than ever before, a necessity. It is a requirement if our country is to maintain its top position in world affairs.

Education may be divided into three necessary parts. There must be the ability and the will to learn among the youth and our Nation's young men and women. There must be adequate numbers of excellently trained teachers in a profession made attractive in principle as well as a way of life. There must be adequate physical facilities, such as buildings, libraries, and laboratories, such as this fine new high-school building we are here to dedicate this afternoon. America posseses all of these, but not in the right proportions or in adequate numbers.

There are increasing numbers of students with the ability and will to learn. There are not enough teachers, largely because the present income of teachers is not sufficient to guarantee a comfortable way of life in comparison with other professions. This fault must be corrected. There is still much to be done in the construction of adequate physical facilities. This new Billerica High School is an example of the improvement that is taking place all over the country. As time goes on the education of the children of America will continue to improve, and as a result our country will be a greater and finer nation.

Only a few days ago with mixed emotions we read of the successful explosion of a hydrogen bomb dropped from an airplane with a devastating force of 20 megatons. We were astounded, shocked, proud, and, without question, sad. These were our mixed emotions. Exemplified by this explosion and many other great achievements is the tremendous march of the knowledge of science in our country today. In his perseverance, constantly raising the curtain of the unknown, man has reached the frightening crossroads where if he makes the wrong decision he will destroy himself, for within his hands there is this power.

In the vast area of physical and scientific knowledge there are many secrets. As mankind discovers these secrets and unlocks the forces they hold, man can either use these forces for benefit or destruction. To unlock the doors to fission and fusion, the intelligence of man has given to civilization a very great power. If this power is used to make for mankind a greater and more beneficial type of civilization, then these discoveries are indeed fine and good. If, on the other hand, these forces which are now completely in the control of the intelligence of mankind are used for destruction, then indeed they are wrong and bad.

If in his knowledge and wisdom and perseverance mankind has discovered forces which, uncontrolled, will force those of you here and in every community throughout America to carve out caves of safety in the sides of the great rocks or construct shelters deep in the ground, just as mankind lived in the days of his dawn on this earth, can it then be said that with all his knowledge man has indeed progressed? At the crossroads which I mentioned stand all of us, you and I. As we choose our path we must be right. The path we choose for our Nation to take must be right. The decisions we must make now which concern all of us must be right. The alternative to right is now completely beyond all comprehension.

If we concentrate upon these tremendously important decisions which face us an individuals and as a nation, now and in the future, we can so easily comprehend the significance of this unusual event we are celebrating this afternoon. On this Memorial Day afternoon, we are engaged in the dedication of a magnificent new building devoted entirely to education, one of the great essentials in our American way of life. But this education so important to mankind, must be channeled into benefits and not be the cause or the way of the annihilation of civilization.

Many of you here this afternoon are parents of young men and women who will experience all there is in this great new education institution. Many of you here are parents of children who will be absorbing much of the knowledge that is to be offered here in the years to come. And here today also are present, students who will experience the next 4 years in this magnificent new structure devoted to basic knowledge. Also here are children, tomorrow's young men and women, who will also have the wonderful privilege and honor of attending this wonderful new high school. All of you parents and students, both present and those of the future, have cause to be proud and cause to be happy that this great institution is actually in reality and waiting for you in this fine community of Billerica. You are proud and glad that this new institution is going to touch very basically all of your

lives and that you are going to be a part of it forever.

In an inspection of this new high school here in Billerica, it is only natural for many of us to look back over the years, at a comparison of this great modern institution with all its conveniences and physical equipment, to the high school of our day and its facilities. Compare, if you will, the buildings and equipment you used in your respective communities in your high-school days, as well as those which were available to your parents and grandparents, with this new modern high school. In any such comparison we know progress has in fact taken place, as it has taken place in every field of human endeavor. It would be, indeed, thrilling for me, and I know it would be thrilling for all of you parents here this afternoon, if we could somehow turn back the years and go back to high school in this wonderful new modern high-school building. Just as this would make our hearts skip a little faster, I am sure this wonderful new high school is a source of pride and an anticipated, exciting experience for you children, those students who will in fact have the great advantages in this modern new Billerica High School in the years to come.

This is an age of science. It is often referred to as the atomic age. It is an age when man's competition against man, requires knowledge and judgment to survive. Important as science is, important as is the whole field of knowledge, there are other values which are just as important, and are a significant part of our successful living and the future of our country. These values relate to a strong and well developed body, to a strong and well trained mind, to a great spirit that fears only God. These values relate to such qualities of life as fine character, the intellectual honesty and the courage to know the right and to stand and die for the right. These values relate to conscience, to understanding, to kindness, to thoughtfulness, to unselfishness and to moral integrity. These values all are involved in the necessity of community cooperation, in the work of the Nation, and in the peace of the world. Without these values man will use the great power he now possesses to destroy his own civilization. It is upon these values that man must depend, if his world and his civilization are to be saved through the control of these gigantic forces he holds within his power.

Here in this beautiful new Billerica High School all of these values which I have mentioned will be developed in the young men and women who have the honor and the glory of attending this new modern institution. Science, literature, languages, history, and all of the arts represent fields of basic knowledge. All are necessary and all have their use in the educational process. Important as learning is, however, it is more important to know how to use one's knowledge properly for the benefit of improving life and living during one's time and privilege upon this earth. Here in this new Billerica High School all of you parents will see your children enter as children and graduate 4 years later as well trained, well balanced young men and women. In addition to basic knowledge gained, they will possess strong bodies, strong minds, a strong faith and a God-fearing spirit. They will be prepared and ready to take their next step, whatever it may be, in the direction of future leadership.

Just as we compare this new Billerica High School with the physical facilities of years gone by, it is also possible to compare the quality and methods of instruction and teaching, for in this noble profession there also have been great strides of progress. In the days years ago, one teacher gave instruction in all of the subjects in the curriculum, and in some cases instructed all of the classes. There was one teacher for the entire high school. Today our teachers are specialized and only teach the subjects in which they are specialists. They are fine scholars in their respective subjects and are expert in their knowledge and presentation of all the elements involved in their particular subjects of instruction. As a result of this specialization, teachers in our high schools today, as well as in our colleges and universities, only instruct in 1 or 2 subjects but in doing so teach hundreds of students.

A teacher in the modern high school is a part of a very important and a very great profession. Just as our Government has done much, and is doing more and more to improve the physical facilities of high schools, through the erection of fine new modern buildings, such as this new Billerica High School, so also must the Government aid in every way possible, in the improvement and the making more attractive, the noble profession of high school teaching. This is progress which cannot be overlooked. It is progress that must be accomplished in the near future. I am confident it will be done.

As we look across the valleys to the far off horizon and focus our attention on the possibilities of the future we know in fact that, knowledge is power. Among the young men and women who will have the privilege and opportunity of attending this fine new Billerica High School, and among the young men and women in communities like Billerica all over the Nation, America must depend upon its leadership of the future. Among the students of future years, who will graduate from here, there may be a great scientist, there may be a great teacher, there may be an inspired leader of the church, there may be a great actor, there may be a great doctor or lawyer, or a great musician. Among these students there might be a future Member of Congress, a future United States Senator, yes, there might be a future President of the United States. It is from among these students our leaders in all walks of life must come. The teaching they receive here, the inspiration and values they develop here, the fundamentals they acquire here, all will have a bearing upon the type and quality of the leadership they bring to our country in the life of tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, like you I love my country, the great principles of its foundation, the great accomplishments it has achieved over the years for the benefit of mankind everywhere, its enormous sacrifices and contributions to maintain and establish freedom, its freedom of religion and the right of everyone to worship God in their own way and all of the rights and privileges we enjoy as Americans.

I am proud of our power and strength as a Nation. I am proud we possess the power of the hydrogen bomb. But over and above this pride, I am proud that our America will never use this power aggressively, to injure or cripple mankind anywhere. I am proud of the fact our leadership today possesses the balance and judgment necessary to make the right decisions at the crossroads.

Many despair of the future. Many are fearful man is on the threshold of his own destruction. I do not possess this fear. On the contrary, I possess the confidence the march of scientific discovery and knowledge in America will always be shaped and molded into benefits for mankind. This confidence I possess is inspired by the countless numbers of the young men and women of America I have talked with, observed, and appraised, like those here in Billerica, who will have the privilege and honor of attending this magnificent new high school. I have this confidence because I know that within their ranks is endless material for greater, wiser, and more unselfish leadership than any we have experienced and known thus far.

The young men and women who are attending our high schools today, know full well the great responsibilities they must shoulder in the near future. They are preparing themselves. They are getting ready and when their time comes, I know they will be ready. It is because of this confidence that I have in them, the young men and women of today and tomorrow, that I know our great country is safe. I know they will find the solution to ultimtae peace throughout the world. I know that in the life to come, they will meet their tests and challenges successfully, and the march of knowledge and science will be channelled into peaceful processes, for the benefit of mankind throughout the world.

June 2, 1956, 10th Anniversary of Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable comeback stories of the postwar years has been the restitution of Italy into good standing as one of the democratic nations of the Western community. Its record of internal reconstruction and rehabilitation and international cooperation, since the birth of the new Republic on June 2, 1946, has been outstanding. There is no doubt that the world has gained a new and stable democracy.

This Italian comeback was no easy task. The war had shattered Italy's economy; inflation was rampant, and the rate of unemployment was unusually high. Furthermore, this economic disorder bred political instability, hunger, and despair, providing fertile ground for the expansion of communism on the peninsula. Eagerly and industriously, however, the Italian people under the astute political guidance of Alcide de Gasperi—the first Premier of the Italian Republic—set to work to rescue the suffering country from the brink of chaos.

We can, incidentally, take pride that our aid program helped the Italians in their struggle to get back on their feet.

In addition to achieving internal economic stability the infant Italian Republic has gained prestige internationally. Italy became a partner in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and eagerly supported a policy directed toward military and economic integration with Western Europe. Again with United States assistance, under the Mutual Defense Act, Italy has equipped her army, navy, and air force with modern military equipment and material and has become an effective unit of the Western defense system.

Today is the 10th anniversary of the birth of the Italian Republic. When one considers that Italy has achieved internal economic stability and international recognition in these few years, it makes the story of her comeback even more astonishing.

It is with intense pleasure that I join with all America in applauding Italy's tremendous progress on this anniversary day.

Fred A. Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago a distinguished citizen of my district and my home State of Nebraska was selected as Secretary of the Interior. This appointment, tendered by the President, was enthusiastically and wholeheartedly received by those who know Fred Seaton and have worked closely with him. Likewise, it has been favorably received by the press, generally, because of his splended record of public service to Nebraska, the Midwest, and our Nation.

Fred Seaton is a man of firm convictions—a loyal, conscientious, and capable person who will perform in this job, as in any other, in a most commendable manner. This is an appropriate recognition of his caliber and ability. It is a signal honor for Nebraska—previously accorded to only two other outstanding Nebraskans, J. Sterling Morton and William Jennings Bryan.

I urge all of you to read the editorial comment from the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star, as well as what the home folks think of Fred—from the two leading metropolitan newspapers of my district and Nebraska, the Lincoln Evening Journal and the Lincoln Star:

[From the Washington Post of May 29, 1956]

CHALLENGE IN INTERIOR

President Eisenhower has used splendid discretion in nominating Fred A. Seaton to be the new Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Seaton is one of the most sensitive, progressive, and broad-gaged members of the Eisenhower administration. He is admirably equipped to give the Department the sort of nondoctrinaire direction it needs in order to protect the Nation's natural resources and provide for their judicious use. There is special reason for gratification because the President disregarded the pleadings to appoint a mere replica of former Secretary McKay.

Mr. Seaton, a liberal Republican who was among President Eisenhower's early supporters, was mentioned for Secretary of the Interior after the 1952 election but reportedly declined the appointment at that time. That he enjoys the deep confidence of the President has been shown by his role in the White House, where he has been an assistant in charge of administrative liaison. A Nebraska newspaper publisher and stock raiser himself, he has served as a troubleshooter on agricultural problems and had a great deal to do wtih the soil-bank proposal. Previously he served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, a post in which he demonstrated an awareness of the public interest in adequate information—an awareness which unfortunately has not been displayed at top levels in the Pentagon since he left. As interim Senator from Nebraska appointed after the death of Kenneth Wherry in 1951, Mr. Seaton voted his conscience without regard to political consequences. He flew back from Germany in order to vote against the McCarran internal security bill.

Mr. Seaton can be relied upon to scrutinize carefully the charges of giveaway that have been leveled at tlhe Department of the Interior. He also can be relied upon to have little patience with the notion that the protection of public resources against private encroachment is socialism. It will not be easy for him to remedy all the weaknesses in departmental administration under the regime of Secretary McKay or to disavow the narrow policies of his fellow Nebraskan, Under Secretary Clarence Davis. But Mr. Seaton will assuredly give the Department conscientious, enlightened and responsive direction. We congratulate him and the President on a fine appointment.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 29, 1955]

SECRETARY SEATON

It is doubtful that the President has made any appointment which has received more widespread approval than his choice of Fred A. Seaton to take over the hot spot in the Interior Department.

At his May 9 press conference Mr. Eisenhower, with a show of understatement, said there were difficulties in finding exactly the right man to succeed Secretary Douglas McKay, who left the Interior Department to go forth and give battle to Senator WAYNE MORSE in Oregon. In turning to Mr. Seaton, however, the President has come about as close as possible to finding exactly the right man for this important and politically sensitive job. It is significant in this respect that Senator MORSE is among those praising the appointment as a very good one.

Although he is only 46 years old, Mr. Seaton has had a rich and varied experience. His background in his home State of Nebraska is that of newspaperman and cattle raiser. He came to the Senate by appointment after the death of Kenneth Wherry, and also served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Recently, as a White House deputy, he has served as a topnotch troubleshooter for the President. As liaison man with Congress, Mr. Seaton has been especially effective in the fight over the farm bill.

If there is any dissatisfaction with the appointment, it will be found in the more conservative wing of the Republican Party. But Mr. Seaton is wholeheartedly committed to the Eisenhower brand of republicanism, and there is no doubt that he will battle faithfully and effectively for the President's policies. And as a sort of extra dividend, his advancement to the Interior Department post can be expected to blunt the Democratic political assault on the so-called giveaway policies of his predecessor.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal of May 29, 1956]

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL: A CHAT WITH THE EDITOR

Fred Seaton, of Nebraska, is admirably qualified for the secretaryship of Interior. He knows the needs and aspirations of the West, and the realities of government and politics, and of course he is intimately in tune with President Eisenhower's progressively conservative philosophy.

His elevation to the Cabinet measurably strengthens the Eisenhower administration. Conservationists generally will acclaim it.

SECRETARY SEATON

The dispatches on the national news wires do not begin to suggest the extent of Fred Seaton's qualifications for this tremendously important assignment. A successful businessman, he is identified with not just one, but with 5 of the 17 reclamation States—having publishing interests in Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado. As such, he has participated actively in many phases of the development of the natural resources of the Plains, and for years has lent support to every sound conservation cause. As a former United States Senator, who made his weight felt in a very short time on Capitol Hill, he has applied to each subsequent assignment a splendid understanding of the executive-legislative relationship. As an assistant secretary of defense, to whom fell some top priority tasks of a non-publishable nature, and later as deputy assistant to the President, he has demonstrated unusual administrative skill.

In recent months, from his White House desk, Seaton actually has been performing in some respects as a sort of secretary of natural resources without portfolio, helping co-ordinate the resources functions of the Interior, Agriculture, and Defense Departments.

A trusted Eisenhower adviser from the very outset of the 1952 campaign, Seaton has handled an endless variety of ticklish problems with finesse and good judgment, from the Nixon flareup of 1952 to the farm problem of 1956, and has proved to be a shrewd, even brilliant, strategist. With the successful execution of each successive assignment, he has grown steadily in stature and in the confidence of the President.

Ike knows exactly what he is getting in the Cabinet—a moderate progressive of skill, judgment and complete integrity, and an energetic doer.

Fred did not seek—or want—this job; it has come to him as a genuine surprise. It is of course a bitter personal disappointment to another splendid Nebraskan who has proved his mettle in Washington, drawing on his head a good deal of undeserved and unfair criticism. But Undersecretary of Interior Clarence Davis proves his own stature again by his decision to stay on the job despite the disappointment. Seaton and the administration need his experience and talent.

If anyone had "earned" the secretaryship, Davis probably had, having actually run the Department perhaps as much as Secretary McKay, having hammered together the President's report on water resources policy which even the most vociferous critics of McKay and Davis admit is a constructive document, and having sat in the Cabinet on many occasions. But he is too experienced in Government himself not to understand that you do not "earn" this particular position. He knows the peculiarly personal relationship between the President and his Cabinet, and the nature of the Cabinet as the President's own personally chosen circle of advisers and administrators.

This relationship, as much as his excellent qualifications, made Seaton a perfectly logical choice.

RAYMOND A. MCCONNELL Jr.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of May 30, 1956]

OF MEN AND THINGS

(By J. E. Lawrence)

To our way of thinking, the President could not have made a happier selection for Secretary of the Interior than in his choice of Fred A. Seaton, Hastings publisher. We do not anticipate that Mr. Seaton will carry a flaming torch for public power. But at least he will know what it's all about, his natural sympathies will be in the right direction, and he has the rugged courage to face up with realities. Foremost among the realities today is that the Department of the Interior needs the capable, competent hand of Seaton, reinforced with the knowledge of the responsibilities of any Secretary of the Interior fully in tune with the times.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HIM

This is to extend heartiest congratulations to Mr. Seaton, native of Kansas, an adopted Nebraskan, and a man, we believe, with an enlightened forward-looking sense of public service. He has a job on his hands. We can be happier for Mr. Seaton than the new Secretary of the Interior can be for himself. An impression has taken root among a very considerable number of people, particularly those living in the 17 reclamation States, that under the administration of former Secretary Douglas McKay, who resigned to par-

ticipate in the Oregon primary for a Senate seat now occupied by WAYNE MORSE, reclamation policy has suffered. The great giveaway became a dinner table byword at altogether too many tables. While denials were many and on occasion vehement, the fact remains that there was a substantial feeling in this country that McKay and his two chief assistants, Clarence A. Davis, of Lincoln, and former Governor Aandahl, of North Dakota, had reshaped power policy more to the liking of the private utilities. They were said to be the chief exponents of the partnership doctrine—the partnership between Uncle Sam and the friendly electric companies, privately owned. And while the battle has not reached the boiling point, the fact is that any long-term thoughtful view of the program of conservation of natural resources in this country inherently is stoutly opposed to turning over the Nation's resources or spending the Nation's tax money to add to private profit for private enterprise. Mr. Seaton naturally endorsed the partnership program—is yet to give it application.

Mr. Seaton is more liberal, more enlightened and, we believe, closer to the heartbeat of the American people than Assistant Secretary Davis and possibly any other Republican Mr. Eisenhower could have chosen. Some steps may have been taken which are irreparable in their long-range consequences. We are in no position to pass judgment on that. And we recognize that these steps which we mentioned represent an honest difference in viewpoint and are open to criticism only on the basis of a conflicting philosophy with reference to the administration of the Department of Interior.

GREAT OPPORTUNITY BECKONS

Nebraskans who know Mr. Seaton will rejoice at his selection. He is a good man for the job. There are many tapelines to provide a measurement of him. He likes to work, is not afraid of long hours, grinding toil. If he chose, with his varied interest we believe Mr. Seaton could hoist his feet upon the desk in front of him, lean back, and take it easy. A great many men would choose that pattern if they occupied his place, instead of throwing themselves into the throbbing, punishing millrace which is Washington official life, its headaches, its sacrifices, and its physical burdens. Yet above it all, Mr. Seaton's appointment opens the door to him for signal service to the American people. In the development of river basin planning, the battle against floods, the expansion of irrigation so vital in this western country, the preservation of the forests and the care of the national parks—in this and in untold other matters Mr. Seaton has the opportunity for outstanding, unselfish public service.

We do not anticipate that he will be a crusader filled with the zeal and enthusiasm of one with a holy mission, but we have every confidence that he will turn out to be a most welcome replacement for Secretary McKay. This is to express a fervent wish for his fine success and faith that his vision will be clear-cut, his good right arm strong and purposeful.

The Late Alben W. Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following resolutions adopted April 30, 1956, at the regular meeting of the Democratic League of Delaware:

MEMORIAL

At the regular meeting of the Democratic League of Delaware held Monday, April 30, 1956, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That as members of the Democratic League of Delaware we record this expression of our sorrow at the death on Monday, April 30, 1956, of our fellow member, Alben W. Barkley.

"His long and unselfish service both to the Government of the United States and to the Democratic Party made him known, respected and loved by all who hold dear the finest traditions of our American way of life. His vigorous and tireless efforts to further these traditions will ever live as one of the outstanding glories of the democratic ideal. Though we have lost his sparkling companionship and though his eloquent voice is now forever stilled, yet shall his memory live in our hearts as the symbol of the best of American initiative, political courage and moral force.

"*Resolved*, That we extend to his family our most heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement, and that a copy of this memorial resolution be sent to them."

For the Democratic League of Delaware:
JOHN J. CLARKE, *President*.
JOHN A. HULL,
W. R. STEWART, Sr.,
HARRIS O. BUNEL,
FRANK T. DICKERSON, *Secretary*.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the formal presentation speech of Mr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, given on Monday, April 16, 1956, at which time the Eloy Alfaro grand cross and citation were bestowed on the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, secretary of state of New York and Democratic national committeeman from New York, in the New York Times Building in New York City. I also include the acceptance speech of Mr. DeSapio:

Mr. BAYERN. I am delighted to have the honor, as American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, to confer upon you, Carmine DeSapio, the jewel of the foundation, in view of the fact that I have heretofore, 2 years ago, given you the citation of this famous foundation.

The late General Alfaro served 10 years as President of Ecuador at the turn of the century. This foundation was created to perpetuate his memory, not as President, nor as general, but as one who strove all his life to bring to his fellow men in Latin America the blessings of medical care and education, and liberty, and peace.

In this tradition, you, Mr. DeSapio, have labored. As chairman of the Democratic Committee of New York County, as national committeeman from the State of New York, and as secretary of state, you have advanced the liberal causes of this country. By your astute political leadership you have led in electing the Honorable Robert F. Wagner as the mayor of New York and Hon. Averell Harriman as Governor of the State of New York, and, who knows, you may succeed in electing a President in 1956.

For these activities, so close to the spirit and purposes of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, we are pleased to confer upon you the foundation's jewel, and I now call on Mrs. Elaine Verdi Greenspan to pin this jewel on our distinguished guest of honor.

You now join a goodly company—President Eisenhower, former President Truman, General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, Mayor Wagner, and Commissioner Robert Moses.

Mr. DESAPIO. I am deeply grateful and greatly honored to receive the grand cross and citation of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. I shall always cherish this honor and regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts toward promoting the ideals of democracy so well championed by Eloy Alfaro. Thank you.

Remarks of Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, Third Anniversary Dinner Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address made by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, at the third anniversary dinner of the Herbert J. Pasco Educational Scholarship Foundation of New Jersey:

It is a pleasure for me to meet with the Barbers" Association of New Jersey on an occasion where they are both honoring a good friend, and at the same time doing something constructive for a New Jersey community. I confess that I did not know until this invitation was extended to me what the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation of New Jersey was. I assume that my lack of knowledge would be shared by a great many others in the State, and I assume they would also be as surprised and pleased as I was to discover what the aim and purpose of your foundation is.

There are many ways in which we can honor our friends. We can give them gold watches and hope that either the watches will run well, or will have enough loan value to help a man who later falls into trouble. We can give him a big dinner, and hope that the indigestion he suffers will be somewhat relieved by a feeling of warmth and good fellowship on the part of those who sponsored the affair. We can even erect a statue in a public square, hoping that the effect of the weather and the elements, not to mention the pigeons, will leave something of the spirit we sought to honor in this way. Lastly, we can present him with a scroll inscribed by hundreds of persons whose names are not well known to him, and trust that in spite of the bad handwriting, he will realize how much he is esteemed by other people.

It seems to me that this foundation has taken a much more practical way of honoring a person who had a foresight in what he was attempting to do for public education in our State. Today, talk of high real

estate taxes is heard everywhere, but we should realize that if it had not been for the efforts of Pascoe and others like him, the situation would be far worse.

Prior to the passage of the Pascoe bills on education in 1947, almost the entire amount of State aid for education was provided by a State school tax levied on local real estate. The revenue from this tax was turned in to the State treasurer and 90 percent of it was returned to the local districts on what was presumed to be a kind of equalization formula. The effect, however, was simply to put another tax on real property which already bore almost the complete load for the financing of education in New Jersey. It was largely through the leadership of Herbert J. Pascoe that the idea of State aid for education based on general State revenues derived from other than real property taxes became a possibility. While those first sums appropriated, actually $13 million, seem rather small in contrast to the more than $76 million of State school aid which we will distribute to local districts in the next school year, they represented an important change in the concept of local and State government.

We were stating in this legislation the very practical principle that not all children had a minimum educational opportunity. As the years have passed we had continued to give some aid to all school districts and to help in greater proportion, those districts where children suffer in their educational opportunities because there is not sufficient wealth to support an adequate program.

It takes more than money or buildings to provide the kind of education we want for our young people. It takes a good teacher who is well trained. It has been said that no one can measure the ultimate influence of our good teachers, or can calculate how many lives they affect in their period of service. As I speak, I am sure everyone of you can remember a fine teacher you had somewhere during your school days and the help and inspiration you received from that person. The purpose of your foundation is to provide scholarships for future teachers who might otherwise not be attracted to the profession. In doing this you are really affecting the lives of thousands of young people who will pass through the schools in the generations ahead. What could be a more fitting memorial for a person who is so interested in education when the watches have ceased to run, when the dinners are gone and forgotten, and when the statues are shaky on their pedestals, the living memorial to Herbert J. Pascoe will continue in the lives of the teachers and the students whom they teach because of your gratitude to this outstanding citizen. I hope that your work will prosper and that through the success of your efforts more and more fine young people will enter this important career to the benefit of all the boys and girls in New Jersey.

The Port of Hampton Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more progressive port in the world than that of Hampton Roads, which serves my district. It is not only the world's greatest natural harbor, but it is blessed by a community that recognizes its importance in the economic life of the world.

The port of Hampton Roads has served the Nation well in peace and in war. It is with a great deal of pride that I observe the increasing activity in our harbor year after year. It is attaining that position of preeminence in our Nation's foreign commerce which its facilities, its economic advantages, and the leadership of its people so richly justify.

Mr. H. M. Thompson, executive vice president of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, has for many years done a magnificent work in carrying forward the interest of our maritime community. Recently he made a most illuminating and comprehensive address on the history and growth of maritime trade in the port of Hampton Roads. That address is reprinted below. I feel sure it will be of much interest to my colleagues—those who represent maritime districts may find it challenging and those who represent inland districts will recognize that the port of Hampton Roads offers economic advantages to their constituents who are now, or subsequently may be engaged in foreign trade.

ADDRESS BY HARRY M. THOMPSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, HAMPTON ROADS MARITIME ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF NORFOLK, APRIL 26, 1956

I have been asked to speak to you today on the history of the development of the maritime trade of Hampton Roads. It's an impressive sounding title—and a big order. But I am not like the old fellow who said he had lived almost 80 years and had seen a lot of changes, and that he was agin 'em all. I've seen a lot of changes, too, but I am for most of them—because they represent progress. And so I shall try to recall for you a few things that some of you may be too young to remember, and the rest of you may wish you were.

Many things and many people have contributed to the development of the great port of Hampton Roads that we know today. It is my opinion that in any attempt to review the efforts and causes that have led to its present stature we must go back a great many years, because I believe, as did the old blue-nosed down-East Yankee skipper who considered himself something of a philosopher, that "everything that happens in this world is because of a previous relation."

So, with your indulgence, I will try to go back half a century, to the year 1906, when I began my career in the shipping business in Hampton Roads.

At that time the business of the port was almost entirely coastwise. I entered the employ of one of the larger and more important coastwise steamer lines. This company operated a fleet of seven steamships between Norfolk and New York, a dozen or more steamboats to points in Virginia, and a fleet of harbor tugs, barges, and lighters. The Merchants and Miners had regular service to Boston and Providence, the Clyde Line to Philadelphia, the Norfolk and Washington Line to Washington, and the Baltimore Steam Packet and Chesapeake Steamship Co., known as the Old and New Bay Lines, to Baltimore. There was one small line operating through the inland waterway to North Carolina.

These coastwise steamer lines were successful largely because of a differential rate situation which obtained, and in connection with several dispatch routes to the Southeast and Central West, such as the Cumberland Gap Dispatch; Virginia, Tennessee and Georgia Airline; and the Kanawha Dispatch. These rates extended as far west as Chicago and Denver, and south to Birmingham and Atlanta, and provided a nucleus of the cargoes which made it profitable for these ships to operate, rather than the port-to-port cargoes, which never aggregated a great deal in total tonnage.

The coastwise lines, and the trade they represented, served their time and age, and made an important contribution to the development of the port.

The automobile was still in its infancy. Trucks represented no threat to established transportation. Rail service of course was available, but, between certain points, steamers were the only means of transportation. Perhaps some of you saw an article in the Ledger about a week ago, in the 40-year-ago column, that a party traveling by automobile fought mud all day long in a drive to Richmond, and on arriving there, shipped the car back to Norfolk by steamer and came home themselves by train.

Since the port business was primarily coastwise, we find Norfolk's waterfront still lined with old wharf structures that were designed especially to serve this business, beginning at the foot of East Main Street and extending all along the Elizabeth River, to what is now Fort Norfolk.

The Norfolk & Western coal terminals at Lamberts Point were placed in operation in 1885; those of the Chesapeake & Ohio at Newport News 8 years later, 1893; and the Virginian, the last to establish at Hampton Roads, opened its Sewells Point terminals in 1909.

Somewhere before 1900 the Norfolk & Western built two piers at Lamberts Point, which were used for handling overseas merchandise, but these have practically disappeared. One is now used as a layup berth.

On the Portsmouth side, the Seaboard Air Line constructed wharves just above and below the ferry slip. The Atlantic Coast Line and the Southern Railway had wharves at Pinners Point. The Coast Line pier was used exclusively for coastwise business, but the Southern operated two coastwise piers, and one, now known as Pier 4, for overseas business.

The Security Docks in Atlantic City were built about 1912 or 1913, but were never used extensively as waterfront facilities. Adjacent to these docks were some smaller wharves and facilities of various types, and then came the Cotton Docks, where for many years a compress was operated.

The Chesapeake & Ohio piers of course have been in use for a long time. The coal terminals were opened for business in 1893, and the merchandise terminals go back a year further, to 1892. Piers 5 and 6 were burned and rebuilt in 1898. Pier 8, destroyed by fire in December 1944, was rebuilt in 73 days. One wharf, which no longer exists, Pier A, was used by the smaller passenger vessels which operated to Richmond, Smithfield, Battery Park, etc.

At one time the C. & O. operated two grain elevators at Newport News, but these were later destroyed by fire, elevator A in 1917, and B in 1933.

Although we had a wonderful harbor then as now, and I remember we did just as much bragging about it, the port did not develop too rapidly prior to World War I. However, our coal business was important. The record shows that 50 years ago our coal dumpings were almost 7 million tons annually, and by 1918 had grown to 18 million. We were growing as a cotton port, with exports of 500,000 bales a year. By the early twenties, our tobacco business was approximately 225,000 hogsheads a year. With the opening of the Panama Canal to commercial business in 1914, and the resultant trade with the Pacific coast, particularly lumber, new impetus was given to our port business. The coastwise trade showed steady and consistent gains. Overseas business was relatively unimportant, but a limited number of ves-

sels were operated in this trade from both Norfolk and Newport News.

The first record of a Hampton Roads overseas steamship line appears somewhere between 1895 and 1897, when Furness, Withy & Co. operated a line for the C. & O. Railway to London and Liverpool. The names of the ships were typically Virginian—*Shenandoah, Rappahannock, Kanawha, Chickahomany, Appomattox, Rapidan,* and *Greenbrier.* This service, and the ships, later were acquired by Furness.

In keeping with the times, just prior to World War I, Norfolk City came to a realization of the potentials of its port, and began to plan toward a development of its overseas business. It acquired property at Sewells Point—formerly held by the old Norfolk Country Club—and actually began the erection of a pier.

Then came World War I:

The Government took over this property and constructed two piers on it—which are now the Army Supply Base—or the Hampton Roads Army Terminal. I believe World War I first showed us what the port was capable of—and we began to plan for an orderly growth—and time and events have since proved the wisdom of this course.

When the war was over, and thoughts could once more turn to normal events, the city of Norfolk continued its plans to establish Norfolk as a world port, and created the Norfolk port commission, of which the late Barton Myers was chairman. The Port Commission acquired a site at Sewells Point upon which ultimately piers A and B, and the grain elevator were built. Soon after the war, the port commission employed Arthur King, whom many of you will remember, as Norfolk's first port director. Mr. King had gained considerable distinction in the Armed Forces during the war, and also valuable experience as manager of the Canton Terminals in Baltimore—and he immediately put all of this to work for the port of Norfolk. The port commission was an important factor in stimulating business.

Under its program, one of the first developments was a movement of export tobacco out of Hampton Roads which had previously moved almost entirely out of northern ports. While we had earlier developed a coastwise tobacco business, this commodity had never been exported from this port.

The importance of imports was not overlooked, and many of the commodities which were attracted to the port at that time, still are important in our import trade today: Logs, paper, Turkish tobacco, burlap and bagging, cotton and fibers.

The Norfolk Port Commission was able to persuade the railroads to extend the service of the Norfolk & Portsmouth Belt Line by utilizing the tracks of the Virginian Railway to the east side of the Elizabeth River, thus providing shipside deliveries with absorption privileges to the terminals located on the Norfolk side—the Army Base, Sewells Point, and so forth. This was a very important factor in the development of the port, as it largely obviated the necessity of expensive lighterage in Norfolk Harbor.

About this same time, the wharfage charge was eliminated against vessels loading and discharging.

Following close on the war's end, it became apparent that there was a need for facilities through which to ship materials and supplies to rehabilitate Europe. This was causing serious congestion at the northern ports, and an opportunity appeared to move some of these cargoes through this port. The Norfolk Port Commission, in 1919, through a lease arrangement with the United States Shipping Board, began what continued for nearly 10 years, the operation of the Army base as a commercial overseas terminal, using the supporting warehouses for transit and other storage purposes.

At Newport News, an extensive group of war-built warehouses on the C. & O. tracks at Morrison were placed in commercial operation by the Hiden interests. These operated under switching arrangements to and from the piers, and provided the practical equivalent of waterfront storage.

These warehouses had been operated during World War I in conjunction with the Hampton Roads Port of Embarkation, which during World War I—as was the case in World War II—was headquartered at Newport News.

When the Norfolk municipal terminals at Sewells Point were built in 1922–23, the city entered into a lease arrangement with the late Harvey Miller of Philadelphia (who was represented here for many years by Jimmy Moore), and the Shipping Board, for the joint operation of the Army base and the Sewells Point terminals. Later the city withdrew from the actual operation of the terminal and the Harvy Miller operation continued until the Army base contract was given to another concern, and the Sewells Point terminals transferred to the Norfolk & Western Railway.

When the country found itself with a surplus of war-built ships following the close of World War I, these were placed on various trade routes where cargo was available—under the terms of the Shipping Act of 1920—and this really gave the port its start in the overseas steamship business. As the business developed, of course, foreign-flag lines entered the picture to meet the competition, and regularly scheduled services were established. Today, a majority of the important American and foreign-flag lines serve Hampton Roads on frequent schedules.

The American merchant marine received its second "shot in the arm" with the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, sponsored by the late Judge Otis Bland, of Newport News. This provided a definite method of subsidizing American-flag vessels, both from a construction and operation standpoint. This bill and its later amendments have without doubt encouraged American capital and ingenuity to engage in the shipping business. The result is 1,073 active and 2,158 inactive ships, or a total of 3,231 ships in the American merchant marine—with vessels of the type of the *United States, America, Constitution,* and *Independence* carrying the flag of the United States into the ports of the world. This, of course, has had an important effect upon all ports—Hampton Roads included.

The ambition for a home-owned line was realized in 1928, with the inauguration of service to the United Kingdom and Northern Europe by the American-Hampton Roads Line. A few years later—the Baltimore Mail Line inaugurated direct freight and passenger service between Hampton Roads and ports in France and Germany on a weekly basis. This service later was extended to England.

Even with the concerted and effective effort that has been made to develop the port and its commerce, it is only fair to say that some of the port's most important and most lucrative business—and that which has contributed most to its growth—has been the result of favoring economic conditions.

Our overseas business came about largely because the Shipping Board found itself with surplus ships after the First World War.

Our tremendous oil business is the result of a transformation of coal-burning ships to oil, and later the introduction of diesels, and the tremendous increase in domestic consumption of petroleum products.

Our ore business is the result of increased production of steel in the United States, and the development of iron-ore deposits in various parts of the world—because of a fear of exhaustion of iron-ore deposits in the Mesabi Range.

Our grain business is primarily the result of advantageous lease arrangements made with one of the country's largest grain dealers, supplemented by the fact that the facility was available in the port.

Our more recent export coal business, which has placed the port in first place among Atlantic Coast ports in export tonnage, is the result of improved economic conditions abroad.

Even the two world wars, which have been in our time, have had their part in the development of our port—because each time the port has risen to the emergency, and each time, it has demonstrated its potential for efficient operation—and port interests have been spurred into greater effort.

When World War II came along practically all normal operations ceased, and the entire facilities of the port were devoted to the winning of the war. However, port planning continued, and my own organization, though it lent its full aid to the war effort, had a Postwar Planning Committee that did some very important work—and many of the plans made in that committee have since become realities, and are helping Hampton Roads to make a name for itself.

In World War II, as in World War I, the United States engaged in an all-out shipbuilding program to meet its war needs and those of the Allies. Vessels of the *Liberty* and *Victory* types were rapidly placed into operation, as had the *Lake* and *Hog Island* types in the First War. But again—after the war—surplus:

Here, however, it is evident that we have profited by past experience, because these ships are receiving much better care than their counterparts in World War I. The 83d Congress made provision to keep many of them in usable condition. Large numbers have been used to store grain. The Government has also continued a program designed to assist in providing new vessels for the American merchant marine. In addition, extensive ship replacement programs are underway by several private lines.

Backtracking a little bit, it may be said that the economic and physical change that has come about in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River exemplifies that of the entire area. Years ago, the Southern Branch was lined with sawmills, but as the timber was cut back from the port area, naturally, the point was reached where it was no longer profitable to bring lumber from southeastern Virginia and North Carolina into this area for processing—and these sawmills gradually disappeared.

The next business to emerge into prominence was the fertilizer mixing and distributing industry. This came about at a time when foreign materials were used largely in the manufacture of fertilizers, and waterfront facilities were necessary because the material was brought in by ship.

Another business that goes back a long time in this community is wood preserving. The old Norfolk Creosoting Co., now operated by Eppinger and Russell, was one of the first plants of its kind to be established in the United States.

Later, with the introduction of oil for commercial, residential, and marine purposes, many of the larger petroleum companies acquired sites on the Southern Branch, where they located tank farms for the storage and distribution of petroleum products.

The Southern Branch has been deepened from 22 feet to care for this changing industry, and now has a draft of 35 feet throughout its length.

A few ship repair yards are located on the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River, but this area never has gained the prominence, from an industrial or economic standpoint, that the Southern Branch has. There are two reasons for this. The first is that it lacks proper railroad connections—although

it is crossed by the Virginian & Belt Line pretty well up the branch—but the second, and primary reason, is because the entire area is surrounded by residential developments which, of course, hamper industrial development.

The value of industry to port commerce is something that cannot be overestimated. A majority of our local manufacturers depend upon shipping for the receipt of raw materials and the distribution of finished products. As an example, one industry, located in the port area in recent years, is importing nearly 500,000 tons of raw materials annually, and shipping out more than 10,000 carloads of freight a year over local railroads.

An oil refinery rapidly nearing completion at Yorktown and another projected at West Norfolk will not only materally round out our industrial structure, but will give tremendous impetus to the business of the port.

Any consideration of port activity must by all means take into account the extensive shipbuilding and repair facilities located in Hampton Roads. The world's largest private shipyard is located at Newport News. Here vessels of the type of the *United States* and *Forrestal* are among the latest to come off the ways, but they are all descendants of old hull No. 1, built in 1890, small tugboat—still in operation in Hampton Roads—the *J. Alvah Clark*. It is said that you could place 145 vessels the size of the *Alvah Clark* on the deck of the *Forrestal*.

At Norfolk, extensive ship repair facilities—which were materially augmented during World War II—provide splendid service on this side of Hampton Roads. There is available at both Norfolk and Newport News equipment capable of handling underwater work on vessels of any size.

Other factors which have contributed to the growth of the port are the railroads—steamship lines—freight forwarders—customhouse brokers, and others who have provided services, and through their extensive connections in this country and abroad—carried on effective solicitation programs.

Equally important to the smooth operation of the port are the ship-repair yards, tugboat companies, fueling stations, fresh water suppliers, stevedoring concerns, ship chandlers, ship watching firms, pilots, consular representative, marine surveyors and underwriters' agents, banks, etc. The generally satisfactory labor relations which have obtained in the port over the years deserve special mention.

There has been a tremendous growth in port business—and a material strengthening of port facilities and services—at Hampton Roads in recent years. A great upsurge has occurred in the overseas coal traffic. Grain exports reached an all-time high last year. Imports of residual fuel oil, ore, gypsum rock, are impressive. General cargo commodities are becoming more and more important and diversified in both the export and import trades. Hampton Roads is continuing in first place among Atlantic coast ports in export tonnage. Import tonnages are moving upward.

Pier N, one of the finest piers of the Atlantic coast, was placed in operation by the Norfolk & Western in 1947. Extensive additions have been made to its warehouses at Sewells Point. Further additions are planned at Lamberts Point.

The Southern Railway has recently completed a dredging program at its piers 2 and 4 at Pinners Point (Southern Tidewater Terminals).

The Virginian has in advance planning a $2 million expansion of its pier facilities at Sewells Point.

Ore facilities are being made available at Newport News by the Chesapeake & Ohio. Esso Standard Oil has placed in operation a bunker oil terminal on the Newport News waterfront, which will permit fueling of ships while loading or discharging at C. &. O. piers.

The storage capacity of the grain elevator has been more than doubled in the past few years. A marine leg for discharging grain direct from vessels has been added.

Extensive additions have been made to the coal handling facilities at both Norfolk and Newport News.

The vessel movement at Hampton Roads last year was the highest on record. More than 7,000 vessels called at the port. Exports exceeded 31 million tons—practically double those of 1954. Imports advanced from 2,600,000 to 4,388,000 tons. Customs receipts increased almost $4½ million.

One of the most important things that has occurred, however, has been the impetus given to the development of the port through an awakening by the people of the community—and as a matter of fact, the people of the State of Virginia—to the importance of the port to the economy of the entire State. A realization that the prosperity of Virginia's ports is important to the prosperity of all of Virginia.

And so—in 1948, the Norfolk Port Authority was created, to stimulate business for the port of Norfolk.

Shortly thereafter, the Virginia State Ports Authority—which was originally created by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1923 as the Hampton Roads Port Commission, later operating as the State Port Authority of Virginia, and still later, as the Virginia Division of Ports—was reorganized along much broader lines, with more adequate support—having for its objective the development of all Virginia ports—and under the leadership of Admiral Clark is doing a splendid job. It maintains soliciting offices at strategic points in this country and abroad.

More recently port commissions have been formed at Newport News and Portsmouth.

The Maritime Association, the oldest port organization in Hampton Roads, was organized soon after World War I, and in the years since, as most of you know, has made important contributions to the growth of the port, and provided valuable services for the shipping people.

It has been successful in securing many harbor improvements, improvements to steamship services, improvements to port facilities.

It endeavors to keep port services, charges, customs, regulations, and practices of every character in line with those of competitive ports. To insure a fair and equitable administration of the numerous Government regulations that affect shipping, it keeps in close touch with all legislation affecting ships and shipping, and takes appropriate action in each case—strongly supporting that which appears beneficial—and opposing with equal vigor that which is felt to be detrimental to the shipping industry.

It maintains a close liaison between the military and commercial interests in the port, and at Hampton Roads the military is an important factor.

Included in its service to members is an extensive ship reporting service, which not only includes current reports on vessel arrivals and sailings at Cape Henry, but expected arrivals, and other pertinent information concerning the movement of ships in the port.

Port statistics compiled and disseminated by the association provide a valuable basis for studies of port business.

It publishes a port annual which ranks high among such publications. By means of this annual, information on the port, and its facilities and services, are placed in the hands of those directly concerned—ship owners and operators—and shippers and receivers of cargoes—around the world.

Among its more recent accomplishments has been the disposal area at Craney Island. This will materially facilitate dredging in Hampton Roads and the harbors of Norfolk and Newport News for many years to come.

A new belt line bridge—now under construction—was long advocated by the association.

The deepening of the channel of the southern branch has been one of the projects of the organization for 30 years.

Also high on its agenda is the improvement of the Thimble Shoal Channel, the widening of the Norfolk Channel off the naval base, and additional anchorage space off Lamberts Point.

Going back to the early days, it was instrumental in the location of the United States Public Health Service Hospital on Hampton Boulevard.

There is one other thing I would like to mention—and that is, the Maritime Association was, in part, responsible for the formation of the Propeller Club in this port. Back in the middle twenties, there was a strong movement to organize a club within the Maritime Association, where the shipping fraternity could meet and discuss mutual problems, and for social contact, and working from this idea, we cooperated closely with the late Joe Godwin in organizing this club.

At the present time our organization is headed by Barron Black, prominent admiralty attorney. We number among our members outstanding firms in shipping in the entire port area—as well as firms and individuals in the ports to the north of us. Our directors and committees are well qualified to direct the important affairs that affect this growing port.

It is expected that the association will be housed in its own building in the very near future. This will serve to stabilize the organization in the community, and will enable it to perform a more comprehensive service for its members.

When we think back over the years about the port, many names come to mind. Names of men who have made important contributions that will be remembered for years to come: Capt. J. D. Wood, onetime mayor of Norfolk, who developed the tugboat business onto a workable basis. Capt. W. R. Boutwell, of the Virginia Pilot Association, who 30 years ago visualized Hampton Roads with a tunnel from Old Point to Willoughby; the Craney Island disposal area completed; a bridge across the James River—all of which are now becoming realities. To Barton Myers, chairman of the Norfolk Port Commission, goes a great deal of credit for the development of our port facilities and services; T. S. Southgate, who developed Southgate Terminals, and William Holmes Davis, one of the early presidents of the Maritime Association, who foresaw the growth of the cargo business of the port.

At Newport News, P. W. Hiden and Homer Ferguson were outstanding port figures—and no discussion of this character would be complete without naming my good friend, the late Mr. A. B. Schwartzkopf, who coined the phrase, "The port's the thing," and who served as president of the Maritime Association for two decades—and many others.

I believe you will agree that the growth of the ports of Hampton Roads is a culmination of many years of effort—by many people—all fired by a common ambition—a greater Hampton Roads.

When we can look backward with pride, we can look forward with confidence. Therefore, in conclusion, I salute those who have labored for the port in the years that are gone—and with you—place my trust in the younger men now at the wheel. God willing, nothing can stop Hampton Roads' progress.

Preventing Parched Acres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as part of my remarks an article by Robert E. Struthers, agricultural economist, Denver, Colo., taken from the Reclamation Era:

PREVENTING PARCHED ACRES
(By Robert E. Struthers)

For the third consecutive year, Colorado-Big Thompson project supplemental irrigation water in 1955 spelled the difference between success and failure of crops in many parts of northeastern Colorado.

Drought began in 1953, the same year when project construction, started in 1937, reached the stage of permitting delivery of large quantities of western slop water diverted through the Alva B. Adams Tunnel.

By 1954, the project was ready with water to combat what had become the most severe drought Colorado farmers ever experienced. The 301,000 acre-feet of project water used in that year meant an estimated $22 million boost in crop value.

The drought cycle continued into the 1955 season—again calling for emergency water delivery from the project storage system. The 240,000 acre-feet of transmountain water furnished in 1955 represented one-third of the total surface irrigation water in the area served by the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. And it likewise accounted for one-third of $51,210,000 in crops, or $17 million.

Normal inflow to the district averages about 900,000 acre-feet annually. By the reuse of return flows, this initial supply is multiplied to the extent that actual measured diversions throughout the district total 2,200,000 acre-feet. Another half million acre-feet are supplied by well irrigation, all of which arises out of the initial inflow.

The average supplement to be provided by the Colorado-Big Thompson project is estimated at 257,000 acre-feet. Approximately the same rate of recurrence is expected of this water, and the beneficial effects will thus be felt throughout the district as well as in the areas of initial application.

The project is expected to furnish about 22 percent of the district's annual supply. In 1954, however, the project water was 45 percent of the supply and in 1955 it was 34 percent.

Availability was even more important in 1955 than quantity. Throughout the unusually dry spring months project water was heavily used. For the season the Colorado-Big Thompson supplied 58 percent of the stored water used.

The same drought conditions that multiplied the uses at the same time prevented replenishment of storage. At the end of the year the 804,000 acre-feet of project storage capacity contained only 239,000 acre-feet of water. As the spring of 1956 approached, however, a heavy snow pack in the mountains held forth hope that total storage may increase even while full demands are met for supplemental irrigation water.

The water content of snow on the Colorado River drainage above Granby Reservoir, the project's main storage, was 160 percent of the 20-year average at the end of January. Should the rains be scant and the suns hot again in the summer of 1956, there still is assurance that near adequate supplies will be available for the district and the seven towns served with municipal water.

Crop production within the district increased about 8 percent in 1955 over the previous year, offsetting a 6-percent price decline. Farmers were not entirely spared the expenses and frustrations of drought, seeing sugar beet and corn plantings lost and having to replant to beans and sorghums.

The Big Thompson farmers commiserated with their fellows elsewhere in Colorado who had no means of supplementing their irrigation, or had no irrigation at all. Winter and spring moisture deficiencies destroyed the plantings on thousands of acres. The production of wheat, the major dry-land crop, was only 40 percent of the past 10-year average.

Abandonment of croplands over the State amounted to 43 percent of the cropped acreage. These failures, coming on the heels of 1954 when 39 percent of the crop acreage was abandoned, had an extremely depressing effect on the Colorado farmers' economic status. Business was down in drought-stricken communities and mortgage debts increased.

Business traditionally prospers or declines in western farming communities in direct proportion to moisture conditions. It follows that local merchants are among the most enthusiastic supporters of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

Retail sales tax collections are an indicator of general business conditions and volume of spending. In the northeastern and southeastern irrigated valleys of Colorado, widely divergent trends in retail sales tax collections are evident, although both areas have been affected similarly by drought.

In the Northeast, where supplemental water has been available, a progressive growth trend has been established. In the Southeast, where drought-induced water shortages remain uncorrected, retail sales have declined with serious effects on the valley towns.

Such indirect effects are well known and accepted in irrigated communities. The Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, contracting agency with the Government for construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, is organized under a pioneering law passed in 1937; under the law, the general population of 160,000 is helping to support the project through ad valorem mill levies. This form of support recognizes that the project means added stability and new wealth, not only for farmers but also for townsmen. Many similar conservancy districts have now been formed throughout the West.

The project provides an important service to Western Slope irrigators. Western Slope project reservoirs include storage sufficient to replace any project-induced shortages among irrigators on that side of the Continental Divide. In addition, 95,000 acre-feet of storage capacity was provided on the west side for future irrigation expansion.

In 1955 Western Slope irrigators drew 39,000 acre-feet of water from this storage to offset shortages in their own supplies. This was water that otherwise would have been lost in the surplus spring flows, and it was provided without cost to the Western Slope irrigators.

These farmers could join the farmers of northeastern Colorado in a hymn of praise. Both groups are able to tell anyone of the wisdom and foresight of the individuals, private and public, who brought the Colorado-Big Thompson project into existence.

Available water supply in Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District

[Acre-feet]

	Normal year	1953	1954	1955
Local supply:				
Inflow to district	900,000	671,800	314,700	472,300
Local storage		+36,700	+59,600	−10,700
Total	900,000	708,500	374,300	461,600
Project water	257,000	177,500	301,000	240,000
Combined gravity supply	1,157,000	886,000	675,300	701,600
Growing season precipitation	540,000	355,000	234,000	483,000
Total available water	1,697,000	1,241,000	909,300	1,184,600

Lloyd Thurston Rips the Bradley Report to Shreds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of the dynamic statement before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans and an outstanding member from Iowa in the 69th, 70th, 71st, 72d, 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses, as follows:

First, I might say that I was honored by being selected as Commander in Chief, United Spanish War Veterans, for the year ending September 1955. At present I am a member of the committee on legislation and its administration of the organization. I am reimbursed for my actual traveling and subsistence expenses but receive no salary.

I served as a private in the 51st Iowa Volunteer Regiment in the Spanish War and in the Philippine Insurrection.

It is with some hesitancy that I appear before your committee to submit comments in regard to the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, more commonly known as the Bradley Commission.

I have been afforded the opportunity to examine the statements made by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS, so I doubt if any good purpose would be served by making a complete or minute analysis of the matters set out in this report. However, I do feel that there are a number of factors which are related to and I believe are highly pertinent to the general subject matter, so I will ask the indulgence of the committee to permit me to briefly explore this field.

READS LETTER TO BRADLEY

When our organization was first officially informed of the appointment of this Commission, I was then the commander in chief, and through the press and otherwise had

learned of the apparent intention of the President to have a survey made which would undoubtedly recommend the incorporation of veterans' benefits with those of some social agency maintained by the Government, so I sent a letter to General Bradley, the chairman, which I desire to now submit to your committee:

"The directive of the President of the United States to the Commission on Veterans' Pensions, requesting a survey be made 'that steps be taken to examine the entire structure, scope and philosophy of our veterans' benefit laws in relation to each other and to other Government programs' was received.

"Therefore, the study of your group must necessarily examine into every material branch and department of the Government as related to expenditures, not only for veterans but also other Government programs.

"It is to be regretted that no mention is made of the debt of our Government to those who served in the defense branches, and likewise, the resulting profits and gains of those who directly or indirectly increased their resources because of the protection afforded by those who served. Commodity, stock exchange and other important indices during the past decade must be evaluated. The quantum merit—the value of the service—must be first determined so that the sum of the debt may be known. This is elementary, perhaps, but a principle so fixed that it is a law of human action.

"It is obvious that the economy of the Nation is coupled with all of its obligations to those who served in the civil as well as military forces. There is concern as to the ability of the country to sustain a large outlay for the groups mentioned, but if and when the untold billions of dollars now being distributed over other nations in the world are sharply curtailed or discontinued, the same economy which now sustains these gigantic gifts likewise can be applied to civilian and veterans' benefits. The complaint against the veteran might well be a smokescreen for the thousands of persons who travel over the world hunting ways to further distribute the resources of our land. This item alone would cover the present and proposed expenditures for veterans for many years to come. This is one major item to be surveyed."

RETIRED GENERALS ARE VETS

"As the pay of officers in the defense branch has been materially increased in the past few years, which, of course, increases the three-fourths pay, or pension, of such retired officers—an appreciable increase having recently been sponsored by the President—brings the category mentioned in the same list as the discharged enlisted man and the temporary wartime officer when benefits are surveyed. A retired general is a veteran just as much as a discharged enlisted man. All of the veterans of the country will be interested in learning the suggestions made in this respect.

"Each member of the Commission is familiar with the provisions in the Federal Constitution, which prohibits the taking of private property for public use without just compensation, but the draft laws of the Nation sanction or call the young man for service, and what is important to him is his health, his property (which is diminished when he is in the service because of low pay), even his life which can be taken without "just compensation," so it logically follows that a debt is thereby created in favor of the veterans against the Government, whether he be drafted or a volunteer. The low pay of the serviceman, whether enlisted or commissioned, must be weighed and considered before he is listed as a dependent citizen.

"Your attention is specifically directed to paragraph 5 of the President's transmittal letter, wherein it is stated 'there is no means of taking into account the degree of the veterans' need.' Which veteran? The retired general, or the discharged enlisted man? One may be drawing several thousand dollars a year, while the other may not receive one-tenth of that sum. Why not be honest and say that the income of a veteran, general or private, is none of the Government's business? The phrase mentioned would penalize the veteran who might be thrifty or have accumulated modest holdings through frugal living. Why choose the veteran for this harsh, unfair discrimination?

"The needs clause is only applied to the discharged soldier when he becomes a veteran. Nowhere in the salary structure of the Government is this after requirement exacted. Gentlemen, just think of asking a retired general officer, or a retired diplomat of the Foreign Service, if his income exceeds $1,400, single, or $2,700 married. If this rule did not work such hardship on the veteran, it would be considered humorous; instead, it is insulting."

DISPARITY IN PAY

"An important phase of this subject should now be mentioned. The low pay of the serviceman, as compared with the income of the civilian during war periods, means that the serviceman has contributed a sum to the Government which in fairness may later be applied to the benefits he receives. Compare the earnings of those employed in Government projects, public or private, with the pay scale of the veteran. This disparity can be clearly set forth.

"There is a philosophy involved in veterans' benefits which many citizens and public officials have never considered. The owner of physical property takes out insurance policies to cover possible losses, and pays the premiums thereon, although he may never have any losses. Such expenses are charged to business operations, with no complaint about the cost. But those who have amassed considerable property as a result of the protection afforded to their property—not to mention their family—loudly protest over veterans' benefits when required to pay deferred insurance premiums called pensions. Good sports? Well, some might say they were ingrates. If the budget fails to balance, the same beneficiaries set up the cry that it is the veterans' benefits which prevent a solvent program. But sheltered softies have more callouses on their lungs than on their hands.

"When alluring posters depicting the glories and wonders of the defense services are exhibited in public buildings throughout the land, is the "needs clause" mentioned? Are not these posters used to encourage enlistments? A private employer who would make representations to those seeking work, and who would then bring forth a needs clause as a condition to retirement pay, would be haled into court for such a repudiation. Your Commission should meet this situation headon.

"An economy wave blew into Washington about 20 years ago, and many are surprised to learn that the dust is being removed from this relic. The prime purpose at that time was to trim the veterans so as to have more funds for domestic purposes; more recently, it appears that there are no boundaries to these operations, but must it be at the expense of those who have served?

"The veterans of the United States do not intend to occupy any secondary position in the national structure. They are willing to be considered in the entire economic picture, but unfair curtailments and inferior classifications will not be tolerated.

"Not only veterans but also the whole citizenship of the country will be deeply interested in the findings to be made by this Commission. The 'survey of veterans' benefits and other Government programs' will enlighten the country as to the major benefits provided by the tremendous expenditures in all fields of Federal activities.

"A nation waits a complete and impartial report.

"LLOYD THURSTON,
"Commander in Chief."

Both requisites, just mentioned, were absent—neither complete or impartial.

COMMISSION DID NOT COMPLY

I would call the committee's attention to the first paragraph requesting a survey be made "that steps be taken to examine the entire structure, scope, and philosophy of our veterans' benefit laws in relation to each other and to other Government programs," which of course would require the Commission to explore the entire field of Government expenditures, so that the relation of funds available to veterans could be considered alongside all other major activities of the Government.

Of course, a narrow investigation into veterans' benefits alone, without a comparison to other expenditures would only disclose about 7 percent of Federal expenditures. As veterans' affairs are closely woven with the entire national fabric, it is to be regretted that the Commission did not comply with the President's directive as mentioned just above, hence, those who study this report have been denied the right to know about the entire fiscal program of the Government, and especially the relation which a part, the veteran's part, plays in the entire picture.

In a number of instances the report makes reference to the large amount devoted to veterans' purposes, but nowhere mentions a sharply increasing national economy which results in the distortion of relative facts.

In a judicial inquiry or a survey to be made of any important phase of our national life, it is pertinent to inquire as to the background of those interested with making such a survey. The interest, or bias or prejudice—or lack of them—of the members would doubtless be reflected to some degree in their findings. In the instant case, probably three or more of the members are former officers of high rank, receiving three-fourths retirement pay; the other members having little first-hand knowledge of veterans' affairs. Therefore, it is proper to analyze the approach made to the subject of the inquiry.

I wish to interpose here and say that I have the highest respect for the able, brilliant men who have in the past and who now constitute the commissioned personnel of our armed services. I am only surprised that some of the members would seek to do a great injustice to the enlisted or discharged enlisted men of our forces in preparing to demote the proud status they have held for many years.

RANK DOES DOWNGRADING

Having had the opportunity to make rather considerable observations in regard to the relationship existing between the commissioned and enlisted personnel of our armed services, I had gained the impression that officers of field or high rank occupied a position comparable to a parent or guardian in their contact with the enlisted men, and especially, the civilian soldier. It goes without saying that I was deeply grieved and pained to learn that general officers who had been educated in service schools at the public's expense, and who served until they were discharged in the highest ranks of the military service, with three-fourths retirement pay, amounting to $15,000 or $20,000 per year, should be the first to propose that the discharged, enlisted veteran, should be downgraded and listed in a relief category. It never occurred to me that those who had attained a high military rank through the trials, sweat, pain, and blood of the enlisted man, should want to bring humiliation to those who had made it possible for others to reach positions of high distinction.

Doubtless the citizens of our Nation were greatly surprised to learn that a temporary body, partly composed of persons who had no firsthand knowledge of the subject matter, should be entrusted to make a report to cover the entire field of veterans' affairs, when there were many members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives who had served on committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter from 10 to 30 years; that probably a majority of that number had seen active service in the several theaters of our recent wars. The qualifications of these Members of the Congress was, and is, so greatly superior to that of the personnel assembled in this Commission leads a disinterested person to readily conclude that the findings, either in commission reports or legislation, would be of a much higher degree of competency than the hurried ill-considered and somewhat prejudicial viewpoints of this temporary research Commission.

As to the interest or want of interest of the major elements in the Commission, in a number of places in the Bradley-Eisenhower report, reference is made to "the obligation of citizenship which should not be considered a basis for future Government benefits," also, to the duty of male citizens to respond to military duty when the Nation might require their services; likewise, references to the fact that most of the enlisted personnel were in better condition when separated from the service than when they enlisted.

If the foregoing is accepted, then it follows that those in the commissioned grades owed a duty to serve, and because they had better housing, food and medical attention, their physical condition would be even better than that of the enlisted personnel, so if their services were to be based upon the altruistic philosophy and duty to serve, and better health after serving, why should they be entitled to three-fourths pay upon separation, and then baldly suggest a denial of the benefits to the discharged enlisted man?

I recall, gentlemen, when a group of general officers called on a member of one of your committees and asked it to take hasty action. This took place before a committee to increase the compensation of the Regular officers; they did not mention the enlisted men. Well, I think they finally beat a rather hasty retreat on that occasion, because I asked them if a group of enlisted men could come up and ask for an increase in pay, and what would happen to them. They failed to reply. I said, "They would be court-martialed, wouldn't they?" The enlisted men did not have representation quite often when those matters were considered.

Apparently, no thought was given to the financial or economic phases involved, such as the sacrifice made by the veteran who left his home, business or means of making a livelihood, which of course entailed a substantial loss. The fact is that the pay of the soldier as compared with the prevailing wage of the citizen received no consideration in the conclusions reached in this report.

COMMISSION SELF-PREJUDICED

A reading of this report and recital in the 415-page document discloses that the members of the Commission did not miss an opportunity to suggest action which would provide a better status for the commissioned personnel in the services, such as their warm endorsement of the Hardy bill which proposes that the beneficiaries thereunder would receive several times as much as a dependent or an enlisted veteran, so with this disclosure established, inquiry might properly be made as to the bias or interest in other phases of the report. The future of the career officer is a matter of deep concern to this Commission. Elsewhere, reference is made to organized pressure, the inference being that the enlisted veteran was able to obtain greater benefits than merit warranted. Of course there was no reference to pressure in which might have been exerted by those who might be interested in the betterments mentioned.

To epitomize the findings, it was asserted that all veterans' benefits should be based on "need;" that a veteran who had been industrious, frugal, economical, and through many years of intense application and had built up a modest competence, should be denied any benefit if his annual income, single, exceeded $1,400 annually, or, if married, $2,700 per year; that if the veteran should come within the limitations mentioned, the Government was thereby freed from a definite obligation it owed to the veteran because of the low pay he had received while in the service. I now assert that such a policy is devoid of common honesty and would virtually permit the Federal Government to take bankruptcy and discharge this fixed obligation.

The retired member of the judicial, the legislative or executive branches of the Government are not subject to such limitations, and many of these individuals never made any particular sacrifice in the discharge of their Federal employment.

Having in mind the high cost of medical and dental service, as applied to the aged veteran or his widow, the high cost of housing, and other necessary incidentals of life, when the individual does not have the best medical service accorded to retired officers without expense, plus their right to purchase considerable part of their living expenses at the PX at cost, would it not be interesting if those who proposed that assistance of $70 per month single, or $105 per month for a married couple as a fair living allowance, tried the luxury of the generous living scale mentioned?

Whatever contributions any of these persons might have made toward the retirement fund very likely was matched by the veteran in the inadequate pay he received while in the service.

NO FAIR RELATIONSHIP

It is even suggested in the report that there should be a difference in the amount paid the veteran living in different sections of the country. This proposal is so impractical and preposterous that no further comment is necessary.

Projections in graphs and tables are submitted as to future cost of veterans' benefits, and while such totals deal in large amounts, the value of the service of those who serve the Nation is not mentioned or considered in the approach to a fair relationship between those who served and those who benefit by such service.

Possibly, 1 or 2 members of the Commission might have had some dealing or firsthand information in regard to the operations of the Veterans' Administration, so the portion of the report dealing with this splendidly manned Government unit is of little value when compared with the knowledge gained by constant contact of the Members of Congress for many years with the unit of the Government mentioned.

A longstanding recognition of the services and sacrifices of veterans was inaugurated many years ago when preference in civil service employment was accorded to veterans, through a credit of 5 percent for all veterans, and 10 percent for disabled veterans, shown on page 319. Recommendation No. 46, without any reasons assigned, proposes that such privileges should be abolished as follows:

Recommendation No. 46: (a) The reemployment rights program fills a positive function in assisting ex-servicemen to return to employment. Inconsistencies in the statute should be clarified and resources augmented. (b) The Commission believes that veterans' preference in entering civil service and the special appeals procedure for veterans should be provided for a limited period after discharge (say 5 years), but should not continue for nondisabled veterans after a reasonable period for readjustment has been provided. There is no justification for special retention rights for nondisabled veterans, beyond crediting toward length of service the time spent in the Armed Forces during wartime. For veterans with significant compensable service-connected disability, a permanent preference both in hiring and retention seems justifiable, since their disability may put them at a disadvantage both in obtaining and retaining jobs. Such permanent preference should not be given, however, to those with only minute disabilities certainly not to those with less than 30 percent ratings.

Why this Commission should arrogate unto itself the authority to make such a determination is another evidence of their incompetence to deal with any material phase of veterans' affairs. In other words, these seven commission members are telling the Congress to repeal statutes on this subject that have been voted upon by several thousand Members during the period of the existence of this statute; the presumption of these temporary members of the Commission to make such a recommendation borders upon a presumption without a precedent.

It would not only be interesting but highly informative if all the correspondence engendered by the proposals of the Bradley Commission which have been sent to veterans' organizations could be physically presented.

This committee could then realize the fear that has been generated through press reports released by the Bradley Commission and news agencies. As many of the veterans and their widows are dependent upon the pay which they receive from the Federal Government, one can understand how concerned these aged persons would be when it was reported that the Government intended to curtail, in some instances omit, the pensions or compensation they are now receiving.

Therefore, it would be an act of human kindness if this committee could give assurance to these citizens in regard to the ultimate action to be taken on the recommendations of this Commission.

HAS INSTILLED FEAR

Because of the wide publicity given to the proposals offered by this Commission, a fear has been instilled into the minds of thousands of veterans and their dependents to a degree that is deplorable to those who are in constant contact with these servicemen and their dependents. If this committee should promptly table the entire report, a great wave of relief would be accorded to these aged persons who are so deeply concerned about the implications in the report of the Commission.

The Commission has been rather generous with the time and talents of others when they so blandly suggest that it is the prime obligation of young men to follow the colors. I say it is the prime obligation of the Congress of the United States, acting for the millions of citizens who have profited through the sacrifices made by the veterans, to see that fair and equitable provisions are made to those who have done so much for others.

In conclusion, it can be fairly said that this Commission did not investigate or report as to the necessary and pertinent facts which could be the basis for major legislation with regard to veterans. It is apparent that the Congress has the talent and the knowledge to fairly legislate in behalf of the veterans and their dependents. It is doubtful if any of the self-serving declarations of a part of the membership, plus the lack of information possessed by the others, will have little if any influence upon the future course of the Congress in this respect.

In closing, I would be remiss if I did not again mention that the Spanish War veterans are unanimous in their support of a pension bill introduced by Congressman O'HARA of Illinois, wherein he has proposed to increase the pension of their widows from $54.18 to $75. We earnestly hope that this measure will receive early and favorable consideration of your committee.

The American veteran whether an officer or a private, has just reason to be proud of the splendid record made by our Armed Forces, and he would feel humiliated beyond expression if the proud status he now bears and holds should be downgraded by either their comrades or the Congress. No human agency should presume to bring such a disaster and humiliation to those who wore the uniform of our country.

Federal Scholarship Loan Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1955, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to increase the educational opportunities of needy students through a Federal loan fund.

Titled "The Federal Scholarship Act," the bill would set up a scholarship fund with an initial 2-year appropriation of $15 million. The fund would be on a self-liquidating basis, and would provide loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education.

I wish to stress that the fund should not cost the Government anything and would help to alleviate a general manpower shortage in certain fields, while at the same time increasing the opportunities of the youth of America.

All loans would bear only 1 percent interest and be repayable by the student during a 10-year period commencing upon the completion of his schooling.

The bill provides that any shortages in the fund shall be made up by the States according to the amount of assistance their students have received, thus making the Federal Scholarship Act a self-sustaining, Federal-State cooperative venture. The interest charge should pay all expenses of operation of the program and may eventually be reduced or eliminated.

The Federal Scholarship Act would grant qualified students $1,000 per year for 4 years in any institution of college grade studies, or $1,500 per year in any institution of post-college-grade studies. My bill provides that the States shall set qualification standards under which loans shall be granted, and that States will receive grants in proportion to their congressional representation.

The basic plan for Federal scholarship aid has been the subject of bills in every Congress since 1949. We had had a temporary wartime measure, the student war loan program, which granted $3⅓ million in its 2 years of existence during the Second World War. Since then, more than three-quarters of this sum has been repaid. About one-third of 1 percent of the loans, or about $13,000 out of over $3,300,000, is probably uncollectible according to the Deparment of Health, Education, and Welfare. The great majority of the 11,053 needy students who received loans have completed or are completing their repayments.

Twelfth Annual Charles Coolidge Parlin Memorial Lecture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following 12th annual Charles Coolidge Parlin memorial lecture given by Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., before the American Marketing Association in Philadelphia on May 15, 1956:

Despite Mr. Minnelli's kind introduction, I want to say at once that my feet do not fit the tracks made by those who have delivered the previous lectures honoring the memory of Charles Coolidge Parlin. For the men you have invited to give them up to now have come from two groups: students of marketing and practitioners of marketing. And I am neither.

Most of my life has been spent in the mass media of radio and television. While broadcasting has a part in the marketing process, I do not feel I qualify as a member of your profession. All the more, then, I appreciate the part you have invited me to play in this annual tribute to one of marketing's great leaders.

And so it is from my experience with an instrument of marketing, rather than that of student or practitioner, that I talk to you this evening.

The Parlin Memorial Lectures are not very old—at least by my standards. The first one, by Prof. George A. Lundberg, was delivered in 1945—just after V–E Day, but just before V–J Day. The shadow of World War II was still so heavily on us that even second lecture, by Prof. Edwin B. George, given just 10 years ago, bore the title, "The Role of Marketing in War and Peace."

Since that time, there have been some kaleidoscopic developments in and around marketing. Those who thought that the great American drugstore had reached its zenith of complexity had, as it turned out, small vision; they had seen nothing yet. Moreover, if drugstores could sell alarm clocks, phonograph records, light bulbs and screwdrivers, why, some bolder thinker asked himself, could not grocery and delicatessen stores sell drugs? The answer was, of course, they could and now they do. In a New York delicatessen—a small one, about the size and shape of a Philadelphia streetcar—I recently counted between 50 and 60 proprietary drug items for sale alongside the pastrami and the yoghurt.

There have been other and more significant changes since the war. There has been the discount house, that economic mystery to the plain man. The soaring rise of the supermarket and the shopping center represents more dramatic and significant new concepts in retailing.

Coincident with the rise of the supermarket and the shopping center we have some relative decline in the importance and attractiveness of the old concepts of Main Street and downtown. We have also witnessed the extraordinary suburban shift; not to old suburbs only, although even these have boomed, but to new suburbs, sometimes tailor made to the needs of new industrial communities.

Our markets thus grow bigger—and bigger still. But the significant thing to me is that as markets grow bigger today, they also grow more supple and better articulated between themselves. The Delaware Valley and the Hudson River Valley are slowly merging. Now we are apparently going to build an intercontinental set of superhighways from coast to coast and north to south—52 billion worth over the next 13 years—that will surely destroy the last vestige of isolation in America and force regionalism further and further back into our past.

Sociologists and political scientists may write the books that comment on our changing America, but it is the successful marketing of goods that makes the changes; that causes the great ebbs and floods of populations from here to there; that makes one community thrive and another grow stagnant. I am not trying to set up buying and selling as the be-all and end-all of our activities here on earth; I am asking for a more realistic recognition that the search, either for new markets, or new goods to satisfy old markets, is the search that has expanded our civilization from a small camp huddled on the shores of the Mediterranean to the dimensions we understand and are able to manage today. From this point of view, market research can take on a dignity and importance that has not often been accorded it in its brief modern history. And this age-old process is still accelerating; I believe it true that, just physically considered, markets in the United States have changed more, and more for the better, during the last 10 years than they have changed in all the 20th century before that.

In some of these changes, in some of this market growth, in some of this dis-isolation, if I may use the word, television has played an important role. For television had the good fortune, in contrast to Miniver Cheevy, to have been born just at the right time—and, for that matter, just at the right place. If I may turn my glance back again to Professor George's lecture of a decade ago, marketing, as the title of his talk indicates, then had a dual role—in war and in peace. So far and fast have we come since then that it is hard for us now to remember that when Professor George's great lecture was new, it was still all but impossible to buy a new passenger automobile. There was a black market in Christmas tree ornaments, and if you wanted to hang a picture in your living room you probably had to use string because your local hardware store was still out of picture wire. These were the days in which we talked about "the inflationary gap"—the gap between the ample supply of dollars and the short supply of goods. War production had never absorbed more than 40 percent of total United States output, but that cut into civilian supply left our everyday economy gasping for breath.

When peacetime production began to resume, its first effort was, in the language of the day, to "refill the pipelines." Seen in perspective now, this process was quick. So great was the incentive to produce, and so great did the production become, that had it not been for the rise of marketing techniques and researches to meet it, this country could shortly have been confronted with such an insoluble glut of immovable goods as could have plunged us into acute economic indigestion from which we might not have recovered for years. But this was precisely what did not happen. Many bold innovations were responsible for our increasing ability to produce and consume and keep

these two processes in step, but none deserves more credit, or has had less, than what went on in the domains of marketing and distribution.

I like to think that it is not just the fumes of the Madison Avenue buses which convince me that television played a substantial role in helping market the tremendous output of this country's postwar productive facilities. And as a market-shaping and market-changing force of some considerable magnitude, television rose from a force of virtually zero at the end of World War II to a force embracing 6 hours a day of the time of 34 million families in the United States 10 years later.

But, tempting as it may be, I am not here this evening to tell you about the effectiveness of television as a tool of marketing. Rather, I want to discuss with you some coproducts of marketing's use of this tool of television. For what television has done for marketing is known to you. What your use of television has done for television, and has made it possible, in turn, for television to do for the people, is of the highest importance in our land.

Hand in hand, television has served American business and risen to become a remarkable social force in American life. Television has been able to grow, more rapidly than any other industry that I know of, not only because it has, by and large, given the American public what it wants, but more important because it has given to the viewers what they want without any further payment once they have bought their sets. It seems to me self-evident that television would not have developed so well or so fast had there been a penny of cost to the owner other than for the purchase and maintenance of his set.

What is significant, and what can be so easily overlooked, is that the marketing function—which is the sole source of television's income—pays not only for the great entertainment programs which the public has come to rely upon and enjoy so much. It also pays for the other programing activities which have given television its social force and status—its functions in the public service. By this, I mean its function as a part of the press—its news efforts, its programs devoted to the major issues of the day, its broadcasts devoted to carrying from one end of the country to the other the great events of our daily history, when and as they happen, the functions of education and culture, from opera to Dylan Thomas to Shakespeare to the study of the Constitution and the life of African Bushmen.

Television has brought to this Nation a wholly new form of journalism—electronic journalism—which gives the people an opportunity to see the great events as they happen, and see the leading protagonists of the main issues of the day—see and hear for themselves firsthand, so that they can make up their own minds. This, I submit, is a great instrument of pure democracy existing as a coproduct with the marketing function.

This year—1956—is, in fact, a year of special importance in this area for television. This, in many respects, will be the year of the television conventions, the television campaigns, and perhaps even the television election. As we approach convention time the news from Washington and elsewhere makes it abundantly clear that television is a focal point in the planning and shaping of the conventions and campaigns this summer and fall.

This year 1956 will be only the second year in television's life—and, in truth, in some respects even the first—in which these events will have fully national, fully professional television coverage available to all of the 99.2 percent of the people in the United States within range of at least one television signal. Philadelphia, the birthplace of so much else of moment in American history, is the birthplace, too, of national political coverage by television. Television coverage of national conventions began right here in Convention Hall in 1948 when the Republican Convention nominated Governor Dewey and the Democratic Convention nominated President Truman.

(If I might interrupt myself here for a moment, I would like to say that earlier that same year WCAU–TV was the first station to join our own New York station to begin what is today the CBS Television Network of 218 stations. In a sense, this was network history repeating itself, for in 1927 WCAU was the first affiliate of the CBS Radio Network.)

Convention coverage this summer will present a very special challenge to television, requiring the most exacting kind of thought and planning, and huge resources in both manpower and dollars. The cost of CBS Radio and Television convention coverage this year will run to over $5 million. Over 300 members of our networks will be working directly on this giant task. Planning for this year's convention coverage began in earnest in September 1954—23 months before the first call to order. And because the two conventions are scheduled so closely together in time, and so far apart in space, we will have the unprecedented task of transporting between 10 and 12 tons of delicate electronic gear 2,000 miles by air—having it in working order in San Francisco's Cow Palace 24 hours after the final gavel falls in Chicago. This is just about the tallest order ever faced in the history of communications. But the organization and resources of the nationwide networks are, I am certain, fully equipped to meet this order.

I find it more than a little ironic that I should feel it even relevant, not alone necessary, to remind ourselves that tasks such as these can only be performed by networks and that, if there were no networks in 1956, someone would have to invent them promptly, simply because necessity is the mother of invention. I find it ironic, too, to feel it appropriate, at this stage of television's life when networks and their program product have such pervasive impact and such explicit public attention, even to pause for a moment to underscore the obvious truth that only networks can provide live nationwide television service such as this.

The importance to the marketing function of live and simultaneous nationwide television service needs no emphasis from me to you. Marketing students and practitioners know well the significance of the flexible, simultaneous commercial message at a predictable time and at a predictable place in the program schedule—put there through a simple order which exposes the message to a potential 100 million customers at once. Only a network can do this.

And, apart from the commercial message, it is only a network which can provide on a nationwide basis the real magic of television—its real vitality—the live program, seen by the Nation just as it happens and just when it happens. I do not for a moment deny the entertainment and informative qualities of some film programs. Indeed some programs require film and are better for it. But good as film programs are—and many of them are very good—it is the live quality that gives television its truest excitement and strongest vitality. Never forget that it was the live program that launched television—Milton Berle, Ed Sullivan, Arthur Godfrey, Studio One, and the World Series, to name but a few. And it is the live feature that gives television an extra dimension today—the spontaneous, instantaneous slice-of-life, not something whose end is guaranteed at its beginning. Try to imagine a program like the $64,000 Question as a filmed show; you cannot do it, because the whole point is that you know only that you don't know what may happen the next instant.

Even more important, it is the networks and their ability simultaneously to communicate events as they happen, and people's thought as they are articulated, which gives to this Nation its most effective means of nationwide visual communication in time of national crisis. Network television has brought a cohesion among the people to a greater degree than has existed before. And it has provided the national with the potential of an incalculable benefit in terms of national interest, for it makes available a means by which, in time of national crisis, we as a Nation are afforded a mobility—an ability to turn on a dime—which may even be a condition to survival if we should ever have to meet totalitarianism head-on. For network television has made it possible, and will make it possible, for the people to act promptly and on an informed basis because they want to act. And that, I submit, is a far surer way for a nation to respond—a way far more certain of success—than to act without understanding and just because that is the action which some distant, disembodied terrifying voice has ordered.

These benefits to the Nation are benefits of the nationwide means of simultaneously communicating sight and sound. They are, as I say, benefits of incalculable worth which the distribution and marketing leaders of this country have helped give to the Nation through their use of television networks.

They are benefits which should and must be preserved. You will agree, I know. Yet I think it important that I urge this point on you this evening. For although I find it hard to believe, these benefits are now being attacked—heavily. We have in Washington at present a strange spectacle. One of the most ardent champions of the withdrawal of Government regulation of business proposes now to regulate the private radio and television networks—from transmitter to receiver—as public utilities. A most vigorous advocate of private enterprise, free of Government supervision, would now, suddenly, straight-jacket advertisers by formulating new ground rules perhaps affecting program service, station coverage, network affiliation policies and rates. In other words, the marketing of goods and services would be forced into agonizing, artificial economic patterns.

And only yesterday he was quoted by the Associated Press as saying a Government "checkrein" may be needed to make sure television networks broadcast unbiased news. According to the story, he cited this as an additional reason why he believes Congress should hold hearings on his bill to put networks under Federal regulation.

This gentleman is Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, who now appears before the Nation as a 20th century King Canute, ready to tell the electronic signals that they must turn back at the edge of a town. If he is not moved in his proposals by misinformation, or by ignorance, then we shall have to guess what other motives he may have for his proposed suppression of an essential part of our national communications system. For he would say to you that your marketing efforts must concentrate on fewer people rather than more—or, alternatively, to deny the fact that more people live in a big city than live in a small town. Senator BRICKER seems unaware that it is the radio and television networks that interconnect the Nation; that give small towns the same programs as big cities.

The attack on networks is serious. It is serious to the marketing function of television, and it is serious to the public service function. Should the enemies of networks ever succeed in destroying them, a serious deterioration in television programs and national coverage would be a swiftly following consequence. The entertainment function of television could continue, mostly through

the use of films. But the live and instantaneous linkage provided by the nationwide networks, whereby Twin Falls and Tampa are in the same bloodstream with Philadelphia and New York, would disappear.

There could be television without networks—but only in the same sense that there would still be banks if the Federal Reserve System were abandoned, or that automobiles would still run even after the destruction of the Nation's turnpikes. In a day when our American pride is that our national interconnections are becoming greater and greater; when we are building superhighways and the St. Lawrence seaway to achieve greater and greater accessibility with one another, the hamstringing of networks would be a monstrously grotesque backward step.

But assuming that this backward step is never taken, I see the growing interdependency of markets and communications as a great and good thing in the future. I feel quite sure that the new mass communications, far from rendering everything bigger and more brittle and harder to manage, are more likely to render things more plastic, better articulated, more understandable, and in many ways will turn many matters away from specialists and back into the hands of the people. An era of flexible and closely articulated decentralization seems to me to be the era we are most likely to enter. Although "regionalism," as meaning conflicts in tastes and customs, will tend to disappear, "regionalism" as meaning more autonomy for district and local managements is almost bound to increase. The idea that fewer and fewer groups of bigger and bigger moguls will manage the whole country from New York—or from Washington—is obsolete. The flexibility of democracy must win out, over the rigidity of imposed control at the top.

Television and marketing, together, are only at the threshhold of their contributions to the American people. For the viewing screen in the living room today can bring back to American politics the spirit of the town meeting, in which all citizens know the looks, the voice, the demeanor of the man who is asking for their confidence. The viewing screen in the living room can bring back to business dealings the intimate face-to-face confrontation, the ability to demonstrate, the person-to-person simplicity that flourished in earlier days—when the lady of the house went out to the peddler's cart to see for herself; when she did not need to take a carriage, or a steam train or an electric street car to a metropolitan trading center, to buffet the crowds of downtown and of Main Street, to come home with a coffee-grinder or a broom, or 5 yards of cheesecloth.

In short, it looks to me as if American life would in some ways resume the aspects of the intimacies of 100 years ago, as opposed to the heavy, unresponsive and, in many cases, arrogant, institutions of the 1880's 1890's, and the 1900's, when the dominant phrase was not Charles Coolidge Parlin's "the consumer is king," but was "the public be damned" of the monopolist. Politically, I think the mass meeting is on the way out—along with torchlight parades and red fire, and the crowds in the street waiting for the magic lantern in the newspaper office to project a hand-drawn slide onto a bedsheet hoisted between two wooden telegraph poles, to tell the public of the day that McKinley was running ahead of Bryan.

And what modern technology adds to this older pattern in our lives—this new simplicity, I would be willing to call it—boils down, in essence, to one great thing: the ability to throw the demagogue or the thug, or the bore, or the snake-oil salesman, out of the house, out of consciousness, if he does get in there, by a gentle twist on the knob that says "off."

And with an expression of gratitude to you for your attention tonight, and with this final word of homage to the pioneer we honor in Charles Coolidge Parlin, I turn that knob on my own self now.

Military Family Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the statement of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, made on May 24, 1956. We are all interested in our military personnel and I feel this statement will be of general interest. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been asked to express my views on how the shortage of adequate housing affects the combat capability of my command. I am particularly grateful for this opportunity as I am vitally interested in this subject. For several years, I have been in the position of demanding that my people work long hours under constant pressure, to insure that we are capable of performing our mission in case of an enemy attack. At the same time I have been able to give them very little in return.

The primary mission of SAC is to be strong enough to convince any potential enemy that a conflict with the United States would be unprofitable—that he would certainly lose more than he could possibly gain. Secondly, should an enemy miscalculate and launch an aggressive strike against us, SAC must have the capability of striking the base of the enemy's air power with such promptness and force that his ability to continue an effective attack is destroyed.

Planes and bases alone will not give us this capability. We must also have highly trained professional airmen, and we must have them close enough to the planes that they can be gotten into the air at almost a moment's notice at any time in the day or night.

Adequate housing, within reasonable distance from the base, is without question one of the major factors necessary to the retention of our trained airmen, and to their almost instance availability for duty.

Appropriations for military construction have never been sufficient, nor within the foreseeable future are they expected to be sufficient, to provide a significant number of family quarters to satisfy our requirements.

It was particularly gratifying to me that Congress saw fit to enact legislation last August to provide family housing for military personnel. Public Law 345 offered the hope of a decent home to thousands of Air Force families and eventually a more stable, professional Air Force. However, it provides too little time for awarding of construction contracts on more than a small percentage of our requirements before the law expires on September 30 of this year.

The lack of adequate housing on or near Strategic Air Command bases has three direct, immediate, and inevitable bearings on the ability of this Nation to survive a major nuclear war and has, in addition, a long-range effect on our capability to build and maintain a professional force.

I. IT DELAYS THE MANNING, TRAINING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMBAT CAPABILITY IN NEW UNITS

Since 1948 it has caused the combat capability of my command to be seriously retarded. Because of the lack of family housing, I have been forced to reduce manning and make selective assignments of officers and airmen to certain bases. Specifically, I found it necessary to restrict manning at 4 bases, each designed for one or more wings, and to thereby delay obtaining combat readiness for these units for periods up to 8 months. These delays have resulted in a direct increase in costs ranging from three to twelve million dollars in attaining combat readiness at each of four bases. Although I have now been forced in the interest of national security to abandon the policy of restricting manning at bases where housing is not available, the separation of my men from their families is seriously affecting their peace of mind and thus the quality of their work.

II. LACK OF ADEQUATE HOUSING REDUCES THE CERTAINTY THAT OUR COMBAT-READY WINGS WILL BE FULLY EFFECTIVE IN THE EVENT OF HOSTILITIES

Right now we have a given number of wings ready to go to war. Ready, that is, with one qualification. Because much of the housing in the vicinty of our bases, and on our bases, is inadequate, many of my key operations personnel and combat air crew members have been forced to go from 10 to as much as 50 miles from the base to find acceptable homes.

What does this mean when a sudden red alert occurs? Can we be sure that our pilots and other key men will be able to fight their way to their base with roads probably choked with civilian evacuation? Under such conditions, it is probable that many key men would never reach their duty stations in time. This would mean that many of our bombers would never reach their assigned targets. Primarily, these targets are, as I previously indicated, the enemy long range Air Force that is capable of reaching American cities with nuclear bombs.

Thus, as you can see, the lack of adequate housing on or adjacent to our bases will reduce the survival insurance we are paying for and need.

III. THE LACK OF ADEQUATE HOUSING HAS A SERIOUS, IMMEDIATE AND LONG RANGE EFFECT ON OUR AIR POWER

In the last year, United States intelligence estimates indicate clearly that the Soviet Air Force is rapidly expanding its strategic air arm. It appears that they may surpass us in numbers of long range jet aircraft by the 1958 to 1960 period. This trend is significant in that it endangers our superior capability for deterring attack, which is basically our best defense. As a result of this trend, we cannot afford to continue losing our skilled personnel, who are to a large measure responsible for our present capability. Under these circumstances, it is more necessary than ever to make an Air Force career worthwhile for our Air Force people.

I have never believed that Air Force officers and men should be forced to live as second-class citizens. They are too important to the security of this Nation to be expected to accept substandard conditions. Certainly, one of the most important factors in making Air Force life attractive is insuring the individual that his family will have a decent house in which to live.

In my opinion, not one man conscripted the day war starts will get into the decisive phase of the fight. The survival of this Nation in an all-out nuclear war will depend

on the character, the capability, the readiness, and the determination and courage of the men who are in the military establishment at the onset of hostilities.

It is a well accepted conclusion that our increasingly technical air power can only be sustained by professional personnel. We cannot maintain a qualified professional force unless we are able to obtain and retain high caliber men in our Air Force. At present, we are not attracting sufficient high caliber men to maintain such a force. This type of personnel has more assurance of providing their families with adequate housing and other advantages if they go into civilian industry.

In the past 4 fiscal years, the Strategic Air Command alone has lost approximately 108,247 airmen through failure to reenlist. The cost of training the replacements for these men was $1,610,000,000. This does not include the cost of the officers we have lost. Unless something is done to make an Air Force career attractive, those costs will be recurring indefinitely.

When Public Law 345 was enacted, I instructed my staff to take all possible measures to insure the expeditious construction of housing. However, even with this effort I find that the Strategic Air Command will get less than 9,500 housing units under construction before the law expires in September. Strategic Air Command will require approximately 13,900 additional houses for officers, 22,800 for noncommissioned officers, and 18,500 for lower grade airmen on its bases and for tenant units on the bases belonging to other commands.

You will note that I have included housing requirements for lower grade airmen for whom quarters allowances are not provided under permanent legislation. Many of these airmen are assigned to key positions in SAC, such as critical electronic work and ground crews and are indispensable to getting aircraft in the air. Furthermore, these lower grade airmen are the source of our future noncommissioned officer personnel. If we are to expect these men to stay in the service and assume greater responsibility, it is necessary to provide them with a decent place to live. It seems that every time I activate a new base the housing rentals in the nearby communities jump far above their true value. Since my married lower grade airmen draw only $50–$70 a month in quarters allowances, they are being forced to live generally in quarters that could only be called hovels. With this situation in existence they are naturally going to want to get out of the service. For these reasons I feel that it is essential to provide housing for the lower grade airmen as well as for officers and upper grade airmen.

When Congress, recognizing our problem, enacted Public Law 345 last year, I am certain their intent was to provide housing in which our airmen and officers could live with dignity. However, during the months since the law was enacted certain problems have been encountered that tend to nullify much of the benefit expected of this law, with the result that the intent of Congress has not been realized.

Generally, the problems stem from procedural practices that delay the start of housing projects up to 18 months in many cases, and cost limitations that will not permit the construction of adequate housing in many areas.

With this in view, I believe that the following considerations warrant your attention:

1. Legislation for title VIII military housing should be extended for a period of at least 3 years.

2. The cost limitation for housing should be increased in order to provide adequate housing in all areas of the country to make allowances for varying building cost indexes.

3. The cost of site development should be excluded from the cost limitation placed on the housing. These costs often amount to more than $1,000 per unit.

4. The low bid received for construction of housing on any base should be accepted as sufficient evidence of the value of the housing project and permit award of a contract, provided that it is within the cost limitation specified by the law.

With legislation including such provisions, I believe that it will be possible to provide my people with the housing they require in a reasonable time, as I am certain Congress intended.

With adequate housing, plus increased pay for skill, and appropriate dependent medical care, commissary and exchange privileges, and educational benefits to active duty personnel, we will achieve the strong, professional Air Force we need with an overall substantial net saving to the taxpayer.

Orin Lehman, President of Just One Break, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Only Human," by Sidney Fields, which appeared in the New York Sunday Mirror of May 13.

The article refers to the wonderful work that is being done by Orin Lehman, president of Just One Break, Inc., an organization devoted to the task of placing the physically handicapped in productive jobs.

J. O. B.'s efforts in this direction are most commendable, and it is hoped that other business firms throughout the country will extend a helping hand to those whose potential abilities can be developed into valuable assets.

The article follows:

Since Orin Lehman began J. O. B., or Just One Break, in 1949 over 2,000 physically handicapped people have been placed in productive jobs. Orin has an abiding interest in the handicapped. During the war he lost his left leg above the left knee and the other was badly crushed.

Until J. O. B. found work for them their communities kept the 2,000 at a cost of $3 million a year. Even figured at the minimum wage, they now earn over $4 million a year. The cost of placing them was $250,000.

"More important," says Orin, "we've opened up the minds of industry to the idea that there are 3 million handicapped in America who can do a job. So indirectly J. O. B. has placed more than 5,000 in productive work. But we're not too interested in numbers. We're more concerned with human beings and their feelings for each other, whether they're employees or employers."

Orin, 36, a bachlor, soft-voiced, fair-haired, and quietly determined, is part of the Lehman Bros. banking family, and nephew of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN. As soon as he got out of Princeton in 1942 he went into the Army as a 2d lieutenant, piloting a Piper Observation Cub and serving as a forward artillery observer.

When he was discharged in 1947 he was a captain with a Distinguished Flying Cross and a Purple Heart. He was hit by a shell near the Rhine on March 1, 1945. How did he react mentally?

"As a civilian you never expect it to happen to you. In the Army you know it may happen. The surgery is quick. Then you look around and see men of your own age in the same fix: I remember one, burned and bandaged from head to foot screaming for water, which he couldn't have. When we came out of it no sympathy was wasted on each other. In fact we kidded about our handicaps. But look, actually the disabled vet is a minority. There were only 17,000 military amputees in World War II and 130,000 civilian amputees in the same period."

Anyway Orin rejected self-pity, went to work for a few years in his father's banking firm, liked it, but it wasn't enough. He returned to school at night, is about to receive his master's degree in history from New York University, and is headed for a doctor of philosophy. He bought up four unprosperous weeklies and one daily newspaper in upstate New York and is busy reviving them.

He's a trustee of Montefiore Hospital, serves on the boards of the George Junior Republic, and the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. But he spends most of his days with J. O. B. As a result he was appointed to Eisenhower's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped and last March was made chairman of Governor Harriman's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

"The idea for J. O. B. belongs to Dr. Howard Rusk," Orin says. "He was in charge of rehabilitation for the Air Forces during the war and found it did little good to patch them up and just send them home to vegetate."

But Orin is president of J. O. B., and one of the founders along with Bernard M. Baruch, Thomas J. Watson, Bernard Gimbel, John Hancock, and others. Mayor Wagner has proclaimed this Monday J. O. B. Day, and Monday night J. O. B. holds its annual dinner-dance at the Waldorf.

In less than 7 years J. O. B.'s influence has been widespread and weighty; not only in new hope for all the handicapped, and a new attitude by industry, managers, supervisors, personnel directors, but even the medical profession.

"Doctors recognize a man's disability," Orin says, "but they do not recognize that the man's measured ability can be fitted to the needs of a job. It's interesting that those groups who raise tremendous sums for research of specific afflictions are now getting around to what happens to the victims after they're helped or cured."

In a recent survey of 300 people J. O. B. retrieved from the human junk pile it was learned that most of them had married, raised children, had savings accounts, and bought homes and cars. The Federal Security Agency estimates that for every dollar spent on rehabilitation of the handicapped they return to the Government $10 in income taxes.

National business firms like Metropolitan Life, Sperry, IBM, Lever Bros., have become ardent J. O. B. supporters. Several hundred civic groups and cities have asked J. O. B. to help them set up similar operations in their communities.

"In peacetime it's economically wise and good business sense to employ the handicapped," says Orin, "but in a national emergency it's a downright necessity."

And such sense cuts across national lines and boundaries. The United States is rooted in the concept of equal opportunity. Until recently that concept has been ignored with the handicapped. They were looked on as a burden, not a potential asset. But what better way can America exemplify the glory of equality than to show the world that it can rehabilitate its own handicapped and the handicapped in other nations. We did

it with hundreds of thousands of war-maimed Koreans, who might now be beggars.

"The vital thing," says Orin, "is that we give the handicapped neither sympathy nor charity; we give them back their dignity."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a portion of an address made by me over KWKH radio station, Shreveport, La., on Sunday, May 27, 1956, on the subject of foreign aid. The remainder of this address dealt with local and domestic matters. The speech is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the perennial foreign-aid bill is now before the House of Representatives and a vote will occur within the next few weeks. After a lot of good work in reducing the amount of money included in this bill last year, we had confidentally looked forward to a smaller recommendation to be made in the giveaway program during the coming year. We were, of course, rather disturbed when we learned that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had set a goal to increase last year's gifts by 40 percent for the coming year. The presure has been on, and we who have steadfastly insisted on reductions in this program have been under fire from those who want to give away more money.

When Secretary Dulles appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, he asked for $4,965,275,000. The committee has cut his request by $1,109,000,000—a considerable figure but not yet a big enough cut. I believe the Congress will further reduce the amount; and unless it is cut to the bone, I may vote against the entire bill as a protest against the huge giveaway program.

While the committee has reported a bill carrying with it the sum of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid, this does not give the entire picture. This amount is to be used for administration expenses of the far-flung organization; it is to be used for the point 4 program; the military aid program, and the economic aid program. And this new money, over $3.5 billion, is to be supplemented by the additional sum of $6,800,000,000, which is carryover money; that is, the money appropriated by Congress during past years which has not been spent, and, as they say, is in the pipeline, and is being carried over for use during the coming year. If you add the amount of money carried over as unexpended to the new money appropriated, you will have the total figure of money available for foreign aid of some $11 billion—yet they want more than this to give away. This sum is so huge that it will take years to finish giving it away even if the Congress stops appropriating money at once; and the foreign aid organization of the State Department will be in existence 10 years hence even without receiving another cent.

One of the projects to receive money under this program is the Aswan Dam and Reservoir to be built along the upper Nile River in Egypt. It is to be built, according to plans of our State Department, to cost $1.3 billion—a sum so large that even at the rate of $100 million per year, it will require 13 years to complete our promises. And this dam and reservoir is to be used for the purpose of impounding waters of the Nile River in Egypt to be used for irrigation and to reclaim the dry sands of the Sahara Desert. Some 3 million acres of land can be successfully irrigated with this water, and, of course, according to the Egyptian Government, this irrigated land is to be used to grow cotton, to send to a world market in competition with Louisiana-grown cotton, now in surplus supply on the world market.

Our Government is using this money in foreign lands today for the purpose of teaching these foreign people to grow cotton in competition with our own southern-grown staple. I have seen some of this cotton with my own eyes and held it with my own hands. I know what I am talking about. I have seen it in the fields where American-trained personnel showed the local people how to grow this staple.

To show you how ridiculous this situation is, I have to remind you that this week the House passed a new farm bill, creating a soil bank recommended by the administration, which will cost our taxpayers $1.2 billion per year to administer. This is necessary according to Secretary Benson, because of the tremendous surplus of American agriculture crops.

We added to the bill an item which I consider small but very important for our cotton people. This provision requires the State Department to sell 5 million bales of American cotton on the world market in competition with world prices. For some time, Congress has been urging that American surplus cotton be sold on the world market. Other countries have taken advantage of our price-support program, which has kept the domestic price of cotton at a reasonable level. They have increased their own production of foreign-grown cotton, and when it has been increased they have sold it on the world market at prices slightly lower than the support prices of American-grown cotton.

Of course, these countries are going to yell to high heaven when we sell 5 million bales of our surplus cotton. This fact alone will hurt their sales in foreign markets, and I expect the State Department to take its customary position against selling our local product so as to permit foreigners to get a price for their own staple. Nonetheless, the sale of 5 million bales of American cotton on the world market will reduce our surplus of cotton to the point that it will not be a serious threat. It will take the pressure off the domestic price and will have the effect of bringing us to a point where our further curtailment of planting cotton may not have to last long and we may not have to be so rigid in applying it.

This Midweek Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I urge that all Members and all others who read the RECORD give careful attention to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on May 30:

THIS MIDWEEK HOLIDAY

The main purpose of today's legal holiday, of course, is the honoring of our Nation's dead. The growing United States custom, however, is to regard Memorial or Decoration Day also as the year's first chance for a real look at the out-of-doors. And, when May 30 happens to fall on a Friday or Monday millions of Americans are able to enjoy a 3-day break.

This year, though, those extended joys are out. Our erratic Gregorian calendar has granted just a 1-day holiday for 1956. For 99 percent of us, it'll be back to work tomorrow.

And if you'll flip your calendar leaves a bit, you'll discover that other possible 1956 triple-decker holidays have been washed out. This Fourth of July will fall on a Wednesday. Christmas arrives on Tuesday. Only Labor Day, because it's always scheduled for a Monday rather than a date of the month, will provide one of those refreshing 72-hour vacations.

The proposed world calendar

FIRST QUARTER

January							February							March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SECOND QUARTER

April							May							June						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																			**	W

THIRD QUARTER

July							August							September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

FOURTH QUARTER

October							November							December						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																			*	W

*The year-end world holiday, W or Dec. 31 (365th day), follows Dec. 30 every year.

**The leap-year world holiday, W or June 31 (an extra day), follows June 30 in leap years.

Dozens of proposals for calendar reform have reached Congress and other countries' legislative bodies, and have been approved tentatively by some United Nations members. One is the World Calendar, reproduced above.

DATES HAVE SHIFTED

It would cure most of the exasperations of the ancient job the Western world is struggling along with now. The calendar you have on your wall or desk was first whipped together some 2,000 years ago for Roman Emperor Julius Caesar by a Greek mathematician, one Sosigenes. It was reworked by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582, and was imposed on the American colonies by Great Britain in 1752. The British at that time decreed that the day following September 2, 1752, should be called September 14—a loss of 11 days.

That messed up George Washington's birthday (originally February 11, 1732) among others, and also casts a different light on the feelings of some religious and historical organizations that our present days of the week have always been set that way.

On the other hand, some of today's orthodox religious groups do point out that time switches such as those proposed by the World Calendar with its "Worldsday" would seriously disrupt their present 7-day sabbatical cycle.

Calendar reform advocates and representatives of the faiths affected have, so far, failed to reach agreement on the Sabbath question. The best minds on both sides,

however, are still working on the problem.

In the meantime, our own United States Congress could be doing us a real and more immediate favor by decreeing that all legal holidays except those of religious significance shall hereafter fall on Mondays, like Labor Day.

CONGRESS CAN ACT

In most cases, there would be little problem. Even now, for instance, our Independence Day is celebrated on a Monday whenever our inconsiderate calendar happens to spot July 4 on a Sunday. A regular Monday observance of this holiday would give us all a 3-day break at the steaming stretch of year when we need that respite most.

It's too late to do anything about Memorial Day this year. But, should you feel sufficiently resentful as you slog back to the job tomorrow, why not inquire of your Congressman what, if anything, he is doing to eliminate such calendar annoyances in years to come?

H. R. 6588, which I introduced on June 1, 1955, would provide that all legal holidays except those of religious significance shall fall on Mondays. That bill has aroused a good deal of interest over the country. Similar legislation is now pending before several State legislatures. There has been some, but not much, opinion adverse to the plan but it has not assumed serious proportions. Personally, I should like to see the calendar reform adopted, but I am quite sure that would take a long time. In the meanwhile, I hope sufficient interest will be stirred up in H. R. 6588 and similar bills to induce their passage.

More About WOC's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion on the floor today with reference to WOC's, I think the following item from the Florida Times-Union of April 1, 1956, is most apropos:

HEADS OF THREE INDICTED FIRMS SERVING AS UNITED STATES ADVISERS

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Agriculture Department said today the presidents of 3 firms indicted this week in a cotton antitrust case are serving as unpaid Government consultants on cotton.

In response to queries, Assistant Secretary Marvin L. McClain said the three are members of the 10-man Export Advisory Committee advising the Government on how to get rid of a huge cotton surplus.

The three are Allison H. Pell of Pell Cotton Co., Charlotte, N. C.; Roger L. Dixon of R. L. Dixon & Bros., Inc., Dallas; and E. F. Creekmore of E. F. Creekmore Co., New Orleans.

A Federal grand jury in New Orleans on Wednesday indicted 8 corporations and 4 individuals on charges of engaging in an unlawful combination and conspiracy to restrain competition.

The Pell, Dixon, and Creekmore firms were among those indicted but they have denied any charges of wrongdoing.

The indictment alleged the defendants—8 companies and 4 individuals—violated the antitrust laws through collusive bidding in the purchase of more than $20 million worth of Government-owned cotton.

McClain said that while the Export Advisory Committee was considering questions involving the cotton surplus, its recommendations were not binding on the Department of Agriculture.

"The Department makes its own decisions," McClain said.

The Department is expected to announce soon a plan for disposing of the surplus.

One question involved is whether some cotton shall be sold competitively in the world markets, or whether it may be subsidized by the United States.

McClain said the Government never disclosed how the advisory committee members vote on such questions.

Promises, Politics, and Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include an address recently delivered by the Honorable Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

PROMISES, POLITICS, AND PERFORMANCE

(Address by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, before Federal Reserve Bank Assembly, Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., April 24, 1956)

This is open season for politicians in rural areas of America. They are at once the hunter and the hunted. Both the frequency and intensity of burst will increase during the next 6 months. Charge will be followed with countercharge, propaganda with counterpropaganda, and promise with still more glittering promise.

It is fairly traditional in American politics for the party seeking to gain control of the administration to exploit areas of potential unrest.

It is unfortunate, from the viewpoint of the minority party, that in 1956 there are relatively few areas of unrest among our people. Issues that capture the imagination of masses of voters are difficult to find.

But agriculture is in a relatively soft position, as compared with the rest of our economy. This is a fact concerning which there is no dispute. The disagreement arises over the cause of the farm price decline, and what should be done about it.

This means, therefore, that a disproportionate share of the total campaign effort in 1956 will be in the agricultural arena.

It will not always be easy to view the agricultural problem objectively. Frequently, more heat will be generated than light. And that kind of heat is never conductive to rational analysis or sound solution.

The foregoing discussion points up some of the great dilemmas in the farm policy debate. Should Government farm programs be based upon economic soundness or upon political expediency? Should the solution we seek be long-run or short-run? Should answers to our problems be sought in the company of statesmen or in the arena of politicians? In short, should principle rule politics or politics override principle, as we treat the illness of a basic American industry?

This is not to infer that long-run and short-run solutions are always incompatible, that principle and politics are always in conflict. They are not. But, whenever they are, principle and soundness should prevail.

FARM PROBLEM IS ECONOMIC, NOT POLITICAL

There is a growing number of farmers and farm leaders who are convinced that the farm problem is economic in character, not political. Its solution must be sought in sound and constructive measures, not in political platitudes.

We are witnessing a tremendous political struggle to curry the favor of the United States farm vote. After 3 months of hearings and debate, the Congress 2 weeks ago adopted an agricultural bill which the President felt, in good conscience, he could not accept.

The bill passed by the Congress contained many good points, but it also represented such a hodgepodge of legislative proposals that many people and important organizations felt it would do more harm than good. It was largely a political bill, in response to the President's recommendation last January for legislation that would seek constructive solution to our farm problem. The bill which the President vetoed represented primarily an effort to seek solution to the farm problem in politics, rather than in sound economics.

Let us think together for a few moments about the problems of our agriculture—problems of an agriculture beset for the last 5 years by declining prices and incomes, in the midst of an economy otherwise fat with prosperity. We must look at the basic causes of that decline if we are intelligently to discuss remedies.

The farm price slide is now 5 years old. It started in February 1951, some 8 months after the Korean war began. At that time the farm price parity ratio stood at 113. Last month it was 82. Some political sharpshooters would have you believe that the decline is all of recent origin. This simply is not true. Three-fifths of it, or 19 points, occurred in 2 years before Ezra Taft Benson became Secretary of Agriculture. Only about two-fifths of the decline has occurred in the 3 years since he became Secretary. The decline has slowed down markedly in recent months. Prices received by farmers turned up slightly the last 2 months. Our next job is to restore the index to a level that will assure satisfactory incomes.

The most serious price-depressing factor in agriculture today is the tremendous hoard of farm products under Government ownership. Nearly all sectors of agriculture feel the price-depressing influence of heavy supplies, either directly or indirectly. The Commodity Credit Corporation has approximately $9 billion invested in commodities owned or under loan to the Government.

FARM INCOME CUT ONE-FIFTH BY SURPLUSES

It has been reliably estimated that, were it not for the presence of excessive Government-owned surpluses, farm prices would be from 10 to 15 percent above present levels, and farm income last year would have been some $2 billion higher. This would have meant a 20-percent increase in net farm income.

It was logical, therefore, for President Eisenhower in his message of last January to recommend to the Congress an acreage-reserve program in the soil-bank plan. This was designed to make a frontal attack on the surplus problem. It would attack the problem where it occurs.

It was significant that the soil bank feature of the bill passed by Congress 2 weeks ago had almost universal support in both major political parties. The President, in his veto message, urged the Congress to pass the soil bank promptly so that it could be made operative yet this year with fall-seeded crops. It should be possible for the Congress to do this, since both Houses of Congress and both political parties are agreed on the desirability of having the soil bank.

The thing that split the Congress wide open during the debate on the bill was not the soil bank, but half a dozen other controversial issues added to the legislation. It is imperative that we get the soil bank authorization promptly, if we are to move as aggressively as we should in attacking the chronic surplus problem. But we need new legislative authorization as well as new appropriation. To get the one without the other is to be critically restricted in what the Department can do to solve the surplus problem.

For a number of years, one of the major arguments in farm legislation has revolved around the level and method of farm price supports. This argument has taken the form of high, rigid versus flexible supports.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for a gradual shift to flexible farm price supports, beginning with the 1955 crops. However, when flexible supports first became operative in 1955, the more than $8 billion worth of agricultural commodities which had accumulated in Government hands under previous price support programs had such a price depressing influence that the more moderate and economically sound provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954 scarcely had a chance to demonstrate their merit.

PRICES DECLINED UNDER RIGID SUPPORTS

Practically the entire decline in farm prices and farm income which we have experienced in the last 5 years occurred under operation of the rigid price support system. This all occurred while we have been arguing the question of rigid vs. flexible farm price supports in the legislative halls of America—indeed, while we have been living and operating under the high, rigid price support system itself.

If the high-price-support philosophy were the answer to our problem, we would have no farm problem today. We have been operating under that system for a number of years. Congress continued wartime price support laws too long into peacetime in order to protect farm income. However, these laws obviously failed to protect farm income. Under their operation, the Government acquired tremendously increased holdings of a wide variety of food and fiber. But even that could not stem the decline in farm prices and farm income which had already been in progress for two years before Secretary Benson assumed office, and which has continued less rapidly since that time.

But that was not all. This system of uneconomic price supports brought other important and undesirable consequences. It stimulated excess production abroad as well as at home. It encouraged substitute products to rob our markets both in this country and in other lands. It helped destroy our export outlets, as expanded production abroad robbed us of traditional markets. It even attracted foreign production to our shores, to compete with domestic output. It brought upon our farmers the most strenuous set of production and marketing controls in the history of American agriculture.

These controls are just as unpalatable to us in Government as they are to you who operate our farms and our marketing institutions. They are the undesirable product of an uneconomic system of price manipulation. They portray the futility of seeking solution in expediency rather than in integrity.

It is now abundantly clear to all that rigid price supports and rigorous production and marketing controls are the Siamese twins of agricultural policy.

And yet there persists strong sentiment in the Congress and even among some farm groups to etxend he very system that brought this yoke upon our farmers.

POLITICS WITHOUT PRINCIPLE

This represents the victory of politics over principle, of promise over performance. In the long run such a victory will become hollow; in the short run, it can be damaging.

The inconsistency of this position is like forcing a farmer to eat green apples to cure his stomachache he got from eating too many green apples in the first place.

Even the stringent production and marketing controls currently imposed upon our farmers do not prevent growing accumulations of Government-held surpluses. And yet, producers of cotton, tobacco, wheat, and rice have been cut back on production quotas to the point that many of them face liquidation.

Producers of basic crops with compulsory controls as is true of cotton, tobacco, wheat, and rice, have so small an allotment that many of them find it difficult to meet operating and living costs with production so curtailed.

A cotton farmer with a 3-acre allotment, a tobacco farmer with his 1-acre allotment, or a wheat farmer with an allotment only 60 percent of what he used to grow, needs something besides 90 percent of parity. One hundred percent of parity would not solve his problem. There isn't much that any kind of price-support program can do for him. His crying need is for an opportunity to expand his production.

When a commodity gets itself into the fix of producing for the Government rather than producing for a growing market, it almost inevitably finds a ceiling placed on opportunity.

Burley tobacco provides an excellent illustration of where you ultimately get with production controls. The Congress has established five-tenths acre as a minimum allotment for any individual burley tobacco farm. When acreage reductions were called for, the cut fell most heavily on larger farms. No farm is reduced below five-tenths acre.

TOWARD A NATION OF PEASANT FARMERS

But it is impossible to make any kind of decent living for self and family on five-tenths acre of tobacco. Indeed, it is very difficult even to be an efficient producer on an allotment of size.

Yet last year, of a total of 317,000 burley tobacco farms in the United States, more than 60 percent of them were at the minimum level.

This means that your Department of Agriculture is now in the business of rationing poverty among burley tobacco producers.

The same trend is taking place, although to a less marked extent, among flue-cured tobacco producers in the Southeast. Interestingly enough, just in the last couple of years, the world's largest market for flue-cured tobacco moved from Wilson, N. C., to Salisbury, southern Rhodesia. We have no control over southern Rhodesia producers, who are moving into the European markets our farmers once supplied. And while this takes place, American farmers are being severely curtailed by government in their opportunity to exercise their God-given right of initiative, imagination, and production in a healthy atmosphere of economic freedom.

There is no Government program that can provide a decent living for a family with a cotton allotment of 4 acres, a tobacco allotment of less than 1 acre, a wheat allotment so small that necessary equipment can't be used efficiently, or a corn allotment cut down to the size that the rigid price support program would impose upon our Midwest farmers.

We have gotten ourselves into this incredible mess primarily because many of our people believed, or at least hoped, an act of Congress could brush aside fundamental supply and demand relationships. for many years we have set out to legislate price at artificial levels, without effective measures to maintain consumption rates to curb production increases.

We have shackled price as an economic throttle, and provide no substitute regulation, other than Government controls. In most cases, these proved to be too late and too lenient. Indeed, to impose the kind of controls necessary to make this system work would have been to destroy the very freedoms that our farmers hold dear.

When production and marketing controls are imposed, they always strike hard at the small farmer. It is true we have the minimum acreage allotments below which a farmer will not be reduced. Under this system, the biggest relative cuts are taken by the large producers. On the other hand, the minimum acreage allotments established are usually so low that an individual farmer finds it impossible to make a decent living for himself and his family on his minimum acreage.

When farmers have been throttled down to an uneconomic production base so small that it hurts, they can have their level of price supports set at 150 percent of parity, and still not be guaranteed an adequate living.

They need an opportunity to produce. They need to know that if they are efficient and ambitious, they can expand their production and therefore increase their income. They realize now, perhaps too late, that income is the result of production times price. The high price guaranteed by the Government means nothing, if that same Government removes from them the right to produce. Their incomes fall, living standards suffer, and disillusionment follows.

What do these small farmers then do? They are forced either to resign themselves to a miserable level of living, or to seek employment off the farm. In the latter case, many of them drive anywhere from 25 to 50 miles each way daily for off-farm employment, and then do their farming operations on weekends and evenings. After a while, their principal source of income is off the farm, with farming operations more or less incidental. Their production begins to compete with legitimate farmers whose principal source of income is on the farm. Then the farm situation is still further complicated, and still additional small to medium-size farmers are forced either into liquidation or into seeking additional off-farm employment. And so the cycle goes on and on, with large numbers of small farmers being forced into liquidation by the very system that set out initially to improve their incomes.

It is significant further to point out that the great bulk of price support benefits goes not to the small farmer, but to the large farmer. For example, a year ago the top 1 percent of all Government loans made on wheat included 12 percent of total dollars loaned on wheat. Corresponding figures were 8 percent of total loans on cotton, 6 percent on corn, 11 percent on oats, 24 percent on barley, 8 percent on flaxseed, 11 percent on grain sorghums, and 8 percent on soybeans. These figures are indicative of the extent to which Government price assistance goes to the large farmers.

It is obvious why this is so. A small farmer limited to a couple of acres of cotton, half an acre of tobacco, 10 acres of wheat, or 15 acres of corn, has insufficient total production to benefit very much from any Government guaranteed price.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS ARE BACKWARD LOOKING

Few if any agricultural commodity groups have ever expanded after accepting the "favor" of Government high price supports, and the necessary production and marketing controls which follow. On the contrary, the production of many price-supported commodities has shrunk in recent years.

When the benevolent hand of Government is called upon to control prices and direct the flow of goods, opportunity to produce and market is usually rationed among producers. Farmers are limited to a percentage of some historic base of what they have produced in the past.

Government production and marketing controls are essentially backward looking—not forward looking. Under these circumstances, producers with above average managerial capacity and ambition are severely limited in what they can do. They suffer, consumers suffer, and all America suffers.

We must not continue to injure our small to medium-sized farmers throughout America. We don't want to see their opportunity to expand and to become more efficient thwarted by the very Government that sets out to help them. We don't want to see them progressively throttled down and down until they are forced to abandon their farming operations because their Government would not permit them to produce enough to make an income sufficiently large to support self and family at a decent level.

AGRICULTURE IN THE POLITICAL AUCTION RING

This is a political year. It is a season when unscrupulous politicians feed on unrest. Some agitators even seek out and foment unrest. Promises are made which defy performance.

It takes political courage to face reality, and to recommend an economically sound course of action, even though it doesn't promise any white rabbits out of the hat, any political nostrums, any patent medicine panaceas.

In the 6 months ahead, frequent attempts will be made to place agriculture on the political auction block. This is unfortunate. American agriculture is not for sale to irresponsible bidders in the political auction ring. American agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat, and its welfare must not be sacrificed on the altar of partisan politics.

The problem of agriculture today stems in part from the fact that for at least a decade many political leaders whose public heart bled for farmers had their private eye on the ballot box.

When such people come to you in the months ahead, ask yourself then whether they are really interested in your vote, or in your long-time welfare and freedom. If the answer is the former, subject them to the light of truth, and unmask them for what they are. If the answer is the latter, join with them, regardless of political affiliation, in a constructive and economically sound approach to a solution of our farm problems.

In this way our great agricultural industry surely must move toward increasing prosperity, progress, and freedom for millions of Americans who choose to live in close communion with the soil.

The Late Hon. William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker. It was with a deep sense of personal loss and shock that I learned of the passing of my friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN. BILL'S tolerance and understanding, his sincerity and his conscientiousness will long be remembered. I learned to know him, not only as we sat side by side during committee hearings, but during our travels to South America with the committee and it was during these days that I grew to admire his ability and his devotion to his fellow man, characteristics which he hid beneath a cloak of great modesty.

The respect in which he was held by his colleagues was unsurpassed; his friendship was genuine; his smile ever ready and cordial. He will be sorely missed by all of us.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan and the other members of his family.

Address of Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, in Dallas, Tex., May 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the speech delivered by the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, Senator from Arizona, in Dallas, Tex., May 16, before a large group of the people of Dallas County. It is my hope that my colleagues will find great merit in the principles and the reasoning of Senator GOLDWATER presenting his views. I was particularly impressed with his remark about the common man philosophy which is so antithetical to the American's creed and beliefs as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution:

It's a pleasure, as a Republican, to come to Texas without fear of being horsewhipped. Of course, I realize that, like the fellow who passed up filet of skunk, the "name of the animal" still bothers a lot of folks; but as long as we are together on the fundamental ideals of American Government I'm not too concerned about party labels.

I am glad, though, to see signs of the development of a two-party system in Texas. We went along for too many years in Arizona under the delusion that only Democrats were entitled to hold public office; but now, having experienced success in recent elections, Arizona Republicans no longer hide beneath the cloak of defeatism.

When the voters of this district elected BRUCE ALGER to Congress, they opened the way for the release of the fundamental Texas philosophy of conservative, free enterprise government. Not only did they send to Washington a man of the highest caliber and character, they also said to the Republican Party: "We are tired of New Deal socialism in America. The leaders of the pseudo-liberal Democrat Party of today can't, or won't, save our liberty. Here's BRUCE ALGER to help Republicans do the job for Texas and America."

Believe me when I say that Texas can be proud of this decision. Your confidence in BRUCE ALGER has been fully justified. You can do no better than to continue his service for you in Washington.

BRUCE has one quality above all others, which authenticates him as a Texan—he brags. He brags about Texas—its traditions, its institutions, its opportunities—and I suggest that this is a trait which could well be developed to a greater extent by all Americans with respect to those principles of freedom which have enabled us to build on this continent the most perfect form of government yet devised.

There is something going on in Texas today, however, which leads me to believe that you people aren't going to be content with boasting the wonders of your State. In fact, when someone told me the story the other day about the fellow from Texas who was struck by lightning while he was swearing, I replied that there was nothing so strange about that. Indeed, it would only be unusual if lightning should strike a Texan when he wasn't swearing.

The truth of the matter is that people in Texas aren't the only ones cussing these days. In Arizona, folks have been swearing pretty lustily for 6 years or more. It's done them some good, but they still aren't satisfied; and if I know Arizonans they'll keep right on swearing, just like Texans, until the efforts of the self-styled, pseudoliberals to substitute their socialistic pipedreams for our proven system of constitutional, free enterprise government are effectively and completely combated.

Despite what might be said by your philosophical critics, you Texans aren't really moss-backed reactionaries. This kind of epithet is invariably hurled at men and women who believe in liberty and who want to preserve the creeds and institutions which created that liberty. It represents the only ammunition of the sordid crowd of New Dealers who have been trying for years to convince our citizens that we have reached the zenith of freedom's promise and must now revert to an antiquated theory of slavery and regimenation.

This attitude, of course, they advance in the name of liberalism; but I suggest that it is the New Dealers who are the true reactionaries—the revolutionists—who want to take America back down the jagged road to tyranny, who want to take from us the liberty for which we and our ancestors have fought and bled.

Texans brag because they know that there are no commen men in their midst—that, in fact, there is no such thing as a common man in America.

Texans recognize the wide diversities our country has in races, nationalities, religions, occupations, and income levels.

Texans believe in treating our citizens as individuals, with sacred rights and freedoms, and opportunities greater than anywhere else in the world.

They do not subscribe to the collectivist theory that Americans—or Texans—are cast from a common mold.

The preachers and prophets of gloom in our country—the New Deal revolutionists—have long leaned heavily, in the name of liberalism, upon the theme of the common man.

They have employed the tyrant's tactic of division and disunity by appealing to the lingering prejudices of a system of ranks and class which pure freedom does not recognize. When they speak, they speak not to all Americans as Americans, but rather they set labor against management, farmer against worker, black against white, Jew against gentile, Catholic against Protestant, rich against poor.

In other words, they classify Americans according to race, color, religion, and occupation, and they say to each group that they are the common men who are being oppressed by the privileged few.

This privileged few, of course, in the eyes of the Socialist-minded, pseudo-liberal, is anyone who has enjoyed a measure of success and prosperity that is greater than that of the particular group to whom he is speaking.

For many years, the Democrat Party has applied this strategy. It has portrayed itself as the people's party, while Republicans have been described as the party of the special interests—in other words, the common man in opposition to the privileged few.

This claim is utterly false, but the self-styled liberals who have, unfortunately, gained control of the mechanism of the Democrat Party, have pressed it so boldly, for so long, and in so many forms that they have achieved for it a substantial measure of popular acceptance.

It is a flagrant example of the big lie in politics.

No major party could function successfully in a country of the size and diversity of the United States if it served only the common man or the privileged few.

It is one of the virtues of our nationwide two-party system that the voters may switch from one major party to the other and find each one an adequate instrument to serve the Nation as a whole.

If this were not true, our political system would soon degenerate into a multiplicity of small special interest parties not capable of governing.

The very health and vigor of our two-party system—each one drawing strength from all four corners of the Republic—belies the Democrat Party claim.

These statements by so-called liberals who have corrupted the traditional Democrat Party philosophy are so absurd that I often wonder just how stupid they think the American people are.

In his acceptance speech before the Democrat National Convention on July 15, 1948, Harry Truman said, for an example:

"The people know that the Democratic Party is the people's party and the Republican Party is the party of special privilege."

He said further, at that same time, "The Republican Party favors the privileged few and not the common, everyday man."

Adlai Stevenson, in a speech at Chicago on November 19, 1955, said:

"In whatever direction we look—tax policy, resources policy, credit policy or whatnot—we see the sharp outlines of what can only be described as special interest government in Washington, something we haven't seen since Republicans were there last."

Another instance of this pseudoliberal, common-man approach to Democrat partisanship may be found in the Report on Congress issued by the CIO in September 1954. This report says, on page 20:

"The question is not whether there will be any tax relief, but who will get it. The Democrats wanted it for the people. The Republicans wanted it for the upper brackets and the corporations."

As recently as April of this year, according to a story which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the 13th of last month, Democrat Senator SAM ERVIN, of North Carolina, said:

"The Republicans believe in government for a few elite; the Democrats believe in a government serving all the people."

The big lie marches on.

One reason behind the Democrat Party claim that it is the party of the common man is the fact that for years it has labored hard to mold the American people into common men.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell called attention to this tendency of the Democrats to turn our people into common men in an address at Flint, Mich., on January 20, 1956, when he said:

"The keepers of this doctrine were interested not in individual men but in collective man, massed man. For them social problems were quite simple. One merely had to determine what was good for collective man and then shove it down his throat like castor oil. The Government was of the people, for the people, but by the social planners."

Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, put his finger on the source of the doctrine of massed man when he wrote:

"The Soviets seek uniformity and strict adherence to the creed of Marxism-Leninism."

In that creed man is nothing as an individual. He exists only as an unidentifiable atom in a collective mass; and men and mass exist only for the state.

Recent history shows the many steps through which the Democrats, who were in control of government, deprived our people of their individuality.

Democrats centralized the government of everyday affairs in Washington, leaving less and less for people to do in their home States and localities. They handed out billions in relief, grants, and aids from Washington, making people dependent upon the Great White Father at the Nation's Capitol.

Through social security, they reduced the individuality of persons to numbers in electronic computing machines. They forced men into unions to bargain collectively.

By raising great citizen armies to fight in foreign wars, they put the GI stamp of uniformity on every mother's son. By spawning Government housing developments they scattered clusters of identical brick and frame boxes from one end of the country to the other.

The list of laws, acts, and regulations which systematically robbed people of their individuality and piled them up in collective masses could be extended a mile long.

No one can deny that the Democrats intended to do good by these operations. No criticism need be leveled against relief programs, social security, collective bargaining, and public housing. Yet, it cannot be denied that an inescapable and most harmful byproduct of such operations has been the weakening of individual personality and self-reliance.

The Democratic Party has done its utmost to pour our people into the mold of common men and to deal with them in the mass. This is the basis of their political philosophy and voting appeals.

While they have had some measure of success, especially where our technical progress has emphasized collective or mass action, this success has been superficial because deep down our people are proud and jealous of their individuality. They resent being compressed into the mold of the common man.

Behind the mass production and the collective this and that, our people still have wide diversities and at heart remain individualists. This is clear when we examine some of the deep-seated diversities in American life.

Where Democrats are sincere in making the claim to be the party of the common man, as some of them undoubtedly are, they see the forest and not the trees. They look at the material uniformities in American life—the same trains, hotels, restaurants, cooking, and newspapers—and quickly come to the conclusion that all our people, too, are of a common mold.

What they fail to see is that this conformity is merely an expression of our technical, material progress. They fail to understand, or deliberately close their eyes to the fact that beneath the common material veneer is a people still highly individual in talents, aspirations, and with the intense desire to fulfill their individual personalities.

Again, in his address at Flint, Mich., in January of this year, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell declared:

"We were told for some years that Government was supposed to minister to the common man. This doctrine of the common man was as singularly unfree a doctrine as we have ever witnessed in this country. The idea that we are all alike, a common mass, the products of some sort of biological punch press, seeking the same end, through the same means, with the same ideas, desires, and needs, is indeed a devastating one."

A similar view is expressed by James B. Conant in his latest book The Citadel of Learning, where he says: "We in the free world, through our schools, colleges, and universities, seek to perpetuate that tradition of Western culture which emphasizes diversity, controversy, and tolerance."

So where are we to find the common man the Democrats are always talking about?

Is he of the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Germanic, Latin, Slavic, Celtic, or the score of other races which make up our population?

Is he English, Irish, Scotch, German, French, Italian, Norwegian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, or among any of the other three score and more nationalities which people the United States?

Do we find that our common man is a Catholic, Methodist, Unitarian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Jew, or any othe other hundreds of religious sects which flourish among our people?

Is he the business executive, the local banker, the city or rural lawyer, the office clerk, the shop manager or foreman, the factory worker, the school principal, the teacher, the corner grocer and his wife, the chain-store manager, the garage owner or mechanic, the department-store clerk, the Army officer or private, the housewife, or in any of the other thousands of occupations which make up our working population?

We have over 65 million employed persons in all occupations today. Where is the common man in this total?

Is he the worker in manufacturing who numbers only 15 million of our nonagricultural employed; or the 1 million engaged in mining; or the 2 million doing construction work; or the 4 million engaged in transportation; or the 9½ million who work in wholesale and retail trade; or the million and three-quarters who handle finance, insurance, and real estate; or the 5 million engaged in service industries; or the 5½ million people who work in Federal, State, and local government?

Is the common man to be found among our 8 million farmers? Is he the soft or hard winter wheat farmer, the cotton farmer, the rice farmer, the truck gardener, the cattle rancher, the cattle feeder, the peanut grower, the dairy farmer, the sheep raiser, the poultry and egg producer, or among the hundreds of other farm producers in our vast lands?

Does he come from the 7.6 percent of consumer units who have a family personal income of $1,000 per year or under; or the 15.1 percent whose income ranges from one to two thousand dollars; or the 18.9 percent with income from two to three thousand dollars; or the 19.3 percent with income from three to four thousand dollars; or the 12.8 percent with income from four to five thousand dollars; or the 14.8 percent whose income is from five thousand to seventy-five hundred dollars; or the 4.8 percent with incomes between seventy-five hundred and ten thousand dollars; or the final 4.5 percent who have incomes of $10,000 and over?

What do these facts show?

They show one thing above all else: That there is no such thing as a common man in the United States.

Every man and woman is an individual, with talents, interests, needs, hopes and dreams of his or her own. Each person seeks freedom to live his own life, to develop his own personality, and a fair opportunity to get ahead in the game of life on his own merits.

When young we dream of making a professional career, starting a small business, operating a farm, owning our own home, establishing a family, and building a competence for old age.

America is the land which urges us to "hitch our wagon to a star," to plan and to build on the rich foundations of our freedom and the heritage of those who came

before us and provided for us, and for the generations of Americans yet to come, the opportunities we have had, as well as inspiration to move ahead to yet undiscovered frontiers in this sanctuary of freedom.

Democrat Party leaders who make the claim that theirs is the party of the common man are well aware that ours is a Nation of great diversities, and that there are no common men in our midst.

Still, they do not hesitate to develop and inflame class distinctions in their aim to separate a few of our people from all the others.

One doesn't have to think hard to find the reasons for such Democrat trickery. One reason, is that the Democrats have been running the Government on the doctrine of the collective man, massed man.

A second reason lies in the field of raw politics.

Political history shows that Democrat Party leaders will make any claim and follow any line which promises them the votes to gain control of the country and remain in power.

They have shrewdly calculated where the bulk of votes lie and they make their appeals accordingly. That is why they label Republicans as the party of the "rich," the "bankers," "big business," and the "privileged few." They know that such labels carry an unpleasant, even sinister implication; and that few votes can be had from those sources.

They label their own party the party of the common man, the average man, and include among these the farmer, the laboring man, the white-collar worker, and the small-business man because such labels sound wholesome and the bulk of votes can be drawn from those sources.

It apparrently does not trouble Democrats in the least that this deliberate inflaming of class distinctions can do great harm to the peace and unity of the Nation.

It apparently does not bother them to malign good men and women among our people.

Their consciences seem not to trouble them when it is pointed out that their party, too, has its share of millionaires, its quota of advisers from banks and big business, and a very sorry record of favors to the privileged few. It doesn't seem to bother them, either, that a great many of the things they have done with professed intentions to help the so-called little man have resulted in great harm to the bulk of our people.

In using the inflammatory phrases of class distinction, they have had but one thought in mind—to get in power and stay there.

We are reminded in the third chapter of the First Epistle General of John that "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murdered."

Isn't this, after all, the end result of these pseudo-liberal, common man appeals?

They are attempts to instill fear in the minds of our citizens—fear of one another, fear of those who are different, fear of the self-reliance which is the keystone of liberty.

What has happened to the faith of our fathers?

America was not made free by hate. Humanity does not move forward in a climate of fear.

America has grown great because its citizens have trusted wholeheartedly in God, in our country, and in each other.

If the deceit of this new New Deal-Liberal dogma of the common man is perpetuated, freedom's call will go unanswered, opportunities will go unfulfilled, and competence for the future will be destroyed.

We cannot continue to reap the blessings of liberty by incubating cowards. We cannot carry on America's tradition of strength and leadership by stifling ambition, curbing incentive, and abandoning faith.

We need—desperately need—the uncommon men of our Nation. We need the courage and unquenched spirit of adventure which inspired the freedom of these United States.

We need to remind ourselves and each other that the Federal Government doesn't give us anything that it does not first take from us, so let's stop looking to Washington for the blessings of life and start doing more for ourselves.

Let's encourage in all Americans the devotion and optimism that characterizes Texans so that throughout this Republic men and women will proudly boast that in the United States we have "the biggest, the most, and the best."

You who are gathered here tonight know this to be true, and you are dedicated, through the Republican Party and your love of freedom, to the task of assuring that it will always be so.

A Tribute to the Commonwealth of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit a tribute to the Commonwealth of Virginia prepared by the Honorable C. Orville Hammack, of Sunnybank, Northumberland County, Va.

Mr. Hammack is an outstanding citizen, a Virginian who is proud of his heritage and who embraces the fundamental doctrines and principles upon which our country was founded. He is held in high esteem by the people of Northumberland County, and he served some years ago as a member of the House of Delegates of Virginia from that legislative district.

The tribute is as follows:

VIRGINIA

(By C. Orville Hammack)

This is Virginia. Mother of States, home of patriots, birthplace of Presidents. Virginia, where Indian braves fished and hunted and fought. Home of Pocahontas, true friend of the struggling colonists.

This is Virginia. Whose shores are washed by the Chesapeake and the Potomac. With her beautiful inland waters and magnificent mountains that rise as medieval castles, peak upon peak.

This is Virginia. Where the stalwart settler cleared the forests, built his rude home, tilled the soil and buried his dead. It was the vision of these pioneers, blended in the crucible of sacrifie and labor which carved out of a wilderness, the foundation stone of a nation.

This is Virginia. Where mothers reared their children, taught them by the light of the primitive candle, and when the days work was done, tucked them in their trundle beds, and then with tired fingers spun the yarn and knitted their garments, weaving therein the dreams and prayers of the pioneer mother.

This is Virginia. Whose soil is hallowed by the blood of the defenders of her sacred rights. The doorway to a great Nation, destined to be baptized in the blood and tears of suffering and sacrifice, that her people might know and share the immeasurable cost of unyielding valor and loyalty.

This is Virginia. Which gave to the Nation, Washington, "Father of his Country"—Monroe, author of the great historical document bearing his name—Mason whose vision and wisdom gave us the Bill of Rights—Jefferson, ardent supporter of independence—Henry, champion of liberty and a host of others who modestly wore their mantels of greatness.

This is Virginia. Home of the immortals Lee and Jackson. Birthplace of men and women whose names have added lustre to the Nation's history. Men and women, conquerors of the seemingly impossible, who with indomitable will and inflexible courage broke down the barriers of subjugation and political slavery, that unborn generations might breathe the wholesome atmosphere of freedom.

This is Virginia. Grown from an infant Colony into a great Commonwealth, with her schools and universities that have enriched the minds of here people—her institutions of mercy that have ministered to the needs of the unfortunate. Truly it may be said, that the fine culture and broad sympathies of western civilization were seeded in the vision and sacrifice of her pioneers.

This is Virginia. With her great farms and orchards—stock that graze peacefully in her rich valleys—fish that teem her waters and birds and game that inhabit her forests. Virginia with her modern highways uniting country and village and city, and her winding trails that lead through flaming rhododendron and fragrant mountain laurel.

This is Virginia. Land of gracious hospitality and friendly atmosphere, with her humble homes and colonial mansions, her flowering gardens and sacred shrines. Home of romance, tradition and history—land of chivalry and valor—this is Virginia.

Judicial Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Judicial Merry-Go-Round," which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner for May 17, 1956:

Supporting testimony to a recent proposal that appointees to the United States Supreme Court should be required to have had several years of judicial experience, can be seen in the case of the railroad brakeman and his $90,000.

The Supreme Court, by 5 to 4, reversed its previous 5-to-4 decision affirming the grant of $90,000 in a damage suit brought by the brakeman.

The issue now goes back to the original district court that heard the trial. If the matter is tried again and it goes against the brakeman, he would be forced to return the money.

But he has already spent a good piece of it, and as the minority opinion in the latest reversal said, "there should be a finality somewhere."

This ring around the rosy adds to the number of split decisions and reversals that gives Supreme Court verdicts, as the supreme law of the land, a terrible beating in the public's estimation.

It emphasizes the fact that eight members of the court have had little or no judicial experience.

And of course it emphasizes the need of having on our highest tribunal men matured by actual experience on the bench.

Nowadays, even astute constitutional lawyers are bewildered as to what exactly is the law in many instances.

That is certainly not a warrant of continued public confidence in the august body which, by interpreting the Constitution, gives final direction to the administration of justice.

No One's Too Poor To Go to College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have for many years been urging the enactment of a bill similar to my bill H. R. 7846. Under that bill, by means of a loan program, we would be sure that every boy and girl who is acceptable for admission to a college would be able to pay the cost of such education. In that connection I desire to call the attention of the House to the following article which appeared in the World-Telegram and Sun of May 5, 1956:

NO ONE'S TOO POOR TO GO TO COLLEGE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—College is an expensive proposition—and getting more expensive every year. You would like to go. You have the mental ability and the drive it takes to be a good student. But where is the money coming from? There's no blinking at the problem; it's a formidable one, not only for you but for thousands of other students as well. In fact, 7 youngsters out of 10 probably run into money difficulties in planning to go to college. Nevertheless, American colleges are bulging at the seams. Nearly 3 million students are enrolled this year, the largest number in our history, and that figure is expected to swell to about 6 million by 1970. As these students pick up their diplomas and step into jobs, their numbers will only begin to meet the growing demand for university-trained manpower. There is still plenty of room for you provided you have what it takes, including, of course, the ability to pay your college costs. How to meet those expenses is a family-size question, and the time to face up to it is long before high-school graduation. Has something been put aside over the years? Good. Add what you believe you can earn summers and partime. Consider the possibilities of a loan, available at most colleges. And don't fail to look into your chances of getting a scholarship, even if you are not at the top of your class. With all the help that's available to serious students, no one's too poor to go to college.)

Is it worth going into debt to pay for a college education? To many an able youth the answer to that question spells the difference between going to college and not.

Few families would hesitate to buy a house, a car, a television set or a host of other items on credit. Many people even take "fly now, pay later" trips abroad. Why shouldn't you go to college now and pay later?

Certainly the value of a college degree can hardly be disputed. Colleges are teeming, and the diploma is becoming a basic requirement for more and more jobs.

Measured in dollars alone, the college investment pays off handsomely for most students. From the beginning of his career a college graduate generally makes more money than the average person without a college education earns at the top of his experience. What the other, intangible advantages of a higher education are no one can measure fully.

Granted that in principle you may be willing to go into debt for college training, you can't plan ahead without digging into a dozen down-to-earth questions. What will interest cost you? Will you have plenty of time to repay? How much can you borrow?

Until now, strangely enough, comprehensive information about college loans has been hard to come by. Here are some factual answers to most of the questions that will occur to you as you consider whether a loan can help solve your college budget problem.

How many colleges lend money? At least 800 do. The big universities generally have more to lend than the small colleges.

Is there enough money to meet current demands? Most schools have enough or more than enough funds. About a third of the colleges, though, say they could use a good deal more than they have.

How strong is student competition for loans? It's surprisingly light. Each year a sizable amount of loan money goes unused for want of applicants. Of the funds that were available for lending at colleges last year, less than half were actually borrowed.

What are a student's chances of getting a loan? On the average, quite good. In a group of about 300 colleges to which nearly 40,000 students applied for loans last year, 88 percent of the applicants were successful.

Are you permitted to borrow as much as you need? You are likely to find that a ceiling has been placed on the amount you may take. About a fourth of the colleges that participated in this survey lend as much as the full tuition for each year. More than half, however, permit you to borrow only the equivalent of 1 year's tuition. Some, though only a few, occasionally lend enough money to cover a student's full expenses for the 4 years.

Can the student with just average grades qualify for a loan? On the whole, yes. Loans are usually granted on the basis of financial need rather than marks. Most administrators would probably agree with the director of Taft College in California, who points out that many a student may not qualify for a scholarship but may make an excellent loan risk.

As a rule, colleges require that loan applicants maintain passing marks. In some schools loans are not available to freshmen or even sophomores. In others, a high school graduate who has been admitted to the college may qualify.

Are scholarship holders also eligible for loans? Yes. In fact, more and more schools are offering package arrangements that include scholarship, loan and job. The aim is to spread available money more widely and reduce loan burdens.

What are interest rates? Most loans cost 2 percent or less while the borrower is in college and 4 percent or less afterward. A good many carry no interest at all during the school years, and a few no interest at any time. Some, though, cost as much as 6 percent both during and after school.

How long do you have to repay? Chances are excellent that you'll be given all the time you need. Nearly half the funds included in the survey set no time limits. The rest give up to 6 years or more. Often you can arrange to extend the period provided that you keep up interest payments. Some schools encourage installment repayment; Harvard, for example, allows you to repay at the rate of $120 year.

When does repayment begin? Usually when you leave school. Quite a few of the loans, though, compute the repayment period from the date of the loan.

Are students usually able to pay off their debts? According to the director of admissions at Rensselear Polytechnic Institute. "The experience of almost every college is that there is virtually no loss by default." Last year colleges did write off as uncollectible an average of about $540 per school—that is, for every student who took a loan, schools wrote off a loss of about $5 from previous loans.

Do parents assume any responsibility? They are sometimes asked to sign the loan notes as comakers, which means that they are responsible in case of default.

Do college administrators encourage borrowing? Ninety-six percent of those who took part in the survey agreed that a student should think of his education as an investment for which he would be willing to borrower.

Does that apply to all students? Much depends on whether a loan would mean the difference between going to college or not. If you are headed for a comparatively low income field such as teaching or the ministry, you will probably want to borrow only as a last resort. Women students, too, often shy from the idea of carrying a college debt into marriage.

Which would be wiser: To postpone or interrupt college, or to take a loan? Nine out of ten educators say the loan is preferable.

Why don't more students use the loan funds? Students are generally reluctant to borrow, but loans would increase, say administrators, if college youths received better financial counseling. Apparently many young people are just not aware of how good an investment college is or how well they stack up as loan risks.

Is it wiser to take a loan than to do part-time work? No. Educators put jobs ahead of loans. The more you earn, the less debt you carry.

Are education loans available only at colleges? No. Many private foundations and organizations lend money to students. Some local banks offer education installment plans in cooperation with nearby colleges. Most officials say they would like to see a general privately financed fund set up for long-term, low-interest loans—one from which young persons would not hesitate to borrow.

Is the loan idea spreading? Yes. As time goes on, students will probably find it easier to borrow what they need for college. "Loans," says the director of financial aid at Harvard, "ought to be the most important development in student financing in the next 10 years."

Isn't a scholarship better than a loan? Sure, if you can nail one. But the intense scholarship competition among colleges for top-ranking talent sometimes elbows the ordinary fellow who also deserves a degree. Besides, many administrators think that students ought to be willing to shoulder some of the costs of their education. Readiness to borrow for college, they feel, signifies healthy maturity.

This school year about $55 million will be offered by colleges and other sources in the form of scholarships. As many as 175,000 students will benefit. However, more than 20,000 scholarships worth over $4 million will probably go begging, as they do each year, mainly because there is no one to claim them.

Here's how to know whether you qualify for a scholarship, and here is how to ferret out the grant that may be specially tagged for you.

Do only the top students get scholarships? Not at all, though nothing will give you as powerful a boost as a steady record of high marks. Selection committees generally base

their awards on a combination of elements: Above-average marks, financial need, good character. As a starter, see how you measure up.

Are you above average, or better still, in the top third of your class? Those are usually the minimum scholastic requirements, according to the College Entrance Examination Board, which made a study of about 450 scholarship programs. High grades were called for in only 5 percent of the awards. In many cases, however, candidates were asked to take aptitude tests.

HOW TO LOOK FOR A SCHOLARSHIP

Do you really need help? Colleges and private sponsors have been placing more stress on this element. About half the programs studied by the CEEB required proof of need.

Can you show evidence of general all-round ability, leadership qualities and worthwhile extracurricular interests? The College Board survey found these elements stipulated in about one-fourth of the programs.

For many scholarships you must meet other specific, and often very peculiar, requirements as well. Some insist that you study in a certain field, some that you live in a specific county or city or, in one instance, along a certain railroad line. In other cases you are eligible if you have one parent who was born in Sweden, if you are a Boston newsboy, if your father is a New York cabdriver, and so on.

Awards may run from as little as $50 to as much as full tuition and expenses for 4 years at the college of your choice. The averages are about $225 for an undergraduate scholarship and $638 for a graduate fellowship.

There's no telling where or how much pay dirt you will find until you look. And the time to start your prospecting is 2 or 3 years before you will need the help. What you discover may very well help you shape future college plans. The application itself should be filed early in your senior year to reach selection committees in time for spring decisions.

Organize your campaign. Much will depend on your thoroughness and ingenuity. Check the following sources:

Your high school: Consult your vocational counselor or principal. The school library probably has several of the books mentioned below. Keep an eye on the bulletin board for up-to-date announcements. Beginning this year, for example, National Merit Scholarships carrying full college expenses will go annually to winners of a nationwide high school competition. No doubt your bulletin board has details.

The colleges: They administer about a third of the available money. Write to all schools in which you may be interested, requesting not only regular scholarship information but facts about other special arrangements, such as tuition rebate programs and work-and-study plans.

Your community: Explorations in your immediate locality may turn up many surprising leads. Graduates of Cook County schools in Illinois can get help from the Chicago Community Trust, and high-school students of Worcester, Mass., can get help from the Alfred Pinkerton Fund. Similar scholarships are available in dozens of other communities.

Look for information at your local board of education, library, newspaper, board of trade, and service and fraternal clubs.

Industry: About 2,000 grants are offered each year by some 300 companies. Many are available on a national scale—for example, the General Motors awards—and your high school probably has details about the tests required. Most, however, are designed for employees and their children or for residents of the localities in which the companies have offices or plants.

Look into the college-aid programs of all large nearby companies, especially if a member of your family works for one.

Professional societies: If you know what field you are going into, follow the professional publications and write to the national organization. Magazines for librarians, as an example, often carry scholarship information that may not be found elsewhere. The Council on Social Work Education puts out an annual scholarship list, and other professional groups do the same.

Foundations: You may turn up a nugget if you go through the volume American Foundations and Their Fields at your library. Scan the section devoted to your State and the foundations listed under your field of study. A resident of Boston, Mass., for example, will discover that the Edwards Scholarship Fund is tailored to him.

Unions: Does a member of your family belong to a union? A carpenters' local in Tacoma, Wash., offers $400 to an above-average student recommended by his principal. Dozens of other awards are offered by local, State, and national labor groups, and many are granted regardless of union connections.

Your State: Three-quarters of the States give some kind of scholarship aid. In some the valedictorian of each high school graduating class is entitled to an award. In others you are eligible if you agree to practice medicine in rural areas when you graduate or if you plan to teach. New York State hands out more than 5,000 scholarships each year. Write to your State department of education for details.

Your church: Whatever your religious affiliation, you will probably find that some scholarships have been set up either by foundations or church organizations expressly for members of your faith. Consult your minister and your church's national organization. The Board of Education of the Methodist Church, as one example, publishes a list called National Methodist Scholarships.

Veteran's groups: If you are the child of a veteran, get the American Legion's booklet Need a Lift? available for 10 cents at local posts or from Scholarship Information Service, Post Office Box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind.

Most State governments give educational aid to the children of veterans, so write to your State department of education.

Veterans themselves, of course, are eligible for help under the GI bill. For details write to the Veterans' Administration.

The Federal Government: There is no general program of Federal scholarships. However, the following sources may be helpful:

For help in studying abroad, see The Handbook on International Study at your library; for additional information write to its publisher, the Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21, N. Y. Your library may also have a copy of the UNESCO book, Study Abroad, published by the Columbia University Press, New York 27, N. Y. (price, $2).

For information in the field of physical and occupational therapy write to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington 25, D. C.

For more extensive lists of scholarships awarded each year see Scholarships and Fellowships Available at Institutions of Higher Education by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C. The price of the book is 70 cents.

For details about special Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs under which students receive practically full education costs, write to the individual services at Washington 25, D. C.

As you can see, a good scholarship lead may turn up almost anywhere. If you have what it takes in mental equipment to be admitted to college, add an extra bit of persistence and probably a touch of luck, and the chances are good that you can land the help you need to get through the college of your choice.

A few samples of college loans

School	What you may borrow	Interest	Time to repay
New York University	$1,000 maximum for 4 years	4 percent	Depends on individual.
Columbia	Up to amount of tuition. Freshmen in 2d semester.	2 percent during college and a year after. 4 percent thereafter.	Payable in 1 year or less.
Fordham	$200 annually	2 percent from day of loan	No time limit.
Pratt Institute	$300 average each year	1 percent after graduation	After graduation.
Rutgers	$300	5 percent	Repay each year.
Stevens Tech	$400 to $500	4 percent, some at 2 percent	After graduation.
Princeton	Flexible. $125,000 loan fund.	1 percent as student. 4 percent after graduation.	3 years after graduation.
Yale	$700 a year or $2,000 over 4 years. Freshman eligible.	None as student. 2 percent 5 years after graduation.	5 years after graduation.

Coerced Into Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there has just been brought to my attention a very able article by George H. Todt, in the San Fernando Valley Times of August 29, 1955. Touching upon the very important subject of coercion, I request it be included in the Appendix under unanimous consent previously granted me:

COERCED INTO UNIONS

(By George H. Todt)

LABOR BOSSING BY STRESS, DURESS

Should self-anointed labor bosses be permitted to impress free citizens of the United States against their will?

Should any American be compelled to join a labor union?

"Compelled," it says here—whether the exaction be caused by physical, mental, or moral duress, and regardless of its being either directly or indirectly imposed upon its victim.

Why should any free citizen who has been guaranteed the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as decreed by our inspired Constitution be blackjacked by force into entering an association he may not wish to join if he were allowed his own free agency to decide for himself?

The word for this is extortion.

Extortion, as defined in the dictionary, is "to wrest from a person by force or any undue or illegal power or ingenuity; to wring from, to exact."

Now this is not to be construed as any attack upon the legitimate aims of labor. The writer is a working man himself, and enlightened self-interest causes him to side with those—and they are in the vast majority in the American capitalistic system, both

in the ranks of management and labor together—who wish to see working conditions constantly and consistently improved within the bounds of reason and commonsense.

Few informed persons will deny that labor and management have each made significant contributions to the welfare of the American worker, so that the latter is now the envy of the civilized world. So much so, indeed, that they have caused the false predictions of Karl Marx against capitalism to fall flat on their face. We have no downtrodden proletariat in the United States, where the workers average out better in conveniences and luxuries than the lesser nobility of Europe and all except the aristocracy of Asia and Africa.

Labor unions have played their part in this unparalleled improvisation of plenty, but theirs is not the whole part, nor necessarily even the largest part. The latter is a controversial matter which will demonstrate a wide range of opinions by the public.

At the present time, one-third of the American labor force belongs to unions—the other two-thirds, comprising the majority, do not. The reason the majority of these citizens have not become organized by labor bosses is, quite frankly, because they do not wish to be so organized. Actually, many who are already in labor unions have not joined of their own free agency—but because they have been forced under duress to do so.

Now we are told that the labor bosses are frantically organizing efforts to capture the balance of American workers who have not already been caught up to them.

There is nothing wrong with any citizen joining a union of his choice providing he is permitted to do so according to his own free agency in the matter.

But to force an American to join such an organization against his will, to force him to pay tribute he can ill afford to spare from his family, is reprehensible on the face of it.

This smacks of totalitarian tyranny and abuse against a free people.

The Prospects of a Part-Time President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpts from the New Republic magazine of March 12, 1956, are interesting and enlightening:

THE PROSPECTS OF A PART-TIME PRESIDENT

I. LIGHTENING THE LOAD

Although Leonard Hall's worst worry is over and Eisenhower has been signed up for the duration, this doesn't mean the Republicans can take a vacation. For the candidacy of a recovered heart patient compels them to anticipate and counter two fears in the minds of many an independent voter: will the President have the physical capacity to carry the full burden of his office, and is RICHARD NIXON morally and intellectually fit to take over command were that required?

The first task, therefore, of the defenders of the Republican cause is to downgrade the enormity of Presidential responsibility.

Even before Ike announced his intention to run again, Life and Newsweek, in their respective February 27 issues, neatly reversed the customary campaign procedure by grooming the office to fit their candidate.

Pointing to the sheer bulk of the duties that somehow have settled on this office, Robert Coughlan, the Life man, argues that reform is needed and long overdue. "President Eisenhower's recent illness, along with dramatizing the need, has given it urgent priority." He suggests that life could be made a lot easier for the President by delegating many of his duties to Mr. NIXON and Sherman Adams, by reducing the number of his visitors, and by cutting down the number of documents he must study and sign.

Not to be outdone at saving the President from his office, Mr. Raymond Moley, of Newsweek wants to see the number of documents requiring Presidential signature reduced to the point that they "would be no more strain than doodling on a scratch pad." He also wants to see the President surrounded by "agreeable, restful" companions during his leisure hours. "A bore," Mr. Moley warns us solemnly, "may be more deadly than a brink of war."

It appears that Mr. Moley considers it a ridiculous waste of time for the President to keep up with the world by way of the press. "There is no reason," he declares, "why a President must read newspapers except for relaxation. A Steve Early or a Jim Hagerty can convey press opinion to him." Although he ruefully concedes "the press conference probably must be continued," the Newsweek columnist holds that "the President could greatly help himself by cultivating a habit of fewer and shorter answers." This is a shrewd stroke, inasmuch as it will lighten still further the burden of keeping up with the press by drastically reducing the amount of news.

It is just plain silly, in Mr. Moley's estimation, for the President to be bothered with political questions. "Some individual, perhaps the Republican national chairman, should have precedence and, with 3 or 4 members of the President's staff and 2 or 3 Members of Congress, should form a political security council to formulate decisions for the President." Similarly with the Cabinet: it must be staffed with topnotch men who will accept responsibility and make their own decisions, because "second-raters always try to pass judgments to the chief."

As we get the picture, then, the President is to sign his name as infrequently as possible, read no newspapers, curtail his attendance at parties, banquets and balls (a feast may be more deadly than the Middle East), limit the number of his visitors, delegate political decisions to the Republican National Chairman, and policy decisions to his subordinates.

II. WHAT IS THE RISK?

If, during this campaign, the Presidency is made to appear less demanding than in fact it is, and Mr. Eisenhower's competence is made therefore more plausible, there is still certain to be continuing discussion of the relevance to the present situation of Mr. Eisenhower's categorical remark, made after a 4-day illness and published in his book Crusade in Europe:

"I learned a lesson I did not thereafter violate: A full measure of health is basic to successful command."

What is a "full measure?" What do doctors tell the average "recovered heart patient?" What can he and what can't he do? "The man himself really decides," says Dr. James Watt, director of the National Heart Institute.

"First he tries one thing, then another. What the doctor tells him is conditioned by what benchmarks he passes. It's difficult to measure the reserve of a man's heart. You can put it to a test, and if it does all right, you know; or you can put it to a test, and if it doesn't do it, you know that, too."

Above all, Dr. Watt points out, every physician must protect his patient from harm. The heart's strength, therefore, should be put to the test no more than absolutely necessary. Each time the patient shows that he can take an additional step the physician extends his limit a notch more—stopping at the point where "the patient is satisfied, where he can live the life he wants to live. You don't stretch it more than you have to."

In the President's case, Dr. Watt's analysis suggests, the demands placed on the heart might be stretched beyond that imposed on a private citizen following the safest course. This is especially true in that crucial but shadowy area, emotional strain. The President himself said in January that a major factor in his decision would be "the zip and zest that you can take into conferences when you have to get something done for the good of the United States." Measuring zip and zest is quite elusive in any man, Dr. Watt commments, "Call it a psychosomatic factor or simply part of the medical picture, it is a matter of deciding what is stress and strain to the man in question."

The psychosomatic approach to coronary cases has been sharply stated by Prof. Harold G. Wolff, of Cornell Medical School, a pioneer in his field, who showed in his study Stress, Emotions, and Cardiovascular Disease, published last year, that under stress and strain, the accelerator nerves stimulate the heart to work too hard. "Such unusual cardiac exertion evoked by anxiety implicitly requires restriction of demands on damaged myocardium (heart muscle)." He cites the case of a middle-aged man who suffered minor heart trouble and decided to slow down and assume fewer responsibilities for a brief period. As a matter of fact, however, circumstances so shaped themselves that such relaxation was impossible, and he was obliged to assume more than the usual workaday burden. Under these circumstances of conflict he became resentful and tense. * * * The picture was one of a man fighting with his back to the wall.

To apply this psychosomatic analysis to a specific patient, Dr. Wolff says, "you have to decide what types of people and situations upset him, and delete that, circumvent that, in his daily life."

But can any President who is more than a casual occupant of the White House avoid people and situations that upset him? More specifically, can Mr. Eisenhower who, for all his charm and benignity, has his flashes of hot temper?

One White House correspondent believes that what disturbs the President most is any sign of what seems to him disrespect or impertinence. It is then, as the Alsops put it, that the well-known telltale flush creeps up over face and forehead.

"Decisions distress this man," says another close observer of the President, "and coming up to one in the pinches is his toughest moment. His impulse is to go along with the thing that's easy or traditional." Obviously, in these circumstances, one of the many things from which Mr. Eisenhower will have to be protected is the kind of aggressive, provocative questioning that heretofore has marked successful presidential press conferences.

But what if the special strains of the Presidency were not at issue? What if we were talking about the future of Dwight D. Eisenhower, chairman of the board of General Motors? What would be his prospects?

Mr. A. Z., a 58-year-old executive in a large automobile company, suffered "a few small strokes." As heart attacks go they were minor, yet "the executive was retired from active participation in the business. Since retirement he has been enjoying better health and he has been able to regulate his own life according to his wishes, and not according to the dictates or needs of the business."

This case has been cited in Executive Health Programs, by Dr. George M. Saunders, medical director of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. Pointing to "the special stresses and strains which are exerted on the executive demanding peculiar qualities of resistance for survival," Dr. Saunders lists an electrocardiogram as 1 of 7 "musts" in executive health examinations. While stressing that it is still

not known "whether heart disease is an occupational hazard of business executives, it is known, however, that emotions such as anger, fear, anxiety, or pain may affect the heart profoundly, not only its action, but also the rate, the sounds, the electrographic tracing, and the blood pressure."

All life is a risk, the President's affirmative decision seems to suggest. As to the degree of risk which he is asking the American people to take, it is pertinent to consider how the professional risk-takers, the insurance companies, regard recovered heart patients.

The best statistical answer so far has been presented by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. in its 1953 study, "What Happens to Men Disabled by Heart Disease," which shows that 1 out of 3 recovered heart patients do not last 6 years, a conclusion drawn from the observation of 100 white male coronary victims between 50 and 64.

Because of such findings, insurance companies do not normally sell life insurance to recovered heart patients. Dr. Harry Dingman, vice president of the Continental Assurance Co., declares flatly in his standard reference work, Risk Appraisal (revised edition, 1954):

"Coronary disease is not an underwriting problem. The underwriter says "No." It is a claim man's problem. He deals with an impaired man. * * * Experimentally a few companies are insuring a few coronaries. Wisely? Future will tell."

III. WHAT ABOUT NIXON?

If Eisenhower's bad heart is the first worry of Republicans, the second is the distrust that persists throughout the Nation of the man who is and hopes to be within one heartbeat of the Presidency.

NIXON, the President affirms, can have the vice presidential nomination if he wants it. On the matter of NIXON'S wants at least there is no doubt. His campaign to eliminate the opposition to himself is underway, and is well expressed by NIXON'S personal friend and adviser, Representative PATRICK HILLINGS, Republican of California.

First, says HILLINGS, NIXON is indistinguishable from his leader on every aspect of the Eisenhower program. "To disparage NIXON is to disparage Eisenhower."

Second, HILLINGS declares, "The smear campaign against Vice President NIXON is being directed by the Democratic National Committee and certain leftwing elements in the country who have opposed NIXON ever since his exposure of Alger Hiss."

This second comment might seem to some, to confirm the charges of moderate men that Nixon debases the democratic process by identifying opposition to himself with treachery to the United States. Its accuracy is best judged by the comment of an ardent Eisenhower supporter, Walter Lippmann, in many Republican newspapers.

Writing 1 month before the President's declaration, Lippmann noted that if Eisenhower ran he would probably be reelected President, that his chances of serving out his term were at best problematical, and that he bore in consequence a heavy responsibility to the Nation in picking as Vice President one who sincerely shared his spirit and principles. Lippmann continued:

"He can give no such guaranty for Mr. NIXON. It is not a question of whether Mr. NIXON supports the Eisenhower legislative program. * * * Of course he does. The question is whether he represents the central thing which Eisenhower represents, the thing which has given Eisenhower such a hold on the American people.

"The central thing is that Eisenhower unites the country and heals its divisions. This is precisely what NIXON does not do. Instead of being a national leader he is a ruthless partisan. He is a politician who divides and embitters the people."

Dr. John Milburn Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this month Dr. John Milburn Price completed 41 years of service to the School of Religious Education which he founded at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth.

He has been, in truth, a pioneer in this portion of the Lord's vineyard. In 1915, under his direction, Southwestern became the first school among Baptists to offer vocational training in religious education.

In 1917 it became the first school in America to offer a religious education diploma.

In 1919 it became the first Baptist seminary to offer a doctors degree with a major in religious education.

In 1921 it conducted the first vocational conference on religious education and the first demonstration kindergarten in a Baptist seminary.

In 1922 it developed the first vacation Bible school among Baptists, and this is the oldest of such institutions.

In the following year, it began reaching out to those not blessed with the academic prerequisites and became the first school to offer special seminary courses for noncollege graduates.

In 1950 Southwestern erected on its campus the first building in America designed exclusively for teaching religious education, and in the following year it became the first school of religious education among Southern Baptists to become accredited.

All of this is a tribute to the magnificent leadership of John Milburn Price.

While a Marston scholar in Brown University, Providence, R. I., J. M. Price was inspired by the thought that he should train lay men and women to become Sunday school teachers. And in less than 3 years, while completing his theological training at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., the door of opportunity was opened through which he might enter and realize the achievement of his life's dream.

Dr. L. R. Scarborough, president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Tex., wrote Price a letter, which said in part, "It is now our purpose to establish a school of Christian Pedagogy. I think we have hold of the small end of a big proposition. We will have to do pioneer work and break new ground." Then he asked J. M. Price to organize the School of Religious Education in Fort Worth.

The offer was challenging and divinely inspired but somewhat disconcerting. Others were requesting his services, too, and a decision had to be reached immediately. He had been elected as Sunday school secretary for Kentucky (his home State) and he longed to stay there. Friends in Canton, China, urged him to join their faculty at the seminary there.

J. M. Price was a praying man and he turned to God often in those heavy hours in order that he might find his Lord's will. When the answer came there was no doubt in his mind that he was to go to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. For, then, he could be in Texas, Kentucky, China, at the same time, through the students he would train and sent out.

In August 1915 he arrived in Fort Worth, Tex., to pioneer and break new ground in religious education for the Kingdom of God. The first year only 5 courses were taught and today 129 courses for vocational training in religious education are available to a student, as he desires to select.

Since 1915 there have been 6,000 students to enroll in Southwestern's School of Religious Education with 2,250 of them graduating. There are 880 students enrolled in the school today. These trainees have revolutionized Sunday school and training union work in the Southern Baptist Convention, at home and abroad.

Since 1920 the Southern Baptist denomination has increased from 3 million to 8 million members. Total gifts to all causes have increased from $35 million per year in 1920 to $332 million in 1955. The phenomenal growth is due, in part, to the teaching ministry of the church as provided by the teachers receiving vocational training in religious education, mainly in Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

There are five Southern Baptist seminaries in America. Southwestern Seminary sends out 47 percent of the Baptist missionaries around the world. Of those going from Fort Worth, Tex., 50 percent, totaling 300 in foreign fields alone, have been trained in religious education.

Southwestern's School of Religious Education is first in the South—largest in the world among schools of religious education. It stands as a permanent memorial, vibrantly alive, to the man who dared to establish his life "by way of the throne of God," John Milburn Price.

Work and Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that most of our colleagues are receiving inquiries, as I am, asking for the details of the number of days our President spends in Washington. The following excerpt from the New Republic magazine of March 26, 1956, gives that information as of that date:

WORK AND PLAY

At mid-March Mr. Eisenhower had held the office of President 1,151 days and had been away from the White House 517 days, roughly half the time. A check of White House records shows most of these absences described as work-and-play vacations.

Mr. Eisenhower's longest work-and-play period was 56 days in Colorado in the summer

and fall of 1954. Next longest was for 43 days in Colorado in the fall of 1953. Last year he had been in Colorado 40 days before he was stricken, and he thereafter spent 50 days in the Denver hospital, 37 days at Gettysburg, and 10 days in Key West.

Before his illness the President vacationed at a Georgia golf course 44 days on four different trips averaging 11 days each. Three brief business trips abroad took him to Ottawa, to Bermuda, and to Geneva.

The President's friends have said that his critics are unfair in calling him a half-time President; the problems of the Chief Executive, after all, are always with him.

Adlai Camp Beset by Pensions Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to make the following statement and have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

In recent days, much has been said about the record of Adlai Stevenson on old-age pensions while Governor of Illinois.

Stevenson has said that he vetoed an old-age assistance increase "because the legislature failed to appropriate the money." Several of his followers here in Congress have echoed this explanation. This is not so and I think it is time we set the record straight.

Furthermore, Mr. Stevenson has been claiming that pensions were increased during the first part of his administration. He failed, however, to give due credit to Congress, which voted a $5 a month increase to the States for old-age and blind assistance and a $3 a month increase for needy children which became effective October 1, 1948, and which made possible the increase to Illinois pensioners under Governor Stevenson's administration.

I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column written by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 28, 1956 and which gives more of the facts on the subject:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)

ADLAI CAMP BESET BY PENSIONS ISSUE

Long-distance telephone lines have been burning up between California, Chicago and Washington over the question of Adlai Stevenson's record on old-age pensions when he was Governor of Illinois.

First to pick up the telephone were harassed Pat Brown, Attorney General of California, and worried Paul Ziffren of Los Angeles, both top strategists of Adlai's California campaign. They called Dick Finnegan, Adlai's campaign manager in Chicago, to say that George McLain, powerful leader of the old-age-pension movement in southern California, had published in his "National Welfare Advocate" a scathing review of Governor Stevenson's pension record, showing that he had vetoed a bill for a 10 percent raise in Illinois' aid to the needy.

Brown and Ziffren were worried sick over what this would do to the vote for Stevenson in southern California.

Dick Finnegan promptly did some telephoning on his own. He called Congressmen JIMMY ROOSEVELT and CECIL KING, both from southern California, both Stevenson delegates, and both friends of oldster-champion George McLain.

ROOSEVELT and KING promptly buttonholed McLain in Washington. They were in a good position to do this because both have introduced his bill to overhaul the entire public assistance section of the Social Security Act. This pertains to aid for the aged, the needy, the blind, the physically handicapped, and dependent children.

The shame list

What put Stevenson somewhat on the spot is that Senator KEFAUVER is the sponsor of this same bill in the Senate.

Quite a hassle followed between McLain, King, and Roosevelt despite the fact that McLain has been a stanch backer of both Congressmen, and went down the line for JIMMY ROOSEVELT for Governor in 1950.

Finally McLain compromised by publishing a statement by Congressman KING praising Stevenson's record for old-age pensions. McLain also omitted a previously planned account of Stevenson's record in O. K.'ing the shame list, the list of oldsters receiving Government aid, which is made public in Illinois and which oldsters bitterly resent.

However, McLain also ran a full-page photo of KEFAUVER on page 1 of his paper over the caption "KEFAUVER—Friend of the Needy," while on the editorial page he ran a letter from Warren Lamson, president of the Illinois Pension Union, giving Stevenson's record on pensions and on the shame list.

When McLain was asked by this writer why this information had not come out regarding Stevenson in the 1952 campaign, he replied:

"I did not know about it until I spoke in Chicago this spring and was shown pictures of members of the Illinois Pension Union picketing the executive mansion when Stevenson was Governor. I then investigated the record in Springfield and published it as soon thereafter as I could.

"My organization has 23 radio stations in California which are broadcasting the Stevenson record—almost every day."

Defense of Stevenson

Congressmen ROOSEVELT and KING, defending Stevenson, said: "On 134 occasions in 4 years the Republican Legislature of Illinois tried to pass bills for roads, bridges, pensions without appropriating 1 cent to finance them. Governor Stevenson insisted that the funds be appropriated before he would approve the bills."

The facts, as tabulated by the California Institute of Social Welfare, are that on August 3, 1951, Stevenson vetoed house bill No. 85 providing for a 10 percent increase for food, clothing, and personal incidentals for the aged and the needy.

But 1 month earlier, June 30, 1951, he vetoed amendment 2 of senate bill 556 carrying a $14,300,000 appropriation to pay for this 10 percent increase. Thus he vetoed both the appropriation and the authorization.

On July 28, 1951, Stevenson signed senate bill No. 485 which required each county department of welfare to publish monthly reports of those receiving pensions, disability assistance, blind assistance, and aid to dependent children. This is called the shame list and was passed contingent upon passage of a similar law by the Congress in Washington.

On October 1, 1951, Congress passed the Jenner amendment which activated the shame list in Illinois.

Illinois versus California

The California Institute of Social Welfare also compiled figures showing that pensioners in Illinois received an average of $60.50 a month, as against California's average of $70.11; that Illinois requires a lien on the oldster's home while California doesn't; that Illinois allows a single person to have only $400 in personal property and $600 for married couples, while California permits $1,200 for a single person and $2,000 for married couples.

Stevenson gave as one reason for vetoing the increased assistance bill in 1951 the fact that oldsters and blind people had an effective lobby while the children did not. Children were omitted from the bill.

He has also said: "We ought to work out a system that encourages an older person to work if he wants to instead of discouraging him. We ought to have a program for training people who have finished their regular work to do things they want to—things for which their age will be an advantage instead of a handicap.

"It is high time we started rebuilding this whole program around the central idea that we want to make life meaningful and worth while, all the way through."

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, may I join in the tribute paid a great American and a great Congressman. I had the pleasure of meeting Representative BILL GRANAHAN in the last session and I found him to be a delightful personality, a good friend, a devoted husband and a great citizen. His constant thought was for the well-being of his district. Both my wife and myself are indebted to him for his help and hospitality. May our tears of bereavement crystallize as they flow and be worn as a rosary of remembrance for his beloved memory.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

From South Dakota to South Carolina—An Invitation and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on May 5, I had the opportunity to address for the second time the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers Association. The meeting was held in Greenville, S. C.

My central theme was that it is fully as important that American businessmen understand the mechanics of politics and the science of political engineering as it is that they understand their machines of business and production or the science of economics.

My address was transcribed from the radio tape provided by the radio station broadcasting my off-the-cuff address to the convention, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, very much, indeed, Mr. Chairman, for that altogether too generous introduction.

Distinguished officers of the South Carolina State Bankers Association, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it really is worth the long trip from Washington to Greenville just alone to hear such a wonderful introduction as was presented to you by the distinguished chairman, a fellow politician of parts who accorded me all of the customary courtesies which extend between the members of our profession. However, I must make one slight correction in what we had to say because I recognize that it is dangerous enough for a Yankee Republican from South Dakota to come down into the sacred portals of South Carolina without having added to the uniqueness of the situation, a designation of having come from North Dakota. I come from far enough north as it is, and as long as there is an affinity between us which we have as South Dakotans and South Carolinians, I feel like I can speak with greater candor than if I came from that altogether strange land known as North Dakota.

They sometimes do confuse us, frequently confuse us, and I can understand why, but I like to point out the fact that there is at least one great distinction between North Dakota and South Dakota. It was brought out by the Associated Press statistics a couple of years ago which pointed out that the two States which have the greatest record of longevity from the standpoint of the people living within the boundaries of those States were North Dakota and South Dakota. For some strange reason, the climate or water or weather or something, the people there have a little slower rate of mortality than they have in any of the other 46 sister States. For some time it was a matter of chagrin to us, however, to realize that the people of North Dakota were a little bit better in their statistical averages than the people of South Dakota. Some way or another they cling to life a little more tenaciously, their mortality statistics were a little bit more optimistic than South Dakota. We thought, pondered, and worried about that for several months and tried to figure out what we could do to improve the living conditions of our State, and finally came to the inevitable conclusion that the reason why our good neighbors to the north hung on to life a little bit more persistently, were a little more reluctant to pass on, was because they cherished in their hearts the hope that before they died, they might live long enough to move down into South Dakota and become citizens of our State, and for that reason we are content to be only second high from the standpoint of those statistics.

Seeing you all here this morning brings to my mind a great many happy memories of my previous visit before this great association when you were in convention assembled over at Charleston. It brings to my mind many of the happy continuations and resumptions of those friendships which I have had during the intervening years as I have seen some of you here in South Carolina and have met some of you in other areas and as some of you have dropped into my Washington office to visit me.

I cherish greatly the friendships I have made in my visits into the South, and I rate none higher than those made in talking to this distinguished company of business people and their wives here from this great State of South Carolina. It is indeed a privilege to be back. I have tried to figure out since I received the invitation from Mr. Alexander just why I was invited back. You know there are two kinds of speakers that come back for a second time before the same audience; there is the kind they invite to come back, and there is the kind they dare to come back, and I imagine, perhaps, that I come under the second category, because I recall that I spoke to you with complete candor when I was here before, as I intend to do this morning, because in these busy lives which all of us lead, there isn't much use of our just sitting around listening to pleasant mouthings of unimportant things.

It is interesting, when, on occasion, people with different points of view can get together, however, and discuss the things which they have in common and discuss the things as well on which they differ, and to try and find out how we can harness together each other's ideals and energies and abilities and talents in the public interest. That shall be the purport of my message here this morning.

I suspect that during the past quarter of a century of world history there have been more important changes made than in any other like period of human history, and, in my opinion, none of these changes insofar as they affect the American scene are concerned, none of the changes on the American scene is more important than this simple but incontrovertible fact, and that is that 25 years ago, economics—the profession in which you gentlemen have specialized—25 years ago economics was the controlling factor of our political life, and today politics has become the controlling factor in our economic life. It seems to me that that tremendous change very well typifies many of the problems which confront us, and pretty well challenges our ability whether we are economists, businessmen, or politicians to try and find a way to correct any difficulties which may have eventuated from that strange reversal of the coin.

In the early 1930's and in previous eras of American history, the economic tone of the Nation in large part determined the voting behavior of our citizens, and decided the fate of our various national administrations. We had slogans about the full dinner pail; campaign platforms, and campaign promises, and campaign pronouncements were made dealing with the unemployment statistics, dealing with the earning power of citizens, dealing primarily with the economic situation.

Today, I think, few if any among us, will deny the fact that the Government has grown so strong and Federal spending has become so important that the political bias of our national administrations determine the economic tone of our Nation and the financial status of millions of Americans whether they be workers or farmers or businessmen. Not all change in my opinion is progress, and, in my opinion, we have gone too far in the direction of gearing our prosperity curves and our individual financial success to the political philosophies which dominate the White House and the Congress. To return to an era in which the operation of economic principles and policies once again have a dominant part in determining our national destiny, however, is going to require a substantial shrinkage in the power, in the spending, and in the regulations of the Federal Government.

America today is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. We hear of that as we study every financial report of virtually every successful corporation in the country. Optimism for the future prevails on every side. These rose-tinted conditions have developed from the fact that we now have a national administration which commands public confidence and a bipartisan Congress which respects private ownership and individual freedom. However, in any era, when the stock market stampedes up or down depending upon the readings of an electric cardiograph and when a public address by a member of the President's Cabinet can stimulate or retard vast industrial expenditures, there can be no denial of the fact that we are living in an era where political behavior has become the throttle which determines the speed or the success of economic expansion.

This being true, and I believe it to be true, businessmen, including bankers, including, may I say, especially bankers because so much of the rest of the economic community rightfully depends on bankers for counsel and advice, businessmen then, especially bankers, must reexamine their political prejudices and preferences and performances. I think the same is true in labor whose success is tied in so closely with the success of business but I am speaking here primarily to businessmen who, in my opinion, must become as well versed as to what is good for them politically as they are trained in what is good for their institutions economically.

To do less than that is to turn over the ultimate success of their enterprises to power-seeking professional politicians who consider politics solely as a device for achieving office and who use public power as a mucilaginous device for holding them in their positions of prestige and importance as long as possible. Those tactics have destroyed the economic strength and the political authority of many of our western de-

mocracies who less than 20 years ago were comparatively strong and stable. Those tactics, in my opinion, can deviatlize America as well, and unless we pay as much attention to the polilitcal machines as we do the machines of commerce that we use in our offices and in our factories, it can very easily happen in this great country that we call America.

Increasingly the strong arm of Government is moving into your shops, into your offices, into your every economic determination, and that my good friends, brings me to the theme which I desire to talk about. With that historic backdrop I think that I should discuss with you the machinery and the mechanics of politics as I have come to understand them after some 20 years devoted to a study and analysis of them from the inside following, as the chairman has said, 10 years of study of them from the outside when I was engaged in teaching college youngsters about the basic tenants of America. Because of that, I appreciate this invitation even more to come down into the Deep South to think out loud with you for a while about some of these conclusions or conjuctures which I have because I know that here I have always received respectful and responsible attention to the analysis.

AS DIXIE GOES, SO GOES THE WORLD

I come here not necessarily with any desire whatever to seek approval or acceptance of the suggestions that I make, but I always have the right to hope, and sometimes my hope is encouraged by some of the performances of recent history. I come here, however, primarily to discuss with you as honestly and as frankly and as faithfully as I can what I think is happening to America and what I think primarily can be changed in America only by the behavior politically of the people of the South.

I think of that when I get criticized by the people of my section of the country, when I turn down invitations as I had to do for today to talk about some pleasant subject before a noncontroversal audience, such as addressing a Republican convention about republicanism or talking to a woman's club about foreign policy or to a veteran's organization about patriotism or to farmers about farming in order to come down into this perilous atmosphere to discuss with you subjects which, in my opinion, are so important to be discussed here and before you.

But I have a prevailing feeling which has continued to evolve to greater and greater clarity and greater and greater emphasis, in my opinion. I have a prevailing conviction that what happens in Dixie in the next 10 years is going to determnine definitely what happens to America in the next 100. And this I also believe—that what happens in America in the next few years is going to pretty clearly determine what happens around the globe, because so many little people in smaller countries or less-developed areas are watching this great clash of the ideologies hoping that our system will prevail, but fearful that it won't, so I think that our capacity to make America work well is going to go a long way to determine what happens in other countries of this great world of ours.

I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to talk to important people in the most important area of the world, because what you do or fail to do, I believe, is going to determine the fate of humanity in the century just ahead. No other great area of the country or of the world by its own free choice has such an opportunity and with it, in my opinion, such a tremendous responsibility.

THE CURSE OF MODERN GOVERNMENT

I think the curse of modern government around the world is the fact that steadily and continuously and perniciously it has been constantly expanding the power of its functionaries in the capital cities of each country of the world. Without exception, in the countries of importance the power of people in political jobs like mine and in the executive department, and in the judiciary, and in the central cities of the land has been expanding steadily over the functions of people in private jobs like yours. It has brought disaster and war and unhappiness to large segments of the world. It has brought to Britain almost a collapse of its economic solvency. We in the United States have resisted this global trend more successfully than others, but few among us will argue that we have resisted it completely or enough.

We have gone downward on the same train, down the same hill; our brakes have held us back a little, but not enough to protect our economic and political safety. I believe, and I may have said this when I was here before, that future historians writing about the America of the thirties and the forties and the fifties, and future histories written about the pages of America which are yet unknown, looking for a point of departure, looking for a place in which to put a thumbtack marking the time and the date and the hour and the place where America changed from a complete and faithful following of certain economic, social, and political concepts to something strangely and dangerously different, are going to find that place and mark that hour as the occasion of the great national convention of the strong and great Democratic Party, to which you belong, which was held in convention assembled in the year 1936, in the city of Philadelphia.

I think they will mark that development in 1936 as they study what has been happening in America to such universally accepted American institutions and practices, for example, as private ownership, as our reward of merit system, as the great American concept of giving individual initiative unlimited opportunity to expand, or the great American and uniquely American concept of States rights and the feeling that in this Commonwealth of States which makes up the Republic known as the United States of America, States have functions and States have privileges and States have rights, along with maintaining a meaningful significant effective two-party system with adequate political machinery to make it operate.

As they inquire as to why America, blessed with all of those things preceding the thirties, has suddenly begun a concentrated attack upon them all trying to devitalize and trying to stultify them, trying at times to destroy them, they will also have to analyze what developments followed your actions in that convention. Why did it happen to us? No other foreign country has adopted a formula of economic or political behavior even remotely approximating the successes we had achieved. We had lived well and had gone forward with great rapidity regardless of whether your party or mine was in power in the White House. Under Republicans and Democrats alike in Congress or in the White House, America had gone ahead. We had become the envy of the world, the only country compelled to erect immigration barriers to be safe from being flooded out by all the rest of humanity that wanted to locate here so that they could enjoy private ownership, to locate here so they could enjoy the reward of merit system, to locate here so that they could give their individual initiative a chance to expand, to locate here where they could uniquely become a citizen of a state which had some rights and a governor and a supreme court and some mores and some customs and some laws of its own. From every other land they wanted to locate here because we had a two-party system. We had a political machine and political mechanics which made every man a king, gave every individual a right to help determine his own destiny. Why are we changing? Why have we changed? When did it happen and where?

A TURNING POINT IN AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Historians will have to answer that. I think as I said that they are going to pick the place that I have mentioned, and the Democratic convention of 1936 as the hour, and the change of your convention rules as the cause—when the South was compelled to abandon your two-thirds rule reluctantly it was with far less a degree of reluctance, I am sure, than you would have shown had you known as clearly then what was going to happen as we all know now. In all of this when the South was compelled to abandon their two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions, and at the same time retain the unit rule which was a siamese twin companion of the two-thirds rule, we set in operation political machinery which has influenced completely our ensuing developments. The spirit of America has not changed; our basic goals have not changed; our objectives have not changed; but something has happened to the politics and the machinery of self-government in this beloved Republic of ours.

This whole thing we call politics—or the mechanics of self-government. Thus, it is political engineering and the machinery of politics which has changed your lives and mine, and which has altered tremendously all predictions for our future. By projecting forward the trends of the past 20 years we can rather accurately predict what lies ahead for all of us unless some sharp and permanent political changes are made by you good folks of the old South. We can now envision how political developments determine all human behavior and what you do or fail to do down here different from what has been your prevailing political behavior will call the tune for all Americans.

It isn't only upon your traditional Democratic Party that the break with the past which took place at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 had a propretic and determining impact. Actually that change in your convention rules had indirectly but definitely almost as important and lasting an effect upon our Republican Party. In a great 2-party country like ours, the behavior and bias of one of our parties always tends to influence the behavior and bias of the other. Anything which succeeds steadily for the one is certain to be emulated by the other. Anything that brings defeat to the one is likewise avoided by the other. Thus, our two parties learn from each other just as they tend to imitate and approximate each other at regular intervals.

When for a long time—a sorrowful and mighty expensive long time, I might say—campaign and convention tactics which were designed to appeal to mass voters in big blocs (especially in our metropolitan cities of the North) brought you stupendous and steady majorities to the Democratic or the New Deal Party, it was understandable and inevitable that my Republican Party started emulating some of those tactics. We started directing our appeals to those same bloc voters. Since, in the main, the interests and ideals of the South do not coincide with those of the CIO-PAC, or those of Americans for Democratic Action, or those of the "banana-bunch" type of voters who group themselves in ethnic, vocational, left-wing, or other pressure groups, it appeared for a time that the fine folks of the old South were to be left out of the picture altogether when it came to determining the political policies of either major party. You were on the way to becoming the world's largest group of enfranchised citizens whose voices were ignored in the making of party policy and in the selection of party candidates and whose votes were considered so safely in the bag that neither party paid you any heed.

Then came 1948, when four courageous States of Dixie signaled to the rest of the country that they had had enough. No

longer were they willing to be tied tight in the back seat of a political automobile which they were never permitted to steer.

And then came 1952. I sometimes feel that the Divine Architect of the Universe, realizing that America is His last chance to make decency prevail, to make freedom function, and to give law-obeying citizens a civilization which they themselves can regulate and control decides to step in to help us all set America right. Recognizing, for example, that if peace and self-government collapse here, they will have failed all over, perhaps He moves in just 15 minutes before it is altogether too late in order to give Americans and America another chance.

In all events, came 1952, and an unanticipated, and unexpected development took place. Americans, pretty much without any party designation whatsoever, turned to a great American leader in a military sense who himself had no political designations whatsoever, and both parties sought to secure Dwight Eisenhower as their candidate for President. My party happened to succeed. I don't suppose he would have been any different individual had your party succeeded. In all events, pretty much by acclamation, joined in, I am proud to say, by five great southern Democratic States and encouraged by the rest of them, the country turned to someone outside of political life, and said, "Mr. Eisenhower, you take over and be President of the country."

AMERICA NOW HAS A SECOND CHANCE—PROVIDED DIXIE LEADS THE WAY

That has given us a breathing spell; that has given us a chance for a second look. It has not, nor could it be expected to have, solved completely any of the problems and challenges that we are confronted with. It has not altered what, in my opinion, is positively going to eventuate as a result of what happened in that Democratic convention, or even what happened to my party as a result of that convention; it has not altered what is going to lie ahead once the Eisenhower era is over. I very frankly was one of those who thought for a long time after the President's unfortunate heart attack that he would not be able to become a candidate for office. I worried about that, because this I believe: Once Ike is no longer a candidate, America is going to face a showdown decision on basic principles the verdict of which is going to dominate the lives of all of us for the rest of our existence. I expected that to come in 1956.

I consequently worried about that 1956 decision because I knew America wasn't ready from the standpoint of political engineering to make that verdict honestly and effectively and on basic principles devoid of partisan prejudices. We are not yet ready to avoid old political affinities or to eliminate a lot of cloudy fuzziness in our elective machinery which makes it pretty well impossible today for right-thinking people in America to unite on a basic issue, regardless of where they happen to live geographically or how they happen to be registered politically. Unless we can develop the necessary political machinery to do that, I am going to tell you before this address is over who is going to write the ticket for Uncle Sam, and you aren't going to like the ticket, and neither am I. You aren't going to have anything to do about writing the ticket, and neither am I, unless down here you people rise up to one of the greatest challenges our civilization ever had and utilize the essential techniques of sound political engineering to write the right kind of ticket for the country and the world.

I know you are not ready for that in 1956, and that's one reason, I suspect, if I were to be completely frank, that is the greatest reason, I am so glad that Ike's heart has restored itself to the point where he can run again and thus give America until 1960 to develop the necessary political changes to preserve our cherished freedoms.

Some of you will like what I am going to say now, and some of you will dislike it, but I tell it to you as an observation I believe to be a fact: I think that if that heart holds up, as I believe it will, our present President is going to be reelected for a second term. I think our breathing spell, which looked like it was going to be cut short by 4 years, which wouldn't have given us much time for political engineering, is going to get a second breath, and that we will now have until 1960 to get ready for the showdown issues.

I think this breathing spell, this era of moderation, this middle-of-the-road consolidation of our position, this resistance to further movements in the direction of socialism, will carry on under Eisenhower's leadership until 1960. If it does, the question is, "Will we be ready then to answer the five prodigious questions you and I are going to have to answer then and could conceivably be called upon to answer even as soon as next November?"

FIVE BASIC ISSUES FACING US NOW—OR IN 1960

The first question is, "How big would you like to have the Federal Government become?" We have two opinions in this country. I don't discredit or disparage the patriotism of those who hold as many do that the Federal Government should grow on continuously. That 20 years from now State governors should not have any importance whatsoever except to perform ceremonial functions like a British king. State legislatures even less. People are entitled to that opinion. The British have had a unitary system of government without a breakdown into states' rights, and states' capitals, and states' functions for a long while. The British are a remarkable people. I have visited there many times. I respect their indefatigability and their courage and what they are able to do in their Island Kingdom. So few of them have affected the lives of so many. But that is something you have got to decide—how big do you want our Federal Government to grow? I'll make a guess with you. I know the people of South Dakota better than I know the people of South Carolina, but I can tell you this, that the people of South Dakota say, "Our Federal Government has already gotten too big, we want it smaller." I think you also believe that; I don't know; but if you believe that, I submit to you that we don't have the political machinery today with which you can effectively and easily join up with South Dakotans who believe like you. We've got to cut down the size and the interference and the power of the Federal Government. But still we lack effective political machinery for deciding the question in conformity with our convictions. If we decide that we want the Government bigger than it is, that's a permanent decision because once you socialize an industry, it can be power or it could be banking, and it's likely to be banking's big sister, the insurance industry before it actually is banking—once you nationalize a big industry, it is very difficult to denationalize it, to get it back to private owners. So remember we are playing for keeps. We are making a verdict for which there is not going to be a mistrial and a second chance, and in my opinion we are not ready to make that verdict properly with our existing political allotments. That is why I prayerfully give thanks for Eisenhower, who is going to give us time, in my opinion, to get ready for this big important decision in 1960.

Second question: "How much should the Federal Government cost?" There are good people in this country, patriotic people, who say they can settle this question: "Spend as much as you can. We only owe the money to ourselves. Why worry about balancing the budgets? Spend for everything, spend everywhere, spend all the time, you can always get it from the people in taxes." I don't question their patriotism. I question their economics. I deplore their judgment. I know they are preaching something which is anathema to the economic concepts which I studied in college; repugnant to the economic concepts which my people believe. I know my people don't like these spending sprees out in South Dakota. They think we are spending too much now. I think so too. I think you think so too, but if you do, there isn't any generally acceptable political machinery in this greatest country in the world today which will easily and effectively permit the people in South Carolina and the people in South Dakota in a national election to join forces to strike a blow for economy or to team up in voting for a party or a President pledged to perform economically and who will be faithful to that pledge.

Third big decision: "How much should the Government own and operate?" I don't know what you believe. I know there is a big segment of the South that believes that the power business should be turned over to the Federal Government. Maybe so. I certainly believe the Federal Government should own some things. Most of us surely agree it should run the Army, and the Air Force, and our post offices, but I think and I believe you think, and I know the people of South Dakota think that the Federal Government should cease expanding out as a giant competitor to private enterprises all over. I believe that you and I believe and I know the people of South Dakota too, believe the Federal Government shouldn't get into the automobile business, or the insurance business, or the banking business, that we shouldn't have socialized medicine, that we shouldn't have Government radio, we shouldn't have Government railroads, we shouldn't have Government newspapers. Now there are good Americans who believe otherwise. Some of them are in Congress now. We are going to have to decide this basic issue pretty soon. I thought, perhaps, we were going to have to decide that in 1956. With Ike a candidate, we'll have additional time, but in 1960 when we go back to bidding for the bunches of votes where they are and have to promise the bloc voters the things they want, it will be an issue. In fact, it could unhappily become a fact without ever having become an issue in the campaign, because if both parties start promising what your one party was promising in the forties, these things can become an actuality without your ever having a chance to vote upon them in the good American way.

How much should the Government own and operate?

I introduced a year ago in the Senate of the United States an amendment which was a simple amendment, I thought. I thought it would go through almost unanimously. I never had been as discouraged in 18 years in Washington as the day my amendment was defeated on a roll call vote. The President of the United States had sent up a request to Congress. It was a simple request. He said that we have discovered that there are over 2,500 different private enterprises in which the Federal Government is unnecessarily engaged. That your Government and mine was operating 50 coffee-roasting plants, a bunch of pop-bottling works, 2 or 3 barbed wire factories, some paint factories, some clothing factories, some furniture factories, all under the guise of supplying things for the armed services or of making them more economical for our give-away programs of foreign aid, whatever they were. I was aghast when I saw the President's report. He asked for permission to sell them back to you, the private citizens of America. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee so I

introduced an amendment to the Appropriation's Act implementing the President's request. Let's give the President the power to divest himself, and the Federal Government of all the socialistic enterprises not essential to our national defense or our national economy, I stated in support of my amendment. In a roll call vote, the United States Senate in the year of our Lord 1955 defeated that amendment. Why did they defeat it?

Some good, sturdy, strong private enterprise Senators voted "No" because it happened that one or more of those particular industries were located in their communities or in their States and the realities of practical politics induced them to vote that way. I am happy to say that we finally got an amended version of my proposal through which said that unless the Appropriations Committee itself resisted by resolution any divestments of economic enterprises by the President, he could go forward with the program. So through that hurdle and through that screen he has been able to get rid of some 500 of the 2,500. Two thousand of them still are run by you and me as collective entrepreneurs under a system as completely socialistic as anything the "B and K boys" of modern Russia could possibly conceive, because there isn't anything more totalitarian than the complete government ownership of an industry, whether you do it under the stars and stripes or whether you do it under the hammer and the sickle. If the politicians run it, they run it and it is in competition with the rest of the economy if competition is at all permitted. Anyhow a decision on how much further America should move toward national socialism is one which we shall have to make in 1960.

The fourth decision: "How much authority should government exercise as a device for influencing our individual lives? How much authority do you want to give to us in Washington, to determine how you live, what you can and cannot do, into what businesses you can or cannot go, what hours your laborers can work and what you might pay them, what you can raise on your farms and plantations and what you cannot raise, the social mores of your community, who can and cannot attend church with you or go to school with you or work with you—these are the questions to be decided by voters in national elections—I don't know.

Some very fine friends of mine in Congress believe that people like you and people like me cannot be trusted to be ethical or decent or chivalrous or Christian or honest in our behavior, so that you have to give to politicians down in Washington custody over the collective goodness of the country and let them project it out from their angelic countenances by the political power of unimpeded centralized government. I do not believe that. I don't denounce them for their beliefs. I simply say that I, myself, dissent from their conclusions. I think the people who elect the politicians are certainly as good as the politicians they elect, and that the collective judgment of our people is always better than the individual judgment of anybody they elect. Consequently, if we retain for ourselves some of the rights of decision, we vest those determinations in a better spot than if we turn them all over to politicians and the Federal Government.

This is an issue to be decided, if not in 1956, most certainly in 1960. You know what is going to happen in 1960 as well as I. You don't have to have spent 30 years studying political behavior of the great parties of this country to know that in 1960 the great bid is going to be to the groups of voters in the big towns who want to do certain things in America, and who say if you agree to do them, our millions of people will vote your way. So if one party promises it, as your Democratic or New Deal Party is most likely to promise it on the basis of the historic record, the other party is going to be compelled to promise it or be defeated.

Either eventuality would be almost equally calamitous insofar as resisting the expansion of political and economic power in Washington is concerned. Our political machinery isn't in order today so that those who resist these trends in the South can join your forces to those in the North resisting them. Divided as we are by antiquated and meaningless political labels and legends, we cannot win. This is another reason I am happy that things are happening as they are in 1956. We need at least until 1960 to develop some new political machinery.

The fifth big decision that we have got to make: "How far should the Government go to take us into the functions of the welfare state?" We all recognize our joint responsibility to people who are injured, disabled, too old, improvident, blind, diseased. How far do we want to go? How far is it necessary to turn over to Federal politicians in the Capital City the operation of our hospitals and our health-insurance programs; our clinics and our local relief activities? How far must the old cash and charity that used to permeate the heart of most Americans be collectivized in the office of a member of the Cabinet down in Washington? We are not going to go back. We are not going to abandon what has been started. I said earlier that it is difficult to desocialize. It's mighty hard to take away from somebody something he has been getting. Each Congress, though, each national convention, each presidential candidate is beleaguered by those who constantly say "We want more." We are going to have to decide where we draw the line, or do we draw the line; do we follow the example of Great Britain? I like it like they put it down on paper that hot sticky summer down in Philadelphia's Independence Hall so long ago when our wise, far-sighted constitutional forefathers knew what was likely to happen if they brought forward on this continent a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that the men and women living there could rule themselves, so they wrote it in the preamble.

At Philadelphia they said the function of this new Government is going to be in part to provide the national defense. To be free, we must be secure. To be secure, we must have a common national defense. The function of the Federal Government is to provide it. To tax the people for the arms that they need, to conscript the soldiers if you need them for a war, to win a war if we get in, to protect ourselves, to maintain peace if we can do it. We must be strong. The function of the Federal Government is to provide that defense. Our constitutional forefathers made that clear.

People were thinking about general welfare in those days also. The next clause in the preamble of our Constitution is an interesting one. Interesting because of the language that they used. They talked about general welfare. They had said that the purpose of the Federal Government is to provide the national defense. What about the general welfare? Note well the word that they used. To provide the national defense and to promote—and to promote—the general welfare. What a difference. That's the difference, isn't it, between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A.? It's the difference between Hitler's Germany and us. It's the difference between the welfare state and welfare assistance in this country. It could be the difference between two political parties. It could be an issue that we are going to decide in 1956 or 1960. Do you want to keep it that way? Does that make sense? Did it work out all right to have a great big Republic like this which provided the national defense and promoted the general welfare, made jobs available, made it easier for people to secure general welfare, did what we could to promote it without adopting a paternalistic Government so that everybody was fastened to the Federal pact? We are going to make that decision in this country not later than 1960. In my opinion, we are not ready to do it today because of our political machinery. And, in my opinion also, our American experiment not only worked out all right but it has provided living standards for all elements which are the goal and envy of the entire world.

I have said all this on an assumption that may be false or wrong or right and proper; namely, that South Carolinians, along with South Dakotans, will be on the side of limited powers of Government on these five major decisions. If I'm wrong, you have nothing to worry about, except that you have had to listen to a speech of no particular interest to you; but if I'm right, and you want what we want, you have some mighty serious thinking to do on a plane so much higher than partisan politics that it isn't even in the same range of atmospherical statistics. We have got some political engineering to do if you agree with my assumption. Let me suggest five things that might be done now, or that we can start to do now, to save us from the great big controlling bloc of votes and the socialistic trends that I am going to mention soon.

FIVE SUGGESTED REMEDIES

In the first place, we might develop the kind of political realinement that I was talking about when I spoke to you in Charleston some years ago. Getting the right thinking people of the country—let's not say that—let's be completely fair—getting the people who think alike in this country and who think conservatively and in terms of a modification and limitation of the powers of the Central Government; getting them into some kind of political party or political apparatus or political association or political instrumentalities so that they can vote alike for the same candidate on the same ticket regardless of what the party label is or where they live geographically.

We have made some headway in that direction. We haven't made it very fast. That's why I shuddered when I thought we were going to make these five great lasting determinations for the rest of my life in 1956, and why I hoped we could defer them for another 4 years to get ready to write the verdict. Then I'm content to live by it if most of my fellow Americans under a voting system which gives them a fair chance to vote in a national referendum desire the towering size of the omnipotent state, I'm willing to accept it. I suppose I will be a candidate again from the State of South Dakota, although I'm not going to be happy with all of that power because I know that it isn't going to be good for you. I think that under that kind of system I could talk up a speech that would be persuasive enough to be elected for the rest of my natural life out in South Dakota. I would have authority and I would have power and where I couldn't talk them into voting my way, I could seduce them to come over with a dam, or a bounty, or a pension, or a new post office or something else that I could bring by nature of loot from the Federal Government which by that time would be dominating all their lives. But I wouldn't like it. I would rather take a chance on trying to discuss with them the basic principles in which we jointly believe and win or lose on that basis.

I believe firmly in free choice by free voters. To get such free choice, however, and for freemen to reach sound political decisions, it is essential that we realine our partisan groupings in America. Southern Democrats and rural Republicans in this country have much in common. Their points of agreement on basic economic and political issues far outstrip their areas of disagreement. But we need to do some

political engineering so we can work and vote together. So long as we cancel out each other's votes for President, we help the trend toward the total American state and defeat our ideals and our own best interests.

A second device we tried, and may I say here that we tried this with the support of your two good South Carolina Senators in this session of Congress: OLIN JOHNSTON, whom I have known for a long time and with whom I have served on the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and Strom Thurmond, that new gladiator from down South that you sent up there, who has cut probably the widest swath in the United States Senate ever cut by so young a Senator in so short a time. We proposed to do some political engineering, to get ready for 1960. We offered a constitutional amendment that wouldn't do any good under any circumstances for 1956, but would take off from the neck of the Democratic Party of America and the Republican Party of America, the big foot of the big cities of America who now dominate in the main the thinking, the activities, and the trends of both political parties.

We proposed by our amendment to break up the bloc-system of electoral voting. We proposed to give both those who vote for the winning candidate and those voting against the winning candidate a chance to have their votes counted at the electoral college level. This proposed constitutional amendment would have driven a death nail into the domineering controls of the city machines and some of their associated pressure groups. It takes a two-thirds vote to get it through the Senate. We debated it for a week. We received a majority vote but we lacked six votes from getting the essential two-thirds majority required to pass a constitutional amendment, so it's back in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary again. It's called the Mundt-Daniel-Thurmond amendment. I'm presently corresponding with Strom Thurmond, who's down in South Carolina enjoying a short vacation before resuming his activities in Washington, and we are soon going to come up with a new version of this amendment which we hope the Senate will approve early next year.

I think it is tremendously important, for example, that we break up a system which means, as I put it during a Senate debate, that one sodden drunk can fall off of a park bench in Battery Park of New York City, and hitting the ground wake up and stagger and stumble into a voting booth on election day, not knowing where he is, and, in the heat of the election booth to keep from falling on his face in his drunken stupor, reach for an election lever as a support and accidentally pull the election lever down, thereby determining the entire outcome of a national Presidential election. Do you all fully realize this can actually happen? That one vote cast by Mr. Stumble Bum in New York City can put in action 45 electoral votes which mean more than all of the votes cast by intelligent people voting unanimously in 12 or 13 separate States of the United States. Break up that system of unit voting in the electoral college so that no one group, no one city, no one State, and no one collection of 12 metropolitan cities in this country can run the rest of us, and you are moving in the direction of modernizing and improving our political machinery. We would then begin giving like-minded people a chance to vote alike regardless of where they live politically or where they are registered geographically. We would be taking our elections out of the hands of pressure groups and big-city political machines and putting them back in the hands of the people where they belong.

The third available remedy is revising your State election laws. We can do something in all of our States to make it easier for people to cross party lines and make it easier for a second party to get into operation, to make it easier for people who happen to be registered with one party and want to vote for another party for a certain cause to do so. That's a local responsibility which, in my opinion, can and should be locally met and which was locally met courageously under the leadership of Governor Allan Shivers over in Texas prior to the last election. I hope it can be met with equal success in a great many other States of the Union.

Of course, other States may follow the example of South Carolina in the last election under the leadership of an old friend of mine and a great American, who, except for the political mechanics of our country during his prime might well have been a candidate and President of the United States. I'm talking about Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina. Jimmy Byrnes in 1952 demonstrated a courageous and patriotic leadership which other States, I hope, and other Governors will follow. His example in the last election, when, ignoring parties and concentrating on principles and confidence in personalities, he supported a candidate not of his own political party for the highest office in the land, deserves emulation by other courageous Democrats who are neither Fair Dealers or New Dealers. It is the medicine in the bottle that counts—not the label on the outside of the container. Governor Byrnes came pretty close to running up the score for South Carolina in support of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He came close enough to help write some new American history. He came close enough to cause even the city machines to wonder if somebody might be trying to get out of the bag in which they have been held so long and on which the party bosses in the big towns thought they had tied the knot.

Senator HARRY BYRD, a great American in anybody's book, did the same thing in Virginia. Virginia voted for the man HARRY BYRD supported. Allen Shivers and PRICE DANIEL did the same thing in Texas. Texas voted for the man that they supported. I simply point out that there are times when principles prevail, when the perils of following the line of least resistance are so great, that men have courage like Jimmy Byrnes, whose golden wedding anniversary I was happy to note this week has been observed by Mrs. Byrnes and Jimmy. Men take leadership to get results. They are history-makers. As long as southern political traditions continue, that is one way to break out of the trap.

I have discussed this for many years in every State of the South as your chairman said, and I did it because of no partisan motive. I do it only because there isn't any other place that America can be saved from the consequences of the new controls which have been operating in this country as a result of what we all lost in the Democratic National Convention of 1936, and I use the word "we" advisedly. In the evolution and the development of the competent forces which now control the country, there is no way to escape those consequences except by some of the devices that I am mentioning. Changing the two-thirds rule in 1956 is a fourth method by which conservatives at the Democratic Convention could do the job. I think it may be hard to do but it could be done. Even breaking up the unit rule, which was a part of the two-thirds rule would help tremendously. It would once again have its same impact on my party as it has on yours, because parties emulate each other.

A FLORIDA LEGISLATOR SPEAKS OUT

It would move political controls in both our parties back to the hands of the people and out of the hands of political bosses and pressure groups. I was talking on this subject 2 months ago in Florida, and at a friend's home afterward, a man came up to me by the name of O'Neil Rogells, and may I say now that I use his name with his permission, came up to see me and introduced himself and said: "I have been a member of the legislature down in Tallahassee; I'm a Democrat. No northerner has ever come down and talked to us like this before. I'm more interested in America than I am in my political party or my political career." Mr. Rogells further said: "If you could promise me, Senator MUNDT, that your party at the next convention would write a strong States right platform, as strong as you did in your last convention in 1952, and nominate candidates who will support it and believe in it (Eisenhower will do if he is available), if you can promise me that you will get that kind of platform and perform on it in Congress, I'll register Republican in Florida despite I'm a member of the legislature of the Democratic Party in Florida."

I said, "Mr. Rogells, that is a very interesting suggestion, and a very encouraging one, because what does a political party mean in a war? Did you ever hear anybody come back from the war in Korea, and that was a war, did you ever hear anybody say 'We lost a skirmish down there because I told the boys in the troops that half of them belonged to the other political party and I wouldn't work with them'? You never heard that, did you? You forget all about political registrations when you get into the uniform of Uncle Sam. When you have a common cause, who cares if your Commanding Officer is a Republican or a Democrat or a North Dakota progressive or an Independent? You are concerned only about result."

So I said, "Mr. Rogells, your suggestion is challenging and interesting. As the issues confront us now, we are having a tough fight to hold our Party to an unfailing support of State's rights. I happen to belong to what we call the 'Thin White Line' of the Republican Party that's trying to keep our State's rights position alive; that talks about it openly and votes for it consistently; and tries to pursue it; and encourages the White House and the executive agencies and even the courts when we can, to remember and to sustain our State's rights. But we lose almost as many battles as we win. We are going to have a hard time at our convention. Those opposing the rights of States have been fighting us consistently since 1932 and driving us further and further into a corner. We could lose our fight in 1956 or 1960. Why don't you join us now? We need your help."

Mr. Rogells said, "I can't be sure that you are going to win it. I want to be sure." I said, "Look, my friend," I noticed he had a service button in his lapel, "You remind me of a situation where in a battle on a mountain slope, your side of the battle is up on the ridge with a thin and faltering line that is facing stupendous odds, and you send a runner back to a commanding officer who has a large platoon of troops about a half mile down the hill and tell him you need reinforcements quick or we'll lose the battle and the officer sends back the runner and says 'Keep on fighting boys and if you can get the enemy on the retreat, we'll come on up and join you with the cheers.' Mr. Rogells, we need you now, or we're apt to lose."

The conversation ended on that and then two weeks later I got a clipping from a newspaper down in Sarasota saying "Rogells Breaks With Demos." I read the article and Mr. Rogells tells how he is joining the Republican Party in Florida for the sole purpose of trying to be sure that they send to the convention Republican delegates who'll stand up and fight for a States rights platform in the Republican Party. He says I know we can't get it in the Democratic Party because we have tried it there and failed completely.

I wrote him a letter and told him I certainly appreciate that and that I was going to make a talk in South Carolina to the State Bankers' Association and I would like to mention his courageous action as another possible device if I may, but I wouldn't think of discussing our conversation or his name unless he gave me his permission. Here is his wire: "Senator MUNDT, appreciate your kind

remarks. You have my permission to use statement in any way you see fit, O'Neil Rogells."

I mention this action as another way to solve our political problems. I'm not necessarily advocating; I don't think perhaps that it is the most effective way in a completely one party State like South Carolina. I simply mention it as another remedy. If 500 of the most prominent Democratic families in South Carolina, for instance, were to register Republican within any given month and publicize it widely you could go far toward rewriting the future pattern for America. There are ways that free men can escape from the trap you're in. The formula followed by Mr. Rogells is a fifth such possibility.

I have mentioned five possible remedies. Suppose we don't take any of them. May I make one final prediction, then before we close? Unless some way or another this great section of the country becomes unpredictable, unchained, unless you can take the lead, the five biggest blocs of votes in this country are going to continue to dominate your party and perhaps mine. I'm perfectly frank to say that they have already influenced mine to a considerable degree. And to the greater degree to which they influence yours and the greater degree to which that brings victory to your Democratic standard, I'm frank to confess, to that greater degree we are going to go in the direction of total centralization of authority in Washington. Unless some of these things that I have talked about are done, and they can be done only in Dixie, and only by southerners in Dixie, and only by Democrats in Dixie, because most of the best people of the South are Democrats, then I know unless you do something different, socialism will soon again become a realistic menace in America.

FIVE VOTE BLOCS WHO KNOW WHAT THEY WANT

The biggest voter bloc in this country today that influences more political behavior in Washington than any other bloc, I suppose, including the Republican and Democrat National Committees combined, is this new organization known as the CIO–AFL–PAC. Two great labor unions have merged and they have told the world "We are going to whip our enemies and elect our friends." They have told the candidates in both parties, "If you will move in the direction that we want you to move far enough, we will support you, or we'll support the one that yields to our demands the most, even though he is your opponent and of a different political party."

Add them up my good friends; there are tens of millions of them, these voters incroporated in the CIO–AFL merger. They are going to control a great many public decisions unless we find a political mechanism so those holding a different point of view can work together. I say that without criticism of the CIO–PAC. Why shouldn't they do that? They are Americans. They are loyal. They have a right to organize. They have their points of view, and while it happens they belong to a certain class and they unhappily seem to be trying to develop a class consciousness in this country, which in my opinion is unconscionable in America, still their patriotism is unquestioned and they have a right to function in the political system if they are smart enough to do it, and if those opposing their excesses are stupid enough not to react effectively, who can complain? If they should bring socialism to America under Mr. Reuther as President some day, that would be their right is it is done by the ballot, and if we permit our political machinery to be controlled by their zealous leaders.

The second biggest bloc is your city machines led by politicians who play politics for pelt not for public service. These are bossed by men who discovered in the last quarter of a century that "There is gold in them thar Potomac hills" and they are no longer going to fool around merely with electing sheriffs and police judges in big cities like Chicago and New York. They have learned they can drive people to the polls by multitudes, many of whom can neither read nor write in the English language, who haven't studied American history, who don't know American traditions, and who come from countries which had paternalistic governments before they moved here. Yet, they can outvote all of the rest of us. You can forget about Dixie as you can forget about the Dakotas and Nebraska and Kansas, so long as you continue to give the bosses of the city political machines in the 12 major cities and the 8 big States of this country votes enough to bring about a determination in a national election because of our failure to change some of our political machinery, especially the method of unit voting in our electoral college. I don't complain about that. I simply point out that we should exceed them and excel them in their wisdom and in their determination. They have a right to do what they can to boss America. But we have a duty to make the reforms needed to prevent their successful domination.

The third big group, and I say this completely without any suggestion of criticism of the colored voters of this country, is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The have a right to their opinion. In my opinion they have a right to vote. They have a right to organize, and they have become a great organized voting bloc in this country seeking successes from their standpoint. There is nothing un-American about that, but it's a tremendous appeal to politicians on every side in every party to say, "If that many votes are involved, from the third biggest voting bloc in America, why not get them? Why not solicit them?" They have become more important through their association than the collective vote of all of Dixie, and more important than the collective vote of the States of the Missouri and Mississippi Valley, and we think that we are important people. We would like to get back into the Union, and we would like to find a way to join you in adopting basic fundamental principles which are not swayed by emotional suasion and are not based on prejudicial points of view. We want you in Dixie to get back into the Union, too, insofar as your voting importance is concerned.

The fourth biggest bloc of votes in this country is what they call the ethnic groups, the hyphenated American organizations: People who come here and organize associations with the land of their ancestry and are attached to it. They read newspapers in the native language of their homeland, make frequent trips, write many letters back and forth, and maintain for many years greater attachments over there than over here. But, above everything else, they form voting blocs. This reminds me that a Democratic Congressman told me the other day in Chicago that all he needs to do to get elected is to see one Polish leader in Chicago and he's in. All of the Polish people, said he, in Chicago follow his suggestion. There is nothing wrong about that. It isn't illegal. I don't criticize it. I simply point out that we are living in a political era when blocs like that, which join at least in desiring more power for the central Government are going to control unless intelligent folks like you and me start living in the present and forget about the past and make at least as much of a study of political engineering as we have of mechanical and electrical and atomic engineering, in which fields we all have had to become educated.

The fifth largest pressure group is Americans for Democratic Action, a little association of self-protesting liberals who actually preach a doctrine carrying you back to feudalism when the king could do no wrong and the state was supreme. Americans for Democratic Action offer up their votes to the highest bidder. I'm happy to say that I belong to a political party which up to now has consistently refused to bid for the votes of that outfit and I hope that we Republicans continue to resist them even though we lose, because they are trying to push us as far toward socialism as is possible, as far as is favored by any sizable group in the United States of America today. They'll pack in a lot of people at their meeting a week from today in the city of Washington to write the ticket they are going to insist you Democrats adopt at your convention in Chicago this summer. I note a report in the papers of yesterday that they are inviting speakers including Elmer Davis, Kefauver, Stevenson, Walter Reuther of the CIO–AFL, Governor Williams of Michigan, Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Lehman, Senator Humphrey, Senator Morse, and other like-minded and bewildered "liberals." I'm happy we Republicans have been excluded from the speakers' rostrum. I must point out that these people in the ADA are smart Americans and what they are doing is legal. I don't question their patriotism. They are just outsmarting the rest of the country. They point out that their main job in that convention in Washington next week is to further devitalize the influence of the South in the Democratic Party. That's why they are there.

I emphasize that you have a bigger bloc of votes in Dixie than any of the five great groups that I have mentioned provided you can develop a voting mechanism that will attach you some way or another to other right-thinking people in the North for specific purposes in specific campaigns. By doing that you can exercise the political influence which alone can save America.

I have nothing against any of these organizations: the CIO–PAC, the city machines, the organized colored voters, the ethnic voting blocks, or the ADA. I accept them all into our fraternity of Americans as good citizens, but I simply point out that, in my opinion, I wouldn't want any of those blocs, or all of them combined, to write the final political and economic ticket for America. I'd rather have it written by the people of the rural areas of this country, and by voters in our cities and on our farms who belong to no self-interested pressure groups. I'd rather have it written by the Republicans I know back home and the Democrats I know down here.

Yes, my good Democratic friends of the South, all I suggest is that we develop our abilities in the science of political engineering so that no longer will an imaginary line created by the War Between the States continue to divide into rival political camps people who have an identity of convictions and such close similarities of concept. It would be tragic indeed if a generation that has split the atom and harnessed its great power would let a problem in Semantics—an attachment to labels, tradition, and prejudice—cause us to continue to split people dedicated to identical high principles into rival camps under the comparatively meaningless names "Republican" and "Democrat," so that we are impotent and powerless to harness our great vote power into a single effective voting machine.

OUR 10TH AMENDMENT

I feel that next to our great written Constitution itself, the greatest invention of Americans in the field of self-government was the concept of States rights as set forth in our Bill of Rights by the 10th amendment. Other civilizations and other lands have contributed much toward the evolution and maintenance of human freedom. But it was left to freemen on this continent and in the early formative days of our system of government to establish by the 10th amendment formal recognition of certain inalienable rights of both States and individual citizens

which could be transferred to the Central Government only by the voluntary and specific delegation of those powers by those entrusted with them by our Constitution. This, then, is America's greatest contribution to the science of self-government and the endless contest of free citizens versus the Central Government. This, to a great degree, is the great genius of what we call the American system. This, then, we must preserve if our future is to be as resplendent as our past. And, finally, it is this great key to our success that we must support by proper changes in our elective machinery and our political procedures lest those who lack faith in this concept, or who find it a barrier to their ceaseless drives for power succeed in developing too many powers for too strong a Central Government in Washington. It is this challenge which Dixie—and perhaps Dixie alone—can successfully meet by recognizing its dangers soon enough and by taking the indicated steps required to meet and defeat it.

Good friends, I have suggested five possible remedial steps. Others may occur to you. I believe the challenge to all of us is crystal clear. I appreciate your close attention. You have been very kind. I have been very frank. These are days which call for blunt talk and unpleasant truths. I came here neither to try to please you nor to lure you away from your traditional political behavior. I came only to describe what I believe I know and to predict that which I know I fear.

I came especially, however, because I am positive that the people of Dixie can determine America's destiny for the next half century. By so doing you will chart a course for all the world. No other group in America has the homogeneity, the good judgment, the high patriotism, combined with the tremendous vote power of our Southern States. You can have it as you want it. You will get it as you merit it. You can call the tune for Uncle Sam or you can become the victims of inertia and remain docile and impotent while living through a future the nature of which you will have failed to help in fashioning.

In conclusion, let me suggest to you as bankers that you always keep in mind that it is more important to you to help determine what takes place in the polling places of America than what takes place in the teller's cages of your banks. I beg of you to divert some of your great genius and your many talents to the problems I have discussed with you to the end that we can solve them in the best interests of all America and all Americans. In our country, we must all remember always that there is never anything wrong with America that a single good election will not cure. Likewise, there is no immortality for our freedoms and no security for our property that a single bad election cannot jeopardize and perhaps even terminate.

I salute you as the custodians of our country's future and I wish you well.

Materials and Energy Supplies of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, meeting in Cleveland, was addressed by the Honorable Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals Resources, on May 23. His paper was entitled "Materials and Energy Supplies of the Future." Secretary Wormser reviewed the operation of our present barter program, through which we dispose of agricultural surpluses and acquire strategic materials.

I was, of course, a Member of the other body during the 83d Congress. When Public Law 480, 83d Congress, was debated in the Committee of the Whole of the other body, it was my privilege to submit an amendment to protect the mining industry. The amendment I sponsored was adopted. Under this amendment, a supplemental stockpile was established for the minerals obtained both under the barter program and through the use of foreign currencies acquired by our Government in payment for surplus agricultural products. The Congress was given the sole authority to release any materials placed in the supplemental stockpile in time of peace. The text of this amendment and the debate on it may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1954, at page 8363.

Secretary Wormser in his excellent address shows how the administration has implemented this legislation to the benefit of both our farmers and our miners. His address also reveals the consistent philosophy of President Eisenhower's administration to promote free competitive enterprise at every turn.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will make 2⅓ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $187.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Wormser's remarks to this distinguished group may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATERIALS AND ENERGY SUPPLIES OF THE FUTURE

(Address by Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, Department of the Interior, before the National Association of Purchasing Agents, Cleveland, Ohio, May 23, 1956)

It is a distinct pleasure to meet with men of your profession, with men who have an intimate knowledge of markets and marketing practices and the economic environment within which this great country has prospered. It is also a pleasant experience to speak to you as a member of the present administration's team, and to bring to your attention some of the fundamental concepts of President Eisenhower's economic philosophy.

The President's frequent endorsement of "free competitive capitalism" scarcely could have escaped your notice. It has been extremely gratifying to me to assist in the development of Government policies stressing the vital importance of free competitive enterprise in the growth of our Nation. It has been good to see the application of these policies stimulate American businessmen to progressive action. It has been a thrilling experience, also, to see a persistent reapplication of traditional American business principles in the administration of public affairs. The results speak for themselves and are there for all to measure or appraise.

A deep understanding of traditional American economic philosophy was needed to design the courses of action which facilitated the general business readjustment called for after the close of Korean hostilities. A sense of economic balance and courage were required to place these policies into practice. The rapid removal of direct controls over prices and wages was a bold but effective step in the face of the dire predictions of inflation. The restriction of public spending, despite the fact that it was accomplished without jeopardizing the Nation's defensive strength, was unpopular in some quarters, but it was the only certain way to lighten the tax burden. An attack upon the basic causes of weakness in the agricultural situation has brought political strife, but determined action on the problem is beginning to bring order out of chaos. The liberalization of trade has won enemies as well as friends, but it is the only sound way of solidifying free world economic strength. The partnership approach to resource development has been maligned, but it is a sensible way of returning misplaced Federal control over certain aspects of this important activity to the grassroots level.

These and other achievements, together with the curtailment of governmental activities that could be handled more effectively by private enterprise—as an effort to eliminate Government competition with industry—restored confidence and set the stage for the period of unequaled economic development experienced during recent years.

This administration recognizes the fact that the main source of our economic strength lies in American free institutions and the qualities of our people. Americans have always been characterized by their love of freedom, their ambition, inventiveness, skill, and their enterprising willingness to put forth their best efforts in behalf of self, family, and community. Consequently, actions taken to date are based upon this important principle, that each individual citizen should be permitted to pursue, within wide limits, his interests according to his own lights.

Consistent with this philosophy is the view that open markets and effective competition are the means of channeling materials and products, that normal supply-demand relationships should govern the distribution of productive effort, and that flexible prices are not something to be avoided, but are essential if resources are to be shifted to uses in which the rewards are the greatest. It has been said that competitive markets are as basic to the proper functioning of our dynamic economy as the secret ballot is to our political democracy.

Freer markets are also essential if world trade is to flourish and make its contribution to free-world economic development. In devising its foreign economic policies the administration has stressed the need for a freer system of trade and payments. It has taken the position that responsible governments should establish and maintain a trade environment within which private traders can carry out their transactions with the fewest impediments from exchange controls or other forms of trade restrictions.

The domestic agricultural situation with its huge surpluses has posed a stubborn problem. There has been a lot of head scratching over this one, which was inherited by the present administration. Government policies to foster a strong and vigorous farm economy are vital, but this does not mean that unrealistic price supports should be continued. This could serve only to aggravate the present conditions under which many agricultural commodities are not free to move in competitive world markets because of our artificial pricing system.

Experience indicates that the Federal Government invites problems which are difficult to handle whenever it takes action to disturb supply-demand relationships. It is quite a trick to employ man-made economic devices

without diluting or destroying the competitive influence that generally can be relied upon to cut production or use down to size. Furthermore, it has been my observation that any movement to initiate one type of government intervention in commodity markets, if successful, leads inevitably to another.

I think it might work out this way if the Government became seriously involved in the scrap-metal situation. During the past 2 or 3 years we have heard proposals to stockpile scrap, and others to control its export, depending, as I see it ,upon the direction of the trade winds at the particular moment. Some of these proposals persist, despite the fact that responsible Federal officials have agreed that there is no present justification for the Government to do anything about scrap as a defense mobilization measure.

My advice to any businessman who would seek to solve an immediate production or marketing problem by asking for some kind of direct Government assistance is simply this: Think twice before you offer to sell any portion of your economic birthright for a mess of Government pottage. Give Washington a particularly wide berth when markets apparently misbehave.

If we are sincerely devoted to our wonderful system of American free enterprise and free competitive markets, we must learn to take the bitter with the sweet—to take periods of business adversity in stride with those of prosperity—to endure the night as well as the day, winter as well as summer. We must destroy the illusion that Government controls can bring about an eternal spring.

Today you may remain certain that the Federal Government will not unnecessarily intervene in the everyday activities of its citizens. One of the greatest apprehensions a businessman can have is that legitimate Government interest in the economic welfare of its people may degenerate into an attitude of paternalism, and that reasonable Government regulation of private industry may deteriorate into arbitrary bureaucratic controls.

Please don't misunderstand these remarks. There is an all-important role for Government in modern economic affairs. We are in an extremely critical period in national and world history. Daily it becomes more evident that military and economic security are closely related. This, together with the fact that our economy has grown to staggering proportions and has become much more complex than it used to be, requires some central unifying or coordinating force. The trick in Government administration is one of learning how to use the so-called built-in stabilizing devices to moderate business conditions without stifling individual initiative or without using Government power to favor one group over another. The idea is to stimulate rather than to retard economic development.

In the crucial days ahead the one great hope for a lasting peace will rest upon our ability to lead the free world to a position of impregnable economic strength. The Communists have thrown a new challenge our way. Only recently we have seen a sharp shift in Soviet tactics. The new line of approach is one of economic penetration, and it is one that can prove highly effective in many underdeveloped areas throughout the world. To me the big cut in Russian military expenditures means that the Soviet plans to divert manpower and facilities from the production of guns to the manufacture of trading items. It is further evidence that the new Soviet plan of strategy for waging cold war is one of using every industrial and commercial weapon at its disposal. Incidentally, I might ask, how does a free enterprise country compete on even terms with one having only Government monopolies? It appears that the free world faces a period within which it must reckon with a new and ruthless competitive force. There will be an increasing amount of competition in certain markets and a new urgency undoubtedly will be placed upon the availability of raw materials.

Through a long siege of cold war the American public has become aware that the security of the Nation as well as its continued prosperity is heavily dependent upon the international political and economic environment and upon public policy to improve conditions. Programs for defense, therefore, embrace a concept of mutual security, and those for economic development envision cooperation with friendly foreign nations to increase total free world productivity and to reduce barriers which impede the flow of raw materials, finished goods, and capital. The continued growth of our own production is in no small degree contingent upon expanding resource development in other countries and upon an expanded world market for the products of American industry.

America's greatest asset is its productivity. We built more airplanes and tanks during the war than anyone thought possible. Our factories can turn out automobiles, refrigerators, and television sets at an amazing clip. The future by way of technological advances promises even more. We are just beginning to realize the benefits of automation. We have virtually opened up the universe by splitting the atom. Over the long run the effects of nuclear energy almost defy imagination. Even now private industry is spending a quarter of a billon dollars on atomic powerplant development.

One question looms large as we look over the eventful past and contemplate the challenging future. To all of you, who are daily engaged in the business of buying, it must appear obvious that sustenance of economic growth involves more than new technology and the expansion of productive capacity. The question is, can we continue to supply the material ingredients that make up the industrial mix—the raw materials that come from the land, sea, and air?

Fifty years ago the future availability of basic materials was far from being a principal worry to the American public. Our own resource base appeared inexhaustible, and it was relatively easy to obtain from abroad the materials we didn't have. We were still young, with a relatively small industrial economy. Now that we have grown up economically we are finding that more and more of the stuff that is digested by our factories must come from friendly foreign nations, particularly that of mineral origin. As a result we have been giving an increasing amount of attention to domestic natural resource development and to the availability of minerals elsewhere, in the first place to provide an assured supply of indispensable materials should another war come, and, secondly, to make certain that we can obtain the wherewithal to meet expanding industrial requirements.

Suppose we review some of the things your Government is doing to help lick the raw material problem. Permit me to say at this point that I will confine my remarks to minerals and metals, which are within my official field of interest. First, for purposes of defense.

This country does not and cannot economically produce from its own resources enough led, zinc, copper, manganese, tin, nickel, and a host of other strategic materials to meet its normal demands. We are void of many. In time of war foreign sources of supply can be cut off, so the only way of avoiding serious production bottlenecks is to build up inventories of essential strategic materials in advance. This explains very simply why the United States Government has become in recent years a big customer in world metal markets for military stockpiling. This has significantly reduced the availability of certain items.

The Congress, in enacting stockpiling legislation, attempted to avoid a disruptive impact on markets by specifying that stockpiles, to the maximum extent feasible, should be accumulated from supplies of materials in excess of current needs. Unfortunately, the Korean conflict, with its potentialities for widespread all-out war, led to considerable acceleration of the rate of procurement. For a time we were trying not only to meet the stepped-up demands occasioned by almost full-scale mobilization, but in addition, rapidly to accumulate stockpiles of these materials. We are now back to a position where military stockpiling should have a much lesser impact upon markets. Once the minimum objectives are met, it is the policy of the Government to pursue a more leisurely course in purchasing to meet long-term objectives. Further acquisitions are to be made only when prices are right, or when purchases would aid distressed mineral industries whose current production has been calculated as an essential component of the mobilization base.

In keeping with this general policy of exerting as neutral an effect upon markets as possible, the Office of Defense Mobilization has been diverting to industry certain shipments of aluminum, copper, and nickel, originally intended and scheduled for delivery to the stockpile. Since January 1955, for example, more than 450,000 tons of aluminum have been diverted from the stockpile to private industry. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization announced on May 10 that a diversion of 20 million pounds of nickel would be made in the third quarter and another of 20 million pounds in the fourth quarter. This brings the total nickel to be channeled into industry instead of into the stockpile during 1956 to some 74 million pounds. At the same time that the ODM was announcing the diversion to industry of nickel, it was authorizing the GSA to negotiate for the delivery of 40,000 tons of copper to the stockpile which previously had been diverted into industry. The ODM also announced that there would be no further deferments of delivery of copper in view of the easing supply situation in this commodity.

Generally speaking, the stockpile is in pretty good shape and future purchases for this account should have slight effect upon materials availability.

There is another avenue through which minerals and metals may pass into Government hands and this was opened up in an effort to relieve the agricultural surplus problem. For a long time the Commodity Credit Corporation has had congressional authority to exchange its commodity acquisitions for other materials and to sell the latter in the open market. This is known as the barter program, and it has gained prominence since the 83d Congress in Public Law 480 directed the Secretary of Agriculture to use every practicable means to export surplus farm products via barter for strategic and critical materials.

Public Law 480 also authorized the sale of $1½ billion worth of these agricultural surpluses for local currencies abroad. These moneys, among other things, are being used to acquire strategic minerals and metals and are being used to finance certain developmental programs within the purchasing country.

What is the effect of all this to be? For one thing it means that the Government will acquire metals and minerals over and above those needed for military stockpiling. These acquisitions are to be isolated—locked up tightly—from commercial markets, of course, in the same manner as those for the military stockpile. It means, also, that agricultural surpluses can be used to provide capital to lesser developed countries. This, along with other programs aimed to diversify the economies and thereby raise the standards of living of our less fortunate friends, may have great significance in terms of overall raw materials supply.

The Secretary of Agriculture is working closely with my Department to prevent these transactions from creating an undue amount of disturbance in metal markets, but it is only in line with economic reason to expect some price reaction when amounts of any material are bought and then solidly frozen. Actually, the trading of relatively small quantities of metal and minerals can generate international price changes, because these markets are particularly sensitive to shifts in supply and demand.

It may seem strange that we worry about agricultural surpluses and mineral shortages at one and the same time, but nature made a big distinction between the two. We can grow the things we eat, using the same plot of ground over and over again, if we put back a few of the minerals that plant life consumes. But we have yet to find a way of speeding up the geologic processes, whereby the fossil fuels are generated and whereby metallic substances are pushed close enough to the earth's surface to be within human reach. Once these are removed from the ground they are gone from it forever as far as countless future generations are concerned. Mining is a one crop business.

The search for these nonrenewable mineral deposits, their exploitation, and their processing is a unique business. It is a long-term proposition requiring an intimate understanding and application of almost every science known to man. Incidentally, it is a venture that involves large capital outlays and a high degree of risk. Years of patient research in the field and in the laboratory usually precede the introduction of new mineral products. For example, the topographer, the geologist, the mining engineer, the metallurgist, the chemist, the financier, and many others had a hand in bringing aluminum into common use. Here is a metal that means much to us today—yet for thousands of years it rested quietly in chemical union with other elements while man walked over it. Subsequently magnesium, now titanium and zirconium, are newer additions to our supply of useful metals. Still others will follow.

It appears, however, that some action by the public is called for if it is to enjoy the benefits of full and orderly development of mineral resources. The President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy made a number of recommendations with this in mind, many of which are identified with the Department of the Interior. The committee observed that the development of these resources is primarily a function of private enterprise, but that the Government must continue to assist in many ways.

An adequate appraisal of the Nation's mineral assets is needed, first of all, and we have plans at this time to accelerate the Geological Survey's topographic and geologic mapping activities as rapidly as added funds and manpower are made available. The Department intends, also, to intensify the Bureau of Mines' program of mineral and metal research aimed at the development of latent resources, new mineral raw materials, and improved utilization of existing raw materials. We plan to coordinate these efforts fully with research performed by other agencies of Government and, as far as practicable, with private industry.

These activities have paid handsome dividends in the past. Two of the newer metals, titanium and zirconium, were produced initially in Bureau of Mines laboratories. Both are in commercial production now, although use will be limited to special purposes until costs can be lowered by further technological development.

A great concern to us in the Interior Department is the fact that we are rapidly depleting easily accessible high-grade reserves of the minerals and metals used most commonly by American industry. Furthermore, it is generally believed that we have found most of the higher grade easily worked deposits which can be located from outcroppings of ore near the earth's surface.

Much attention, therefore, is being devoted to the technology of handling lower grade ores. Much remains to be done in this field of endeavor despite remarkable accomplishments to date. The fact that some of you are buying magnesium obtained from sea water attests to the fact that mineral deposits in minute quantities can turn up in strange places. Again, some of the copper which you are purchasing today came from domestic ore deposits averaging only one-half of 1 percent of this red metal. Good grade ore in this country just a few years ago used to average better than 3 percent. Much of the iron and steel of the future will be derived from taconites. Not long ago I had the privilege of visiting the iron ore country and was agreeably surprised to see how rapidly large-scale mining methods, using modern equipment, have brought some of our vast taconite deposits into production.

The technology involved in the production of the mineral fuels has made rapid strides, also, in recent years. Better mining methods and improved equipment have increased productivity within the bituminous coal industry by approximately 50 percent since 1947, and the trend is still definitely upwards. Most of the natural gas that used to be flared is now captured and placed into pipelines or sent through refineries. The oil industry has learned how to drill to deeper horizons in the search for new petroeum reserves, and it has doubled the life of many existing fields through secondary recovery techniques. All of these developments increase availability and assist in keeping energy costs down to reasonable levels.

None of these things happened in a day. Increased productivity and economical production from low-grade deposits have become realities only because the groundwork was done years ago. In many relatively obscure laboratories research is proceeding at this time on plans to beat the cost factor and bring other meagerly distributed minerals into profitable production. Much of the metallic substance that you will buy 10 or 15 years from now will reach the commercial market at that time because of processes being developed now.

But enough of this long-range talk. I know that you must be thinking in more practical terms. What can you buy tomorrow and the next day and what will it cost? Making forecasts along these lines is a hazardous business, and I won't attempt to guess what the very near future holds for each basic commodity. I don't mind at all, however, risking a few predictions with respect to the general outlook for business in the near future.

I am optimistic concerning the days ahead. There may be a few minor setbacks, because economic progress never runs in a straight line, but everything seems to point to a continuing period of prosperity. Businessmen have regained their old confidence. Profits in most industries are satisfactory. Capital investment is increasing. Employment and wages are at record levels. The gross national product and the standard of living moves steadily upward. A greater number of industrial leaders are becoming research minded. As a result, technology will make increasing contributions for our comfort.

I look for even higher levels of economic activity, and I am certain they will come under the sound policies which have been placed into effect by President Eisenhower's administration.

This is an age of great challenge and one of great opportunity. Our spiritual, social, and economic freedoms are at stake. Let us make the most of our opportunities, meet every challenge, with faith in our way of life to keep America free. Certainly there is no one I know better qualified than the purchasing agent to appreciate the priceless asset we Americans possess in our devotion to freedom—and that must include freedom in the market place.

The Civil Rights Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered yesterday, Sunday, June 3, at the annual meeting of the Urban League of Greater New York, held at the Williams Institutional CME Church, 131st Street and 7th Avenue, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT 45TH ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK, WILLIAMS INSTITUTIONAL CME CHURCH, 131ST STREET AND SEVENTH AVENUE, JUNE 3, 1956

I take this opportunity to pay my heartfelt tribute to the Urban League which has been working on the problem of intergroup and interracial relations for almost half a century.

Over the years the Urban League has made historic contributions to the solution of many aspects of the civil-rights problem. One of the league's main achievements has been to help expose and define its roots and manifestations, in terms of housing, schools, recreation facilities, and other phases of segregation and integration.

The Urban League has furnished a framework within which men of good will of all races could work together to achieve steady advances toward the goal of adjustment, focussing their efforts on the neighborhood and the community.

This organization has helped to show how vast are the ramifications of intergroup and interracial adjustment, what concrete and specific evils flow from discrimination and segregation, and what must and can be done about it.

Some people, including some of the leaders of our Government, act as though civil rights were a brandnew problem, which has just arisen and needs nothing so much as to be studied. And they indicate that as soon as they finish studying it, they will probably do something about it. And, of course, that may take a long time.

Others talk as if the civil-rights problem were like a sudden attack of virus and that all that should or can be done is to give the patient plenty of rest, and maybe a dose or two of some patent medicine, like a conference.

You and I know how unrelated to the facts of life these views of the problem are. We know that the problem called civil rights is one of vast complexity, some of whose manifestations will take time to work out, but all of whose aspects need to be worked on, without a moment's needless delay, urgently, deliberately, and zealously.

You and I know, and some of you better than I, how galling and intolerable are the

many aspects of injustice, discrimination, and segregation based on race, and how they involve almost every phase of neighborhood, community, and national life.

In basic respects, the civil-rights problem is as much a northern problem as it is southern. Harlem here is a glaring manifestation of the civil-rights problem in the North, and I shall speak more about that in a moment.

But, above all, the civil-rights problem is one which involves each of us and millions like us, in our personal everyday lives, either as victims of discrimination and segregation, or as those who, willing or not, or consciously or not, are the victimizers, the discriminators, or the segregators.

The civil-rights problem is reflected in the house or apartment we live in, in the street or neighborhood we call our own, in the job or profession we work at, in the shops we patronize, in the movie we attend, in the vacation we plan, and in the schools to which we send our children or to which we ourselves go. In short, the civil-rights problem touches us all in the most personal and intimate details of our lives, in one way or another, depending upon the racial, social, and economic group to which we belong.

These aspects constitute the real core of the civil-rights problem. Around this core are gathered the more dramatic manifestations—the legal and political manifestations which furnish the major approaches to the core and substance aspects of it.

In our concentration on these approaches, which are the obvious instruments of our efforts, we must never lose sight of the core and substance, which are the end objects of these efforts.

In recent months the civil-rights problem has sharpened into a national crisis. This crisis dominates our thinking today; it dominates our political life, too, unwilling as some are to recognize that fact.

Just as the possibility of atomic warfare overshadows our foreign policy today, so the possibility of a racial conflict overshadows our domestic policy.

The civil-rights problem is like a volcano, smoking and bubbling, in the full view of the Nation. All eyes are upon it. Endless words are now being spoken and written about it.

But that volcano has been there for a long time. Only a relatively few have paid much concentrated attention to it in the past, or tried to understand the teeming forces within it. Yet we must understand those forces or we will be unable to cope with them, or control their disastrous consequences.

Today, as I have already indicated, too many Americans, including, I fear, many at the highest levels of our political life, do not understand those forces at all, either as to their nature or their magnitude. And in this lack of understanding lies our greatest danger. Without such an understanding we will not be able to meet the crisis or mobilize the efforts needed to solve the deep-laid problems which underlie the crisis.

In my work in the United States Senate on the civil-rights problem, my efforts are necessarily limited to the tools with which I work. Those tools consist of national legislation and such influence as I can bring to bear, as a Senator, upon the executive branch of the Federal Government. I must further limit my efforts to those undertakings which have either some practical prospect of success, or indicate some possibility of having a constructive effect. None of us can operate on all fronts or move simultaneously in all directions.

At the moment in Washington I am devoting my efforts to the following fronts:

1. Legislation to guarantee to all our citizens the right to participate fully in political activity, in all parts of the country—the right to vote.

2. Legislation to guarantee to all our inhabitants physical security of person, and the equal protection of the law in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—the right of equal justice under law.

3. Legislation to provide a greater degree of equality of opportunity—in jobs, in education and in access to the major avenues of personal fulfillment and realization—in other words, FEPC, school integration and nondiscrimination in all publicly-supported facilities.

4. Legislation to provide a greater measure of social welfare for all underprivileged groups, including minority groups—such as housing and medical care.

5. And, executive action to complete integration in all branches of the Government service, especially in the so-called elite services, such as the Foreign Service.

This is a big order. How much, if any, of this legislation will be enacted at this session of Congress I cannot predict. The prospects are not too bright.

But speaking for myself, alone, I am going to continue to fight for legislation designed to achieve these objectives, and will continue to press the executive branch for action and for leadership; to the full extent of my energies and abilities.

And if we are frustrated in Congress, I am prepared to carry the fight to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in August, and to the people, in the elections in the fall, regardless of whether I am a candidate for reelection or not.

I pledge that I will not spare my own efforts, or withhold any influence which I can exert toward these ends.

A few moments ago I said that the civil-rights problem is a northern as well as a southern one, and that here in Harlem we have both illustration and proof that the acute manifestations of this problem are not confined to the South.

Harlem is a community rich in tradition and culture. Its contributions to the mainstream of national life, politically, socially, economically and culturally have been many and varied. But Harlem is also a rebuke to us of the North, and a challenge to clean up our own backyard, even as we press forward with our efforts to bring justice and equality to the Negroes and other oppressed minorities.

Harlem is a ghetto. Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schooling. These conditions rather than the race or national origin of the people who reside in Harlem, are primarily responsible for the high incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency in the area.

We need residential integration in New York City. Housing segregation is responsible for the high incidence of school segregation in our metropolis, the empire city of the Nation. I am afraid that the policies of our New York City planners have not helped the situation.

We have built too many housing projects, not on vacant land, but on congested land. We have cleared some slums only to create new and worse ones. We have constructed housing projects which were, by their location, forced into a pattern of segregation.

There are substantial elements, including the Urban League, which are working patiently, persistently and strenuously toward the solution of these aspects of the problem, which are as much a part of civil rights as the right to vote and FEPC. Residential segregation is the other side of the coin of school segregation.

One public official who, long before he became a public official, had analyzed this problem, focused on it and agitated consistently for its solution over a period of many years, is my old friend, Charles Abrams, whom Governor Harriman was wise enough to name last year as chairman of the State commission against discrimination.

I want to pay my public tribute to Charles Abrams for his long-time efforts in this field.

I was amazed and, may I say, deeply shocked when Charles Abrams was recently made the object of a political attack by a leading political figure in New York State. Mr. Abrams was accused of being a zealot in the cause of nondiscrimination. Well, if ever there was a cause which called for ceaseless dedication and agitation, this is it.

In this whole struggle I range myself on the side of the Charles Abramses in this, and there are quite a few of them in this country.

I cannot be a neutralist. I cannot stand above the battle.

I identify myself with the victims of oppression and discrimination, wherever and whoever they may be. If that is being a zealot, if dedicated efforts to uphold the law, the Constitution and the laws of New York make one a zealot, well, call me a zealot, too.

We need more and not less of this kind of zealot in the fight for civil rights. Of course, I do not mean that we need more intransigent extremists. I mean men of practical understanding and of patient energy, but also of unlimited dedication and devotion.

Yes, we need more men like Charles Abrams, in New York and in the Nation, and we need less who spend their time trying to understand the viewpoint of those who defy the law or the spirit of the law but who have little concern for the victims of illegal oppression and discrimination.

We need fewer public leaders who utter empty platitudes instead of proposing concrete plans for action.

There are too many in Washington and elsewhere in the North who, when they say "we must sympathize with the problems of the south," really mean—the problems of the southern whites, and particularly the problems of those southern whites who have a stake, political or economic, in the maintenance of segregation and the doctrine of white supremacy.

I think I understand the problems of the South, or at least I try to, but I have little sympathy for those elements of the South that are determined to defy the supreme law of the land and to maintain the practice of segregation for their own comfort, convenience and advantage.

I have genuine sympathy with those in the South who are sincerely working to bring about a change, in an orderly way, and with the least possible dislocation.

But most of all, I have sympathy for those long-suffering individuals—Americans like you and me—who, for all of their lives have endured the whiplash of discrimination and segregation. They are the ones whose plight calls for our first concern. They are the injured, to whom justice must be rendered.

Through the lowering darkness of this present crisis, the light of hope shines true. This is a right cause. Justice is on our side.

We may hope that God is on our side, too. At least, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, we can hope that we are on His side.

We must proceed, and are proceeding, without hate or rancor. Compassion and understanding are written on our banners. But we will not stay our efforts or be stayed. We are the upholders of the law, and we will not be denied.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from remarks I made at the Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress, in Philadelphia, on May 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR DUFF AT THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, AT PHILADELPHIA, MAY 30, 1956

In a period when there is the greatest known prosperity in the free world, the horrible and haunting tragedy of our time is that many once free people are now ground under the ruthless heel of a foreign communistic oppressor.

It matters not what the economic well-being of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain may be. Several thousand years ago Pericles stated the eternal truth when he said: "There can be no happiness without freedom." And no people who have ever known freedom can ever be happy until they regain it again.

It is the devout wish of every American irrespective of national origin, that the wonderfully brave and heroic Polish people may be made happy again by recovering their freedom.

Despite all protests to the contrary, and despite the substitution of a forced smile by Khrushchev and Bulganin for the snarl and hate of Stalin, communism still remains what it has been from the very beginning, a fanatial and godless movement determined to conquer and destroy the government of free people everywhere.

Stalin today stands accused even by the present Communist leaders as a vicious and cruel murderer. Five thousand of his own officers were executed under his orders without trial merely because he was suspicious of their intentions. If any proof were needed, and it is not needed, this admission by present Communist leaders proves beyond any peradventure that 10,000 Polish officers who were captured under a promise of amnesty were ruthlessly and cruelly murdered by the Communist regime under Stalin in World War II.

The present Communist leaders were the disciples and agents for Stalin. They cannot escape the infamy of one of the most horrible violations of the rights of prisoners in all military history. Certainly no confidence and trust can be placed in the word or promises of men who now defame and downgrade Stalin, who when they were his agents and subordinates did not raise their voice against some of the most infamous acts ever recorded.

If Khrushchev and Bulganin really want world peace, as they repeatedly say they do, the first gesture of sincerity would be to liberate the countries which the Communists have so ruthlessly deprived of their liberties. That would indeed open wide the doors of the whole world to peace.

The only peace the Russians want is peace on the basis of their retention of the conquered countries. Even a thief would be willing to settle with the law if he were permitted to keep untouched all the loot that he had acquired by reason of his violation of the law.

I am aware that one of the main purposes of the Polish Congress is to reestablish Poland as a free and independent nation through the legislative and executive branches of our Government. No purpose could be more commendable and no effort more worthy of the support of all people who believe in freedom and who hate tyranny and oppression.

No group in America understands better than those of Polish descent the horrible menace of Soviet imperialist communism. The ancestral lands of the Poles have been overrun; the government of the people destroyed, all civil and religious rights of the inhabitants violated, and the iron heel of the oppressor felt throughout the length and breadth of the land. All this without cause or provocation or any assertion of the right by the Communists except their greedy desire for power and domination.

What happened in Poland is the pattern of what will happen everywhere unless the continuous advance of communism is brought to a halt.

I salute you in your determination that Poland shall again be free, and I join with you in your prayers that in due time under divine guidance these prayers may be answered.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Dedication of Eisenhower Lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday a great milestone of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway was reached when the Eisenhower Lock was dedicated at Massena, N. Y., at a tremendously impressive ceremony. Several significant addresses were delivered on this memorable occasion.

One such address was offered by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the man who is generally regarded, and rightly so, as the father of the St. Lawrence seaway law. He was introduced by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick, who gave a well-deserved tribute to our colleague.

I send to the desk a brief excerpt from Assistant Secretary Roderick's introductory comments, together with the text of Senator WILEY's address. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and excerpt from the introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM COMMENTS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY RODERICK

America's part of the St. Lawrence seaway has already reached 10 percent of completion, and is actually running ahead of schedule. That it has advanced this far is in great measure due to the men I will have the honor of presenting to you now.

The first of these is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Senator WILEY, one of the most able and distinguished legislators in the Government, has served continuously in the Senate for almost 20 years. Among his many high posts have been those of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

More important on this occasion, however, is the fact that he was one of the two sponsors of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, which President Eisenhower signed into law in 1954. He has been called the father of the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator WILEY had his teeth in the St. Lawrence project for over 17 years. And like a bulldog he held on and on until the Senate passed the bill which makes all this possible.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LOCK: ENGINEERING FOR ATOMIC PEACE

(Address by Senator WILEY at dedication of Eisenhower Lock, Massena, N. Y.)

This is a great day in the history of Massena.

It is a great day in the lives of the tens of millions of people in the valley of the Great Lakes. It is an historic day in Canadian-American relations; and it is an inspiring day for peoples elsewhere throughout the world.

In the comments which have preceded mine, we have all heard with pleasure of the enormous significance of this lock, and of the other seaway installations to ourselves and to our good neighbor to the North.

Naturally, for those of us Americans who come from areas in the upper lake region, we are particularly looking forward to the completion of work—further up the lakes—on the deepening and improving of the connecting channels. We hope for all possible speed in approval of United States funds for this vital upper lake purpose.

In the meantime, however, we rejoice in the splendid progress, evidenced in every single step in this mighty waterway and power project—every step everywhere along the Lakes.

To myself, as one who has been proud to fight for this cause since the time I came to the Senate in 1939, this is indeed a day of real gratification.

And it is, of course, particularly appropriate that this lock be named in honor of our great President, an American and world statesman, who has contributed so much to the coming into being of this bi-national seaway, itself.

In the few moments that I have available, I would like to comment on the significance of the man from Abilene, the distinguished leader in the White House, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I hope that the cable dispatches to overseas will fully describe our meeting today, for this dedication in his name to the free world, may this news come as further inspiration of what free men can do under Eisenhower-like leadership, and what they will achieve, with cooperation and teamwork.

This is the type of project into which we of North America gladly put our strength and our resources.

This is the only type of engineering we Americans really enjoy—engineering works that advance the well-being of mankind. There is no American, no Canadian—there is no thinking person anywhere in the world—who likes to see the genius of engineering, the genius of construction, devoted to weapons of destruction.

And so may the cables which will be read in Moscow tonight remind the leaders of the Kremlin that it is Dwight D. Eisenhower's and our most fervent hope, it is his and our prayer, that in the months and years up ahead, the people of this world may increasingly devote their energy to the building of other great works of peace.

This lock—this project symbolizes greater good for man—greater prosperity, greater harnessing of the forces of nature, for man's betterment.

It is but a symbol of what we can do and will do on an ever larger scale, in many other fields, particularly if the cloud of nuclear conflict is forever banished from our horizon, as it should and must be.

As one who is privileged to serve as a senior minority member of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I hope that the worldwide significance of the event today will be fully noted by all peoples.

Let them note that we proudly apply the illustrious name "Eisenhower" to a mighty engineering lock of peace—not to a tank, not to a missile, not to a bomb.

Why? Because Dwight D. Eisenhower, although he has devoted a life of honored service in the uniform of his country, is a man truly of peace.

He knows that there is no goal in all this world dearer than the twin goal of peace and freedom.

Dwight Eisenhower knows and has said that "There is no alternative to peace." Modern nuclear war could be mutual mans' suicide—mass inhuman slaughter—mass destruction of edifices such as this.

That is why it is my earnest hope that we here today who dedicate Dwight D. Eisenhower lock will simultaneously rededicate ourselves to President Eisenhower's goals—world peace and freedom. But how to achieve those objectives? By continuation and strengthening of our policies of partnership with the free world, by mutual security with all likeminded nations.

These are policies to which our Canadian good neighbor is contributing with outstanding effectiveness.

Perhaps a somewhat brighter day in East-West relations may be ahead. Perhaps, for example, Molotov's resignation be taken as a further possibility for a bit more—I emphasize—just a bit more of easing of East-West tensions.

But I warn: the whole ominous Soviet record of the past, the record of treachery and doubledealing, the record of e. g. zagging Red policies and waves of purges—this dark record bids us to remain cautious and vigilant.

Meanwhile, however, thanks to the seaway, we are growing stronger with each passing day.

So, congratulations, my friends to all who have contributed to the arrival of this splendid hour. Congratulations to Administrator Lewis Castle, and to my able colleague, GEORGE DONDERO, and to all those, named and unnamed today, who dreamed great dreams, who worked and toiled and sacrificed that this proud event might come to pass.

Commencement Address Delivered by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Staunton Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, four of the most memorable years of my life were spent in the Shennandoah Valley of Virginia where I attended the Staunton Military Academy. The beauty of the surrounding countryside, the historic significance of the area, and most of all, the delightful sincerity and friendship of the people, have remained with me all the intervening years since my graduation. I feel as close to that part of Virginia as I do to my own home, and it is pleasing to me to have my two sons in attendance at that same school, where they, too, will add to their education and to their appreciation of the fineness of Virginia.

Yesterday, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered the graduation address at my old school, and it carries such a message of importance to the youth of our Nation that I wish to make it available to my colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADUATION ADDRESS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, STAUNTON MILITARY ACADEMY, STAUNTON, VA., JUNE 3, 1956

It is a coveted privilege to address the Cadet Corps of one of the best military academies in the Nation, founded by a distinguished Confederate veteran and located in the second oldest city in the Valley of Virginia. While Staunton was not established as a town until 14 years before the Revolutionary War, it has been the county seat of Augusta County since 1745. At the present time, Augusta is just the second largest county in Virginia but when it was first created it was larger than the present State of Virginia because it extended to the Mississippi River, including all of what is now the State of Kentucky and the State of West Virginia, and even a small part of what is now the State of Pennsylvania.

I once heard a distinguished Staunton lawyer, Col. Rudolph Bumgardner, deliver an address which recounted a trip that George Washington made on horseback from Mount Vernon to Staunton after he had finished his second term as President. He first examined his land titles which were recorded in the clerk's office of Staunton and then proceeded through what is now West Virginia where he owned large tracts and into Pennsylvania where he also had holdings in what is now called Washington County, named by the grateful citizens of that Pennsylvania area for George Washington because when a boundary dispute arose between Virginia and Pennsylvania over who owned the land Washington urged the Virginia Legislature to cede it to Pennsylvania saying that Virginia would still have plenty left. And I am sure in your course on American history you learned that the first Declaration of Independence was adopted at a mass meeting in Augusta County and you also will recall that Washington said during the Revolutionary War, when many of his followers had gotten faint hearted: "Leave me but a banner to place upon the mountains of Augusta, and I will rally around me the men who will lift our bleeding country from the dust and set her free."

Augusta County furnished many brave soldiers for Washington's army and many brave soldiers to Stonewall Jackson's army of northern Virginia. It was, therefore, highly fitting and proper that William H. Kable, who later served as a captain in the Confederate army, selected Staunton as the site for a military academy, the primary aim of which was the development of character, of personal integrity and unselfish service. And needless to say, during my 23 years of service in the Congress, first as the Representative of this valley district, and since 1946, as the junior Senator from Virginia, I always have taken pride in saying that the Valley of Virginia is as fertile as the Valley of the Nile but more centrally located and that Staunton is a wonderfully fine place to send either a boy to get an education combined with military training or a girl to get an education and instruction in the art of gracious living. Incidentally, my mother graduated from Staunton Female Institute, now named for the greatest of all southern cavalry leaders, "Jeb" Stuart.

The goal Captain Kable set for character training at Staunton Military Academy has been kept constantly in sight by those who succeeded him in the leadership of this school, as is evidenced by the fact that its catalog says the aim of the academy is to send its students out into the larger world of adult life "with trained minds and bodies, adequate cultural resources, high personal ideals, and a sense of responsibility to society."

In looking over this catalog recently I was pleased to notice the personal word to parents, in effect warning them not to send boys here if they are looking for no more than military discipline which would harden bodies and mental discipline which would prepare minds for meeting college entrance requirements.

Those goals also could be acheived in a Communist school and, as a matter of fact, we have reason to believe that the educational system of the Soviet Union compares most favorably with the general run of schools in the United States in the fields of physical and scientific training.

Former Senator William Benton, who is publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, recently made a startling report on his personal observations of education in Russia. He said education has become a main theater of the cold war and that Russia's classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs and guided missiles.

Benton said all children in Russia are required to attend school between the ages of 7 and 17 and that the standards of academic accomplishment set for them are higher than the best American high schools and would be comparable to the level of a junior college in the United States.

The Russian boys and girls go to school 6 days a week and 10 months a year. In addition to studying the three R's and algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, they are required to take 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 of biology, 1 of astronomy, 1 of psychology, and 6 years of a foreign language, preferably English.

After completing this general schooling graduates may go to 1 of 2,000 vocational colleges which train specialists for industry and technicians in the fields of medicine, education, and the arts or they may go to 1 of 800 institutions of higher learning which train engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, advanced scientists, and teachers.

But the objective of this system of education is not to train individuals for a life of happiness or to fulfill their potential in a free society. It is to discipline them for maximum service to the state. Teachers are given no academic freedom, nor are they allowed to criticize the political regime of the country or any official dogma. Students not only are required to follow prescribed courses in school but, once they have picked a particular profession and started training, they cannot change their minds about entering it and after graduation they must work 3 years at any assigned job. That last requirement, incidentally, might well be brought to the attention of any young man in America who considers it a hardship to be called for a limited period of service to prepare himself to help defend his country against any future attack.

Now, if our goals were the same as those of the Russians and the graduates of Staunton Military Academy were called upon to compete directly with the graduates of their

schools, I believe the boys trained here would acquit themselves with honor. I know that this academy was the first school in the South to be rated by the War Department as an honor school on the basis of the military aptitude, training, and efficiency of its ROTC unit. I know also that in one of the recent yearly examinations given in all the honor schools in the United States to select 10 boys to enter the Naval Academy at Annapolis, with each school permitted to name 3 candidates, all 3 of the Staunton nominees won appointments—a record equaled by no other school. And I know, also, the school's record for winning football championships.

I am thankful, however, that the goal of Staunton Military Academy is not the same as that of the Russian schools and that parents considering sending their boys here are specifically told in advance: "We cannot be satisfied with the fostering of only mental and physical accomplishments. Our higher trust is to instill in the boy a sense of responsibility, encourage in him a respect for the soundest virtues and, through a discipline which is firm, kind, and just, to teach him the art of self-discipline." Self-discipline, as Henderson said of Stonewall Jackson, is the root of all manliness.

It is primarily to commend that attitude toward education that I have come here today.

We live in an age in which man's ingenuity in the physical sciences has enabled him to produce weapons capable of wiping out civilization and there are some who believe that destructive result cannot be avoided. They have seen a generation which triumphed over one form of totalitarianism at the cost of unleasing the atom bomb now confronted by a more dangerous form of totalitarianism which has been held in check only by the threat of the hydrogen bomb. But, since the totalitarians also have that weapon now, and do not have our scruples to deter its use, there is ample ground for pessimism about the ultimate result.

I am not personally willing to concede, however, that men are now powerless to control their own inventions or that it already is too late to choose any road other than the one which leads to destruction of civilization. Tht start which this Nation had in development of weapons of total destruction and the means of delivering them anywhere in the world has bought us time. In the words of Sir Winston Churchill, they were sanctions which have preserved an uneasy peace. All the free nations of the world fervently hope for a program of international disarmament and a lessening of the heavy burden of defense spending, and even the nations behind the Iron Curtain pay lip service to such proposals. Until they evidence their good intentions with respect to peaceful coexistence by deeds, such, for instance, as the release of East Germany and withdrawal from Korea, we cannot afford to let down our guard. But while maintaining a defensive power well calculated to stay the hand of a possible aggressor every effort must be made to bring into line the spiritual forces on which ultimate victory will depend.

Commenting on why the United States entered the First World War one of our distinguished Federal jurists, Judge Learned Hand, said we were not so much afraid of a physical German invasion, if they won, as we were that the example of totalitarian success would convert mankind, including Americans, to a discipline after the German pattern. "Not the violence of enemies would undo us," he said, "but our own spiritual weakness, the shallowness of our convictions."

That statement, I believe, reflects the thinking of that great native of Staunton, Woodrow Wilson, who in 1917 sincerely sought an honorable alternative to war and was unable to find it; and when the war was over tried unsuccessfully to show us the road to a lasting peace based on spiritual strength.

Another Federal judge, Harold R. Medina, who studied under Wilson at Princeton, recalled recently some of the things he learned there which had made the most lasting impression on him.

He said Woodrow Wilson had taught three things:

"(1) That American democracy could not function properly without a constant renewal of its leadership from the rank and file, the men and women who today are boys and girls trying to get some sort of an education.

"(2) Colleges do not exist for the purpose of sharpening our wits for our own use, but rather to quicken our social understanding, instruct our consciences, and develop in us what he called a 'taste of unselfishness and self-sacrifice.'

"(3) Ideals and moral principles are 'of the very spirit of all action,' and we are put in this world not to twiddle our thumbs but to act."

Again in World War II our greatest danger was not a German invasion but worldwide acceptance of the principles for which Hitler and Mussolini stood. Under that system, of course, there could be no such constitutional democracy as we now have, based on recognition of individual worth.

And today, as I indicated when I told of Senator Benton's observation of Russian education, our greatest danger is not that our cities will be wiped out by hydrogen bombs but that we shall be pressed by economic and psychological weapons to the point where a minimum security guaranteed by government seems preferable to the risks and gains of private initiative—where we yield our civic and social responsibilities to a centralized bureaucratic authority and where the despotic figure of a paternalistic state blocks our vision of the dignity of man.

One of our chief bulwarks against that threat must be schools and colleges which, like Staunton Military Academy, pledge themselves "to promote the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service." And I know of no city and no institution better equipped by heritage and tradition to carry on that program than Staunton and its military academy.

In 1864, just 4 years after this school was founded, the streets of Staunton echoed with the unusual sound of a nursery song played by a military band and sung by hardened soldiers.

In that dark hour for the Confederate cause the VMI cadets had been summoned from nearly Lexington to help defend Staunton. Although they were of college grade, records show that those boys were little older than the present students of SMA. The average age was 18, and 4 of them were just past 15. Their youthful appearance amused the older soldiers quartered in Staunton, and when one veteran detachment's band started playing Rock-a-Bye Baby the men took up the air, singing and rocking their guns as it putting a baby to sleep.

Two days later, however, those boys made their famed charge at New Market, and as they marched to the front, past the weary veterans they were relieving, there was no derision but rather an admiring shout of "Look at the seed corn battalion, look, look."

At New Market and elsewhere during that sad, fratricidal war much of the seed corn of southern youth was lost, and after nearly a century we have barely recovered from that sacrifice of young manhood. As a compensating factor, however, we have profited by examples of irrefragable courage and self-sacrifice that will never die.

The spirit which led the boys of VMI to New Market as volunteers in defense of their native State not only has been perpetuated at VMI, but it has been stimulated wherever their story was known. Robert E. Lee, at Washington and Lee University, and William H. Kable, at Staunton Military Academy, set the pattern for training the kind of leadership a Republic demands. Woodrow Wilson carried that concept from Staunton to Princeton, and in his writings and speeches urged it upon our Nation and the free world.

I congratulate you, who are graduating today, on the privilege of sharing a great tradition, and I charge you to apply the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service to every duty that may be required of you, remembering:

So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
When duty whispers low, thou must,
The youth replies, I can.

The Importance of Clearance Laws and Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 24, and 25 at Omaha, Nebr., the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners held its annual convention. The States comprising this association, in addition to my own State, are Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Arkansas.

One of the major speeches delivered at this convention was that of Harry See, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in Washington. Because of the alarming increase in accidents in the railroad industry, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. See, which deal with the subject of railroad safety:

THE IMPORTANCE OF CLEARANCE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

(Address of Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Washington, D. C., before the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Hotel Paxton, Omaha, Nebr., May 24, 1956)

I am especially grateful for the privilege of appearing before the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners. While this is my first opportunity to visit and exchange ideas with your group, I have had the pleasure of attending other conferences of railroad and utilities commissioners, the most recent one being the convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners held at Asheville, N. C., last October.

At that time I had the opportunity to discuss with several State commissioners matters relating to railroad safety, and this proved to be of mutual benefit. Ever since the Asheville meeting, I have looked eagerly toward participating in other meetings of that type.

I want to thank President Rasmussen for asking me to talk about clearance laws and related safety matters. This is a subject that is close to me, and I feel conversant with it. I have devoted a major portion of my brotherhood life to the improvement of safety conditions on railroads, and it is with growing pleasure that I see continued improvement along this line.

For 25 years I served as the State representative of the brotherhood in the State

of California. When I first undertook the job, California had very little in the way of railroad safety regulations other than a full crew law and some minor legislation. The legislature had delegated to the California Railroad Commission almost as much authority as the legislature itself had over railroads and other public utilities. The commission did have an old clearance order, which had not been kept up to date. That order was amended in January 1926 and has been improved several times since then.

I believe California was the first State to require more than 13 feet from center line to center line of parallel tracks, and the first order to base overhead and side clearances on the size of equipment to be operated alongside of or under those clearances. And I am sure it was the first order to require the placarding or the stenciling of extralarge cars and loads. These cars have to be moved in specified places in the train, and notices given to train crews and yard employees of those movements. Since that time several other States have followed California's example.

After coming to Washington 10 years ago to take over the post as national legislative representative for the Brotherhood, I continued to work in my spare moments for the adoption of similar orders in other States that had no regulations or inadequate regulations. During this period I have participated in the writing or revision of clearance laws in 20 States and the District of Columbia, and assisted in the passage of clearance laws in Massachusetts and Tennessee. At the present time there are pending before five other State commissions the Brotherhood's petition for standard clearance orders.

Many of you, therefore, are more than slightly acquainted with our work, and the position of the Brotherhood on this important subject of railroad safety, and specifically railroad clearances.

Some of you may have cause to wonder why the Brotherhood has been conducting such a stepped-up campaign in those sections of the country where no clearance regulations exist. It is not by chance that the great number of clearance orders now in existence have been issued or revised within the past 5 years.

As a forward-looking labor organization, we are interested in obtaining for our membership as much in the way of protection from occupational hazards as we are in securing wage increases. The concentrated effort to establish clearance regulations has stemmed from changing conditions on American railroads.

Railroad yards were not built to accommodate the increase in the size of freight equipment, which we witness daily. At the time of their construction, the yards were probably large enough, and the tracks were so spaced as to take care of the size of equipment then in use. That equipment was 10 feet or less in width, and the highest cars were about 12 feet high.

The space that was allowed between two tracks or between the track and a structure might have been sufficient with the old type of equipment, but with the new and larger equipment, it is entirely inadequate.

I recall several years ago reading an article about close clearances, and it was aptly entitled "Diet or Die." It was a satire on fat brakemen, and how squeezed they would be if they tried to ride cars through a narrow section of a railroad yard that had insufficient clearances. I might add that the point of the article was brought home through the humorous medium and had its effect on future negotiations with several carriers.

Following the close of World War II, when the attention of industry was again devoted to peacetime production, the railroad industry began to build longer, wider, and higher cars. Shortly after I went to Washington, I began to keep a running check on the increase in the size of freight equipment, and I am sure you will be as surprised with the startling number as I am.

We make it a point to check the Railway Equipment Register, which is published four times annually, for the increase in bigger equipment on every common and private carrier in the country. Our research department has compiled statistics, which we mail to our legislative representatives in the various States for their information and use.

In 1950, there were 557,379 cars that were 10 feet 6 inches wide or wider on the American railroads. By 1956 that number had increased to 875,566, or an increase of 318,187 in approximately 5 years. Similarly with cars that are 15 feet 1 inch high or higher to the top of the running board, the number increased from 17,030 in 1950 to 23,205 in 1956, an addition of 6,175.

The trend during all of this time has been only in one direction, and that is upward. At no time did I detect a decrease in the number of big cars, and so I feel it is safe to say that freight equipment in the railroad industry is changing by becoming bigger, wider, higher, and longer.

I recently read an article in Railway Age about the new cars being built in Canada to transport automobiles. While I was in Moncton, New Brunswick, last fall, I checked on this equipment, and find that experiments have been successful, and no doubt the scheme will be picked up by the American railroads. The Canadian cars are now in production and will be available for summer traffic.

The measurements of these cars strike an all-time high. They will be 78 feet long, 16½ feet high or possibly a little higher, and about 11 feet in extreme width. When you recall the average length, height, and width of a freight car a few years ago, it is easy to understand the greater danger presented by this new equipment, when the physical conditions of railroad yards have not changed materially to accommodate larger cars.

If shippers by rail require larger cars, then we feel it is the duty of the railroad industry to provide the cars to meet the demands of customers. But we also feel that it is the brotherhood's duty to insist that the men we represent in train and yard service be furnished with a reasonably safe place to work alongside of and on top of these cars.

It is this long-range and far-sighted building program on the part of the railroad industry that has made it necessary for the railroad labor organizations to also look ahead with regard to the safety of the men who work with and ride these cars. I am happy to state that 30 States now have some kind of standard clearance regulations or laws. In at least 21 of these States, the requirement for the distance between the center lines of parallel tracks is 14 feet. The point-to-point trackage in these States totals more than 81,000 miles. In some States the distance is only 13 feet 6 inches, but generally speaking these are older orders that are now being amended. The Ohio Commission, for instance, amended its order last year to provide for 14 feet between the center lines of parallel tracks.

Most clearance regulations obtained recently provide for 14 feet clearance between the center lines of parallel tracks, the overhead clearance of 22 feet, in some States 22 feet 6 inches, and a side clearance of 8 feet 6 inches. In several of the orders, specifications are set forth for clearances of platforms at different heights above the top of the rail. Clearance between team, house, or industrial tracks is usually set at 13 feet, and between ladder tracks 17 feet, while parallel ladder tracks take 20 feet.

Last month I traveled to Montana to meet with representatives of the carriers and the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission. After conferences with carrier representatives and the commission, and a short hearing before the commission, it agreed to issue a clearance order, which I believe will contain most of the provisions I just cited.

I was happy to make the trip to Montana and to be given such a cordial reception by the commission. Members of the commission exhibited an understanding of our problem and their attitude was a sympathetic one. I have confidence in their judgment to issue an order that will be satisfactory to the railroads, and at the same time afford our members the safeguards they need to work with the large-sized equipment.

I was anxious to work on the Montana order, because it is the only outstanding State in the West that does not now have a standard clearance order. With the issuance of that order, the States in the Pacific coast and Rocky Mountain area will present a solid bloc of acceptable clearance regulations, that is a credit to management, the State regulatory bodies, and a real source of comfort to the employees.

And I want to compliment the Midwest on the progress it is making. Last year the commission of this fine State issued its first standard clearance order, and it is a good one. I hope this will kindle a similar interest in some of the other midwestern States and pave the way for other commissions to take action, just as the California order did among the Western States.

In the instance just mentioned in Nebraska, the Brotherhood received splendid cooperation from the Nebraska railroads and the Nebraska commission. This cooperation has generally been present throughout the West and Midwest, and is becoming more apparent in the Northeast. However, some of the railroads in the central and the southern States still do not seem to keep up with the parade, and from them we receive very little cooperation.

There are only 19 States that do not have some kind of clearance regulations. In some cases the Public Utilities Acts of these States do not empower the State commissions with the authority to pass upon such matters. I am hopeful, however, that in view of the general improvements in safety regulations all over the country, that these States will gradually get in line and make changes in their utilities acts, or take action if they are already clothed with that authority.

Those of us who are removed from the actual blood and toil of the work-a-day railroad world are inclined to lose sight of the fact that such protective measures as clearance orders are not merely details on the States' statute books, but necessary safeguards to prevent avoidable accidents. As I peruse the Accident Bulletin issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission each year, I am encouraged to note an improvement in the accident rate attributable to close clearances, although the figure is still depressing and means more work for those of us interested in saving lives.

I wish I could make the same statement for the accident rate generally, but unfortunately I cannot. While I have thus far discussed clearance regulations, close clearances constitute only one hazard in the railroad industry. The compilation of accident statistics for the full year of 1955, indicates an alarming increase that year over the previous year. In 1954 in employee classifications there were 208 persons killed, while the figure in 1955 jumped to 256. This represents an increase of 23.08 percent, too stout a figure to be complacent about. The number of injuries in 1955 also increased, but not quite so drastically. In 1954 there were 16,518 persons injured, and this figure rose to 18,299 in 1955, or an increase of 10.78 percent, in itself no small increase.

I have checked the preliminary reports for the first 3 months of this year, and I am unhappy to report that the same trend con-

tinues—an increase in deaths and injuries in employee classifications. A report issued last week by the Interstate Commerce Commission indicates that already this year there have been 63 railroad employees killed on duty and 4,611 injured, which is a substantial increase over the same period in 1955.

These figures may be surprising to some of you, and I can understand why. So many persons have the mistaken impression that as long as there is an Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington, all is well in the safety life of the railroad man. But we know from experience there is little comfort in that thought.

As you gentlemen know, the Interstate Commerce Commission does have jurisdiction or authority over certain matters, but I am one of those people who believe somewhat in States' rights, and I think it would be a mistake to give the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over all safety matters on a railroad. Take clearance orders as an example. There always comes time for an exception to an established rule to satisfy a particular local condition. And if the authority to make that slight change rested solely with a national agency, it would be necessary for the railroad or the industry to go to Washington to ask for an exception.

It is obvious this would work a hardship on many persons. But by leaving that authority with a State agency it is much less difficult to go to a State capital or make a telephone call asking for an exception, than it is to have to go to Washington. In addition, matters can be handled more promptly on a local basis.

As you know, the Interstate Commerce Commission's jurisdiction in safety regulations on interstate railroads is confined to four categories: the enforcement of the Hours of Service Act; the Safety Appliance Act; the Locomotive Inspection Act, and jurisdiction over signaling systems and devices. It is true the Interstate Commerce Commission also has within its jurisdiction the enforcement of the Accidents Reports Act, but even after exhaustive investigations, unless the matter falls within one of the above four categories, the Commission is limited to a recommendation.

For instance, a bridge or piece of track on a railroad might be in a very unsafe condition. Yet the Interstate Commerce Commission could not compel the carrier to reconstruct or repair the bridge or piece of track. It could only recommend that the carrier do so. On the other hand, the State either through its legislature or one of these enforcement agencies, does have the power to effect that correction.

All other safety regulations fall within the purview of the State commissions, where I feel they properly belong. As I previously mentioned, I have long been a "States Righter" when it comes to matters of safety on railroads, and I am pleased to see so many of the State regulatory agencies insisting on retaining their jurisdictional powers.

At the present time Congress is considering the proposals set forth in the recommendations of the President's Transport Policy Committee Report; hearings have just concluded in Washington. It has been the position of the Brotherhood, as well as all other railroad labor organization, that the sovereignty of the States in such matters must be recognized and maintained. We have been vigilant in watching this legislation to detect the slightest effort to invade the powers of the State in matters of this kind, and while it has not yet happened, I will be quick to oppose it if it does.

Most States have delegated the necessary authority to a State regulatory body to establish; promulgate and enforce regulations pertaining to safety on railroads. However, a few States have not taken advantage of this privilege. I hope these remaining States will realize the duty that accompanies the privilege and that their legislatures will give the proper State agency the jurisdiction it should have. The State fo Maine was the most recent to strengthen its Public Utilities Act, and the commission of that State lost no time in issuing a standard clearance order, once it had been empowered to act.

As the principal executives of your various State commissions, it is needless for me to mention the dependence the employees have on the interest taken in railroad safety matters. But it may serve as an item of information to some of you to realize there is a vast field in our industry over which there is no effective regulation.

Congress has not delegated authority in any law, nor has a like authority been assumed by very many State commissions in such matters as the handling of extra largesize freight equipment, oversized loads on open top cars, or the manner in which cars are loaded with lumber and pulpwood, poles, sheet metal, and scrap iron—all potential accident hazards. Through the process of education we hope to acquaint regulatory bodies such as yours with the new and everpresent dangers in railroading of today.

I spoke previously about causes of accidents in addition to those resulting from close clearances. If I may return to that point for a few moments, I would like to discuss a causative factor in the accident rate that is ignored in most calculations. For a long time I have felt there is a direct relationship between the accident rate and the maintenance of railroad equipment, rights-of-way, and structures. While my attention to this subject has been brief, I have nevertheless come up with some comparisons which are by no means coincidental.

From 1951 until 1955 we witnessed a reduction in the number of accidents to operating railroad employees. As I pointed out before, the year 1955 reversed the trend and the early months of this year indicate a continuation of the upward trend. This fact is also borne out by the latest reports from the Interstate Commerce Commission, which indicate a 14-percent increase in total accidents. The statistics used earlier in my address, as I mentioned at that time, covered accidents to all employees. The figure I now refer to includes just the operating employees, the group with which I am most familiar.

I have examined the statistics for the past several years, beginning in 1949 with the view in mind for ascertaining the casual connection, if any, between the number of accidents and the man-hours applied to maintenance of way, structures, and equipment over this period.

I have included at the end of my prepared address three tables from which it is more easy for me to demonstrate that the number of operating employees killed and injured follows the level of expenditures on maintenance of way and structures and equipment.

From 1949 to 1954, man-hours applied to the maintenance of way and structures and equipment were held at a high level. As a result of these consistently high expenditures, the year 1952 inaugurated a decline in the number of operating employees killed and injured, and this decline continued in 1953 and 1954. We may conclude, I believe, that the relatively high man-hour expenditures for maintenance from 1949 through 1953 was a direct causative factor in the reduction of the number of killed and injured operating employees in 1952, 1953, and 1954.

In 1954, however, the picture changed and the story was a different one—in fact, a discouraging development. In that year the man-hours applied to maintenance turned sharply downward, and the effect of this was obvious in 1955 when there was a 14 percent increase in persons killed and injured, and a shocking 44 percent increase in the number of operating employees killed on class 1 carriers. Anyone interested in the hazards of employment could not fail to inquire into these factors, when the increases in the numbers of killed and injured in 1955 mounted so sharply.

I feel the record is unmistakable that a high level of maintenance means safer working conditions and a reduction in the number of injuries and contrariwise, a reduction in maintenance means more hazards in employment and an increase in such accidents.

The relationship between man-hours of maintenance and the number of railroad employees killed and injured contains a lesson to which the railroad industry must give serious consideration.

I should explain that these data are for class 1 carriers, and that I have not taken money expenditures; instead I have used man-hours applied to maintenance of way and structures and equipment as reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission (table III). I have used man-hours to eliminate the disturbing factor brought about by fluctuating wage costs. Also, to insure accuracy in my compilation, I used the number of accidents per 1,000 operating employees instead of the total number of killed and injured, because I wanted to eliminate the variations in the volume of employment (table II).

I have confined myself to the rates on operating employees because the employees who take the risks and suffer the accidents are the employees who are most concerned with proper maintenance. I have also included a table (table I), which lists the average number of trainmen in service, total number of killed and injured and index numbers of the killed and injured for class 1 railways 1948–55.

I realize the importance of maintenance on railroads, and for that reason I dislike to read that a carrier is cutting down on maintenance as a means of keeping pledges to its stockholders, I know that reduced expenditures for maintenance will show up in the gruesome statistics of life and death of railroad operating employees. As a representative of the largest operating railroad union, I voice to you my concern that there is not some definite policy undertaken by the carriers to insure a high level of maintenance every year, even at the cost of dividends in a particular year.

What a stockholder may gain in 1 year by the deferment of maintenance, he will lose in a later year, and perhaps lose more than if the maintenance had been kept at a satisfactory level; because depreciation on railroads, like depreciation for other property, becomes greater the longer it is postponed. Maintenance can be deferred, but not avoided. It certainly cannot be systematically and irresponsibly deferred, if railroads are to remain in active competition with other modes of transportation.

It is my contention that adequate maintenance is good business. In addition to keeping our industry fit for today's keen competion, it also lessens the financial burden for the carriers by lower actual charges for maintenance, and improved safety conditions avoid the needless high cost of accidents.

And I do not want to pass over lightly this cost of accidents. If anyone doubts the hole in the railroad treasury the cost of accidents carves, let me cite just briefly the amounts the carriers have been compelled to pay during the years 1952 through 1954 as a result of personal injuries.

In 1952 they expended $101,550,342 for death and injury cases; in 1953 this cost amounted to $100,129,580, and 1954 this figure decreased to just under $1 million. The total for the 3-year period, however, was over $300 million. These figures include only personal injuries to persons in maintenance of

way and structures, maintenance of equipment, and transportation. There is not included injuries in other classes of employment.

This constant and gigantic drain in railroad resources should be motivation enough, without regard to the humane factor which is of primary interest to us and also of interest to the carriers, to make the carriers want to spend more on maintenance, and thereby reduce the number of avoidable accidents.

We hope those commissions that are represented here today which do not have adequate safety regulations will proceed to give this matter serious consideration, and perhaps join the large majority of other States that already have adequate regulations. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen will be glad to cooperate with any of the State agencies in an effort to bring about the lessening of hazards in an extremely hazardous industry.

I will not at this time impose upon your patience any longer, although the subject of safety is one in which I have a consuming interest, and I could speak on it at greater length. I feel that I have touched upon the highlights in the general field, and at the conclusion, I will be very happy to answer any specific questions, that any of you might have either on certain portions of my address or on any related matters.

I have enjoyed this opportunity to appear before you, and I want to once again thank President Rasmussen, the other officers of the association for inviting me to attend.

I hope that I will have the pleasure and privilege of another invitation to future conventions. Thank you.

TABLE I.—*Average number of trainmen in service, total number of trainmen killed and injured, and index numbers, class I railways, 1948–55*

Year	Average number of trainmen in service	Total number of trainmen killed	Index numbers	Total number of trainmen injured	Index numbers
1948	282, 179	278	100	13, 152	100
1949	251, 250	195	70	9, 128	69
1950	252, 056	165	59	9, 633	73
1951	263, 921	202	72	10, 563	80
1952	255, 009	170	66	9, 230	70
1953	251, 487	145	52	8, 341	63
1954	230, 729	84	30	7, 071	54
1955	235, 541	123	44	8, 170	63

TABLE II.—*Trainmen killed and injured per 1,000 employees and index numbers, class I railroads, 1948-55*

Year	Number of trainmen killed per 1,000	Index numbers	Number of trainmen injured per 1,000	Index numbers
1948	0.99	100	46.41	100
1949	.78	78.7	36.33	78.0
1950	.65	65.6	38.22	82.3
1951	.77	77.0	40.02	84.0
1952	.67	67.7	36.19	78.0
1953	.58	56.5	33.17	71.4
1954	.36	36.3	30.65	66.0
1955	.52	52.5	34.69	74.7

TABLE III.—*Man-hours of maintenance-of-way and structures and equipment employees, class I railways, 1948–55*

Year	Man-hours (thousands)	Index numbers
1948	1, 613, 102	100
1949	1, 325, 733	82
1950	1, 248, 740	77
1951	1, 314, 543	82
1952	1, 241, 664	76
1953	1, 210, 866	75
1954	1, 005, 177	62
1955	1, 010, 811	62

Why Our Forests Are Important to Us—Essay by Dorothy Haus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a prize-winning essay entitled "Why Our Forests Are Important to Us," written by Dorothy Haus, a student at Brattleboro, Vt.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY OUR FORESTS ARE IMPORTANT TO US

The first object Tom saw when he returned home from school one bright October afternoon was a large envelope on the hall table. When he examined the envelope closely, he noted with satisfaction that it was addressed to him, but it bore a foreign postmark. When he saw the return address, he discovered it was from his pen-pal, Eric, in Denmark. Tom had postponed writing to him for a month, and now Eric wrote to him first.

Eric wrote that he had had a very pleasant summer and described his bicycle trip along the picturesque countryside. He told of the fiords, colorful flower gardens, and a mountain 500 feet high, which he had climbed. He even enclosed a picture of himself, a smiling fair-haired lad of 14. The boy in Denmark seemed much less like a stranger now, and Tom was eager to write an equally friendly letter telling of his country.

One of the highlights of Tom's vacation had been a trip with his 4-H Club to Plymouth with a stopover at Coolidge State Forest, which the campers enjoyed immensely. It provided a picnic table and lean-to, and beautiful scenery. As Tom remembered the magnificent woodland view and the spicy fragrance of pine, he wrote eagerly about the charms of Vermont, best of all homelands.

"In all seasons Vermont is the most beautiful of all, as approximately 63 percent of it is forest land," he wrote.

Looking out the window, he admired the colorful foliage on the wooded bank and the rose and gold colors on Mount Wantastiquet against a clear blue sky.

Then he wrote, "Our Vermont woodlands are valuable for their timber, for cover on watersheds, for sanctuary for wildlife, for sport and recreation, and for sweet maple products."

Stopping to think of the many uses of wood even in his small room, Tom was amazed at the number of wood products he found. His desk, his bed, its rayon counterpane, the veneer on his bureau, and his plywood bookshelf are all gifts of the forest. Even his brush, clock, and pocket comb, which are plastic, are made from wood. It is quite an increase from 100 years ago, when people only had two main uses for wood, and they were timber and fuel for houses. Tom realized then why $2,500,000 is paid to Vermont tree growers each year. He could scarcely believe it when he had read it on a State bulletin with items about Vermont's 535 sawmills, 3 pulp and paper mills, and 182 other wood-using plants.

As Tom wrote to Eric about the fun of camping in Coolidge State Forest he had more appreciation of the Green Mountain National Forest Service. Now he knew how important the Forest Service must be with the Nation's rapid increase in population and the greater demand for wood products. "All 153 national forests are operated on the multiple-use principle as much as possible," he had read. The Federal authorities cooperate closely with Vermont foresters in conservation measures, especially of water. Forests protect the source of rivers and prevent floods. The roots of the trees hold back the soil which might be washed away and clog river beds and cause streams to overflow. A carpet of leaves underneath the trees, like a thick piece of blotting paper, soaks up heavy rains and melting snow. The Vermont idea of small upstream units with less than 250,000 acres of watershed is the aim.

Just how necessary land management is in providing a sanctuary for wildlife, Tom realized as he described to Eric the thrill of watching deer running across the hills, grey squirrels jumping from branch to branch, and chipmunks picking up crumbs. Benefits to wildlife are considered in cutting operations, most of which improve cover for game. Tom closed his letter with a promise to send a gallon of maple sirup so Eric could sample the product of the Vermont "sugar feast." As he reread his letter he had a better idea of how much his own Vermont forest meant to him.

DOROTHY HAUS.

BRATTLEBORO, VT.

Report to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report to the people of Wisconsin by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] concerning East-West trade.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR McCARTHY'S REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN

Our committee (the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations) has just completed an investigation of current, United States-authorized strategic trade with the Communist nations. Since most newspapers have printed few, if any, of the hair-raising details of the committee's findings, I thought I should bring the principal facts to your attention.

The long and short of the matter is that you, the American taxpayer, are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine. This conclusion is inescapable since you are footing the bill for billions of dollars of American aid to so-called friendly nations, that, in turn, are supplying highly strategic war materials to the Soviet war economy.

The committee's investigation of this matter began in 1954 under my chairmanship and has continued up to the present in the face of strenuous efforts by the executive branch to keep the story from Congress and the American people. The committee discovered that in August 1954 our Government made secret concessions to our allies as regards what they could ship to the Communist bloc without losing American aid. As a result of these concessions, over 200 highly strategic items—such as machine tools, metals, and electronics, transportation and electrical equipment—were removed from the anti-Communist embargo.

I list below a few examples of the materials we agreed to let countries receiving United

States aid ship to Soviet Russia, together with an indication of their strategic value.

Electric power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts, turbines up to 85,000 horsepower, and motors up to 12,500 horsepower: This electrical equipment is used in making fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

Horizontal boring mills: These machine tools, which cost between $200,000 and $500,000 each, are used in making tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, and atomic reactors such as those used on the submarine *Nautilus*.

Vertical-boring mills: Essential in making jet engines.

Dynamic balancing machines: Used in making jet engines and guided missiles.

External cylindrical grinding machines: Used in making guided missiles and radar equipment.

Surface griding machines: Used in making jet engine parts, guided missiles, radar equipment, and diesel engines.

High precision boring mills: Used in making jet engine and guided missile parts.

Copper wire: Next to fissionable materials, copper is the single most strategic metal. Thousands of miles of copper wire, for example, go into the engine of every bomber.

Aluminum: Indispensable in making aircraft.

Nickel alloys up to 30 percent: Used in making aircraft parts and tanks.

Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent: Used in making jet aircraft parts.

Magnesium: Used in aircraft construction and in foot-soldier equipment.

In return for these highly strategic war materials, the Communists are shipping to the free world butter, cotton, and woodpulp.

The American people were not informed of these secret concessions to our allies; indeed, deliberate and (until our committee got on the track) successful attempts were made to conceal them. Here is how the strategic trade agreements were reported to the Nation by Harold Stassen, who was the central figure in the negotiations. The agreements, Stassen announced in the summer of 1954, "will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items."

Not content with misleading statements of a general nature, Mr. Stassen resorted to specific falsification when, as Battle Act Administrator, he made his annual report to Congress in November 1954. The following is a paragraph from Mr. Stassen's report: "Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the * * * embargo list."

Mr. Stassen's statement, with respect to aluminum, copper wire, magnesium, and alloys of nickel and molybdenum was, simply, untrue.

The seriousness of our concessions can be appreciated by taking a closer look at just one of the items being shipped to the Communists—copper. Mr. Stassen said that copper was still embargoed. He was right about unprocessed copper, but he failed to mention that the finished product, in the form of highly strategic copper wire, was taken off the embargo. The committee then learned the following additional facts: (a) Since August 1954, when the embargo was relaxed, over 200 million pounds of copper wire have been shipped to the Soviet bloc by countries receiving United States aid; (b) the principal shipper is Britain; (c) the United States is providing a direct subsidy to British copper mines in Rhodesia; moreover (d) copper is on the United States critical stockpile list, and because it is in short supply in this country, we found it necessary during 1954 and 1955 to divert 150 million pounds of copper from our strategic stockpile for industrial use. In other words, although copper is badly needed in this country for our own war potential, we are giving the British money to mine copper, which they then turn around and sell to the Communists.

Congress provided in the Battle Act of 1951 that the President must immediately terminate United States aid to nations that ship materials of "primary strategic significance" to the Communists—or that he must immediately explain to Congress why he is not doing so. In this case, aid was not cut off, nor were the facts of the 1954 embargo revision transmitted to Congress. The way Mr. Stassen, as Battle Act Administrator, got around the Battle Act was to determine that certain obviously strategic items were not of "primary strategic importance"—despite the fact they had been so regarded in the past. The executive branch thus brazenly defied the clear intent of Congress.

Later on in this session, Congress will be asked to appropriate some $5 billion for aid to nations that are now shipping the Communists strategic war materials. I intend to oppose that appropriation unless it is accompanied by an airtight guaranty that American money will not be used in the future to build the Communist war machine.

I should add that the executive branch is now studying British demands to relax the embargo against Red China. These demands must be resisted. I trust you agree with me that trading with any of our enemies, in any goods whatsoever, is contrary to American interests.

Award of Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree to Hon. Mike Mansfield, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today Montana State University will award an honorary doctor of laws degree to my distinguished colleague from Montana, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. Last night at the university, where he studied and taught history and poliitcal science before coming to Congress, Senator MANSFIELD delivered the baccalaureate address to the graduating class.

I know that all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, will be as pleased as I am to learn of the well-deserved honor to Senator MANSFIELD from his alma mater. I am pleased, too, that a fine editorial on Senator MANSFIELD and his contributions on the State, national, and international level has appeared in one of the popular newspapers in our State, the Hungry Horse News, published by Mel Ruder in Columbia Falls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous concent to have this editorial inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOR FOR MANSFIELD

We are delighted to see where Montana State University is awarding Senator MIKE MANSFIELD an honorary doctor of laws degree, June 4.

At the same time the university is conferring an honorary doctorate on Dr. Philip R. White, plant physiologist at Bar Harbor, Maine, and also a MSU graduate, who has become a leader in the field of plant tissue and organ culture.

The Mansfield honor comes at an opportune time.

These are the days just before the primary that we have the magnifying glass of public opinion directed at the men and women who would be our leaders in Government. Some of these candidates are mediocre, a few obviously unfit, and now and then one is outstanding.

It is hard to think in terms of MIKE MANSFIELD being a freshman Senator serving his first term, even though he's had the benefit of five terms in the House.

MANSFIELD is proving himself an outstanding Senator. He's prominent on the national and international scene and at the same time, a letter or wire to MIKE about a local problem always get some action.

The American political system recognizes that there shall be outstanding Republicans and outstanding Democrats in Government—some of both.

The Democrats can take a bow in MANSFIELD'S case.

Freedom: The Dynamic of the Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Paul G. Hoffman on May 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM: THE DYNAMIC OF THE FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(Address by Paul G. Hoffman, Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration, the City College, Baruch lecture, New York, N. Y., May 15, 1956)

The invitation of the City College to deliver the Bernard M. Baruch lecture this spring was accepted by me with great satisfaction. Because of the name it bears, it confers upon me "prestige by association," something the exact opposite of "guilt by association" which we have heard so much about. Perhaps I should remark that there are many who question whether either guilt or prestige legitimately can be conferred in this manner. Nevertheless, I am proud to be associated with Mr. Baruch, whom I greatly admire even in this rather synthetic way.

I am an ardent believer in the American free-enterprise system. I believe it so deeply that I have made an earnest effort to understand it and to identify those elements which give it its strength. I became peculiarly conscious of the need of doing so when I was administrator of the Marshall plan. I was operating under a congressional directive to sell America to the countries we were helping. I took on the assignment with enthusiasm and built up a sales story along standardized lines. I thought it was quite effective. It was full of facts about the high standards of living enjoyed by our workers and farmers, and the oportunities for everyone in education and social and cultural life—all supported with statistics about our thousands of schools and factories,

and the millions of automobiles, radios, and telephones we owned.

The people who heard me and read it seemed impressed, but somewhere along the line I became uneasy. In my own mind, my story was inadequate and inaccurate. It failed to take into account one very vital fact—that America was a great country in the times of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, long before we had high standards of living; long before we had our radios and telephones, and, yes, even our automobiles. I had been dealing with effects, not causes.

We have, I believe, every reason to take pride in the fact that with one-sixteenth of the world's population and one-sixteenth of its natural resources, we turn out one-third of the world's total goods and one-half of all its manufactured products; that in America people of widely different origins and divergent beliefs work together so effectively for their common good; and that we have made even higher education available to practically every citizen who wants it.

But the question is: How did all this come about? Certainly not because we are a master race, because there is no such thing as a master race. We are, in fact, an amalgam of races. Anyone who has traveled in the world is well aware that the potential for growth and development is astounding within all people, wherever they are, whatever their color, their religion, or race. We all know there are brilliant Chinese, Japanese, Burmese, Negroes, Indians, or any other nationality or race you may name; brilliant Catholics, Jews, Protestants, Moslems, Buddhists, or any other religion you may name.

This forces one conclusion: that these things have happened in the United States because more people, since the beginning of our country, have had more opportunity to grow and develop than in any other country of which we have knowledge. As a consequence, we have had more than our share of individuals with the initiative, imagination, and drive, which are so essential to a country's progress.

What has brought this about? To find the answer we must go back to the founding of the Republic. Our Founding Fathers were profound believers in the dignity and worth of the individual. Many of them were deeply religious, holding all men to be children of God with certain inalienable rights as individuals. And even the few who were not in the formal sense of the word "religious" shared the conviction that society must serve the individual—that anything else would be a tragic return to serfdom.

They had in mind the creation of a society in which there would be not only equality but certainty of opportunity for everyone—a society whose every child would be born with the opportunity to realize fully upon his capacities for material, intellectual, and spiritual growth.

To give reality to this concept, they set forth two great principles that were to be the guidelines of the new Nation.

First was the guaranty of freedom and justice for the individual. In our Bill of Rights we Americans were guaranteed that our Government would not interfere with our right to speak freely on any subject we chose; to assemble freely with others for any peaceful purpose; to worship our God in our own way; to be equal with every other American before the law; to be secure in our persons and our property; to be free from unreasonable arrests or detention without real cause; and to a fair public trial if accused of any crime.

The second great principle was the limitation of powers of the Government. The Founding Fathers, thinking of the supreme rights of the individual, were deeply concerned about power. They would have agreed fully with Lord Acton's assertion that "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

They were therefore careful to provide devices for a wide diffusion of decision-making. It was not to be the power of Government alone to make decisions affecting the lives of the governed. Government, in fact, was to make as few decisions as possible, and the governed as many as possible. A large field was left open to the individual for voluntary action.

So it is that every day you and I are making decisions that determine the course of our own lives, and we are joining with others to make decisions of mutual importance to us. These are decisions that, in most other forms of government, are kept within the power of the Government. But our forefathers willed to the American people not simply the privilege, but the responsibility of voluntary determination.

And voluntaryism has flourished almost from the day the Nation was founded. People in other countries poke fun at us because we are joiners. It is true that we are the greatest joiners in all the world. But this fact has had much to do with ours becoming the strongest society in all the world. We organize on a voluntary basis to improve our schools, our towns, our health, our spiritual life, our industries, and our local and national economies.

It was quite inevitable that a society committed to the two principles of individualism and voluntaryism would carry on its business activities under a system of free enterprise. Neither governmental monopolies nor private cartels square with these concepts. Conversely, we as businessmen should never forget that there is no free enterprise except in free societies. There is no free enterprise in Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, or Russia. As a matter of fact, there is no Russian word for businessmen.

Therefore, it follows quite logically that if we want to keep the free enterprise system to which you and I are so devoted, we should give thought to how we can maintain and strengthen our free society.

A very special responsibility rests on us at the present moment, because along with the usual impediments to progress, we are faced with the menace of tyrannical international communism. I think it is important that you young people who are about to enter the business world give thought to this responsibility.

There are some who believe that we cannot meet this menace unless we accept an abridgment of our basic freedoms. They feel we must fight fire with fire, which means that to fight totalitarianism successfully we must use totalitarian techniques. This, to my mind, is a most dangerous notion. I believe that if we are to win out in this titanic struggle, which has been so aptly called the "struggle of the century for the century," we must keep our society free from any taint of totalitarianism; we must sharpen our determination to hold fast to those concepts which have made these United States the strongest of all societies.

If we are to keep this society free, we must make a living document of our Bill of Rights. That we cannot do unless we recognize that our civil liberties can be vitiated by social pressure as well as by legal action, and further, that they are being so vitiated today. Everyone pays lipservice to freedom of thought, but freedom of thought is a sterile and meaningless right unless we are free to discuss, to criticise, and to debate. And yet today there are a number of subjects which are taboo—for example, the question about whether Red China should be admitted into the United Nations. For a number of reasons, speaking personally, I do not believe she should, but that is neither here nor there. The important thing is that we can't hope for the right answer to that and other questions unless they can be freely discussed and debated.

The right of peaceable assembly is no longer sacred to many frightened American citizens. The use of a Los Angeles auditorium was denied for a meeting at which a respected and prominent clergyman was to speak. The reason given was that he was a controversial figure. In Indianapolis the American Civil Liberties Union was denied the use of several halls for a meeting to organize an Indiana chapter. The manager of the auditoriums, including the publicly owned War Memorial Building, simply acceded to pressure by uninformed groups, doing so even though the meeting was sponsored by some of the best citizens of the State, and even though the national organization itself—which is 34 years old—has been endorsed by Americans of highest repute.

The identity of the speakers and the groups in these examples is not the issue. Nor is the point as to whether we agree or disagree with them or their critics. The question is simply whether we are willing to deteriorate into a society in which people who are labeled as controversial are not allowed to speak their piece. In deciding that question, we shall do well to remember that among the most controversial figures of all history are Jesus, Moses, Mohammed, and Mahatma Gandhi.

The guaranty that American citizens will not be deprived of life or property without due process is also under challenge. We are faced with a newly evolved process of trial by innuendo, or public accusation. It is a process in which the accused is assumed guilty until proved innocent—a process by which one person can do serious and irresponsible harm to another person by whispering such words as "subversive," "pink," and "fellow traveler."

It is a procedure—a new form of Ku Klux Klanism—by which a group of Americans having no judicial status whatsoever can set itself up to pass judgment on the loyalties of fellow citizens, and gain a considerable measure of acceptance.

It is an atmosphere in which self-confessed ex-Communists can make charges of their own choosing that can ruin innocent Americans without legal proof ever being established.

I could cite numerous other instances showing how our civil liberties are being whittled away by the use of blacklisting, intimidation, and fear. Some of the people responsible have, to their own way of thinking, the best of motivations; others are sinister. In all cases their activities are voluntary. And here is the major joint I wish to make: If these un-American activities are to be thwarted—if instead of retreating we are to advance toward the great goals our Founding Fathers envisioned—our major reliance must be on voluntary action.

We are fortunate in having a President who understands clearly the issues which are at stake. He has spoken with clarity and feeling on the subject of civil liberties many times, but never more forcefully than in his speech at Columbia University in 1954, when he said:

"Here in America we are descended in blood and in spirit from revolutionaries and rebels—men and women who dared to dissent from accepted doctrine. As their heirs, may we never confuse honest dissent with disloyal subversion. Without exhaustive debate—even heated debate—of ideas and programs, free government would weaken and wither. But if we allow ourselves to be persuaded that every individual—or party—that takes issue with our conviction is necessarily wicked or treasonous—then indeed we are approaching the end of freedom's road."

I suggest that in addition to working within groups for freedom, we as individuals

should follow the example of the President and speak out for freedom regardless of whatever unpleasantness may ensue. We must also be ready to speak up for justice. Everyone concerned about freedom in America must be concerned about justice, too. One reason why we must encourage criticism is that we must encourage people to point out such injustices as remain in America and to fight for their elimination. An unjust society cannot long endure. An injustice against one puts all justice in danger. Only by safeguarding the rights of minorities do we safeguard the rights of majorities. Racial and religious discrimination, special privilege, inequality of opportunity for growth are on the wane in this country; but where they still exist, these and other injustices must be discovered and rooted out.

As a final word, I suggest that the business community has an unusual opportunity to render a significant service to our country. We are often falsely accused of being interested solely in the almighty dollar. Let's take the lead in speaking up for freedom and in speaking out against injustice. Let's dedicate ourselves anew to making in America a demonstration of a free, just, and unafraid society at work.

Let me illustrate what I mean by telling you of an incident which took place in Waverly, Iowa, last year. Waverly is a small town of about 5,000 inhabitants. Nearby is an Air Force radar station. An Air Force captain, Virgil A. Daniels, who had recently completed a long tour of duty in Korea, was assigned to this station. He was a Negro. His first problem was that of finding a place to live for himself, his wife, and three children. He was told of an apartment house in which there was a vacancy. He signed up for the apartment and paid a month's rent in advance. The day he was scheduled to move in the superintendent of the apartment called him and told him that four of the tenants had objected and asked him if he would be willing to withdraw his application. His answer was "certainly."

Then things began to happen. A Mr. Sherman Spear, who is the advertising manager of the Lutheran Mutual Life Insurance Co., which has headquarters in Waverly, told the story to Bud Lackore, manager of the Waverly Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Lackore immediately called his executive committee together and arrangements were made for Mr. Lackore and Mr. Spear to meet with all of the tenants of the apartment house.

To make a long story short, the 4 tenants who protested against the Danielses moving in signed a letter of apology and joined the other 17 tenants in urging them to come. A big celebration and housewarming followed.

The local paper, of course, published the story, which was picked up by the Des Moines Register and Tribune. The Fund for the Republic heard of it and decided to give the town of Waverly a $10,000 award for the contribution they had made to better racial relations. I had the pleasure of presenting that check to Mayor Willard Osincup, of Waverly. I shall always remember the response he made. He said, "We appreciate the honor and we can make very good use of the money, but it seems a little like we are being paid for believing in God."

That story was picked up by the United States Information Service and went around the world. It shows what can happen when a few individuals are willing courageously to speak out against injustice. No police system can keep news of this kind from reaching all peoples, even those behind the Iron Curtain. This is one of the ways that we can most effectively "portray to the world the true story of America and our Nation's peaceful and constructive desires."

You have been most gracious in listening so attentively to this lecture, the content of which is so far removed from such practical questions as how to get a job, how to get ahead, and how to make a better living. I have subjected you to it because you are young. If I may quote President Eisenhower again, he said, while speaking at the annual convention of the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, "Because you are both young and responsible, you know what is your greatest responsibility of all—tomorrow—the whole future of freedom." It is, after all, quite normal that this responsibility should be yours. You have just spent 4 years in an atmosphere where ideas like freedom and bravery are important. I hope you will continue to think that they are important, because, while making a living, and a good one, is a worthy ambition, living a good life—a free life—is even more important.

United States Observers at Geneva Urge OTC Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of May 16, 1956:

UNITED STATES OBSERVERS AT GENEVA URGE OTC MEMBERSHIP

Four nongovernmental advisers to the United States delegation negotiating tariff agreements at Geneva, Switzerland recently reported to President Eisenhower.

They were: Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week and chairman of the McGraw Hill Publishing Co.; Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Bryan Essick, president of Essick Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles; Stanley N. Ruttenberg, director of research, AFL–CIO.

Their comments on the work of the United States delegation were most complimentary. After observing at firsthand the tariff negotiations in Geneva they told President Eisenhower that "the interests of our country have been well served," and went on to say they had been "greatly impressed by the competence of the career men from the nine departments and agencies of the United States Government, who handled these important negotiations."

The nongovernmental advisers were "particularly impressed with the unfailing concern of our negotiators to advance the broad interests of the United States. By no stretch of the imagination could the tariff negotiations, as we observe them, be called a giveaway program."

"The entire program," they emphasized, "is based upon reciprocal trade concessions and we found our negotiating teams and the Trade Agreements Committee to be bargaining in what seemed to us to be the best Yankee tradition. They insisted on obtaining concessions of full value for each concession made by the United States. There is great need for better public knowledge of these facts." As a result of their observations in Geneva, the nongovernmental advisers told President Eisenhower there is need for the permanent administrative machinery provided for in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation.

They pointed out that the setting up of this administrative machinery, subscribed to by all the interested nations would clearly be in our self-interest. It would help make all our trade agreements more truly reciprocal. It would also strengthen both the resolve and the ability of the member nations to continue their efforts toward an expanding and mutually profitable world trade.

It would provide an effective continuously operating instrument in giving fuller effect to existing commitments to remove such trade barriers as currency restrictions, quotas, discriminatory taxes, and other indirect devices that limit the exchange of our goods with other nations.

Failure on the part of the United States, the world's greatest trading Nation, to join in setting up the Organization for Trade Cooperation would cause great dismay and disappointment throughout the free world at a time when the Soviet Union is stepping up its foreign economic efforts.

As we have emphasized over and over again the OTC does not involve any new tariff reduction authority, does not change the present tariff law in any respect, does not give the President any additional powers.

President Eisenhower strongly believes American agriculture, labor, and business will be benefited by what OTC can do in expanding world trade.

Certainly, we need to expand our world trade. The bill authorizing United States membership in OTC has been approved by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. It should be enacted into law during the present session of Congress.

More Arab Border Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of our colleagues the following item which appeared in the Israel Digest of May 11, 1956:

MORE ARAB BORDER ATTACKS

Despite the undertaking to observe a complete cease-fire, attacks against Israel from across the Arab borders continued.

Following is a list of incidents which occurred during the last week:

May 5: Infiltrators penetrated into the fields of Kfar Aza and attempted to reap the harvest. Egyptian soldiers opened fire as an Israel patrol approached.

May 6: Infiltrators from Jordan opened fire on a civilian car in the Kfar Saba area.

May 7: Workers near Motza were shot at by Arab infiltrators. Some shots were also fired at the guard of Neve Ilan.

On the same day, automatic fire was opened from the wall of the old city into the Israeli part of Jerusalem. Window panes in one building were shattered. There were no casualties.

Egyptian soldiers opened fire on workers near Nirim. Later during the day a platoon of Egyptian soldiers penetrated 300 meters into Israel territory. They retreated as an Israeli patrol approached.

May 9: Infiltrators opened fire on a civilian car between Ramat Hakovesh and Kfar Saba. Footprints led to the Jordanian border. There were no casualties.

On the same day, an Israeli patrol south of Nitzana Oz was fired upon. The shooting came from the Jordanian border.

An Arab infiltrator was killed in the Budrus Kivia sector, inside Israel territory when he opened fire on an Israeli patrol.

May 10: The new Beersheba-Tel Aviv spur was sabotaged for the second time in recent weeks by Arab infiltrators. The attack took place about 2 miles north of Beersheba.

The Israel-Jordon Mixed Armistice Commission failed to condemn Jordan for the blasting of a building at Kfar Yavitz, near Natanya, by infiltrators who fled across the Jordianian border.

The investigation revealed that a concrete house was almost completely destroyed on the night of May 5–6. United Nations observers followed the tracks of the attackers which led to the Jordan border.

While the U. N. observer responsible for the investigation twice reiterated that there was no doubt that the path taken by the attackers led to the demarcation line, the chairman of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission said that he was not convinced that the perpetrators of the crime had come from Jordan or returned there. The chairman abstained on the draft resolution submitted by the Israel member of the Commission and thus no resolution was adopted.

An Unfinished Letter to 2 Million Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unfinished Letter," which was published in the Farm Journal for June 1956. My own personal comment is that the question dealt with by the editorial must always be an unfinished one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNFINISHED LETTER

Editors get lost of advice, some of it pretty blunt. There's the fellow, for instance, who says "When are you going to have the courage to tell 2 million farmers that they ought to get off the farm and go work somewhere else?"

Well, O. K. We'll do it now. Miss Q., take a letter:

TWO MILLION FARMERS,
R. F. D., America.

GENTLEMEN: Please plan to leave your farms. They tell us you are not going to be needed—that you are surplus. You will want to keep on living, no doubt, so you'll probably have to look for town jobs. Your families—

Wait a minute. Maybe we had better not sent that letter just yet.

Who are these people? Why most of them are our friends. They're folks we know.

Nearly all of them really love the land. They are farming because that's what they know and like. Their fathers and grandfathers were farmers. It's in their blood.

They like being independent. They like to be their own bosses. They like to work out of doors. They may not pay much attention to the birds and wildflowers and sunrises and changing skies but they love all those things. They like to work with animals and see them grow.

Some of them have been struggling hard to stay on the land. They want their children to have a chance to choose farming, too, if the youngsters wish. They don't need to be told about hard going. But they hate to give up. They want to succeed at what they have started.

Who has the brass to say they must quit farming? And why should they? That won't solve the farm problem. Someone else will farm it and raise as much or more.

Sure, some of them will change over to other jobs. If doing so solves their problem, God bless them. Not everyone wants to farm just because he was raised on one. In fact, we hope any farmer who wants to go into other work or business will be able to find a spot. And, as generations before us, many of the farm youngsters will move on to better opportunities.

Suppose factory jobs are waiting for all these folks? What made those jobs?

Why, somebody, lots of people, have kept figuring all the time on new things to make. Rayon, nylon, radios, television, automobiles, electric devices, plastics, all sorts of chemical things. Took a lot of research and engineering and inventing. That's why there are so many new factories making new things. And people are earning good wages and salaries and making money in these new industries.

Why haven't we got new things farmers can raise and sell? Let's do like the factories. Put researchers and engineers to work. Find us new crops to grow, new uses for our crops, new places to sell stuff.

No. Let's not tell all these good farm folks to move to town. Let's get busier at finding ways they can make better money farming. Let's give them and their youngsters a better chance to stay on the land.

Let's not turn more farmers over to industry—let's borrow some of industry's ideas so more folks can enjoy profitable farming.

Never mind about that letter, Miss Q. No; we're not going to write it.

Cargo Preference Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the national commander of the American Legion, J. Addington Wagner, at the Maritime Day banquet of the Propeller Club in New York City on May 22, 1956. In making this request I invite the attention of my colleagues to the comments in the address with respect to the cargo preference legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, J. ADDINGTON WAGNER, AT THE ANNUAL MARITIME DAY BANQUET OF THE PROPELLER CLUB, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 22, 1956

When President Eisenhower issued his recent proclamation at the White House, establishing this day, May 22, as National Maritime Day, he urged the people of the United States to commemorate an event which has changed the course of our history.

Just 137 years ago today a little vessel with a crooked smokestack, paddle wheels, and plenty of precautionary sails, was standing out of Savannah Harbor. She was flying the Stars and Stripes. Dead ahead was the wide Atlantic—never before crossed by a steamship. Named *Savannah* after her home port, this brave little ship, that could easily be carried on the deck of a modern vessel, used her steam engine on 14 of the 22 days en route to Liverpool. Together with Robert Fulton and other steamship pioneers, Capt. Moses Rogers and the *Savannah* gave the United States the distinction of being the leader in this new field of ocean transportation.

What is this merchant marine, which by Presidential proclamation and act of Congress we assemble once a year to honor?

To many who watch the street parades and water pageants, I fear it is simply a fleet of gallant ghosts, the *Savannahs, Flying Clouds,* and *Baltics,* hull down on the horizon of the past. But your group, of course, knows better. You know what our merchant marine, has been, is, and should be. You know the mistakes we have made in the past and the costly lessons we have had to be given before we learned they were mistakes.

But let's not look backward; let's profit by those mistakes and look forward.

We of the American Legion are deeply concerned with the future of the American merchant marine. We advocate a rugged defense system in this age of danger. The United States merchant marine, in two World Wars, has meant the critical difference between fighting those wars over there and over here. We fought them over there.

Today, seapower is absolutely necessary for our security. It will remain so, in spite of nuclear and other technological advances, as far into the future as reasonable men can see. And seapower cannot function without a powerful merchant marine.

Within the past few days, a dispute between the Army and the Air Force has gained public attention. While I would not offer judgment on the merits of that issue, I do believe that the Nation will profit from a full airing of the differences and their consideration by both the executive branch and the Congress. Certainly, one result will be greater public interest in the national defense and better understanding of its problems and cost.

But what is even more significant, I believe, is the fact that here you have leaders of two vitally important armed services battling hard for the things which they feel their respective service needs and can do. The Army leadership obviously believes in the Army—its importance, its mission and its potential. Air Force leaders feel equally strong about their service.

I say there is reassurance for all of us in the aggressive spirit shown in this conflict. It is far better, from the standpoint of the common safety, that our military leaders in their enthusiasm overreach their target than that they underreach it by reason of apathy or lack of concern for their assigned responsibilities.

The leadership of the merchant marine will do well to maintain a comparably vigorous fight for maritime power. Like the fighting services, yours is an indispensable arm of American security. You have allies, like the American Legion, who are eager and glad to stand with you. But the cause of our merchant seapower is primarily your cause, and upon you rests the lead responsibility for defending and sponsoring it.

The American Legion is acutely aware of the danger of weakening our present national policy on the merchant marine. Congress has displayed courage and foresight in originating legislation designed to sustain that national policy. In doing so, it has won the praise of every thinking American.

For our part, the American Legion supports Congress 100 percent in its unremitting efforts to foster and improve the merchant marine, particularly on the important question of the 50–50 policy which guarantees to American ships the right to carry half of those cargoes paid for by American taxpayers and shipped abroad for the aid of countries outside the Iron Curtain. This

guaranty has been enacted by the Congress on nine occasions in the past. It expresses the characteristically American philosophy of the even break.

Of course, there are critics of this program. It seems incredible that attacks on such an honest and cooperative policy should originate in the very nations which we are doing so much to help. Thousands of Americans gave their lives to liberate these countries from brutal oppression. Our citizens are not only being severely taxed to pay the expenses of that war, but are continuing to pay heavy levies to help rehabilitate and defend those nations. To deny to American ships the right to carry half of our agricultural shipments to these countries is simply unthinkable. But the attacks on our 50–50 policy, inspired by foreign shipping interests, continue, and constitute a real threat.

The American Legion, at its annual conventions has emphatically and unanimously expressed its view on the importance of maintaining the 50–$0 principle so that we may maintain a strong merchant marine as a vital corollary of national defense. We reaffirmed this policy pointedly at our 1955 National Convention, and even more recently on January 18, 1956 at the National Security Council meeting in Washington, in the following language, and I quote:

"This legislation (the Cargo Preference Act) is literally a matter of life or death to a significant part of the merchant marine, and of health or sickness to the whole industry.

"The real problem is that shipping interests in some foreign maritime countries have induced their governments to object to our 50–50 principle either as a bargaining lever or as an outright threat. This politically astute move kills two birds with one stone. It helps their government bargain for lower prices and it plays upon the fears of the most influential partner in our whole economy—the American farmer. Foreign shipping interests are thus trying to drive an artificial wedge between two great segments of this Nation, agriculture and shipping, which traditionally and in reality are partners."

The American Legion formally and firmly opposes any attempt to change this law. We believe it should remain on the statute books unaltered as one of the most practical and effective supports we could give our merchant marine.

It is appropriate that on this Maritime Day the American Legion should join with you distinguished leaders of our merchant marine industry in recognizing the importance to our security and our economic well-being or a strong merchant marine. It is far more significant, however, that our support of modern, adequate, privately owned and operated American merchant fleet is not reserved for Maritime Day or for occasions such as this.

Without fanfare or publicity, but with a firm conviction that we are fighting for what is right and necessary, the American Legion is constantly seeking to achieve the objectives so clearly stated in the merchant marine resolution adopted by our last national convention.

This resolution has but one purpose: to give America the finest, most modern merchant fleet in the world.

We know that our security and our prosperity depend upon such a fleet. We believe that America can have the world's best merchant marine if the following measures are taken:

The national maritime policy established in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 must be maintained and supported.

The operating-differential payments to contract lines must be based in the future, as they are now, on the concept of parity with foreign-flag competitors.

Congress should keep governmental obligations incurred by these contracts on a current basis.

Further steps to stabilize the merchant marine industry and to attract more private investment should be encouraged.

The purpose and mechanics of the 50–50 law should be explained to the American people so that they will understand that this policy does not impede the disposal of farm surpluses or deprive foreign-aid programs of United States dollars.

United States exporters and importers should be encouraged to use American ships wherever possible.

These are some of the objectives of our merchant marine resolution. They are practical and necessary. Most of all, they evidence the American Legion's concern and the concern of the American people over the strength and effectiveness of our merchant marine.

We are determined that the maritime leadership given the United States 137 years ago today with the sailing of the Savannah across th Atlantic shall not be lost. We are determined that the Stars and Stripes will fly supreme on the Seven Seas.

NATO and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial entitled "NATO and Foreign Aid," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO AND FOREIGN AID

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, in his typically impressive testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has said things that ought to be taken to heart by any American who questions the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or who takes a pinch-penny view of military and economic aid to our friends and allies abroad.

There has been a good deal of loose and irresponsible talk in recent days about NATO's alleged disintegration and about how foolish the United States is to keep on pouring money into such a moribund alliance. But what is the basis for this talk? Is it justified? Is the Atlantic community really falling apart, as some of our inveterate defeatists say?

General Gruenther, NATO's supreme military commander, has answered these and similar questions with an emphatic and altogether persuasive "no". As he has told the Senators, it is true that France's troubles in Algeria and the bitter British-Greek-Turkish dispute over Cyprus have created strains within the alliance. It is true, too, that the whole organization is challenged as never before by an extremely dangerous propaganda campaign designed to undermine and dissolve it—a campaign on which the Soviet bloc is spending between $1.5 billion and $3 billion annually. But the reality still remains that the Western allies are basically united in a firm determination to maintain their common defenses.

An eloquent measure of this determination is the fact that our allies in free Europe are now spending $12 billion a year for defense, or almost twice as much as 5 years ago. This figure is enough in itself to serve as a fitting answer to those pessimists who speak so mournfully of NATO's demise and who also, in doing so, unwittingly give aid and comfort to the Kremlin. Actually, as General Gruenther has testified, the alliance continues to be very much alive, and very formidable in its potentials, and even if it were falling apart—which is most definitely not the case—our country would be urgently impelled to see it was put back together again.

The reason for this is that there is no substitute for NATO as a collective-security instrument to safeguard not only free Europe but the United States as well. In General Gruenther's words, the alliance is not "a community chest" to which we donate just for the sake of being generous. Far from it. For the contributions we make to it are "simply contributions to our own survival," and so we had all better realize that our foreign aid is not mere altruism and that the Kremlin's smiles and happy talk do not justify indiscriminate cuts in it.

Yet the House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended a slash of $1.1 billion in the $4.9 billion requested to carry out such aid in the coming fiscal year. Clearly, considering what General Gruenther has said, and considering similar warnings from other high quarters, this is much too drastic a cut, and Congress will be taking a perilous risk if it enacts it.

Confusion Worse Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following syndicated article by Drew Pearson shows how terribly confused our executive departments are and how our distinguished President helps confound the confusion:

UNITED STATES BEHIND REDS IN MANY WEAPONS

American scientists and military men have made some shocking admissions lately. Their statements have appeared in separate, scattered parts of the newspapers or behind the closed doors of hearings. If you add them together, however, they show an alarming state of our national defense.

Here is a compilation of recent admissions by United States scientists, military men, and intelligence agents:

Earth satellite—United States experts admit Russia will launch an earth satellite ahead of us—probably in 1957. This will be 1 year in advance of the United States of America.

Guided missiles—Central Intelligence reports flatly and categorically that Russia is ahead of us in guided missiles. This means Moscow will probably build the dread intercontinental ballistic missile capable of flying from Moscow to Washington before we do.

Nuclear reactors—CIA representatives testified behind closed doors recently that Russia was ahead of us in building atomic reactors. This means Russia is making faster strides in converting A-energy to industrial uses, probably including an atomic plane.

Jet planes—The Defense Department has acknowledged that Russia is building more jets than we are. She is also outproducing

us in long-range jet bombers of the type that just dropped the H-bomb in the Pacific. It appears that Russia is building more of all types of jet planes except B–47 medium-range bombers.

Hydrogen bombs—Intelligence agents have reported that Russia is now only 1 month behind us in her stockpile of H-bombs. Hitherto our chief reliance has been on a long lead in the stockpile of H- and A-bombs.

Despite this, Secretary of Defense Wilson repeatedly states: "The Russians aren't 9 feet tall," and pooh-poohs congressional attempts to increase the national defense.

Despite this, also, President Eisenhower has consistently assured the American public that the present defense budget is adequate.

IKE QUOTED IN 1950

Military men recall that on March 20, 1950, 3 months before Communist leaders struck at Korea, General Eisenhower appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and assured them that the current defense budget of $15 billion was adequate.

Explaining that he had been asked to coordinate the needs of the different armed services, Eisenhower testified:

"I would say that I would add $500 million to the present budget (which has been cut under $14 billion). But I would be determined to stay somewhere below the $15 billion which always in my mind has represented the maximum, and I should be determined to stay well below that."

Three months later the United States found itself unprepared to meet war in the Far East and increased the military budget to a high of $38 billion in 1952. Of course Mr. Eisenhower did not foresee war when he testified in 1950; but military men say no one can predict war or peace today either.

CAPITOL CHAFF

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, has accused President Eisenhower of taking high supports away from American farmers, but granting them to Brazilian coffee growers. In a blistering private letter to framers, Chavez declares: "Each morning when you drink a cup of coffee, I want you to remember just one thing. While the President is unwilling to agree on any reasonable pegged farm price, he was willing to participate in the agreement signed in Brazil 2 months ago to fix the support price of coffee at artificial heights to prevent a collapse of the market because of a substantial coffee surplus. The complete lack of understanding of the President on domestic problems," adds CHAVEZ, "is appalling". * * * Secretary of Agriculture Benson, who opposes high supports at home, seems to favor them in Switzerland. At least, his Agriculture Department has issued a favorable report on Swiss farming which asserts: "In Switzerland, the policy of protecting, supporting, and promoting agriculture has been carried farther than in any West European country. This is due * * * partly to the desire, widely shared by the Swiss people, to halt the decline in farm population and to secure a high degree of self-sufficiency."

Drugs in the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD two recent editorials from the Washington Post that remind us again of the courageous and distinguished service rendered to the people of Oregon and the United States by the senior Senator from our State. Thanks to his alert and vigorous action, the Senate, last week, struck from the narcotics bill a provision that, for the first time in our history, would have legalized wiretapping by the Attorney General of private telephone conversations. However, worthy the purpose this provision was to serve, any retreat on the wiretap issue would, as Senator MORSE pointed out, be an opening wedge for gross invasion of the rights of all Americans. As a result of Senator MORSE's eloquent argument, the Senate has refused to permit this breach of our individual liberties.

Because we are proud of WAYNE MORSE, it is a pleasure to record these editorial remarks of an outstanding newspaper which expressed some of the high regard we feel for him:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 27, 1956]

DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT

Senator MORSE did a courageous job of attacking some of the excesses in the proposed Federal narcotics bill. Atrocious as are many of the crimes connected with narcotics, the capital punishment provision and the authorization for Federal narcotics agents to tap telephone wires seem to this newspaper too severe a remedy. This sort of remedy would invite new evils of a different sort. Certainly these sections deserve the reconsideration which the Senate will give them later this week.

These objections do not hold, however, for the thoughtful proposals which Senator PRICE DANIEL'S Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code has made for dealing with the disturbing illicit narcotics problem in Washington. This is a problem which was described in the report of the Council on Law Enforcement for the District of Columbia last year as "serious and tragic and expensive and ominous." Mr. DANIEL'S group recommends a three-pronged approach, more effective treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic users; tighter control of certain dangerous drugs, and increased freedom for law enforcement authorities in seeking evidence and making arrests. These recommendations are apart from the broader questions of national policy on narcotics debated in the Senate last week.

Regarding narcotic users, the subcommittee report begins with a recognition of the basic fact that drug addicts are sick people—people in need of hospitalization, psychiatric care, and help in the achievement of some useful place in society. The report recommends additional treatment facilities in the District of Columbia General Hospital, the establishment of a local narcotics farm for addict-patients, prompt commitment of narcotic addicts, including juveniles, supervision of addict-patients after they are released from hospitals and authority to arrest and prosecute the chronic or "incurable" addicts who are not amenable to ordinary treatment and rehabilitation. All of these suggestions strike us as thoroughly sound, although it is clear that the last of them will call for a large measure of humanity and restraint on the part of law enforcement authorities.

The subcommittee sees an extremely serious danger to the community in the absence of effective controls over the sale and use of barbiturates, amphetamines, and certain other dangerous drugs in the District. The so-called goof balls and thrill pills can lead to the worst forms of drug addiction, according to the subcommittee and the fact is, apparently, that possession of them even in large quantities by an individual is not illegal and distribution of drugs used in them by pharmaceutical firms is not subject to police inspection and control. Obviously this laxity ought to be remedied as swiftly as possible. The subcommittee has rendered a most useful service in bringing it to light.

Some of the restraints imposed peculiarly upon the police of the National Capital in dealing with the drug traffic seem excessive, and we readily agree with the subcommittee that they ought to be relaxed. Federal rules of procedure provide, for example, that warrants for searches may be issued on "probable cause" but may be served only during the daytime; in dealing with narcotics violations, night searches may be very necessary. Similarly, we agree that warrants should be issuable to Metropolitan Police officers as well as to Federal officers. We share the subcommittee's view also that the Government ought to have a right of appeal from District Court orders suppressing the evidence in narcotics cases.

In any event, the District bill ought to be considered on its own merits quite apart from the controversial issues of the broader Federal measure.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 1, 1956]

MOST DEADLY DRUG

The narcotics bill passed yesterday by the Senate was made much less objectionable by elimination of its wiretapping provision. Senator MORSE aptly referred to this provision as "the most deadly drug that can be injected into our body politic." The inevitable effect of giving Federal police officers authority to eavesdrop on private telephone conversation and to use the evidence so obtained in court would be, as Mr. MORSE put it, "to deaden our sensitivity to individual liberties." This went far beyond the Keating bill to authorize wiretapping under court warrant in cases involving the national security. The drug traffic, sinister and serious as it is, has very little to do with national security. And if Congress has been leery about authorizing the use of wiretap evidence in national security cases, there was the more reason for it to consider the implications of the proposal in connection with narcotics.

Senator DANIEL and other sponsors of the narcotics bill took great pains to point out that the wiretap provision had been recommended by the Attorney General, that the use of evidence gathered from wiretapping now conducted was necessary to obtain convictions of the big narcotics racketeers, and that the authorization would not set a precedent. But how could this measure escape being considered a precedent and being used as an argument to authorize use of wiretap evidence in other situations? The use of wiretapping has far outrun the legal sanction; the principal restraint is the inability to use wiretap evidence in court on Federal cases. If it could be said that wiretapping was warranted by the heinousness of the crime involved in drug peddling, why should it not be warranted equally in connection with other heinous crimes such as extortion, blackmail, rape, industrial sabotage or gang warfare? If the suspect were, as well might be the case, a physician suspected of giving prescriptions for narcotics too loosely, his private conversations with numerous wholly innocent patients might be recorded by police agencies. The dragnet character of this general search warrant should be obvious.

Drug peddling is a vicious, dangerous crime, and Senator DANIEL and his colleagues deserve credit for the exhaustive inquiry they have made. But the crime is not so prevalent in the United States that we need

to invite other dangers in order to counteract it. The bill passed by the Senate would allow juries to impose a death penalty for selling heroin to teen-agers or for a third conviction of selling the drug to adults. Long experience has shown that this kind of severity sometimes serves more to impede conviction than to diminish crime. A great deal needs to be done to check narcotics traffic and addiction—by facilitating law enforcement, by providing more Federal narcotics agents with more general authority, and by emphasizing education, medical care, and rehabilitation. When the House considers the bill it ought to recognize that many constructive steps can be taken along these lines without resorting to either the death penalty or legalized wiretapping.

Don't Kill the Goose Just Because It Lays an Egg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 30, the New York Times carried a very significant feature article by C. L. Sulzberger, entitled "Don't Kill the Goose Just Because It Lays an Egg." This article analyzes a critical review of policy and activities which is now taking place within the United States Information Agency and the new and more difficult task which that Agency must face in meeting the vastly expanded worldwide propaganda effort of the Russians. Attention is invited to the severe cut in the appropriation request made to Congress by the United States Information Agency. Congress is warned never to forget that the Soviet Union employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. This, coupled with the fact the the Communists maintain 600 special schools for the training of professional propagandists from all parts of the world, makes it clear that Congress must take more than a casual look at the program of the United States Information Agency and that Congress must begin to give more concentrated attention to the development of a more dynamic information program.

During the last session of Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 433 which authorizes the establishment of a joint committee of Congress on United States international information program. The primary purpose of such a joint committee of Congress is to lay a solid foundation for the development of an international information program capable of winning the cold war as the surest way of preventing a hot war. A program as important as that charged to the United States Information Agency and having such a direct and vital bearing upon the winning of a just and lasting peace, demands more time and attention than Congress has given to it in the past. It is for these reasons that I introduced in the last session of Congress House Joint Resolution 433.

Mr. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, is to be congratulated for his frank and forthright analysis of the place of the United States Information Agency in the war of ideas between the Russian Communists and advocates of freedom everywhere in the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert his article in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS
(By C. L. Sulzberger)
DON'T KILL THE GOOSE JUST BECAUSE IT LAYS AN EGG

PARIS, May 29.—American propaganda policy toward Communist Eastern Europe is now experiencing serious revision. Andrew Berding, Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, has ordered a review of the entire program, "a country-by-country study of information policy with relation to the satellites to insure that program content takes into account the different situations in each country."

This column recently discussed certain prevailing weaknesses in our propaganda to the Soviet orbit. These included overemphasis of statistics, paucity of ideas, and insufficient stress on our ideals. It was suggested that objective commentary and calm, straightforward news are durable psychological commodities. The following recommendations were made:

1. That we "cease treating the satellite countries as an unimportant, uniform bloc, a mere adjunct of Soviet empire, and discuss with them their separate problems. These interests, beneath the gray uniformity of communism, remain disparate. Can we not explore diversities more skillfully?"

2. "Let us take advantage of ferment and press for publication of provocative books" such as Koestler's "Darkness at Noon" and Hemingway's "For Whom the Bell Tolls."

3. "There is deep-seated craving within the satellites to travel to the West and test comparative freedoms. Do we fear to let them satisfy this appetite?"

4. "Hankering for happiness is one of mankind's most contagious diseases. * * * Let us remind the East of the existence of life's simpler pleasures."

Two purposes

The policy review ordered by Berding was stimulated by these observations and has two purposes: "To determine which criticisms against United States propaganda in general can be applied to USIA" (as distinct from private organizations such as Radio Free Europe); and to take measures to improve output in accordance with the above recommendations.

Unfortunately, just as our only official information agency prepares to devise a more realistic approach to the post-Stalin Soviet empire and to exploit the present ferment there, it is having to fight a battle on an entirely different front. This is with an economy-minded Congress.

During the current fiscal year the USIA was granted a budget allocation of $87,400,000. It has requested $135 million for the 1957 fiscal year to develop new programs and advertise United States interest in world peace—a theme Moscow has been exploiting on its own behalf. The additional funds requested would promote the use of atomic energy and science for peace and President Eisenhower's mutual inspection plan. It is hoped to invest in worldwide television activities; low-priced books expressing the American viewpoint, above all in the Orient and Middle East; and an increase in broadcasting facilities to eastern Europe.

Cut in funds

Unfortunately, these ideas may be stifled at birth if Congress is not more generous. The House of Representatives voted to cut the organization's request for funds from $135 million to $110 million. The Senate has now raised the proposed allotment to $115 million. But this is still considerably less than is asked for to carry out a more dynamic propaganda program.

There isn't the slightest doubt that the USIA has made mistakes in the past. It may well do so again in the future. But one sure way of not helping to build up the agency is to cut down its funds. Propaganda is necessarily one of the most important features of Government policy during this era of competitive coexistence. It must be further developed and improved.

Congress ought never to forget that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists, that the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Should we reduce our efforts to combat this immense apparatus?

To some degree, USIA is hampered in its activities by the need to disseminate all important pronouncements concerning Government policy. Some of the slogans advocated by American leaders in the past have proven embarrassing abroad, where they are remembered long after they have been forgotten at home.

Furthermore, the Voice of America has been confused frequently in the minds of foreign listeners with programs of other, nonofficial, broadcasting stations, such as Radio Free Europe. These practice differing forms of exhortatory propaganda, political subversion, or mere reflection of émigré political views as distinct from those of our Government.

The Voice of America is designed to reflect accurately the attitudes and policies of the United States Government. Were this effort to be hampered by congressional economy, our long-range interests would ultimately and almost inevitably suffer. Even if the Voice sometimes lays an egg that is not golden, there is no point in killing the goose.

Use of Sports for Political Purposes by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in continuation of a series of speeches which I have made during the past 2 years relative to the use of sports for political purposes by the Communists, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release of the United States Information Agency, dated May 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Communist drive to utilize international sports for political purposes is not merely well underway, but is being planned for many years in advance, the United States Information Agency said today.

Sports exchanges between Communist countries and the free world have increased greatly since 1950, the Information Agency reported. In 1953 and 1954 there was a marked increase in these exchanges, and in 1955 the rise was even more substantial. The object of this growing exchange, according to articles which have appeared in vari-

ous Communist publications, is to strengthen the "peace offensive" and "to demonstrate to the whole world the advantages and strength of the Soviet system."

The Information Agency said the prospect for 1956 and the future is for a still greater flow of sporting delegations between the Communist orbit and the free world and, because of the Communist emphasis on winning, for even more impressive Communist sports victories.

"With the 1956 Olympics not yet completely behind them, Communist teams and sports officials are pointed toward the 1960 and 1964 Olympics," the Information Agency said in its survey. "Hungary is constructing athletic facilities to accommodate the 1960 Olympics and the U. S. S. R. is reported spending the equivalent of $90 million to make a strong bid for the 1964 Olympic games."

In 1950, 21 foreign sports teams visited the Soviet Union and 29 Soviet teams went abroad to both Communist and free world countries, the Information Agency said. By 1953, the number of these teams had increased to 64 visiting teams and 68 teams "exported"; the visiting teams came from 19 countries and the Soviet teams went to 29 countries.

The motivation for the increased emphasis put on sports in the U. S. S. R., perhaps can be found in a Radio Leningrad announcement on January 12, 1952, that "physical culture and sport are not a matter of amusement but a matter of state importance."

As an index of the Communist determination to make political capital out of sports, the Information Agency compiled this table of 1955 Communist sports exchanges with the free world:

Area	To orbit	From orbit	Total
Western Europe	214	216	430
Near East, south Asia, Africa	25	17	42
Free Far East	5	1	6
Latin America	10	5	15
Total	254	239	493

These exchanges constituted 16 percent of total Communist delegation exchanges with the free world in 1955, according to the Information Agency. That the other Communist countries are extremely active in this program is indicated by the fact that the Soviet sports exchanges constitute less than one-third of the grand total.

Soviet sports exchanges with the free world, 1954–55

Area	1954			1955		
	To U.S.S.R.	From U.S.S.R.	Total	To U.S.S.R.	From U.S.S.R.	Total
Western Europe	23	31	54	54	60	114
Near East, south Asia, Africa, free Far East	2	2	4	9	7	16
Latin America	0	1	1	2	1	3
United States	0	0	0	4	0	4
Total	25	34	59	69	68	137

Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there was recently concluded here in Washington a nationwide conference on industrial safety. This conference was called by President Eisenhower, who addressed the opening session in a speech which I should like to include at this point:

Mr. Secretary, ladies, and gentlemen, the concentration of 3,000 people here in the city of Washington to conduct a conference on this problem of occupational safety is the most heartwarming experience I have yet had in my months of examination into this problem.

I want personally to thank each of you for the interest you are taking in it. I want to congratulate you for the simple reason that I know that out of this conference will spring the greatest advance we have yet made in this field.

Now, on the highways we know we lose a tremendous number of our people each year—I believe 38,000 were killed last year. The number we lose through occupational accidents is not so large, but in a way it is more tragic.

In the one case we have many millions of fast-moving units on the road with no possibility of coordinated control among them, except as they may choose to obey the laws in the areas in which they are driving.

In this occupational field we have much of our trouble arising in organized bodies and groups, in our factories and other places. Through proper spread of information, proper adoption of methods and procedures, we know that much of this could be eliminated. In other words, the 14,000 that we lose through occupational accidents seems to be more easily controllable within limits, at least, than does the other.

I don't know how many of the individuals in this audience have ever had the task—almost the daily task—of writing letters of condolence to families that have lost a dear one. For my part, I assure you, it is one of the most heartbreaking things I have ever had to do. And when you stop to think of 14,000 bereaved families in this country every year, occasioned by preventable accidents, it is indeed, to such a person as myself, a tragic fact.

So I believe that such people as yourselves have the solution largely in your hands. The Federal Government can do little. The President can call a conference to bring you together so that you may exchange ideas; so that each of you may gain some inspiration from the fact that so many people do come to look into this thing and show their determination to do something about it.

But the Federal Government's part here is limited very definitely to that of a general leadership. Federal law and Federal Government should not extend into the factory, into the farm, into the other places where these accidents occur. The community and the State, therefore, must pick up the burden of teaching, of devising, of planning, so that this tragedy is certainly lessened in extent and comes as close to the point of elimination as human ingenuity can bring it.

This is a short description of the feelings I had when, with Secretary Mitchell, we determined to invite you to this particular conference.

I again say, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for coming.

I have every confidence that from today forward, from the moment you return home, we will begin to show improvement, and we will improve all the time, each year, until practical elimination has been achieved.

Each of you will share in the great satisfaction that will come from that development. I for my part, expect that I will look baik on this day for a long time as one of the finest things that has happened for America in this line.

It is a serious problem, but as they used to say in the war when people would complain about how tough this particular job was: "Well, if it wasn't tough, they wouldn't have brought such good men to do it."

I say that to you.

Goodbye and good luck.

Mr. Speaker, that same day the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, also addressed the Conference. In both these speeches the need was stressed for our people to give greater attention to the increasingly serious problem of occupational safety. Although the role of the Federal Government in this field may not be crucial, certain legislation is desirable. On April 25 of last year, I introduced H. R. 5740, which would provide certain assistance to States in their efforts to promote industrial safety. Although no action has yet been taken on this bill, it is my hope that Congress, through the appropriate committees, will consider this whole question in the near future.

Mr. Mitchell's address follows:

I am happy to welcome this vast audience to the fifth and largest President's Conference on Occupational Safety. I particularly want to greet the several new groups who are here for the first time this year. When we started this Conference, we concentrated by general agreement on certain segments of our economy—manufacturing, construction, utilities, trade and service, finance and government. This year we invited the Department of Agriculture and the farming community to join us. Increasing mechanization and greater use of chemicals have drawn farm safety problems close to those of industry. They have responded generously and we are very happly to welcome them. I hope this year's addition will stimulate future Conferences to invite the 1 or 2 remaining groups which are still not included.

This year for the first time we have invited leaders of the major religious organizations and women's groups to attend. We believe their knowledge of, and influence over, human motivation will help us discover what it is that makes a man take care of his own safety and that of others. In industry, labor, and government, we have developed many techniques and made much progress but workers continue to be killed and maimed. Something more is needed. The experts suspect we must find that something in the elusive wellsprings of human motivation. If anyone can help us with that quest, we believe it should be these groups whom we have asked to join us this year.

I ask all to consider with me for a few minutes what is the Nation's stake in occupational safety. Concern for human dignity is a tenet upon which our Republic was founded. The worth and well-being of the individual should determine all of our activities. Our first stake is to protect that well-being against needless suffering and pain. Our second concern is to maintain a high production and avoid economic waste.

Our third is directly related to our survival in competitive coexistence with our enemies in the world. Despite record employment levels today, we face dangerous shortages of skilled workers, not only scientists, but maintenance men, repairmen, mechanics, electronics experts, and many others.

When a jet aviator is killed, we know what we have lost in human and economic terms—not only a fine American boy who is lost to his family and his country, but whose intelligence and imagination, nurtured in freedom, gives us our qualitative superiority in the air. We are less aware of the loss sustained by death or injury to the man whose skill in maintaining the magic instrument box that keeps the pilot's B–47 jet effective in the air. In addition to his life and skill, and in addition to the untold suffering and anguish caused by injury, the loss of one repairman of these instrument boxes through occupational death or injury costs the Government an investment of 4 years and $22,500 in training, pay and allowances. We cannot afford this waste.

This is a dramatic instance of the importance of safety to world peace and survival. Every work injury is worse than one by enemy action because it is preventable.

Four decades of experience by industry, labor, and Government have taught us how to prevent over 90 percent of all work accidents. Despite that progress, last year 14,200 workers were killed and nearly 2 million injured on the job. These are not statistics—but the casualty list of our American economy in the peacetime year of 1955. We are shocked by newspaper headlines of a great disaster. Yet three times as many workers died on the job last year as in the Chicago fire, the Boston Coconut Grove night club fire, the Hartford circus fire, the sinking of the Titanic, the Johnstown flood, and the San Francisco earthquake combined.

Thet tremendous suffering of these workers and their families is immeasurable, and naturally transcends any economic losses involved. But the economic loss can be estimated, and is a factor with which businessmen must reckon. A rough estimate by one of our large insurance companies sets the employer's cost of a work injury at four times the cost of compensation. When a man is killed or permanently disabled, his production is lost not only at the time of the accident but for years to come. The 1955 work injuries cost our Nation a total of 193 million man-days of output—enough to produce 100 million refrigerators or cut and make 200 million men's suits, or make 1½ billion pairs of men's shoes, or fabricate more than 26,000 jet bombers, or build a million 6-room houses, or mine 2 billion tons of coal.

We can estimate, too, what a work injury will cost a worker in wages. For example, the average factory worker earned $76.52 a week in 1955. Suppose he were single and suffered a work injury in the State of Oregon. He would have lost $216.59 a month in wages. If he were married, he would have lost $191.99 a month. Suppose he were an average building craftsman earning $96.39 a week. If injured in Oregon and single, he would have lost $302.69 in wages each month; if married, $277.69. Maximum weekly benefits under the Oregon law—an unusually liberal one—would allow these injured men to live on only 30 to 40 percent of their previous monthly income. What would you and I do, if ill, in pain, and uncertain of our future earning capacity, we had to reduce our monthly living expenses by 60 to 70 percent?

This suffering and these costs need not happen. The Labor Department knows of 12 machinery plants which suffered less than one disabling injury per million man-hours worked in 1954. One such plant recorded 2.3 million hours without a disabling injury. On the other hand we know of 11 large plants with more than 1,000 employees each which suffered over 25 disabling injuries per million hours. If 12 plants can produce such a fine record, there is no reason why all the others can't also.

A frequency rate of 5 injuries per million man-hours is considered by most safety experts as very good. It is thoroughly practical. It has been achieved by many plants. Do you realize that if we could achieve that rate wherever people work in the United States, we would have had 1¼ million fewer injuries last year? With that completely achievable rate, we would have prevented two-thirds of our reported injuries. We would have had 238,000 fewer injuries in manufacturing, 225,000 fewer in trade, 228,000 fewer in agriculture.

How can we go about achieving such a rate? That's what this conference is for. Our problem is to convince those firms, who do not think safety is important or who think they cannot afford it, that safety is good business. A sound safety program pays the best dividends in the world.

How can we reach these firms? One way is through State labor departments who know the nonagricultural firms in their States. These departments are recognizing more and more that they cannot depend upon law alone to prevent accidents. Most work injuries today do not violate law but arise from a variety of other causes. The modern concept of a State labor department's service to industry is no longer that of a policeman but of a friendly and highly trained consultant.

If a State labor department is to realize this modern concept, if it is to build a competent, technical service, it needs the support of all of us. Governor Langlie will, I am sure, have a good deal to say about this today. What he has been able to achieve in Washington State can point the way for us all.

Another way to reach the unawakened firm is through community action. This, too, will be discussed tomorrow afternoon. That community safety programs can be effective is shown by one heavily industrialized county in Ohio whose 92 reporting firms—mostly engaged in fabricating iron and steel products—came up with a combined frequency rate of 5.5 last year. The Trumbull County Industrial Safety Committee has been at this game for a quarter century and had reduced their injury rate 75 percent in that time. They have the support of top management, the Ohio Industrial Commission, and their County Foremen's Club. Were they satisfied with their 5.5 frequency last year? No. Their goal had been "under 5 in 1955." So this year their goal is "4.6 in 1956." In 1955 they had an exposure of over 6¼ million man-hours and 29 of their 92 firms had perfect records—a frequency rate of 0.

How did they accomplish this? You can read their story in your complimentary conference issue of Safety Standards. Nor are they unique in Ohio. There are a number of similar community industrial safety programs throughout the State. I'm sure we can learn much from them that we can take back home and, I hope, put into practice.

Another way to reach the unawakened is by developing public understanding and support. At the 1954 conference you suggested we should utilize all the media of communication and that we have tried this year to do. President Eisenhower designated this week as Job Safety Week and called upon all citizens to join him in making it a success. This conference is the climax of the week. A number of Governors have issued similar proclamations and we are most grateful for the generous way in which they have helped bring before the people the importance of saving human life and limb in the workplaces of America. As the Federal Government's contribution to this observance the Federal Safety Council is sponsoring No Accident Week and using it as an occasion to stimulate safety meetings, training, and other safety activities.

In many other ways, we are trying to follow your suggestions of 2 years ago. They are all designed to reach men and women in every walk of life and arouse them to the horror of needless work injury and the necessity to preventing it. In a word, we go back to the community, to the neighborhood where people live and work. America's economic and social progress starts in the community, in the grassroots. The home is vitally important in motivating a safe community.

Fortunately the home was the one major area which last year reduced accidents, according to the National Safety Council. Safety in the home can influence safety at work, at school, on the highway, in the community. In other words, a safe home atmosphere reaches out into every activity of human life. Let us discover and utilize every motivation there is Let us incorporate safety into our daily life. Let us apply the skills that made this Nation an industrial giant to the problem of making it safe.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one will accuse the Wall Street Journal of rabble rousing or of being a prophet of gloom and doom. That is why the following item from the May 1, 1956, edition of the Wall Street Journal is so very interesting:

SMALL BUSINESS: EARNINGS CLIMB BUT SHORTAGE OF CAPITAL STYMIES BIGGER GAINS—DETROITER LOOKS FOR A LOAN FOR 6 YEARS—CHICAGOAN REJECTS $800,000 ORDERS—TAXES TAX A TOY RETAILER

"If I had $25,000 I could really rake in the money. I could run circles around a lot of people in this industry."

Those are the wistful words of youthful J. P. Dunnett, owner of J. P. Dunnett & Associates, a 4-year-old electronic engineering and sales concern in Detroit.

Mr. Dunnett's problem is shared by many a small-business man. The Nation's biggest business boom is bringing plentiful sales opportunities in many fields. But smaller concerns often haven't the money to build up inventories or to finance new plant facilities.

"We recently turned down three contracts totaling $800,000," says the vice president of a Chicago manufacturing concern. "We have the technical ability to produce $1.2 million in business a year and the finances to do about $500,000."

SMALL COMPANY SELLS OUT

A small manufacturer in Boston, after a fruitless search for additional capital, finally sold out to a bigger company. Says the owner: "I can make more working 40 to 50 hours a week for the larger company than I could working 80 to 100 hours for myself."

Wall Street Journal reporters talked with businessmen and bankers in 13 major cities across the United States. With few exceptions, the businessmen report earnings are running at high levels. But most of them claim they'd be doing better if they could locate additional capital.

After-tax earnings of the smallest business concerns—those with assets of less than $1 million—totaled $252 million at last report by the Small Business Administration in the third quarter of 1955. That's an increase of 37 percent from a year earlier and it's the highest quarterly figure since the April-June period of 1953, when small business profits totaled $264 million.

Officials of the SBA, the Government agency charged with watching over the little concerns, are confident that earnings have held at a high level since last year's third quarter.

HIGH TAXES, TIGHT CREDIT

Why is it difficult for small business to boost capital? Businessmen and bankers both mention high taxes, which make it tough for small concerns to build up capital from retained earnings. They also agree that there's a sharply limited market for new stock offerings by the smaller companies. Most businessmen—and a surprisingly large number of bankers—say small concerns usually bump into problems in lining up bank loans.

Small companies find long-term financing their chief problem.

SBA comparisons of companies with assets between $250,000 and $1 million and those with assets over $100 million point up the small concerns' greater reliance on short-term loans. In 1947, loans, notes, and accounts payable within 1 year amounted to 15.2 percent of the smaller concerns' assets. By the third quarter of 1955—the latest period for which figures are available—the 1-year debt had risen to 19.9 percent of assets.

For the biggest concerns, the trend was reversed. Debt payable within 1 year declined from 8.6 percent of assets in 1947 to 7.3 percent in last year's third quarter.

"The banks prefer to make their long-term loans to larger corporations," says Jules Abels, top economist of the SBA.

PROBLEMS GROW

Small business has always struggled with capital problems, of course. But many businessmen and bankers contend these problems have been growing steadily more severe, especially when viewed in the light of abundant sales opportunities.

"The spread between the opportunity to grow and the ability to finance growth seems to be greater now than at any time I can remember," says a Detroit banker.

"The chances of a small business becoming highly successful are growing smaller all the time, something we all hate to admit, but nevertheless a fact of business life today," comments an executive of a major Boston bank.

Among small-business men, taxes arouse more bitterness than any other single capital problem. "I don't know whether I'm working for Uncle Sam or myself," complains an angry Clevelander.

"After the year's figures are in, we might see a good profit on paper," says Ben Aaron, 1 of 3 partners in Aaron Bros., a Dallas distributor of women's apparel. "But after taking out living expenses and taxes, there's never enough left to finance any expansion."

Abraham Sinoff, vice president of Jacksonville's Toytown, Inc., a retail toy store, claims high taxes helped put his brother, Toytown's President Barney Sinoff, in the hospital with a heart attack. Says he: "We were working 12 to 18 hours a day—running the business, unloading trucks, waiting on customers, and so on—so we'd have something left after taxes."

FULBRIGHT BILL

Small-business men talk hopefully of a proposal introduced in Congress by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democract, of Arkansas, but now stymied in the Senate Finance Committee. The Fulbright bill would reduce to 22 percent from the present 30 percent the tax on corporate net earnings below $25,000 a year. At the same time, the rate on profits above $25,000 would be raised to 53 percent from the current 52 percent.

Other businessmen offer other solutions to the tax problem. A Bostonian suggests graduated tax rates for corporations, similar to those for individuals. "My company pays a lower rate on the first $25,000 of its earnings—but so does General Motors, and that wouldn't even pay the people who open the doors for them," he says. But he concludes: "My idea is probably socialistic."

Arthur B. Davies, an executive of the Smaller Manufacturers Council, affiliated with the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, has an even more radical suggestion: "Exempt up to $100,000 in profit, providing the company can show it put all the money back into the business. Any part that didn't go back into the business would be taxed."

An executive of Atlanta's Citizens & Southern National Bank says high taxes often push businessmen into questionable management practices—high salaries, bonuses, and expense accounts. In one case, C. & S. disposed of the assets of a concern forced into liquidation by creditors. Two of the assets: A Florida fishing camp and an over-sized yacht that had been at the personal disposal of the defunct company's president.

A LOT OF HURDLES

A small-business man who decides to build up his capital by selling common stock faces a lot of hurdles. "Investment banking houses generally steer clear of equity financing issues of small concerns," says the SBA's Mr. Abels.

"There is almost no risk capital available for small business," claims W. W. Faris, president of a St. Louis concern that makes minnow buckets, picnic jugs, and other sporting goods. "If something isn't done soon to correct the domination of the available supply of money by big companies, there won't be any small companies."

Frank B. Diamond, president of Philadelphia Securities Co., points to a Philadelphia food manufacturer, which he describes as "a good company with sound management." But, he adds, "they can't get capital. With this tax situation they can't build their net worth in relation to sales."

Small businesses generally are privately owned. Most of their owners would prefer to keep them that way. "If we go to public financing, we lose control of the business," explains Stanley L. Mead, who owns 31 percent of the stock of Package Containers, Inc., a Portland, Oreg., producer of paper and film bags that's now looking for capital. "We've just got the business going nicely and we don't like to lose control of it now."

George Lippincott, president of the 25-year-old Nic-L-Silver Battery Co. of Santa Ana, Calif., has needed some $250,000 for expansion for the past 5 years. He's finally had to sell stock to raise the money. "It doesn't look like taxes are ever going down enough to let us build up any capital, so I'm raising it the hard way," he says.

SEC MAY TIGHTEN UP

Stock sales may become even more difficult for small companies. The Securities & Exchange Commission, worried about recent heavy offerings of highly speculative securities is considering tightening of its regulations on stock issues under $300,000. The SBA is objecting, contending that the proposed rules would "handicap" legitimate financing by small companies.

High taxes also discourage individuals from putting up funds for small business—either through stock purchases or loans. "High rates make people hesitate to take risks," says Robert Williams, vice president of Philadelphia's Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank. "They feel the risk is all theirs while they get only a part of the profit."

Another Philadelphia banker, Vice President A. L. Raffetto, of Philadelphia National Bank, claims the plight of the small business man has been recognized and that loans of up to 5 years have grown in popularity. But he admits: "We don't necessarily go out looking for this business."

Milton Burns, owner of a Detroit office supply store, claims he has been looking for a loan, without success, for the full 6 years that he has been in his present business. He says: "Banks have been of absolutely no help to me."

When a small-business man finds a bank that will lend him money, he usually pays a higher interest rate than a big company. "The smaller concern has to pay more because it's a poorer risk than a big company," says a Boston banker.

The size of the loan is a factor, too. It costs a bank more to process 10 $10,000 loans than it would to handle 1 $100,000 loan.

A Federal Reserve System survey of banks in major cities shows that the average rate on short-term business loans of less than $10,000 during 1955 was 5 percent, compared with 3.5 percent for loans of $200,000 and more.

Tighter money is making bank loans even more costly. New York City banks recently boosted the prime rate—the rate on loans to the biggest borrowers with the best credit ratings—to 3¾ percent from 3½ percent. In some cases, rates for smaller borrowers were boosted even more. "When I applied for a loan last week, my bank told me my rate had been raised from 5 percent to 5½ percent," reports one New York City wholesaler.

FEDERAL HELP WANTED

Several businessmen argue that more liberal Government loans to small business are needed. Complains Mr. Davies, of the Pittsburgh Smaller Manufacturers Council: "If you can get a loan from the Small Business Administration now, you can certainly get it from a bank. You can't get an SBA loan unless you sign away your property and your wife's property."

Some businessmen are hopeful about the spread of business development corporations. These privately financed organizations, providing loans to small business, have been largely limited to the Northeast. But they're spreading. In Georgia, for example, the State chamber of commerce, assisted by a committee of Georgia bankers, has agreed to launch a development corporation this year.

Small-business-capital problems in many cases stem from poor management, bankers are careful to assert. A businessman often fails to provide for sufficient capital when he starts out. According to a New York City banker, this lack of foresight is especially evident in wholesaling and retailing.

"A salesman breaks away from an existing concern—he thinks the boss is making too much money—and sets up for himself," this banker explains. "Then he sudenly discovers that he needs a lot more money than he had thought to carry inventories and accounts receivable."

Fred F. Stadelhofer, president of San Francisco's Berkeley Pump Co., sees one solution to small-business-capital problems: Merge with a bigger company. "At least from my own experience," he says, sadly, "I can't see any other way."

Still My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the press

called attention to the fact that some years ago some Members of Congress, who believed that one's loyalty should be given first to his own country, were supporting Hitler. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

One referred to in that article was our former colleague, Hamilton Fish. He recently issued a statement which reads as follows:

THE TIDE HAS TURNED AGAINST INTERNATIONALISM

(Statement by former Representative Hamilton Fish, of New York, May 28, 1956)

This is an answer to the veiled implications that Nazi money was given in 1940 to the National Committee To Keep America Out of War. I was chairman of the committee, composed of 50 Members of the House of Representatives and a few former Members, and I welcome the opportunity to defend its actions and all of its members.

We had only one objective: To keep America out of the European conflict, representing the sentiment of 85 percent of the American people according to public opinion polls at that time. We raised approximately $4,000, sufficient for our purposes of using every legitimate means to keep us out of war, including one advertisement in the New York Times just prior to the Republican convention in 1940. We never received, and never were offered, any Nazi money. There is not an iota of evidence of any kind that a single cent was ever given to the committee.

I have been asked why the State Department released this dead cat 16 years afterward, and whether it was routine procedure or premeditated for political purposes. If I thought it was a political release made in desperation to head off the rising tide of Americanism, I would denounce Secretary Dulles without reservations, and the New Deal internationalist holdovers in the Department, for another attempt to smear the 1940 Republican noninterventionists who represented 85 percent of the people, and who in 1952 still constituted one-half of the Republican Party under the leadership of Senator Taft.

In the last year, the pendulum has swung back and I believe today that once again a large majority of the Republican Party is opposed to our huge foreign handouts, to making the NATO a world government, and are in favor of the Bricker amendment. If Secretary Dulles wants to debate our foreign handouts and one worldism, without dead cats, I accept the challenge. The overwhelming rejection of Senator WILEY by the Republican convention in Wisconsin, where the Republican Party was born; and the withdrawal of Senator GEORGE because of opposition to his intense internationalism and support of foreign handouts, are significant political-opinion straws indicating distaste of our extreme internationalistic policies. Public opinion is now once again in favor of placing our own American interests first.

I was proud to be associated with such Americans in 1940 as Senators Taft, Vandenberg, Wheeler, Reynolds, Walsh, Nye, Clark of Missouri, Clark of Idaho, Johnson of Colorado, and a host of Congressmen, including Representative Joseph Martin, who realized that the lend-lease bill was a phony war measure—the money and arms to be followed by soldiers and war. Today, many of the supporters of the lend-lease bill admit it was a war measure, including Editor Sulzberger of the New York Times. It was forced through the Congress by the most outrageous use of patronage and political influence. I denounced the presidential campaign of 1940 as the grossest fraud ever perpetrated on the American people. President Roosevelt proclaimed his love of peace by promising the American fathers and mothers again and again and again that their sons would never have to fight in foreign lands. And Willkie afterward called his own speeches mere campaign oratory. After F. D. R. won, he exerted his vast powers to incite us into war. I agree with Ambassador Claire Luce that President Roosevelt maneuvered and lied us into war against the wishes of the American people.

I know nothing about the dead cat release of the State Department except what I have read in the newspapers. Senator MUNDT, then a Representative, led 20 Members of Congress to the Republican National Convention in 1940, to urge an antiwar plank, and succeeded in having a very strong one written. No Member of Congress was paid his traveling expenses to Philadelphia. Our committee had ample funds if anyone had required $20 for such expenses. It is obvious to me that the Nazi telegraphic suggestion to provide $60,000 for numerous newspaper ads was rejected, as no such ads were ever published except in the New York Times, which out committee paid for. There would have been nothing legally wrong if our committee had taken money from any source, a year and a half before Pearl Harbor, but it did not. For every dollar Germany spent to keep us out of war, Britain spent millions to drag us in. I wonder why the State Department release contained no reference to the vast sums, amounting to many millions of dollars, spent for British propaganda in the United States in order to drag us into World War II? How much of these huge sums came from lend-lease money or actually from our own taxpayers to involve us in a war against the wishes of our taxpayers and of most of the American people?

I am proud of the fact that up to Pearl Harbor I did everything in my power to keep us out of war. I voted for war after Pearl Harbor, but what a tragedy it turned out to be. We had a million casualties, spent $300 billion to destroy Germany and Japan—the only powerful barriers to the spread of world communism. A mad Hitler was replaced by an even madder Stalin, and 70 million Germans by 700 million Communists. Now we are trying to placate West Germany, Japan, and Spain, and make military allies of them. We have spent over 50 billions since the war in foreign handouts, and the more we spend, the more we are hated because Britain, France, and Italy fear we are trying to drag them into world war III. The truth is that the result of the Second World War, which we entered to save the liberty of Poland and the smaller nations, was that we threw them to the dogs and communism, which has taken over half of the world. What a tragedy and travesty it has all been. The American people are just beginning to realize the ghastly blunders of our war-making internationalism. We are now confronted by world communism, a frightful, evil, dangerous, and powerful force which is determined, by fair or foul means, to communize the entire world.

In my opinion, the members of the National (Congressional) Committee To Keep America Out of War should be awarded medals for meritorious service, for their efforts to keep out of war instead of being subjected to snide smear attacks 16 years later. If it had not been for the activities of this entire antiwar committee, President Roosevelt would have involved us in war 6 months or a year before Pearl Harbor, and then Germany would never had attacked Russia on June 21, 1941. In all probability, we would have been fighting Germany and Soviet Russia, and might have lost the war, or it might have been a deadlock, with millions of American soldiers sacrificed in vain.

I am reminded of other unfair and untrue smear attacks made on me. I was accused of renting my house in New York to Otto Von Keip, the German consul general, and raising the rent twice. The fact is that it was my father's house, and the rent was reduced twice, and some years later Otto Von Keip led the conspiracy on Hitler's life and was tortured to death. He was never a Nazi.

Again in 1938, when I was chairman of the military affairs committee of the New York State Constitutional Convention, I introduced a bill to outlaw the Bundists and Communists from arming, parading, and marching in uniform. Fritz Kuhn, the Bundist leader, came up to Albany to oppose the bill. I never had met him before or seen him since, but someone took a picture of him asking me at the hearing for an opportunity to oppose my bill, and thereupon circulated 100,000 copies, stating that I was affiliated with him.

There are other smears that I remember, but time will not permit discussing them. But one thing is positive: There is not one word of truth in any of them. No one has ever questioned my integrity or Americanism, except possibly some fanatical Communists. However, I am not interested in making any defense of myself except to keep the record clear that I and my nonintervention colleagues fought a valiant fight to keep America out of war in 1940 and 1941, and only lost when we were maneuvered into war through the back door by President Roosevelt issuing a secret war ultimatum to Japan 10 days before Pearl Harbor to get out of China and Manchuria. Secretary of War Stimson called it a war ultimatum in his memoirs.

The repudiation of Senator WILEY and the withdrawal of Senator GEORGE will have a discouraging and terrifying effect on the internationalists and one-worlders. The time has come for a complete revision of our foreign policies, no matter how agonizing it may be to some misguided internationalists and one-worlders.

Magna est veritas et praevalebit—the truth is mighty and will prevail.

Furor Over Bill Baseless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much interest shown in H. R. 6376, the bill to provide for mental health of the citizens of Alaska, that I am inserting the following column of Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the Los Angeles Examiner of March 16, 1956, on the subject:

FUROR OVER BILL BASELESS

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—A bill known as the Alaska mental health bill, passed by the House and pending before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is creating one of the strangest political phenomena of recent years.

The phenomenon lies in the inordinate number of protests being received in Washington against the measure. I have received, literally, hundreds of letters protesting bitterly against the bill. I have had telephone calls to the same effect from California, Texas, and other parts of the country. Members of Congress report identical reactions.

The accepted mode of reference is to call it the American Siberia bill. Critics view it as part of a nefarious plot to set up a vast concentration camp to which enemies of whatever administration currently is in power, could be railroaded on any pretext.

Actually, the principal sponsors of the measure are the residents of Alaska; its pur-

pose is to authorize the Territorial government to set up its own mental institutions and operate them, and to provide rules and regulations for commitment and admittance of persons to those institutions.

PATIENTS FAR FROM KIN

Congress enacted legislation back in 1900 providing that the Governor of Alaska (who was and still is appointed by the President and is a Federal officer) should contract for the care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane. This contracting power was transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Congress in 1905 by legislation which still is in force, and under which all Alaskans adjudged mentally incompetent have been sent to a private sanitarium in Portland, Oreg.

Understandably, the people of Alaska have become increasingly insistent that provision be made for treatment of mentally ill Alaskans within the Territory. Their biggest argument is that under the present setup, relatively few Alaskans with loved ones suffering mentally, have the financial means to go to Portland to visit them.

Opponents have chosen as their primary target a provision granting 1 million acres of federally owned land to the Territorial Government, contending that the only reason for such a vast land grant would be to create a huge reservation to house untold numbers of people.

INCOME FOR WELFARE WORK

But the purpose of the grant is to assist Alaska in financing the program. Traditionally, the Federal Government makes land grants to Territories and young States to assist them in financing educational and other welfare programs. Income from sale, lease or other use of the 1 million acres is to be used for the mental health program.

Another objection involves the bill's provisions for commitment of individuals to mental hospitals. On this one, there appears to be legitimate grounds for objection. An eminent Washington attorney who is familiar with commitment procedures and cases, says these provisions should be tightened in several respects to provide more adequate safeguards for individuals.

These objections have been brought to the attention of members of the Senate committee considering the bill, and they predict necessary revisions will be made.

One observer suggests the widespread protests are symptomatic of a growing distrust of government in general. It's the most plausible explanation I've heard.

Twenty Years of Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a speech made by me on the agricultural situation over the past 20 years. The speech is as follows:

This is the 20th anniversary of a project that has been of tremendous value to the American people. It had its beginning in the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana—the district I have the honor to represent.

Twenty years ago a demonstration project was established on the Brushey and Cooley Creeks watersheds near Minden, in Webster Parish, La. With alternating enthusiasm and doubt, a group of men set out to test the visions and dreams of a man who had for a long time been "crying in the wilderness" in a vain attempt to warn the people of America against the devastating effects of soil erosion.

The Soil Erosion Service was created by Executive order in the Department of the Interior in 1933 to demonstrate on a farm-wide, watershed basis that by application of all known practical conservation measures something could be done to stop this enemy of our national economy.

That demonstration was a tremendous success. It proved that erosion can be controlled through practices that are of immediate benefit to the landowners. It also proved that most erosion control practices can be applied by landowners using the equipment, power, and labor available on the farms being treated.

It is with great pride that I mention the fact that my native State passed the first Soil Conservation District Act which made it possible for farmers to organize soil conservation districts to conserve and improve land resources. Since that date most of the States have passed similar laws and today the soil conservation district movement is national in scope.

It is well to remember that early settlers in this country had no problems of erosion for the reason that under virgin conditions the surface soil was protected and held in place by grasses, trees, and other vegetation. This topsoil was filled with spongy organic matter, holding rainwater until it could soak into the ground to replenish subterranean acquifers, thereby maintaining high underground water level and rendering no damage to the land surface by rushing down the slopes to overflow the streams.

It has been charged that farmers invited soil erosion by their unsound land use. I have heard this denied by men and women who closely observed conditions during the latter part of the last century. They vehemently claim that soil erosion was unheard of until after commercial sawmills denuded the forests and destroyed the source of the spongy material that once covered the surface of the earth and held the rainfall.

Whoever may be guilty of the crime, unmistakably the corpus delicti lies before us. Unfortunately we cannot bury it; we are forced to live with it.

It is estimated that the annual cost of erosion in the United States, in wasted soil and reduction of crop yields, amounts to approximately $4 billion.

Surveys made in Louisiana by the Soil Conservation Service show that erosion has removed all of the topsoil from more than 170,000 acres; that 200,000 acres have lost 80 percent of the topsoil; and that 60 percent of the topsoil is gone from 1,400,000 acres.

It is scarcely necessary to remind you that we depend on topsoil for our production of food, clothing, and much of our shelter. Most of the soluble nutrients available to growing plants are found in the topsoil. The loss of any portion of it reduces the ability of fields to produce, for the reason that it contains a high percentage of organic matter.

Referring specifically to my native State, we suffer additional damage from unchecked soil erosion in States north of us. Floodwaters which rush down upon us come from watersheds that are mostly barren of forests or cover of any sort. Unchecked on eroded uplands, water builds up in Louisiana's stream channels, clogging them with sediment and debris to result in destruction of food and cover for wildlife. For many years commercial fishing played an important part in our State's economy. But soil erosion in Louisiana and in northward neighboring States has produced silt-laden waters which are detrimental to the propagation of fish.

However, I am happy to report that great progress is being made in Louisiana toward protection of soil and restoration of its fertility. Conservation surveys there have determined the proper land-use capabilities. They show that we have four kinds of land from the standpoint of proper use, namely, lands suitable for continuous cultivation, lands suitable for limited or occasional cultivation, lands suitable only for the growing of grass or trees, and lands suitable only for fish, wildlife, or recreation.

Four years ago the western gulf region of the Soil Conservation Service sounded this warning:

"Soil erosion is one of the biggest tasks Louisiana ever had. Planning the necessary conservation practices and fitting them to the land according to its capabilities and needs were an enormous undertaking. It required millions of many-days of skilled and unskilled labor, technical assistance, and work with heavy and light equipment to accomplish the task. If Louisiana had been afraid to tackle a big job and see it through to completion, the situation would have been hopeless."

It is pleasing to be assured that while the task has not, as yet, been completed, the situation is far from hopeless.

For several years I have been gravely concerned about our water-use, or more specifically stated, I have been apprehensive of our lack of serious planning for future water-use. If, in the future, we are as indifferent toward water-use as the two preceding generations were of forestry-use and land-use, the next immediate generation is going to find itself in a precarious situation. Our streams are polluted and our ground-water level is becoming distressingly low. A friend of mine relates that he sat at his desk and from memory listed 50 bubbling springs of pure and potent water that were bold and inviting to him as a young man 40 years ago, not 1 of which is visible today. I am told in my district that many shallow wells which were once generous in their production of pure water, are today either bone-dry or polluted beyond safe usage.

What has caused this distressing change?

It all goes back to improper use of our once bounteous timbered areas. When we denuded the forests we invited soil erosion which is the proximate cause of our present diminution of surface and underground water supply. We left nothing on the land to hold the rainwater or sponge it long enough for it to seep into the soil and into the fresh-water acquifers that were once so bountiful and dependable. In regard to our water supply, the future is rather dismal.

However, it is gratifying to learn that the Soil Conservation Service is including proper water use in its plans for the future, realizing that if we are to conserve our soil and protect our sources of water supply, we have got to grow trees or vegetation of some sort on every acre of land that we do not need for intensive cultivation.

I do not agree with the statement of the disgruntled old gentleman who acquired from his neighbors the nickname "Pessimistic Pete." When the overflow came and destroyed his cotton crop, Pessimistic Pete whined mournfully, "All nature is against man." And the following year when drought and heat burned his corn crop he gave tongue to the same plaint, "All nature is against man."

It seems to me the reverse of that statement is more nearly the truth. Hasn't man been against all nature? At any rate, the fact remains that whether the farmers or the commercial sawmillers invited soil erosion and coincidental water troubles, it behooves

man of this generation to rectify those mistakes.

In that portion of Louisiana which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, the two oldest subdivisions of service are known as the Saline Soil Conservation District and the Dorcheat Soil Conservation District. The recent annual reports from these two districts reflect considerable progress. The Dorcheat reports disclose that, "During the past year, 2,891 acres were given improved woodland management practices and 1,686 acres were selectively cut. Pine seedlings were planted on more than 1,100 unproductive acres." These reports enumerate the progress that is being made in soil conservation practices, under such headings as, "Planning and Application of Conservation Practices," but the general subject is too broad for discussion at this time.

We ordinarily think of soil conservation as a means of restoring fertility to land in order that we may grow more crops. But I am more definitely concerned with what conservation practices will do for future generations in order that those who follow this generation will not condemn us too bitterly for spoiling that which we only had a right to use with care and skill.

The recent report from the Saline district shows:

"Plans are made to apply woodland management to 11,096 acres of woodland on lands of our new cooperators. The district as a whole actually applied woodland management to 7,833 acres."

In order to give you a picture of what the Soil Conservation Service is doing, please consider for a moment the results of that agency's mismanagement of two tracts of land in my district that were acquired by the Federal Government during the depression. This land was classified as submarginal, that is to say, it was considered worthless for row crops. There are 12,624 acres in the project near Minden and 18,533 acres near Homer.

Last year those 2 projects, under management of the Louisiana Division of the Soil Conservation Service, brought in a revenue of $153,678 from forest products, grazing permits and concession fees. In lieu of taxes which would be paid to the parish if the land were privately owned, the project pays each year a percentage of its earnings. Last year Claiborne Parish received $1.36 per acre and Webster Parish got $1.03 per acre, whereas comparable nearby land, privately owned, paid a tax of 21 cents per acre in Webster and 16 cents per acre in Claiborne.

One other figure concerning these two projects and I will leave with you conclusive proof that we can afford to cover every slope and hillside in the entire South with growing pines and at the same time be helping nature recover her balance and again to function in a manner that will assure us of productive soil and a bountiful water supply.

Under 5 years of management by the Louisiana Soil Conservation Service, those 2 tracts of submarginal land have produced, chiefly from trees, a total revenue of $616,571. And that timber is increasing in production as the years pass on and the land on which it grows is regaining its fertility. The cost of this management has been nominal. Mother Nature has been the boss and the conservation boys have listened attentively to her.

To January 1, 1953, 6 soil conservation districts have been organized within the area that I represent, consisting of a total of 6,626,900 acres and representing 31,461 farms. There is much of which I could boast concerning the achievements of the soil conservation as applied in the fourth Louisiana congressional district. I would like to point out to you the democratic manner in which districts are formed and operated and how the farmers themselves take the initiative and assume the obligations. There is much to say about the practices as applied to contour farming, strip cropping, terraces, cover cropping, et cetera, but I am restricting my discussion to those practices of soil erosion which more directly concern the future water use and resources.

Our land and water resources are the very foundation of our fabulous industrial and agricultural strength. They are the principal source of our wealth. Our great cities, with all their complex activities, are dependent directly on these resources. Ours is the highest standard of living on earth and it has been built largely on the abundance and fruitfulness of our land and water.

You may think it strange that I am apprehensive of our general neglect of water resources, particularly since Louisiana has an annual rainfall of upwards of 50 inches. Millions of acre-inches of water pass daily down our bayous and rivers, and yet I rejoice to find in the last annual report of activities in the fourth congressional district such items as:

	Acres
Pasture improvement	393,035
Seeding of pastures	245,961
Woodland management	255,421
Tree planting	41,030

Such items reassure me that some day in the future we will have trees growing on every acre of land that is not needed for intensive cultivation of crops. Trees covering our slopes and hillsides mean better soil and more abundance of pure water.

Time does not permit me to pay deserved tribute to the Agricultural Extension Department and the Louisiana Forestry Commission in their efforts to augment the general plan of growing forests for the protection of soil and the prevention of a future water famine.

Such a project does not entail the expenditure of a large sum of money. Protection from fire is the most expensive item in the program, which means that someone must be assigned the task of protecting nature against the carelessness and indifference of man.

Let's give nature a chance to restore the balance which we have so ruthlessly disturbed.

However, in fairness to "Pessimistic Pete" let me admit that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Farmers are no longer independent of other phases of economy. There was a time when young men chose to be farmers because that life assured them of almost perfect aloofness from all other activities. They could act independently of the towns and cities. But this is no longer true. Farming has become a part of the fabric of our total economy. Tractors, motor trucks, combines, hay balers, and other mechanical equipment are necessary and make farmers dependent upon the factories who have built for them 4 million tractors, 4 million automobiles, and 2 million trucks, all of which use fuel and lubricating oil that help force farmers into the lifeline of trade and make them dependent upon many industrial enterprises.

Mechanizing the farm has not only brought the farmer into closer contact with industry, but it has changed his manner and standard of living. And it has also reduced his ranks, that is numerically.

Total agricultural production of the United States was harvested in 1952 with a half-million fewer workers than were used in 1950. Yet the harvest was approximately equal to the high records reached in 1948 and 1949. In other words, a half million fewer workers were needed in 1952 to harvest bigger production than was had 2 years previously.

The use of mechanical devices and the utilization of gasoline and electric power have combined to change the economic status of the farm family. The availability of electric power has done more to raise the living standard of rural people than any other innovation within my memory. Of the approximately 5 million farms in the United States, nearly half of them now depend upon electric power.

Who made this power available to rural people?

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Executive order on May 11, 1935. The following year an act of Congress was passed which gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year lending program. In 1944 this authority was extended indefinitely, leaving to Congress the authority to determine each year the amount of funds REA may lend.

The basic policy of REA is to render "certain technical advice and assistance to its borrowers * * * and to assist rural people in doing things which they cannot do for themselves." The plan of the REA is democracy at its best. It provides credit for rural families who want to help themselves and furnishes technical guidance when needed. "Each borrower is an entirely independent corporate body, locally owned and controlled, and existing pursuant to applicable State laws, and each such borrower is itself responsible for the management of its own affairs, proper and successful construction and operation of its own system, and the repayment of the REA loan."

REA itself operates no rural-electric facilities, and its program involves no grants or subsidies. Its loans are paid out of the operating revenues of the locally owned and locally managed co-op organization.

The rural people of Louisiana have availed themselves of the opportunities offered by the REA. As of June 8, 1953, there are in that comparatively small land-area State 12,812 subscribers represented by 10 co-op organizations that have borrowed a total of $4,610,000 with which to construct many miles of powerlines.

These powerlines are a network of security. They relieve the mind and the body of many vexing and fatiguing problems and tasks. They pump water and keep it flowing through the home; they cook food, wash clothes and dishes; they milk cows and supply lights to the home and the barn; they provide communications with the doctor, with neighbors, and markets. Those lines are there because rural people put them there through their own initiative and labor, with assistance from an enlightened Government.

In October of 1949 the REA was authorized to make loans to local telephone co-ops for the purpose of constructing and operating telephone facilities. As an interest rate of 2 percent, loans totaling $106 million have been approved for borrowers from the different States of the Union.

It is important to note that commercial utilities companies supplied, last year, about 54 percent of the power used by rural consumers. However, in addition to the power purchased during the fiscal year 1952, REA borrowers used 649 million kilowatt-hours generated in their own plants.

Science has spread to the farms and the intelligent use of it has brought about many changes during the past century. Perhaps the rural family is again taking a prominent place in the social, political, and economic life of the Nation.

When this country was young, the farmer—particularly the planter of the South—enjoyed the highest standards of living American society had experienced. The Civil War, followed by discriminating legislation, such as differential freight rates and high tariff on manufactured imports, completely reversed the situation and the rural agricul-

tural South became, in the words of the late President Roosevelt, "the Nations No. 1 economic problem."

Through such subsidies a vast discrepancy developed between prices the farmer had to pay for what he bought and the prices obtained for what he produced, and out of this unbalanced economy there emerged legislation that sought to remedy the situation. Agriculture had at last become a basic industry, closely meshed into our complex system of economy. Industry, labor, and agriculture became dependent one upon the other. Farmers demanded and deserved full-parity prices for farm products and parity income for farm people. It is true that this objective cannot be obtained by Government programs alone, nevertheless, the farmer needs some protection against changing international relationships which quickly affect prices of farm products, over which he has no control.

Earlier in this talk I called attention to the fact that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Everyone who is interested in agriculture or who speaks or writes about farm families and rural people should make some effort to comprehend the word "parity." I particularly commend to certain city newspaper columnists the following definition of the very much misunderstood word:

"The parity of an agricultural commodity, generally speaking, is the price which will give the commodity the same purchasing power as it had during a given base period in terms of (1) prices of commodities farmers buy, (2) interest on mortgage indebtedness, (3) taxes on farm real estate, and (4) for most commodities, wage rates for hired farm labor.

"The parity price of an individual farm commodity, in other words, is a standard for measuring the purchasing power of that commodity in relation to prices of goods and services during a definite base period."

Through the influence and direction of the USDA the southern farmer has been getting away from the so-called one-crop system and turning much of his acreage into pastures. As a consequence, the dairying and beef cattle industries have expanded while cotton production has decreased. During this same period of time cotton production has increased in some of the far-Western States. Sufficient time has not elapsed to determine that the South should sacrifice her traditional superiority in cotton culture in favor of animal husbandry, nor have those Western States had ample time to assure them that they should plow up their pastures and plant them in cotton. For better or for worse, the South has been far more than a century and a half the throne of Old King Cotton. And the prevailing economy of 150 years cannot be shifted abruptly without deplorable consequences.

There are many phases of agriculture which I would like to discuss, such as reciprocal trade agreements, trade expansion with foreign countries, foreign agricultural service and technical assistance, all of which are important factors in our national economy and of particular interest to rural people. However, I must acknowledge that no one could completely cover, in less than a book-length treatise, all the "Problems and Progress in Agriculture."

Even so, I consider it a duty, as well as a privilege, to express my high regard for work done by the Animal Husbandry Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry. I am amazed at the network service provided farmers by these divisions of the USDA, reaching down through their affiliates to the State livestock sanitary boards. May I cite only one example of accomplishment?

Five years ago that dreaded animal plague known as foot-and-mouth disease had spread over an area of nearly 260,000 square miles. Farmers in my section were alarmed. In fact, there was danger to the cattle of the entire Nation. To wipe out this scourge, it was necessary to kill almost a million cattle, sheep, hogs, and goats. Vaccination was administered to more than 60 million animals. These agricultural agencies of the United States were forced to spend about $123 million to carry out our part of the program in conjunction with Mexico, but that money was spent wisely and effectively.

We hear some growling about the tremendous sums that the National and State Governments spend on agriculture. But we haven't seen that man, woman, or child who wants to stop eating, wearing clothes, living in houses, and covering their feet with shoes. We haven't talked to a single historian who refused to admit that we won two world wars largely because we outproduced the enemy, nor have we talked to one who refuses to admit that our ability to grow food and clothing and to produce materials of war is our greatest deterrent against attack by the Communists. We haven't seen that person who isn't grateful to farmers for what they did during the last World War. Remember, farmers were called upon to do the impossible. And they did. They actually produced four times the amount of commodities called upon to produce.

But with our rapidly increasing population, how far away is that fatal day when our soil can no longer produce enough food, clothing, shelter, and water to sustain the people? How long before we reach the saturation point? Will it be a century from now, or will it be 80 years, or only 50 years from now?

Shouldn't we of this generation open our eyes and watch the jaws of the stupendous pincers steadily closing? Those jaws are someday going to squeeze the very life out of us if we don't begin right now making plans to avoid that catastrophe.

Shouldn't we open our eyes and see the terrible threat to our economic safety that is so evident in the rapid increase of population and so obvious in our diminution of water and land resources?

What countries are always the source of unrest? The pages of history unmistakably answer that question. Wars are started by and in those nations where populations have grown beyond the ability of land and water resources adequately to sustain them.

Where is communism flourishing today? In what lands has that evil doctrine taken root? The answer is:

In those parts of Asia and Europe where 1 acre of land is required to support 80 people. That's the answer, fellow Americans.

With our natural increase in population, plus our far too liberal laws that haphazardly govern immigration, how many years before every acre of our soil will be called upon to furnish 80 people with food, water, clothing, and shelter?

And yet there is demand from some quarters that we increase the immigration quotas during the next 2 years by admitting an additional thousands of Europeans. This demand is supported largely by tear-jerking stories.

The people of my district are sick and tired of tax burdens for the purpose of supplying peoples of foreign countries who thank us by a kick in the teeth. The people of my district don't want those huge quotas of aliens here to hasten the fatal day when our soil may no longer be able to sustain the population. Why should we be continually called upon to give, give, give and keep on giving to sustain some of them at home and at the same time called upon to bring great numbers of them to the United States to hasten the day when our land can no longer sustain the people?

In my opinion, immigration agreements with each country should be on an exchange basis, reciprocal in number. Example: We accept a thousand people from Shang-ri-la if there are a thousand Americans who want to go to Shang-ri-la.

I shed no tears with those who misinterpret Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Abel had disappeared under suspicious circumstances and when Cain was asked, "Where is Abel thy brother?" the killer replied, "I know not: Am I my brother's keeper?"

And the murderer's sentence was pronounced in these words, "When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

I don't find in this Biblical story any suggestion that we Americans should be classed as murderers among nations. I see no suggestion that we should run the risk of destroying our economy in order that we sustain peoples of the world in their own kitchens until they decide they'd fare better by coming to ours. It is shameful to distort the meaning of Biblical phrases in order to play upon human emotions.

These grave problems, which I have stated very simply, are being seriously pondered by the cotton farmers along the fertile Red River Delta and by the dairymen and cattlemen of the same area, as well as by the hill farmers who are wisely turning most of their land into the growing of grass and trees.

The fathers and grandfathers of these hill farmers were accused of the crime of depleting the soil by unsound farming. They were charged with inviting erosion. I seriously doubt their guilt. I think their only offense against the general economy was the selling of their timber for a mere pittance of what it was worth. It may not be unjust to accuse them of being accessories to the fact, because they permitted their slopes and hillsides to become denuded and made barren of trees.

This being the 20th anniversary of the soil-saving demonstration that was begun in the 4th Congressional District of Louisiana, I ask for the privilege of congratulating those people and saying to them that if it is true that each generation merely has the right of trusteeship over our natural resources, then they, the farmers, have demonstrated beyond peradventure that the precious treasures of this country are in trustworthy hands.

Let's Help Our Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of bringing to the House the mutual security bill, I believe it important that every Member read the following item which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 31, 1956:

PAKISTAN NEED FOR UNITED STATES AID STRESSED

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Continuation of approximately the current level of American economic aid to Pakistan over the next 4 years should make possible the success of that nation's current 5-year development plan.

Pakistan Ambassador Mohammed Ali gave that estimate this week during a discussion with newsmen of the plan for the period ending March 31, 1960.

The aim is to increase Pakistan's national income by some 20 percent gross or about 12½ percent when allowing for a 1.5 percent annual population increase. Present population is around 80 to 82 million.

Main goals of the plan, which tends to emphasize agriculture over industry, are to increase foreign exchange earnings, create 2 million new jobs, raise food grain output by 13 percent, extend the village development program, irrigate 3 million acres of new land and make other irrigation improvements, add 580,000 kilowatts of electric power, build 250,000 new housing units, boost hospital beds from 23,000 to 32,000, add 3,000 post offices as well as 35,000 new telephone connections.

The Ambassador declared that Pakistan "cannot keep up its heavy military expenditures" as a member of both the Baghdad and SEATO defense pacts "unless we can build up our economy with help from those foreign nations which believe in the same things we do."

Currently, American aid is running at about $145 million a year, he said, other than purely defense aid but including surplus agricultural exports and other nondevelopmental help. From the Colombo plan nations Pakistan is obtaining about $25 to $30 million a year while World Bank loans the past 2 years have averaged about $20 million annually.

Pakistan estimates that its 5-year plan will cost $2,436,000,000 in all with a gap of $882 million which can only be met by foreign help. Allowing $84 million anticipated from private foreign investment, the other $798 million is hoped for from the United States, the Colombo plan and the World Bank with perhaps some additional loans through the newly created International Finance Corporation.

Mohammed Ali said that it is Pakistan's hope "to stand on our own feet for the most part at the end of the plan."

Washington Lithographer Perfects Zinc Plate Process for Making Fine Prints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star magazine of May 6, 1956, reported that a young Washington, D. C., lithographer has developed a zinc plate process for making fine prints. His results prove that stone is not the only satisfactory vehicle for lithographs. The ancient process of using a heavy stone for printing lithographs was felt to be cumbersome by Jack Perlmutter, a Federal employee who works at the Navy's Hydrographic Office in Washington as a lithographer, so he experimented with light zinc plates.

As is usually the case with those who break new paths, Mr. Perlmutter was warned that "you'll never get the same effects. You can't beat the old tried-and-true method." And, as is usual, also, this inventive young man worked nights, sometimes until the small hours, perfecting his process. The reward for his persistence is that today his lithographs are in the permanent collections of our finest museums, including New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Philadelphia Museum, the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, the Library of Congress, and the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

Her husband's consuming interest in lithography aroused her own interest to such an extent that Mrs. Perlmutter, who is also a painter in addition to her full-time job as mother to two lively daughters, studied intensively to become a professional lithographer herself.

In addition to his other activities, Mr. Perlmutter helped establish an adult education art center at District Teachers College where he teaches a class in painting. With his usual drive he also helped establish an art gallery at the college for firsthand study by the students.

The article describing Mr. Perlmutter's work was written by Mrs. Joyce Field, able president of the Society of Washington Artists. The Society of Washington Artists is one of the more important cultural organizations in the Nation's Capital, and its members through the years have worked hard to make the Federal City a cultural center. The article from the Washington Star follows:

PROLIFIC PERLMUTTERS
(By Joyce Field)

Step into the Perlmutter household and you are immediately lost in a bewildering maze of easels, canvases, lithographs, paints, zinc plates, brushes, and frames of every size and shape. And the wet paint warnings in the living room do not pertain to a freshly decorated wall or varnished trim, but to the new art creation lying on the couch or perched on an easy chair. The home of Jack and Norma Perlmutter, 3826 Halley Terrace SE., is not so much a dwelling to live in as a haven to work in.

During the day, Mr. Perlmutter is employed at the Navy's Hydrographic Office as a lithographer. Evenings, he is always at his easel or drawing board. Three years ago, he joined a new project at District Teachers College: An adult education art center where he teaches a class in painting. His vibrant enthusiasm is caught by his students and reflected in their work. With his usual drive, he has helped establish an art gallery at the college for professional art exhibits and firsthand study for the student.

Any art lover, student or ordinary layman who just knows what he likes has undoubtedly seen and probably admired a Perlmutter painting or lithograph. For Perlmutters have hung in every art gallery in Washington, in theater lobbies, and at art fairs. And the Perlmutter reputation has spread beyond the Nation's Capital, so that today Mr. Perlmutter is represented by the Kennedy Galleries and the Contemporaries in New York. Any artist who has struggled for recognition knows what it means to win New York approval.

The Corcoran Gallery of Art will hold a one-man show of Mr. Perlmutter's paintings and lithographs June 2 through September 30.

Norma Perlmutter is a painter in her own right, and has exhibited extensively in Washington. She signs her work with her maiden name, Mazo. Her husband's ardor for lithography aroused her interest to such a degree that she studied intensively to become a professional lithographer herself. Yet, despite this beehive of activity, she has managed to bring up a pair of daughters, Ellen and Judy, aged 8 and 11.

Even in their rare social evenings, the Perlmutters will expound on their favorite subject, color lithography.

"I'm opposed to 'mail-order lithography'," Jack will tell you, "where the artists do the drawings but send them out to be printed. I believe that printing can be just as creative as the drawing."

But the ancient process of using a heavy stone for printing the lithographs was too cumbersome for Jack, so he experimented with light zinc plates.

"You'll never get the same effects," he was warned. "You can't beat the old tried-and-true method."

But Jack worked nights, sometimes until the small hours, perfecting his process. And the reward for his persistence is that today Perlmutter lithographs are in the permanent collections of our finest museums, including New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Philadelphia Museum, Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, the Library of Congress, and the Corcoran. His paintings locally are in the Phillips Collection, Howard University, and the Watkins Gallery of American University.

Most young families long for larger homes, equipped with all the ultramodern gadgets that make for luxurious living. Jack and Norma Perlmutter dream of a larger home, too, but only to gain more room for their prints and paraphernalia. Those prolific Perlmutters have a passion for art, not luxury.

The Case of Cain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item, which appeared in the New Republic magazine of May 14, 1956, is deserving of the attention of our colleagues:

THE CASE OF CAIN

A couple of weeks ago this reporter told of a rollicking GOP gathering at which the President uttered—amidst toy balloons and Fourth of July sparklers—lofty statements about the "supreme importance" of the individual; the need for "a heart as well as a head" in government and his distress at the thought of making citizens serial numbers in the files of a Government office. The president laid down, in fact, six principles.

Well, it appears that ex-Senator Harry Cain, Republican, of Washington, now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, wants the President to put those sentiments into execution right inside his own administration. Unknown to the President every one of the six is being violated, Cain told a New York audience last week, in the Government's present security-risk procedure. In 3 years of operation under the present procedure, Cain reported, not one single spy, traitor, saboteur, or Communist has been found in a position of trust. The procedure has got rid of some genuine "risks," he agreed, but at the same time it has operated so cruelly that hundreds of faithful servants have been hounded or ruined as "risks." Furthermore, Cain produced the sensational charge that Soviet agents are actually fishing among these innocent vistims who have been made pariahs by their Government and who cannot find employment. It is worth while to repeat here Cain's story of one case in particular.

Let us call him X. He joined the Census Bureau in 1940. In 1948 he was cited, but cleared, in a loyalty action. He was represented in his successful defense by Alfred Bernstein, counsel of the United Federal Workers of America (CIO) of which X was a member. He had not known Bernstein be-

fore the charges nor seen him after their dismissal.

In February 1955, X was charged again. By now he had risen to a post where he had access to secret information in a higher Government agency. Old charges were renewed plus a new one—associating with Bernstein, his lawyer. Cain said he has reviewed the case—sweated over the 525-page file. He is convinced of X's innocence, as are two of X's superiors. But X, a man with a family, has been suspended, payless, for 14 months, also rejected everywhere for private employment because of the cloud on his reputation.

But now comes the new angle. X desperately advertised for a statistical job at any pay, anywhere. A man—calling himself "Machoff"—made contact with him. He wanted research work done on the United States aircraft industry. Our man X was suspicious, got in touch with the FBI. "Machoff," according to Cain, turned out to be Methiov, connected with the Soviet Embassy. Melodramatic? Sure. But there is another twist.

On March 7, X sent an affidavit telling the Government agency that had suspended him all the facts. On April 3 he got the tentative notice of his dismissal as a security risk.

Maybe somebody is hoaxing Cain. Cain is an emotional man but a compassionate one; he says he has looked into the matter thoroughly and believes in X. It is an odd fact that the agency which has now fired X never asked him a question about the affidavit he submitted although this is now over a month ago. Maybe the department couldn't be bothered with current events; maybe it was too busy pondering earlier matters in X's life on which the suspension was based—events running back to 1941.

Almost imploringly Cain asks Eisenhower to give the situation his personal attention. Do those six Eisenhower "principles" uttered at the GOP rally about the importance of the individual mean anything? Says Cain sadly, "He (Eisenhower) does not speak because he does not know."

GATT and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the position of some of our labor leaders on H. R. 5550 which would provide for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation often referred to as OTC.

The endorsement of our trade policies by the top leaders of the AFL and CIO does not carry the approval of scores of the local unions that go to make up these major groups. A point in illustration is an editorial in a recent issue of the Standard Times published at New Bedford, Mass., that takes these union leaders to task for their failure to consider the unions in small industry while favoring a policy of support to union men working in mass production industries such as steel, automobile and heavy machinery.

I think the editorial, which follows, is timely:

GATT AND LABOR

Stanley H. Ruttenberg, research director for the AFL–CIO, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee endorsing administration aims of expanding trade in the free world. Specifically, he said his organization felt Congress should approve United States membership in the proposed International Organization for Trade Cooperation.

This suggested agency, known as OTC, would administer the 35-nation GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), which has been in operation for 8 years without any machinery to police it. A bill proposing American membership in OTC now is before the House committee; it is one of the most controversial measures in the administration's program aimed at liberalizing trade.

Mr. Ruttenberg emphasized the possibility that the OTC would provide a focal point for discussing the relationship of labor standards to tariff policy.

It would appear, however, that all of the unions within the organizations Mr. Ruttenberg represents, do not agree with the point of view which he expressed. One of the most outspoken sources of opposition to GATT and OTC is the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy. This group maintains that GATT is assuming more and more power to regulate United States tariff and trade, a function assigned solely to Congress, in accordance with the Constitution.

Among the members and associates of this committee on import-export policy are the Seafarers International Union of North America, American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, Atlantic Fishermen's Union, International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America, United Wall Paper Craftsmen and Workers of North America, Cannery Workers Union of the Pacific, Cannery Workers and Fishermen's Union, International Handbag, Luggage, Belt and Novelty Workers Union, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, and International Brotherhood of Bookbinders.

It would be interesting to know the reaction of these unions to Mr. Ruttenberg's declaration of approval of GATT and OTC in the name of the AFL–CIO and its members, since all of these are included in that category.

Water and Land Conservation and Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present a brilliant address delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its 43d annual convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, presents in a most able and constructive manner the problems of water utilization throughout the United States and gives, as far as I know, for the first time his views on what may be the No. 1 internal problem within our country.

The speech is as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to discuss one of the Nation's most urgent problems—the conservation and use of our water and land resources.

History shows that every civilization which has risen to world prominence has done so only in areas where the soil was fertile; and where pure water was abundant.

It was not by coincidence that man's first cities were built along the fertile banks of the Tigris-Euphrates River in Mesopotamia; and along the Nile River in Egypt.

These areas were the "cradles" of early civilization.

It is a historical fact that no nation has long maintained a leading world position after either its soil or water supply became depleted.

As illustration, Rome was perhaps the proudest of all ancient empires.

But by the second century A. D. that empire had become so impotent agriculturally the historian, Simkovitch, was moved to write:

"Province after province was conquered by Rome to feed the growing proletariat * * * Latium, Compania, Sardinia, Sicily, Spain, Northern Africa, as Roman granaries were successively reduced to exhaustion. Abandoned land in Latium and Campania turned into swamps; Northern Africa into a desert. The forest-clad hills were denuded."

In other words, when the Roman Empire became an agricultural parasite, like all other parasites, it perished when its sources of food became exhausted.

History's greatest lesson may be the fact adequate water and land are prerequisites not only to improved living standards but also to national survival.

When the United States was first settled some 350 years ago timber, water, and rich soil existed in great abundance.

But the population grew steadily and the consumption of soil products and water steadily increased; and therefore shortly after the year 1900 we realized that shortages were possible even in America.

As a result President Theodore Roosevelt initiated the Nation's first conservation program.

Then came World War I with its tremendous drain on our productive capacity; and later the gigantic growth in our industrial complex during the 1920's.

By the early 1930's the complete exhaustion of our natural land and water resources could be foreseen; and so, under the leadership of another Roosevelt, our Government undertook to carry out the greatest reclamation, conservation, and resources development program ever conceived in all history.

Vast tracts of arid desert became areas of fertile productivity. Denuded hills were reforested. Deplenished agricultural plains were first fertilized and then sown in grass and grain. Multiple-purpose reservoirs were constructed.

This was a program to preserve our greatest heritage—the soil and water of America.

With the exception of the air we breathe, water is the material most vital to human life. It is the largest single controlling factor in the growth of population, in the growth of industry, and in the growth of agriculture.

Because we of America were particularly blessed with an initial abundance of fresh water, we can only blame ourselves for that lack of foresight which in turn now forces us to face up to this impending water shortage.

As our population increases we must devote ever more attention to the elimination of water waste through uncontrolled floods, lack of conservtaion practices, and stream pollution.

In all probability within 20 years water will be the most critical scarcity of all our national resources.

According to the Hoover Commission, in 1975 water consumption will be 1½ times greater than it was in 1950, but in 1950 we were already suffering serious water shortages in many areas, a trend that is increasing each year.

Last fall the chief of the fish and game division of the Missouri Conservation Commission warned about this problem, as follows:

"Approximately three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, one-fourth land. I contend that the Lord made the earth that way because that is the relative importance of the two. Regardless of what anyone may believe, however, the fact remains that life on this earth, in all its forms and facets, has developed and must live accordingly.

"Water is our most important resource. The available supply of fresh, pure water is an absolute deadline beyond which no community, state, or nation can ever go. When humanity runs out of clean water everything stops—that is the end of the road for man and all his activities."

The growing domestic, industrial, irrigation, and power needs for water make imperative the adoption of a national water policy which will insure the development of our new water supplies.

To that end the following six steps, some now being taken haltingly, some not at all, should be followed resolutely:

There should be a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the water arteries of the Nation.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for organization and development of local watershed districts to control water runoff at its source. This would conserve and preserve a supply of fresh water on the land where it falls.

There should be a strong program of stream pollution control. That control should embody, first, provisions for interstate cooperation in the control and prevention of stream pollution; and, second, Federal grants-in-aid to towns and cities for the construction of sewage treatment plants, along with other water purification facilities.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the reclamation of used water by the removal of waste and the use of purification processes.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the development of new ground water reservoirs. This would tap the presently unavailable underground lakes and streams.

There should be a national research program designed to investigate the possibility of inducing rainfall through artificial means, the development of a practical method of removing salt from sea water, and the development of methods to use fresh water substitutes in industrial and agricultural production.

Unless we follow through on a positive program of this type, in the not too distant future we will find ourselves as a Nation in the position of the throat-parched ancient mariner who cried, "Water, water, everywhere—but not a drop to drink."

Now is also the time to give serious consideration to the problem of how to conserve our native soil, and make it more productive.

Each year millions of tons of our best soil are eroded by rivers and streams.

Add to this the tons of topsoil eroded by the wind of our western plains, and we begin to calculate how many acres of agricultural productivity are sacrificed each year through natural causes alone.

For many decades, farmers in this country, schooled in the tradition of their fathers and grandfathers persisted in the raising of the same crops on the same soil. As a result, the once fertile topsoil has been depleted of its regenerative powers; and in many cases each year the crop yield becomes less and less.

Despite this continuing loss and depletion of soil, our present agriculture production is high—so high that many persons, including the Secretary of Agriculture, term it a "crushing abundance."

Therefore, some people believe this is not a popular time to talk about practices that will increase rather than decrease our present farm production.

I am not one of those people.

I believe our present so-called agricultural abundance is a temporary economic condition.

By 1975 the population of this country will have increased to approximately 193 million people.

For this reason alone we will then consume 41 percent more food than we did in 1950, a record agricultural year.

To be specific: By 1975 according to the report in 1952 of the President's Materials Policy Commission, we will consume 41 percent more corn, 42 percent more beef, 23 percent more wheat, and a total of 25 percent of such nonfood agricultural products as wool and cotton.

As can readily be seen, our present so-called crushing abundance will not meet those increased needs of the future.

We do have the potential of a substantial increase in agricultural production during the next 20 years. It is estimated that through irrigation, reclamation, and other conservation practices, we may be able to add some 80 million or 90 million acres to our present agricultural land.

But as stated in the materials policy report:

"In years gone by, an increase in farm production normally meant an increase in acres planted. But new lands for the extension of farm frontiers no longer exist. Relatively few new acres remain for the plow * * *. The bulk of future farm production—for the next 25 years or the next 100—must come from land already under cultivation."

Present indications are that by 1975, through straining our production potential to the utmost, this country will nevertheless want to consume 3 percent more wheat than we can produce, 23 percent more fresh vegetables, 11 percent more eggs, 7 percent more wool, 27 percent more beef, and 30 percent more pork.

This is why I say that unless we adopt now a program of nationwide soil conservation, improved farming practices, and agricultural research we will be faced with the necessity of having to go abroad for more and more of our food supply.

In this connection, the material policy report, a great piece of work, predicts that by 1975 our agricultural imports will increase 46 percent, while our agricultural exports will decline by about 36 percent.

In my judgment, therefore, it is imperative we now begin to explore all ways to reclaim land, control erosion, develop better seeds and fertilizers, improve and encourage crop rotation practices; and also launch a long-range program of research on how to conserve and preserve the soil on which every one of us depends for physical livelihood.

During the last war, after our rubber supply was almost completely cut off, the scientists went to work and came up with synthetic rubber.

But the big difference in this analogy and our impending food shortage is the fact there is no substitute for food. No one wants energy pills as a substitute for steak.

In the long run, civilization, as we know it could be as seriously threatened by the possible future shortage of these resources as by the possibility of a hydrogen war.

In the fields, mines, mountains, and waters of the United States and its possessions lies much of the opportunity to preserve our national security as well as our future prosperity.

Therefore, let us now take stock of our present conservation programs, and adapt them to meet the needs of the future.

It was Daniel Webster who said:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

Address of Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah, at Memorial Day Services, Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent and most appropriate remarks made by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah, at the Memorial Day services held at Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, in St. Louis, Mo.:

We are met here today—in this place of peace and beauty—to spend a brief hour in contemplation of the meaning and purpose of our great country and the parts these men have played and we must play in its destiny.

As I sought to prepare myself to participate on this occasion, my mind went back to the Savior's profoundly beautiful parable of the talents; and there I found a focus for my thoughts.

To us Americans—as to the servants in the parable—has been given a great treasure: all that can be embraced in the word "America."

Our country is more than the geographic area which we inhabit or the material possessions we enjoy. From the beginning, it has been to its patriotic citizens the symbol of their greatest spiritual resources—the promise of their dreams for happiness—the reward for their devotion.

Our country has never been just another piece of land to those who came to its shores out of an older world. To some it was a refuge, to others a challenge. To all, it has ever been a promise of freedom. And this concept of freedom—spiritual before it became manifest in the form and function of government—is the greatest treasure that we have, and makes us the richest nation in the world. In the symbolism of the parable, we are the servants to whom the five talents were given.

Up to date, on the whole, we have used this treasure well. In the beginning it was little more than a dream, but in 300 years we have given it great substance. In the parable, the worthy servant doubled his talents. Ours have been multiplied almost to infinity. Inspired by it, each generation has made its own sacrifices for the future, so that our blessings have grown faster than our population, and there is more for each of us among the millions than there was to be divided among the first few. Certainly, because our fathers were faithful over a few things, we have been made rulers over many.

But the parable is never a completed story. It is a new challenge to every new American in every new generation; and before we can earn the plaudit of "well done, thou good and faithful servant," we must, in turn, make our own contribution to the growth of this great treasure.

To do so effectively, we must first learn for ourselves its true significance. If we lose sight of its spiritual foundation, if we fail to comprehend the irreplaceable part that freedom has played in its accumulation, we cannot use it wisely. Unless we realize that our material abundance is the product of our spiritual strength, we are in danger of losing it all—like the slothful servant. If we measure America only in terms of the number of gadgets per capita—and preen and boast of these—our current contest with the Soviets becomes no more than materialistic marauding.

For, because it is a great treasure, it attracts and inflames the evil motives of evil men. Being without understanding of its spiritual significance, they seek to seize its material values which, in their hands, would turn to dust and despair—as it will in ours, if we lose our understanding.

So, how do we best make use of this great treasure that has been entrusted to our care?

The first and obvious truth we draw from the lesson of the parable is that in a world that so desperately needs help to build a similar treasure, we cannot save it only for ourselves by burying it in isolation. We must protect it, of course, against all enemies of peace and freedom; but to keep it vital, we must share its blessings and expand its power, both in our own country and in all the world. As a nation, this need should ever guide our fundamental policies at home and abroad. At home, we work to keep the light of liberty alive—abroad, to share its blessings and thus justify our stewardship as good and faithful servants.

In the spirit of this concept, President Eisenhower is completely right when he reiterates as our continuing objective the ultimate freedom of the enslaved nations.

He is profoundly wise when he works patiently for peace, because only in an atmosphere of peace can the blessings of liberty expand to full flower.

But he must also be prudent and alert to the danger of attack and the need for adequate defense. Peace and war are always literally hanging in the balance; and the skillful blending of plans for peace—with postures for defense—without letting either overturn the other is a task requiring almost superhuman judgment and infinite patience and devotion.

He has demonstrated his broad grasp of the scope of the problem and his ability to adjust to meet the changing challenge of the evil enemy by his proposals to broaden the effectiveness of NATO beyond its present limited military emphasis and breathe into the alliance the spirit of community in the spiritual values of liberty. This is a classic example of one means by which we can put our American talent to use and thus expand its value to the world.

Another great demonstration of adaptability has been our more effective use of the U. N. Since Eisenhower became President, we have ceased our previous passive policy by which we expected U. N., by itself, to solve all international problems and have used it affirmatively as an instrument to expand our influence for peace—a forum to explain and sell our basic concepts to the world—a channel through which our contributions could be made.

And in his recent appointment of Senator GEORGE to serve America abroad, he provides a living reminder to the world that Americans of both political parties stand and serve together in its great mission to build this great treasure by sharing it with all men everywhere.

Perhaps by this time you are asking yourselves, "Why talk about this problem here, in this place that has been hallowed by the presences of these men who gave their lives in war and on this day on which we honor them?" I know of no place more fitting and of no day more appropriate. It was in the furtherance of this great responsibility that these men gave their lives.

The concept of freedom is always in peril. Since the beginning of recorded history, most men have lived in virtual slavery, under the shadow of tyranny, and few men have been free. Our own American experience has been the longest and strongest flowering of freedom. But its perpetuation will never be assumed. The lust for power will never disappear. And we must always be prepared to defend and preserve it, by war if necessary.

And yet in a way, this is a wise part of God's purpose, because without opposition there can be no growth—without challenge, no inspiration to overcome. If there were no new areas in need of liberty, we might be tempted to "bury" liberty like slothful servants, and thus lose it.

As long as the evil challenges the good, it will seek to resort to its obvious weapon, force; and men will be called to use force in liberty's defense. Of these, some will die as these have done, making their life's contribution in one sacrifice. Their task has been to preserve for the rest of us the opportunity to build. They died to keep the door open and the hope alive. Theirs is a necessary and honored part in the process of peace.

Their sacrifice deepens our obligation to use the opportunity they preserved with greater effectiveness and more devoted zeal—to keep the light of liberty bright and make its blessings more abundant here in America so that all men can draw inspiration from this source and, working together, we can spread both light and blessings ever farther in a grouping, starving world.

Extension of Defense Production Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time merely to ask a question of the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. MULTER. I believe I heard the gentleman quote Secretary Weeks; where was that testimony?

Mr. MULTER. I quoted from page 180 of the hearings before our committee on this extension.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Actually, standby controls would come under the jurisdiction of Mr. Flemming, would they not?

Mr. MULTER. No; I do not think so. I would say that Mr. Flemming also has jurisdiction over the matter, that Mr. Flemming as the Director of Defense Mobilization should certainly give attention to this. I can give similar quotations from Dr. Flemming's testimony, at another page of the record.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would be interested in that quotation because it is my memory during the testimony of Dr. Flemming before our committee, that we questioned him at some length concerning this matter and the impression which I gathered was that the matter had received very serious consideration and was still under study.

Mr. MULTER. I will agree that the gentleman did tell us that the matter is still under study.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

The Fault in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the fault in the armed services is not that the top brass in the Army, Air Force, and Navy—at the moment primarily the Army and the Air Force—disagree and are arguing publicly as to which is the more important in preserving our national security; as to which should receive a major portion of available funds for the development of the weapons or equipment which it considers to be advisable or necessary; as to which service should be entrusted with the performance of a particular function.

The reason for and the purpose of the armed services is to maintain a front which will deter any potential enemy from attacking us and, in the event it fails in that, then to defeat that enemy as quickly and with the least possible loss of life.

From the very beginning, individuals in the Army and the Navy disagreed as to the roles and missions which each was best qualified to perform in defense of our country. Naturally, when the Air Force came of age, the controversy was intensified.

Beyond doubt, the Navy needed carrier-based fighting air equipment to protect and make successful its operations. This was demonstrated in the last war. Experience also demonstrated that the ground forces needed air coverage if they were to fight successfully.

One has but to read the history put out by the armed services to realize that in World War II and in the Korean war each service was dependent upon the other for successful operation. Unified action by all three is necessary if we are to survive.

It is only natural that patriotic, ambitious, aggressive individuals in each service should, as do experts or specialists in any other human activity, become obsessed with the idea that their branch of the service is the most important, the best qualified to give us effective national defense. That is a healthy and desirable situation, for it keeps everyone on his toes. It leads to progress and the acquisition of the best.

Nor does any harm result unless one branch becomes unfairly, unduly, critical of the other. Even then the remedy is at hand. We have not only Joint Chiefs of Staff, but we have a Commander in Chief who can, figuratively speaking, knock the heads of even the generals

together and tell them just how far to go.

In addition, back of it all, sits the Congress which, while its individual Members may know very little about what each service should do, is supposed to possess commonsense and, sitting as a jury, decide upon the testimony of the experts, not what each branch should do in peacetime or in war, but how far the country can go in spending money for national defense without destroying our security through bankruptcy.

As I see it, the fault in the armed services is that because of the technical training of its officers—they get into the academies when they are 20 or 21—they have never learned, they do not realize the efforts which the taxpayers must put forth to earn and contribute the dollars which the services spend. Hence, millions are wasted because of duplication in purchasing common items, because of the lack of unified effort to keep down the cost of overall national defense.

With 52 percent of the national income being spent for national defense—and this year we are giving the armed services something like $34½ billion, in addition to a holdover of some $20 billion—the top brass should have impressed upon it the realization that we can spend ourselves into insecurity as well as becoming insecure through lack of preparation.

Better Late Than Never—Eisenhower Belatedly Adopts Proposals on Research and Development Which Democratic Leader John McCormack Urged 3 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many times during this administration we Democrats have urged certain actions for the security of our country on the responsible leaders of the executive department. Most of the time we are told that we must not disturb the tranquility of the people or question the supreme wisdom of the general in the White House.

Yet again and again the things we have urged have been done—belatedly, perhaps halfheartedly—but nevertheless done. One supposes that action is better late than never.

A prime example of these thoughts is the decision of the President to ask us for new leadership in the field of military research and development. Exactly the same thing was urged 3 years ago by the majority floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], but then he was laughed at and ridiculed by responsible subordinates of the President.

So now, 3 years late, it is an administration proposal—perhaps better late than never.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer a story by John Kelso from the Boston Sunday Post:

(By John Kelso)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—The facts of life in the nuclear age are now reaching the higher echelons of the District of Columbia and nearby Virginia, it became obvious today.

President Eisenhower is urging Congress to write legislation aimed at improving research and development in the Armed Forces.

It was explained that his proposal follows recommendations of the Hoover Commission, calling for establishing an office of Assistant Secretary for Research and Development in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

When House Majority Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Boston, made much the same recommendation in 1953, he could get no place with it because of the opposition of the Eisenhower administration.

Congressman McCORMACK even appeared before the House Armed Services Committee in connection with a bill he introduced on March 30 of that year which would have done substantially the same then as Eisenhower wants to do now.

OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

"Without minimizing in the slightest manner any activity of our military organizations," commented McCORMACK in his testimony, "I think it can be said that, in the world of today and of a foreseeable future, military research and the results thereof is of primary importance. Its value cannot be underestimated or undervalued with safety for our country.

"Research is of such importance that the very safety and future of our country may depend upon the brains and the ability of our scientists in the field of basic research and in the other vitally important fields of research."

A reading of that 1953 testimony shows that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson and other GOP chieftains made extremely light of the McCormack suggestion.

It also shows that Congressman McCORMACK, who has been around Capitol Hill 28 years, was fully aware of the tradition-encrusted concepts of warfare prevailing at the Pentagon, across the Potomac in this Old Dominion. That is why he began his statement with the words, "Without minimizing in the slightest manner any activity of our military organizations."

He knew that cavalrymen hated to give up steeds for Patton tanks, that admirals of wooden ships and iron men paled at the thought of abandoning tree-born craft, and that all of the left-face, right-face martinets have stubbornly refused to believe in anything more advanced in the sphere of electronics than the TV set in the bar—at the officers' club.

At any rate, it is clear that McCORMACK did his level best, with no thought of political concern, to force the Defense Department to get on the right track.

The currently sizzling row at the Pentagon, it was emphasized, has at its roots a failure to cope with the problems being brought about by great technological advances.

The world's biggest office building, it was emphasized further, is still seething this weekend with discontent. The brass hats are at sixes and sevens and fighting with each other as some of them continue to grumble ominously about brush fires.

McCORMACK and others hope that they will soon get squared away to face the realities of a military future of A- and H-bombs, the intercontinental balistics missile, and the satellite.

One way to do it, it was stated, would be to push through the Eisenhower proposal which was advocated by McCORMACK 3 years ago.

In a somewhat similar connection Congress is expected to pass this session a bill which would remove one of the roadblocks between the private utility industry and a new source of electric power—that generated by atomic reactors.

The roadblock is insurance. "We feel that solution of the insurance problem will eliminate the only absolute roadblock to our program," testified William Webster, president of the Yankee Atomic Electric Co.

Webster's company proposes to construct a demonstration nuclear powerplant in Rowe in western Massachusetts. The power output will be sold to 12 New England utilities which are Yankee's sole stockholders and are responsible for the supply of approximately 90 percent of the electrical needs of the New England area.

"The insurance problem has been a matter of major concern to us from the outset," Webster told the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. "Thus far we have gone ahead with our plans without waiting for a complete solution of this problem, in the confidence that it could and would be solved by the time we were ready to commence major construction."

GIGANTIC RISKS

Insurance men do not feel able at the present time to commit themselves to the gigantic risks the new industry thinks it has to have covered.

The Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that an industrial atomic catastrophe could cause $200 million in damages to human beings and property. But the damage potential may be $500 million or even $1 billion.

The present thinking within the joint committee is that the Government will be forced to underwrite part of the coverage on atomic plants—possibly anything more than $65 million per accident.

The private insurance industry has indicated it will be able to provide a pool that can underwrite risks up to $65 million for for each accident. Nobody knows now what the premium rates might be.

Also testifying before the committee was H. W. Yount, vice president of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. He recently returned from London where he sought additional funds to put into the proposed atomic insurance pool.

Yount stressed that the risks involved in such an insurance program are larger than anything ever before advanced. The biggest single policies presently outstanding, and which are few in number, he noted, are $10 million to $15 million.

The highly articulate Boston insurance executive observed that most insurance men and laymen know little about atomic reactors. They still think of an atomic reactor as a potential bomb, which it is not, he stated.

"We hope," Webster declared at one point, "that more specific information as to the cost of private insurance will be available in the future—the atomic future."

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Representative WILLIAM T.

GRANAHAN I, as a new Member of Congress, lost a good friend and wise counselor.

It was not my privilege to know BILL GRANAHAN well until I came to this body on January 3, 1955. His warm friendship and wise advice was very helpful to me in my efforts to understand the workings of the House of Representatives.

I had known him well by reputation as a political fighter of the highest ideals, a man constantly devoted to the welfare of the people he represented.

I deeply regret the loss of a fine colleague. His voice will be missed in his State and in this body.

To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

A Tribute to James T. Hixson, Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 2, 1956, the former students of James T. Hixson, for over 50 years a teacher, principal, and leader in the field of secondary education, presented to the Webster Groves, Mo., School District a portrait of Mr. Hixson which is to be hung in the new James T. Hixson Junior High School. On the occasion of the unveiling of this portrait I had the following remarks to make:

Many people talk about the need of more people with talent and the spirit of self-dedication in the field of primary and secondary education. I am satisfied that one way of assisting in bringing about that end is to honor those people who have spent their lives furthering good primary and secondary education.

From time to time the busy society of today pauses to evaluate the lives of its component parts, the men and women who go to make it up. We pay tribute with our lips and our passing thoughts to those who have entered the service professions; but this has not been sufficient to bring enough persons into the pursuit of such dedicated living.

Fortunately, our society has adjusted itself so that many of the service professions bring with them monetary returns as well as, occasionally, fame. We do not need to pause to discuss these more fortunate of the service professions, they have their obvious rewards.

We do need to start paying more deliberate attention to those service professions which remain largely unheralded, if we are to continue to attract to them the number of men and women our society needs. Not the least of these unheralded professions is that of education; and in the field of education an area that most lacks proper public acclaim is primary and secondary education.

Today the higher institutions of learning, through their spokesmen, are proclaiming an easily perceived truth that by and large our secondary school systems throughout the Nation are not turning out the caliber graduate that the higher institutions of learning must count upon. This indicates the need for more persons to dedicate their talents and lives to the problems of secondary education.

We in Webster Groves are blessed by having the highest caliber primary and secondary school products. This has not come about by chance. It comes from the dedicated work of men and women like the man we are honoring today.

All assembled know personally the great, fine, and silent work performed by James T. Hixson in behalf of education in our community, because he was our teacher and our principal. Not all of us may be aware of the influence that this work has had upon education throughout our land and yet this, too, is so.

In a sense we honor ourselves here today by following our natural inclinations to honor this distinguished educator. This fine building dedicated to public education appropriately bears the name of a great educator, James T. Hinson. We his former students now give to the Webster Groves Board of Education a portrait of this man to be placed in this building so that all may know and come to recognize the face of the man who personally gave to us so much. The qualities of a great educator are not limited to the fields of scholastic abilities; they also must encompass those that go toward making daily living among people a pleasant experience. James T. Hixson's scholarship is matched by his humanity, his friendliness, his good Christian character. His is a life to be emulated. It will be an inspiration to the thousands of students who will go through the corridors of this beautiful new junior high school to see the portrait of a man who gave so much to the education of the children of this country. It is fitting that honor should come to him while he is still with us.

Extension of Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this amendment, may I say the committee amendment to the bill merely makes the disclosure provisions, which are applicable under present law to those serving without compensation, also applicable to those who come into the Executive Reserve. The amendment which I have offered, and which I believe has been agreed to, would withdraw the provision which would require members of the Executive Reserve to report every 6 months. The feeling, at least on my part, and the reason I went along with the committee amendment, is that it is our job to preserve the integrity of the reputation of those who are in Government, and if there is a challenge of their integrity which can be met easily, I see no reason against it. Therefore, since the disclosure of one's holdings is such an easy step, I thought this could be gone along with and would not keep men out of the Executive Reserve. However, after the amendment was adopted, we noticed that under the language, members of the Reserve would be required to file changes in their holdings every 6 months regardless of whether they were in Washington and regardless of whether they had any connection with Government business at that time except for a membership in the Executive Reserve. This amendment would withdraw that requirement and not make it necessary for members of the Reserve to report unless they were serving as men without compensation in Government.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I gladly yield, sir.

Mr. SPENCE. The Executive Reserve have no employment. They are those who it is anticipated might be employed.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. They merely agree that in time of emergency they will serve in a certain job.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think they ought to have to disclose what they have every time they visit the agency, and I am for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, I gather the gentleman would support this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I said I was in favor of it and I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is this is a training program or a visiting program, or what is it?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The Executive Reserve is a training program similar to that of Reserve officers, for those who are willing ahead of time to accept responsibility within Government should an emergency develop which would require their services. They come to Washington, or some other point designated, for approximately 2 weeks, although the time is not specifically designated, for orientation and reorientation in the department in the service that they would give to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the committee refers to it as a sort of a casual thing, a meeting at which they do little more than visit.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is certainly not my understanding. I think I can compare it to the mobilization tables of a National Guard Division. If one takes it down to the company level, in times of peace you have certain officer allotments, but the men are chosen to fill other officer jobs in case of mobilization, and the troop strength is increased.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many there are in this reserve training program?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I regret I do not have those figures, but the Executive Reserve is at present under formation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Am I to infer that in this particular status they have nothing to do with policy?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. It is my understanding that they do not have anything to do with policy.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. There is a table in the hearings on this bill indicating the number of WOC's who have actually served up to the present time in various capacities.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If I might interrupt, this is no indication of their status in the Reserves.

Mr. MULTER. No, but I was about to say, if you look at that table you can get a fair idea of the number of men who must be trained for the full mobilization, because we will certainly need more men than they have already serving in these various capacities. It is fair to assume we are training as many as we are now using. I might suggest that Dr. Fleming testified that the Department recognized we should not put these trainees under the same or similar restrictions as those of the WOC, and the President had issue an Executive order under which he issued regulations which had to apply——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MULTER) Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON was recognized for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MULTER. Dr. Fleming indicated he had already issued a regulation or directive covering the trainees, and when asked a question, at page 61 of the hearings, he said he would have no objection to the Executive order being written into law. That is what we tried to do by the committee amendment, but, as the gentleman indicated, the committee amendment goes a little too far. The gentleman's amendment to the committee amendment will take care of that situation, and with the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman's amendment, I think then we will have the protection we need as against WOC and trainees so that nobody can complain.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. I want to say in support of what the gentleman from Ohio said in reply to the question of the majority leader that it was stated repeatedly at the hearings that the trainees, that is, the Executive Reserve, have nothing to do with policy.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Gladly.

Mr. BEAMER. I take it the gentleman's amendment and the committee's amendment were offered in an effort to protect the so-called WOC. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Actually it has no reference to the WOC, sir; it refers purely to men who will agree to serve within the Executive Reserve.

The committee amendment extends to the men who agree to serve in the Executive Reserve the same requirements of reporting the companies in which they own holdings as do WOC's.

This amendment which I am discussing, however, would remove from the members of the Executive Reserve the requirement that they bring the status of their holdings up to date every 6 months. In other words, if you agree to serve in the Executive Reserve and you are living in Indiana and do not go on active duty, you do not go for training within that 6-month period, there would be no need for you to make a new report.

Mr. BEAMER. The reason I asked the question was that these are men who serve without compensation. I know some of them who served the Government at great sacrifice to their respective companies. Unfortunately the press and even Members of Congress on the floor of the House have taken occasion to criticize these people.

If this continues we are going to find it increasingly difficult to find people of merit who will give of their time to the Government; and I wonder if we should not attempt to think a little bit in terms of praise of these people. I hope the gentleman's amendment will indirectly, if not directly, encourage these men to come to the Government and give of their efforts and abilities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as the WOC's are concerned there can be no thought of impugning the honesty of their motives. There are some of us, however, who feel that dollar-a-year men should be confined to service in actual wartime. However, I have no criticism to offer of that.

The criticism I offer is where any man puts himself in the position of undertaking to serve two masters. I am not saying anyone did, but there is some evidence that some have. That is a thing that we have got to watch. I know I cannot serve two masters. Whenever I find myself in that position, which is very rarely, I absolve myself. I think there is an ethical consideration that I should absolve myself from making any decision where I am in any position of serving two masters.

So that is the situation that has got to be watched in the case of men coming here passing upon policy or taking any action where the Government is involved and where a company with which they are connected is directly or indirectly involved. That is the important question and that is the key question.

I do not recognize the right, the power, or the ability of any other human being to serve two masters. I know I cannot, and I do not recognize the ability of any other human being to do so. That to me is the kernel of the question.

But there is another consideration, whether outside of actual wartime, such people should be used. I recognize that I have never made any statement about the present situation, about the employment of WOC's because I realize it is a debatable question and that is where a man puts himself in the position of serving or giving others the color of right to think they are serving two masters. That is where criticism justifiably arises, as I see it.

An Unbiased Look at the Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the Agricultural Bulletin of May 17, 1956, of the Roy Wenzlick & Co. entitled "An Unbiased Look at the Farm Situation." Unlike many articles this one lives up to its title. If we are ever to solve the farm problems we must start analyzing them objectively. I suggest that there will remain ample room for political debate even after this has been done. The present situation of demagogs shouting around in the darkness of ignorance is bound to damage not help the farm economy. I am hopeful that the farmers will show those in politics in both parties, that they are a great deal smarter than they have been given credit for being, this coming November elections.

AN UNBIASED LOOK AT THE FARM SITUATION

In this election year a great deal of misinformation is being poured into the public ear about the stringent financial state of the American farmer. Much of it comes from politicians and from the more radical farm organizations, but a good deal of it comes from radio and television commentators, the big metropolitan dailies, and others who should know enough to keep their news coverage objective.

The argument most often followed is that the farmer is being squeezed by falling income and rising prices; further that, as a result, thousands of farmers are giving up and migrating to the cities. More partisan observers point to these trends as evidence of the failure of the administration's farm policies, and particularly the failure of Ezra Taft Benson.

Now there is just enough truth in all of these statements to lend them an aura of authenticity and to give conclusions based on them a certain amount of apparent steadiness. However, to those who are interested enough to dig a little deeper and think a little longer, there is a great deal in this popular presentation that cannot stand the light of day.

First of all, take the matter of falling farm prices. They are falling and have been for several years. On the other hand, if you will look at the chart below [chart omitted], you will see that their first big postwar drop began in late 1948 immediately after Mr. Truman was elected to his second term. You will also notice that this decline continued steeply until the start of the Korean war. They then rose rapidly to a new peak and started falling again in early 1951. By the time the Republicans had assumed control of the executive branch of the Government, farm prices had been falling for almost 2 years.

This is not to say that the present administration is blameless. Perhaps there are some practical measures that could have been taken to halt the drop in farm prices. Nevertheless, it is recorded clearly that the two serious drops began before the present administration went into office. Furthermore, most informed agricultural opinion holds that the enormous surpluses built up by Fair Deal farm policy are the chief reason for the drops. Moreover, neither the President nor his Secretary of Agriculture has received con-

gressional cooperation in farm matters. Indeed, the recent farm bill was such a miserable piece of legislation that Mr. Eisenhower vetoed it, and was widely applauded editorially for so doing.

Secondly, consider the fact that thousands of farmers are leaving the farm for more remunerative employment in the cities. Everyone knows that this has been going on for 200 years. During the 1910–40 period, however, this migration was slowed to a crawl, as over this period farm population lost less than 1.25 million. However, during the 1940–50 period, which was by far the most bountiful in farm history, the farm population dropped almost 5.5 million. During World War II thousands of young men and women left the farms for the Armed Forces or defense work. Relatively few of them returned, despite the record high incomes earned by farmers during the late 1940's and early 1950's. This migration was simply part of a trend, accelerated by the war, that had been going on for a long time.

This is not to say that some farmers are not being forced out of business by economic factors. Undoubtedly some of them are, but to blame the continuing farm-to-city migration on falling prices and to say that it results from administration failures is to ignore the entire past history of the country.

Strictly from a standpoint of going out of business, indications are that farmers do this a great deal less frequently than do nonfarm entrepreneurs. Figures from the Department of Commerce show that from 1950 to 1954 business ownerships were terminated at a rate of about 165 per 1,000 per year. During this same period, farm sales, both voluntary and involuntary, took place at the rate of 50 per 1,000 farms per year. Thus during the period of declining farm prices and booming business, 3 times as many businessmen (per 1,000) as farmers found it advisable to terminate their activities.

Most of the farmers that have been forced off the farms have been marginal operators or tenants. During the periods of high prices it was possible to make a profit even on poor land or on land unsuited to cultivation. As prices declined, it was no longer profitable to cultivate a good deal of this marginal land, and the operator gave it up. Recent advances in mechanization and changes in crops have also forced many tenants off the farms.

In some parts of the Mississippi Delta, for example, cotton plantations employing 40 to 100 families have been converted to cattle raising, thereby displacing all but two or three families formerly required. Thousands of others have been displaced by more efficient methods and better machinery, particularly the mechanical cottonpicker.

Therefore, instead of the current shift in farm population to the cities being prompted by a falling price level, we see that the major portion of it springs from much healthier reasons. That farm production is becoming more efficient, requiring less manpower, and thereby releasing farm labor for employment in the cities, is a change that should continue. Industry and business will be faced with a continuing labor shortage for many years, and if fewer people are required to raise the necessary food and fiber, that many more will be available to produce other goods and services. That such a low proportion of our population is needed to produce agricultural products is one reason we have had the labor force necessary to man our productive facilities and to continue to increase our standard of living.

As for falling prices forcing the marginal or inefficient farmer off the land, this is strictly a nonpartisan characteristic of the high break-even point. In every price drop in any community it is always the marginal and inefficient operator who will be hurt first. In a good many cases he is a fly-by-night who can prosper only in times of inordinately high prices. His temporary eclipse is certainly not a matter of national concern, though few Congressmen will say so, especially in an election year.

There is an important point usually overlooked in any discussion of farm prices. When the entire economy began moving up in 1940, farm net income rose much more rapidly than did wages and salaries, and more rapidly than did the gross national product. Steadily mounting farm prices pushed farm net income to a peak in 1948; at that time farm net income was 3.87 times its 1940 level. Gross national product was only 2.57 times its 1940 level and did not achieve the proportional gain made by agriculture until 1955. Even in 1955, the wage and salary index was only 2.72 times its 1940 level, while farm net income was still 3.3 times its 1940 level.

This doesn't make the drop in farm prices and in farm income any less painful to the farmer. Nevertheless, we should all recognize that the boom came much more quickly to the farmers than it did to the nonfarm sections of the economy.

Another point seldom mentioned is the overall relationship between total farm debt and the liquid assets of farmers. At the start of 1956, total farm debt amounted to $18.8 billion. This included all real estate and non-real-estate debt owed by farmers. In comparison, the liquid assets held by farmers (currency, bank deporits and United States savings bonds) amounted to an estimated $18.9 billion. In other words, the farmer's cash position was still strong enough to pay off all of the debt against his business, his home, and his consumer durable items. There are few businessmen or other nonfarm groups that are as solvent as the farmers.

While farm income was down again in 1955, in nearly all of the corn and wheat States average income per farm ranged from $4,900 in drought-stricken Missouri to more than $10,500 in Iowa. It also might be pointed out that those States with the highest per farm incomes are those with little history of Government assistance.

Finally, there is the continuing rise of farm land values that points to the farmer's confidence in the future. Despite the fact that farm net income is down, the price of farm land continues to rise. It is now higher than ever before, and since 1953 all States except Vermont has recorder gains. In the predominantly farm States of the Midwest, the increase has ranges from 4 percent to 15 percent in the average per acre value.

That the current farm problem is a difficult one, no one will deny. It will not be eased by recrimination and political misrepresentation. Neither will it be solved quickly. However, the agricultural base is sound, and the long-range demand gives promise of a not too distant day when surpluses will be less of a burden than they are at present.

Bad for the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting evidence that all is not well with the Department of Defense as it is being administered by Secretary Charles Wilson. A genius for the management of big business, which Mr. Wilson undoubtedly demonstrated in his career before entering Government, does not seem to be adequate for the duties and responsibilities Mr. Wilson has assumed as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. The Trenton Evening Times said editorially the other day that—

> Secretary Wilson's weakness for inept utterances, while embarrassing, is on the lighter side. Much more serious is the apparent failure of the United States to keep pace with Soviet Russia in certain vital fields of military development, particularly the air, attended by the bitter dissension among the services.
>
> Attributing the harmful discord to "eager beaver" service partisans, Mr. Wilson declares that the existing conflicts "are not good for the country." This is an extremely restrained estimate of their consequences. They are dangerous, and it is the responsibility of Secretary Wilson and President Eisenhower to see that they are ended.
>
> If Secretary Wilson has not succeeded after nearly 4 years in building an organization that can work in harmony for the creation of a formidable military establishment, he has written a record of failure. The existing situation is far from creditable to him or to the Eisenhower administration.

On Memorial Day I was one of the speakers at the annual observance held at the Beverly National Cemetery by the William A. Cortright, Jr., Post of the American Legion. The size and success of the affair is a tribute to the post members who work for months on the plans. It is a great expression of gratitude to the 10,000 veterans who rest in the cemetery.

The principal speaker at the Beverly ceremonies was Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Herren, commanding general of the First Army. The general's excellent speech emphasized the need for a great Ready Army Reserve to back up the Regular Army which has been cut back considerably in recent years.

General Herren did not say so, but the Reserve Act passed in 1955 has been a resounding flop. This is tragic at a time when the Russians and their satellites have 8 million men under arms. When the Reserve Act was adopted, I reported that, in my opinion, it was poorly drafted and replete with inequities and loopholes. To a large extent it was designed to cover up earlier failures. There have been only 800 Reserve enlistments in New Jersey in the past year. Our present Reserve strength is not much more than one-third of that which is authorized. The boys cannot be blamed for not enlisting in a program which is based upon a law so confusing that hardly anyone can understand how it is supposed to work. The Department of Defense would do well to take off its rose-colored glasses. The services should stop alternately bragging and fighting with each other and straighten out the mess they have created for themselves. Do we have a good Reserve? Do we have the best Air Force? Do we have the best missile program? Are our concepts of the missions of the services correct? These and many other questions of the American people should be answered because the people are, in fact, the owners of the Nation's Defense Establishment.

I include here for the information of my colleagues two editorials from the Trenton Evening Times:

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times of May 22, 1956]

RESERVE LAW FAILS

Endorsement by President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson of Military Reserve Week was not expected to give essential vitality to a movement which has failed from the beginning to enlist public interest, much less the practical support necessary to its success.

President Eisenhower signed the Reserve Forces bill last August with the comment that while it fell short of what it should have been "it does contain provisions that will definitely strengthen the Reserve structure." In practical application, however, the measure has failed to accomplish even this modest purpose.

It was hoped that by July 1 at least 95,000 boys between the ages of 17 and 18½ would volunteer to serve 6 months in the Reserve and that by 1959 the Ready Reserve would be increased to 2,900,000. Most recent figures show, however, that only 22,175 boys have volunteered for the 6-month enlistment and that the Ready Reserve numbers only 890,000.

It is apparent that when Congress, fearful of an unfavorable political reaction to any compulsory features in a military service bill, made the Reserve law wholly voluntary, it enacted an impotent and ineffective measure.

The youth of the Nation is not interested in military service. Its attitude toward this obligation of citizenship is influenced by the fact that the draft is operating in extremely slow motion and that there is little to suggest that service is inevitable. The young men prefer to take their chances on not being called.

It is obvious, accordingly, that if the Reserves are to become "a bulwark of our Armed Forces," the role in which they have been envisioned, more formidable legislation will have to be devised and enacted. It is not too soon to appraise the current law as a failure.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times of May 23, 1956]

BAD FOR THE COUNTRY

There is mounting evidence that all is not well with the Department of Defense as it is being administered by Secretary Charles Wilson. A genius for the management of big business, which Mr. Wilson undoubtedly demonstrated in his career before entering government, does not seem to be adequate for the duties and responsibilities Mr. Wilson has assumed as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet.

Secretary Wilson's weakness for inept utterances, while embarrassing, is on the lighter side. Much more serious is the apparent failure of the United States to keep pace with Soviet Russia in certain vital fields of military development, particularly the air, attended by the bitter dissension among the services.

Attributing the harmful discord to "eager beaver" service partisans, Mr. Wilson declares that the existing conflicts "are not good for the country." This is an extremely restrained estimate of their consequences. They are dangerous, and it is the responsibility of Secretary Wilson and President Eisenhower to see that they are ended.

If Secretary Wilson has not succeeded after nearly 4 years in building an organization that can work in harmony for the creation of a formidable Military Establishment, he has written a record of failure. The existing situation is far from creditable to him or to the Eisenhower administration.

Another and a different phase of the Defense Department record is revealed in the complaint by Joseph Campbell, Federal Comptroller General, that the Department is illegally holding $400 million in foreign-aid funds that should have been handed back to the Treasury. It may be, as Defense Department officials maintain, that this is only a technical violation of the law but it is indisputably bad business practice.

The So-Called Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in Montana a drive has been launched to pass a law modeled after a statute of Iowa that would provide it to be the policy of the State "that no one shall be deprived of the right to work at his chosen occupation for any employer because of membership in, affiliation with, withdrawal or expulsion from, or refusal to join, any labor union, organization, or association, and any contract which contravenes this policy is illegal and void."

Two examples of the advertisements appearing in Montana newspapers follow:

SHOULD MONTANA HAVE A RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW?

Eighteen States have already enacted right-to-work laws. Would you favor a State referendum in 1956 to pass such a law for Montana?

Following is the substance of the right-to-work law in the State of Iowa:

"Right to join union: It is declared to be the policy of the State of Iowa that no person within its boundaries shall be deprived of the right to work at his chosen occupation for any employer because of membership in, affiliation with, withdrawal or expulsion from, or refusal to join, any labor union, organization, or association, and any contract which contravenes this policy is illegal and void (sec. 736A.1)."

What do you think of this law?

We want your comments. Address letters to Box 37, Scobey, Mont. (No letters will be published.)

Circulated and paid for by Montana Right To Work Association, Larry C. Bowler, secretary, Scobey, Mont.

WHO FAVORS, WHO OPPOSES A RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW FOR MONTANA?

Answer: All who want the right to join a union, not to be separated from the right not to join, are in favor. Opposed are those who favor compulsory union membership.

Is there any candidate for office this year, or anyone else, who would deny the people of Montana a right to vote on this question at the general election this fall?

Answer: It would be hard to believe so. This question is nonpartisan and involves a decision concerning basic liberties of the individual regardless of party lines.

What does the vast body of union members and other workers, as individuals, think about right-to-work laws?

Answer: From the flood of letters received here by now, they feel the best chance they have to actually express their point of view without fear of meeting harm, hardship or accident, is this fall at the general election, where they may freely vote as they personally choose.

How can the Montana Right To Work Association carry on its campaign to bring its question directly before Montana voters?

1. Through financial assistance, large or small, by all those who sincerely believe this law should be voted on.

2. Through telling friends and acquaintances that their support is urgently needed at this time.

3. Advertising costs money. The advertisement on May 3 in the press over Montana cost a total of about $902. This advertisement you are now reading would be larger and contain more information if more money were at hand.

4. MRWA calls on every public-spirited Montana citizen for assistance in bringing this question before the voters of this State.

5. Do not make checks out to the secretary of MRWA. Send contributions instead to the MRWA depository, a properly bonded institution, which has been engaged to receive and disburse all moneys on a business-like basis. That address is: MRWA Depository, Citizens State Bank, Scobey, Mont.

Advertisement circulated and paid for by Montana Right To Work Association, Larry C. Bowler, secretary, Box 37, Scobey, Mont.

Mr. Speaker, straight-thinking Montana citizens have been prompt to denounce this movement. In a recent issue of the Montana Farmers Union News some of these statements have been collected. The fact that a farm journal in a farm area carries this condemnation of such statutes is significant of the growing awarness that these laws are not just antilabor but are detrimental to all economic groups and against the public interest. The article follows:

"RIGHT TO WORK" FRAUD EXPOSED

Friends of labor in Montana are watching with alarm the growth of an advertising campaign promoting adoption of a so-called "right-to-work" law—the kind of union-busting legislation which has already been applied in 18 States. As is usual in such matters, the campaign is fronted by an obscure newspaperman—in this case one Larry Bowler of Scobey.

* * * * *

Montana newspapers were generous with space for a United Press release by Bowler announcing "a flood of replies" from "farmers, small-business men, self-employed craftsmen and other workers" showing a "trend" in favor of the law. But news media suppressed a release from James S. Umber, Montana AFL–CIO president, denouncing the movement. To provide a peephole in the lead curtain of the reactionary press, MFU News publishes Mr. Umber's statement, and the views of other leading Montanans. Emphases are ours throughout.—Ed.

James S. Umber, Helena, president, Montana AFL–CIO:

"The so-called 'right-to-work' law is a fake and does not give the workers the right to work, but rather gives unscrupulous employers the right to exploit the worker and destroy his economy. Wages in States having this vicious law have been going down, and the economy of these States will suffer as a result.

"Those who promote this immoral legislation would sacrifice the working people of Montana to low wages, nonunion working conditions and generally poor living conditios, and make all workers secod-class citizens.

"Religious leaders of all faiths have repeatedly condemned this unholy attack on the workers. * * * Republican Governor Fred Hall, of Kansas, veetoed such a bill a year ago on the grounds that such a law was class legislation designed to set one group of Americans against another and was a disservice to our country."

D. W. Chapman, Great Falls, president, Montana Farmers' Union:

"The law in question has one purpose only—to destroy unions, and thus deny workingmen the right to bargain collectively for decent wages and conditions. To sell such a bill of goods under the pretense of protecting a man's right to work is like selling arsenic labeled as candy. It is just one more foul on labor by a bunch of second-string plutocrats who specialize in fouls.

"The labor economy and the farm economy are inseparable. Laws that depress wages hurt the farmer just as much as the Eisenhower farm depression is hurting labor. The so-called right-to-work law is specifically condemned in the 1956 program of the Montana Farmers' Union, adopted by the membership at our convention last October, and will be fought with all our strength."

The Reverend Joseph Mackin, professor of economics at Carroll College, Helena, and director of the Institute of Industrial Relations, Butte:

"The campaign for the so-called right-to-work law in Montana, currently seeking support through the press and radio, is clearly opposed to Christian principles concerning the interests of labor and management.

"It is in the interest of social justice that this right-to-work subterfuge is understood for what it is. In effect, such legislation destroys unionism and, therefore, denies the workers their natural right to form associations. Such legislation, far from contributing to social order, promotes strife and discontent by outlawing gains which labor has rightfully won. The right-to-work law in reality is the right to stand alone against overwhelming odds. In our present economy a worker cannot normally realize his rights acting as an individual. He lacks the ability and experience to represent himself effectively. Organization is necessary for handling grievances, rights, and claims even when there is utmost good will on both sides. For these reasons unions are an indispensable ingredient in our society."

The Reverend E. Paul Conine, First Presbyterian Church, Billings:

"It is my earnest hope that the miscalled right-to-work legislation will not be adopted in Montana.

"Where such laws are in effect, wage standards and working conditions are lowered, and the whole economy suffers. Right-to-work laws prohibit agreements between employers and laborers which would limit employment to organized labor. The reasonable-sounding argument for this legislation is that a man ought not to be required to join a union if he doesn't want to. There are flaws in this argument.

"A man's ability to work is, in a sense, his own property. His rights in connection with his ability to work are limited, however, out of consideration for his neighbors. If I own property in a fine residential area, I am not permitted to build an unsightly shack on it because it lowers the standards of neatness and beauty my neighbors have established. In the communities in which most of us live, every resident is required to maintain certain standards of cleanliness, sanitation, and appearance to protect the standards in the community. Let someone introduce legislation for 'right to live' (in filth and ugliness), and the standards will be lowered.

"Organized labor and wise employers have worked hard to establish high standards for wages and working conditions in our Nation. Let legislation be introduced for 'right to work' (at lower wages and under poor working conditions), and the standards will be lowered, and the economy will suffer.

"There are always those who area ready to take advantage of the costly benefits that have been secured by their neighbors. It is only fair that all who enjoy the benefits share in their cost. When the cost of winning favorable working conditions is being borne by a union, it is reasonable to expect the workers who enjoy the benefits of the union to support it."

Ernest Salvas, Butte, executive board member, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers:

"Passage of a right-to-work law would disrupt long-established relationships between labor and management, to the detriment of Montana's economy.

"Most workers recognize the need to help pay the freight for the tremendous gains which have been won by labor organizations. For every right there is a responsibility; when the responsibility is denied, the right is lost."

The Reverend Howard Y. Williams, United Congregational Church, Butte:

"Trade unions have been a vital force in bettering the working conditions of men and women, and increasing the purchasing power of the masses of our people.

"The right-to-work movement is a deliberate effort to weaken trade unions and undermine working conditions, and should certainly be opposed."

Dr. R. R. Renne, economist, president of Montana State College, Bozeman:

"Right-to-work laws are bad not only for labor, but for business and the entire economy.

"Right-to-work laws provide that no worker shall be deprived of the right to work at his chosen occupation for any employer because of membership or nonmembership in, or refusal to join a labor union organization or association.

"In reality such laws can be used to make collective bargaining ineffective. An employer under such laws is not required to employ union labor or to bargain with workers over wages through their own collective bargaining agency, the union.

"Collective bargaining is well established as a vital part of our modern economy and is essential in establishing satisfactory wage levels basic to a high level of business activity and general progress.

"Without strong, well-managed, effective labor unions to bargain for labor's proper return with leaders of our large corporate industrial units, our economy could not operate successfully because there would be no suitable means of assuring satisfactory wage levels and adequate purchasing power of workers to consume the great output of our modern technology and industry."

A few of the national figures who oppose right-to-work laws are:

James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor: "These laws * * * result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of workingmen and women and their employers to bargain collectively * * * they restrict union security and thereby undermine the basic strength of labor organizations. I oppose such laws categorically."

Dr. Israel Goldstein, president, American Jewish Congress: "Such laws seek the destruction of the trade-union movement, the abrogation of democratic rights which it has taken decades to secure, and the undermining of one of the strongest pillars of American democracy."

Dr. Walter G. Muelder, Methodist, dean of Boston University School of Theology: "The right-to-work laws are a virtual conspiracy of the crafty, the ignorant, or the misguided to subvert industrial peace, exploit men's need to work, and deluge the community with industrial irresponsibility * * * they only victimize the worker and make his organization ineffective."

The Reverend William J. Kelly, lecturer at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and for 6 years chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board: "No man or woman of good will should contribute money to proponents of this legislation * * * to contribute financial aid would be morally wrong. All good men and women, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, should seek by every just means to get such right-to-work laws repealed and should oppose them whenever they are proposed."

Mr. Speaker, one final comment should be made. In the second ad above the Montana Right to Work Association asks if any candidate for office this year would deny the people of Montana a right to vote on this issue. The issue is contained in the question stated in the title, "Who favors, who opposes a right-to-work law for Montana?"

The reason why such a proposition should not be submitted to the people is that the very statement of the question is fraudulent and dishonest. Before the electorate is called upon to pass upon any question it should be fairly and honestly presented to them. The very title of "right to work" is fraudulent and the experience in other States has been that the campaigns to have such laws adopted have been as dishonest as that title.

Before the 84th Congress adjourns the Taft-Hartley law should be amended and section 14b rewritten to permit unions to contract for a closed shop or a union shop in all States. Such action would put an end to these attempts to foist upon the people a piece of detrimental legislation under a thoroughly misleading label.

Steel and Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a very fine speech made by Mr. E. B. Germany, president, Lone Star Steel Co., of Dallas, Tex. He is an able, enterprising, civic-minded man who presents in a unique way the problems which he has encountered in building a veritable empire in the southwestern part of the country. The address is as follows:

It is a privilege to discuss before this 43d national convention of the Rivers and Harbors Congress the steel industry's interests in the waterways of our Nation. I am sure that there are many others in steel eminently better qualified to voice opinions on this subject, but I rather suspect that my presence here is occasioned by the fact that my company—Lone Star Steel Co.—is one of the "have nots" with respect to water traffic.

There is an old quip you hear frequently down in Texas, and it goes something like this: "The wheel that squeaks the loudest is the first to get the grease." I have an idea that those responsible for selecting the speakers for this program had this thought in mind when they asked a representative of a "have not" steel company to talk about the value of waterways. I think their reasoning was good, and, ordinarily, I would not let this opportunity pass to get in a few licks favoring the development of the Red River and its tributaries, one of which flows along the south border of our plant property.

There are many other similar projects, which, when fully developed, will prove to

be major factors in the economic stability of industrial firms of specific areas, but I shall forego the selfish temptation to dwell upon individual cases and, in lieu, confine my remarks to a much broader and more important field—the security of our Nation. Even at the expense of shelving some of the goals of individual companies, the steel industry's greatest responsibility to itself and to the United States is the preservation of our national security and the maintenance of free enterprise. Without either of those, industry, as we know it, will cease to exist.

I am impressed with the rapid strides made in recent years in the development of our waterways. A great deal has been done. The St. Lawrence seaway has been a major accomplishment and a very necessary adjunct to our system of water transportation. There are others, but after naming a scant handful of waterways projects, the list falls off rapidly, and in the place of achievement, we find surveys, reports, recommendations, but very little in the way of real progress.

The past few weeks have been extremely important in the security program of our Nation. Before Congress, and it appears a certainty to become law, is a bill which proposes to build the greatest system of highways the world has ever known. Billions upon billions of dollars are to be earmarked for the orderly construction of a network of roads that will make our country a lacework of highways to serve many purposes. In peacetime, they will encourage the use of motor transport for the hauling of goods. They will provide our people with vacation opportunities that only Aladdin and his lamp could have envisioned. In wartime, they will guarantee the movement of men and equipment at a rate of speed never before possible. They will give our Armed Forces the mobility of the horse cavalry but at a speed that would have left old dobbin at the gate. Yes, our new highway program will produce fantastic possibilities.

In the air, the day hardly passes but what we read of tremendous advances being made in the development of aircraft of all types. Giant skyfreighters, supersonic fighters, global bombers, jet-propelled passenger liners are rolling off assembly lines all over the country, and on the ground, the expansion and construction of airports keeps pace with increasing demands of our airplanes.

In this great capitalistic system of ours, the race for business is the prima facie evidence of our selfish desires to grow and prosper. The presence of competition demands that we go forward if we are to stay in business. Competition, as we have known it for so many years, has been a sort of money game in which the loser had a chance to come back the next day and recoup his losses. There was no finality attached to losing.

From this competitive system emerged the most advanced nation the world has ever known. Today, however, we face another kind of competition—competition from without, and from an enemy who has the weapons capable of subduing if not exterminating. It is a grisly kind of competition we now face. In it, there is no prize for the loser unless you count slavery or death as some sort of sadistic reward. This is a race which we may never win, but it is a race, nonetheless, which we cannot afford to lose.

Now, what has this to do with waterways?

It has everything, and I think that the one most appropriate word with which to link waterways and our security is the word "dispersal."

To understand the drastic need for dispersal of our industry, one has only to look at a variety of maps. One such map shows the air facilities of the Nation. Streaking down from Minnesota to enclose our northern and eastern industrial centers is a prominent, heavily inked area defining the Eastern Air Identification Zone. Every airplane flying into this zone must be identified and cleared. Another type of map shows the concentration of industry, and still another, the concentration of population. Viewing these maps, and others, it is perfectly obvious to even the untrained eye that we have most of our eggs in one basket, the highly vulnerable eastern and northern industrial areas.

In the event you have not recently considered the danger of concentrated industry, I point out to you that only 10 well-placed H-bombs would jeopardize 80 percent of the Nation's steel production. Over half of the Nation's steel comes from four regions: Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Youngstown. Ten areas contain the production of more than 50 percent of primary metals, 45 percent of fabricated metal products, 55 percent of electrical machinery, and about the same percentage of transportation equipment.

Three or four years ago, we undertook to check up on the security forces at our plant in east Texas. We installed what we think is a tight protective system, but even so, we realize that the danger of our plant ever being a bomb target is extremely remote. We doubt if anyone would ever consider wasting a bomb on us when the same bomb might be dropped on an area in the north from which comes practically all of our electrical equipment. If this source of supply is eliminated, our plant very likely would have to be closed down within 90 days.

Dispersal: the one great necessity in our industrial life.

Under consideration at this time are numerous plans to bring about more rapid dispersal of industry. There is a proposed plan for fast tax relief for the company moving a plant out of highly industrialized areas. There is some talk about favoring dispersed plants with defense contracts, and there is a proposal for tax reductions based on distance away from likely bomb targets.

These concessions are looked upon as incentives designed to disperse industry. Not much has been done about the problem and the planners of our national defense are worried.

I submit that if we develop our inland waterways to the extent we are now planning our highway system, no stopgap measures will be needed to lure industry away from the danger zones. Industry, recognizing the danger of concentration, will go of its own accord to sites which offer sufficient water for industrial uses and transportation. No less of an authority than Adm. Ben Moreell, of Jones & Laughlin, who certainly is qualified to speak, says that we can replace 25 percent of our steel capacity with new construction in dispersed areas in only 8 years if we proceed at the rate of only 3 percent per year. Inherently, steel and its related industries are high tonnage shippers. The advantage of water rates is almost a necessity. About 200 of our steel mills, blast furnaces and coke plants are now located on waterways.

This problem of dispersal is no fly-by-night proposition. If you think it is, consider the fact that United States Steel Corp. is presently storing its valuable records in a vast cave in western Pennsylvania. American Machine and Foundry, along with numerous other companies, his plans for quickly moving its general headquarters to an alternate site. The American Iron and Steel Institute has prepared a complete defense planning manual. Preparations such as these sound like the long look to me.

Again, I want to emphasize that none of my remarks is intended to be critical of anything that has been done in connection with the promotion of our waterways. As in airways, highways, and railways—Santa Fe just recently announced it would spend a hundred million dollars in 1956 to improve its system—move aggressively forward, one of the biggest challenges facing our Nation is the immediate development of our waterways, particularly the inland routes.

For a quarter of a century or more we have been struggling to make a waterway out of the Trinity River. This would connect Dallas and Fort Worth with the Gulf of Mexico. River boats once navigated this stream, long since eroded and filled with silt. For a quarter of a century we've been battling to make the Red River navigable to north Texas and Oklahoma. When boat traffic comes to Oklahoma we will have opened up another outlet for that State's considerable coal supplies. Some progress has been made on the Red River project, very little on the Trinity, and I'm sure there are similar projects throughout the entire Nation. In permitting these works to lag, we are deliberately delaying the day when we will have attained adequate dispersal. When we delay dispersal of industry and the people needed in industry, we increase the odds against our security.

The full development of our inland waterways strikes me as being a gilt-edged invitation to industry to expand out of the H-bomb districts.

American Legion Junior Baseball Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most worthwhile of the American Legion's many civic projects is its junior baseball program. From humble beginnings, this program has grown to be the largest athletic activity for young people in this country. For 30 years, with ever-increasing success, this program has served as a bulwark against juvenile delinquency by guiding American youth along the paths of good sportsmanship and good citizenship.

Those who instituted the American Legion junior baseball program and the many responsible adult leaders in the many communities across the Nation who carry it on today, deserve the thanks and congratulations of all of us. Through their efforts this commendable and wholesome project is helping to build a stronger, sounder, and healthier America of the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief article by Irving Herschbein from the June issue of the American Legion magazine, in which the junior baseball program is described:

In the 30 years of its existence the American Legion junior baseball program has grown to be the largest youth sports program in the United States. Even the Legion, which is accustomed to measuring its many activities in terms of thousands of participants, finds the 1 million junior baseballers who play each year a formidable number.

The more than 18,000 teams which compete annually under Legion auspices constitutes the biggest baseball league in the world. Their influence on organized baseball is best shown in at least one respect by the fact that more than half of all major league baseball players are graduates of Legion junior baseball.

Impressive as the figures and statistics are, the thousands of Legionnaires who give their time to the teams find the value of junior baseball to be the opportunity it

affords to teach youngsters the meaning of America.

The 15 million youths who have played baseball under Legion auspices have learned not only how to pitch, hit, run, and field; they have learned citizenship, loyalty, sportsmanship, team spirit and self-reliance.

The adult leadership given by Legionnaires throughout the country and Hawaii and Alaska has been the backbone of the program. Winning teams and healthy boys with an understanding of what America has to offer them can be built only by inspired, persevering leadership.

Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was talking about wage rates in Winchester. Within the last 2 or 3 days a representative of some of the workers who expect to be employed under this bill came to see me at my office. I asked him what the prevailing rate of wage was in his line. He said $3.60 an hour. Assuming that the wage in Winchester was $2 an hour, as I understand the gentleman, the Secretary here can, and probably would, because that Department is created to look after the workers, fix the wage at $3.60.

Now, one more question. Do the taxpayers in the vicinity of Winchester contribute toward the construction of these highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield to answer, of course, that is exactly what is going to happen, just as the gentleman has described it, because that is what has been happening ever since the Davis-Bacon Act was passed. Because of the interruption a while ago, I did not get the opportunity to say that it not only has the effect which I have mentioned but these roads are going to be built in the rural areas. They are a source of work for your country folks. Some of you represent city folks, but a whole lot of you represent country folks, and those country folks expect to get the right to work in that neighborhood. They are not going to get it if you fix the prevailing rates in the metropolitan area and the metropolitan contractor gets the work to the exclusion of the rural contractors and rural labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do those people who live in Winchester help pay for the construction of these highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; they pay 10 percent of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. What is their wage, who fixes it, how much is it? Do they get the $3.60 fixed by the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The prevailing wage in California is going to be fixed by somebody sitting down here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point is this: The taxpayers in Winchester contribute toward the construction of the highway and help pay the wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor. Now, do they get the same wage that the fellows from the outside who are working on the highway get?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They may or may not, I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, they will not, unless they are members of the union. They will be discriminated against because they may not be members of the union, or because their dues or special assessments have not been paid to date. The result is that though they will be taxed to build the highway, they would be denied the right to work on the job, that is, unless the provisions of the Virginia statute, that is, the right-to-work law, are correctly interpreted and adequately enforced.

Visit to United States by Russian Church Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the leading Baptist clergymen in the Nation is Dr. Ralph C. Walker, now the minister of the Madison Avenue Baptist Çhurch in New York City. Before accepting this post, Dr. Walker was minister of the White Temple, in Portland, Oreg., and I have known him and his family for many years. They are outstanding people.

In a sermon recently, Dr. Walker expressed concern about attacks which have been made on the visit to this country of five Baptist leaders from the Soviet Union. From press reports, I understand that a second group of Russian churchmen is now about to make a similar visit here, as guests of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the sermon by Rev. Ralph C. Walker at the Madison Avenue Baptist Chuch, on May 20, 1956, on the subject of these visits by Rusian religious leaders and the attacks made upon them, entitled "That They May All Be One."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Five eminent Baptist leaders from Soviet Russia arrived in this country Friday, May 18. That evening they were in this chuch as guests of our own Baptist people at a dinner of fellowship and Christian welcome. For the next 30 days these 5 Russian Baptist leaders will be guests of 16 million Baptists in the United States, returning a visit paid to them by 4 Baptists from America last August.

The delegation from Russian includes four officers of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists: Jakov Zhidkov, president; Nikolai Levindanto, vice president; Alexander Karev, general secretary; and Illya Ivanov, treasurer. Miss Klaudia Tyrtova, worker in the Baptist Church in Moscow is the fifth member of the group. Their All-Union Council is made up to 520,000 Baptists in 5,400 Russian churches.

The visitors will attend meetings of the executive committee of the Baptist World Alliance, in Washington, D. C., May 22 and 23, attend the Southern Baptist Convention, in Kansas City, Mo., May 30–June 2, and the American Baptist Convention in Seattle, Wash., June 15–17. They will also visit many other American cities where they will preach in many Baptist Churches. These visits are intended to develop mutual understanding and to create a spirit of unity and fellowship among Christians living under different political systems.

This is the first of the recent exchange visits of Russians to the United States, religious or otherwise, to include a woman. It is also the first church delegation to America since 1928, when 11 Russian Baptists attending the Baptist World Alliance in Toronto, Canada, spent several weeks here.

The 4 American Baptist ministers who went to Russia in August 1955, for a 2-week visit included the first Negro American clergyman to visit the Soviet Union, the Reverend Dr. Joseph H. Jackson, Chicago, Ill., president of the National Baptist Convention, United States of America; the Reverend Dr. Theodore Adams, Richmond, Va., pastor of the First Baptist Church and president of the Baptist World Alliance; the Reverend Dr. Carney Hargroves, Philadelphia, Pa., pastor of the Second Baptist Church and former president of the American Baptist Convention; and the Reverend Arnold T. Ohrn, Washington, D. C., general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance.

This is, of course, an event of extraordinary Christian and international signficance. These Russian Baptists are our blood-brothers in the faith. They have suffered for the faith for many years far beyond any experiences of our own. We believe it is the Baptist spirit and the Baptist interpretation of the Gospel which have produced in them a heroism like that of the early Christian martyrs in Rome. After the Russian revolution in 1917, especially after Stalin's ascent to complete power in 1929, there was violent persecution of all religious groups in Soviet Russia. That repression continues in varying degree until this day. These visitors, to use the Bible phrase, "bear in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus." They are upholding the banner of Christ in a difficult, dangerous time.

On June 1 another, second delegation of Christian leaders is coming from Soviet Russia to visit the United States. They come by invitation of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. They will represent the Russian Orthodox, Armenian Orthodox, Lutheran, and Baptist-Evangelicals.

What should the attitude of God-fearing and patriotic Americans be toward these visits of Russian Christian leaders? How shall we receive them? What impression of our country's spiritual life should we convey for them to carry back to Russia?

First, there are two things I want to make unmistakably clear. One is, that because our Lord Himself prayed for and believed in Christian unity, we also pray for it and believe in it. The second is, that we as Christians can have no fellowship with atheistic communism. If we felt that this visit would weaken or compromise in any manner our absolute opposition to the teachings and practices of atheistic communism, we should be worried indeed.

What a strange and terrifying thing communism is. As has often been pointed out, it is a heresy from Judaism and Christian-

ity; a contradiction, a perversion, an upside-down and backwards-going misinterpretation of some of the very fundamentals of judaism and Christianity. It is amazing and frightening how communism takes the very aims and promises of our holy faith and seems to be able to lead the way toward them by hardboiled practical means which appeal to the ignorant and pathetically needy masses of men. Communism substitutes other standards for the standards of truth and then calls them truth, and somehow they succeed in getting men to believe in these new standards.

Communism, like Christianity, claims to be working for the brotherhood of man and a better day for all humanity, a day of justice and hope. But communism is earthbound. As the famed Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, James A. Pike, has declared: "Marxists believe that a man dies like a dog: hence they treat him like one now. If he gets in the way he can be put out of the way."

We who call ourselves Christians turn in dread from atheistic communism, but we give our whole hearts to the prayer of Jesus Christ when He prayed "that they all may be one." In deepest humility we confess that even in our beloved United States, with all its Christian leadership and its multitude of professing Christian people there are division, unbrotherly strife, separation and segregation. Some Americans are doubtless almost as much worshippers of material things as are the Communists. We may take pride and comfort in the fact that while the Communists are Godless, we believe in God; but the question remains, Do we truly worship and serve God in the spirit of Christ?

May God make this tongue to cleave to the roof of this mouth if any unnecessarily critical or accusatory word is uttered here today. But I must speak out, I dare not desist. I must describe to you in terms as temperate and fair and true as is possible some of the attacks which are being made in public today against this visit, against these our Baptist brethren from Soviet Russia, against those of us American churchmen who are their hosts.

Here is a full-page advertisement in the Philadelphia Inquirer, April 26, 1956. I read it to you:

"Eight saints, or eight spies? Eight top Red church leaders are coming over here in June from Russia, sponsored by the National Council of Churches. The Reds are using your church. Protest. Get the facts at the mammoth rally. Philadelphia's Convention Hall, May 4, 1956. Rally sponsored by International Council of Christian Churches representing 57 Protestant denominations."

The International Council publishes a periodical called the Christian Beacon. In its May 10 issue the statement is made: "These men are coming as tools and agents of the (Russian) secret police. * * * Are they Christians * * *, or are they now posing as Christians and in the name of Christianity promoting communism and using the Christian churches as a cloak for sinister purposes? We believe it is the latter. * * * The Christians in Russia are in the underground (or) in the concentration camps."

I bring these matters to your attention because today that same International Council is advertising a rally here in New York City at Carnegie Hall this week at which it will seek to disseminate the same accusations against both the visitors and the hosts in this Russian-American Christian interchange.

Who is this group who makes such serious and terrifying accusations? If they are right, even partly right, a multitude of American Christians are in deep trouble indeed.

This so-called International Council of Christian Churches, in the first place, is a numerically small, very small and insignificant organization. Its substantial membership, contrary to the title "International" is mainly in the United States. Its affiliates abroad though totaling an imposing figure of 43 denominations has a trivial actual membership count. The almost entire popular membership of the International Council is in the United States. For a long time the spokesmen of this dominant American section had claimed a popular membership of over a million persons. But when, under pressure, the true statistics were at last released that number had shrunk to 220,000 and somewhere near 75 percent of that total was in one denomination, the General Association of Regular Baptists, which as a denomination is not even formally linked with the International Council. The other denominations making up the council are very small ones, often called fringe sects.

In the second place, the constituent membership in this international council is only extremist fundamentalist. Those of you who often hear the preaching from this pulpit, and those of you who are acquainted with the record of my ministry through the years will hardly doubt my own theological conservatism. But the fundamentalism of the international council and its churches is harshly extreme. Their proclaimed beliefs seem always to lead them to continually accuse and criticize others organizationally apart from them, even to the point of calling them unbelievers. If you do not express your belief exactly as they do they call you a "modernist," "pacifist," or "near-Communist"; accuse you of denying the deity of Jesus Christ, Hir virgin birth, the inspiration of the Scriptures, or of working against your country and being a Communist agent or dupe. In other words, their policy seems to have been to attack, to criticize, to cast doubt upon the faith, sincerity, and patriotism of others who would not join them.

A third and most discouraging fact about this international council, especially to us Baptists who pride ourselves on our democratic form of church government, is that it is not really responsible to its membership. By the information of former constituent bodies, who have withdrawn from the international council, it is under "boss" rule and undemocratic leadership using objectionable administrative practices. The international council is dominated by a small clique of willful men who are forever trying to force their way to undeserved national religious leadership by blatant campaigns of intolerance and bigotry, using slander and misrepresentation, and encouraging sectarian divisiveness and rancor; men who are ready to endorse many harmful public policies.

Suffice it to say that certain of the Council's leaders have attacked the following: (I refer usually to one or more of their leading men.) They have been bitterly anti-Catholic, and while carefully phrasing their words, have been strongly anti-Semitic. They have made almost endless attacks on the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. Not only that, but they have attacked the regular organizational of the smaller doctrinaire fundamentalists, the National Association of Evangelicals, and also Billy Graham, the evangelist, who returned their fire by saying of the International Council that their "dissensions in the ranks of evangelical Christians are a stench in the nostrils of God." Who could be more conservative than the Sunday School Times in theology, yet they attacked the Times. And who doubts the theological fundamentalism of the great body of Southern Baptists; but in past years a prominent international council pastor said such things as this: that the Southern Baptist Convention was "an unclean church and a denomination permitting worldliness," and "a denomination with a creeping tendency toward apostasy," apostasy meaning "unbelief."

As for our own American (Northern) Baptist Convention, the council's paper, the Beacon, has asserted that our leadership is "Bolshevik," and that our convention "is no fit body for a true Christian to be affiliated with."

One of the most saddening things to me about the leadership in the Council has been their bitter record on the issues of war and peace. During World War II, for example, the council's president, perhaps moved by the hysteria of the times, envisioned the substantial annihilation of the Axis nations, and in the recent cold war years, the council's American directorate found it in its heart to pass a resolution indirectly justifying the policy of preventive war.

If, now, our guests from abroad may perhaps be embarrassed by any accusations against them as our guests and against ourselves as their hosts, let them be encouraged by the fact that their accusers have been accusing a lot of other people for a long period of time. Let them realize that they have a very great number of friends who will not let uncontrolled suspicion draw them away from extending a Christian welcome and a listening ear.

For instance, President Eisenhower wrote a letter last January to Premier Bulganin of the Soviet Union, in which he said: "Consider, also, the mountains of distrust and misunderstanding that would disappear if our peoples freely exchanged news, information, visits, and ideas."

Those eminent American churchmen (including our own Dr. Herbert Gezork, president of our Andover-Newton Theological Institution in Massachusetts), who visited Russia this last March, said on their return:

"We were courteously received in Russia and we hope to reciprocate here. A beginning has been made. Under the guidance and power of God we believe the Church of Jesus Christ may be used for the reconciling and salvation of the nations."

Let our Russian visitors remember that they as Baptists were invited here by their American Baptist brethren in the spirit of trust and confidence and the sincere desire for true fellowship in the common struggle against all Satan's evil, treachery and oppression.

Let them know how strong are the forces of Christ's people gathered into the National Council of Churches, 30 denominations such as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Methodists, and our own American Baptists—representing 35 million Christians as opposed to the International Council's scant claimed 220,000—who wholeheartedly welcome them here.

We Baptists do not think that any one church or demoniation, or any one council of churches on earth today can claim to be the one true church. Yet, because Christ prayed as He did, we do believe that there is one church, one body of Christ, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all.

In knowledge of present facts and the terrible history of past persecution, and in Christian charity and hope for the future, we believe the visiting Russian clergymen are at one with us in that faith, in that church. We believe—unsubstantiated accusations and suspicions to the contrary—in the Christian integrity and faithfulness of our visiting Russian brethren.

Hear the witness of the delegation of our own American Church leaders who after recently visiting Russia confirmed the judgment of famed Pastor Niemoeller as to the living church in Russia. Here is what they said:

"We had formal conferences as well as countless conversations (with) * * * Russian Christians. We visited many churches and shared in the worship of Orthodox as well as Baptists. Lutheran and Armenian

Orthodox joined in our discussions. We were taken to theological seminaries and academies and to monasteries. * * * It is apparent that church and state (in Russia) have reached at least a temporary accommodation. During the last several years the policy of the Soviet Government has discouraged persecution of Christians and regarded the clergy and other believers as loyal citizens."

And here is further witness by our own Dr. Gezork of Andover-Newton, a Baptist member of the National Council of Churches delegation to Russia last August:

"The picture which we found as far as the life of the church is concerned was one of light, but also of deep shadows. Freedom of religion is guaranteed, and we found no instance of interference with worship in the church. In every church we visited we saw large and reverent congregations. I preached twice in the Moscow Baptist Church, on a Thursday night to 1,500 and on Sunday morning to at least 2,000 people, a thousand of whom stood shoulder to shoulder in the aisles and on the steps to the balconies through a service lasting 2 hours and 15 minutes. * * * The government has issued a strongly worded decree that Christians are to be considered loyal citizens of the Soviet state, and insulting attacks on clergy and believers are not permitted. All this is encouraging.

"But there was also the other side: No religious education is permitted, there are no Sunday schools, no Christian youth organizations. The goal of Communist leadership is evident. It is to make out of the church an agency of pure other-worldliness, remote and separated from the reality of daily life, its prophetic voice stilled." And here Dr. Gezork was referring to its voice on the great moral issues of our day such as war and peace and corruption in high places, "its influence upon the coming generation reduced to a minimum."

Surely our Soviet visitors can, as they may be publicly demeaned by the clique in the International Council, take comfort in the fact that this small group of trucculent extremists may be honestly characterized as irresponsible men who have made it their cardinal policy to damn other Christians, whether they be Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox; that the record of these men shows that they are given to divisiveness and separation; men whose own congregations and denominations have repeatedly split off and subdivided into splinter groups; men who have themselves been fairly indicted of grossly undemocratic administration and gross exaggeration and distortion of facts, and of stating half-truths, and of using partial statements as if they were the whole of the statement in order to discredit others; in short, men who are constantly hatemongers and fear peddlers, apparently tending toward a philosophy which may be characterized as an obsessive spiritual and social nihilism; men perpetually filled with rage and frustration; men who are blinded leaders of the blind. These men for years past have on their record been proven to be sowers of discord and dissension, engendering ill-will and suspicion, seriously injuring the peace of God's church. They have compulsively played upon fears rather than facts.

The word of God condemns those given to strife and dissension. See II Timothy 2: 24.

Now I note, also, in the New York Harold Tribune this morning that Herbert Philbrick, who is a Baptist himself, and who was an FBI undercover agent against the Communist Party in America, for which we all thank him, has an article entitled: "Soviet Clergymen and the Church in Russia." In it he comes right out and suggests that the visiting Russian church leaders, including the five in our Baptist delegation now here, are not the representatives of the Russion Christian believers, but, he says, "represent only the Soviet state apparatus," and, furthermore, than "an agent of the secret police (M. V. D.) will be among them" (the members of the delegation). When Mr. Philbrick uses the words "churchmen, clergymen, or Baptists," he puts them in quotation marks to create the impression that the visitors are not legitimate Christians.

His article is full of suspicion and hostility against our Russian guests. Now, there are two things I want to note about his article: One, Mr. Philbrick says his own "facts about religion in the Soviet Union are sparse." I think he means by this that, for the purposes of his article, he was unable to adduce any verifiable derogatory data against the visting Russian Baptist delegation. Second, he states he cannot divulge the names of the informants upon whom he relies for his derogatory conclusions. I am, for one, inclined to agree with the President of our country that we should be reluctant to publicly credit faceless accusers whose witness or credibility may be in doubt.

But I must go one step further. In good caution we might reasonably hypothesize that evil might somehow flow from these visits or visitors. Although, history teaches us that evil is more likely to come to the visitors themselves than to us here in America. For, back in 1928, 11 Russian Baptists came out of the Soviet Union to attend the meetings in Toronto, Canada, of the Baptist World Alliance. On their return home, 10 of these 11 were exiled to concentration camps, and of these, only 1 survives to this day.

But, even keeping our caution, let us see how our Lord would have acted under similar conditions. Look at what he did in mingling with the publicans, lepers, social outcasts, Samaritans, and even thieves. Look at how he acted in the case of Judas, his own disciple who became a traitor.

Jesus knew all along Judas would betray him. Yet, in the upper room, he washed the feet of Judas with the rest. He treated him, like all the others with equal love and trust. If we follow the example of our Lord we must extend that same trust, that same tenderness, and that same love that the Lord extended even to Pilate, even to Judas.

God pity those who conceivably might, in this case, betray the trust of their hosts. But, without knowledge that this is so, or even in unfounded dread that it may be, we who are followers of Christ cannot let down an iron curtain of hate, fear, and suspicion against these our long-suffering Russian brethren who say they come here in the name of our Lord.

The Economic Troubles of the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio broadcast prepared by the Public Relations Department of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minnesota, dated May 29, 1956, dealing with the economic troubles of the farmers.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1956

What kind of ideas do you think the city person gets about farmers after he reads a headline like this in his newspaper: "With Food Setting Pace, Living Cost Is Going Up"? That headline was in the city papers last week. Now, with living costs going up as they are, you can't blame city people, or anyone else, for getting hot under the collar when they read about prices going still higher. And, when headlines tell them that cost of living is going higher because food prices are rising, who are city people going to blame? The farmer, of course.

That gets us hot under the collar here at GTA, because we know it is not true. We know for a fact that farmers aren't to blame for the rise in the cost of living. We wish newspaper headlines did not shave the truth so thin.

What are the facts? Farmers took a 26-percent cut in their prices during the last 3 years. That is how farmers have been holding down the cost of living. They've been subsidizing the inflation by getting less, when business was getting more. Any way you want to look at it, there's inflation in prices of manufactured goods and services. We all feel it. The reason the cost of living hasn't gone up a lot faster is the farmers. They've absorbed the inflation. City folks ought to be aware of that.

It may look good on the grocery bill to let farmers pay for the inflation. But the trouble is that it won't work for long. The farmers' economic troubles are now moving into town. They're coming in the back door. Because farm buying power is at its lowest point since back in the depression days of the 1930's, factories are shutting down. Hundreds of thousands of city workers who haven't got jobs. Sure, the food from the farms is cheaper, but that doesn't mean much when there's no paycheck.

It's the old story all over again—the economic troubles of one segment of the population are visited upon the others. City people ought to understand that a farm depression finally moves to town. Cheap food—which means a few dollars saved on food bills—first causes trouble for farmers, then it starts pinching paychecks in the cities. It's happening now in Detroit, in Racine, Kenosha, Moline, in our own Twin Cities, which depend, in many ways, on the prosperity of farms and surrounding towns for their own prosperity.

Put more buying power in the farmers' hands and farmers will start buying machines and tools they can't buy now. It's as simple as that. Farmers understand it. That's why they voted 95 percent in the wheat referendum last year to keep their farm program intact and their wheat prices stable. They know that farm prices are made in Washington. Now they are getting ready to cast another big "Yes" vote in the wheat referendum July 20.

Thanks for listening, and join wtih your farm neighbors all over the Midwest in GTA, the co-op way.

New England Hospital Plan for Alien Women Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial entitled "New England Hospital Plan for Alien Women Physicians," written by Carl Bearse, M. D., and published in the Journal of the American Medical Association for February 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND HOSPITAL PLAN FOR ALIEN WOMEN PHYSICIANS

(By Carl Bearse, M. D.)

A special program has been inaugurated by the New England Hospital, Boston, in the belief that international relations as well as the care of patients would be improved if extra consideration were shown to alien physicians serving as interns and residents in United States hospitals. Since this hospital is staffed entirely by women, men being included only on its consulting and courtesy staffs, the program was conceived primarily to aid foreign women physicians. There are more than 5,000 alien physicians from 83 different countries now in training in the United States. Of these, 12.3 percent are women. When these physicians return to their homelands, they will come in contact with thousands of their countrymen as patients. It is evident, therefore, that they possess tremendous potentialities for promoting friendship with the United States.

That such a program should originate at this 93-year-old hospital is not surprising. Here was established the first school of nursing in the United States. The New England Hospital was also the first to admit a Negro woman for training as a nurse and the first to use visiting nurses. The current plan for alien women physicians is another pioneer effort, characteristic of this hospital.

It has been recognized by both governmental and civilian agencies that the extension of good medical care to persons all over the world would be helpful to international relations. As a result, thousands of alien physicians have been encouraged and assisted to visit the United States, today's medical mecca. At the present time, about 60 percent of the hospitals approved for residencies and internships by the American Medical Association council on medical education and hospitals have alien physicians on their house staffs. These physicians constitute up to one-fourth of the total of resident staffs on duty in the hospitals of this country. Without the services of these physicians, hospitals would have many more unfilled positions than they now have (20 percent residencies and 30 percent internships). In fact, many small hospitals are advertising in foreign medical journals in an effort to attract interns and residents. Properly indoctrinated, these physicians can be of tremendous assistance in caring for patients, first, in our hospitals and, later, in their own countries.

Wrote Dr. J. E. McCormack: "We should resist every effort to exploit foreign physicians who are in this country for training. Many foreign interns and residents are used in hospitals where they are responsible for menial tasks in the care of an inordinately large number of patients, in return for which they receive little or no training. Even in larger centers there have been isolated instances where foreign physicians who sought research opportunities in this country were actually used as technicians. All this is very bad—for international relations."

The New England Hospital plan, on the other hand, takes into consideration both the social and psychological needs of foreign physicians, as well as the need for medical training. Prior to the training itself, a month's course of indoctrination and orientation is given. Since the English of these alien physicians is seldom fluent, and they are usually unfamiliar with idioms, they are given an intensive course in English. The course stresses medical vocabulary and the technical terms for drugs and other treatments with which the visitor may be unfamiliar. In addition, they witness demonstrations of medical techniques in use in this country. Thirty-six formal lectures in the basic sciences and in the clinical application of new therapeutic techniques are given by experts in their fields. This additional instruction supplements usual housestaff activities such as grand rounds, clinical and pathological conferees, and journal club meetings. Special functions such as teas are arranged so that these alien physicians can meet American business and professional people as well as people from their own country. They are also encouraged to participate in social activities with students from various parts of the world. Tours have been arranged so that they may visit art museums, pharmaceutical plants, and other places of interest. The staff is also raising $5,000 for travel subsidies. All these and many other activities show the visitors what America in action is really like. It certainly seems that the New England Hospital is offering a construction program that other hospitals with alien residents and interns would do well to emulate.

Activities of Midwest International Trade Development Center, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the activities report of the Midwest International Trade Development Center, Inc., which reached its first milestone on April 22, 1956. This report summarizes the scope of this enterprise, and is an indication of Ohio's new "Forward Look" beyond the horizons of its own boundaries. I feel that the report warrants the attention of the Senate, as well as that of the general public.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDWEST INTERNATIONAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC., ENQUIRER BUILDING, CINCINNATI, OHIO, ACTIVITIES REPORT, APRIL 22, 1956

On April 22, 1956, MITDC completed 1 year of operation. During that time, we feel much has been accomplished toward our goals of developing more trade, understanding, and peace between this Midwest area and the free world.

We have had inquiries from abroad requesting names of firms in this area, and we have established these contacts. We have found export managers for Midwest Radio & Television Corp., Central Tool Co., and Senco Products of Cincinnati, of Ohio, and Record Files of Wooster, Ohio. We have had one trade luncheon here, and others are in the planning stage for other towns in the MITDC area. A trade mission to Latin America is planned for the fall of 1956.

We have endeavored, through questionnaires sent to almost four hundred firms in this immediate area to find those desiring foreign markets and sources of supply. We have begun making market surveys for these firms in cooperation with Xavier University.

We have established contacts with the United States Export-Import Bank, the United States Department of Commerce, both locally and in Washington, with all the Ambassadors and Consuls in Washington, with all the American consuls abroad, and the consuls of other countries residing in the MITDC trading area. We have their complete cooperation, as stated in letters to our office, in passing along information concerning this center and its activities to businessmen in other localities to stimulate more trade.

We have secured a consul for Mexico for Cincinnati, Miss Aria Parke Schawe, who has had broad experience in Mexico and other Latin American countries, and the matter is now in the hands of the Mexican Government for approval. We have every reason to believe this appointment will be approved, and continuing efforts are being made by this office to secure consuls for other countries in Cincinnati.

We have provided translation services when necessary for firms or individuals and speakers for various organizations. We completed all research to provide names of all the leading manufacturers and industrialists in this Midwest area. We are now mailing our house organ, The Trade Mart, to approximately one thousand businessmen and other interested organizations in the MITDC trading area each month as well as to American consuls abroad who keep it on display for business opportunities in their localities.

We are affiliated with International House of New Orleans, receiving all of their experience and services. We have a competent corps of representatives in Latin America, in three European countries, one Asiatic country. We shall continue to secure representatives in other sections of the world.

Through efforts of MITDC, Xavier University is now offering a course in International Trade. The University of Indiana is now exploring the possibility of offering more scholarships to Latin American students at American universities and obtaining scholarships at Latin American universities for American students. We have arranged for one exchange doctor in the Department of Radiology at General Hospital.

United States Congressmen GORDON SCHERER and WILLIAM HESS have been contacted, and they are arranging for a meeting of the various representatives in Washington from the Midwest area so that a statement can be issued jointly in favor of MITDC, and arrangements can be made for more support of this project in Washington.

The State of Ohio, in cooperation with MITDC, is preparing a new booklet on Ohio in color. Farson, Huff & Northlich, of Cincinnati, Ohio, are now preparing the dummy for this booklet which will be published in various languages, seeking to draw tourists to Ohio. Mr. E. E. Schnellbacher, Director of the Office of Intelligence and Services, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C., said in his talk before the American Association of University Women in Cincinnati, March 15, 1956:

"If instead of shipping goods to foreign countries, we sent ourselves and brought them back, or if we brought enough customers here to equal production, we would have a balance of trade. * * * Tourism is very sound business because you provide the service industries with dollars which they in turn spend. There is no estimate of how American tourist dollars spent abroad return to this country in purchase of materials from American industry * * * France, for example, made more money from the United States through tourism than from all the things she exported to the United States in goods."

Mr. C. A. Harrell, city manager of Cincinnati, has been contacted regarding the city of Cincinanti assuming some of the expense of publishing this book concerning Cincinnati and Ohio. While the city prob-

ably will not be able to aid in financing, Mr. Harrell stated in a letter to this office:

"I will be glad to discuss this matter further with you, if you feel the city can be helpful, for I am very much interested in the type of thing you are doing."

Negotiations were made with WRUL, World Wide Broadcasting, of New York City, to transcribe their recording of the MITDC banquet speeches in October of 1955, and news of this banquet has gone all around the world together with the news of the establishment of this trade center. NBC–TV has also been in consultation with us, and MITDC is to be included in their special telecast from Cincinnati on April 17 for Dave Garroway's Today.

On the civic service side, MITDC has cooperated with the Children's International Summer Village to provide a luncheon for the delegates to the village. We have provided contacts, home entertainment including dinners, and industrial tours for the following visitors to Cincinnati; Latin American businessmen brought by Amertool Services; Japanese businessmen brought by Amertool Services; Latin American agricultural team brought by United States Department of Agriculture; Mexican group of teachers, secretaries, accountants, etc., brought by Experiment in International Living; teachers from India, Japan, and Argentina brought by Cincinnati Board of Education; doctors from Latin America brought by Wm. S. Merrell Co.

We are now preparing, in cooperation with the William S. Merrell Co., a dinner and reception for the 122 resident international doctors, internes, and nurses at the greater Cincinnati hospitals.

We have cooperated with the Cincinnati Council on World Affairs for their Latin American Institute in January, and we have provided letters of introduction to various Cincinnati area people who were leaving for foreign travel. We have helped Ohio State University publicize its April 7, 1956, regional foreign trade conference covering a 5-State area.

The past several weeks we have been exploring the possibility of JayCee support of MITDC, having had a conference with Mr. George Kral, president, and Mr. Lawrence W. Bratburd, international relations chairman for the local group. We have also had correspondence with Mr. William Hellerman of Columbus, Ohio, JayCee director of international relations who is very much interested in MITDC and is urging support of it by the local group.

We have also had contact with Mr. Roth of the Retail Merchants Association, and they feel they will be interested in participating as founder members of MITDC. In fact, a membership campaign is now in the planning stage, and will be presented for board approval within the next 2 weeks.

We have been exploring the possibility of publishing for distribution abroad, an industrial directory of the Midwest area in four languages, and we have discussed this matter with Diamond Directory and Conover-Mast Co. It is now under consideration by these two firms.

All of these efforts were made while we were also soliciting and obtaining memberships with a staff of never more than 4, most of the time with only 2, with a total budget for equipment, office expenses, salaries, et cetera, of only $21,799.94 with pledges and income of $21,850, leaving a bank balance at this time of $50.06. Naturally, as with all new enterprises, mistakes were made during the first year of operation. However, we feel these have been corrected, and we are now in a much stronger position to obtain more memberships and provide more services to our members and to the community because the necessary groundwork has just now been laid.

Many other cities are now considering establishment of just such a center as ours, and we have been getting many inquiries as to how to start a center. If we do not go full steam ahead, these other cities will overcome our head start and much of the export and import business which could come to this area through MITDC will be diverted elsewhere.

The American Merchant Marine—Key to Trade and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most excellent essay entitled "The American Merchant Marine—Key to Trade and Defense," written by Miss Nancy McDonald, a high-school student of Detroit, Mich. I am pleased and proud that Miss McDonald has been awarded a national prize for her paper in the 1956 Harding Memorial Essay Contest conducted by the Propeller Club of the United States.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE: KEY TO TRADE AND DEFENSE

Every lock has a key. Every nation which is to know economic prosperity and national security in today's world must have in its possession the key to both trade and defense; namely, a strong merchant marine.

Since the end of World War II, the United States merchant marine has not kept pace with the merchant marines of other nations. The United States, the top shipbuilder during the war, has dropped to sixth place. The active United States merchant fleet of approximately 1,500 vessels carries just over one-fourth of all the cargo tonnage transported in the water-borne foreign trade of the United States.

This condition exists largely because the basic pay of an American shipyard worker is 4 to 10 times that of a foreign yard worker. Consequently, United States shippers can no longer compete successfully with foreign competitors, for the building of a vessel in an American shipyard may cost from 50 to 100 percent more than in a foreign yard. For example the superliner the *United States* cost $50 million to build in an American yard in 1952 while in a British yard it would have cost $30 million.

Another reason United States lines receive less business, and consequently order fewer ships from United States yards is that the merchant marines of foreign nations, which have been restored to prewar status, have lower operating costs. For example, an American ablebodied seaman receives an average pay of $315 per month compared to the Britisher's $60 a month or the Chilean's $20. Thus, the total annual bill for the crew's wages of the liner *United States* is almost $7 million which is double what a British crew's wages would be. It is not difficult then to understand why in 1954 out of 850 dry cargo ships built in the world, not one was built for private account in the United States. Moreover, since the end of World War II, while other maritime nations have added more than 2,700 vessels to their fleets, the United States has added less than 100.

Of course, Americans can always play at being ostriches with their heads stuck in the sand, pretending that the United States does not need ships. How many times, however, have ostriches received rather sudden and forceful blows from behind while in this rather defenseless position? It is relatively easy if one's head is not stuck in the sand to understand why America needs a strong merchant marine for trade and, thus, for defense.

The industries of the United States are becoming increasingly more dependent upon ships to keep them supplied with the raw materials which they need in ever-increasing amounts. For example, the United States imports 98 percent of all manganese without which steel cannot be produced. It is estimated that by 1960 the United States will need to import 40 million tons of iron ore. While the United States needs it imports, it, also, has built a very valuable export trade. To illustrate, 1 out of each 20 passenger cars and trucks which comes off American assembly lines is shipped to a foreign country.

Today the people of the United States have a great opportunity to develop new trade for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation expects seaway navigation works to be ready for the first larger ships in the spring season of 1959. The Corporation estimates that 50 million tons of traffic will be able to move through the seaway by 1965. If more ships are not constructed by United States shipping lines, however, the United States may not share in the St. Lawrence trade. By then the United States may not be engaging in much other trade either. Fully 80 percent of the United States merchant marine is composed of ships built during World War II. Since 20 years is regarded as the efficient life of a merchant ship today, this 80 percent of the American merchant fleet will be obsolete by 1965.

While trade is the lifeline of industry, industry is the lifeline of defense. Americans are dependent for defense upon weapons which can be produced only by using certain minerals from foreign countries. Most weapons are made of steel. In order to make steel certain of these foreign minerals, such as manganese, are essential. Modern airpower depends upon jet propulsion. Since jet planes generate intense heats, the metal used in these planes must be able to withstand this heat. Cobalt, three-fourths of which comes from the Belgian Congo, is alloyed with steel to enable it to withstand the heat. Most of these heavy minerals can move only in ships.

Nations friendly toward the United States depend a great deal on this country. The United States is giving material assistance to 49 countries and has troops stationed in 42 nations upon which these countries rely for defense. These nations depend on the United States and its merchant marine to keep provisions coming in.

Arguments against building a strong merchant marine are weak indeed. The first of these is, the United States can depend upon foreign vessels to carry its commerce. This has been disproved many times. For example, at the beginning of World War I, the ships of foreign nations, carrying 90 percent of the United States foreign trade, were withdrawn from normal operations leaving the United States entirely cutoff from foreign raw materials and our export trade became almost nonexistent. The second argument is, strengthening the merchant marine now would be too expensive. If the United States were involved in another war, however, the cost of building an adequate merchant fleet would be tremendous. To illustrate, in World War II, the United States spent $12 billion to create emergency shipyards and hastily constructed ships. This money would have subsidized in normal times the orderly construction and operation of most of this fleet for 340 years.

As for building up the United States merchant marine, while it will require the coop-

eration of the Government, industry, and the voters, it is not an insurmountable task. The Government must increase ship construction and operating subsidies, for while the United States wants and needs shipping, it does not want to lower its standard of living to compete with foreign shipping. Industry must give concentrated attention to technological improvements and higher productivity of labor. Perhaps most important, however, the voters must understand merchant marine problems, for the people's representatives vote for the legislation which they know the people they represent want.

Since a strong merchant marine is the key to trade and defense, use it to unlock the door to greater prosperity and security for the United States.

Fringe Benefits for Business Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time a most informative article concerning the fringe benefits that are more and more being accorded the executives of our corporations and the bonuses proffered to them in return for their special skills and energies. The article appeared in the April 20, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

It would appear that "fringe benefits" will very soon be an accepted and respected phrase in our economic language.

The editorial follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: BENEFITS FOR BIG BOYS

(By Sylvia Porter)

R. A. is one of the policymaking vice presidents of a nationally known corporation which has made a lot of money in the last few years. If you saw his monthly paycheck, though, you would be surprised; you would expect the check to be much bigger, considering the name of the company, the industry, and his key job.

But R. A.'s paycheck would give you a badly distorted view of his actual financial setup. For, in addition to a cash salary, R. A.'s company has just in the last 5 years given him:

A handsome expense account which covers virtually all his expensive entertaining, travel costs, etc. It also provides him with a new car every year and a beautiful vacation haven.

A retirement program under which he's already guaranteed $21,000 a year for life and his retirement benefits are steadily increasing.

A special contract retaining him as a consultant at $14,000 a year for 10 years, beginning when he's 65.

CAN BUY STOCK

A privilege to buy a big chunk of the company's stock at a specified price at any time between now and 1965. The stock is now quoted at $40 above the price at which R. A. can buy (or has bought) the stock and his paper profits on the stock top a quarter-million dollars.

So, if you added to R. A.'s cash salary all his fringe benefits, you would find that he is doing very nicely indeed in this era of stiff taxes on high incomes. R. A. is not only building a major estate for his family; he also is in a position to move easily and comfortably in the so-called million-dollar circles of our land.

Am I making this report on R. A. because he is so exceptional? Oh no. The point of this story is that R. A. is becoming less and less the exception, more and more typical of executives in industry.

In corporation after corporation, key officers are getting contracts and pay deals that rival or surpass the one R. A. has. As an illustration, the magazine Sales Management made a survey of 50 leading corporations a short while ago, found only one in which the chief sales executive is compensated by salary alone.

In corporation after corporation, top management men are being tied to their jobs for life by a "golden cord" of fringe benefits. The deals make the executives all but immune to offers from the companies' competitors because the men would have to give up their impressively attractive benefits if they quit.

What are some of the ways corporations are compensating keymen—outside of cash? These:

A stock option deal. Under this plan, a key employee gets the option to buy a specified total of the company's stock at a specified price during a specified period of years. If the stock soars during the period, he still can exercise his option at the fixed price; when and as he sells his shares, his gain will be taxed only at the capital gains rate, meaning at a top of 25 percent. The profits of some men who have stock option deals run into millions of dollars.

A deferred bonus arrangement. Under this, the company votes the officer a bonus payable in installments over a number of years, thereby cutting his year-to-year tax liability. In some cases, the executive prefers (and will get) payment of his bonus after he retires.

EYE-POPPING INCOMES

Handsome retirement programs. Some contracts I've seen give executives really eye-popping incomes for life. In addition, many have contracts to remain as consultants at impressive salaries after 65.

Rich insurance policies which also may pledge a lifetime income to the wife.

And fat expense accounts, special health programs, profit-sharing arrangements, many other variations of benefits.

The publicized statistics on the rate of rise in executives' salaries are meaningless unless the fringe benefits also are included. It's becoming commonplace for top men to turn down flatly hikes in cash pay in favor of pay in forms which are subject to only moderate taxes.

The cash pay check of an American executive is less and less the yardstick of his financial well-being, and it'll continue to be less and less so as his fringe benefits multiply.

Coordination of Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a very able speech by Maj. Gen. J. S. Bragdon, special assistant to the President, delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the 43d annual convention held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956:

Congressman BROOKS, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege for me to participate in the 43d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. From my experience in the Corps of Engineers I am well acquainted with the fine contribution your organization has rendered in the development of our Nation's water resources and in its sponsorship of great projects which have added to the Nation's wealth. The programs with which you are concerned are among the most important functions of public works.

My subject this morning, Coordination of Public Works, affords me an opportunity to tell you something about a comparatively new staff element in the White House whose purpose is to provide coordination of public works planning at all levels.

The Public Works Planning Unit is responsible, among other things, for keeping the President advised as to (a) the various types and amount of public facilities required by an expanding economy to meet human needs at the national, State, and local levels; (b) the current, long-range plans and programs for the accomplishment of such works by agencies of the Federal Government and by similar agencies of States and local governments and the interrelationships of these programs; (c) the possibilities for the acceleration of public works construction in the event that economic conditions make such acceleration desirable.

Perhaps you may not be fully aware of the magniture of public works. Last year the value of new public works brought into being amounted to over $12 billion. This equals about 3 percent of the GNP. Of this three-fourths or $9 billion was for State and local public works and the balance for Federal works.

There are forty-odd Federal agencies engaged in public works. There are over 109,000 State and local governmental or quasi-governmental entities involved in public works. It is a big and widespread operation.

Much has been said of accumulated backlogs. It is true that 2 wars and a depression have served to accumulate great volumes of public works needed but deferred. It is also true that the amazing spurt in our population growth is rapidly adding to our over-all needs. Our population growth in the 20-year period from 1955 to 1975 will add about 56 millions, a number equal to one-third of the entire population growth attained in 300 years prior to 1955. There are now about 3 births to every death in our country.

These and other major factors have combined to bring the estimated requirements for State and local public works to over $200 billion. If we were to catch up and obtain these needed assets within the next 10 years, the present rate of construction of public works would have to be more than doubled.

The backlog of public works, exclusive of military, in which the Federal Government is directly concerned is something over $80 billion. Sixty billion dollars, or three-fourths of this is in the major water resources fields; namely, navigation, flood control, watershed management, and irrigation.

At our present rate of public works construction it will require over 24 years to catch up with presently estimated requirements.

Public works—schools, streets, water supply, sewage disposal—are tangible assets which are intimately concerned with our everyday living. Because of the great volume of this demand, as well as other construction demands in the future years, it is necessary that we carefully husband our construction dollar and spend it prudently on those things which we most need rather

than on those things which we would merely like to have.

The need for long-range planning to obtain integrated, comprehensive, and sound development becomes more generally recognized and more pressing as our requirements grow. Surveys and studies of possible improvements in organization and policy have almost uniformly come to the single conclusion—that adequate planning, participated in equally by all parties at interest is fundamental to the wise development of our resources in the long run interest of the Nation.

In dealing with this problem we have evolved an approach to the overall planning problem which envisages four major steps:

First, a determination of measured needs, based on flexible general criteria for each area of government following basic guides of population and economic growth, and specific criteria for each type of work. These criteria will be self-determined and by reason of a common basic method, relative urgencies of needs can be ascertained.

Second, long-range plans arranged by functional priorities which reflect relative urgencies. These also will be self-determined by each community but follow a common although flexible method of development.

Third, multiyear programs of capital improvements developed from the long-range plans and constituting the initial phases thereof.

Fourth, annual or biennial budgets developed from these multiyear capital programs.

To assist in developing the details of this aprpoach and to provide firmly rooted bases for procedures, we are launching four general research problems to be carried out by experts in each field. Briefly, these are:

I. The role of public works in the economy, both in times of normal growth and to assist in stabilization, if needed.

II. The interrelationships of Federal, State, city, and local governments in the field of public works with especial reference to financing.

III. The optimum planning organizations for public works at the various levels of government. This would include a study of comprehensive or multifunction planning and single-function planning.

IV. A methodology for the determination of public works needs with their relative urgencies at all levels. This would include the development of these needs into long-range plans.

Since the complete working out of the details involved in research is a long-term effort, we are pushing ahead along parallel lines by having the responsible Federal agencies develop criteria for calculating public works needs. These criteria drafted in cooperation with State and local interests will be reviewed by the advisory committees on Federal public works and the advisory committee on State and local public works and updated as additional data become available, either from the research problems noted above or from experience gained as the program progresses.

Basic to this process are the judgments of leading citizens and governmental officers at all levels in determining needs and urgencies; and second, the willingness of local governments and communities to consciously and enthusiastically organize for and embark upon comprehesive planning programs.

Just last week I attended the National Conference on Metropolitan Problems where was studied the increasing urgency of the problem of the growth of metropolitan areas. Between 1950 and 1955 over 97 percent of the total increase in population was in the 168 standard metropolitan areas. Within these areas there are 16,000 smaller political jurisdictions or an average of 95 in each. A major element of the metropolitan problem is how to efficiently plan, build, and operate public works and services for congested areas where fractionalized government in the form of numerous political entities now exercise varying jurisdictions. Water supply, navigation, and flood-control problems are often involved in this jurisdictional entanglement. In the case of harbors serving one or more jurisdictions there have been many excellent solutions found in port authorities or other interstate or intergovernmental groups.

Until the President initiated this work, there was no organization responsible for taking a broad look at the needs for all types of public works and the progress being made in meeting such needs. Programs have operated pretty much within their own channels and without much long-range planning. There may have been times when inadequate attention has been given to navigation improvements in the overall water resources development program. Our work is pointed toward bringing to light the existence of any serious deficiencies in any category of public works. This will include the needs and plans for rivers and harbors programs as an integral part of our national requirements.

While the foregoing applies to all fields of public works, nowhere is the need for comprehensive long-range planning more evident than in the field of water resources. We are today face to face with water scarcities and flood devastation which can seriously limit our growth and impair our economy. We cannot ever overlook the central fact that water is our most precious asset. Contrary to popular belief, there is not an inexhaustible supply of water. We are consuming this vital resource at an ever-increasing rate. If this increasing rate is not widely recognized and dealt with intelligently, we can only look forward to more serious scarcities. In 1954 the President of the United States stated to this Congress that we must study where every drop of water falls and what we are going to do with it, from the Continental Divide to the sea. It has been calculated that in an average year the total rainfall on our country amounts to about 4,300 billion gallons per day. There is lost in evaporation and transpiration about 3,000 billion, leaving only about 1,300 billion gallons of runoff. Of this, about two-thirds runs off as excess waters in floods in a short period. Only about one-third is available during most of the year. Our present use for all purposes is 262 billion gallons per day. In 1975 it is predicted that 453 billion gallons will be required. If this predicted demand comes to pass, it does not necessarily mean that it will overtake total supply because, as you know, water is and can be stored and reused. It does mean that it is imperative that we plan carefully and wisely for reuse methods. It has been estimated that it would, within economic feasibility, be possible to build reservoirs so that we could utilize 630 billion gallons per day. However, to build up supplies through reservoir and reuse methods requires extensive antipollution measures, both as to domestic wastes and industrial processing of waters. I hasten to point out the foregoing figures deal only with the overall national picture. We are all aware that there are regions of this country facing acute shortages right now.

In an address before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in 1954 your president, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, emphasized some of the problems which were also of great concern to the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources in their recent report. He pointed out that the establishment of a clear national policy in the light of all the varied aspects of water resources development is most difficult; that existing policies have been developed on a piecemeal basis over a long period of time as demands for work in certain specified functional areas arose; that areas of potential conflict in our water resources and land programs could be largely eliminated by the formulation and adoption of a well-defined water policy. He further said that uniform and just treatment would be facilitated if Congress would establish the extent of Federal interest and its corollary appropriate requirements for local cooperation; stressed the need for evaluation of costs and benefits on a uniform and sound basis; emphasized the importance of balanced functional programs; and urged that appropriations follow authorizations in logical sequence.

The committee's report constitutes a great step forward in the establishment of a reasonable approach in the development of our water resources. It was not expected that its findings would become a panacea for all ills. And while the report may not satisfy the zealots of extreme positions, the policies outlined therein are basic and constitute a framework within which the Federal Government, together with State and local governments and other non-Federal interests, may collaborate to best develop the water resources. Broadly, it does two things. First, it reduces or eliminates many of the present conflicting procedures and practices of agencies. Second, it recommends a planning organization that will provide a continuing mechanism for settling those unresolved problems in the water resources fields that are not specifically dealt with in the report and which may arise in the future, to include needed policy formulation.

The report implements the principle of close collaboration in planning with local interests by providing basin committees to coordinate resources planning and develop basin plans. These committees would be formed of representatives of all States concerned on an equal basis with the Federal agencies.

The report also carries out the principle of cooperative planning in its treatment of interstate compacts. It points out that most of our major rivers have an interstate character and that the States should be encouraged to undertake to adjust among themselves through compacts the fair and equitable distribution of water.

Among the important water-resources projects authorized this year, two are unique under present conditions. The Great Lakes connecting channels and the Mississippi River-Gulf channel projects constitute large developments that can be viewed almost solely from a single purpose standpoint. In both projects economic savings in transportation costs is the primary requirement. With the tremendous increase in demands for water and its multiple uses and control, such uncomplicated conditions are seldom found in the development of interior navigation channels.

In the 1944 Flood Control Act the use of water for navigation projects authorized therein was subordinated to beneficial consumptive uses for all water originating west of the 97th meridian. This legislation stemmed from the compelling pressures which developed in the West as water shortages occurred.

The Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy realized the seriousness of controversies arising from conflicting views as to the rights of various groups to use of water. Its report holds that "The principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted. Determinations as to disposition of water should recognize such rights." It also recommends "that a study be made under the leadership of the Federal Government in collaboration with State and local entities to determine (a) the relationship between the establishment of property rights to water and the economic and social development of the Nation and its regions and of the States and their communities, and (b) the principles and criteria to be incorporated into Federal, State, and local laws upon which rights to the appropriation and use of water could be estab-

lished that would assure the best and most effective use and control of water to meet the current and the long-range needs of the people of a region, State, or locality, and of the Nation as a whole, and that would encourage maximum participation by all parties of interest."

In the water-resources field particularly, opportunities are afforded to make public-works projects self-liquidating. Through integrated planning it is often possible to incorporate features serving several purposes into such projects and thereby reduce the cost which would have been otherwise incurred in providing separate facilities to meet each need. This practice also accomplishes a more comprehensive and higher use of the resources available. Furthermore, since such products as hydroelectric power, and water supply constitute salable commodities, the beneficiaries are directly traceable and responsibility for repayment of costs readily assigned.

Under a comprehensive plan the total volume and head of water in a basin is utilized to the feasible maximum; under a multipurpose plan the total head and volume of any given site is utilized to the feasible maximum and thus under complete basin and complete site planning the feasible maximum development with a minimum capital outlay is attained.

When such basin water-resource planning becomes a part of nationwide public-works planning, all elements in this field are seen in proper perspective. Comprehensive planning requires participation by all interests—Federal, State, county, city, and private interests—this from the beginning of planning to the final constructional stage.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is in a peculiar and strategic position to exercise leadership in proposing programs for comprehensive planning in its field.

It is through such organization that we may attain enlightened, comprehensive, and coordinated planning of public works, in which all citizens participate and from which they all will benefit.

The Soviet Challenge to American Technological Leadership Must Be Met

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely and thought-provoking article concerning the Russian challenge to our technological leadership, which appeared in the April 23, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

It is evident that, if we expect to retain our scientific leadership in an atomic age, ways must be found to increase the number of youths pursuing scientific education or else we will be left far back in the race before we know it.

Let us hope that the competent authorities at all Government levels, and particularly in the educational field itself, will bend their efforts and energies toward a quick and adequate solution of this seriously threatening scientist shortage.

The article follows:

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN SCHOOLS

For several years educational leaders have been disturbed by reports that the Soviet Union is surpassing us in technical education. A figure often quoted is the 23,000 engineers which we graduated in 1954 as compared to the 53,000 that the Soviets graduated in the same year.

Americans have been apt to distrust such figures. It has seemed incredible that a backward nation like the Soviet Union could ever challenge the technological preeminence of the United States, where youngsters become mechanically minded at the age of five.

Nevertheless, there seems good reason to feel concern. Writing in the New York Times magazine, former Senator WILLIAM BENTON gives a graphic picture of the herculean efforts that the Soviets are making in the field of technical and engineering education.

In the Soviet Union, Benton points out, practically everybody goes to school. Soon the basic 10-year school will be compulsory everywhere. Russian youngsters already go to school 6 days a week and for more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours do. And the stress is on mathematics and the physical sciences. Unlike the United States where, according to Benton, only 125 new teachers of physics were produced for the 28,000 high schools of the Nation last year, the Soviet Union is rapidly producing thousands of trained secondary school teachers and technicians. The University of Moscow, which has a heavy technological emphasis, alone enrolls 23,000 students.

On the higher levels of engineering also the Soviet preformance is, unfortunately, impressive. The 800 institutions of higher education—training everything from surgeons to aeronautical experts—enroll nearly 2 million students. Contrary to our usual ideas about Marxist suffocation of the intellectual pursuits, the Soviets apparently give free rein to the scholars who deal in theory. The University of Moscow alone has 500 of these. They are committed to pure research, and have no teaching duties.

The result, according to Benton, is that the Soviets are rapidly overtaking us in training their students in the specialized skills. His solution—a massive Federal Government subsidy for 4-year university scholarships—is drastic. With American colleges already crammed to the eaves, such a program would increase the overcrowded conditions.

But there seems good reason to believe that our educational system is facing its greatest challenge. Unless it supplies us with sufficient numbers of technical experts—whose training begins on the secondary school level—we may find ourselves in a critical situation within another 10 years.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped recently held its annual meeting here in Washington. At its luncheon meeting on Friday, May 18, the committee heard addresses by William P. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO and by John S. Coleman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. Schnitzler spoke on the topic of The Handicapped and Labor and Mr. Coleman addressed himself to The Handicapped and Employers. Both speeches typify the excellent work being done by the committee in promoting the rehabilitation of the handicapped and returning them to the productive labor force of the country. They spell out what is being done and what neds to be done in this field which is so important to our Nation's welfare and economy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speeches of both Mr. Schnitzler and Mr. Coleman:

SPEECH BY AFL-CIO SECRETARY-TREASURER WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER TO THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

It is a distinct pleasure to extend the very best wishes of the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations to the hardest working conservationists in our country.

We Americans are great believers in conservation. We've done a tremendous lot to preserve the great natural resources of the United States. We annually spend great sums of money to protect our wildlife; to establish game preserves; to police our game-protection laws.

I only wish we'd do half as much to protect and preserve and rehabilitate America's greatest natural resource—her people.

The American labor movement has no objection whatsoever to game-protection laws; to game wardens; to the expenditure of public funds for conservation. In fact, we are staunch supporters of such legislation.

We do object, however, to a type of political thinking that supports the employment of far more game wardens than industrial safety inspectors.

Most emphatically, we object to the meager sums which are spent by the Federal and State governments for the rehabilitation of those injured in industrial or nonindustrial accidents and those who are handicapped from birth.

Somehow or other, too many of our legislators—both State and Federal—think of rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped, in terms of charity.

We in the AFL-CIO reject that type of thinking.

Rehabilitation, retraining, and employment of the handicapped—that is not charity. Oh, certainly, they are objectives close to the hearts of all humanitarians. But they are more than just humanitarian ideals.

In our practical world, it seems to me important to consider these matters in terms of concrete investment. And it is a good investment. It is good business.

Every survey that I have studied clearly proves that the funds expended in the rehabilitation of the handicapped have been returned to society—and with good interest, too.

Instead of remaining a drain on our economy as wards of society receiving welfare aid, rehabilitated workers become useful citizens—contributors—and good contributors—to the earning power of our economy. Why in income tax alone, the returns are far greater than the original investment.

Even more important than the financial value is the fact that we return to these handicapped folks their sense of self-respect; we return their personal dignity. We are, in each case, once again proving the basic

belief upon which our great Nation was built and has flourished—the all-embracing belief in the importance of each individual human being.

I suppose a political cynic might say that the interest of the AFL–CIO in this entire subject is a selfish one. That is, of course, partly true. While we have a sincere interest in this matter from a humanitarian point of view, we have a deep personal involvement.

Among the 15 million members of the AFL–CIO there are a large number who suffer from all types of handicaps. Some were injured on the battlefield; some are the victims of the industrial machine; some were injured in traffic accidents. Some were born handicapped.

We in the AFL–CIO are committed to the proposition that equality of opportunity must be shared by all men.

No artificial boundary of race or creed or color or national origin or physical handicap can be permitted to block a man's opportunity to a better way of living for himself and his family.

The basic interest of the American labor movement is in the welfare of American workers. That is why we shall wage relentless war against industrial accidents and against all who stand in the way of the handicapped worker in his desire for rehabilitation.

I suppose you could rightly say that every single one of our 15 million members is a potential victim of the industrial machine. There isn't a single job filled by an American wage earner that doesn't involve some potential risk. Of course, there are jobs that are far safer than others. Certainly, the sandhog working under the Hudson River today considers the man working in a bakery as having a far safer job.

Well, I am a baker. And I have seen horrible accidents in a bakeshop—accidents which maim a worker for life.

You know, even the most callous worker never gets used to such accidents. We are shocked whenever they happen.

That sense of shock and the knowledge that today's victim of an industrial accident could, but for the grace of God, have been any one of us, has kept the American labor movement alive to the need for continual battle in this field.

I know of no other single issue more certain to arouse the interest and the fighting spirit of American workers, than a fight for better workmen's compensation laws, for better industrial safety laws and for better rehabilitation services.

Despite our continuing fights and despite the desperate need, the condition of America's workmen's compensation laws is still shocking. Workers still bear not only the pain and the suffering of industrial accidents; they bear as well a disproportionate share of the resulting economic burden.

Workmen's compensation laws are a legalistic hodge-podge. In State after State, the amount a worker receives for the loss of an arm or a leg or an eye—or even the loss of life itself—varies like the score on a pinball machine.

In some States the loss of an arm will bring a worker half as much as he would receive in a neighboring State. By what standard of morality can our legislators determine that an arm is worth more in Wisconsin than in Ohio?

Why, in some States, the loss of an arm at the shoulder has less compensable value than the loss of a thumb in another State.

There is no moral or ethical or economic justification for these varying standards. Nor is there justification for the tragic lag, in every State, in achieving badly needed improvements and economic modernization of workmen's compensation laws.

The same indictment can be returned against the industrial safety laws of many of the States. In the main, these statutes do not reflect the tremendous strides that have been made in our modern industrial life. Today, when the operations of many industries bear up resemblance to the operation in the workshops of two decades ago, we find industrial safety laws which were adopted in the twenties and haven't been modernized since.

But the greatest shortcomings of all are found in the field of rehabilitation. With only a few exceptions, the field of rehabilitation is virtually ignored in the workmen's compensation laws of the various States.

The time has certainly come when the Federal Government must give wise and progressive leadership in this, the most neglected form of social insurance in America today.

We in the AFL–CIO will, I solemnly promise you, continue to fight without a moment's relaxation for rehabilitation measures which will benefit America's handicapped—and benefit equally the American economy.

While we wage this battle on the legislative front, we shall be mindful, as well, that we can also insure substantial gains for the handicapped through the collective bargaining process.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has done an exceptionally fine job in alerting our Nation to the serious gap which separates the large number of unemployed handicapped workers from self-reliant, productive, useful jobs.

The American labor movement is doing much to aid in this campaign. But there is much more that we can and should and will do. Union-management cooperation in this field is a prime necessity and the AFL–CIO will do its best to spur this kind of cooperation.

Out of it and out of a new awareness of the problem, we hope will come the kind of understanding and assistance which will result in the adoption of sound second-injury laws; enlightened rehabilitation legislation; the appropriation of needed funds to erect and staff rehabilitation centers where the proper emphasis is placed on the medical, psychological, and vocational aids that handicapped workers need.

The doctors, the scientists, the technicians have made remarkable progress in this field. We have the tools and the know-how that is necessary. It is up to us—labor and industry alike—to bring the know-why to the attention of our legislators so that we can translate this knowledge into practice for the benefit of the handicapped as individuals and for the ultimate benefit of the entire Nation.

In this campaign, the American labor movement will not be found wanting. We know the need. We know the value. We know the tremendous return which can be achieved.

We are in this fight until we achieve the victory that must certainly be won if right and justice for the handicapped worker are to prevail.

ADDRESS BY JOHN S. COLEMAN, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 18, 1956.

It seems to me that I am wearing two hats at this meeting because the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Burroughs Corp. are both members of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

I had not been president of the national chamber many days before I discovered that it always has a number of the so-called physically handicapped on its payroll. Some of them have been there for years—loyal, valued, and respected members of the staff. Another such person joined the staff last week.

At Burroughs we also hire the so-called physically handicapped—so I am happy to report that both the business organization I represent and the corporation I represent practice what they preach.

We have a written policy at Burroughs, one article of which states that "* * * we will give full consideration to the placement of disabled persons on work they are qualified to do."

The keystone of this policy is that it accentuates the positive. By that, I mean that we emphasize abilities rather than disabilities. We seek to find a job that the disabled person can perform just as satisfactorily as if he were not disabled. That is why I think I was justified in using the phrase "the so-called physically handicapped" twice in the first minute of this brief talk.

I would like to give you the gist of our experiences at Burroughs because I am more familiar with those experiences than any other facts which bear on the subject for discussion today—and because our experiences might be usefully adapted by other business concerns.

Our general policy states that all employees are to be selected on the basis of their skill, their intelligence, training, experience, character, merit, and physical fitness. This same policy applies to the physically handicapped. However—and this is important—we realize that physical fitness is a relative thing and must be judged in relation to a specific job. We do not tailor jobs to disabilities. Rather, we seek to put a person on a job where his disability will not harm his performance.

Our procedure is this:

1. An applicant is considered employable unless defects disclosed by a medical examination prevent him from meeting the specific requirements of a job.

2. A handicapped person is considered employable when he can meet the requirements of any position in which his handicap would not be a hindrance to job performance, a hazard to himself, his fellow employees, or company property.

3. A handicapped applicant is required to submit to a regular company physical examination when it is prerequisite to employment. He must pass the physical exam in terms of the physical requirements of the work for which he is being considered.

4. A physically handicapped person is considered promotable just as any other employee—provided he can meet the qualifications of the assignment for which he is being considered.

In actual interviews, again stressing ability rather than disability, we try to evaluate the applicant's attitude. Understanding his motivation, we feel, is essential to making a good placement. In dealing with the handicapped applicant it has been our experience that motivation can be readily determined from his attitude in certain specific areas.

First of all, we try to determine his attitude toward his disability. We have to find out what his mental outlook is toward this disability. Has he decided in his own mind that he can perform a job just as well as any other worker? Does he feel that he is not just one of society's unfortunates? Does he also feel that if given the chance he can prove successful? We try to find out what are his interests for a career.

This latter is important for placement in training programs and for future upgrading and promotional programs. Last, we try to determine his attitude toward the job and the company. He is not led to believe that he is obtaining the job because of the company's charity or sentiment. He is made to understand that he is being placed in a job which he can perform and that his performance must compare favorably with that of other employees.

Actually, when it comes right down to hiring people to work for us, we do not really distinguish between who is physically handicapped and who is not.

After all, who is to say what is or is not a handicap? Simply because a man is neither in the physical prime of life, nor has a superior physical profile, should he be at once disqualified for employment? The point is—some of us just do not see as well as others. And some of us just do not hear. None of us are really equal in respect to the amount or degree of physical strain we can bear up under.

It would profit no one and harm many if a man with very poor eyesight were placed at a job which put a great strain on his visual faculty. In all instances, be it whether a man has one arm or no eyes, his physical profile is evaluated against a backdrop of the requirements of the job. We would not hire an epileptic to operate a heavy press, but that same man would stand just as good a chance of rising through the ranks as a man with no history of epileptic seizures. We ask ourselves, too, is it necessary to place a man with 2 arms at a job that a 1-armed man could do as well? We try not so much to know what a man can't do, but what he can do.

In our employ there are several hundred persons who are working under medical restriction. They make up what is called the no stoop, no squat, no squint group. Back injuries, visual difficulties, and sundry other disabling conditions have made it impossible for them to perform certain kinds of tasks. Employees with progressive as well as static handicaps—many of whom would have a few years ago been considered unemployable—are working at jobs they can do. Special jobs have not been created for them. Job standards are neither less nor more exacting than those of their able-bodied fellow employees.

We boil it down to this. Handicapped persons can be employed successfully if jobs which they can fill exist. The problem then becomes finding these jobs. Representatives of the company's medical, safety, personnel, and operating departments working together study the jobs in our organization, looking for those which can be filled by persons with various handicaps. We have, in fact, tried to establish an inventory of jobs which the handicapped can do.

Nevertheless, we believe that jobs for handicapped persons should be made available from this approach rather than by creating special work for them. It is our opinion that the handicapped applicant should be treated with the same respect as any other individual and not as disabled if he can do what the job asks of him. We have found that if the handicapped person is properly placed, the fact of his disability immediately disappears.

At Burroughs we also try to work in close conjunction with State, Federal, public, and private agencies whose function is to assist in placing the handicapped. We have found them to be of inestimable value. They filter through such prospective applicants so that our placement problems are made much simpler. They own the established testing and training facilities and the insights of professional guidance we do not have. Several of our executives participate in community activities which are directly concerned with the rehabilitation, employment, the placement of the physically handicapped. The information, the insights they have brought back to us have done much toward enlightening us with respect to our dealings with the handicapped.

It is my personal opinion, and I am certain that it is shared by many, that the greatest step taken by commerce and industry has been the realizing that the handicapped should be treated with the same respect as other human beings. We know now they do not want charity, dole, sympathy, special consideration, favoritism. They want merely a chance to compete on a just and equal basis with the ablebodied. They want simply a chance to show that they can work as well if not better than their unhandicapped counterparts. They want a chance to become self-supporting, self-reliant members of society.

I have often heard it said that quite often a disabled person becomes a more valuable employee purely because of his disability This seems to be a reasonable assumption, because we are all familiar with the driving force of disability on what is sometimes the "genius class."

Beethoven, as you all know, was plagued by deafness all his life, and the fury that he threw into his work was the result of his determination to pour out the music that was in his soul before the world was wrapped in silence. The best-remembered lines of Milton were written after he was blind.

While we are not looking for Beethovens or Miltons—and they are not looking for us—it is certainly true that a normally vigorous young man, for example, lives several lives, all at one and the same time. He has his job, and he has his social life. He may take an active part in some sport. The quitting whistle is actually the signal for another day. He works hard, and he plays hard.

But what about the handicapped person whose social life is strictly circumscribed by his disabilities? He can't fish—he can't bowl—he can't play golf. It is rather easy to understand that such a person would throw everything he's got into his job because his job becomes his only outlet. It becomes more than a means of earning a living. It becomes an all-absorbing interest, a balance wheel, the one thing that provides a man with a sense of participation in the affairs of the world—and the one thing that permits him to hold his head high and meet all men on equal terms.

One more thought, and I rest my case.

Many economists who are looking at the long-range prospects for the American economy envision not a labor surplus—but a labor shortage—more acute than any we have ever known.

By 1965, or perhaps before that, our population is expected to reach 190 million—an increase of 25 million.

But the proportion of persons from 20 to 64—the productive, working years—will increase by only 8 million, which is less than one-third of the total increase.

There are several reasons for this imbalance, as I am sure that you here know, but I think they should be spelled out for the record. The low birth rate in the 1930's is one reason; the large baby crop in recent years is the second reason, and still a third is the fact that people are living longer.

The result is that we can anticipate a larger group of older and younger people in proportion to our working population.

It may become a matter of national necessity—far more than a matter of national concern—to hire more handicapped workers and train more handicapped young persons for employment.

The further mechanization of industry and the trend toward automation will, of course, help meet the production needs of our expanding economy. But mechanization and automation, instead of replacing manpower, call for more skilled workers. Such has been the history of our progressive steps in mechanization.

As electronic controls take over the backbreaking jobs, there will be need for more brains and less brawn. The handicapped workers should be able to compete with the physically robust better than ever when the job is one of tending an automatic machine.

In light of our position in the world today and in light of our changing population picture and our swiftly changing economy, it seems to me that we cannot afford to deny any worker, because of physical impairment, the opportunity to become productive and self-supporting, whenever his remaining talents can be used.

In essence, our discussions today might well come under the heading of not what we owe the other fellow—but what we owe the country.

Editor Feels 3-Cent Stamp Out of Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I find more and more sentiment in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan for a reasonable increase in postal rates and a feeling that a penny increase in the handling of first-class mail is long overdue.

The editor of the Gladwin County Record, published in Gladwin, Mich., says editorially on May 23 that the 3-cent stamp is out of date.

I feel his comments are worthy of the consideration of Members of the House. The editorial follows:

THREE-CENT STAMP OUT OF DATE

Few prices in this inflated world are as ridiculous as the 3-cent postal rate for letters.

Postmaster General Summerfield and the Eisenhower administration have campaigned for 3½ years to get postal rates up where they should be so that the Postal Department would break even. The Department's deficit, which must be made up from general taxation, totals $4.6 billion since the end of World War II.

Summerfield has done a superb job of Postal Department reorganization. He has been able to get some rate increases through Congress. He has greatly reduced the annual deficit. He has repeatedly been rebuffed on his request for a higher first-class rate.

His chief adversaries have been the Democrats, who cry, as usual, that the Republicans are trying to push the costs of operating over on the consumer. The voting public is often taken in on this line and politicians are scared stiff to talk against it.

So let's take a look.

Since 1932 the per capita disposable income of the Nation is up 319 percent. Wholesale prices are up 163 percent. Postal cost index is up 107 percent. The consumer price index is up 96 percent. Rates on telegraph, another method of communication, are up 81 percent. But the rate on letters, the 3-cent stamp, is exactly the same as it was in 1932, the depth of the depression.

Now, who makes up the deficit? Democratic leaders would have you believe that business pays the shot. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Business pays 75 percent of the cost of running the Postal Department's first-class mail service through postal rates, with individuals paying the balance, 25 percent. But the postal deficit, made up through general taxation, demands only 40 percent from business and 60 percent from individuals. As long as the Department operates at a deficit, business transfers a large share

of its first-class postage bills to the individual.

The Eisenhower administration, which Democrats like to refer to as the "businessman's administration," has tried for 3½ years to increase business' postal bill and relieve the individual or consumer. But their efforts have been blocked by Democrats on the pretext of protecting this consumer who is being socked with a postal bill twice as big as he should be paying.

Paying 3 cents to mail a letter makes about as much sense as having a price of 10 cents for a quart of milk.

When we buy a service, we should pay for it. A higher postal rate could reduce a postal deficit so large since World War II that it could have built 460,000 homes or equipped 20 new bomber wings to protect the Nation.

A Threat to the West—Seaton Appointment Raises Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, that there is widespread interest in the enactment of my bill, S. 863, known as the Western Water Rights Settlement Act of 1956, having for its purpose the reaffirmation of the long-standing congressional policy protecting the integrity of State water law in the 17 Western States, is evidenced by the numerous editorials supporting the bill published in recent issues of prominent newspapers throughout the West. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point the splendid editorial of Frank Waddell entitled "A Threat to the West," published in the May 27, 1956, issue of the Casper Tribune-Herald, of Casper, Wyo.

I also ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Denver post of May 30 last, written by Robert Lucas, editor of the editorial page, entitled "Seaton Appointment Raises Questions," be also printed immediately following the Casper Tribune-Herald editorial.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Casper Tribune-Herald of May 27, 1956]

A THREAT TO THE WEST

Sharp criticism of the Supreme Court for a series of decisions increasing Federal authority, and eroding that of the States, could on occasion be turned with equal force against Congress, which shows little eagerness to override judicial decisions where this can be done by restatement of a historic position.

A Presidential veto intervened in the tidelands case, but it still took a long time to get around to returning to tidelands States what always had been recognized as their own but was seized from them by an overbearing Federal authority.

In the natural-gas case the Supreme Court ignored the declared intent of Congress and put gas producers under Federal regulation in a decision that could have far-reaching effect on a great industry. Consumer areas seized upon the situation as offering opportunity to serve self-interest and narrowly missed. It might not be so again when the question emerges from the shadow of a Presidential veto.

These things are of first-hand concern to the Western States, because right now their claims to their own life-sustaining waters are being set aside by judicial decision.

Water rights were assumed to be unassailable. In many instances they are confirmed in State constitutions which were accepted by Congress. But in a time of expanding central authority, a Washington bureaucrat argued not only that title to unappropriated waters is vested in the Federal Government, but that by control of public lands Federal authority can claim waters vested in others.

The Supreme Court has been leaning toward this position and in a decision last year in a case carried up from Oregon seemingly sustained it.

Senator BARRETT has been asking Congress to reaffirm the traditional water law of the West. His bill would prohibit Federal interference in any water right and would require Federal acquisition of such rights as might be desired to be accomplished by exactly the same procedure set forth for any other water user.

Water law is based on the doctrine of appropriation under the exclusive regulation of the State. If is anything else then the very foundation on which the West was built has been destroyed. Surely Congress can't ignore that.

[From the Denver Post of May 30, 1956]

SEATON APPOINTMENT RAISES QUESTIONS

The appointment of Fred Seaton, Nebraska publisher, as Secretary of the Interior is said to have many implications. First, Mr. Seaton is supposed to be an ace troubleshooter with a talent for quieting the controversy that has arisen over Interior policy and administration in recent years. Second, the Nebraskan is described in the editorialized "news" reports of the Chicago Tribune as the Brownell-Dewey faction's man who was triumphant over Under Secretary Clarence A. Davis in the controversy over administration water policy.

The first implication is accurate, in our opinion. Mr. Seaton represents a needed fresh viewpoint on complex questions of resource development and use. We do not know where he stands on specific issues. As of now, however, he is not knowingly allied with the "Keystone cops" who work overtime guarding the Nation against the twin evils of creeping socialism and public power. We will be eager to see how the new Secretary equates the public and private interest in projects for which power is integral to feasibility.

As for the alleged conflict within the administration on water policy, that is something relatively new. If the administration's view on water rights is that of J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, as analyzed during recent hearings on the Barrett bill in the Senate, we will be both astonished and annoyed. For that concept holds that Federal authority, acquired at the time States were admitted to the Union, imposes Federal preeminence in the control of water resources. It challenges the control of water by the States, and undermines both past and future assignment of water rights by legal appropriation through beneficial consumptive use.

It is incredible to us that such a view could be official in the Eisenhower administration. It is in direct and flagrant conflict with the policy of the administration in the case of tideland oil. And it represents outright legal aggression against States' rights without a word of justification either in custom and law, or in present and foreseeable management of Federal lands.

Mr. Davis is said to be opposed to such a Federal policy. We believe he is right in that opposition. And indeed if such a policy is not attributable to the Eisenhower administration, and is not embraced by it, then that should be made clear to the people. For as of this moment, an Assistant Attorney General of the Eisenhower Department of Justice is seeking to superimpose Federal upon State water rights, as was also attempted in Denver's Blue River water case before the move was deliberately called off by higher authority.

The Departments of Agriculture and the Interior have testified in behalf of legislation that would clarify the dominant rights of State law in matters of unappropriated water. That the two Departments would be in complete and open conflict with the Department of Justice in a matter of such great importance is, itself, astounding. And we cannot conceive that the new Secretary of the Interior would be allied with a cause that is so alien to the repeated objectives of the Eisenhower administration.

Carrying Water in a Cracked Pitcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial which appeared recently in the Palo Alto Times, Palo Alto, Calif. I believe that this editorial represents an excellent appraisal of the critical water situation confronting the great State of California:

CARRYING WATER IN A CRACKED PITCHER

Cracked pitchers are poor water carriers, and California is a cracked pitcher. Unless the crack is mended, it will be impossible for the State to get adequate amounts of water from areas of surplus to areas of shortage.

The crack is the dispute between northern California and southern California on the best way to finance the San Luis Dam project.

Northern California is all for Federal construction of the dam so that water can be used to irrigate San Joaquin Valley land and a conduit can bring it through Pacheco Pass to the central coast counties. The proposed dam is on the western edge of the great valley.

Southern California appears to be afraid this plan will block the most feasible route for getting Feather River water to the south by means of the proposed California water system.

Having fought the upper Colorado River project out of fear they would be unable to get all the water they want from that source, the southern Californians now want to make sure nothing is done to endanger their supply from the north.

This is an understandable reaction, but it is being allowed to jeopardize the development of California's water resources and thus cheat all parts of the State.

The spectacle of a delegation from one part of the State rushing into a congressional committee hearing to fight a proposal urged by the Governor and other State representatives is enough to cause the Federal Government to hesitate to give any aid whatsoever until the civil war is over.

As Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has pointed out, sectional bitterness of this kind could make it impossible for the State to solve its

water problems in any way. It would seem that, before any further steps can be taken, engineers and leaders from the north and the south must reach agreement on the program for California.

We have been assured that there is water enough for all. If this is the case, then surely an agreement can be reached and the water now being wasted can be put to use for the benefit of all parts of the State.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Congress this week will again be called upon to vote on the subject of foreign aid. Foreign aid has come to Congress under several different names: First, it was lend-lease, then UNRRA, then the Marshall plan, FOA, and now International Cooperation Administration. I have never voted for foreign aid. I think it is wrong to tax Americans for giveaway programs that have given away something over $65 billion in the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald dated June 2, 1956. This editorial is extremely thought provoking and should be read carefully by my colleagues:

DEAR CONGRESS

Last month the State Department let it be known that a letterwriting campaign might help sell foreign economic aid to the reluctant Congress.

Mr. Dulles' boys passed the word, according to the Wall Street Journal, but left it to the passionate defenders of the giveaways to think up their own arguments.

This was a rather dirty trick, because the supply of arguments is shorter than it used to be.

Could the letterwriters say that aid is vital because Uncle Sam needs all the allies he can buy?

No, that's out of date. It suggests a military alliance. Anything with the word "military" in it these days simply scares the life out of people such as India's Nehru.

Could the letterwriter plead that the alleged need for foreign economic aid is an emergency which will end in a year or 2?

No, the new look in aid is that it should be permanent, with some of the individual spending projects to continue 10 years.

Could the petitioners say that the handouts foster free enterprise abroad and cause foreigners to copy American ways?

No, that would be frightfully bad manners, according to the giveaway people. Besides, it isn't so.

Could the friends of economic aid say that the handouts promote goodwill and cause the recipients to shy away from the blandishments of Moscow?

Well, no, that isn't true either, because America's foreign aid clients are cozying up to the Reds from the Nile to Siam.

Could the letterwriters conclude that the United States should give the money without strings or hope of recompense of any kind, just to let the world know that its old Uncle Samuel is a generous fellow?

No, even that excessively modest reward is outdated. It hurts the tender feelings of America's relief clients to be perpetually reminded that the money comes from the American taxpayer. The latest idea is to remove all mention of the United States of America and let the United Nations or some new international agency pass out the do-good money.

What, then, could the letterwriters say? That foreign aid should continue because the clients have come to expect it? Because thousands of United States bureaucrats would be jobless—or would be put to the inconvience of changing jobs—if economic aid folded? That the giveaways will keep United States factories humming?

None of these seems to be a persuasive argument when presented to a Senator or Representative who is about to face the voters back home.

Which brings us around to the unsurprising fact that the letterwriting campaign has been a flop. No Member of Congress is snowed under with mail whooping it up for the giveaways. Which suggests that when those called upon took pen in hand they couldn't think of anything to say that was worth a 3-cent stamp.

Bustup in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we hear the soft talk from the Soviet leaders, but I have failed to see any action on their part to signify any change in Soviet policy. Actions speak louder than words, and I would like to see actions that scream to the world that there has really been a change of policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Daily News, New York, of June 1, 1956:

BUSTUP IN KOREA

"Better late than never" is our main reaction to yesterday's decision of the United Nations command in Korea.

It has long been common knowledge that the North Korean Reds have consistently violated the truce terms, particularly by building up airpower, and that they have enjoyed the help of the Czech and Polish members of the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission.

The U. N. command yesterday ordered a stop to all of the Commission's activities in South Korea, pulled Commission team members back into the neutral zone, and fiercely denounced the North Korean Reds.

At the same time, it was revealed in London that the 16 U. N. countries which took part in the Korean war on our side have rejected the latest of Red China's hyprocritical proposals for a conference looking toward reuniting Korea.

This twin explosion over Korea should at least serve to clear the air, and remind Westerners anew of the nature of the Red enemy. For all his current peace prattle, he's the same old conscienceless, conniving scoundrel.

The Korea bustup, too, should put in its proper perspective the scheduled visit of United States Air Force Chief of Staff Nathan F. Twining to the June 24 military aviation show in Moscow.

We can see no objection to General Twining's going wherever he can hope to get a peek at the latest in Red aircraft.

But how about Washington making it 100 percent clear to the world that this visit carries with it no United States endorsement of anything connected with communism—especially of the Kremlin's continuing enslavement and ruthless milking of the satellite countries?

The Kremlin obviously hopes to make Red propaganda out of this air show and its distinguished foreign spectators. It's up to our Government to nip that plan and make some propaganda of its own—which, given a little wit and boldness, our Government can do.

No Further Aid for Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including at this point a letter received from a friend who lived a considerable part of his life in Yugoslavia and who has some pertinent observations regarding our aid to the man who has just said the Socialist nations must stand together:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 21, 1956.*

WOULDN'T IT BE MORE HONEST TO TEAR DOWN THE STATUE OF LIBERTY?

To Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, 84th Congress:

A few days ago, looking across New York Harbor toward the Statue of Liberty, the thought struck me:

"What's that Statute of Liberty doing there now? Now, when through its financial, material, and military aid, our Government enables a Communist bandit and mass murderer, Tito, and his America-hating gangsters, to hold our 17 million Yugoslav allies and friends in slavery, wouldn't it be more honest to tear it down?"

That thought struck me again reading the newspaper reports of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's deliberations over the President's request for $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid, which included $30 million as defense aid for Communist Yugoslavia. Why call that defense aid or military aid? Why not truthfully call it what it would be: aid for maintenance of the institution of slavery in Communist Yugoslavia?

Some may say that an unknown businessman has no place mixing into this. But having known the Yugoslavs for 36 years, including 20 years operation of my own company in the former prosperous, food-exporting, pre-World War II Yugoslavia, and constantly meeting refugees, freshly arrived from Tito's present, food-begging, practically bankrupt, Communist slave state, I feel it my duty to submit this for your consideration.

Wouldn't the President's request for $30 million for defense aid for Tito in 1957, and his requested right to spend $40 million in any one country from his special discretionary fund of $100 million permit him to give Tito $70 million in 1957, and this on top of the sum to accrue in Yugoslavia from our January 1956 sale to Tito of $49 million of wheat, lard, and cotton for Yugoslav dinars? Why permit this? What have we received from the $2 billion already given to Tito and his gangsters?

Ladies and gentlemen, whatever our foreign-policy makers may say, the fact is, we cannot hold the trust of the 800 million peo-

ple now in Communist slavery if we aid the atheist Communist dictator, Tito, to hold the Yugoslavs in slavery. Those enslaved peoples and others, knowing the Yugoslav Communists to be real Communists, easily, from our support of Tito and his Communist gangsters, can doubt the sincerity of our Government's expensive worldwide anti-Communist propaganda.

Therefore, shouldn't we stop all aid to Communist Yugoslavia, and show the world that our Statue of Liberty still stands for liberty for all men? But if, for reasons of policy too devious for open explanation, you will feel forced to vote funds for the continued support of slavery in Communist Yugoslavia, ought you not vote also the funds needed for the tearing down of that great statue, and for replacing it with a memorial to the ideals for which we once were respected?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. SMYTH.

Spiritual Strength in the Cold War Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 27, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, addressed the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency here in Washington at the Washington Hotel.

In his address Mr. FEIGHAN made a scholarly and practical analysis of the cold war and the relation of our great spiritual ideals to a winning program of the United States Information Agency.

Under leave granted, I include Mr. FEIGHAN'S address on this occasion:

It is a pleasure for me to join with you in this, the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency.

As many of you know, I have maintained over the years a keen interest in the program carried out by the information agency.

It has been my good fortune to have an early understanding of the real meaning of the cold war because of my equal good fortune of having knowledge of the real nature of communism at a very early age in my life.

I am one with Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., in the belief that the hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder becomes the possibilities of a hot war.

The work in which you are engaged has a vital bearing upon the question of war or peace.

In your daily work, you do your best to contribute to the United States Worldwide Campaign of Truth.

Such a campaign of truth can do much to dispel the ignorance on which evil seeds of hatred and vengeance thrive.

Hatred and vengeance in turn are the architects of war. Truth is the architect of a just and lasting peace.

It is most fitting, therefore, that you, the Catholic employees of the USIA should have an annual corporate communion and breakfast.

Such an occasion as this provides a singular opportunity for a rededication to those great spiritual truths upon which civilization is based.

It also provides a splendid opportunity to gain added spiritual strength for the difficult tasks that are certain to confront your work in the immediate months ahead.

There can be no doubt that the world of our day is besieged by a force far more evil than any other in all of recorded history.

The struggle for the world is one in which the forces of human freedom and the forces of atheistic communism are locked in a death struggle.

This is fundamentally a conflict of ideas and ideals.

We believe that man is a creature of God, and as such possesses a special dignity, an immortal soul, and that in the hereafter every man must account for his stewardship on earth.

On the other hand, communism teaches that man is an animal, very little different from a horse or a pig.

Communism also teaches that all life ends with mortal death, that there is no hereafter, and consequently no accounting for a stewardship on earth.

It follows that material values are all that count with those who subscribe to the doctrine of communism.

This accounts in very large measure for the unequaled record of inhumanity to man established in the name of communism.

It is this irreconcilable difference in ideals and ideas which lies at the basis of the international conflict between communism and free people. Those who take part in the conflict in defense of our cause of human diginity and freedom must themselves be worthy representatives of our highest ideals.

There is no room for the materialists in the camp of human dignity and freedom.

They can only weaken our cause and dissipate the prospects for a just and lasting peace.

But there is unlimited room in the camp of human dignity and freedom for all those who believe that man lives not by bread alone and that things of the spirit are, in the end, what makes life worth living.

And while we keep open the way for all men of good will to participate in the fight for universal justice and decency, it would do us well to ever bear in mind what the persecutors of the early Christians said about them—"See how they love one another."

The work in which you are engaged is in many respects novel—at least it is new to the American scene.

Consequently you must expect a great deal of criticism and very little appreciation for your efforts. It may be many years from now before due accord its given to much of the good work you are now doing. This, it seems, has been the lot of many great and necessary causes down through history.

I underscore great and necessary because those are the only causes that draw strong fire and criticism. Bearing this in mind, you must not become discouraged no matter how difficult the task ahead may seem or how strong the criticism leveled against your efforts to pursue and expand a worldwide campaign of truth.

In somewhat recent years your work has become more difficult because of the burdens and obstacles created by indifference, expediency, and the growing attitude of laissez faire.

The do-nothing attitude which we see on many sides today springs from the false notion that if we do nothing, we will make no mistakes, and if we make no mistakes, we will avoid public criticism.

This is an attitude which must be completely rejected from the important work in which you are engaged.

Leadership demands a try at the unusual or unique and consequently expects honest mistakes will be made. Real leadership sees its mistakes and corrects them.

That is the kind of leadership which must always be given to the cause of human freedom or else individual liberty as we know it, will perish from the world.

I am reminded of an experience I had last November during the course of an inspection trip in Korea. I attended mass at an Army chapel and as I entered the church, I was handed a small leaflet which announced the masses for the week, the feast days of the week, and other items of interest to the military post. But down at the bottom of this little leaflet, prepared by a chaplain assigned to work close to the front lines of freedom, was this timely admonition to all those who attended mass that morning: "The greatest sin of all is doing nothing."

More and more we are hearing the idea advanced that the only workable formula for easing international tension is to approach the Communists in the spirit of live and let live.

The spirit of live and let live is so fundamental to all established religions that it naturally has great appeal to everyone.

This formula if followed would create a situation in which those who believe in moral principles make great concessions to those who are in fact amoral, and whose basic doctrine holds that if needs be three-fourths of the people of the world must perish in order that communism will triumph.

This presents a very serious dilemma for us as we seek to preserve our great moral principles and at the same time prevent the destruction of civilization by the forces of atheistic communism.

We are also being urged to adopt a policy of forgive and forget in our dealings with the Russian Communists.

Here again all established religions teach the necessity of forgiving our transgressors and forgetting misdeeds of the past in the hope that good works will result in the future. But unfortunately the Communists seek to use these moral principles to cause us to forget the many nations and people enslaved by them and who today suffer the trials of the martyr.

In conscience we can never forget the victims of communism any more than we can forget the moral principles which, if adhered to, will prevent the continuance of the many crimes against humanity committed in the name of communism.

In my judgment, we should be quick to forgive and prepared to forget only when the Communists have corrected their evil practices upon humanity and have removed their apparatus of fear and terror from those vast areas of the world which they now hold by force alone.

Another notion being advanced as a solution to the crisis which now grips the world is that we who are free can safely cohabitate with those who seek to enslave us and that if we will be patient and agree to a mixture of what we believe in with that of what the Communists teach, there will evolve over a period of years a new civilization.

This is called the new political evolution. It presupposes that by some accident of nature, evil can be mixed with decency and that the future civilization it heralds can be at the same time both good and evil.

The misguided advocates of this unworkable concept of political evolution have not learned that it is impossible to mix fire and water.

These are only some of the signs of our times.

In your work you must run across many others that stand as obstacles to the performance of the high task that is yours.

But these obstacles, as many and as diversified as they might be, should only serve as added encouragement to push you forward with renewed energy.

I have long thought that those engaged in work such as yours could well adopt the classic saying of St. Augustine which con-

cludes his writings on the subject of Christian combat.

He said, "The crown of victory shall go only to those who engage in the struggle."

In every sense of the word, you are engaged in the struggle to preserve the dignity of man and the decencies which make life worth living.

It is my hope and prayer that you will win that blessed crown, if not in this world, in the hereafter when all of us must give an accounting for our stewardship here on earth.

Agriculture and Food Supply in Various Parts of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a splendid speech delivered by Dr. W. E. Colwell, assistant director, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, at a recent meeting of the Raleigh Rotary Club in the city of Raleigh, N. C. The speech contains much real food for thought, and I hope that it will be read by every Member of the House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I especially hope that the speech will be read by those who live in the great metropolitan areas of our country who do not seem to appreciate the great importance of agriculture and the problems now facing our farmers.

I commend and congratulate Dr. Colwell, both upon the preparation and presentation of this fine speech:

AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLY IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE WORLD[1]

(By W. E. Colwell, assistant director, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, in charge of tobacco research)

I am appreciative of the opportunity to speak today on some agricultural observations made recently in various parts of the world. While the primary purpose of the trip I took was to visit some of the principal tobacco research centers of the world and some of the main production areas, it would appear to be of more general interest today to discuss with you matters of broader agricultural significance than recent advances in tobacco research. Suffice it to say that it is most beneficial to us to be in communication with other tobacco research programs. There is much we can learn from these centers where the level of technology is increasing rapidly. We've had students and other visitors from all over the world studying tobacco in our State but until this year we hadn't made it a two-way operation.

The topic I have chosen today is agriculture and food supply in various parts of the world including the United States. In developing this topic I have tried to keep in mind one of the principal objectives of the rural urban committee, viz, that of bringing about on the parts of both rural and urban people, a better understanding of the problems of the other. Though I am no authority on the subject of world agriculture and food supply it's quite impossible for one interested in agriculture to visit some 13 countries and not pick up certain information on this subject. I trust that some of my impressions will be of interest to you.

As background for my comments I would develop the fact that many people of the world know what hunger really is. Then there are two points I would make: (1) What is it worth to have reasonable assurance against hunger. (2) The food supply of the United States could depend in part upon Russia's activities in the Middle East.

On January 23, I was in Hamburg, Germany, about 25 miles from the barbed wire, floodlights and buried mines, hound dogs and police that guard the border between East and West Germany. I would like to read from a letter taken from a newspaper I bought that morning in Hamburg. It is from a woman referring to East Germany conditions.

"Have a look at the prices. A worker earns from 250 to 300 East marks a month and sausage or meat costs 6.50 per pound. A pair of shoes cost 100 to 200 marks and they are made out of pig skin which becomes like stone after the first rain."

About a month ago at a Presbyterian luncheon on the campus at State College, an East German refugee across the table told us: "You know, I have stolen a potato for my wife and me. I'm not proud of the fact but I did it. I was so hungry."

In Vienna, one of my traveling companions, an Austrian who was in a United States detention camp in World War II told me that the food supplied by the United States after the war to him, to his family, and thousands of his countrymen will forever make him a loyal friend of America. As best I can recall he said these words, "You know, there were times just before food came in from your country that I thought my family was going to die of starvation."

In Italy, I met a secretary now employed by the United States Embassy in Rome, an Italian woman perhaps 50 years old and a charming person, who told me that she lost 22 pounds during the war. She said there were entire days when she didn't eat. Food in Rome just wasn't to be had.

In the Union of South Africa, the natives this very day live on a handful of cornmeal, one-quarter pound of meat, including bone, and small portions of beans or rice. In Southern Rhodesia, where 95–97 percent of the population is native, the same is true. However, production potential is tremendous.

In Egypt, the standard of living has actually declined during the 20th century. Sixty percent of their 23 million people live on farms and all but 3 percent of the country is desert. This means that these 23 million people have about as much cultivated land (6 million acres) as North Carolina. Imports of corn and wheat must be paid for in some way.

India, with more than twice as many people as the United States (370 million), has two-thirds the land area and with poor rainfall distribution and low technology, food supply is of critical importance. Famines this decade are clearly recalled by many Indians—especially in the larger cities. This moment it's near midnight in Calcutta and hungry women with babies are sleeping on the streets. I saw this 2 months ago. The population is so dense that on the average in Calcutta a lot the size of mine in West Raleigh, 75 by 200 feet, accommodates approximately 165 people instead of 3 as it does in the case of my family.

The level of technology in India is low. Production is low. Population increases at the rate of about 1 million a year and food supply is recognized by the government as a principal need and a major goal of the two 5-year plans.

In Japan, pressure on the land is terrific, though production is high per unit area. Since the war some 89 million people (over half the United States) are crowded on the islands and they have only 13 million acres of available land—roughly twice the farm land in our State. When I was at Hatano some 75 miles from Tokyo, visiting one of the experiment stations, the director had lunch served in his office. In addition to the cold fried eggs and several other items, we had a huge bowl of rice. They told me that during the critical season they and all their city neighbors watched closely every daily report on the rice crop. If it were short, they said, reduced rations would follow, and if a failure it would mean near starvation to many people. "There's nothing more important to us than the condition of the rice crop," they said. I wonder how many of you this afternoon could tell me how the winter wheat crop is in Kansas?

With this background, let me develop the first point. What is it worth to have an assured food supply?

On the corresponding Monday a year from now we expect to be served Rotary luncheon in this room and I venture to say not one of us has ever even thought about the possibility of not having adequate food for the occasion. We are indeed fortunate. To whom are we city people indebted for this happy situation? Farmers, it is true, produce the food—about 13 percent of our people do that—but many of us in the 87 percent group sometimes get pretty tired of paying storage costs on surplus wheat and corn, and stabilizing prices and farm income. It's pretty ridiculous, some of us say, to give these special favors to the farmer; especially when granaries all across Iowa and Indiana, for example, are already filled to the brim.

I take you back to Hatano, Japan—with the conversation centered on the rice bowl. But the rice bowl in your kitchen and mine has been filled equally well now for the last many years. Your share and mine of the total net cost of programs for stabilization of prices and farm income since 1932 is $2.80 per year. The storage of wheat plus the storage of corn is costing each of us in the United States $2 this year. Personally, I think it is worth it though I, too, would like to see it reduced. Just keeping food cool in my refrigerator costs me more than that. I'd be quite alarmed if we had much less than the 9 or 10 months' supply of corn which we now have. I know that people can be hungry. We might find this cost of assuring our food supply surprisingly small when compared with that of national defense or even our share of the Government subsidy on national magazines or many other items.

But let us assume that the $2 storage cost is too high—and let us assume the $2.80 annual per capita cost is too high a price to pay for the stabilization of prices and farm income—both of which are involved in assuring you and me a good meal a year from today. This brings me to the clock set at 11:45 and on exhibit in front of me. We live in an era of the most rapid scientific and technological change of all time. If you were to put the full recorded history of man on the face of a clock, starting with the story of creation in the Book of Genesis and continuing until 1854—100 years ago—the hands of the clock would have moved from noon around to 11:45 p. m. The last 15 minutes on the face of the clock represent the last century. This is the slice of time colored in red. The output per worker in the United States has increased more in that last 15 minutes than in the entire previous 11 hours and 45 minutes. And most of the increase within that last 15 minutes has occurred since the turn of the present century.

Let us imagine for a moment that a good Egyptian farmer in the day of Moses could have been brought back to life in the day of the Caesars, some 12 centuries later, and placed on a good farm in Italy, then the most

[1] Talk before the Raleigh Rotary Club, May 21, 1956, as a program of the Rural-Urban Committee.

advanced nation of the world, but now with eroded soils and a poor agriculture and a poorly fed people. He could have farmed with practically no additional instruction, for the art of agriculture had changed little, if any, in the intervening 12 centuries.

Let us imagine that same farmer brought back to life on a good English farm in the day of Shakespeare, some four centuries ago. He still would have been a pretty good farmer with no additional instruction.

Now, let's bring that same ancient Egyptian farmer to the eastern shores of America 150 years ago and put him on Thomas Jefferson's farm, one of the advanced farms of that day. He still would not have found the art of farming very different from that which he practiced in Egypt 3,000 years earlier. He still would have used the same methods of power, the same crude implements, and large amounts of hand labor. He would have known very little about fertilization, improved varieties, high producing breeds of livestock, and the hundred mechanical and electrical gadgets which occur on our modern farms.

Now, imagine for a moment that same farmer on a modern American farm. He would be completely bewildered. He would not even recognize the working end of the tractor parked in the farmyard. It would require hard years of instruction and apprenticeship for him before he could even begin to operate the modern American farm.[2]

In spite of all the changes crowded into this 15 minutes on the clock, or more specifically, the last 7½ minutes, representing the 20th century, an adjustment, perfectly satisfactory to all is not far from attainment. And if it has to be off one way or the other, I'm sure we'd all have it in the direction of surplus instead of on the short side. Remember, it could have been the other way, and in many, many countries it is the other way. I met so many people concerned with food supply that I feel quite convinced our system is one we should appreciate more than we sometimes do, especially since a lower percent of our income today is required to supply us with a given food list than was the case 20 years ago. (18 percent versus 23 percent in 1935–39, assuming diet same. Actually we now spend 26 percent because diet is improved.[3])

It causes me to re-read the statement in the May 7 issue of Time to the effect that at the close of 1955 the index of what a farmer sells has dropped to 80 as compared to 100 for what he buys. (The highest it has been in recent years was 13 points over the 100 in February 1951.)

On the second point of my discussion, I wish to consider how Russia's activities in the world today could affect our menu here next year or some other year thereafter. Observations of grave concern regarding Communist activity came to me in every country I visited with 1 or 2 exceptions. This is a subject in itself and I'll not go into it today, other than to mention the specific item that deals directly with our agriculture and food supply. It relates to a source of power, viz, oil. Without oil we would not farm very much. Tractors and trucks would be idle, many trains also. Horse and mule population is so low to be of little relief as a source of power to plow, sow, and harvest. Where does our oil come from and how does Russia figure in this? Around two-thirds of the proven oil reserves of the world exist in the middle east, next door to the Soviet Union, particularly in Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.[3] Iran, saved from communism by a hair's breadth not long ago, still is under heavy Communist pressure. Unrest among a poverty stricken people provides fertile ground for Communist leaders who work undercover. Iraq is under heavy Communist pressure from both Communists and Arabs to desert its military alliance with the West. Saudi Arabia, now oriented toward the United States is lined up strongly with other Arab states against Israel.

Communist countries are buying surplus agricultural products from the area—and offering Communist products at cutrate prices in return. Russia is buying Syria's cotton, for example, and offering to put up a complete oil refinery cheap.

At present, 90 percent of the Arabian oil is controlled by the United States and Britain.[4] With it many of our tractors here in North Carolina operate. We probably burned some of it driving to work this morning or in coming to this meeting. Without it, the 13 percent of our population might have some difficulty feeding themselves plus those of us comprising the 87 percent. We are placing an unusually high degree of dependence on the one commodity—oil, especially when two-thirds of the world reserves (of 158 billion barrels) are next door to a country dedicated to the goal of world domination.

I for one am glad those granaries in Iowa are filled with a 9 to 10 months' supply of corn. This doesn't seem excessive to me.

In conclusion, let me say that it's an unforgettable experience to see really hungry people and to hear the stories of those who have had the misfortune to be in that condition. This very day millions of people in the world will not have enough to eat. Tomorrow morning there will be 80,000[5] more mouths to feed than there were this morning. Hungry people make good hunting ground for the operation of global communistic agitation techniques.

The American farmer has fed us well. We appreciate his efforts—yes, three times each day we appreciate his efforts. However, we may not have told him of the good job he's doing. I believe this is one thing each member of this club can do as his own opportunities present themselves. Let the farmers know how well we like to eat.

[2] Butz, August 1954, Special Series No. 3 at Renner, Tex.

[3] National Resources Conference, 1955–56. Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, p. 30.

[4] U. S. News, March 16, 1956.

[5] Peterson, May 1956 Rotarian.

President Appoints New Commission on Small Business—Again a Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, President Eisenhower appointed a Commission in Aid of Small Business. Why the solicitude for small business now? Can it be that election is only a few months hence?

This Big-Business Government has given small business the absent treatment for 3½ years of its existence. Small business failures are up 15 percent over last year's. Up to May of this year, almost 5,500 small firms went out of existence. The Commission is too late for them.

This new commission will go the way of all commissions. There are scores of them floating around in space in Washington. We have them on floods, taxes, natural resources, parks, science, labor, schools, health, and what have you.

They are usually set up with fanfare but like fireworks in the night they peter out in the darkness.

Who is the administration fooling?

Someone wisely stated:

A commission is a group of uninformed, appointed by the unwilling, to do the unnecessary.

Spiritual Values in a World of Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 28, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at the 56th annual commencement excercises of Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa, at which time I was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws. My address follows:

We live in a time of desperate challenge. Great problems confront us.

Your generation will be called upon to assume responsibilities of vast magnitude. You will be called upon to assume the burden of a world torn by two conflicting ideologies.

One preaches the Word of God, sustained and strengthened by faith in the divine teachings of the Holy Bible.

The other plots in darkness to enslave mankind under a cruel tyranny that denies God and would tear down all that we hold sacred.

One believes in freedom under God as the source of all human progress. That philosophy, to which we adhere, upholds the dignity and sanctity of the individual. The other would destroy all freedom and all religion except worship of the state. In the Communist philosophy the individual exists only to serve the purposes of the government.

Within the lifetime of all of us here today revolutionary changes have taken place.

The swift pace of modern scientific development has touched upon every aspect of human activity. The old concepts of time and space have been swept away. Research into the secrets of nature has made possible the destruction of civilization should the world become involved in total war.

I bring these grim facts to your attention only to emphasize my firm belief that the future of mankind depends upon a clear understanding of the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destinies of men and nations.

I wonder if you will agree with me then that the human race is living today close to the edge of eternity and that this unprecedented fact in history calls for a reappraisal, so to speak, of the future of the world.

I wonder if you will agree with me that had we been living in a more normal period of history—before the nuclear age—we would, as the result of the natural forces of international attrition, be deeply involved at this hour in World War III.

Now what I want to be concerned with here today in my meditations with you is a determination—just among ourselves—on just what it is in civilization that endures. Our problem is to decide where to put the major accent on life and how to shape our world in the immediate hours ahead so that we shall not blow ourselves and all of life

on this planet into a mass of nuclear gases.

This we know: There is no comparable period in human history during which so much has happened to so many people in so fractional a space of historic time.

We want to know first how we can go on living as the human race. And then we want to know how we can go on living without being enslaved.

I begin with a premise.

My premise is this:

My premise is that the United States of America is up to this hour the greatest triumph of Christianity.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address in 1955 made this statement: "As we build a richer material world, we must always remember that there are spiritual truths which endure forever. They are the universal inspiration of all mankind." George Washington in his farewell address more than 150 years ago uttered these words: "Religion and morality lead to political prosperity." These great men, though living many decades apart, shared the belief that a sound prosperity cannot be accomplished without a foundation of high standards of spiritual and moral principles and values.

My premise is that the moral values are the enduring values.

My premise is that victory in the struggle we are now in is so deeply involved in moral values that we cannot hope to survive without them. We shall need and maintain our strength-in-being, our Gideon's sword, but, I insist, we shall get nowhere without the Ark of the Covenant.

Now when I say that the United States is the greatest moral and practical triumph of Christianity I am not to be misconstrued into believing that I think we Americans are (a) the chosen people, or (b) the master race.

I am not putting out that kind of boast.

On the contrary, I hold it the most vital long-term duty—a duty of the greatest magnitude—that the whole world, under whatever religion, feel at the heart of its peoples and the seat of its governments, the power of the moral principles that make for survival of mankind and amity among the nations of the earth. It is up to the United States to be among the nations what Paul of Tarsus was among men.

Now when I say we here represent the greatest triumph of Christianity, I mean by triumph of moral principal over that which is bad. Our Constitution says that "all men are created equal." It is a cornerstone in our sense of moral values. The question is: So you believe all men are created equal? So what? Here is the difference: The Americans spelled that phrase out into statutory law. They spelled it out in their Constitution. They amended their Constitution to spell it out even more. And they are rendering decisions in their highest courts not only to keep the Constitution, under which they established Christianity in Government alike, but to expand and enrich it.

When you do these things you then give yourself the right, by virtue of your conduct, to preach; you give yourself the obligation to teach, perhaps to boast.

The Bible came out of the steaming ferments of the Middle East in antiquity. But in 2,000 years I do not know where its credo has been applied more practically than in the Congress of the United States, the White House, and the Supreme Court. For that matter we did not invent the internal combustion engine. But when we got hold of it we made the automobile the greatest industry of all time. It is this business of plucking a great ideal out of the dreams of the visionaries, and the schemes out of the half-realized hopes of the great inventors—foreign and native—and putting them to work for the good of all men that explains so much of America's success.

The moral ethics we live by came from Christ, they came from Moses, they came from Aristotle, and others. But before we got through we had: trial by jury, habeas corpus, due process, no unusual punishments, equal justice under law, and a sublimely organized system of courts for the protection—precisely for the protection—of the dignity of man.

By triumph of Christianity, I mean we took the blueprints of Christianity and law and created working tools.

That has built us up to the present hour but it does not protect us for the future.

We began this Nation with 3 million agrarian citizens and a sort of gross national income in 1799 of $667 million—substantially less than $1 billion. Our gross national product is now approaching—as President Eisenhower pointed out in his state of the Union message recently—$400 billion.

From less than one billion, in rough economic language, to upward of $400 billion in something over 150 years. What made possible this fabulous progress?

There have been other great land masses with enormous resources.

Why did they not blossom with a parallel prosperity?

I venture a few broad-gaged guesses:

They gave priority and privilege to some one church instead of giving the fullest opportunity to all, as on this soil—and priority to none.

They failed to separate church from state and they totalitarianized the one and persecuted the other.

They preferred aristocracy and privilege to democracy and equal opportunity.

They perpetuated corruption and accelerated decay because they lacked the purgative powers and the self-criticism of a free press.

Their system of popular education was so debased by despotism or semi-despotism that teaching a nation to read and write made the people only more vulnerable to a form of totalitarian propaganda and yellow journalism, and the victims of deliberately designed falsifications.

They failed because they ignored the moral and spiritual values that alone give strength to a nation's roots, its foundations, its reason for being.

The system that grew up here was imbedded in the public school, the town meeting, and the free press. We implemented democracy and justice in government by providing a government by consent of the governed. When we talked about "all men * * * created equal" we worried, as Lincoln did at Gettysburg, about giving it meaning in everyday life. When we Americans say, "love thy neighbor as thyself," we are not just reading Leviticus in the Old Testament and Mark in the New and letting it go at that. If someone invents a steam engine, we Americans expect it to run a locomotive. We expect it to replace sails on the sea, to carry freight, to move passengers, to build an economy. When we thunder at the greatest power of the time that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," we Americans are not kidding because we expect to get those rights, fight for them and, if necessary, die in the process. All of which is precisely and exactly and extravagantly just what we do.

And we do it again and again and again.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself" did not mean for us sharing cookies with the family across the street on some one day during the Christmas season. It meant that Cuba was to be free. It meant that the Philippines were to have their independence, just as we had our independence. It meant that any little people anywhere on this earth could lift its melancholy face towards Washington, D. C., and hear ringing out to the oppressed peoples the electric language of the "self-determination of nations" in the ennobling words of Woodrow Wilson and his successors.

It meant relations with our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, founded on persuasion and consent. It meant a climax of thinking across the frontiers that rendered senseless and unthinkable any policy of violence, of infiltration, or conquest. It meant a relationship founded on mutual respect, not mutual fear, and it produced hemisphere understanding and vast regional solidarity and strength on the side of the free world.

That's what it meant.

And it meant that for the free world—after the United States had spoken and practiced its words—the existence of satellite nations would stand out as a symbol of shame, of national peonage, and that it would be an affront to the whole world's sense of freedom and right in the era that is our era.

Yet we are but seven perecent of the population of the world.

After 157 years, this tiny confederation of 13 States emerges as the greatest power of all time. It is the unexampled phenomenon of 166 million people governed by 166 million people. It is so much the very heartbeat of world liberty that monarchs and statesmen, kings and queens, those in power and those in exile—but all seeking liberty of strength for liberty—come to the podium in the House of Representatives in the Capitol of the United States of America to plead their cause. The satellites that come to Moscow look glumly for their orders. The nations that appeal to us for whatever influence we have to give to enable them to continue free and independent.

As clearly as black is black and white is white, Washington means freedom and Moscow means enslavement.

We have then to ask ourselves: Now what?

If you agree with me that we have the moral might—in the interests not alone of our own preservation but in the interests of the preservation of the free world and life itself on this planet to right a wrong, then our problem is: What processes shall we employ? What methods shall we use, what tools, what means? And, can we do this at all without going to the brink and without precipitating the very World War III we are so bent upon preventing?

The answer is that, in one form or another, it all happened before—and in our time. The answer is that of course no people grimly determined to maintain its integrity against enslavement or destruction can hope to survive against a resolute and a dangerous enemy without some element of risk. But I insist that the risk can be buttressed by character, courage, and strength. And with these I feel—as history I am about to relate proves—that Communism has been and can be stopped dead in its tracks. I believe we are doing this under our administration today and I believe, moreover, that in this contest between freedom and communism there are no party lines.

Of course, given the brute strength of a limitless army, given conditions of desperate poverty, given widespread chaos, and the Soviet Union, or its fatal export, communism, can and does expand. But unless everything we know about conquest by force as against conquest by moral principle is wrong, it will be impossible to convince me that communism has even begun to take root among the third of the earth's population and the fourth of the world's surface where it now rules.

It is only just now giving itself its own blow to its own solar plexus.

We now have the proof in the Kremlin's own words that communism in general and the Soviet Union's oligarchy do not respect each other or themselves.

It is because they are vulnerable on moral grounds that they are vulnerable on every other ground—economic, political, diplomatic, ideological.

We all remember Austria, France, and Italy in 1947. They were becoming Communist-ridden. Their governments were tottering under the vast despair of postwar chaos. Exercising our high moral standards we stopped, on the home soil of the other man's country—the tragic overwhelming of free government by Communist infiltration. We stopped subversion and the misuse of a people's poverty to destroy their liberty.

In our overall program, Western Germany was brought into the anti-Communist fold. It happened that total success was not to be our lot. For while we succeeded brilliantly for the most part in Europe, we underwent dismal failure for the most part in the Far East. We have to accept the conditions of combat—for wars are like that.

I could go on and relate the story of Iran, which but for us might have been swallowed by the Soviet Union.

I could go on and tell the story of Greece and Turkey with the Kremlin breathing on their necks.

I could go on and report the heroic tale of the Berlin airlift.

What I say in sum is that the Communist ideology is not an irresistable force. The Soviet Union, with its Kremlin, is anything but an immovable body.

But moral force is both.

No one with an open mind and a clear view will belittle the compelling impact of President Eisenhower's challenge to the Soviet Union on disarmament and aerial inspection at the Geneva "meeting at the summit." Who can miss the sheer power of the confidence President Eisenhower enjoys from the people of his own country and the world in relation to this contest with communism?

What I urge today is that we seek with all the diligence we have, with all the wisdom we can get to lead us, with all the sincerity of our own people, some formula tailored—in each case—to the prevailing situation, for the defeat of the Communist enemy.

One part of this formula must be our own strength in the area of education in our own country.

We may even turn the Soviet tragedy to some benefit if under pressure of its crisis we exert ourselves on the educational plane to meet it head-on. We must defeat the peril of drastic shortages in skilled occupations. We must determine why students drop out of school and how gifted students may develop their abilities. I go all the way with the proposal that opportunities for higher education should be available to all Americans to the extent of their capabilities.

What I have sought to emphasize in this address is the suddenly, extended, suddenly accentuated meaning of our moral and spiritual values in the light of atheism's physical and ideological threat from Moscow. We cannot miss the importance in a technological age of the need for higher education and the development of our national talents to their noblest flowering. It is this that will contribute mightily to a strong and progressive America. Above all, this growth, morally and spiritually, this strengthening of our native talents by training and education, is without meaning if it is not based on the bulwarking, equally, of our faith in our constitutional rights. Given these moral and spiritual forces, given this all encompassing education for all our people, given this faith in the American heritage, victory for the free world will be the inevitable reward for mankind.

Nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here at Westmar. May each of you bring something to a world in need of light and understanding.

The Fight for Industrial Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, among a number of interesting speeches made at the President's conference on industrial safety was one by William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO. I should like to include Mr. Schnitzler's remarks at this point:

I am not happy to be speaking here today because the subject which brings us together is cruel and heartbreaking—the subject of industrial accidents.

Certainly this meeting is necessary; certainly this conference has helped tremendously in calling public attention to this grave problem. But none of us can honestly say we are "happy" to be here.

You know, as well as I, the statistics of industrial accidents—the annual toll of 14,000 dead, and nearly 2 million injured.

It is very easy to recite those statistics. It is very easy to talk about the necessity for preventing this terrible waste of our Nation's most precious resource—her people.

It is quite another thing to appreciate the suffering, the tragedy that industrial accidents bring in a worker's family.

It is quite another matter to substitute action for speeches.

I have been assigned the topic "Labor's Responsibility for the Prevention of Accidents." I submit that it is impossible to talk about labor's responsibility and not talk about management's responsibility. It is impossible to talk about either the responsibility of labor or management and not talk about the responsibility of Government as a representative of all the people. It is impossible to talk as a labor representative about the subject of industrial accidents without getting mad and without stepping on some toes.

I shall strive to restrain my indignation. I shall not try to avoid "stepping on toes." For this is a matter so serious as to make the normal social amenities pointless.

I am a baker. I have seen a man lose an arm in a dough mixer—and later die of gangrene. I have seen a lovely girl lose four fingers in a slicing machine. And mind you, I do not come from an industry that is considered "hazardous."

I represent here today the people who have the greatest stake in the abolition of industrial accidents—the workers whose eyes and hands, whose legs and lives are at stake.

I represent as well the people who are denied, in all too many instances, an effective voice in dealing with industrial accidents. Oh, we have a voice in conferences like this, but we are often denied a voice at the plant level—where it really counts.

Let me point out that the concern of the trade union movement in this field is not new. One of the earliest fights we waged was for the achievement of workmen's compensation laws and factory inspection and safety laws.

It is often forgotten that we achieved workmen's compensation laws and State safety laws over the fierce opposition of the representatives of management.

We did not achieve a workmen's compensation law or a factory inspection law in a single State just because of our logic or our powers of persuasion. We won our fight because men and women died—died horribly—died needlessly.

Just the other day, President Meany reminded a group of union leaders, who were here in Washington, of the fact that in the State of New York it took the death of young girls in a garment factory—the Triangle Shirt Waist disaster—to bring decent laws and decent enforcement of laws in that State.

New York wasn't the exception—it was the rule.

Men lost their jobs because they fought for these goals. Men were blacklisted as "agitators". Employers spent large sums of money to defeat workers in their campaign for this kind of legislation. They fought us vigorously but we won.

Or did we?

Today's statistics would indicate that there is a tremendous job still to be done. The workmen's compensation laws have not kept pace with economic advances. The proportion of pay that an injured worker receives is far too low. The disqualification pitfalls are far too many; the red tape too snarled.

The factory inspection and safety laws have not kept pace with the tremendous advances of the industrial world. We have States where there are more game inspectors than factory inspectors, as though our wildlife is considered more important than human life.

I think we in labor have a right to point the finger at those responsible.

In every battle in every State legislature, over the issue of workmen's compensation improvements, we have been opposed by the organizations representing business and industry.

Every time we have fought to improve factory safety laws or to see to it that there were enough State enforcement officers to police these laws, we have been opposed by lobbyists of the State chamber of commerce, or the State manufacturers association.

I have been sometimes puzzled by this opposition. Some members of these employer groups are companies that have demonstrated, at the collective bargaining table, maturity and a progressive and understanding attitude.

Some members of these employer groups are companies with active safety programs—companies that have established safety programs which save skilled manpower, save production and protect profits.

Why then the opposition from the lobbyists of these employer groups? I don't know. I have never been a member of these organizations. Some of it may come from individuals who believe they are protecting the best interests of their members. Some of the opposition may result from the fact that progressive employers fail to exert an influence in the organizations to which they belong.

Much of it comes, I believe, from a kind of cash register mind that is unable to see that a short-range profit in cash could be a long-range deficit in human values—from the kind of mentality that places profit before people and dollars before decency.

I am told that no progressive company today opposes industrial safety. On the face of it, that's probably true. But the fact is that there is a good deal of opposition—almost concerted opposition—to what we consider the only sound and sensi-

ble approach to the achievement of industrial safety.

That approach can be summed up in one word—"cooperation".

In those instances where the cooperative approach has been tried—in those companies where there is now agreement that safety is not the job of management alone or the job of safety technicians alone or the job of labor alone—the record of industrial safety has been astonishing and heartwarming.

But in all too many companies, top management is afraid that the cooperative approach which we advocate would be an infringement on management's prerogatives. In all too many companies the safety technician is considered just an employee. He has no say in top management policy. He can recommend, but he cannot act.

In all too many companies the labor unions are ignored or scorned or fought when they attempt to get into the safety picture.

Labor organizations recognize that, in a large part, plant safety is a technical problem. We recognize that management has the prime responsibility for making the workshops safe.

We recognize, too, that the labor union, which is the workers' representative, and which the worker respects, can play an important role in building plant safety.

But it can't play an effective role if it is considered only a messenger boy for top management. It can't play an effective role if its recommendations are not heeded. It can't play an effective role unless safety is a cooperative matter in which the technicians and the union and management work together with an understanding of each other's problems, with an appreciation of each other's sincerity and with the common purpose of making the job safe.

All too often, employers with whom we have excellent relations will say to us privately and confidentially that they would make their plants safer and provide for the purchase of expensive safety equipment if all of the companies in their industry would do likewise.

But they can't be caught in a competitive squeeze—they can't afford higher operational costs if a competitor is going to continue hazardous practices just because they are cheaper practices.

That's the reason why labor unions consider that this is a job in which Government, as the representative of all the people, must play a prominent role.

We need factory inspection laws that are modern, strict, inclusive. We need fair and continuous enforcement of these laws without fear or favor.

I pledge to you that the trade unions of the United States are going to continue their fight to get this kind of industrial safety legislation and to get this kind of enforcement of these laws.

That will end the competitive squeeze which worries some employers.

I spoke before of the cooperative approach. Let me remind you that during World War II, there were some 7,000 labor-management production committees going in American industry. Statistics show that over 80 percent of these worked on safety. Safety was by far the most frequent subject of joint cooperation. It was by far the most effective.

Today a great many of these committees have disappeared. Some still exist—far fewer than I would desire and those that do exist are doing an excellent job.

I want to commend to your attention the labor-management safety program in the west coast pulp and paper industry. The management's side of the table is represented by my predecessor on this program, Mr. Zellerbach.

I want to congratulate Mr. Zellerbach and the employers he represents, and I want to congratulate the unions involved in this program. They have demonstrated far better than any words of mine the fact that labor-management cooperation for safety does work.

Some of the international unions of the AFL–CIO today have full-time safety directors. Some have part-time district safety directors. Many of the local unions have safety committees. Some of the unions provide training in the basics of safety in their industry, and they have sought and found expert guidance in this field.

In honesty, I must say to you that the unions have not made as much progress in this field as they should and as they will in the future.

But the concern of the trade-union movement for industrial safety is growing in the AFL–CIO. At our founding convention, we established a constitutional committee on safety and occupational health which includes top leaders of organized labor who come from the most hazardous industries.

Let me assure you this is not going to be a sweetness and honey committee. It is not going to be a committee that will content itself with writing a resolution for the biennial convention to consider. It will be a committee that will take an active, hard-boiled, practical interest in this field.

The members of the AFL–CIO, I assure you, will be fighting at every level for the enactment of enforceable, up-to-date occupational safety and health codes. We will be fighting for adequate appropriations to insure the policing of these codes at every level of Government.

We will be fighting for decent, modern, and humane standards of workmen's compensation.

Yes, the AFL–CIO will be fighting. But we will also be ready to cooperate—to cooperate at the plant level, in the State legislatures or in the Federal Congress—with men of good will from management who believe, as we do, in the preservation of human life and the prevention of human suffering.

This Conference serves an excellent purpose in bringing the need for occupational safety before the public.

But it serves no purpose at all if the noble words which are uttered here are not matched by concrete deeds back home.

We applaud the words—but we'll wait for the needs before rendering judgment.

The Late Miss Lucinda Rayburn

SPEECH
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my condolences to our Speaker on the loss of his beloved sister, Miss Lucinda Rayburn.

Miss Rayburn was a fine woman, highly respected, loved, and revered by all who knew her. To our Speaker she was sister, companion, confidant, and hostess; a person dedicated to his welfare and happiness. Her loss will be keenly felt by her family, friends, and the many thousands who had the opportunity to benefit by her kindliness, graciousness, and sincerity.

Our Speaker and other members of his family have my deepest sympathy in this time of bereavement.

Memorandum on Kearns Bill, H. R. 10424

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following memorandum on my bill, H. R. 10424, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra-high frequency television channels:

COMMITTEE FOR COMPETITIVE TELEVISION,
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM ON KEARNS BILL, H. R. 10424

In order to achieve an all-channel television system it is essential that receiving sets at manufacturer's level be built as all-channel sets. Because of the inept manner in which allocations were made at the outset by the Government, it is now essential that the Government help to correct the error by creating an excise tax differential between all-channel sets and VHF-only sets at the manufacturer's level.

This is the purpose of H. R. 10424, and the following facts relate to the tax effect of that bill which provides a 5 percent reduction in the excise tax on television sets capable of receiving 50 or more UHF television channels:

The average cost at manufacturer's level before taxes of all-channel sets is currently $134 per unit.

The average cost at manufacturer's level of VHF-only sets is currently $120 per unit.

It is estimated that all sets costing at manufacturer's level $129 or more would be manufactured as all-channel sets if there were a tax differential of 5 percent.

It is estimated that this would cause the manufacture of 50 percent of present VHF-only sets as all-channel sets. It would affect 3,300,000 sets.

In addition, in 1955 there were manufactured 1,181,000 all-channel sets.

The reduction of revenues from the 5 percent differential would be as following, presuming 1956 and later production would be approximately on the 1955 basis:

Value of 1,181,000 UHF sets	$160,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent	16,000,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent	8,000,000
Value of 3,300,000 UHF sets	425,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent	42,500,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent	21,250,000
Total loss	29,250,000

However, this loss would be offset by at least a 10 percent increase in set market as a result of increased stations. This will amount to approximately $6 million. In addition, the present UHF stations will have increased revenues. If this were to be an average taxable revenue of only $100,000 per

station, there would be a gain to the Government of $5 million. The advent of new stations to the extent of only 400 stations with taxable income per station of only $50,000 would increase tax revenues by $20,000 per station or $10 million. All of these taxes would create a recoupment of $21 million per annum.

Additional employment of taxable employees, additional revenue to networks, and additional orders to manufacturers for transmitting equipment and receivers will all generate more taxable income than could be lost by the Government.

Therefore, the Government would under the Kearns bill gain revenue rather than lose it.

The foregoing is based on facts and figures supplied by the Statistical Division of Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association.

Bulganin and Khrushchev Are Not Welcome in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Mr. Robert E. Allen, which appeared in the Charleston Daily Mail of West Virginia on May 29, 1956. Mr. Allen tells us how anxious the Russian bosses are to visit Canada and South America and points out that their real objective is the United States. Let us hope our good neighbors make known to these murderers that their presence is not welcomed on this side of the Atlantic.

The article follows:

BULGANIN AND KHRUSHCHEV SET SIGHTS ON CANADA

(By Robert E. Allen)

These two globe-trotting Kremlin czars are eyeing this side of the Atlantic.

They are putting out feelers about coming to Canada.

It's being proposed to Premier Bulganin and Communist Party boss Khrushchev be invited to make an official visit to the Commonwealth, as they recently did to Britain.

Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent has done nothing about the matter. Moscow has been informed he is "considering it."

The Reds' strategy, in proposing to tour Canada, is obvious.

Their real objective is not the Commonwealth. It is merely the means to far greater ends.

The Russians' actual propaganda targets are the United States and Latin America.

A Bulganin-Khrushchev trip to Canada is deemed certain to be extensively covered by the United States press, radio, and TV, which in turn would transmit reports to Latin America. Thus the two Soviet rulers would, in effect, be making a tour of the entire American continent.

Further, they would be doing that without taking any undue personal risks, added fatigue, and with the opportunity to wheedle for invitations to the United States and elsewhere.

The Reds are making no secret about courting Latin America. At the latest Kremlin diplomatic reception, Khrushchev went out of his way to be cordial to South Americans. To the Ambassador of Argentine, with whom the Soviet is negotiating a big trade deal, Khrushchev expressed the enthusiastic hope of visiting that country "soon."

A significant straw of what is in the wind along this line occurred in Uruguay last week.

The Uruguyan Chamber of Deputies accepted a Russian invitation to send a delegation there for an extended visit. Similar invitations have been made to a number of other Latin American countries.

Management's Responsibility for the Prevention of Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a speech made recently at the President's Conference on Industrial Safety by J. D. Zellerbach, president of the Crown Zellerbach Corp. Mr. Zellerbach points out the responsibility of management, together with labor and the individual worker, to attack the problems of accident prevention. His speech follows:

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS

(By J. D. Zellerbach)

Throughout the first 2 days of the President's Conference on Occupational Safety you have explored accident prevention from several different approaches. You have heard safety discussed as a community problem. You have participated in safety clinics. You have looked at safety from the standpoint of our farms and our public employees. This morning you will hear from management and labor.

All of you have presumably received copies of the Conference Fact Sheet. At the risk of repeating statistics from this document which may already be familiar, let me mention briefly the following figures: in all industry divisions within the scope of the President's conference there were more than 1,700,000 disabling injuries in 1955. The number of fatalities exceeded 12,000.

My point is this: the majority of these injuries and deaths occurred in industries operated by American management. The figures, in short, provide us with a graphic indication of the tremendous scope of the safety problem faced by management. It is management's responsibility to use every device available to lower as far as humanly possible the number of deaths and injuries in American industry.

At the same time it must be recognized that management has made great steps forward in making American factories, mills, and mines safe places to work. We know that American management as a whole has become acutely safety conscious and that no responsible industrial concern can afford to function without a sound accident-prevention program.

But we also know that to the homes and families hit by fatalities, to the permanently disabled, it makes little difference whether the figures are relatively better or not. Death and pain are not relative. They are bitter reality—to the man who is hurt or to the survivors left behind.

A single accident, a single fatality is bad, wherever and whenever it happens.

Taking accident prevention from the management viewpoint, we can start with the fundamental assumption that management is most emphatically responsible for industrial safety in the United States. That responsibility will be reflected in literally thousands of individual safety programs of varying complexity across the country, programs which are designed to protect American workers from the physical hazards of industrial employment.

But whereas certain obvious jurisdictional lines can be drawn between management and labor in many areas of industrial activity, no line can be drawn where safety is concerned. Safety represents a unique form of responsibility in that accident prevention cuts straight across every industrial organization and involves everybody—without exception.

This means that management must share its responsibility for safety with labor and with the individual worker, completely and wholeheartedly. We might call accident prevention the eternal triangle of industrial relations, to take certain liberties with that familiar phrase. On the one side, there is management, on the second side organized labor, and on the third side the worker himself. Unless there is a sense of mutual responsibility for safety, a sense of personal participation by every member of the organization, the triangle flies apart, accidents happen, and people get hurt.

Today I want to discuss with you some of the implications of the triangular approach to accident prevention, and then to show you how we have used this approach in the field where I am most at home: the Pacific coast pulp and paper industry.

Management's responsibility to provide a safe place to work requires far more than the provision of guards around machinery or dangerous chemicals, adherence to State and local safety regulations, or the establishment of elaborate safety campaigns. It requires the generation and the steady maintenance of a safety climate.

This climate must induce every member of the organization, from top management down to the man on the line, to think, feel, and breathe safety all the time.

If the safety climate is sufficiently well developed, it should even permeate the home and the community and thus act to prevent accidents away from work—where, in fact, most accidents occur. An employee who seriously injures himself falling from a defective stepladder while pruning an apple tree is just as much a loss to the company as though he had been hurt on the job.

This need for a good safety climate cannot be overemphasized. Indeed, it has been growing steadily in American industry through the years. Where it does not exist it is apparent that top management or the employees are either indifferent to safety or merely paying lip service to accident prevention. In such cases a plant cannot be completely safe. In a complex industrial facility—and what facility is not complex these days—the lack of a good safety climate can be dangerous to management and labor alike.

To build a proper safety climate, management must have the full cooperation of the union and the individual worker. Each must hold up his end of the triangle. There can be no blockage of communications, no attitude of "let the other fellow do it," no abrogation of the mutual responsibility for safety. Management cannot afford it because of its legal and moral obligations to its employees and because of its heavy investment in trained manpower and in equipment. The union cannot afford it because it is obliged to promote the welfare of union members. The individual worker cannot afford it because his good right arm, and possibly his life are at stake.

The plain fact is that nobody cannot afford it. The pursuit of safety is about the most "mutual" interest I know of.

In order to generate a proper safety climate, management must be prepared to do everything within its power to prevent accidents. Safety must be built into the entire industrial process, from the building of new plants and equipment to the lowliest work order. The plant manager, backed up by top management, must be ready and willing to curtail production in order to solve a safety problem. And the safety message must be effectively communicated up and down the line.

Building safety into the industrial process obviously calls for system and method. A program is the sine qua non of accident prevention and it is up to management to provide direction and support for safety campaigns. I do not wish to fill in for you all the details of a management safety program, since many of them will be known to you as established techniques. Nevertheless, the common denominator of all safety programs must be a combination of five basic elements:

First, good housekeeping. Safety and clutter, like the mongoose and the cobra, are natural enemies.

Second, protective equipment and emergency procedures.

Third, safety supervision and inspection. This would include the preparation of safety rules and their enforcement, accident investigation and analysis. And it would include action to prevent the recurrence of accidents.

Fourth, sanitation and medical facilities.

Fifth, safety education. This means the indoctrination of new employees, building safety into job training and holding safety meetings. It means keeping the safety message before all members of the organization all the time.

It is possible, of course, for management to blueprint an accident prevention effort on the basis of these five elements and delude itself into believing that complete safety has been achieved.

Let me give you a useful illustration of what I mean. In the Pacific coast pulp and paper industry we thought we were all for safety during the years before the war.

Most of our member mills probably considered that their safety standards were adequate for the times. But there was a missing link. The proper safety climate had not been established. And our accident rate proved it. From 1923 to 1945 the sum total of our safety effort was a drop of around four points in lost-time injuries—from 43.50 to 39. No such rate could be tolerated today.

Then something happened.

Fortunately the pulp and paper industry on the Pacific coast had always enjoyed excellent relations with the two labor unions representing our employees: The International Brotherhood of Papermakers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. Through the years we had bargained collectively with considerable vigor, without losing respect for the other side of the bargaining table. Bargaining was, and is, on an area-wide basis and the wage contract agreed upon applies to the workers of all mills in the Pacific Coast Association of Pulp and Paper Manufacturers.

During the course of our wage negotiations in 1945, the two labor unions, representing nearly 50 local unions, by the way—proposed a joint labor-management attack on accidents in the pulp and paper industry. They fully recognized that safety cannot be covered in any adequate way through a labor contract and saw considerable merit and wisdom in the joint approach.

So did management. We agreed with the idea at once. Thus began one of the most unique developments in labor-management relations throughout all of American industrial history. We had discovered, at least in our industry and in our area, the triangular method of accident prevention.

To put the proposal into practical effect, the unions suggested that we establish an annual series of joint labor-management safety conferences to be held in the three States of Oregon, Washington, and California. The purpose of the conferences was to be "the consideration of safety education, accident prevention and first aid." From that day to this we have never wavered from this purpose and the results of the whole experiment speak for themselves.

Our first conference took place in Olympia, Wash., in 1946, with 35 member mills taking part. It was recognized that the conference would be conducted in a vacuum unless we also developed a fool-proof system for reporting back to the mills, so that every employee was familiar with the topics discussed and the solution or safety procedures recommended. Thus the conference machinery of discussions, clinics, talks and feed-backs was shifted into gear and off we went.

From that first conference the accident rate began to drop. Our rating in 1945, as I have just mentioned, was 39. In 1946, the year of the first conference, we were able to lower it several points. By 1952, we had cut it back successively each year to 10.06, a drop of nearly 30 points.

Last March we held our 10th annual Joint Labor-Management Safety Conference of the Pacific Coast pulp and paper industry. It was a time for stock-taking, of course. And we allowed ourselves at least a measure of satisfaction from the fact that our 1955 accident rate, with 39 mills participating, was down to 6.40 accidents per million man-hours worked, as against 11.9 for the pulp and paper industry as a whole. The frequency of injuries had been reduced by 84 percent while the number of workers in Pacific coast pulp and paper mills had increased by more than 50 percent, from 15,000 to 22,500. The actual number of injuries in 1955 was 291. With fewer workers in 1946, the number of injuries in that year exceeded 1,000.

The successful reduction of an accident rate, however, permits only a momentary burst of pride. For a 6.40 accident rate is still too high and we have found it increasingly difficult to reap the spectacular gains we made during the initial phases of the experiment.

Moreover, the very moment when you take pride in a good accident-prevention record is the time to look for trouble. At our 10th conference a Los Angeles paper-converting plant was awarded a trophy for a lost-time accident rate of zero during 1955. Within a matter of a few days the record of this mill was broken when a man fell from a ladder, breaking two bones in his foot. Shortly afterward a second man injured his hand in a winding belt. Luckily, nothing more serious occurred.

I am quite familiar with the details. The mill happens to belong to my own company.

At the same time a drop of more than 32 points in lost-time injuries speaks volumes in favor of our labor-management safety conferences. We found, for example, that had we maintained the accident rate of 1945 during the 10-year conference period there would have been 10,000 additional lost-time accidents. We can argue soundly, it seems to me, that those accidents were prevented by our conference program. It is now safer to work in a mill of the Pacific coast pulp and paper industry than it is to stay at home.

From the first year of the program, active union-management committees were established at each mill. Through the years these committees have continued to meet regularly, often once a week, to review plant accidents, to investigate the causes of accidents and to discuss various safety measures. Again at the mill level, considerable attention has been given to encouraging safety consciousness on the part of individual workers through buletins, posters, and meetings—in fact, up to and including safety book matches.

In order to keep up sustained interest throughout the industry, the manufacturers' association publishes every month the accident-frequency rate of member mills. And at every annual conference friendly competition among the mills is encouraged by the presentation of awards based on the 5-year frequency rate, the lowest frequency rate for the year and for the lowest injury rate in each of the 3 States.

Each conference meets and deliberates under two cochairmen, one representing labor and the other management. It has always been agreed that the meetings should not be sounding boards for the settlement of local plant disputes or grievances, which can be more effectively solved in the mill itself. The deck is thus cleared for the consideration of suggestions and ideas which can be used by individual delegates to improve their own safety programs. We can also count on many visitors from other parts of the country to contribute their own recommendations for accident prevention, based on their regional experience.

Now it is true that the joint labor-management safety conferences of the Pacific coast pulp and paper industry grew out of a history of successful collective bargaining. We cannot deny that the soil for this type of experiment had been well prepared by a pattern of cooperation which had been long established. There have been attempts to adopt the technique elsewhere and not all of them have been successful. We are familiar with many accident-prevention campaigns which collapsed after the initial enthusiasm had waned.

Nevertheless, I commend our experiment to your attention as one approach to the problem of accident prevention.

Safety, like many other aspects of our modern technological world, is here to stay. Management must think first of the humanitarian considerations of accident prevention. Every effort must be made to see that the man on the line is sent home to his family as sound of mind and limb as when he reported for work on his shift.

Management has discovered, however, that safety pays and that accident prevention is another effective way of protecting the total corporate investment. Safety helps to reduce high insurance costs, eliminates waste, and prevents the loss of valuable property and equipment. While serving its humanitarian purpose, safety also protects management's investment in its most valuable asset: Skilled and experienced manpower. And that investment will loom larger as the technological revolution advances and jobs in industry become more highly skilled and better paid.

In connection with this subject of cost saving through safety, it is often wrongly assumed that only the large corporation can afford effective safety programs. Studies have been made which demonstrate that the small company also can cut costs and get a higher return on investment through systematic accident prevention. And yet, as a group, small companies are generally found in the rearguard of the national safety movement.

For the small concern safety is an effective form of accident insurance. Actually a large corporation might be able to survive an accident which could ruin a small company.

In short, safety is "a game in which everyone can win." That apt description was given at one of our Pacific Coast Joint Labor-Management Safety Conferences by William Riggs, international representative of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers.

It is the mutual responsibility of management, labor, and the individual worker to see that commonsense rules of the game of safety are drawn up and applied. Management also shares with labor and the individual worker the responsibility for seeing that the game never ends.

The Administration and Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Sokolsky in a recent column foretells the seating of Red China if the proposed appointments of Paul Hoffman and Dean Rusk to the American delegation to the United Nations are confirmed. While I thoughts Mr. Sokolsky expresses, noneam in agreement with many of the theless, it is most disconcerting to find a spirit of submission on the part of the press. Mr. Sokolsky states:

It will not be long before the Government of the United States * * * will recognize Red China.

I, for one, have more confidence in the judgment of the American people. The column, which appeared in the May 28 issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail is as follows:

HAVE REPUBLICANS TURNED SOFT ON COMMUNISM?

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the State Department sent the names of Paul Hoffman and Dean Rusk to the Republican leadership in the Senate, it did something profane in the sense that it violated Republican promises to the electorate in the 1952 campaign that Red China would not be recognized by the United States. The Republicans had bitterly and even cruelly attacked President Harry Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson for their pro-Red China machinations, giving the country to believe that the Democrats were a party of treason.

But the cold fact is that Truman and Acheson did not recognize Red China nor did Red China get into the United Nations. It is no secret in international circles nor among U. N. delegates who make their headquarters in New York that the 1956 meeting of the United Nations General Assembly was postponed from September until after the presidential election for the convenience of the Eisenhower administration, so that the United Nations General Assembly would not be an embarrassment during the presidential campaign. And the most embarrassing subject is, of course, the seating of Red China which could change the votes of many Americans if it occurred before the November presidential election. Apparently for the same reason reports from Moscow indicate that Bulganin and Khrushchev will come to the United States after the election.

The proposed appointment of Paul Hoffman and Dean Rusk to the American delegation to the United Nations is bound to give the impression that the China problem was a factor in these appointments, Paul Hoffman is chairman of the Fund for the Republic. According to the Daily Worker of May 16, Paul Hoffman compared Americans who are fighting Communists to "a new form of Ku Klux Klanism—by which a group of Americans having no judicial status whatsoever can set itself up to pass judgment on the loyalties of their fellow citizens." Since when do Americans require judicial status to express their views on a public question or about public personalities or fellow citizens?

The objection to Dean Rusk is that he was Deputy Under Secretary of State and at one time Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs under Dean Acheson and was, in a measure, responsible for the policies which the Republicans criticized so constantly and so heatedly from 1947 to 1952. The Republican leadership in the Senate feels that the appointment of Rusk is a direct slap at them and at the Republican Party.

But behind all this is the belief that some time ago, the State Department secretly agreed that Red China would be admitted to the United Nations by 1957 and that the stage is being set for this event.

It will not be long before the Government of the United States, on the theory that the game is up and the Soviet world has won all the victories and that there is no use bucking the tide, will recognize Red China.

Unfortunately, this concept of the solution of the China problem makes a liar out of every Republican who said it was all a Democratic plot to appease either Great Britain or Soviet Russia, that it was the concoction of the perverse mind of Dean Acheson. Now that it turns out to be a Republican plot, the product of the realpolitik of John Foster Dulles, it is embarrassing to the Republicans who for so long have denounced it.

Study of Aluminum Industry Announced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and also as chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I announced today that the Antitrust Subcommittee staff will undertake an extensive study of various conditions in the aluminum industry. Upon completion of the staff study the subcommittee will hold hearings on this industry.

The House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee has long concerned itself with the aluminum industry. As part of the subcommittee's examination into this industry, a predecessor subcommittee—the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power—held hearings in January and February 1951 in the course of which 32 witnesses testified. Based upon this comprehensive body of facts the subcommittee reached unanimous conclusions in its report, submitted to the House on March 13, 1951.

Following this report, the Government and the industry adopted policies which resulted in more than doubling the productive capacity of the aluminum industry.

In addition to the increase of productive capacity, the independent fabricating segment of the industry has also experienced a very substantial growth in this period.

Against this background the Antitrust Subcommittee deems it desirable to bring up to date the factual information concerning this industry, which is most important not only to the civilian economy but to the national defense.

It is particularly important for the subcommittee to determine whether the substantial expansion program of the past 5 years has resulted in greater or lesser concentration and competition at various levels from production through fabrication.

In the course of the study and the hearings, representatives from all segments of the industry will be given ample opportunity to submit relevant information to the subcommittee and to testify.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped on May 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 17, 1956

It is a privilege and personal pleasure to meet today with the President's Committee. I want you to know the important work you are doing is deeply appreciated by all of us in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The President's Committee and our Department are both working toward a common goal for the handicapped person—a useful, productive place in life. One of the essentials in this common cause is an active and forceful program of public education about the people who are handicapped and their rightful place in the world of work, because lack of public understanding and acceptance still presents great obstacles to vocational rehabilitation. Your Committee is carrying on an effective program to tell the American people the facts about our handicapped citizens, and for these efforts we are grateful.

Our mutual concern for handicapped people raises many questions about the broader problems of disability among our people—problems which should be the common concern of businessmen, organized labor, and your local, State, and Federal Governments.

This century has seen a tremendous breakthrough in medicine, just as in air flight, nuclear energy, and many other fields. Medical research and preventive medicine have opened great new frontiers. Dramatic advances in curative medicine and surgery, too, have made it possible for thousands of individuals to survive illnesses and injuries which would have been fatal a few decades ago.

For example, around the time of World War I, the death rate for young diabetics at age 20 was 400 per 1,000. In other words, about 3 out of 5 survived. Then came insulin. Experience in the last few years shows that 99 out of 100 live.

Nevertheless, the diabetic persons' problems of living today are still serious. When he applies for a job, he must say, "Yes, I am a diabetic." And the employer must ask himself, "Will I hire a diabetic?"

For these and many hundreds of thousands of other disabled persons, the progress of medicine has brought new problems of living. This very success in medical science contributes to the mounting number of handicapped people who have survived serious illness and injury only to find that there may be no place for them in our social, industrial, or business life.

Disability raises many problems far beyond the direct question of medical care—problems which are felt more keenly each day in our homes, offices, and factories. These problems are reflected in the work of your local, State, and national governments, and in the taxes you pay to support them. The so-called catastrophic illnesses and injuries mean more than a catastrophe of the body. They mean the financial collapse of thousands of hard-working, thrifty families every year. When income is halted while medical costs mount and living expenses continue, then another family faces destitution.

As a nation, we provide some measure of financial protection against this hazard through a variety of means—the voluntary and private charity groups, various forms of insurance, workmen's compensation, and others. Through the public assistance agencies, we try to see that no person in serious want is ignored and that basic financial needs are met. To the extent that money payments can help, we have taken many steps in the right direction.

However, we are now reaching a stage of greater maturity, I believe, in our approach to many social problems. In the administration of public-assistance programs, for example, we have enough experience to realize that cash payments, by themselves, are not a satisfactory solution for either the people who receive them or the taxpayers who provide them. Our efforts so far have been to alleviate the effects of personal misfortune—but we have only recently begun to move against the causes.

With this in mind, the President this year recommended that Congress enact legislation which would lend the support of the Federal Government to this concept of getting at the causes of public dependency. The administration has proposed an approach which will encourage research to produce more facts, along with a broadening of public welfare services to help people overcome their problems and advance to a place of self-support and dignity.

There is no better example of the constructive results of this approach than the experience of the vocational-rehabilitation program. In recent years, this program has given an increasing amount of its attention and resources to restoring and reestablishing disabled people who are dependent upon public assistance.

The State rehabilitation agencies are contending with an enormous problem, in relation to their resources, for disability ranks high among the causes of dependency. About 1 million people, including some 325,000 dependent children, must look to the public assistance agencies for support because the family breadwinners are disabled—some of them with permanent impairments, others with short-term conditions. Payments by the public welfare agencies to maintain these individuals have reached nearly a half billion dollars annually.

No one knows, of course, just how many of these disabled men and women could be rehabilitated. But as experience accumulates, it becomes increasingly evident that an all-out effort in rehabilitation could make a substantial reduction in the number of disabled people who must depend upon public support.

The financial gains for both the disabled men and women and the public would be substantial. In 1955, over 11,000 disabled people who had been on the public assistance rolls were rehabilitated and placed in employment. To leave them on the welfare rolls would have cost almost $10 million a year. To rehabilitate them cost less than $8 million. Estimates indicate that these persons will pay in Federal income taxes alone much more than the funds spent on their rehabilitation. Far more important than the economic advantages, however, are the human rewards for a life of independence and self-reliance.

The value of this program has been widely recognized, but this recognition has not always been followed by adequate support. One of the first legislative proposals made by the President was to expand and improve this program. Congress enacted a new Vocational Rehabilitation Act without dissent in either the House or Senate—a rare occurrence on such important legislation.

Under this broadened act, the program already has made progress toward its goal of bringing the Nation's rehabilitation resources abreast of the needs of the handicapped. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reported an increase in the number of disabled people restored last year and another increase is expected during the current year. Meanwhile, we have been building a foundation for much greater advances in the future.

To take full advantage of the new act, the Federal and State Governments and many voluntary groups have joined in a cooperative effort to bring more and better services to those who are disabled. Nearly 150 nongovernmental organizations have launched projects—some to expand the range and volume of their services, others to undertake research and other developmental work—to widen the horizons for the whole field of rehabilitation.

These voluntary groups include such fine organizations as the crippled children's societies, Goodwill Industries, and their nationwide system of affiliates, local units of the American Heart Association, and many others. In these projects now going forward with the support of the Federal and State rehabilitation agencies, the voluntary organizations are investing their own funds as well.

Several research projects are seeking answers to employment problems. In New York, a project is now under way to analyze hiring practices among a representative group of employers. Another investigation is aimed at learning the extent to which a rehabilitation team can improve the employment outlook for persons who are confined to their homes.

In Massachusetts, another study will try to find improved techniques for preemployment evaluation and work preparation of those who have chronic rheumatic disease. In California, the vocational rehabilitation agency has sponsored a project to develop ways of speeding the rehabilitation of in-

jured employees under workmen's compensation.

In making grants for these special projects, our Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has the benefit of the advice and recommendations of a National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation—an outstanding group of national leaders in medicine, education, rehabilitation, industry, and labor. In helping to shape the direction of this new research and demonstration program, the Advisory Council has performed a valuable public service for which we in the department are grateful.

Many other benefits of the new Vocational Rehabilitation Act are becoming apparent each day. Under the new training grant provisions of the act, 90 colleges, universities, and special institutions have joined forces with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to augment their teaching programs in rehabilitation and to develop new ones. From these schools, located in 30 States, will come the bulk of the professional workers we must have to provide more and better rehabilitation services in the coming years.

Services for the blind, particularly in the vending-stand program, have been greatly strengthened by the 1954 act. The cooperative work between the Department of Labor, our own Department, and the President's committee—which long has been important in developing new job opportunities for the handicapped—has been recognized formally by the act. Out of this new relationship came a series of cooperative projects during the past year—all aimed at improving job opportunities for those who are disabled.

Another portion of the new law provided for staffing each Employment Service office with at least one person specially qualified to direct placement efforts for the handicapped.' Under this provision, the United States Employment Service and the State employment services have substantially increased the number of handicapped individuals placed in jobs.

The progress made under the new law during the past year and a half has been possible because many persons and organizations have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to the interests of the handicapped men and women of this country. Many of the people in this auditorium this afternoon have played important parts in this progress.

We have a responsibility now to look at the situation in its entirety and to understand the size of the task still before us. If the vocational rehabilitation program is to achieve its full potential, if it is to accept all the people needing services each year, then we must increase by 300 percent the number of persons restored to employment annually.

This constitutes tremendous growth, and it cannot be accomplished overnight. We are, however, dealing with a problem whose magnitude we have only recently begun to appreciate. Growth will be measured each year—and our task now is to provide for full, healthy growth each year.

Under the new act, Congress has voted increased funds for rehabilitation each year and has indicated its support of expanded services to restore more disabled persons. In this State-Federal program, the degree to which the States give their support—financial and in other ways—provides the key to successful expansion. Many States already have responded vigorously to the opportunities provided in the new law. In less than 2 years, the amount of State financial support has increased by more than 50 percent for the country as a whole. But some States still have not seized the opportunities that are open.

There are great variations among the States in the funds invested in this constructive work. To illustrate: the per capita expenditure for vocational rehabilitation in one State is 23 cents. At the other end of the scale, one State is devoting only 3 cents to rehabilitation of its handicapped people. It is noteworthy that there seldom is a relationship between the amount devoted to rehabilitation and the per capita income of the States concerned. In fact, some of the low-income States are far surpassing the higher-income States in the funds they are investing to rehabilitate their disabled people.

The rate of growth of the rehabilitation program reflects to a large degree the extent to which we have been successful in our educational efforts. Even today, rehabilitation is not always recognized widely and used effectively. Thus, there is a challenge in public education for all of us and, particularly, for the President's Committee, which has done so much to foster a better understanding of handicapped people.

It is important that we help the public to understand the many ways in which the restoration of disabled people is contributing to the progress of our country. The rehabilitation and reemployment of handicapped men and women is not simply a question of doing something for them. They, in turn, are doing much for us.

Last year, in the midst of a growing shortage of engineers, 212 disabled people completed their rehabilitation programs and went to work as engineers—proving that a man can have a disability and still be a good engineer. In the same year, another 60 were restored to the practice of medicine and surgery.

As a result of last year's rehabilitation effort, our country acquired 74 chemists, 163 trained nurses, 370 laboratory technicians, 390 draftsmen, and nearly 1,300 teachers. Thousands of other disabled people now are performing just about every type of work found in this country. Our national life has been enriched and our productive might has been strengthened because these trained individuals had a chance to reestablish themselves in useful work.

In the years ahead, hundreds of thousands of men and women will win their battles with illness and injury. They will travel the difficult road to recovery and rehabilitation. Most of them will be looking toward that all-important day when they are ready for a job.

At that critical point, their futures will rest with the employers of the Nation. At that time, an employer must decide whether a welfare payment or a useful job is the answer. This should be a challenge to American business and industry, large and small.

I join the President's Committee in its appeal to the Nation's employers to recognize the ability that so often seems obscured by a disability.

For the wonderful work which the Committee is doing, and for this opportunity to participate in your meeting today, I thank you.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at Dinner of Paterson Branch, NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], on Monday, May 21, 1956, at the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, in Paterson, N. J., made an address to the Paterson branch of the NAACP.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT DINNER OF PATERSON BRANCH, NAACP, MONDAY, MAY 21, 1956, AT ALEXANDER HAMILTON HOTEL, PATERSON—SENATOR CASE RECEIVING A CIVIL RIGHTS CITATION FROM THE BRANCH

Meetings such as this play a significant part in helping men and women of America find ways of bringing equality and justice to all Americans. But, in addition, they also make a contribution to the foreign policy of this country; for it is by evidence of such concern and such progress that other nations recognize the worth of our democratic form of government.

Let us not forget that all through the world, nations are stirring. They are restless, watching closely the movements of the two major powers—United States and Russia—and evaluating whose example offers them the best chance for self-realization—for the fullest flowering of their potentiality. Each day they read in their newspapers of events in the field of racial relations in this country. A Government official who visited our office recently after a tour through Africa told us that such news was reported at length and with great prominence and that unfortunately, most of it emphasized the conflict and violence of racial relations.

This is not a criticism of the press; if we want a better press with the nations of the world, we must do the things which earn it. We cannot convince the colored people of the world that we are their friends as long as we deny the colored people of this Nation the rights accorded to all others. We can only win friends by deeds, not declarations.

We had a chance to see this in practice in Washington this week. President Sukarno, of Indonesia, one of the new and uncommitted nations of the world, came to Washington at the invitation of President Eisenhower. He addressed Congress warning that the mainspring of the nations of Asia and Africa is the drive toward freedom and that unless these aspirations are recognized "no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment."

After a tremendous welcome by the people of Washington, the Indonesian President responded with this comment—and I think it bears repeating—"Today I am in Washington for the first time in my life and I feel that here, and I am sure in all America, democracy is a reality. I saw the faces of the people along the street and the hospitality given me.

"Look here, I am a brown man, an Indonesian, an Asiatic. I am the son of a nation only recently emerged into the world of national existence. Yet you accept me as a friend; you accept me as a human being and perhaps you accept me as a brother."

That word "perhaps" bothered President Eisenhower and he indicated this at a meeting Thursday night. He emphasized that the secret for success of the foregn policy of the United States is to convince other nations that "we are all brothers under the skin." He said that if we, as a nation, "can convince every other nation that when they refer to us as a brother, they won't have to say 'perhaps,' they will see a real democracy."

About this there can be no doubt. We are making progress toward this ideal—it is slow; it is hard, but we are moving in the right direction. And with this progress comes great responsibility, for Negroes now are

pioneers—the first to enter a white school or college; the first to become a policeman or city councilman; the first to stay at a particular hotel or attend a certain theater.

The record made by these trailblazers is bound to have great effect on the acceleration of progress toward our ideal. The path cut by them will be traveled by thousands of others who have waited long to obtain the full benefits of our country. They must be strong; they must be dignified; they must radiate integrity. A great stake rests on their shoulders.

We have before us many fine examples already, and in thinking about our Nation's foreign policy, there are, for example, Ralph J. Bunche, the Under Secretary of the United Nations, and J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor for international affairs. Mr. Wilkins, in addition, was recently honored by election as chairman of the judicial council of the Methodist Church, the highest lay body of the church. We all recall the late Walter White, for so many years head of the NAACP as well as a representative of the United States abroad, officially and unofficially. Their achievements are the greater because of the handicaps they have surmounted.

Their presence on the international scene as citizens of the United States should go far toward convincing the two-thirds of the world populated by people of other colors that we are trying in this country to prove that we are all sons of God and that recognition will be accorded by accomplishment, and not color.

Indeed, the united voice of American Negroes raised against the distortions of international Communist propaganda is a great demonstration of courage and foresight by your people.

All Americans concerned about the attitude of other countries toward us are in the deepest debt to those Negro leaders who have spoken out firmly against Communist racial propaganda used against our Nation overseas.

Our Negro leaders have denounced the ceaseless efforts of the Communists to paint all Americans with the brush of bigotry, and to make us lose face with the nations of Africa and the Middle and Far East. We have our faults, but we are struggling toward their elimination. It is palpable nonsense for the Soviets, with their slave camps, their programs and their grinding down of all minorities to the will of Moscow, to set themselves up as the champion of civil rights. The American Negro has recognized this false propaganda for what it is, and his forthright rejection has benefited his country, even more than himself.

In my heart, there is the constant hope that you and I will yet enjoy the day when no Negro mother in America need to tell her son that he is "different"; that he cannot enter the school or profession of his choice, or the polling place of his district. When Negro mothers can be spared this painful hour, I will be glad to join you all here for a dinner of thanksgiving. Until then, we must continue to strive toward this end.

Address by Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, delivered an address of tribute to America's honored heroes on the occasion of the Memorial Day ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery.

Beyond the benefitting and poignant tribute, Secretary Brucker delineated what we, the living, must do to keep faith with those honored patriots who gave their lives to preserve the freedom we possess.

His address is truly a blueprint for the perpetuation of the American way of life, and I commend it to all patriotic Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST KEEP FAITH

(Speech by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, Arlington National Cemetery, May 30, 1956)

It is with a deep sense of humility that I rise in this sacred place to pay tribute to America's honored heroes. Can we, who enjoy the manifold benefits of freedom, ever forget what an enormous debt we owe them?

The soldier known but to God who lies here in glory, and all his comrades—those whose graves dot the rolling green of Arlington, and those who rest elsewhere, beneath the sod of every continent and the waters of every ocean—paid a tremendous price to preserve and defend our American heritage. We cannot discharge our solemn obligation to these men of deeds with mere words of homage. We, too, must be doers of great deeds. We must fight as valiantly as they did for the principles and ideals which have made America the mighty Nation it is.

Our freedom and our American way of life are always under attack from within as well as from without. Only through eternal vigilance and unremitting effort on the part of each one of us can freedom be kept secure. Freedom is not like a prize that can be won for all time and locked away as a perpetual treasure. It is a living thing that must be constantly nurtured by the toil and sacrifice of dedicated men. Freedom will continue to bless us with its presence only so long as it is vigorously cherished and zealously guarded.

Democracy is always an unfinished work. Its permanence is never guaranteed by past achievement. We cannot take it for granted simply because we have had it for 180 years. America cannot rest on the laurels of Washington or of Lincoln or of any of the other illustrious patriots who helped to fashion our Government. Democracy is strictly a matter of day-by-day accomplishment. We may take off our hats to the past, but we must take off our coats to the future. We derive great inspiration from the magnificent achievements of yesterday, but unless we translate that inspiration into equally splendid accomplishments today, our democracy cannot long survive. Democracy is not like a granite statue that is finished for all time when the sculptor has smoothed away the last rough spot. On the contrary, it is like a ship that needs constant attention by every officer and member of the crew to keep it in repair and moving steadily forward, weathering the rough buffeting of every storm, wind, and wave.

This country was built by patriots, and it will be kept secure only by patriots. As I stand here today my thoughts go back many years to the time when, as a small boy, I was first privileged to participate in a Memorial Day observance conducted by the GAR. How clearly I remember my pleasure when one of the veterans in his big blue coat with brass buttons handed me an American flag and permitted me to march in the parade. Carrying that little flag over my right shoulder, with other schoolmates I followed proudly behind the column of old soldiers, and there stirred within me a feeling of patriotism which has never since been stilled. The patriotism that was kindled in those days kept growing in power and meaning as boy grew into youth, and youth into man. Nobody in those days was ashamed to admit that he was patriotic.

Today we have some self-satisfied sophisticates who think they know all the answers. Cynics are fond of saying that patriotism has become outmoded, that it doesn't mean anything any more. Can we believe that when we contemplate these thousands of little white markers here at Arlington? Were the brave men who lie beneath them impelled to serve their country to the death by greed, by love of money, by comfort, or convenience? Or was it a love for America that was stronger than any other influence in their lives—patriotism? Sometimes patriotism lies dormant until it is stirred to life by some great event, some moving experience. However, it is always there in the breast of every true American. We should teach our youth to revere the flag, and to sing with all their hearts the words of "the Star-Spangled Banner." Patriotism is one of man's most noble attributes.

Today America has a greater need than ever before in her history for men and women who are proud to be Americans, men and women who think in terms of what they owe their country, not what their country owes them.

Our Nation, our freedom, our lives, and everything we hold dear are threatened by the hydra-headed Communist conspiracy, which is backed by the mightiest mobilized military forces on earth. However, it is more than a military threat we face. It is the menace of a diabolical and insidious ideology of hate and deceit and intellectual perversion which saps men's moral stamina, impoverishes their minds, and destroys their souls.

We are keeping ourselves militarily strong in order to cope with the formidable military aspects of this Communist threat. We have a magnificent Navy, with fighting ships, atomic-powered submarines, and carrier aircraft. We have a splendid, versatile Marine Corps. We have a great Air Force with intrepid pilots manning modern jet bombers and fighters. We have our reliable and ready, mobile Army with its streamlined infantry and artillery, its tanks, and guided missiles. All together, working as a team, they constitute the greatest material power for peace in the world today. Nevertheless, they are no more than the outward manifestation of our real power to defend ourselves. In a larger sense, it is the spiritual strength and determination of the American people which now as always in the past are the chief guaranties of our national survival.

The propagation of the myth that we can ever manufacture security in the laboratory or in the machine shop can lead to nothing but disaster. The American people should not be lulled into a false sense of security that there is any easy way short of blood and sacrifice. The safety of America and American ideals today and through all the years to come depends upon the indomitable spirit of millions of other Americans—in and out of uniform, in every walk of life—willing to stand up and be counted for America, and take the hard road for the sake of their country.

We will not have the splendid bulwark of spiritual strength we sorely need to see us through this troubled era unless we rekindle in full flame the kind of uncompromising Americanism that inspired the pioneers when they created this great Nation out of a wilderness—the kind of uncompromising Americanism which brought our free institutions to full flower—and has defended them in the past against every demoralizing influence.

We must believe in America first, last, and all the time, with the unalterable faith that

will move any mountain of difficulty. We must believe in America and in American principles, not half-heartedly, or with an academic spirit, but with full-fledged, unquenchable enthusiasm. This is the most wonderful, the most prosperous, and the fairest country on earth, and American principles—the principles laid down by our forefathers—have made it so. We must strengthen our determination to keep it true to those principles.

We value freedom, of course, but do we value it high enough? Do we truly understand the insidious danger of holding anything more precious? If we value our comfort, our money, our convenience, our leisure more than we value our freedom, we will not only lose our freedom, but along with it we will lose everything else. That is the most important lesson that history can teach us.

America has always been in the forefront of the battle for human freedom and for the dignity of man. We must keep her there. We seek peace not from ignoble motives, not from distrust of our own powers, but from a sense of moral obligation which is deeply rooted in the ideals upon which our Nation was built. We know that true peace is not just the absence of war, but the presence of justice throughout the world. If we are to lead the world to a peace founded upon justice and honor, which is our paramount objective, we must revitalize in all our hearts the true spirit of patriotism and of devotion to the highest tenets of our American faith, which have been the strength and glory of our Nation from the very beginning.

We must do more than honor our hero dead on Memorial Day. We must keep full faith with them every day of the year, and in every aspect of our lives. Let no indifference, no indecision, no sluggish citizenship, no moral weakness, no shirking of our responsibilities undermine and destroy what they gave their last full measure of devotion to keep secure. Are you willing to do your duty to your country and pay your debt to the brave men who lie here? The future of this Nation will be even more glorious than its past if we develop to the utmost the sturdy American character which faces any challenge with the watchword: "It can be done"—and then proceeds to do it.

Last December in the course of an inspection trip to the Far East, I visited Pearl Harbor. It was 15 years from the time of the infamous attack, and I told the admiral who welcomed me that I wanted to visit the spot where the battleship *Arizona* sank under the unexpected rain of aerial bombs that terrible day in 1941. He took me out in a small boat, and as we approached the area in the harbor where the *Arizona* lay, I noticed that the form of the great ship was outlined by small floats. The deck was 15 feet or more under the water. I asked if I might stand on the bridge, which projected several feet above the water.

While standing on the bridge of that historic ship, I looked down and let my eyes trace her outline under that dark water, and I thought of the 996 Americans who lie there within her shattered hull in eternal honor—where they fell, and where they remain because their dear ones want it that way. As I stood there, I noticed the irridescence of an oil slick on the waves. As I pointed to it, the admiral said: "Yes, we've noticed it many times. It's oil, still oozing up from the *Arizona*." It was a solemn moment.

I turned toward the stern, and there an American flag was flying. I mentioned Old Glory to the admiral, who told me proudly: "Sir, we like to think of the *Arizona* as still on the active list of the Navy. Every morning we come out here and raise her flag, and every evening we take it down." We both saluted the *Arizona's* flag and her immortal ship's company—while I gulped and wiped my eyes.

After an experience like that, you have a tingle running along your spine—greater faith in your heart—a spring in your step—and renewed determination to be fully worthy of that glorious flag and all it stands for—fully worthy of the courage and sacrifice and devotion of the patriots who have given their lives to defend it. You don't have to shout about patriotism. You don't even talk about it much. You just feel it deep inside you—and you live it.

There is a little couplet which expresses my faith in this Nation, and in the inherent patriotism of our people:

"America's strong, America's young,
And her greatest songs are still unsung."

The Leftist Fringe Could Elect a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the information of the Congress and the country, I hereby call attention to a most interesting and impressive editorial printed in that great all-American journal, the Saturday Evening Post. It deals directly with the necessities of electoral college reform, a subject in which I have long been interested and in connection with which I have recently introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, we must find a suitable method for breaking up the bloc-voting system presently employed in our electoral college if our way of life is to be preserved in this country. We must find a method whereby our Presidents will be elected by the people of the United States rather than by the political pressure groups which marshal their determining strength in a few large cities in less than a dozen States of this Republic.

This Republic is dedicated to the principle of government by the people, by the people, and for the people. It was never intended that it should be dominated or controlled by political bosses of selfish and soulless city machines or by the leaders of self-serving pressure groups. By breaking up the electoral votes in the electoral college in accordance with the manner in which the voting citizens desired them to be cast instead of on the winner-take-all basis prevailing by use of the unit-rule and bloc-voting in the electoral college, we shall be striking a great and lasting blow for freedom in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEFTIST FRINGE COULD ELECT A PRESIDENT

The idea that those who vote for the loser in a presidential election should have greater representation in the electoral college, where the votes assigned to the States are cast, is rapidly taking hold, despite the failure of Congress to agree on a constitutional amendment to carry it out. The present system, of course, is to give each State's entire electoral vote to the candidate who has the largest popular vote, regardless of how close the runner-up may have come.

The most potent opposition to change comes, of course, from politicians who fear they may lose some advantage ,and from left-wing liberals. Why the liberals? A clue can be had by a look back at the presidential election of 1944. In that year in New York, Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate, received 2,987,647 votes, and President Roosevelt received a total of 3,304,238, a plurality of 316,591 votes. However, Roosevelt's vote as a Democrat was 2,478,598. Thus, he would have lost the State to Dewey had it not been for 825,640 votes cast for him by members of the Liberal and American Labor parties. Thus, two small splinter parties, composed largely of left-wing radicals and liberals representing a fraction of the total votes cast, held the balance of power in New York State, and were able to hand over all of the State's 47 electors to Mr. Roosevelt. As far as the result was concerned, the Dewey voters might as well have stayed at home.

Naturally, the politicians and parties which are strongest with left-wing and racial blocs in our large cities hate to surrender this advantage. It is not an advantage which appears only on election day. It enables these blocs and pressure groups to exert influence upon the executive branch of the Government all out of proportion to their actual popular strength. Fear of losing the electoral votes of our largest industrial States is ever present in any national administration. Thus, we find Presidents, regardless of party, urging all sorts of measures, such as weakening of the immigration laws designed to appeal to these blocs. Congress, the majority of whose Members owe nothing to big-city pressure groups, seldom goes along.

If in 1944 New York's electoral vote had been distributed in proportion to the popular vote for each candidate, Mr. Roosevelt would have got slightly more than half the New York electoral vote and Governor Dewey would have got the rest. Had the 1944 electoral vote in New York been divided according to congressional districts, as Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, proposes, President Roosevelt would have received 23 electors and Governor Dewey 22. The splinter parties, not having carried any congressional district, would have got none. These doubtless boring statistics should be sufficient to indicate why change is being resisted.

It is unfortunate that the Senate could not agree on the congressional district method, which really makes the most sense. Besides reflecting more truly the real result of elections, such a change would go far to eliminate from presidential elections the temptation to kowtow to small factions which represent only a fringe of American opinion, but are in some States placed strategically to decide elections.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, Before 78th Annual Convention, New Jersey State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], delivered an outstanding address before the 78th annual convention of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor at

the Traymore Hotel in Atlantic City on May 30, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE 78TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT THE TRAYMORE HOTEL IN ATLANTIC CITY

It is always pleasant to address a labor meeting, and particularly so when our economic barometers are registering fair weather and relatively clear skies ahead. Things generally are going well. Certainly, there are soft spots in the economy where things are not working properly, but last month this Nation had 64 million people working at jobs—a new record. And each month, these working men and women are bringing home pay checks of near-record size. In addition, the cost of living has been stabilized during the Eisenhower administration so that the pay raises are real—not illusory.

Basically, the situation is good. This is a testimonial to our dynamic economy—to the leadership of our great President, to the unflagging efforts of the various segments of our economy, management, labor and capital and to the general advantages of our form of government.

This economic good health offers a fine opportunity for making further improvements in our way of life—for bringing more benefits of our economy to more people. There are some who are doing well and who have given up one of the Nation's greatest assets—vitality and enterprise. Their position is quickly stated in this way: "Things are going fine. Why look for changes now?" Such complacency is often harder to defeat than an organized campaign by vociferous interests aimed at holding back the clock of social progress.

The obstacles delaying the enactment of adequate school construction, health, housing, flood insurance, civil rights and minimum wage legislation are formdable, but not impossible. We should make progress on these basic matters and there is no better time to do so than when the Nation's economy is at an alltime high and the Nation's energies can be devoted to improving the peace. There is no credit for either Republicans or Democrats in a record of "no progress" on social welfare legislation.

It seems to me that this period is just the one in which we should constantly press forward for improvements, solid steps in the right direction. Social welfare legislation has worthy goals and, in addition, it provides resources to keep our economy rolling.

The achievement of real progress in the social welfare field, it seems to me, depends on two areas of activity: the first is the enactment by Congress of the legislation which I have just mentioned. The second is the organization of the unorganized workers in the South and elsewhere. With less than a third of our 64 million workers in organized unions there is plenty of potential.

On the legislative front, there are several bills before Congress now which could use a good shot in the arm. President Eisenhower has given us a list. The legislative department of the AFL–CIO has given us another one, not too dissimilar. There are good bills on both lists and I know many of my colleagues in the House and Senate are eager to vote on them.

What then is the problem? The major one is apathy—people are talking politics and candidates, but are not giving equal attention to the legislative issues. Another side of the problem is the deep-freezing of legislation by unsympathetic committee chairmen. I need not remind a labor meeting of the cooling-off treatment extended by the southern Democratic chairmen of such committees as House Labor, House Rules, and Senate Judiciary.

Secretary of Labor Jim Mitchell has been hitting his head against a stone wall in trying to get hearings on the tiniest pieces of labor legislation in the House. Labor groups have recognized the fine work of this New Jersey man. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America even nominated him for another term as Secretary of Labor, regardless of who is President. I join with President Potofsky in his evaluation of Jim as an outstanding public servant. A few days before that, President Dubinsky, of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, praised Jim, too, and added similar words for Newell Brown, director of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Administration. Mr. Dubinsky said that although his union had opposed Brown's appointment, Brown had turned out to be the right man in the right place and a man of integrity, intelligence, and understanding.

Such kind words from two union officials who have had some other things to say about the Eisenhower administration in the past are most appreciated. I am glad to see that as these union people get to know some Republicans better that they find they are rather nice folks. Sometimes, I feel that the Republican Party is in the same boat as some minority groups in this country and that if only we could be measured by the yardstick of individual worth, we could receive a lot more support.

In addition to speeding action in the legislative arena, there is a big job to be done by the labor unions for themselves and the Nation—that is the organizing of workers in the South. The disparity between wages and working conditions of the South and the North is a constant threat to the security of workers in this part of the country. As long as this gap continues there will be employers closing up shop here and moving South to the land of no-unions and low wages. The continuation of the South's lower economy has social and political implications for the whole country.

Unions traditionally have brought higher living standards to their members—both Negroes and whites. Accompanying this there is usually a greater interest and awareness about the right to vote. Such a change could interfere with the present security of officeholders in these districts. More Democrats with enlightened views would stand a chance for election for the first time and perhaps even a Republican could squeeze in now and then. But the big gains would be for the country at large—gains in terms of a more widespread prosperity and an alert electorate. For remember this: Laws in Congress are voted on by all, not just those from our section of the country.

There is much to be done by all of us toward bringing the benefits of our great democracy to each American. Working together in a spirit of modernization and good will, we shall make progress. This is our opportunity—and our duty.

International Food and Raw Materials Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations conducted hearings on May 28 and 29 on Senate Resolution 86 to establish an international food and raw materials reserve.

Raymond Moley was a member of the United States delegation to the London Economic Conference in 1933. That conference dealt with many of the problems covered in Senate Resolution 86. Mr. Moley discussed this resolution in his syndicated column which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 28.

Mr. President, I believe Mr. Moley's views on this subject are of interest to the entire Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE FIXING

(By Raymond Moley)

A legislative mongrel was introduced about a year ago with Senator MURRAY as the original sponsor. It carried, under MURRAY'S, names of 19 Democrats and 3 Republicans.

It is Senate Resolution 86, and with a great outpouring of platitudes and flourishes it states that it should be "the policy of the Congress that the United States participate with other nations, under the auspices of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other international agencies, in establishing an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve."

UPLIFT ACTIVITIES

Various countries would contribute to this store of all kinds of raw materials, including food and presumably minerals, which would probably be managed by an international authority.

The money or I O U's given to this reserve for the purchase of materials therefrom would be used for all sorts of uplift activities among needy nations. It should be noted that credits are involved which would mean a new kind of commodity currency. The effect would be a sort of international price control—just another of the many proposals made in recent years for some sort of international control of our trade and economy.

The idea was submitted to the State Department, which took a very dim view of the idea. Assistant Secretary Morton, replying for Secretary Dulles, replied that the idea was not new but had been presented in many other forms in the past. It would, he said, create more problems than it would solve. Moreover, Morton wrote that it would involve "rigidities and distortions" which might well constitute "a danger to a free competitive economy."

HEARINGS NEXT MONTH

Nevertheless, there will be hearings, beginning this month, on this proposal.

It would seem that the Senate in its rush to get essential business done before an early adjournment might find more profitable ways of spending its time. That, however, is not the way of Senators in an election year.

Development of St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues in this august

body, as well as the people of my own State of Michigan, are well aware of my continuous and enthusiastic support of the development of the Great Lakes as this Nation's fourth coastline. Knowing that this interest is shared to a high degree by many others, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which the Marine News graciously published for me in its issue of April 1956. This is the thrilling story of what enterprising and forward-looking communities of Michigan can expect from the economic impact of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and the opening of the Great Lakes to world trade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON TRADE ROUTE 32—PORT OF MUSKEGON

(By Senator CHARLES E. POTTER)

Almost from the time of the discovery of this Continent the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes have been of great importance to the history of this country. This system of waterways has provided transportation. It has played a strategic part in the wars between the early settlers. It was one of the main highways leading to the opening and exploration of the great heartland of this Continent. All my life I have been interested in the activities on these lakes and thrilled by the thoughts of their potentialities as great seaways for world commerce and as a fourth coastline for the United States.

Today we are nearing the realization of that idea. The St. Lawrence Seaway will be completed soon. I fully expect that the channels connecting all the Great Lakes will be adequately deepened to provide for free passage of ocean-going vessels to the many ports situated in the Great Lakes. World trade routes have been authorized for the Great Lakes putting such ports in direct contact with ports all over the globe. I expect action will be taken which will insure the building and maintenance of an adequate fleet of United States ships to be operated on such trade routes from the Great Lakes and their ports.

As a sidelight, we will realize within a few years the completion of Michigan's Marine Highway. That would be the completion of a series of harbors of refuge being built all around the coastline of Michigan to accomodate small craft. This is of particular interest to the thousands of water tourists who then can travel the entire coastline of the Lower Peninsula with the greatest of safety and convenience.

All this means the spurring of new industry both commercial and tourist. New businesses will be born and will start to grow along our shores. With particular reference to the commercial aspect of this growing business, I have picked one Michigan city, as an example, to show the potentialities of such growth for the entire State of Michigan. Naturally my interest is broad and encompasses all of the State of Michigan. I forsee great things for many ports in our State. I have urged repeatedly that our various port cities or potential port cities along our shorelines take action now to do the necessary puanning and projecting for the future so that they will be ready when this opportunity for prosperity knocks at their door. As an example, then, let us take the City of Muskegon to see what can happen in some measure to many cities in our great State of Michigan.

Muskegon, located on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan just south of the parallel bisecting Lake Michigan between the Straits of Mackinac and Gary, Ind., has one of the most ideal natural harbors throughout the lake waterway chain.

The town grew in early lumber days on the south shore of Lake Muskegon, an inland lake connected to Lake Michigan by dredged channel approximately 1 mile long. The Muskegon River, flowing into the eastern head of Muskegon Lake, was utilized in these early days to float down logs, and by 1880 Muskegon had over 16 lumber mills along this eastern and southern shore of Lake Muskegon.

With 33 sawmills, a thriving lumber port developed which built Chicago and a hundred prairie towns. But by 1890 the lumber had completely disappeared and Muskegon was faced with the problem that has pressed many similar cities of either developing new industry or reverting to a small tourist and agricultural community.

The people of Muskegon favored industry, and with their strategic location and natural harbor advantages pushed forward to become a leading industrial center. During the last 50 years a diversified industrial economy rapidly developed.

Water transportation continued to play an important and vital part in Muskegon's program. Pig iron to supply the foundries was brought in from Gary, South Chicago, and Cleveland. Aggregates and limestone, so important to construction, were brought down from the northern peninsula. High quality sand used in the production of steel developed as an important export. Petroleum products were brought in, and about the same time oil was discovered near the head of Lake Muskegon, thus petroleum became an import and export product. Later, as the automobile industry grew in Michigan, a thriving traffic in new cars and tourist trade across Lake Michigan to Milwaukee and the Northwest became an important asset to Muskegon's development.

Using cost-per-ton figures for the various commodities averaged for the year, Muskegon's water commerce total is estimated at $250 million. A preliminary survey by the harbors department of the chamber of commerce indicated the 1955 value total would show at least $275 million. The value totals do not include car ferry shipments, since there is no reliable estimate or value due to the wide variety of products carried, and difficulty of getting value statistics.

Muskegon's 21 commodities in lakewise, foreign, and overseas shipments consisted of fish and fresh products, canned fruit juice, woodpulp, bituminous coal and lignite, motor fuel and gas, gas and oil distillates and fuel oil, crude petroleum, kerosene, residual fuel oil, building cement, limestone, crushed rock, sand and gravel, pig iron, scrap iron and steel, standard newsprint paper, manufactured metal parts, construction mining machine parts, motor vehicles, other commodities, and valued shipments.

Along with tonnage increase, 1956 will record a rise in the number of foreign flag vessels calling here. Purchase of the steamer *E. C. Collins* from the Kineman Transit Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, has been announced by Paul H. Townsend, president of Huron Portland Cement Co. The *Collins*, a 440-foot bulk ore carrier formerly owned by the Pittsburgh Steamship Division of United States Steel Corporation, was built by American Shipbuilding Co. in 1904. Huron Portland reported it had no definite plans for reconstruction of the *Collins* into a self-unloading cement carrier. The steamer *Presque Isle*, which was purchased last year by the company, is being converted from an ore carrier at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., and will be ready to sail next spring. Purchase of the *Collins* brings total number of ships owned by Huron to six. The Huron fleet calls regularly at the company's Muskegon Lake terminal.

Harbors Department of the Chamber of Commerce will launch a major drive this month to secure for the Port of Muskegon a larger part of the growing volume of foreign and Canadian wood pulp shipped in for the vast Kalamazoo Valley paper mill complex.

Woodpulp shipped to the Kalamazoo mills has risen steadily in volume since World War II and is increasing at a rate which will easily surpass the 50 to 60,000-ton level of the prewar period within a few years. Estimates see Valley wood pulp volume increasing to over 100,000 tons a year.

Surveys show the import of wood pulp to the Kalamazoo mills is the largest single commodity—including newsprint shipments—currently carried to Lake ports from overseas.

Estimates indicate the Seaway will be carrying as much as 800,000 tons of wood pulp to Lake ports by time of completion of the deep-draft waterway, and that the Kalamazoo Valley, one of the top three areas in the Upper Lakes in total pulp use, would eventually take off 100,000 to 200,000 tons of this total, and possibly more.

The port of Muskegon will have a new dock available for open cargo operations by start of the 1956 shipping season.

Emery Toth, president of the Great Lakes Dock & Material Corporation, has announced filling of swamp and water-covered land in its 1,750 feet of lake frontage on Muskegon Lake and reported that by spring it will have a completed slip 1,000 feet long and 100 feet wide, dredged to 24-foot depth.

The slip and dock facility will be ready by this month (April) to handle all types of cargo suitable to open dock movement. About 225 feet of sheet steel piling will bulwark the dock facing, and the slip width will be extended to 240 feet in operations during the year. The existing 100-foot width is sufficient to accommodate most lakes vessels.

In addition to this development, the corporation has completed about 80 percent of fill work in the corporation building and operations area west from the new slip to a second planned slip of 180 feet in width and 800-foot length. This slip will be dredged to 24-foot depth to accommodate one ship, with the major slip area beyond that dredged to 8 feet to provide a small marina which could accommodate scores of small craft. It is expected fill work on this section can be completed this year.

A Chesapeake & Ohio Railway spur has been laid from the rail right-of-way to the main dock section adjoining the slip now nearing completion. Long-range plans call for four docks to accommodate all types of Lakes shipping. Existing facilities, with the new slip, will accommodate four vessels.

The private industry development has taken place gradually and without fanfare since 1953. The firm started filling and dredging work in September of that year, developing four acres and a dredged slip 800 feet long and 100 feet wide by 24 feet deep. By March of 1954 company offices, equipment storehouses, and other facilities were constructed on the reclaimed land. First ship to use the dock arrived April 21, 1954.

Future operations call for considerable expansion of terminal facilities. Warehousing facilities have not yet been installed and initial operations will be limited to open dock movements which do not require storage.

Plans outlined by the corporation for the Michigan Corporation Securities Commission envisage a major terminal operation, including facilities for repair, construction and renovation of vessels, the stevedoring and warehousing operations, as well as general construction work. The completed dock and slip system under present plans will accommodate five vessels.

Final figures for economic 1955 indicate Greater Muskegon has enjoyed the best year in its history in a majority of fields which make up the business picture.

The outlook for the first quarter of 1956, with total employment expected to rise over the 50,000 mark and unemployment to drop

to the lowest level since May 1947, presages another boom year.

New all-time records were posted in the categories of bank debits—within nudging distance of the $1-billion mark—postal receipts, residential building, air traffic volume, utilities service expansions, department store sales, and other factors.

Total factory and utility workers' income for the year aggregated $139,938,953, second highest in history and exceeded only by the $1,600,000 margin of the record $141,538,953 of 1953.

The above figures are based upon statistics from a special year-end survey by Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, and are based on an average industrial work force averaging 29,800 for the year. The special survey included some 30 industries which do not report regularly to Muskegon Manufacturers' Association and hence reflects somewhat higher figures than those recorded in the regular chamber indices. According to the special compilation, worker's average income for the year was $4,695.

Muskegon's shipbuilding program got its start 2 years ago with the local industry task of converting the former Government C-4 vessel steamship *Marine Star* into a multimillion dollar lakes passenger liner, the *Aquarama*.

Muskegon's harbor has played a vital role in the industrial development of west Michigan. With the advent of the St. Lawrence seaway project, Muskegon's port operations offer Michigan's industry new and greater opportunities for expansion and development of world markets.

In considering the potential expansion of trade that will result upon completion of the seaway, it is interesting to note Michigan's early history. The State's economic development is traced directly to the completion of the Erie Canal which gave access to the Hudson River and the completion of the Soo locks which provided the means for Michigan's vast mineral deposits to economically traverse the lake waterways.

The seaway is the final link in this lake chain which opens new horizons to Midwest industry.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the story of one of Michigan's port cities. This story is not the exception but rather it is an example of what many cities of Michigan may expect. Again I say, the Great Lakes are the fourth coastline for the United States. The development and realization of the potentialities of this coastline will write a thrilling chapter in our Nation's history and those cities which are prepared for it and plan for it may well play a major part in writing that chapter.

Uncle Sam's Campgrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, every citizen in America is proud of our national parks and national forests. They are, indeed, the Nation's playgrounds. We, as custodians of these playgrounds, have a solemn obligation to pass them on unblemished and untrammeled to the next generations of Americans. An eloquent and informative article about our national parks and national forests, under the title "Uncle Sam's Campgrounds," appears in the June 1956 issue of the Ford Times, which is published by the Ford Motor Co. The article was written by one of America's most brilliant writers in our own time, the late Bernard DeVoto, and is published posthumously after his untimely death last November. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Bernard DeVoto from the June 1956 issue of Ford Times may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with a brief salute from the same issue to the covered bridges on the scenic McKenzie River in my own State of Oregon, entitled "Two Ways to Cross the McKenzie," by Harry De Lasaux.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM'S CAMPGROUNDS

(By Bernard DeVoto)

A good many areas suitable for camping are owned by individual States. By far the largest and most numerous ones, however, are in the permanent reservations called the public lands, owned by the people of the United States at large and managed by the Federal Government. Of these all the important ones are included in the national parks or the national forests. It is a curious fact that many enthusiastic outdoorsmen do not clearly understand the differences between these two kinds of reservations.

Camping is permitted in most of the 28 national parks and in the largest of the national monuments, which are managed by the same Federal bureau but have a slightly different legal status. They are all areas set aside in order to preserve intact scenery acknowledged to be the most beautiful, most majestic, or most interesting in the country. A visitor goes to them primarily to see the scenery, and the basic fact for campers is that they are maintained in their natural conditions. No logging is allowed nor is any other commercial use of the natural resources permitted. Flowers may not be picked and only qualified scientists working under permit may make collections of any kind.

Fishing is permitted and, in a few parks, without a license, but a limit is set to the catch. There is no hunting; all firearms must be sealed by a ranger at the entrance stations. Except by special permit, readily obtainable, campers are restricted to regularly maintained and supervised campgrounds. The remote mountain and plateau country of the big parks is open to pack trips.

An American who does not know his national parks has missed a priceless part of his heritage. Camping provides the best as well as the least expensive way to see them. The National Park Service maintains campgrounds which are provided with water, toilets, fireplaces, and sometimes with additional facilities.

In the most popular parks many of these facilities are strained to capacity throughout the season, because they are situated near famous scenic features and the number of visitors has increased enormously since the war. National park visitors, too, are gregarious and love to crowd together. The campgrounds on the valley floor of Yosemite National Park, for instance, are small cities of tents (all kinds of tents) pitched so close to one another that blankets have to be hung between them to secure a little privacy. Yet those in the Tuolumne Meadows, up toward the Sierra timberline and spectacular beautiful, may be almost deserted, though they are easily accessible.

The National Park Service is a bureau of the Department of the Interior. Its Washington office or any of the regional offices—Philadelphia, Richmond, Omaha, Santa Fe, San Francisco—will gladly furnish maps showing all National Park System areas. On these, too, are brief descriptions of these areas, lists of facilities, including campgrounds, names and addresses of concessionaires who provide overnight accommodations, and the addresses of the superintendents. On arrival at any area of the system, the visitor can obtain a free publication with more detailed information. Any of these publications may also be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C., who issues a price list of all of them.

There are national forests in all but 9 of the States, 150 all told in the United States. A few are comparatively small but many in the West cover from 1 to 3 million acres. All are open to camping, at any time and mostly without restriction. Hunting and fishing are permitted in all of them, under the laws of the States in which they are situated. (Out-of-State visitors are charged higher fees than residents for licenses.) Portions of some forests have been set aside as game refuges; in others some streams and small tracts are reserved for wildlife research and experiment. These, of course, are posted.

The national forests provide by far the best opportunities in the United States for the person who is interested primarily in camping, rather than in being surrounded by world-famous scenery. But it must be said at once that many areas in many forests are spectacularly beautiful, especially in the North country and the Southern, Western, and Southwestern mountains. Many people prefer the Uncompahgre, San Juan, or Sangre de Cristo Mountains, which are not included in national parks, to the Colorado ranges that are. If Wyoming's Wind River Mountains lack the drama of the nearby Grand Teton National Park, they are in some ways more beautiful. Many of the loveliest parts of the Sierra and the Cascades are in national forests.

There are regular campgrounds in most forests (usually not so well equipped as those in the parks) but also in practically all of them a camper may pitch his tent almost anywhere he cares to. Exceptions may be sites easily reached from big cities, areas reserved for experiment and research in forestry, damaged or eroded areas, and areas of critical importance to town or city water supplies. These are likely to be clearly marked but it is best to inquire at the office of the forest supervisor, which is always in town, or that of a district ranger, which usually is. You will have to go there anyway to get a campfire permit, a map, and a descriptive pamphlet, the last of which is full of valuable information. Wherever you camp, a ranger will probably visit you to explain the fire regulations all over again, and he is a man to tie to. He knows the best fishing places, the best lures, where and when you are likely to find game, the areas of special photographic or scientific or historical interest. He is also the man you make for in emergencies.

In periods of extreme fire danger, which means prolonged dry weather, Western forests and occasionally a Southern or an Eastern one may be temporarily closed to campers. Legally, everyone in or near a national forest is liable for fire-fighting duty, but it is hard to imagine circumstances in which anyone would be drafted for it. Forest fires do many millions of dollars' damage every year; it is a matter of conscience to observe to the full the precautions which every outdoorsman knows by heart. In certain western forests the commonest cause of fire is lightning. But it is a dreadful comment on the thoughtlessness of tourists and campers that everywhere else the overwhelming majority are started by campfires that are not properly extinguished or by carelessly discarded cigarettes.

The main roads in a national forest are good and the fire and access roads that lead off them wholly adequate, but many areas can be reached only by trail, afoot or on horseback. In addition, there are 78 reservations all told which are called wilderness areas or wild areas. (Not counting similar reserved tracts in eastern forests too small to be called wilderness.) Practically all of them are remote and difficult; in mountain country most of them are near timberline and above it. The three in Minnesota forests include lakes and streams which many sportsmen consider the finest canoe country we have. There are no roads in such an area; there are no hotels, lodges, resorts, private camps or cabins, stores, or landing fields. Wheeled vehicles are prohibited, including jeeps, and so are motorboats. The camper's outfit must be taken in by pack train or, if practicable, by canoe.

Apart from the back country of the national parks and some deserts, these areas are the last remaining primitive wilderness in the United States. Dude ranches in or near the forests provide outfits and guide service and some wilderness areas should not be attempted without such professional help. Most of them, however, are accessible to anyone who has a suitable outfit and is sufficiently skilled at outdoor crafts. Skill is a prerequisite, for the wilderness is as dangerous today as it ever was, despite airplanes and radio.

The United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, or any of its 10 regional offices, will send free of charge a map showing all the forests, a pamphlet called "National Forest Areas" which lists them by region, and maps and pamphlets describing any individual forests you may be interested in. Ask too for "Wilderness and Wild Areas," Yearbook Separate No. 2159. Somewhere in this great national heritage, owned by and preserved for all of us, you are certain to find precisely the kind of country you want to camp in—though it is likely to be much finer than you thought it would be. And it may be surprisingly near your own home.

Farm Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have a newspaper editorial which appeared in the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., on Saturday, June 2, 1956. This editorial is entitled "Parity: A Much Misunderstood Word That Simply Means a Fair Break." It is shown in this editorial that the farmers have lost another fight and that they will continue to suffer under the present administration's farm policies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY: A MUCH MISUNDERSTOOD WORD THAT SIMPLY MEANS A FAIR BREAK

A farm bill has been passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower. It does not provide 90 percent parity for the basic crops.

The soil-bank plan—a product of Democratic thinking sternly rejected last year by Secretary Benson's office—was advocated on a rush basis this year by President Eisenhower.

This plan, however sound, does not provide the immediate relief from price squeezes that farmers need. It is a long-range program, adopted this year as political sop by Eisenhower.

Clarence Poe, editor of Progressive Farmer, says the farmers have lost one fight and must now make another. He deplores misconceptions that have harmed the farmers' fight to get fair prices.

He lists some misconceptions in this order:

1. "It's just a bill to help the farmers," a feeling prevalent among nonfarm citizens. Actually, Poe points out, all classes of people benefit when the farmer is prosperous—manufacturers, merchants, laborers, all others

2. "I just don't understand parity." (Parity means a price which will enable a given quantity of a commodity, say cotton, to buy 100 percent as much goods as the same quantity would have bought during a fair-base period—originally 1909–14.)

3. "Many voters thought 90 percent parity would virtually mean riches for the farmer—'all this and heaven, too.'" Actually, 100 percent parity would give farmers only a fair decent income—whereas at any level less than that they are penalized.

Editor Poe touches on still another strange development in this Republican regime.

"The Department of Agriculture and some farm organizations seemed at times to be willing to see how little could be given the farmer and still keep him satisfied.

"To them, the doctrine 'What is good for the country is good for the farmer,' seemed sound, but didn't seem to work both ways.

"We never expect to see the Department of Labor trying to see how small a wage labor can be made to accept.

"Nor do we ever expect to see the National Association of Manufacturers trying to see how much tariff reduction manufacturers can possibly stand.

"Certainly now, at a time when labor's wages are the highest ever and the manufacturer's profits the biggest ever, the Secretary of Agriculture and our farm organization leaders should be the farmers' retained attorneys to fight for his full share of the country's prosperity."

The basic trouble, of course, is that the farmer—especially smaller farmers—has no friends in the Eisenhower administration which has successfully whittled farm income by billions while boasting about Wall Street prosperity and corporation profits.

Address by the Ambassador of Bolivia During World Affairs Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very plain-spoken address delivered by the Ambassador from Bolivia, Victor Andrade, before the Rotary Club of Dallas, Tex., on May 16, 1956. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing this address will be $180.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICTOR ANDRADE, AMBASSADOR OF BOLIVIA, DURING WORLD AFFAIRS WEEK BEFORE THE DALLAS, TEX., ROTARY CLUB LUNCHEON HELD AT THE BAKER HOTEL IN DALLAS MAY 16, 1956

I feel at home in Texas. Partly it is your generous hospitality and partly the feeling that, because of geography and your Spanish heritage, you understand the importance of Latin America to the United States. Here, one does not have to sell Latin America or spell out the things we have in common. You know them. Your financiers and industrialists and your ambitious young men are looking more and more to the south.

Latin America today is one of the few economic frontiers left in the world. The Latin-American countries are in various stages of development, but almost all are years behind the United States. They have great wealth—timber, minerals, oil, and tropical agricultural products which do not compete with the United States. To a great degree, our common future depends upon the use which is made of this wealth.

The reasons for the economic lag in Latin America are interesting. As you know, North and South America were discovered in approximately the same time period and exploration and settlement paralleled each other. Why then did the United States advance so rapidly by comparison with most of the Latin-American countries?

Some of the factors were geographical: the high Andes Mountains and the tropical jungles, for example. However, a primary factor was the difference in viewpoint between the English colonists and the Spanish and Portuguese colonists. The English settlers came here prepared to make the New World their home. They did not expect to make their fortune here and return to the Old World and enjoy it. This country was their physical and spiritual home.

Most of the Spaniards thought of the mother country as home and always hoped to return there. Even after the revolutions which cut the political ties with Spain, they still looked to the Old World. The wealthy and influential educated their children abroad and they retired there to spend their last days.

All the settlers in the New World, or almost all of them, searched for gold and silver. The Spaniards found the precious metals and, in doing so, intensified their interdependence upon Spain and Europe. They did not develop the land as did the English settlers.

The Indian tribes in North America were relatively few in number; they were mostly hunters and fishermen. The Spaniards found well developed civilizations in Mexico, Peru, and in other areas of South and Central America. The Indians were conquered, but they still comprised the bulk of the population.

The North American Indians were swept away by the advance of the settlers. Most of them died in battle, or from disease and alcohol.

In several Latin-American countries the relatively few conquerors spent a lot of their time and energy in keeping the Indian subordinated. They succeeded so well that the problem today is how to rescue him from second-class citizenship.

One could detail at length other reasons for the failure of Latin America to make the material progress which has characterized the growth of the United States. It is more important to take a look at the situation and relationships of the republics in this hemisphere today in terms of what these may mean to all of us tomorrow.

The United States has preoccupied itself with events in Europe and Asia since the end of World War II. You have given away and loaned more than $50 billion to help economic recovery in Europe and Asia. Obviously, you had a political purpose in so doing;

you wanted to stop the spread of communism and hold the free world together.

I do not intend today to try to pass judgment on the success or failure of the United States policies since the end of World War II. Many persons think the danger of another world war receded. I hope so; we have been very close to another holocaust on several occasions in the past 11 years. But obviously the conflict between capitalism and communism, a conflict symbolized on the one hand by the United States and on the other by Russia, still continues. It will continue in all probability for years to come. If the danger of an all-out war has receded, then the necessity for prosperity and stability in the free world becomes all important. The two systems are on trial and will be judged by the masses on the basis of performance.

In making this statement I hope I am not misunderstood. My own personal opposition to communism is well known. I opposed it at a time when some leaders of the Western World thought the two systems could live harmoniously side by side. My Government is on record in opposition to communism and has proved it by its actions. Yet as beneficent as capitalism has been to the masses in the United States, it has been something else in other countries. The opposition to colonialism which is keeping the world upset today is in part opposition to capitalism. The United States has abandoned imperialism. Some other countries have clung to it and have used colonialism as the means of exploiting and victimizing backward countries and peoples.

One may say with a good deal of truth that communism also is imperialistic and that it also exploits countries. Yet it is possible that the techniques which have resulted in a great increase in heavy industry in some of the Communist countries could result in similar increases in consumer goods. Or to put it another way the standard of living in the Communist countries may rise sharply; with that rise may come a better feeling on the part of the people under communism. Moreover, communism could become more attractive to people in backward and poor countries, who might see little hope of improvement under the existing system.

Some western leaders already have pointed out the dangers inherent in the new attitude by Communist spokesmen. It could result in making international communism seem rational and logical once more; it could revive its appeal to the intelligentsia and to the youth of many countries.

Therefore, the situation of every country in Latin America becomes of particular concern to the United States. For the prosperity of the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon Latin America. Likewise, the material prosperity and stability of Latin America is becoming increasingly dependent upon the United States.

The trade between the hemispheres averages around $7 billion annually, being pretty evenly divided. The United States has more than $6 billion invested today in Latin America, and the return is over $750 million a year. Since World War II the United States has loaned and given Latin America less than $1 billion, and the profits from investments alone in Latin America exceed that in 2 short years. More and more American money is going into Latin America each day, since developments are making it one of the few places where capital can be put with any assurance that it will be safe.

And as important as Latin America is today, it will be much more important tomorrow. The population of Latin America is growing at an amazing rate; someone has termed it a population explosion. The United States today has a population of about 166 million; Canada has approximately 15 million; the combined population of the Latin-American countries exceeds that of the United States by nearly 10 million. If the present rate of increase continues, there will be a half billion people in Latin America before the year 2000.

Along with this rise in population will come, in all probability, a great increase in the living standard in Latin America and a lessening death rate. Together with a corresponding rise in the United States standard, this could mean an era of material prosperity such as the world has never seen. It also could mean the triumph of the free enterprise system. And finally, the right kind of relationship between the countries in this hemisphere could mean an inter-American system which would assure the peace of the world. Its capacity to retaliate in case of attack could be so great that no aggressor would dare start a war; its geographic sweep would be so great that its defeat even in case of attack would be almost impossible.

There are encouraging factors in the relationship today between the Americas. The United States is not imperialistic; it has taken the lead in trying to outlaw the use of force in the hemisphere. There was a time when the marines landed and punished defiance of the national will of your country. We still hear echoes of the resentment which this policy caused, and it was a long step toward hemisphere solidarity when it was abandoned. I believe that most of Latin America today gives the United States credit for good intentions, and undoubtedly the loans and grants given Latin American nations in recent years have been very helpful.

Since Latin America, generally speaking, produces raw materials and is a purchaser of manufactured products, the two economies complement each other. The clash of interests which attends your trade with Europe and some parts of Asia does not evidence itself to any great extent in the dealing between our continents.

Nor is there any significant ideological conflict. Communism does not attract Latin Americans to any great extent. There are some exceptions, but on the whole Communism is only a threat—whatever may come in the future.

I do not mean to say that the Latin American countries have solved their political problems. The reverse is true. Over the years there has been a familiar pattern in Latin America. A strong man rises and, with the help of the Army, he rules for a time. He dies, or there is a revolution, and an attempt is made to solve familiar and pressing problems through a democratic and revolutionary program. All too often this effort fails. Once again there is the military dictatorship.

So familiar is this routine that some persons feel it is the solution to the political problems in Latin American. There is a question in the minds of some North Americans about the capacity of the Latin Americans to govern themselves, as you know government in the United States. But let me point out that the unrest and turmoil which forced the military dictatorship continue. The mass of the people in all too many Latin-American countries remains poor and discontented. The contrasts between wealth and poverty are too great.

The military dictatorship is an expedient which may have worked for a long time. It will not work indefinitely unless it is accompanied by programs which help the people as a whole and give them something to look forward to and to hope for. This is extremely unlikely. It should not be forgotten that the imperialistic nations held down their colonies for generations. Yet the time came when force availed no longer. The steam within the kettle had too much power.

The danger in Latin America today is that the forces of repression will be followed by radical revolutions. In many countries the United States might find itself unable to work with the leaders of the governments. They could be men who had lost faith in private enterprise and the democratic processes.

The result would be chaos and an end which no one could foresee. All concerned would be injured. Then the United States would be forced to concentrate its attention upon Latin America. The republics to the south could no longer be taken for granted. But surely there is enough wisdom among us that we do not allow affairs to drift and degenerate. Surely we can work together to strengthen the forces of constructive reform in Latin America. Surely we can see that the development of Latin America must proceed in a way that will help the masses. The capitalism of the United States has been dynamic. The average workingman in your country laughs at the idea of becoming a Communist. Why? He feels that he has more opportunity and is doing better under your system than he would do under any other system in the world. He likes the feeling of freedom which he has; the absence of fear because of the religious and political views which he holds. That is the kind of system then which all of us should work for in Latin America.

Let us proceed from the general to the specific. My own country of Bolivia, which is half again as large as your great State of Texas, is backward and poor. It is a country whose masses have been repressed even if the dictators ruled in the name of democracy. The masses of our people are Indians.

The one fully developed industry of Bolivia is tin. The development of this industry made three families rich and kept most of the rest of the country desperately poor. The rich men concentrated upon their own interests. Bolivia has oil, iron, lumber, almost every valuable mineral known, and rich agricultural resources, but these remained almost untouched. The ownership of the tin mines gave the Patinos, Aramayos, and Hochschilds, the tin barons, great political and economic power. They used it to rule the country behind the scenes. They scuttled every attempt at reform. They bribed the politicians who could be bribed, they intimidated those who could be intimidated; they turned the machine guns on the miners when the latter rebelled; they took their money abroad and lived there in a style which attracted the attention of the world. They gave an example of the very worst side of capitalism.

In 1952 a revolution overthrew the power of the tin barons, and that same year the Government nationalized the mines. A great hue and cry went up. The United States did not like nationalization. Neither did we. We took the drastic step only because we felt that the only way to make Bolivia a modern and prosperous state was to eliminate the power and influence of the tin-mine owners. Otherwise, they would bribe and bully their way to power again and the country would be back in the gutter.

Since 1952 Bolivia has systematically tried to develop its great resources. We have great faith in private enterprise, and we want the partnership of United States capital. We have given guaranties against expropriation of private property and assurances that profits made and the capital invested can be taken out of the country. The Government recently issued a new oil code, the most liberal, I believe, in this hemisphere. Experts tell me that the Bolivian oilfields which extend diagonally across the country from north to south, probably will be some of the greatest in the world. Private operators are moving in. Glenn McCarthy, of Houston, Tex., has held a concession since 1953; one of the world's great companies, the Gulf Oil Co., recently obtained a sizable concession.

I have mentioned our links with Texas. We have another link, an economic link, the

tin smelter at Texas City, which processes ores from Bolivia.

This smelter was built because of the crisis which the United States faced in World War II. Bolivia is the only source of ore in the hemisphere and was the only source available to the Allies after 1942. The mines in Malaya, Indonesia, and Africa were cut off.

The Texas City smelter was hurriedly built to process Bolivian ore, since you had to have tin for many, many uses. The United States wanted to be certain that for the remainder of the war, and the future, it had available the tin in this hemisphere and the means to process it.

Now the proposal has been made to sell the Texas City smelter to private operators, and if that cannot be done to close the plant. If the plant is shut down, it will deteriorate to the point where it will become valueless in a short time.

I only want to point out that the situation which caused the Texas City smelter to be built in the first place still is with us. The Communists hold all China, and their influence is strong in the area where most of the world's tin is produced. Unquestionably, Bolivia would make its tin available to the United States if another war came, but before the tin could be used it would have to be smelted. The statement is made that a new tin smelter could quickly be built in this country if the need arises. I only want to point out that no one knows what the situation will be if another war comes or what demands will be made upon the time, manpower, and materials of the United States. It would seem to me that the Texas City tin smelter is a vital asset for national defense, not only for your country but for the hemisphere. All of us have an interest in preserving our vital assets.

The course which Bolivia has followed since 1953 should please the businessmen of Texas and the United States. Our program could have been written by a member of your own Rotary Club. I am glad to say that we have had the help of the United States and that invaluable aid is continuing. We had to have help. The price of tin fell after the Government took over the mines. The cost of mining Bolivian tin is between $1.10 and $1.25, and the world market price has averaged around 90 cents since 1952. Nevertheless, tin had to be mined. It was the only source of exchange which we simply had to have. Meanwhile, we were forced to spend money trying to develop our agriculture, in building roads, importing blooded livestock—doing all the things which should have been done generations ago. Lots going out; very little coming in. No wonder Bolivia has a bad case of inflation.

We made mistakes. Not long ago the President, Victor Paz Estenssoro criticized some of the workers in the nationalized mines. He said they did not work as they should and showed a lack of discipline. He spoke plainly and frankly, something which political leaders do not often do. The result was an outcry that nationalization had failed. Our enemies implied that everything would be all right if only the tin barons had kept their properties and had continued to machinegun the miners when the latter protested low wages and intolerable working conditions.

One of the reasons for nationalization was to end maltreatment of the workers by the tin barons. From that standpoint nationalization has succeeded very well indeed. Not a worker in the mines has met his death because of labor strife since 1952.

From the standpoint of the United States, the very worst thing which could happen in Bolivia now would be the fall of the existing regime. The Government has the support of the people and could fall only through revolution, and then only if economic conditions grow so bad that the workers give up in despair.

The tin barons—who never learn—seem to feel they could take over again. They could not. If they did, it would be for a short time, and then there would be a violent rebellion again. The people are through with them. The miners and the farmers—the repressed Indian masses—know there is no hope from the tin barons and their ilk. They will not submit to them again.

What would happen if the regime falls? Inevitably, the swing would be to the left. The leaders who have put their faith in private enterpise would be thoroughly discredited. The leaders who said that friendship with the United States was the way out also would be thoroughly discredited. The blow to the prestige of the United States would be tremendous; for it is well known that your great country has helped us. The assumption has been that if we do our part, aid would continue until we are solvent.

All Latin America is watching the Bolivian experiment and the relationship between our two countries. As I have said, and I repeat, that this relationship may refute the Marxist charge that a strong, capitalistic country always exploits a weaker one with which it deals. The help given us by the United States has been generous with no strings attached. It has enabled us to start projects and programs which hold great promise for the future. In 1953 Bolivia was an importer of oil; in 1956 Bolivia is an exporter of oil and within a few short years oil may take the place which tin once held in our economy.

If the Bolivian experiment fails, it will be a blow to the future of private investment in Latin America. For Bolivia has tried to stimulate foreign investment. We have gone out of our way to allay fears caused by nationalization of the tin mines and the expropriation of the Standard Oil properties in 1937. This latter expropriation grew out of a quarrel between Bolivia and Standard Oil during the disastrous Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay. In my opinion, the nationalization of the oil properties was unfortunate. In any event, the existing regime had nothing to do with it, since the MNR, the party now in power in Bolivia, was not formed until 1940. If Bolivia goes ahead to prosperity and stability, it will be with the help of foreign capital and will demonstrate what constructive capitalism can do to help develop a potentially rich country like Bolivia. It will encourage other countries to follow our example. It will show that true democracy and private enterprise will work in Latin America—provided they are given the right kind of chance.

The success of our experiment will increase the friendship of the masses in Latin America for the United States. The liberal forces in the continent know what is going on. They know my Government is really trying to help its people. They know that Bolivia is one of the few countries to attempt genuine land reform. It seems incredible that Indian farmers in some Latin American countries have had the status of serfs down to the present day, but that is what they have had. We are giving land to the landless farmers and paying the owners for it. The plan has been described as collectivism. It is the opposite of collectivism. It is a program to base our agricultural economy upon the ownership of family-sized farms. It is action to perpetuate private enterprise and capitalism.

Incidentally, Bolivia acknowledges and is grateful for the help given by the United States. Our leaders speak of it openly. What is more important, they have told the people about it. The result is that the average Bolivian looks upon the United States as a friend and, when he has the opportunity, makes his views known. One of the things we cannot be accused of is ingratitude.

Since 1953 the United States has given Bolivia approximately $30 million in loans and grants. As I have said, we are grateful. We are hopeful, however, that your great country will take a close look at our stiuation and will provide enough aid to really put us on our feet. We do not want to remain, nor does the United States want us to remain, forever on a subsistence basis, always having to come back year after year to ask for more. It would take comparatively little to enable Bolivia to complete some of its programs and to be, as one of your sayings goes, out of the woods. It would be too bad if reactionary pressures caused this aid to be withheld at the very time when it spelled success or failure. The time will come fairly soon, if we work together, when we could be almost as rich as Texas. In that event we will have paid back the United States many times—in one way or another—the aid which you have given us.

I do not want what I have said here today to be interpreted as a threat in any sense. I have found that your people understand plain language and like it. As you say, they want to know the score. Bolivia has come a long way since 1952, and it will not take too much more to put us over the hill. Once we become self supporting, I can say that every penny we have borrowed will be returned with interest and that Bolivia will be a good place for American business and businessmen.

My only concern is that our situation is not thoroughly understood and that the propaganda of the tin barons will have its effect. They have been busy of late, for they sense that the crisis is approaching. A few more difficulties and we may roll downhill; a little more help and we are in. It would be a tragedy if the help given by the United States should be, to use a familiar expression, too little and too late. It would be a calamity for Bolivia and a hard blow to the United States and the private enterprise system which is fundamental to the preservation of our economic and political freedoms.

I do not think we will fail. I have never thought so; I do not think so now; and I will do all in my power to prevent its happening. I hope that the good people of Texas will help us succeed. It will be good business for all of us.

Tax Exempt Foundations

SPEECH
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document which raises questions of such a fundamental importance to the preservation of our Republic that I feel it should be read and studied by every loyal citizen.

The Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations revealed much that should disturb Americans. Still, to my knowledge, it did not uncover an instance of a foundation being sued for libel. I question whether those who established the privilege of tax exemption ever dreamed of such a contingency. After all, was not this privilege to be extended to only those who, without profit to themselves, sought to advance the general welfare? And how could the general welfare conceivably be advanced by libeling a citizen?

The citizen who alleges libel is Dr. Bella V. Dodd, former Communist, who, unlike so many unrepentant conspira-

tors, has given unstintingly of her time to all branches of our Government at great cost to herself. While in the party, Bella Dodd lacked not for finances nor prestige, nor accolades from the groups and individuals who today vilify and attack her. But once she came to the aid of our Republic in its hour of crisis, foresaking the Red dictatorship which plots our end, we find a different story.

From that day forward Dr. Dodd has existed on the paltry return she could achieve from a greatly reduced law practice and teaching career, supplemented by occasional fees for lectures.

But the friends of the Red Fascists begrudged her even this and sought to turn all against her. In May 1955 the Fund for the Republic circulated 25,000 copies of a reprint from Harper's magazine entitled "The Kept Witnesses" to labor officials and business executives. This article is the subject of the complaint I hold in my hand, naming the Fund for the Republic, its officers and trustees, and Harper's magazine as defendants in a suit for damages.

However, the article "The Kept Witnesses" is also an all-out attack on our national-security program and on the agencies of our Government which Dr. Dodd has so often helped. Dr. Dodd fights not only to rectify a wrong to herself, but to defend the very agencies which loyally strive to preserve us as a sovereign Nation.

And here let us pause to note the most amazing fact of all. Whereas Dr. Bella Dodd courageously rides into this legal battle at great expense which must be borne by her, and by her alone, she fights our Nation's battle alone, no tax money, no tax-exempt privilege, no multimillion dollar gifts, no support.

But what of her opponents who attack the security program of our Nation? They march to battle with millions of dollars of tax-exempt funds, withheld to promote the general welfare.

Alice in Wonderland was never like this. What American could ever have dreamed that one day the United States would subsidize the destruction of those who would defend them?

In this unequal battle Bella Dodd could easily be crucified, alone and unaided. What magnificent courage prompted her to undertake it. May God help her and our country.

By consent, I am inserting the complaint against the Fund for the Republic in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK, BELLA V. DODD, PLAINTIFF, AGAINST HARPER & BROTHERS, CASS CANFIELD, FRANK S. MACGREGOR, JOHN FISCHER, RUSSELL LYNES, CATHARINE MEYER, THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC., ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, PAUL G. HOFFMAN, DAVID F. FREEMAN, W. H. FERRY, AND RICHARD H. ROVERE, DEFENDANTS—COMPLAINT

The plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd, by her attorneys Dodd, Cardiello & Blair, alleges as follows:

1. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Harper & Brothers, was a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

2. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Harper & Brothers, was engaged in the publication of the magazine known as "Harper's Magazine," and that such magazine is published for circulation and was circulated throughout the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Mexico, and all countries participating in the International Copyright Convention and the Pan American Copyright Convention, and was read by the general public, including those who are active in the fields of politics, business, and labor.

3. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Frank S. MacGregor, was president of the defendant, Harper & Brothers, and actively participated in its business operations including the circulation of Harper's magazine.

4. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Cass Canfield, was chairman of the board of directors of Harper & Bros. corporation.

5. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, John Fischer, was editor in chief of Harper's magazine, and the defendant, Catherine Meyer, was an editor of Harper's magazine, and were in direct charge of the preparation and publication of various articles published in Harper's magazine.

6. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Russell Lynes, was managing editor of Harper's magazine and in such capacity selected and determined what material and subject matters were to be printed and published in Harper's magazine for circulation to the general public.

7. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, was and is a resident of the State of New York.

8. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., was a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

9. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Robert M. Hutchins, was president of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and as such determined the projects and subject matter to be investigated by the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

10. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, W. H. Ferry, was vice president and David F. Freeman, was secretary-treasurer of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and on information and belief, participated in determining the program of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and deciding on what subjects were to be investigated and what books, articles, and other literature were to be distributed.

11. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Paul G. Hoffman, was chairman of the board of directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and participated in deciding the policy, what subjects were to be investigated, what books, articles and publications were to be distributed.

12. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., is a corporation having its principal office within the city of New York.

13. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., is exempt from tax under the revenue laws of the United States, and under applicable State taxing legislation and does not contribute financially for the support, maintenance, and defense of the United States of America.

14. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned and for sometime prior thereto, the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, was the author of the article entitled "The Kept Witnesses," published in the May 1955 issue of Harper's magazine, and upon information and belief had been engaged and employed by the defendant, Harper & Bros. Corp., agreed to and did pay a consideration to the said Richard H. Rovere.

15. That upon information and belief the defendant Richard H. Rovere, for and on behalf of and at the instance of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did write the article making specific references to the plaintiff as shall more particularly hereafter appear.

16. That in the May 1955 issue of a magazine known as Harper's magazine, defendant Harper & Bros. published the heretofore mentioned article under article under the title of "The Kept Witnesses."

17. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the facts of the plaintiff's good reputation were known to, or should have been known to, or could readily be ascertained by defendants, Richard H. Rovere and Harper & Bros., and the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

18. That the aforementioned article entitled "The Kept Witnesses," published for general circulation in the May 1955 issue of Harper's magazine, did contain libelous statements and insinuations about and concerning the plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd.

19. That said libel did consist of libelous statements directly and indirectly reflecting upon plaintiff's character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional practice, social, and economic standing.

20. That plaintiff was libelously attacked in that said article attempted to create a public impression in regard to plaintiff's character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional practice, social and economic standing, by using a device popularly referred to as "guilt by association" or "libel by association," and that such article tended to hold plaintiff up to public scorn, ridicule, and hostility.

21. That among the persons mentioned in said article was one Whittaker Chambers, a former Communist, and that the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, inserted explanatory matter after the name of said Whittaker Chambers, which explanation stated that said Whittaker Chambers was not guilty of the same alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations as defendant, Richard H. Rovere, attributed to the other persons grouped or associated by said article.

22. That the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, owed plaintiff a duty, when he included her name in said article, to explain to the public that plaintiff was not guilty of the alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations defendant Rovere attributed to the other persons grouped or associated by said article.

23. That the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, by use of plaintiff's name in said article was purposely and with malice attempting to associate plaintiff with the alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations attributed by him to others through the said article, and to libel her by association and to create the impression that she was guilty by association, and to create in the public mind an attitude of scorn, ridicule, and hostility toward the plaintiff.

24. That upon information and belief, subsequent to publication of the said article in said magazine, defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc. distributed, through the mails and otherwise, at least 25,000 copies of said article.

25. That upon information and belief, such distribution of said article was made mainly to labor officials, business executives, Government personnel, and professional people.

26. That on or about May 31, 1955, the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc. published and issued a report of the activities and financial condition of said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

27. That upon information and belief, the officers and staff and the members of the board of directors of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., are as follows:

Robert M. Hutchins, president, W. H. Ferry, vice president, David F. Freeman, secretary and treasurer, Hallock Hoffman, assistant to the president, Edward Reed, Joseph P. Lyford,

Thomas J. Gardner, assistant treasurer, Winifred G. Meskus, assistant secretary, Bethuel M. Webster, counsel, Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, George N. Shuster, vice chairman, Harry S. Ashmore, Chester Bowles, Charles W. Cole, Arthur H. Dean, Russell L. Dearmont, Erwin N. Griswold, William H. Joyce, Jr., Meyer Kestenbaum, M. Albert Linton, John Lord O'Brien, Jubal R. Parten, Elmo Roper, Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, and James D. Zellerbach.

28. That said officers, staff, and directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., knew, could have known, should have known, and must be considered to know the contents of the said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

29. That said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., in the appendix thereof, did set forth as an activity and accomplishment of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., a list of books, articles and other material distributed by the Fund for the Republic, Inc., by title, author, source, number of copies distributed, and main audience to which they were distributed.

30. That said list did include as an article distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., the aforementioned article The Kept Witnesses in these words—"The Kept Witnesses, by Richard H. Rovere. Article. Harper's, 25,000 copies. Labor officials, business executives."

31. That on the basis of the information contained in said list in said report only one other book, article or other material received a greater distribution.

32. That upon information and belief the officers and/or directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did select the material that was so distributed.

33. That upon information and belief the officers and/or directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did pass upon and approve of the distribution of material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

34. That by selection of the books, articles, and other matter distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., said fund was acting with malice and intent to discredit, malign, intimidate, and otherwise persecute witnesses who cooperated with congressional or governmental investigating agencies, of whom plaintiff was one.

35. That said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., lists and sets forth the names of 17 books, articles, and other material distributed by said fund, among which is the said article, The Kept Witnesses.

36. That upon information and belief the said 17 books, articles, and other material distributed as set forth in the said report of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., all deal with the general subject of communism and investigations into communism.

37. That upon information and belief at least seven of said books, articles, and other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., dealt or were concerned with congressional or governmental investigations into communism.

38. That upon information and belief each one of the books, articles, or other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., as recorded in said report of said defendant and dealing with the subject of congressional and governmental investigations, and witnesses testifying before such investigations, is part of a program designed to unfavorably influence public opinion in regard to the necessity of such investigations, and the character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional status, social or economic standing of those witnesses who testified before and cooperated with such investigations, particularly former Communists, including the plaintiff.

39. That upon information and belief the above referred to books, articles, and other material all tend to and attempt to so present the subject matter referred to in the preceding paragraph as to influence public opinion in opposition to congressional and governmental investigations, and to vilify and hold up to contempt the witnesses testifying or cooperating with such investigations, including the plaintiff.

40. That upon information and belief the publication and distribution of said books, articles, and other material was part of a program designed to influence public opinion against the necessity, usefulness, and integrity of congressional or governmental investigations into communism, and to create in the mind of the public an attitude tending to hold up to scorn, contempt, ridicule, and hostility those witnesses who cooperated with congressional or governmental investigations, of whom plaintiff was one.

41. That such program was known to, or should have been known to the officers and directors of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

42. That upon information and belief the various books, articles, and other material above mentioned, and the writers, of the above-mentioned books, articles, and other material do quote from and mention in the various books, articles, and other material distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., the other books, articles, and other material distributed by said defendant in an attempt to create a general atmosphere of authority for the books, articles, and other material so quoted or referred to, and attempt to pyramid and compound the effect and impression that any one such book, article, and other material may have in the public mind, and to create the impression that any one book, article, and other material is a greater and more reliable authority in reference to the matter dealth with by any such book, article, and other material than is actually the case, or than such book, article, and other material would have were it not referred to or quoted in the various other books, articles, and other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

43. That since the original distribution of the aforesaid article, The Kept Witnesses, the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., has continued in the distribution of said article to the general public.

44. That upon information contained in the annual report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., hereinbefore mentioned, every project planned by this defendant for the future deals with the general subject of communism and/or its investigation.

45. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., will continue to carry out with the distribution of articles and other means, its program to influence public opinion belittling the danger of communism and of the necessity, usefulness, and integrity of congressional or governmental investigations into communism, and to create in the mind of the public an attitude tending to hold up to scorn, contempt, ridicule and hostility those witnesses who cooperate with congressional or governmental investigations, of whom plaintiff has been, and may again be one.

46. That the distribution of said article, The Kept Witnesses, did tend and attempt to create and, in fact, did create in the minds of the general public an association between plaintiff and the other persons mentioned in said article, and did tend and attempt to and, in fact, did associate witnesses who cooperated with congressional and governmental investigations into communism and its infiltration into our social, political and economic life, with the same alleged crimes, sins, acts and motivations as were set forth in the said article, or implied in said article, of the plaintiff and the other persons named in said article.

47. That further distribution of said article, The Kept Witnesses, will increase in the minds of the public the scorn, ridicule and hostility and false, libelous impression of the plaintiff, and each such article distributed is a separate and distinct libel.

48. That distribution of books, articles or other material by the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., subsequent to distribution of the aforementioned article, The Kept Witnesses, and dealing with the same subject matter as dealt with in said article and distributed to those who received distribution of the aforementioned article, will tend to recall to mind, refresh the memory of, strngthen, lend weight to, increase the authority of, or otherwise increase, pyramid and compound the scorn, ridicule, and hostility which the aforementioned article, The Kept Witnesses, attempted to and did create in the minds of those who read said article affecting plaintiff particularly.

49. That upon information and belief the defendants have used the device of guilt by association in libeling the plaintiff, and there is indication that future actions of the defendants will result in a continuing publication of the original libel as well as the publication or distribution of other material that will tend to increase and compound the public scorn, ridicule, and hostility to plaintiff that was engendered by the original libel and libel by association.

50. That such future continuing publication or republication of the libelous article constitutes a continuing wrong against plaintiff.

51. That the past action complained of and the future plans of the defendant, The Fund for the Republic, Inc., as presented in the aforementioned report of said defendant indicates that there is reasonable probability that future action of said defendant will injure plaintiff by use of the device of libel by association with the plaintiff's clients, potential clients, and the general public.

52. That as a result plaintiff has suffered and is threatened with libel of a continuing and cumulative nature that has greatly injured and further endangers her professional standing and practice, her financial earning capacity, her social status, and her health.

53. That the libel and cumulative effect of past and future libel by association is a wrong against plaintiff that has caused and will in the future cause her irreparable harm.

54. That the libel and cumulative effect of past and future publication of said libel by association is a wrong against plaintiff that can result in a multiplicity of suits and for which plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

55. That a copy of the aforementioned article The Kept Witnesses is attached to and made a part of this complaint, and that said article does libel plaintiff.

56. That without being all inclusive, the following phrases and sentences from said article do libel plaintiff, falsely reflect upon her honesty, truthfulness, integrity, reputation and professional ethics, and do injure her professional standing and practice, her financial possibilities, and her economic and social status.

See page 34, column 2, top:

"No man, for example, has had any greater influence on the public view of the Communist problem than Louis F. Budenz. On the basis of his reputation as the Government's leading witness in Smith Act cases and before congressional committees, he has established an almost universal acceptance of himself as a high authority and of his books, articles, lectures, and television discourses as bearing some imagined seal of official approval. Elizabeth Bentley, J. B. Matthews, Benjamin Gitlow, Howard Rushmore, Bella Dodd, and Joseph Kornfeder run not very far behind. (Whittaker Chambers has also

been enormously influential, but of him it must be said that his writings lend more authority to his testimony than his testimony lends to his writings. He is not, therefore of this company.)"

See page 34, column 2, middle:

"Lesser witnesses have established lesser reputations on the strength of their endorsement by the Government. Moreover, they have had and are having a direct influence on policy and law—not through appeals to public opinion but through direct appeals to the governing powers. Paul Crouch tells the Senate what to do about Hawaii and how the Army should be run. Matthew Cvetic is called by the Senate Rules Committee to advise on the thorny question of rules for congressional investigations."

See page 27, column 2, paragraph 2:

"Whether the list is complete is not known. It was specified that the 83 named were all under contract to the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department."

See page 28, column 1, paragraph 1:

"At all odds, the Department of Justice had at least 83 kept witnesses in 1954."

See page 28, column 1, paragraph 2:

"Of the 83 persons retained by the Department in 1954, all were, by their own admission, former members of the Communist Party. Some, like Benjamin Gitlow, one of the first American Bolsheviks and once Communist candidate for Vice President, had been true blievers; others, like Matthew Cvetic."

See page 28, column 1, top:

"The people who receive them are carried on the books, not as kept witnesses but as 'expert consultants.' But kept witnesses is what in fact they are; such usefulness as they may be said to have derives from their ability and readiness to identify people as Communists, to describe Communist activities for the enlightenment of judges, juries, and security panels; and to interpret Communist doctrine in such a way as to bring it within the area proscribed by the Smith Act."

See page 29, column 1, middle paragraph 1:

"Hiring as expert consultants of the former Communists and police agents who make up the Department's corps of professional witnesses."

See page 29, column 2, middle of last paragraph:

"The Department of Justice is subsidizing testimony."

See page, 30, column 1, about one-third from top:

"But the professional witness up to now has made an appearance only as the creature of disreputable law firms and private detective agencies."

See page 30, column 2, paragraph 2:

"The cloak of suspicion is a garment that must be wrapped several times around the witnesses for whose services the Department of Justice has contracted. For one thing, their pecuniary interest assuming, for the moment, that $34 a day constitutes one—has the unusual character of a continuum."

See page 30, column 2, last paragraph:

"As Whittaker Chambers, who has given testimony but has never become a professional."

See page 31, column 1, paragraph 3:

"Louis Budenz, a former editor of the Daily Worker, who has testified that his income from all sources as an anti-Communist witness and publicist has exceeded $10,000 a year."

See page 32, column 2, bottom:

"A considerable number of the professional witnesses are disaffected Communists and clearly carry the stigma and disabilities along with the special insights, of their kind."

See page 27, column 1, paragraph 2, middle:

"And if it is a good racket for anyone, it is a racket for which the Government of the United States must bear the heaviest responsibility. For it is the Government of the United States—'that august conception,' as Samuel Taylor Coleridge once called it—that originated this racket and that continues to encourage and pay for it."

See page 27, column 1, middle last paragraph:

"The Government won't talk. It does not, because plainly it cannot, plead that the safety of the Nation would be imperiled if it revealed the number and the identity of those whom it hires to testify according to the wishes of its lawyers. It does not plead the right to withhold the names on the ground that these people are confidential informers."

See page 29, column 1, middle:

"It reflects not at all on their present condition of rectitude and probity to say that their pasts reek of subversion and sedition and that a number of them are convicted felons."

See page 29, column 1, bottom:

"And as witnesses in other proceedings, the professionals play a crucial role in determining many things. There is, indeed, no end to the number of places where they may turn up in the course of their service to the Department of Justice, and apparently in fulfillment of their agreement with it."

See page 29, column 2, middle:

"One of the most ubiquitous of the breed."

See page 29, column 2, bottom:

"It is a novel arrangement, this hiring of people to take a solemn oath and testify favorably to the Government."

See page 34, column 2, bottom:

"The kept witnesses have been given an opportunity to foul American due process and quite a bit else besides."

Wherefore, the plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd, demands judgment against the defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in the amount of $150,000, and that the defendants, Richard H. Rovere, Harper & Bros., and the Fund for the Republic, Inc., be enjoined from publishing or distributing said article or any book, article, or other material dealing with such persons as the aforementioned article, the Kept Witnesses, which mentions or alludes to plaintiff libelously, and that the defendants, Harper & Bros. and the Fund for the Republic, Inc., be compelled to give publication and distribution to an article approved by the plaintiff exonerating plaintiff from the implications and innuendoes contained in the aforementioned article, such corrective article to receive distribution and publication equal to the distribution and publication of the aforementioned article.

Immigration or Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered at the 66th national congress, Sons of the American Revolution, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1956, at the Sagamore Hotel, Bolton Landing on Lake George, N. Y.

The address follows:

This year—like all election years—brings us that most bipartisan of all political games: The courting of the minorities. It is again played with great fervor by those candidates for elective office who believe that organized minority groups wield enough power to clinch the vote in so-called close districts and States.

There appears to be an irresistible fascination in the belief that when a certain congressional district or a State elects a Democrat one time and a Republican another by a small margin of ballots, the minority groups are responsible for the result.

Consequently, as predictably as night follows day, we are confronted again in this election year with the peculiarly American sport of claiming at political rallies, at fundraising banquets, and in political propaganda pronouncements that this country does not admit a sufficient number of immigrants of one or another nationality.

We do not admit enough Greeks, they say, or enough Chinese. Not enough Italians or Rumanians or Portuguese. We should admit more people from India, more from Indonesia, more from Pakistan, or from Iran.

If we ask how many we should admit, the answer is always the same cry—more. And if we ask more of whom, it turns out that the speaker always means more of the people of that national group which the immigration auctioneer is addressing at that particular moment.

All right then, 5,000, 50,000? No. Sixty thousand? Or that part of the number of immigrants which another nationality has not sent to this country? No. Still not enough; and around and around we go.

And now this quadrennial numbers lottery is on again. The irresponsible, lusty auction has started already this year, exactly as we heard it in 1952 and in 1948—just as we heard it earlier, and in between the presidential election years as well.

The auction is being conducted in the usual uninhibited manner by the presidential aspirants, by governors facing election, by Senators whose terms are about to expire, and by some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It is being carried on by all their assistants and helpers, and by all the professional immigrant-handlers who make a living as paid servitors of various social, religious and charitable agencies which have made a crude business out of the truly noble and humanitarian task of assisting the immigrant.

At the risk of losing some popularity contests within my own political party as well as in my congressional district, I have long ago refused to look upon immigration as a means of winning friends abroad and political support at home.

To me, immigration is first and foremost a matter of the national welfare and national security.

The volume and the type of immigrants coming to the United States must, in my opinion, be predicated solely on unbiased and impartial findings as to how many we should admit and whom we should admit. Findings that are scientific and not political.

The quantity and the quality are of equal importance, and the interest of the American people must be the sole and exclusive yardstick.

Immigrants entering the United States are entering into the bloodstream of the Nation. It is like an injection into the bloodstream of a human being. It can be beneficial to him, increasing his strength and his vitality. But, if the injection is one of improper quality or improper quantity—it could be fatal.

THE PAST

A comprehensive picture of our current problems cannot be presented without an outline of the historical background of American immigration.

From the first settlement of the North American colonies to the end of the Revolutionary War in 1783, immigration to the New World was regulated not by the colonists but by the governments of Europe. The interest of the European ruler was enhanced by the size of the population of his domain. The

more abundant the labor force, the greater his profits and the more gold that accumulated in the royal coffers. Consequently, all European rulers tried to prevent the exodus of their subjects, the peons, who were already then attracted by the magnificence of the wide open land and the opportunities beckoning from across the seas.

The new settlers on this side of the Atlantic deliberately encouraged immigration. Here, more people meant more producers, more consumers, and more wealth to be extracted from the newly acquired soil and—last but not least—more people meant increased safety of life and property.

It is estimated that in 1640, the population of the North American colonies numbered 25,000 people and by 1700, it had risen to 200,000. It took another 50 years to bring the population figure to the first million.

When the Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777, the population of the Thirteen Colonies was well over 3 million, and the first census taken in 1790 put it at 4 million. About two-thirds of the white population were of English, Scotch, and Welsh origin; about one-third were Dutch, French, German, Scandinavian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Except for a short-lived restrictive period created by the alien and sedition law of 1798, immigration flowed into the United States unfettered by any legislation. The vast growth of the new American economy, its progression to the limitless frontiers of the West and the ready acceptance of the newcomer by the thriving communities—already established—exerted an increasing attraction on poverty-stricken Europeans in the countries devastated by the Napoleonic wars. Recurring famines and the great industrial revolution resulted in increased population pressures and caused a gradual relaxation of the restrictive attitude of the European rulers who suddenly reversed themselves and began to encourage emigration. As a consequence, the first official record of arriving immigrants established in 1820 indicated that the population of the United States had jumped to almost 10 million persons.

By that time, public opinion, both in Europe and in America, became aroused by disturbing reports of appalling conditions on vessels carrying immigrants on their transatlantic journey. Thousands of them were crowded among the horrors of the dreaded steerage space where they died of hunger, thirst, and disease. In 1819, a law was enacted in the United States limiting the number of passengers that a ship could carry and prescribing the minimum amount of water and food that had to be aboard. The master of every ship reaching our shores had to report the number of passengers he had brought and their personal data, such as age, sex, occupation, and country of origin. Thus originated the first immigration statistics in the United States.

But, except for these efforts to humanize transportation of immigrants, no attempt at regulating immigration was made during the first part of the 19th century.

The first legislative enactment which may be considered as relating to the quality of immigrants was passed in 1863. It prohibited Americans from carrying on the trade in Chinese coolies. Later laws, still qualitative in nature, established rules for the exclusion of immoral persons, paupers, and criminals.

A tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants after the discovery of gold in California prompted the enactment of the first Chinese exclusion law in 1882. That trend of legislation continued, as witnessed by the enactment, in 1885, of a restrictive immigration measure aimed at prohibiting the importation of cheap labor from abroad.

A few years later, in 1891, the Congress excluded insane persons, persons likely to become public charges, felons, feebleminded persons, polygamists, persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude excepting, however, persons convicted of political offenses.

The ethnic pattern of our immigration began to change in the last two decades of the 19th century. Around the year 1890, there appeared for the first time an appreciable number of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe. They came from the Balkans, from Italy, and from Russia, where the czarist persecution of Jews began to drive them out in ever-increasing numbers.

These changes in the immigration pattern continued until after World War I: While in the decade of 1871 to 1880, almost 74 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe, and only 7 percent hailed from southern and eastern Europe, in the decade of 1901 to 1910 only 22 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe while immigrants originating in southern and eastern Europe contributed up to 71 percent of the new arrivals.

It was about that time that the Congress turned its attention from qualitative restrictions to quantitative restrictions. The first law establishing a ceiling on the number of immigrants—a quota—was enacted in 1921. The second quota law was passed in 1924 and remained in effect with very little change until the enactment of the present law in 1952. The 1924 act was the one that established the much discussed national origin system, a system based on the allocation to every national group of as many immigrants as that national group had contributed to the population of the United States as of 1920.

THE WALTER-M'CARRAN ACT

The 1952 law, commonly referred to as the Walter-McCarran Act, is a comprehensive codification of over 148 laws that were on our statute books when we first began a study of our immigration and naturalization problems in 1947.

We had before us then a hodge-podge of antiquated, and piecemeal immigration and naturalization laws. They had been often amended, but never codified. They were shot through with loopholes, inequities, ambiguities, and outright inconsistencies. There were discriminatory statutes excluding Japanese, Indonesians, Koreans, and other Orientals. There were laws prohibiting the naturalization of large groups of people permitted to remain in this country forever in an alien status. There were unreasonably strict rules under which no member of a subversive organization, however thoroughly reformed, could remain in this country and become a United States citizen. We were admitting alien wives of our citizens outside of the quotas but we were denying such privileges to the husbands of American girls. The wives of lawfully residing aliens were treated differently from the husbands of females who were admitted lawfully. There was no provision under which brothers and sisters of United States citizens could be placed in a preferential position under the immigration quota. There were no provisions under which even the most highly skilled alien technician, engineer, doctor, or nurse, could come even when urgently needed in this country.

We corrected all of those inequities in the Walter-McCarran Act. All countries of the entire globe were granted—without discrimination—immigration quotas under a formula equally applicable to all areas regardless of the color of the skin or the shape of the eyes of its inhabitants.

At the same time, the Walter-McCarran Act made it infinitely easier to rid this country of foreign-born subversives, criminals, racketeers, narcotic peddlers, professional gamblers, and aliens who have surreptitiously entered this country.

These—briefly—are the main achievements of the law about which there has been so much heat and so little light generated.

DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES

I am stating my views on immigration frankly and openly because I do not have to defend my record in this matter. During the last decade, since 1945, to be exact, immigration has been one of the major subjects of my activities nationally and internationally.

The guns had hardly stopped smoking when I moved with the American army of liberation into the infamous concentration camps in Europe which nazism had left as monuments of everlasting shame. I was one of the first Americans to see the wretched survivors of Nazi bestiality. I saw Hitler's victims anticipating with hope an opportunity to start a new life in a free land and I saw them committing suicide when forced to return to the lands where Hitler's former ally, Stalin, was busy continuing his program of enslavement and mass murder.

I am rather proud to point to my work on the laws which, since 1945, have brought to the United States almost half a million displaced persons who are now well integrated into our life, and who have caused but a few instances of disappointment.

Let us not forget that this country alone took one-third of all the displaced persons left in Europe by Hitler's reign of terror and Stalin's postwar, conquests. We took one-third; yet we have only 6 percent of the land area of the world. It was certainly a little more than what is referred to as "a fair share."

I believe that the record will bear me out when I say that the success of our own national resettlement effort undertaken under the displaced persons laws of 1948, and of 1950, is, in part, attributable to my own activities in Washington, in Germany, and in Geneva, Switzerland.

More than that—and at the risk of exposing myself to the accusation of immodesty—I want to mention briefly that the erection of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is similarly the result of my personal efforts.

This organization which we set up at Brussels, Belgium, in December 1951, has so far moved to happier lands almost half a million people who had no opportunities of making a livelihood and bringing up their children in the war-ravaged overcrowded countries of Europe. It is good to see that the committee which had 16 nations as its members at the start, has grown into an efficiently functioning organization with a membership of 26 independent nations. We keep the Committee outside of the United Nations in order to prevent any Soviet interference and we excluded from it any nation under Communist domination.

Australia, Canada, Argentina, and other South American countries have cooperated splendidly with the United States and with the immigrant-sending European countries in the furtherance of the Committee's aims. With the assistance of my colleagues who serve on congressional committees handling foreign affairs and appropriations, I intend to continue my work in behalf of that useful organization.

I now intend to insist, both in Washington and in Geneva, that the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration undertake a determined and sustained effort designed to explore and open up new vast areas of South America and central and southern Africa for the benefit of European migrants who should be resettled in larger numbers on farmlands and not in congested industrial areas.

To bring the unskilled surplus European manpower and families to unsettled lands where they could engage in agriculture, would serve a double purpose. In addition

to providing the migrants with new opportunities, it will increase food production for the ever hungry and now increasingly hungrier world.

EXPLOSION OF HUMAN FERTILITY

Let me digress here for a moment and give you an idea of what is going on in the field of human fertility—a marvel that has a decisive import on our immigration problems.

According to statistical data placed at my disposal by experts from the Population Reference Bureau in Washington, D. C., the world is faced today with a true explosion of human fertility. Every morning there are 95,000 new mouths to feed. Every second 1 person dies, and 2 are born. The world's population is growing infinitely faster than the food supply produced by the globe's good earth.

Japan with a land area about equal to the State of Montana has 88 million inhabitants. In order to realize the overcrowding of Japan, one would have to imagine one-half of the population of the United States squeezed into Montana.

Communist China has 500 million people. That is one-fourth of the world's population. If the present birth rate continues in India, coupled with the decreasing death rate, that country will have 450 million people by 1970. The population of our neighbor to the south, Mexico, has increased by 30 percent in the last 20 years, and the population of Mexico is still growing so fast that at the current rate of growth Mexico's present population of 30 million will jump to 60 million in less than two decades.

And now a quick look at our own population picture. According to figures supplied by the Bureau of the Census, the population of the United States on April 1, 1956, was 167,440,000. This figure represents an increase of over 16 million, or 10.8 percent, since April 1, 1950, the date of the last national census. Since 1950 immigration has contributed 1,700,000 to our population increase. Over 4 million babies were born in the United States in 1955. In comparison, births in 1940 numbered 2,800,000 babies.

Statisticians and economists of the Population Reference Bureau maintain that the increase of our population is entirely out of proportion with the rate of accumulation of capital in our country. They say that we are not earning enough capital to expand our production facilities, our housing, our schools, and our highways, so as to accommodate the future generations of our own citizens.

One glance at the world's population picture and the picture reflecting the increase of our own population leads to one inescapable conclusion: Immigration into the United States has long ceased to be a solution to the problem of crowded humanity. The only solution is a bold concerted effort to increase food production on the still virgin continents of the southern hemisphere coupled with an enlightened attempt to limit the uncontrolled increase in the total number of inhabitants of the globe. To pile up more people on top of an expanding native mass of people seeking employment and a decent living in the countries with a population density similar to ours, is worse than folly. It is clearly an invitation to disaster.

THE PHONY REFUGEE LAW

Having told you how proud I am of the part I played in helping to resettle displaced persons and refugees, I want to refer to another legislative enactment with which I had much to do—mostly opposing it. What I have in mind is the much talked about, the deceptively labeled Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The refugee relief law under which no relief was granted to refugees.

I have on many occasions called that law—a "phony" and I still use the same word to describe it. It was a fraudulent gesture of brazen political hypocrisy. For all its purported humanitarian aims the law, rammed down the congressional throat by a new administration seeking popularity which it lacked, is a crudely concocted piece of old-fashioned pork-barreling on international and national level.

Under that law refugees were created as a matter of pure legislative fiction writing. Real refugees were overlooked. Large numbers of nonquota immigrant visas were arbitrarily allocated to certain countries. The allocations were made entirely out of proportion to any acceptable economic or demographic standards or equitable humanitarian considerations. I believe that the numerical visa allocations of the 1953 act are simply in direct proportion to the strength of the political minority lobbies on Capitol Hill and at the White House.

I opposed this inequitable 1953 law, but having been outvoted in the subcommittee over which I now preside and in the committee of which I am the ranking member, I have undertaken on the floor of the House a little salvage operation. I submitted a total of 11 amendments permitting United States citizens to bring to this country their close relatives because even they, the relatives, just as the genuine refugees, were overlooked by the sponsors and pushers of the phony Refugee Relief Act. All the sponsors and the pushers of the 1953 law were interested in was but one thing—getting in good standing with the strong big-city pressure groups.

However, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 has served at least one good purpose. It provided a perfect demonstration of what happens when immigration visas are distributed—"passed around" would be a better way of saying it—by politicians instead of mathematicians. It provided the strongest argument against any departure from the present equitable, mathematical formula of distribution of the annual immigration quota in accordance with the national origins of those immigrants who fashioned the fundamental legal and social concepts upon which this Republic has been built and upon which it stands.

As you know, it is this fair, nondiscriminatory method of distributing our annual immigration quota that is under the sharpest attack by the leaders of special interests.

I will resist that attack. We all must resist it just as we would resist a foreign invasion. Yes, invasion—and I shall attempt to convince you that the word I use is not just a figure of speech.

FIGURES TELL THE TRUTH

The participants of the immigration numbers lottery say all over this country—and, indeed, have unfortunately advertised that brazen lie all over the world—that under the present immigration laws, access to this country has been curtailed, if not well nigh closed.

Let us look at the figures rather than listen to the chant of the auctioneers. In the fiscal year of 1955, we have admitted 858,736 aliens, of which 237,790 have come as immigrants to dwell among us for the rest of their lives and to bring into the world native-born American citizens. The corresponding number for the previous fiscal year, 1954, is 774,790 aliens admitted, of which 208,177 were immigrants coming to this country for permanent residence. Going back to the preceding years, the figures indicate a lesser number of aliens admitted to the United States, but looking at the figures for the current fiscal year and even disregarding those that come under special legislation, it is obvious that as the years pass, our annual intake grows larger and larger. It is quite possible that during the fiscal year 1957, possibly even in 1956, we will pass the one million mark of aliens admitted to this country temporarily or permanently.

You also hear from the immigration hucksters that we have closed our doors to foreigners who come to this country temporarily to transact business, to visit or to work here, or to study. Let us again take a look at the figures. In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 26,288 foreign government officials, 68,696 foreign businessmen, 27,192 foreign students, well over 18,000 actors, artists, lecturers, writers, press, radio and television reporters, 16,077 foreign trainees who came to our colleges, hospitals, laboratories and similar institutions. If addition to these, an imposing total of 332,394 persons came here to visit. Each of the figures which I have just cited represents a 10 to 20 percent increase over the preceding year which in turn represented a similar increase over the fiscal year 1953.

You have also heard much about the "inadequacy" of our total immigration quota. The truth is that due to the extremely liberal treatment we accord under the existing law to natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere and to all wives, husbands, and children of American citizens—regardless of race, color and place of birth—our annual immigration quota has become but a basic premise from which we operate. Nonquota immigration represents almost double the number of immigrants which we admit under the quota.

In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 82,232 immigrants under the quota and 155,558 immigrants outside the quota. Of the latter only 29,002 came under the Refugee Relief Act.

The numerically unrestricted nonquota immigration is rising constantly. Here are the figures. In 1951 we admitted 49,170 as nonquota immigrants; in 1952—71,273, in 1953—86,259, in 1954—114,079, and in 1955—155,558 nonquota immigrants.

It is safe to predict that in the current fiscal year, we will pass the 200,000 mark of nonquota admissions.

What little bearing the alleged inadequacy of our immigration quota has on the actual number of those who come to this country, is best illustrated by one example. You have heard much about the immigration quotas for the people of Asia. What you probably have not heard is the fact that during the last fiscal year, well over 2,000 Chinese and 2,489 Japanese came to the United States as nonquota immigrants, although the quota for Chinese persons is 105 and Japan's quota is 185. Thus, nonquota immigration from these two countries exceeds the annual quota 10 to 22 times.

THE MEXICAN INFLUX

The most remarkable increase in the number of immigrants coming outside the quota is immigration from Mexico. This is reflected in the amazing increases of 128, 347, and 525 percent, for 1953, 1954, and 1955, respectively, over the annual average of the years between 1946 and 1952. In other words, we are admitting now annually six times as many nonquota immigrants from Mexico as we were admitting in any earlier fiscal year prior to the enactment of the present immigration law.

The great increase in Mexican immigration in the last 2 years is caused to a large extent, undoubtedly, by the closing of our southern border to illegal entrants, which had assumed the alarming total of over 1 million in the fiscal year 1954 alone. In the first instance, thousands of Mexicans who had married American citizens and had American citizen children were living as respected members of their communities despite their original illegal entries. Many of these returned voluntarily to Mexico in the face of the Immigration and Naturalization Service drive for the purpose of obtaining immigration visas, passing inspection, and

reentering this country in order to pursue the road toward American citizenship.

Others who had repeatedly entered the United States illegally in the past now faced the necessity of making a legal entry into this country, which includes the method of obtaining an immigration visa for permanent residence. The latter class is swelled by the present operation of the Mexican bracero program under which, except for a small percentage of individuals, the two Governments concerned have not established a mutual system whereby the recontracting and reemployment from year to year of a bracero can be assured. We know that a bracero wants to come to this country and earn American dollars. If both Governments can agree on a method to stabilize the Mexican labor force and if the bracero is assured that he will be able to come to this country for an unlimited number of times to work, I am certain that he will be content to stay in Mexico and remain a Mexican citizen.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is now engaged in a unilateral operation seeking to achieve this desirable result. Under that system the bracero is inspected, reports concerning him are screened, and if he is found acceptable and satisfactory in all respects, including from the security standpoint, he receives a laminated identification card I–100. This is issued to him with the hope that he will again be selected by his Government the following year for agricultural work in the United States.

Recent reports have been received that in one locality a group of aliens on a farm endeavored to foment unrest among the braceros employed there. None of the suspected subversive aliens in this group was in possession of the laminated identification card. Similar instances have occurred in the past. It is obvious that the protection to the United States which the identification card provides against entries of such aliens, who have infiltrated the bracero program for ulterior or sinister purposes, is essential in the interest of national security.

The Department of State informed me just a few days ago that nonquota visas issued to Mexican nationals will increase this year by 693 percent above the 1946 to 1952 level. This means that we will admit seven times as many Mexican immigrants as we admitted in any single year before the present immigration law became effective.

In 1 single workday, our consuls in Mexico are issuing a peak of 324 visas. This simply means that if our consuls in Mexico work 8 hours a day—allowing a few minutes for a coffee break or a chat with the staff—they are issuing in Mexico 1 immigration visa every minute. However, they are also busy issuing visas to Mexican visitors, and in the last fiscal year they were doing that at the rate of 76,870 visas per year, plus approximately the same number of border-crossing cards, and plus 367,461 cards to Mexican agricultural workers coming to this country.

It would take too long and it would be too tedious to burden you with more figures, but as you may readily visualize, the increase in the number of entries from Mexico—lawful entries only, mind you—reflect a truly vertiginous rise. A graphic chart which the Department of State sent to my office the other day depicts immigration from Mexico in an almost vertically rising line.

What I have not seen as yet is a graphic chart which could reflect in a similarly rising line a like increase in our school facilities, available job opportunities, housing, and four-lane highways.

THE EISENHOWER PROPOSAL

Now, despite all the facts which I have just presented to you, we find President Eisenhower coming before the Congress and recommending, in a message dated February 8, 1956, that the volume of annual immigration intake be considerably increased, possibly trebled.

First, President Eisenhower proposed that we accept the census of 1950 as a new basis for the allocation of annual quotas. That proposal if enacted into law, would by itself mean that our present annual quota of 154,657 immigrants would be increased to 220,000 annually.

Second, in addition to recommending an increase in the total annual quota, President Eisenhower recommends that quota numbers not used by countries to which they are originally allocated, would be made available for use elsewhere. This proposal, if enacted into law, would mean that at all times, all of the annual quota will be actually used although right now, due to the fact that Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and a few other countries do not provide a sufficient number of immigrants, there is seldom more than 60 percent of the total quota used in any single fiscal year.

Third, the President recommends that we wipe out the so-called mortgage imposed on about a dozen immigration quotas for the purpose of deducting from the annual arrivals a prorated number of displaced persons already admitted to this country. This would have a net effect of adding about 8,000 immigrants annually.

Fourth, the President does not recommend any change in the present very liberal provisions under which immigrants are admitted outside of the quota.

If we add these figures together, we see that the President's proposal will have the net effect of increasing our present annual immigration intake by well over 100 percent, and this estimate does not take into consideration the possibility of a further increase in the nonquota immigration from Mexico. If we consider this, too, it is obvious that what President Eisenhower is really advocating is a trebling of our annual immigration. Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, admitted it in his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

There is another consideration involved in President Eisenhower's proposals. If we heed his advice regarding the change of the census base and if we continue to follow the same course of action after the census of 1960 is taken and again after the census of 1970, I believe that it would be entirely safe to assume that by, say 1980, we will have much difficulty making ourselves understood in the English language in some parts of this country.

The distribution of immigrants in the United States represents a growing problem. According to a report prepared at the request of the great statesman who is now the Governor of the State of New York, 33 percent of all immigrants entering under the 1953 law remain in New York and according to other reports, as many as 75 percent of all aliens in this country reside in 9 States out of the 48. When the Immigration and Naturalization Service reviewed the postcards received in 1955, under the alien address reports program, they found that all but 20 percent of the resident aliens live in the following States in this order: New York, California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio.

Do not overlook, please, that the most recent figures released by the Department of Labor place—with the exception of California and Texas—all the areas affected with the highest figures of unemployed in exactly those States.

SOME FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Is it wise to permit at the present time the entry of well over half a million immigrants annually? I do not believe that it would be advisable to embark upon such a venture without having first a good look at both the domestic and the international ramifications of such a decision.

The United States is today the richest country in the world. Our standards of living are undoubtedly the highest in the world with the possible exception of but one country—and that one, Switzerland, is a country practicing the most restrictive immigration policy in the entire world.

With the population growth on the rampage all over the world and with the ensuing lowering of standards of living in the overcrowded countries of Europe and Asia, in the absence of any sustained effort on the part of most countries to have their food production increased and also their industrial capacity, the favorable conditions prevailing in our country have upon the hungry and unemployed masses the effect of a magnet placed near a heap of steel shavings.

Obviously, millions and millions of people are attracted by American prosperity and the opportunities which it offers. It is unfair to blame anyone for wanting to come to our shores, but is it wise to create in this country a problem of unassimilable surplus population on top of the problems created by our fast rising birth rate? Is it wise to bring in more people before we arrange our economy so as to take care of the present 3 million average additional citizens born in this country every year? I have no doubt that the United States has ceased to be what international migration experts call an area of resettlement.

Of course, we can afford to extend our hospitality to a sizable number of victims of totalitarian persecution. We can well live up to our tradition of opening the doors of the land of the free to people who love freedom and want to remain free. Many of those have already joined forces with us in our struggle for survival which we are waging against the cunning attack of a godless conspiracy. Many more want to come to our shores in their quest for asylum. We shall welcome them, although we would expect other free nations to do likewise, and we would expect that they stop insisting that we take once again an unproportionate share of political refugees.

It is also true that we can afford to permit immigrant families to be united and to bring their closest relatives. The present immigration law has been written with that thought ever present in the minds of its authors.

But—we must resist with courage and determination the attempt to convert this country into a disorganized, multilingual, overcrowded dumping ground for the unwanted rejects of the rulers of those countries who selfishly refuse, or neglect, to cope with the problem of their own fast growing population. We must tell those governments that after having spent approximately $50 billion of our taxpayers' hard-earned money to rehabilitate their lands, we would expect them to provide employment and food, to provide improved farmland and modernized industry for their own people instead of conveniently, yes, brutally, seeking to simply "get rid" of them and "send them to America."

Overcrowded and impoverished, torn apart internally by conflicting ideological concepts of uprooted immigrants swarming across our sea and land borders in excessive numbers, the United States could not maintain its present position in the world. The United States will be unable to stay strong, to remain the bulwark of liberty, the standard bearer of the free world and humanity's last reservoir of spiritual and material strength able to repel the onslaught of the atomic age Huns. We must resist the invasion in our own interest as well as in the interest of those who need our assistance.

This Nation cannot afford to play the immigration numbers game. The stakes are too high.

Effort To Admit Communist China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Col. Stanley K. Hornbeck has written very interestingly, in the National Bulletin of the Military Order of the World Wars, on the subject of Red China Does Not Qualify; and the United States Should Say "No."

This is an article which should be read by all Americans, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the major aims of the Communist world today is to effect admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The move to achieve that aim is being given momentum both within the United Nations and outside of that organization.

Among those engaged in this campaign there are strange affiliations. Along with the Communists, many people who are opposed to communism raise their voices and exert themselves in support of the contention that, Communist China being a fact, the government which controls it should be accorded seats in the United Nations.

Many of these people look to the United Nations as an organization—in fact the organization—through which world peace and collective security are to be achieved. They seem not to realize that the aims and methods of Communist China are utterly inconsistent with the purposes, the character and the composition of the United Nations as set forth in its charter. China is an "original" (a founder) member of the United Nations. China's National Government has seats in the United Nations. Communist China does not qualify as a peace loving state or as a state inclined to "accept the obligations contained in the charter" and "able and willing to carry out these obligations." Communist China has in fact made war on the United Nations in Korea (and has been declared by the United Nations to be an aggressor). Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would cotravene both the spirit of the charter and the letter of several of the express provisions of that constitutional document. It would be detrimental to the good name, the interests and the capabilities of the United Nations. It would increase the prestige and capabilities of the Communist empire and would diminish those of the free world.

The people and the Government of the United States should oppose all this with all the vigor and by every means at our disposal.

Fundamental in the making and the activities of our Nation and State have been, first, belief in the reality of a body of natural, moral or divinely ordained law, and second, a practical application of principles evolved and expounded in the precepts of Christian doctrine. We believe in human freedom and in government by and under law. Thanks to many favorable factors, the United States has become a great power. Thanks—or no thanks—to developments in world affairs, there have devolved upon it great responsibilities. Because of its emphasis on the right of men and nations to be free, and because of its possession of material and moral strength, other free peoples and peoples seeking to be free look to it today for honest leadership in the cause of freedom. To give such leadership, we, our people and our Government must—first, last and always—be true to our American heritage of concepts and principles, and to the commitments which we ourselves have made.

American policymakers have declared over and over, and not alone during the present administration, that the United States will judge other countries and governments by their deeds rather than by their words. American public opinion endorses that declaration. As one judges, however, so is one judged. The world will judge the United States by its performance in relation to all of its commitments, formal and informal, multilateral, bilateral, and unilateral. One such commitment, unilateral, is that which was made when, in 1947, President Truman declared: "I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures." Another, bilateral, is that which was made in and by the mutual defense treaty concluded by the present administration a year ago with Free China (i. e., the Republic of China). And we have many other such, including our commitment as a member of the United Nations.

An assent by our Government to admission of Communist China to the United Nations would be a betrayal of our principles and a dishonoring of our commitments.

Our delegation in the United Nations has found and will find many other nations lined up against us on this issue. The United States cannot insist that other states subscribe to its principles or they that live, think, and act as it would wish. In many instances it has to tolerate conduct of which it thoroughly disapproves. It can, however, oppose, and it is under no compulsion to give assent to such. It should refuse to give even a tacit assent to violation by the United Nations of provisions of its own charter. It should not dodge the issue by preserving silence or by abstention from voting.

No matter by what process it might be effected, or with what guaranties, recognition by the United States of China's Central Peoples Government (i. e., the Government of Communist China) either in or out of the United Nations, while that Government persists in attitudes and practices utterly unlawful and utterly hostile to us and to the free world, would compromise the United States in the eyes of all people—even those who urge that we take that step and those who think they would profit from our taking it.

As matters now stand in world affairs, continuance of our recognition and support of China's National Government is in line with American commitments, with the overall purposes of American policy, and with our efforts on behalf of peace, security, freedom, and justice. It serves a broad moral purpose and particular political and strategic purposes. It signifies to all concerned that the United States is truly committed to the policy of supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation and that we can be counted on to honor our commitments.

In the quest for ways and means by which to promote the cause of peace, the question of keeping faith is of paramount importance. In the current quest for new agreements, with its emphasis on processes of give and take, what could be sounder than an understanding at all stages and by all concerned, that the United States, while prepared to negotiate and, if need be, to bargain, with a view to making new commitments, intends to stand by its existing commitments and will withhold from any trading that it may do both those commitments and the principles which underlie them?

The Retailers' Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 1, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a brief concerning the retailers' excise tax which was prepared by the Kansas Pharmaceutical Association. I am certain all Members of Congress will find the brief of vital interest.

THE RETAILERS' EXCISE TAX

THE PROBLEM

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and of previous years provides, and has provided, for the collection, by retailers, of certain "luxury taxes" on items sold by the retailers. Formerly the tax was at the rate of 20 percent of the price at which the item was sold, and at current writing the tax is at the rate of 10 percent.

The retailers' excise tax is required by the following enactments (1954 IRC). All section numbers are reference to the Prentice Hall edition of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, since the official IRC is not immediately available.

Jewelry and related items

SEC. 4001. Imposition of tax: There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold:

All articles commonly or commercially known as jewelry, whether real or imitation.

Pearls, precious and semiprecious stones, and imitations thereof.

Articles made of, or ornamented, mounted or fitted with precious metals or imitations thereof.

Watches.

Clocks.

Cases and movements for watches and clocks.

Gold, gold-plated, silver, or sterling flatware or hollow ware and silver-plated hollow ware.

Opera glasses.
Lorgenettes.
Marine glasses.
Field glasses.
Binoculars.

SEC. 4002. Definition of sale includes auctions: For the purpose of section 4001, the term "articles sold at retail" includes an article sold at retail by an auctioneer or other agent in the course of his business on behalf of (1) a person who is not engaged in the business of selling like articles, or (2) the legal representative of the estate of a decedent who was not engaged in the business of selling like articles. In the case of articles so sold, the auctioneer or other agent shall be considered the "person who sells at retail."

SEC. 4003. Exemptions: (a) Specific articles.—The tax imposed by section 4001 shall not apply to any article used for religious purposes, to surgical instruments, to watches designed especially for use by the blind, to frames or mountings for spectacles or eyeglasses, to a fountain pen, mechanical pencil, or smokers' pipe if the only parts of the pen, the pencil, or the pipe which consist of precious metals are essential parts not used for ornamental purposes, or to buttons, insignia, cap devices, chin straps, and other devices prescribed for use in connection with the uniforms of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Furs

SEC. 4011. Imposition of tax: There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold: Articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value, but only if such value is more than three times the value of the next most valuable component material.

Toilet preparations

SEC. 4021. Imposition of tax: There is hereby imposed upon the articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold: Perfume, essences, extracts, toilet waters, cosmetics, petroleum jellies, hair oils, pomades, hair dressings, hair restoratives, hair dyes, aromatic cachous, toilet powders.

Any other similar substance, article, or preparation, by whatsoever name known or distinguished; any of the above which are used or applied or intended to be used or applied for toilet purposes.

SEC. 4022. Exemptions: (a) Items for babies: The tax imposed by section 4021 shall not apply to lotion, oil, powder, or other articles intended to be used or applied only in the care of babies.

(b) Barber shops and beauty parlors: For the purposes of section 4021, the sale of any article described in such section to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof, or for resale, shall not be considered as a sale at retail. The resale of such article at retail by such person shall be subject to the provisions of section 4021.

(c) Miniature samples: For the purposes of section 4021, the sale of miniature samples of any article described in such section for demonstration use only to a house-to-house salesman by the manufacturer or distributor, shall not be considered as a sale at retail. The resale of such sample at retail by such house-to-house salesman shall be subject to the provisions of section 4021.

Luggage, handbags, etc.

SEC. 4031. Imposition of tax: There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail (including in each case fittings or accessories therefor sold on or in connection with the sale thereof) a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold: Trunks, valises, traveling bags, suitcases, satchels overnight bags, hat boxes for use by travelers, beach bags, bathing suit bags, brief cases made of leather or imitation leather, salesmen's sample and display cases, purses, handbags, pocketbooks, wallets, billfolds, cards, pass and key cases, toilet cases, other cases, bags, and kits (without regard to size, shape, construction, or material from which made) for use in carrying toilet articles or articles of wearing apparel.

Special provisions applicable to retailers tax

SEC. 4051. Definition of price: In determining, for the purposes of this chapter, the price for which an article is sold, there shall be included any charge for coverings and containers of whatever nature, and any charge incident to placing the article in condition packed ready for shipment, but there shall be excluded the amount of tax imposed by this chapter, whether or not stated as a separate charge. A transportation, delivery, insurance, installation, or other charge (not required by the foregoing sentence to be included) shall be excluded from the price only if the amount thereof is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate, in accordance with the regulations. There shall also be excluded, if stated as a separate charge, the amount of any retail sales tax imposed by any State or Territory or political subdivision of the foregoing, or the District of Columbia, whether the liability for such tax is imposed on the vendor or the vendee.

SEC. 4052. Lease considered sale: For the purposes of this chapter, the lease of an article shall be considered the sale of such article.

SEC. 4053. Computation of tax on installment sales, etc.: In the case of (1) a lease, (2) a contract for the sale of an article wherein it is provided that the price shall be paid by installments and title to the article sold does not pass until a future date notwithstanding partial payment by installments, (3) a conditional sale, or (4) a chattel mortgage arrangement wherein it is provided there shall be paid upon each payment with respect to the article tht portion of he total tax which is proportionate to the portion of the total amount to be paid represented by such payment.

The above quoted sections of the Internal Revenue Code therefore require shopkeepers, merchants and druggists to collect from retail purchases an additional percentage (10 percent at present), return the same and remit such tax to the various collectors of internal revenue at regular intervals. The law seems so inoffensive and simple; the application of the law, however, presents innumerable problems, both as to the operations of the retailers and as to the enforcement thereof by the local Internal Revenue Agents and Deputy Collectors.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RETAILERS' EXCISE TAX

A. The merchant: The law states that the retailer shall collect 10 percent of the sale price and remit same to the Internal Revenue. This would, indeed, be simple if the entire stock of the merchant consisted of taxable items or if the store were a small, slow-moving, one-man operation. However, this is not the case.

In almost every instance the merchant, who is required to collect and remit the tax, handles hundreds of nontaxable items, and the taxable items constitute a very small part of his stock and inventory. This is particularly true in the case of the druggist and pharmacist; this is also true in the case of grocery stores, supermarkets, hardware stores, and general mercantile stores. For nearly all of these merchants the "luxury" taxed items constitute, to a great extent, a mere service to the community in which they are located and the actual profit from the sale of these items, over and above expenses of the store's operations, would in all likelihood, be relatively small. However, as to each of them, the public expects them to carry these items for their convenience and if they are not so carried the public frequently is vocally indignant.

The druggist and pharmacist, in serving his public, therefore feels that he must carry these items and, like the average American citizen, he tries the best he can to collect the tax as he understands it and honestly to remit and turn over to the Internal Revenue his collections.

In order to do his duty as a patriotic and loyal American citizen he attempts to instruct his clerks and employees, many of whom are high school and college students working part time in order to receive their educations, concerning the intricacies of the retailers' excise tax. He inquires of the local representatives of the Internal Revenue Service about the items upon which he must collect the tax. The information he receives is very inadequate since he is informed by the Internal Revenue Service that the local office has no list of such items. He is told that he must use his own judgment and, in effect, he is told to "do the best you can." With this meager information he attemps to explain to his employees that they must collect a 10 percent tax on "toilet preparations" and that they must collect a 10 percent tax on "any other similar substance, articles or preparation by whatsoever name known or distinguished" and upon any of the named items "which are used or applied or intended to be used or applied for toilet preparation." We are certain that such instructions make a lot of sense to an 18-year-old youngster working his or her way through junior college.

The same situation prevails when the druggist attempts to instruct his employees concerning the collection of the tax on luggage, and handbags, and billfolds, and other named items. We are certain that it is very clear to the employees as to exactly what they must do when the druggist instructs them that they must collect 10 percent tax on "other cases, bags, and kits (without regard to size, shape, construction, or material from which made) for use in carrying toilet articles or articles of wearing apparel."

If, however, the druggist also handles jewelry he must instruct his employees concerning the collection of the tax on jewelry and he must warn them not to collect the tax on a "fountain pen, mechanical pencil, or smoker's pipe if the only part of the pen, pencil, or the pipe which consist of precious metals are essential parts not used for ornamental purposes."

With these instructions, which are so clear to us and to the druggist and the pharmacist, the employees are prepared to do their loyal duty to their employer and to the Internal Revenue Service and, undoubtedly, they dutifully collect the tax. It is obvious, therefore, that there is no reason why this tax cannot be collected accurately since it is a clear and understandable tax and since the employees undoubtedly have nothing other to do than to meet their customers, ascertain their wants, watch out for pilfering, arrange their stocks and attempt to keep both their employer and the general public in a reasonably happy mood in addition to worrying and thinking about their individual problems, all of this being done under the normal pressures of modern business life.

In addition to the straight 10 percent which the employer and the employees must collect, the Internal Revenue, in an effort to be fair, has provided for different taxes on certain items such as hair-care kits or home-permanent kits. A tax is collected on the sale of these items, but it is not on the basis of 10 percent of the sales price. There has developed and is developing a lengthy list of items on which the tax is computed not at the rate of 10 percent but on some sort of a formula which has been arrived at by conferences between the manufacturer and the Internal Revenue Service in Washington. By way of comment the local Internal Revenue offices are unable to advise the druggist or pharmacist concerning these items and again the merchant must "do the best he can."

As the tax is collected on each item the problem of accounting arises. In some instances where the merchant has invested in a fairly inexpensive cash register costing only $400 or $500, he finds that no provision has been made to ring up his sales price, State sales tax, and Federal excise tax on the cash register. Upon inquiry he finds he can purchase such a machine for around $2,000. However, since he has no such a machine, he attempts to provide 2 boxes beside each cash register, 1 for the State sales tax and the other for the Federal excise tax. At the end of the day, around 11 p. m. or midnight, it is simple to arrive at the amount of tax due to both the State and the Federal Governments; that is, it is simple if he and his employees have remembered in each instance to put the actual sales price in the cash register, the excise tax in the excise-tax box, and the sales tax in the sales-tax box without getting confused while attempting to wait on and satisfy several impatient customers at the same time.

Assuming, however, he and his employees are perfect throughout the year, he still has the problem of proving that he has dutifully collected and remitted his tax to the revenue agent, who is ordered to check his records and to determine whether or not the merchant

has truly collected and remitted. And the merchant had better be ready to prove himself or stand ready to suffer severe penalties, including fraud charges and the penitentiary, not to mention civil assessments, penalties, and interest.

The small merchant possibly would be in a better position to prove his honesty if he employed certified public accountants to make monthly audits of his stock and to attempt to balance the stock purchases, the inventory on his shelves, and the sales made during the month with the amount of taxes that he has in his excise-tax box. This obviously would require a time-consuming inventory count and audit, and the accountant's services, in most instances, are worth, and they are paid, from $7.50 to $10 per hour. There is no way to estimate the amount of time which would be required in an average drugstore or pharmacy to arrive at an accurate accounting of the excise tax. The merchant, obviously, would pay more for accounting services than the tax he would be required to pay. He would, however, be in a better position to protect himself from fraud charges and civil liabilities and penalties.

The more fortunate drugstore operator who has invested approximately $2,000 in his cash register can at least show the revenue agent his tapes from his cash register and can show that tax was collected, and he can even show that he remitted to the internal revenue the total amount of tax which the tape indicates he owes. Even this merchant, however, cannot show that his employees have collected and rung up the tax due on each item sold through his store. To do this he, too, must show a balance of taxable stock purchased, taxable stock sold, and taxable stock still on his shelves. If he fails to do so, he, too, faces the possibility of criminal charges and civil penalties and tax liabilities, and it is entirely possible that his clerks and employees, in order to be right, have charged the purchasing public a 10-percent excise tax on every item in their particular department, irrespective of whether or not a tax was due on many of the items.

It should be obvious, from a practical standpoint, that this tax is awkward and expensive for the retailer who is required to collect it or face the penalties for his failure to do so. The retailer is almost entirely at the mercy of his employees since he, not they, is the responsible party and must suffer the consequences of their activities.

At the same time the druggist or pharmacist is well aware that many grocery stores, barber shops, beauty parlors, and sundry mercantile stores do not collect the tax; many of these are honestly unaware of the fact that they are required to do so by Federal law. The druggist and pharmacist, however, are aware of this law and always have been aware of it, and have attempted to cooperate with the provisions which apply to them to the best of their ability and knowledge, since all druggists and pharmacists have been advised of their responsibility by the various State and national pharmaceutical associations. The others, who are not druggists or pharmacists, in many instances do not belong to any such organizations which provide them with this type of information.

To this scrivener it is indeed amazing that the American pharmacist and druggist can keep his shop or store open from 6:30 or 7:30 a. m. until 11 p. m. or midnight, be on his feet all day long accurately making up his prescriptions, some of which mean the difference between life and death to his customers, oversee his employees, wait on his drug item customers, advise and consult with medical practitioners concerning dosages of drugs for patients, order his stocks, interview salespeople and wholesalers, keep up his payrolls, withhold his withholding tax and his F. I. C. A., accurately report and pay his unemployment insurance contributions, accurately report and pay his State sales tax, pay his mortgages, pay his State income tax, pay his Federal income tax, including his quarterly estimates, and remember at the same time to collect his luxury tax on this item and not to collect it on another, although both are similar in nature, and accurately report and pay in accordance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, all while he is attempting to be a good local citizen and to pay all of his local taxes and at the same time attempt to lead what might appear to be a normal life for an American man or woman. Yes, it is amazing, but that is what he must do or suffer criminal charges and/or civil penalties and fines.

B. The Internal Revenue agent: For the Internal Revenue agent it would appear, on the first reading of the law, that it would be simple to ascertain the tax which the merchant should have collected and should have remitted to the Collector of Internal Revenue. However, in the performance of his duties the honest and sincere agent inevitably encounters situations which he cannot resolve either in favor of the Government or in favor of the merchant without considerable misgivings. If he arrives at the tax due from the expensive cash register tape, he still will not be satisfied in his own mind that a tax was collected on each and every sale. Undoubtedly without checking further he could well have a feeling or suspicion that all of the tax was not "rung up", if collected, or a feeling or suspicion that the tax was neither collected nor "rung up". The only way he can possibly arrive at a conclusion which would meet the demands of his own honesty and of his duty to the Government would be for him to make a complete audit of the period in question, usually that of 1 year.

If he decides to make the audit, or if he is instructed to do so, he presents himself to the druggest and requests the list of taxable items of merchandise which has been purchased from cosmetic houses, jewelry houses, and other wholesalers or jobbers. He is handed an enormous stack of tickets and invoices and the agent then retires to attempt to determine how many taxable items were purchased by the merchant during the year in question.

No sooner does the agent start going through the invoices than he finds that he does not know what items should be taxed or the amount of tax which should be collected on each and every item since the invoices only show the cost to the druggist and not the sales price. The agent does not have a list of the taxable items so, rather shamefacedly, he must ask the druggist which of the items are taxable. He then must attempt to determine the sales price which the druggist received on the sale of each and every item. Then the agent must attempt to arrive at how much taxable stock the druggist had on his shelves at the beginning of the period and how much taxable stock he had on his shelves at the end of the period. Then the agent must attempt to guess what the sales of the druggist were during the period in question, after deducting breakage, pilferage, and unsalable merchandise which was returned to the wholesaler or jobber together with other unsalable items that were merely thrown into the trash heap or given to the Salvation Army.

This scrivener has been informed that in one particular instance one revenue agent quit because of the impossibility of the job and another agent was discharged for his failure or inability to do the job which he felt should be done. Still another agent wound up a report and audit on one druggist, with apologies, since he was approaching his retirement age and dared not fail to make some sort of a report.

A typical example of an audit in the handwriting of an agent is photostated and attached hereto. This computation is a masterpiece of guesswork and gross inaccuracies but the merchant involved, nonetheless, was required to and did pay the additional tax and penalty indicated thereon. He was informed by a local collector that if he did not, his bank account, stock, and store would be seized. He was also informed that he could not afford to contest the assessment since it would cost him more in accounting fees and attorney's fees than the amount involved. Needless to say, he paid.

Another druggist who happened to have an opening inventory and a closing inventory and who happened to have the expensive type of cash register informed the agents, who called at his store, of those facts and they cleared him without any audit. In either instance the agent or agents could not be remotely certain as to whether the tax was underpaid or overpaid. They were, however, fairly certain that they would have had considerable difficulty with the druggist who had the opening inventory, the closing inventory and the cash-register tape. This druggist also employed accountants at considerable expense to "keep him in the clear." In the first example shown, which is represented by the agent's work sheet, the agent, in order to arrive at other years, merely multiplied the tax by 3 in order to cover a 3-year period. No audit of the other years was made and he merely guessed that the tax would have been the same if he had made an audit. This agent had to do something and the druggist paid with the theoretical gun in the ribs.

As an afterthought, the druggist recomputed some of the figures taken off the invoices by the agent. The druggist found that the agent, in his confusion and through his lack of knowledge, had charged the druggist with refunds or credits given the druggist by the wholesaler and had assessed the druggist with a tax computed thereon as though such refunds or credits had been purchases.

These instances are cited, not to embarrass any revenue agent or deputy collector and not to embarrass the Internal Revenue Service. It is generally considered that most of the representatives from the Service are honest and sincere and attempt to do a conscientious job to the best of their ability.

These instances are emphatically cited, however, to point out the awkwardness and unfairness of this method of collecting the luxury taxes. It appears rather unfair to impose this type of burden upon certain of our small merchants, the numbers of whom are few when considering all retail outlets. It is also unfair to our revenue agents and deputy collectors who have the duty imposed upon them to enforce the collection of these taxes. Both the druggist and the agent or deputy collector consider this type of taxation an impractical nuisance and both admit that the Government is not receiving the revenue to which it should be entitled. Both admit that the amount of taxes which the Government is collecting unnecessarily leaves behind it considerable ill temper, displeasure, and amazement over the fact that our American Government cannot devise a more workable system for the collection of the luxury taxes. Instinctively both the merchants involved and the deputy collector or agents realize that the hardship and confusion arising out of the collection and administration of the retail sales excise tax is disproportionate to the amount of tax collected. They conclude that the tax should be abolished or that a more efficient means of collection and administration should be devised.

CONCLUSION

This brief is not dedicated to the proposition that the luxury taxes should be abolished. We make no contention here that there is no need for the proceeds from the

collections of the luxury taxes, since such determination should be advanced and made only by those who have a more intimate knowledge of the needs of our Government. We do not represent that we have such knowledge and we must assume that there is a need for taxes on items which have been found by act of Congress to be luxuries. Neither do we propose to argue that this item is a luxury and that item is not, even though we feel that perhaps a tax on a salesman's sample and display case, which is a necessary part of the salesman's equipment with which he earns his living, is as fair as a tax on a beach bag. It also appears rather incongruous to find that Sen-Sen is taxable but Life Savers and gum are not. We only mention these examples to point out the fact that the present retail sales excise tax is full of inequities and confusion.

It is our purpose, however, to suggest and to respectfully urge a change in the administration and method of collection of this very awkward tax. The reasons which we cite to support our position have been covered above to some extent. Obviously, the above discussion does not attempt to cover all of the inequitable situations which have and will arise under the present law.

We propose and suggest that the excise tax on luxury items be removed from the retailers and that they be placed on the manufacturer at the manufacturer's level. This suggestion, of course, is not new since by far the greater amount of taxable items and taxes collected thereon are received from the proceeds of a tax upon the sale of articles and items by the manufacturer, producer or importer, at the manufacturer's level.

We find that a tax at the manufacturer's, producer's, and importer's level is collected on the following items: Automobiles; tires and tubes; gasoline; lubricating oil; household type refrigerators; household type quick freezers; combinations of household refrigerators and deep freeze units; air conditioning units; electric, gas, or oil water heaters; electric flatirons; electric air heaters (not including furnaces); electric immersion heaters; electric blankets, sheets, and spreads; electric, gas, or oil appliances of the type used for cooking, warming, or keeping warm food or beverages for consumption on the premises; electric mixers, whippers, and juicers; electric belt-driven fans; electric exhaust blowers; electric or gas clothes driers; electric door chimes; electric dehumidifiers; electric dishwashers; electric floor polishers and waxers; electric food choppers and grinders; electric hedge trimmers; electric ice cream freezers; electric mangles; electric pants pressers; electric garbage disposal units; power lawn mowers; badminton nets, rackets and racket frames (measuring 22 inches overall or more in length), racket string, shuttlecocks, and standards; billiard and pool tables (measuring 45 inches overall or more in length) and balls and cues for such tables; bowling balls and pins; clay pigeons and traps for throwing clay pigeons; cricket balls and bats; croquet balls and mallets; curling stones; deck tennis rings, nets and posts; fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits and flies; computing machines; coin counters; dictographs; dictating machines; dictating machine, record shaving machines; duplicating machines; embossing machines; envelope opening machines; erasing machines; folding machines; fanfold machines; fare registers and boxes; listing machines; line-a-time and similar machines; mailing machines; multigraph machines, typesetting machines and type justifying machines; numbering machines; golf bags (measuring 26 inches or more in length) balls and clubs (measuring 30 inches or more in length); lacrosse balls and sticks; polo balls and mallets; skis, ski poles, snowshoes, and snow toboggans and sleds (measuring mor than 60 inches overall in length); squash balls, rackets, and racket frames (measuring 22 inches overall or more in length), and racket string; table tennis tables, balls, net, and paddles; tennis balls, nets, rackets, and frames (measuring 22 inches overall or more in length) and racket string; radio receiving sets; automobile radio receiving sets; television receiving sets; automobile television receiving sets; phonographs; combinations of any of the foregoing; radio and television components; phonograph records; cameras; camera lens; unexposed photographic film in rolls (including motion picture film); electric motion or still picture projectors of the household type; pistols; revolvers; firearms (other than pistols and revolvers); shells, and cartridges; adding machines; addressing machines; autographic registers; bank proof machines; billing machines; cigarette, cigar, and pipe lighters; mechanical pencils, fountain pens and ball point pens; bookkeeping machines; calculating machines; card punch machines; cash registers; change making machines; check writing, signing, canceling, perforating, cutting, and dating machines and other check protector machine devices; portable paper fastening machines; payroll machines; pencil sharpeners; postal permit mailing machines; punch card machines; sorting machines; stencil cutting machines; shorthand writing machines; sealing machines; tabulating machines; ticket counting machines; ticket issuing machines; typewriters; transcribing machines; time recording devices; combinations of any of the foregoing.

And possibly last, but definitely not the least, there is a tax of 2 cents per thousand matches upon the sale by the manufacturer, producer, and importer of matches, except that in the case of fancy wooden matches the tax is 5½ cents per thousand matches.

It may be contended that there would be great difficulty in collecting luxury tax through the manufacturer of hair oils and hairdressings and toilet powders. It might be contended that there would be great difficulty in collecting luxury tax on watches and clocks. However, we cannot believe that there would be any more difficulty in collecting a tax on such luxury items than there is at the present time in collecting a tax on an electric blanket, at the manufacturer's level. It is obvious that the matter of policing the collection and reporting of taxes at the maufacturer's, producer's, or importer's level would place a much smaller burden on our Internal Revenue Service. At the present time our Kansas collector of internal revenue has in excess of 800 druggists and pharmacists establishments to police. We do not attempt to calculate the number of hardware stores, beauty parlors, barbershops, and sundries stores which should be policed and audited by our Kansas Internal Revenue Service. It is obvious that to do so conscientiously would be an impossible job requiring a tremendous number of internal revenue deputy collectors and agents.

On the other hand a tax at the level of the manufacturer, producer, or importer is now being fairly well policed by the Internal Revenue Service throughout the country. We do not feel that a substitution of the present retailer's excise tax for a tax at the manufacturer's level would increase the number of agents but it would, in all likelihood, decrease the present staffs or, at least, it would free these overworked men for more important duties.

We do not contend that our motives in urging a change of the tax from the retailer's level to the manufacturer's level is done solely for the benefit of the Internal Revenue Service, even though this would be a natural result. Quite the contrary.

We do contend that the retailer, the public, the revenue agents and collectors, and the United States Treasury all would benefit. To the druggist and pharmacist for whom we speak it would result in a reduction of the hours which he must spend in collecting the tax, accounting for the tax, in instructing his employees as to the intricacies of the code, and in the number of hours which he would spend with deputy collectors going over his accounts and in attempting to convince the collector of his honesty. It would eliminate one of the many nuisance duties that the pharmacist and druggist must perform both for the Federal Government and the State government. It would eliminate the hours of worry which he spends in wondering whether or not his employees have collected and accounted for the tax. It would eliminate the hours of worry and nervous tension he undergoes during an audit by a deputy collector or while awaiting a threatened audit.

As has been stated it most cetainly would reduce the number of hours and days that a deputy collector would spend if he could check and audit the source of supply instead of being required to check the prints of distribution. It most certainly would result in a greater amount of tax being paid to the United States Treasury, if the tax were collected from businesses and institutions large enough to bear the burden and cost of the extra accounting which would be required.

It might be argued that a 10-percent tax at the manufacturer's level would not produce sufficient revenue. If all the taxes due now were being collected under the present system, possibly this would be true. Assuming, however, that all of the taxes now are being collected under the present system, the same total net tax could be collected at the manufacturer's level, if, in most instances the tax were increased to a 5 percent at the manufacturer's level, making the tax 15 percent. For example, let us assume that a present item is sold by the manufacturer at $1 to the retailer, that the retailer sells the item at retail for a 50-percent markup or a total sales price of $1.50. Under the present law, to the sales price of $1.50, the retailer adds a 10-percent tax of 15 cents, making the total cost to the customer the sum of $1.65. Instead of this system, let us apply a 15-percent tax at the manufacturer's level. Fifteen percent of the $1 cost to the retailer would be 15 cents and the retailer would compute his profit of the 50-percent markup on the actual cost of the item, that is, $1, making a total of $1.50 which, with the 15-cent tax item added thereto, would result in a total cost to the customer of $1.65.

It might be argued by the opponents of our suggestion that it would be unworkable and that the public would suffer, but we offer in rebuttal to such argument, the evidence which is borne out by the present list of items which currently are taxed at the manufacturer's level. This list, as is obvious, is many, many times as long as the list of items taxable at the retail sales level. The method of taxation at the manufacturer's level has worked with a much greater efficiency than the method of taxation at the retail sales level and a greater percentage of the tax due has been received by our Treasury.

We, therefore, most sincerely urge that the retailers' excise taxes be repealed and that a manufacturers' tax be enacted without delay.

It would be a most welcome relief to thousands of harassed retailers throughout the country. It would result in increased sales by manufacturers since many items are not being handled by the retailers on account of the nuisance of the retailers' excise tax on those items.

Respectfully submitted.

KANSAS PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

Schedule of computation of retailers' excise tax, 1953

Total purchases, 1953×1		$104,353.41
Total taxable purchases (converted to 20 percent basis)		$3,086.42
Percentage of purchases of taxable items, 2.95766		
Opening inventory, all items		$23,412.40
Closing inventory, all items		26,359.72
Increase in inventory		2,947.32
Increase in inventory taxable items ($2,947.32×0.295766)		87.14
Purchases of taxable items		3,086.42
Less increase in inventory		87.14
Cost of sales taxable items		2,999.28
Less retail sales made at cost		299.00
Cost of taxable sales made at retail		2,700.28
Markup, 50 percent (based on 33⅓-percent discount) factor		1.50
Selling price of sales at retail price		4,050.28
Less pilferage and breakage, 20 percent		81.01
Net sales at retail price		3,969.27
Plus retail sales at cost		299.00
Total sales, taxable items		4,268.27
Tax due on sales to which tax is added, 75 percent ($4,268.27×0.75×0.20)		640.24
Tax due on sales made, tax included in price, 25 percent ($4,268.27×0.25×0.16⅔)		177.84
Total tax due, 1953		818.08
Tax previously assessed		387.35
Additional tax due for 1953		430.73
Cost of sales, 1953 ($104,353.41—$2,947.32)	$101,406.09	
Ratio of total tax due to cost of sales	818.08	
Computation of tax, other years:		
	Tax due	
1952:		
Cost of sales ($110,775.85×0.00806736)	$893.51	
Tax paid	352.57	
Additional tax due		540.94
	Tax due	
1953:		
Cost of sales ($102,406.37×0.00806736)	$826.15	
Tax paid	246.40	
Additional tax due		579.75
Total additional tax due, 3 years		1,551.42
Penalty (ad valorem penalty applies to the amount of deficiency or additional tax which is applicable to the periods for which returns were filed delinquent)		53.35
Total additional tax and penalty		1,604.77

Statement Re Encouraging the Construction of Passenger Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, when we last met on Thursday, May 31, I introduced a bill (H. R. 11554) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and all major maritime legislation subsequently enacted, has recognized the vital importance of passenger ships in the American merchant marine.

We have been repeatedly advised by our highest defense authorities that, because of its potential for troop transport, the national security demands an adequate modern passenger ship component in our active oceangoing merchant fleet. Such ships are expensive, complicated, and take a long time to create by either new construction or conversion. Yet, they are needed immediately in the event of emergency.

Only three new passenger ships have found their way into the privately owned merchant marine since World War II. Fortunately, today, with an upsurge of consciousness of the necessity for replacement of our merchant fleet, we are assured of the new construction of several modern passenger vessels as replacements in existing services. Even so, the introduction of these fine, more advanced and larger vessels will still leave us seriously deficient in the passenger carrying category.

I have just been advised, within the past 2 weeks, that from the standpoint of initial mobilization requirements, the Joint Chiefs of Staff estimate that there is, today, a deficiency of 15 large passenger vessels in the active merchant marine.

This situation prevails at a time when passenger travel by ship is increasing, but in the important passenger trade between the United States and the tourist mecca of northern Europe, American passenger ships in 1954 were carrying only about 18 percent of the waterborne traffic. Today the percentage is undoubtedly even less, in view of the new foreign ships which have entered the service.

There are only two American flag passenger ships in the North Atlantic service and one of them is becoming obsolete. Forty-one foreign passenger vessels are now taking the bulk of this business.

With higher incomes creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and many items once considered luxuries or nonessentials, have come new opportunities and new demands for travel. Within the past week I have read that 2 million Americans will visit Europe this year. And rehabilitation of European economies is making it possible for our friends across the Atlantic to visit the United States in increasing numbers. Yet this country, providing most of the travelers, has no transatlantic passenger ships to compete for the growing one-class tourist trade.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided for direct Government financing to aid in building up our merchant fleet on essential trade routes. Within the past several years this authority has been implemented by additional authority aimed at providing for private financing of merchant marine operations. It was the goal of the sponsors of this legislation that the Government be relieved of the necessity for requesting appropriations for the direct financing of necessary shipping projects and that the greatest possible participation therein be made available and distributed to private interests. This law, which is title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, provides for 90 percent Government guaranty of ship mortgages on 75 percent of the cost of a new vessel. However, all testimony on the legislation bore out the unlikelihood of securing the use of private investment funds in new ventures involving special-purpose vessels unless the Government would insure 100 percent, of the loan covered by the mortgage. Accordingly, as an incentive for needed new construction the law provides for full Government mortgage insurance on loans for the construction of special-purpose vessels. Whatever the reasons may be the term "special purpose" has been construed as not covering passenger vessels, despite their limited purpose and despite their special adaptability for immediate military use in time of emergency.

The bill I have introduced, H. R. 11554, would place passenger vessels in a position to receive the same Government guaranty of privately financed construction as other special-purpose vessels. Existing provision for 100 percent Government financing will still be available as an alternative to the attraction of private capital.

It is too soon to tell just how successful Government-insured private financing is in comparison with direct Government financing which has been responsible for the present strength of our merchant marine. One thing has become clear, however. That is that the extremely specialized nature of passenger ships, the long period of construction, and their great cost is clearly a deterrent to attracting the use of private funds without the maximum of Government guaranty.

There is at least one well-qualified operator ready, able, and willing to initiate a new type of passenger service on an essential trade route in the North Atlantic not now served by an American-flag operator, whose plans may be frustrated if the Government is unable to participate in the venture to the extent of insuring his mortgage over the long pull, and for reasons of policy is unwilling to provide direct Government mortgage aid.

There are indications of other passenger services which could be expanded or

initiated under private financing methods if the special problems of the passenger trades were recognized by according the same degree of Government insurance as is provided in the case of other special-purpose vessels.

Despite the present demands for transocean passenger accommodations, it is unreasonable to expect that private investment sources should make available its funds in great amount for long periods of time and also assume a heavy portion of unsecured risk on a national asset such as a modern version of the great steamship *United States*. The development of atomic energy and other advanced ideas in ship propulsion and design make understandable the reluctance of private interests, such as insurance companies, to enter upon extensive long-term commitments in an industry which has traditionally been one of feast and famine.

Yet the Government's stake and its need is both real and immediate as long as deficiencies in our mobilization base exist.

Unions Need Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Examiner of May 24, 1956, contains a very pertinent article on political contributions by E. F. Tompkins. It hits the mark so well I am submitting it for the RECORD under unanimous consent previously granted:

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS: UNIONS NEED RESTRICTIONS

David Dubinsky—one of the best respected and also one of the most political minded trades union leaders in the country—has made a vigorous defense of laborism in politics.

Dubinsky was speaking for his own organization, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. That union is itself in the forefront of political activity. It is one of the proprietors of New York's socialistic Liberal Party. Its position in election campaigns is neither nonpartisan nor bipartisan. At its Atlantic City convention, Dubinsky indicated that this year the union—and its captive party—would again support Democrats.

Dubinsky asserted a reason for speaking out. He said he was answering critics of trade union politics who have been "complaining about labor's efforts."

The efforts lie mainly in donating union funds to the campaign chests of favored candidates. The obvious motive is to influence or dictate the performances of successful aspirants to public office. This is an antique custom, once practiced by corrupt corporations, and is one of the techniques for buying an election. The practice, if long tolerated, can only destroy the integrity of legislatures and debase the morale of elected public executives.

Dubinsky's union will continue the practice. Its convention approved a drive to induce, or compel?, the entire membership to make voluntary contributions through a political action coterie for use in the 1956 campaigns. At $1 a head, the ILGWU with 445,000 members, could raise nearly half a million dollars. Moreover, the ILGWU is a component of the AFL–CIO. If the Meany-Reuther organization collaborates fully, the potential is $15 million for 1 year.

The implied threat in this situation daunts many politicians. They assert that a labor vote accompanies every prospective labor dollar, a fallacy that was dramatically blasted by the late Senator Taft in 1950. For the actual truth is that labor union bosses dispense labor union campaign funds but not the ballots of labor union members.

Dubinsky defended his thesis sophistically. He said labor contributions to the 1956 campaign funds would be tiny alongside the huge amounts put up by wealthy corporation officers and stockholders. The facts are (1) the laws forbid corporations to make political contributions from their treasuries, although labor union bosses do this very thing; (2) corporations do not assess their stockholders for political purposes, as labor bosses asses their union members.

The inevitable consequence of Dubinskyism in politics will surely, and rightly, be the extension of the Corrupt Practices Acts by Congress and the State legislatures to cover unions and labor bosses, as well as corporations.

Legislators' Jobs Are No Snaps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in a State famous for journalistic enterprise, few columns of news comment and interpretation are more popular than "The Hoosier Day," authored by the veteran newsman, Frank A. White. Mr. White's article have won front page assignment as a regular feature in dozens of daily and weekly papers of Indiana. I am happy to insert in the RECORD one of his efforts which will be especially appreciated by most of us on Capitol Hill. It follows:

Many Hoosiers, including schoolchildren, are surprised on visiting Washington to find so few Senators or House Members in the Chambers at any given session.

The last time we visited Congress, fewer than 15 Senators and not more than one-fourth of the House Members were on the floor. About the only time the 96 Senators and 435 Congressmen are in the Chambers is when there is a rollcall vote.

Such a circumstance increases a popular conception that a Congressman has a snap job, excitement of living in Washington, with good pay at the same time. What are the facts?

The load of responsibility placed on a Member of Congress is tremendous. A Congressman's duties have been described as an iceberg, with most of it under the surface. Actual presence in House and Senate sessions are but one of the many things a Congressman has to do.

A Congressman receives a salary hardly comparable to an executive of our smaller industries. Training and ability would be equal. A Congressman must maintain a residence in Washington and a home in his district. He has to travel back and forth, stand expenses of campaigning and election. Much of the glitter of Washington vanishes in the sultry summer months when the place is overrun with millions of visitors.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS TAKE MUCH OF TIME

The Commerce-Clearing House, a national reporting service, pointed out that at the end of the first 15 months of the 83d Congress there had been introduced 8,679 bills in the House. Already the present session has seen 10,330 bills introduced in the House and 3,547 in the Senate. A flock of joint resolutions have been introduced and there have been 234 rollcall votes in the House and Senate this time. The President has approved 460 public bills.

Business before Congress grows in volume and complexity. All Members serve on committees.

Not infrequently, a single committee of House or Senate of Congress will have over 100 bills before it. Hearings must be conducted. A Congressman cannot just draw from his wisdom to vote the will of his people. An immense amount of research must be done for a Congressman to do a conscientious job in voting. Our Congressmen, regardless of their political affiliation, have a tough job and deserve our understanding and support.

To Promote Civilian Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an address delivered by Cadet 1st Lt. Joyce Kerley, of Birmingham, Mich., from my congressional district.

The language and construction of the address are especially well done. Miss Kerley deserves a great deal of credit for this demonstration of her ability and finesse in expressing her views on this most worthwhile subject; namely, To Promote Civilian Aviation. Miss Kerleys' address follows:

ADDRESS OF CADET 1ST LT. JOYCE KERLEY, OF BIRMINGHAM, MICH., BEFORE THE 1956 CIVIL AIR PATROL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 24, 1956

"To promote civilian aviation" that's the purpose of the Civil Air Patrol. "To promote civilian aviation." It doesn't take very long to say, does it? Yet those few words cover a lot of territory.

First of all, aviation needs leaders. The cadet program operated on the premise that each and every person has certain qualities of leadership which can be developed. Good leaders aren't just born. They're made through proper training. The idea really works. When I first joined CAP, I was very shy and terrified of people. Last year I was awarded what to me is the highest leadership position a cadet can earn. I was made commanding officer of my squadron and CAP had accomplished a pretty big project in leadership.

Aviation needs people who can adjust to new situations, people who will feel at home with a growing field in a changing world. As a cadet, I have taken party in displays, State fairs, model airplane contests, newspapers, squadron missions, SARCAP's and a dozen other activities. Certainly this is diversification, but aviation needs more. It needs people who can get along with each other, not only those who share the same background and customs, but everybody working toward a better world.

To increase understanding among countries each year CAP sponsors an international exchange program. Our squadron has always been among those chosen to entertain the cadets from other countries who visit Michigan and it's surprising how little we really know about people in other countries and how much we learn from each exchange.

I saw a similar principle working at cadet summer encampments. There cadets of all races, religions, and social standings are throw together and told "You've got to drill together, study together, and live together for 2 weeks. Get busy. You have 1 hour to clean this barracks for a white glove inspection." In situations like this it doesn't matter whether the girl helping you clean dust from the rafters has a different color skin, or goes to a different church. I know she's a cadet and she's working for the same things I am; that's all that really matters. Wouldn't it be wonderful if all the prejudice and misunderstanding in the world could be ironed out and erased as easily as it is in the cadet program?

Last, but not least, aviation needs people who are interested in—aviation.

Before I'd been in CAP very long I decided if I was going to stay in the cadet program I'd better learn all about airplanes. All about airplanes. What an impossible dream. As I started my studies in a squadron engineering class it appeared that there was a lot more to airplanes than I'd anticipated. Each little bolt, every rivet is designed specially to do a special job. The whole thing is assembled, and lo and behold—it flies. (Sometimes it flies.) The fields of aviation are so entwined that I was soon delving into navigation, meteorology, ATC and a dozen other things, I'd never known existed. I even elected a course in physics at school. Before long I passed my proficiency test, which among other things, enables me to join the Air Force as an airman third-class and I'd even won a flight scholarship which paid for my first 10 hours of dual flight time, and introduced me to a whole new world in aviation.

The more I participated in CAP activities the more I realize that we are living in an air age.

At the very least being a Civil Air Patrol cadet has increased the knowledge and understanding I need to participate in this age. If I read in a newspaper that a jet airplane is installed with an afterburner, I know what they are talking about. If my brother writes home from camp that his DI made him march 20 miles in an afternoon, I know what it feels like; I've marched 20 miles. If I hear stories about strange people across the ocean, I know they're not really strange, but people like me.

CAP has given me much more than material things. It has given me confidence in myself, a better understanding of the world and the people who live in it. It has taught me the miracle of flight and provided me the thrill of meeting new people, seeing new places, and doing new things. In a sense it has made me a pilot, a traveler, a debater and a journalist. To sum it all up, CAP has made me a better person, and therefore, a better citizen.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of loss and a great sorrow that I join with my colleagues in saying a word as a last farewell in memory of our departed good friend, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

"BILL," as he was affectionately known to many of us, will never walk this way again—yet once he walked among us a smiling and kindly man who radiated by his mere presence a warmth of affection and friendliness.

"BILL" was a good man—for he was dedicated to all the things that are good. And, he was a fine man because he did those things which are fine.

Though he was small of physical stature, BILL was possessed of a greatness because of his dedication to his fellowman. As a servant of the people he knew well the meaning of service and he gave of himself unselfishly and devotedly to his country's good. He shall always be remembered for these things and those whom he has left behind shall be grateful to his name.

I know that as a friend and colleague, I shall miss him and his kind face in these cherished Halls. His friends and those whom he served will also miss him. But, there is consolation in the thought that his good works will carry on.

To his family and to those dearly beloved to BILL, I extend my sincerest and deepest sympathy in this hour of their great loss.

Civil Servant From 18th Texas District Awarded for Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Agriculture is presenting awards for superior service to those employees of the Department who have made outstanding achievements in their roles as public servants. It is with a great measure of pride that I am able to announce that one of these awards is being given to Miss Nettie Sims, of Clarendon, Tex., in the 18th District of Texas, an employee in the county office of the Farmers Home Administration in Texas.

Miss Sims is being presented with the United States Department of Agriculture superior service award for "her unusual efficiency and dependability in conducting the duties of a county office clerk so that borrowers are given prompt, courteous service."

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Miss Sims I would like to pay tribute to that great army of hardworking, conscientious, able Federal employees who carry on the work of Government and deal directly with the people. I have always been very firm in the belief that the people are entitled to every proper consideration and courtesy when doing business with any Government office and, for the most part, employees in the Federal service strive to give that kind of service. I am glad that the highest award for such service goes to one of these workers in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress. I congratulate Miss Sims in being thus recognized, and I am sure her achievement will be a great inspiration to all Federal employees to strive ever to do a better job for the people whom it is their duty to serve.

Nicholas H. Dosker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual conference of housing and redevelopment officials held at Cleveland resolutions were passed honoring a public housing official of Louisville, Ky., Nicholas H. Dosker.

Because of the outstanding service rendered in the field of public housing by Mr. Dosker, I believe it is appropriate to include those resolutions in this RECORD, as follows:

Whereas persistence is one of man's most admirable traits when properly directed; and

Whereas too often the innermost thoughts we have about our friends are never expressed in words until the shock of their passing recalls them all at once; and

Whereas the members of NAHRO could never be more sincerely appreciative and genuinely grateful for the ceaseless efforts of a fellow member and friend in their behalf; and

Whereas that friend, Nicholas H. Dosker, administrator of the Louisville Municipal Housing Commission and chairman of NAHRO's retirement plan committee, has devoted about 15 years of untiring efforts and hard work to obtaining and assuring practical retirement benefits for the employees of local housing authorities; and

Whereas that untiring effort and hard work began with the laborious detailed collection of actuarial data that was a prerequisite for achievement of the goal he had set; and

Whereas local authorities, because of their peculiar governmental structure, were not able to place their employees under civil service or other local plans making provision for retirement; and therefore, needed to discover a group-type of plan that could offer realistic retirement benefits; and the search for which, Nicholas Dosker almost singlehandedly undertook by investigating plans of innumerable insurance companies throughout the United States; and

Whereas largely through Nicholas Dosker's efforts, a retirement plan for employees of local housing authorities was developed with the National Health and Welfare Association; and

Whereas Nicholas Dosker also was instrumental in the development of an official policy of the Federal Public Housing Authority regarding retirement benefits for local housing authority employees, which he thereafter promulgated among local authorities in getting many of them started on such plans; and

Whereas at the stage where the social-security law finally was amended to provide that local housing authority employees could qualify for social security, the wording of that amendment was such that local housing authority employees under a private retirement plan were disqualified from being covered under social security; and so

Nicholas Dosker promptly took the matter up in the Federal courts; and

Whereas although the court action, which was in process for several years, was not successful, the persistent and faithful devotion to the goal Nicholas Dosker had set for himself and his professional organization paid off last year when the social-security law was again amended, this time making it possible for local housing authority employees to be fully covered by both social security and private retirement plans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials in convention assembled do hereby record their individual and collective thanks to Nicholas H. Dosker, fellow member and friend, for the security he has brought into their lives through his persistent and ultimately successful battle to make it possible for each local housing authority in the country to have a realistic and forward-looking retirement plan for its employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Nicholas H. Dosker and to the board of commissioners of the Louisville Municipal Housing Commission.

Revitalization of the United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. E. L. Schimmel, vice president of Bell & Howell Co., Chicago, Ill., who offers challenging suggestions for the revitalization of the United States Air Force:

BELL & HOWELL CO.,
Chicago, May 17, 1956.

The Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. CHURCH: I take the liberty to draw your attention to an article published in the May issue of the Reader's Digest, which I am enclosing.

As a businessman, it strikes me how inadequate and antiquated is the policy of the United States Air Force in connection with its wages. If we in our company would train young executives or technicians for more responsible jobs but deny them any appreciable incentive, such as increase in pay, fringe benefits, bonus and promotion, both in title and responsibility, we simply would not be able to keep them.

In my opinion, the United States Air Force could do one of several things:

1. Review its nomenclature of ranks and add special ranks for technicians with adequate pay comparable to industry. The wages could be somewhat lower in view of the security offered by the United States Air Force.

2. Make promotion from one rank to the next dependent on merit—not seniority nor time lapse between one promotion and the other.

3. Reduce expenses by cutting out the waste of time and men now part of the schedules of the United States Air Force.

4. Hire a management expert for each of the airbases to streamline the administration and cut out waste.

I am by no means familiar with the problem, but I feel that the renewal of 80 percent of the technicians in the Air Force every 4 years by greenhorns who have to learn everything from scratch would certainly bankrupt any commercial organization and cannot fail to do the same thing to the United States Air Force.

Our defense in the air is vital to the United States and we should take it seriously.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. SCHIMMEL,
Vice President.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid bill, H. R. 11356, authorizing an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid during the next fiscal year is unacceptable to me and I believe it should be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and further reduction in the total amount of authorizations. I am aware that the committee has recommended $1,109,000,000 less than was requested by President Eisenhower, and for this I wish to congratulate and commend them. Nevertheless, I believe the whole question of foreign aid should be further reexamined and reconsidered in the light of present-day world situations and conditions. Changing world conditions make it obvious that policies and practices that may have been justified in 1948 or 1950, or even later, are no longer sound arguments for foreign aid in 1957.

It is a well-known fact that today many of the so-called NATO countries are presently enjoying very substantial economic prosperity.

Most of these countries have declined to comply with their military commitments for the defense of Western Europe. Under these conditions why should we continue foreign military assistance to those countries who are no longer willing to spend money for their own protection? Greece, Turkey, and Iran have continued to show an interest in national defense and probably deserve the $170 million defense support allotted to them.

How an anyone defend the proposition to give Tito, of Yugoslavia, $30 million for defense support? Only last Saturday Tito is reported to have said in Moscow, "Never again will our two countries be divided." He was speaking of Russia and Yugoslavia; and all prudent and realistic appraisals of Tito should convince us that in time of trouble between the United States and Russia he would most certainly be found at the side of and in support of communism. How can our State Department and the administration be so naive as to believe the United States will ever receive any benefit from the military assistance scheduled for Yugoslavia next year? Should war arise between the United States and Russia, this military assistance most certainly would be used against us.

I am in favor of an appropriation to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities or products. In view of the very generous authorizations for other purposes carried in this bill, I question the advisability of the povision that not less than $250 million shall be used for this purpose in 1957. For the present fiscal year the amount specified for this purpose was not less than $300 million. Why not make it $300 million for 1957?

I have noted the statement in the committee report No. 2213, beginning near the top of page 9, on the question of the status-of-forces treaty and agreements. The report states:

> The committee considered an amendment to this bill which would require the President to terminate any assistance being furnished under the Mutual Security Act to a nation which exercises criminal jurisdiction over United States service personnel stationed within its boundaries by reason of any treaty or international agreement. This proposal was not accepted by the committee.

I would be remiss in my duty as a Representative if I did not express my resentment against the fact that American boys are being tried in foreign courts and imprisoned in foreign jails. I am firmly convinced this should not be permitted. I believe the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives and the United States Senate should forthwith take suitable action to insure that the United States shall exercise exclusive criminal and civil jurisdiction over all American military personnel stationed in foreign countries. The President has full authority now to take such action. In view of the failure of the administration to act in this disgraceful situation, it is the duty of Congress to act, and to act now.

Increasing Significance of Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today world attention is focused on the continent of Antarctica where vast economic potentialities occur along with strategic military factors that are increasing in significance day by day.

According to competent authorities, the very first men to set foot on Antarctica were from the State of Connecticut. Dr. Edouard A. Stackpole, of Mystic, Conn., has made an important study of certain aspects of Antarctica. In this connection, I would like to here insert in the RECORD an article written by Miss E. A. Kendall that appeared in the Washington Evening Star in its edition of March 10, 1956:

COLD FACTS

It is most appropriate on the eve of the return of those valiant Americans who have

been in the Antarctic since November that a small but authentic book has appeared, telling of the first landing upon the Antarctic continent by human beings, these men being New England sealers (1820–21). It has never before been known exactly what men first landed on the shores of the huge southern continent, several countries having made such claim. So at last, through discovery of old logbooks, we have the story.

Dr. Edouard A. Stackpole, of Mystic, Conn., has set out in his study, The Huron and the Huntress, some well-documented statements as to first sightings and first landing. New England Captains Palmer, Burdick and Davis hold honors for having first seen the continent proper, and unless some authentic logs are turned up in contradiction, their place on this pedestal will be maintained.

And now, more than ever before, the importance of the Antarctic to our economic, military and psychological well-being is realized. There are questions from the grass roots—questions as to why the United States has never claimed the vast and rich Antarctic areas she has discovered and explored. Formal claims and occupation of our territories are the only logical actions.

E. A. KENDALL.

The Great Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to speak about the great freedom crusade.

I want to ask my colleagues to urge their constituents to join in this movement which has as its objective the release of 13 innocent American citizens who are being held in prison by the Chinese Communists.

I wish each one of my colleagues would make a public statement urging the residents of his district to write a simple airmail letter to Mao Tse-tung in Peiping, China.

In this letter the writer should identify himself by name and by occupation and express his desire to have these Americans released and remind Mao Tse-tung that the Chinese Communist representative in Geneva promised to release these Americans many months ago.

Already thousands of such letters have been mailed to Peiping, China, and those who know the Chinese Communists best tell us that if millions of Americans write similar letters to Mao Tse-tung, there is a strong probability that he will react to this great moral influence.

Certainly it is not much to ask that American citizens take a few minutes and buy an airmail stamp for such a worthwhile purpose.

I have already asked the Members of Congress who have constituents in prison in China to cooperate in this worthwhile endeavor, and I have also asked Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, all the State officials of Connecticut, and the entire Connecticut delegation in Congress to urge people to participate in this great freedom crusade.

GOP Dent in Labor Vote Detected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there has been, in recent years, a belief that labor has largely been in the Democrat camp.

It has always been my belief that labor, or any other economic group, largely follows the party in which it believes its best interests lie. The unusual prosperity which we have been going through outside the purely agricultural areas has brought its benefits to labor as well as other economic groups. It has not failed to have its effect on the average laboring man who expects to vote in 1956.

Two very penetrating analyses of the labor vote have been made by William H. Stringer, chief, Washington news bureau, the Christian Science Monitor, and another distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an article from the Christian Science Monitor of a few days ago and another from the Washington Post of Saturday, June 2, 1956:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

GOP DENT IN LABOR VOTE DETECTED

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—The hard work which a big, powerfully built, friendly gentleman in the Eisenhower Cabinet has put into his contacts with organized labor, is paying off.

The latest Gallup poll, surprisingly, shows that organized labor—as of today and as indicated by a sampling from coast to coast—actually prefers President Eisenhower over Adlai E. Stevenson.

This is sorry news for the Democrats, and it must be qualified by all sorts of provisos. Insofar as it does represent a steady shift in labor sentiment, the man who receives an important share of the credit is Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

CONTINUING EFFORT

Secretary Mitchell is one Republican who has always believed that the Eisenhower administration could make a vigorous dent in the Democratic allegiance of organized labor. And in an indefatigable, painstaking manner, by promoting favorable legislation, by personal contact, and by speaking to labor conventions here, there, and everywhere he has made that dent.

Of course the other Republican who has helped along this unusual shift is President Eisenhower. Riding above the political storms, nonpartisan in his personal preferences, he has attracted labor strength right along.

In 1952 it is estimated that President Eisenhower received a substantial vote from union members, some 39 percent. Now, in a Gallup "trial heat" against Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Eisenhower received a majority of the votes—56 percent.

CAMPAIGN FUND

A polling of union leaders would of course show a very different sentiment. Only the other day David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union estimated that the united labor movement (AFL–CIO) would raise a maximum of $3 million in voluntary political contributions for the 1956 presidential and congressional elections. And the presumption is that most of this money would go to support Democratic candidates.

But not all of the rank and file followed its leadership in 1952, and possibly a still larger percentage of the rank and file may not follow the leadership in 1956.

It should be noted that some members of the Eisenhower camp do not rate precisely as high with labor as do the President and Secretary Mitchell. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, in their recent Washington convention, charged that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was "unfit" to continue in his high office. Labor has had similarly uncomplimentary things to say about Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks.

And as a man who does not shun contact with, and plain speaking to, labor, James P. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, said recently of him:

"Whatever else the American labor movement may thing of the Republican administration it will and does acknowledge that the Secretary of Labor is both a fighter and an extremely courageous man."

SPUR FOR HARRIMAN

By espousing minimum wage legislation, equal pay bills, and safety proposals and by personally opposing State enacted right-to-work laws, Secretary Mitchell has worked to cultivate labor's friendship. Recently he criticized Congress for failing to act on labor legislation proposed by the administration.

A number of other labor leaders have praised Secretary Mitchell for his course of conduct. He is at least as effective with labor leaders as was the original Eisenhower appointee to the labor post, Martin P. Durkin who was himself a union official.

The Gallup poll sampling will be contested by Democratic spokesmen as insufficiently broad. Simultaneously it will set in motion vigorous efforts by labor leadership to return the straying membership to traditional allegiances.

And the fact that Mr. Eisenhower triumphed over Mr. Stevenson will not be lost on the supporters of less "moderate" Democratic presidential candidates, particularly Governor Averell Harriman of New York, who is an original New Dealer enjoying strong support in the labor movement. It will be argued that only Governor Harriman can hold organized labor and the Nation's minority groups for the Democrats in November.

But for the moment the Gallup results remain a testimony to President Eisenhower's remarkable popularity with just about every group in the country and to Secretry Mitchell's able and assiduous courting of organized labor.

Surveys show that in 1936 the GOP won only 20 percent of the labor vote and in 1948 only 26 percent. Which makes today's sampling, showing a 56 percent allegiance to Mr. Eisenhower, all the more impressive.

[From the Washington Post of June 2, 1956]

UNION LABOR AND IKE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

MITCHELL'S POPULARITY LINKED TO GALLUP POLL RESULT

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell is one Republican official who has never accepted the idea that the Eisenhower administration could not win the confidence and support of American labor.

From the earliest days of the New Deal through the 1952 election, union leadership has been overwhelmingly pro-Democratic. But this hasn't deterred Secretary Mitchell from taking continuously the case and the cause of the Eisenhower administration to

labor meetings—wherever 2 or 3, or 2,000 or 3,000 workers were gathered together. This drew from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, the admiring though perhaps slightly wry remarks: "He has—in an almost literal sense—been bearding the lion of organized labor in its own den. He has been addressing union conventions from one end of the country to another."

And then Carey added: "Whatever else the American labor movement may think of the present Republican administration, it will—and does—acknowledge that the United States Secretary of Labor is both a fighter and an extremely courageous man."

What does the American labor movement think of the Eisenhower administration? Nearly all the complimentary remarks which the labor leaders have been making about Secretary Mitchell have rested on the open or implied reservation: "Don't construe this to mean that we are pro-Eisenhower." But even if union leadership is not pro-Eisenhower, what about the rank and file of union labor?

The answer, according to the latest Gallup poll, is that for the first time in at least a quarter century, a clear majority of union members indicate that they intend to vote Republican this fall.

This wasn't a survey based on the vague question of whether on balance you like or dislike the way the President is doing his job. This was a direct, explicit question of how you're going to vote, and if your choice was between Eisenhower or Stevenson, whom would you support.

This poll shows that organized labor would vote 56 percent for Eisenhower and 44 percent for Stevenson. The Republican percentage of the majority party vote among union members in the last five presidential elections is as follows:

	Percent Republican
1936 election	20
1940 election	28
1944 election	28
1948 election	26
1952 election	39
Today's survey	56

This is a development which, I suspect, will surprise many labor leaders. Mitchell would be the first to say that it is not due primarily to his personal popularity with organized labor. But Mitchell's high credentials with the labor movement has given him a friendly and receptive labor audience in expounding the Department of Labor and other Eisenhower policies.

Along with James Carey and Walter Reuther, numerous other labor leaders, including David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Emil Rieve, chairman of the board of the Textile Workers Union; and Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, have been hailing Mitchell as an outstanding friend of the workingman. Potofsky put labor's view of Mitchell in these words: "He is the most enlightened man in public service today. He is a sincere friend of labor. I should like to say that whoever is elected President in November, I hope that Mitchell will be continued as Secretary of Labor for another 4 years."

I am not arguing that labor ought or ought not be pro-Eisenhower. The political sentiment which Dr. Gallup now finds among union members may change as the election draws nearer. But it is fair to say that Secretary Mitchell couldn't prove himself to be a friend of labor, as the leaders all agree, unless President Eisenhower wanted him to be a friend of labor and created conditions which enabled him to be.

Let me cite one revealing fact. The total budget of the Department of Labor in 1950 was $223 million. The Department of Labor budget this year is $468 million. The purpose: To enable Secretary Mitchell to do his job better for labor.

Testimony of Cotton Industry Before Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of the cotton industry before the Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. J. P. Henican, Jr., New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

Mr. HENICAN. May I ask Mr. Knell, who is representing the New York Cotton Exchange, to come to the witness stand with me? We will give testimony for both exchanges.

Mr. GATHINGS. Both of you want to make a statement?

Mr. HENICAN. We will talk together.

STATEMENT OF J. P. HENICAN, JR., NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK J. KNELL, NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HENICAN. We of the cotton exchanges very definitely believe that this amendment will broaden the futures markets, and therefore make them more serviceable to the respective commodity industries.

Mr. Chairman, whereas I am president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, I am also a partner of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, so I am interested in all commodities, other than cotton, but, having been born in New Orleans, my No. 1 commodity is cotton. I think I know it best.

As said, I am interested in all commodities, as a partner of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, so what I believe of cotton I believe also of the other markets.

We think that this amendment is going to broaden the volume in the markets, and therefore make them more serviceable to the various commodities industries.

Mr. GATHINGS. The exchange will handle considerably more business, sir?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; we think so, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. What percentage increase in cotton will you anticipate?

Mr. HENICAN. That is very difficult to say, because I think it will depend entirely on the conditions in the market place at any particular time.

On that score, Mr. Chairman, there are 2 or 3 gentlemen here who represent cotton mills, and who would use the market under these conditions.

Mr. Emmett from Dan River Mills is here, Mr. Kirby from Dominion Textile Co., Canada, is here in the room, too, at the present time. Also, Mr. Robinson is here. He is the mill man representing the ACMI, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

Those people are vitally interested in the amendment, and make use of the markets on the basis suggested by the amendment. I think they are far more capable of intimately explaining to you how they will make use of these markets under the amendments.

I think it is very difficult to explain to you now how the volume will be increased, because it will depend on the conditions in the market place at any particular time.

Last October there was a 2-cent break in the cotton market. That break caused prices to go below the Government loan level. I think under those conditions we could say these people would have been in the futures market had they been allowed to do so. If this present amendment had been in effect, and if they had not been limited to a maximum of 30,000 bales of speculation.

I do not entirely agree with what Mr. Kauffman said about only a relatively small amount of organizations would be interested in this amendment because as the director of the commodity activities of Merrill Lynch, I receive frequent calls from people in the butter and egg business, for example, and in other commodities, that are investigating the possibility of pricing their commodities on an extended period.

They are not familiar with the present CEA Act and want to discuss it. When it is pointed out to them they are limited to certain positions in the market, they then do not go into the positions. I do not think that those kind of people consult with the CEA. Therefore, the CEA does not come in contact with those inquiries.

Mr. GATHINGS. We would like to hear from these individuals who are interested in this amendment. But we do not want to preclude either of you gentlemen from proceeding with your statement.

Mr. HENICAN. That is why we asked them to come, so you could hear them, as to the practical use of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to ask one question. How many cotton mills in the United States have a normal annual consumption of 30,000 bales or more?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. ABERNETHY, frankly, I do not know the correct answer to that question. But as a rank guess, I would say in excess of 100 mills consumed or processed an excess of 30,000 bales annually.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, are there any?

Mr. HENICAN. Any?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have you any idea how many?

Mr. HENICAN. I think there might be in excess of 100.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are a lot of them?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not think there were so many.

Mr. HENICAN. But you ask these gentlemen when you have them on the stand.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, would it be all right to put that question to the audience and see if anyone back there could give a direct answer to it?

Can anyone in the audience give us a direct answer to that question?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Robinson, how many cotton mills consume in excess of 30,000 bales of cotton a year?

Mr. ROBINSON. I was going to say 100 mills. That is a guess. I do not know. But there are numerous cotton mills, large enough to use 30,000 or more, that is, of bales.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Might we identify who the witness was that answered that question?

Mr. GATHINGS. Would you state your full name?

Mr. ROBINSON. Ralph S. Robinson, member of the cotton committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. Robinson, you are an assistant to Mr. Jackson, are you?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the organization with which Mr. Robert Jackson is connected?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. One of my constituents, incidentally.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. MCINTIRE.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Henican, I was impressed with Mr. Kauffman's statement of the fact that if this bill were passed, this broadening of the trading area, that it would have to be encompassed somewhat by some

regulation in order to keep it within bounds.

You mentioned that you are in charge of some of the commodity work of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane, and that concern I am sure is known widely for its part in trading activities, and is a member of these exchanges, I am sure.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Now, in representing clients who wish to trade in commodities, to what extent does a broker for a member, as Merrill Lynch, assume some responsibility in making sure that the client whom they are representing in the trading activity stays within the boundaries of the regulations laid down by CEA.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, we do that very, very actively. In other words, as a partner of Merrill Lynch, I do not want to lose my capital and, therefore, I want to keep these positions in bounds and well margined, depending upon the credit ability of the client, or the integrity of the client, his history in the industry and so on.

And we do not want to take undue risks. So, therefore, even if it is General Motors that wants to buy unlimited number of contracts, for example, we would limit our risks. We would try to spread our risk and supervise it to that extent, very definitely so.

That is why I like to use the word that the processor or manufacturer will be allowed to buy a reasonable percentage of his year's requirements, or anticipatory requirements, a reasonable percentage.

What is that reasonable percentage? I think it will vary, depending on each individual organization. And I like to put it on a personal basis for each account, very definitely so.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do you think that it is a moral obligation then that rests very heavily on the broker that they not permit their client to, participate in any trading activities that is in violation of the trading principles that surround that commodity on the Board?

Mr. HENICAN. Very definitely so; very definitely.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am not acquainted with any provision of the law which perhaps penalizes that broker, but do you not think he ought to have some responsibility under the law that if he permits a client to violate the trading practices of board that should subject him to perhaps being thrown out as a client that that brokerage concern ought to bear some of that responsibility, too?

Mr. HENICAN. Very definitely, Mr. MCINTIRE, because the way I personally feel about it is that if I allow my client to violate the law the controlling exchange is coming back to me for the violation and I subject myself to suspension, expulsion, fines, and so on.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Would you have any objection, as you see this responsibility on the part of a broker, of the law providing that the broker should be suspended if they permit their client to do any such thing as that?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. You would be in accord with that?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, I am not going to allow any customer to buy an unreasonable amount, I mean to take an unreasonable market position on my books and to clear those contracts for him beyond his normal year's requirements or ability to finance, very definitely so. Merrill does not want that risk. I personally do not want that risk.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I think that is a sound position. And thank you very kindly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do you feel that the language recommended by the Department improves the bill?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; in substance. I have a disagreement on the question of liquidation. I recognize the fact that there are people who will purchase large amounts, possibly, to try to manipulate prices or influence prices to their own personal benefits. And, therefore, we have to provide safeguards to regulate or supervise those type of people. There is no doubt about that.

But, nevertheless, as a broker, I do not want to be too controlled as to liquidation, for example. You see, the proposed amendment says, "provided they liquidate in accordance with the provisions laid down by the CEA," the CEA Administrator.

For example, if there is a position in my books that is in financial difficulty, I do not want to have to go to Mr. Kauffman and have him say, "You can only liquidate under certain conditions." I want to get rid of that position as fast as I possibly can, to save my capital.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me put it this way: I can understand your position there.

Would you say that the language proposed by the Department is reasonable?

Mr. HENICAN. Generally reasonable; yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But you would prefer the language of the bill?

Mr. HENICAN. No; I would not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You would not?

Mr. HENICAN. No. I think we can go a little further than the language in bill H. R. 9333. I think we can go a little further than that for protection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You say a little further—do you mean as far as the recommended amendment goes or even further than that?

Mr. HENICAN. No, no; than the original bill, H. R. 9333. We go further than that—than H. R. 9333—to give the CEA supervision. I recognize that the CEA must have certain supervisory authority to take care of people who do not play the game fair. I do not want to be too restricted about the restriction, because as I say, of financial difficulties that they may come into play. I do not want Mr. Kauffman to tell me how I must liquidate.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do the regulations now provide liquidation that you would be willing to work out with?

Mr. HENICAN. There are no restrictions in the present act.

Mr. GATHINGS. In the language here contained in this recommendation here would broaden the authority in the Department by using these words "that such purchases made and liquidated in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe."

That is broader authority than they have today.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. I do not know of any restrictions that tells us how we have to liquidate under the present act.

Mr. KNELL. There are none at all.

Mr. HENICAN. None today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But this would reach all of the act now—that amendment would; would it not?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not know. I am not an attorney. And, therefore, I do not know whether this applies to the whole act or only section "C."

Mr. HAGEN. It just applies to "C."

Mr. GATHINGS. It is an amendment to "C."

Mr. HENICAN. I would like to point out one thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Before you do that, may I go back and ask one question and then I will be through. I want to put to you the same question I put to Mr. Kauffman.

Is there any benefit in your opinion, directly or indirectly, for the consuming public in this legislation?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is it? I am not trying to trap you.

Mr. HENICAN. No; I know that. Don't you think it might be advisable for me to forego that answer, because there are 2 or 3 men here who have the responsibility of acquiring raw materials for their factories and therefore for the public.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am perfectly agreeable to that.

Mr. HENICAN. Therefore, they are better able—they are experts in that line—they can tell you how they may be able to make sheets and pillow cases, et cetera, cheaper—

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right.

Mr. HENICAN. They are trying to acquire raw material every day. They live with it every day. And, therefore, I think they are more capable.

There is one thing I want to comment on. There has been a certain amount of fear, I think, indicated, that these large positions in the futures market might adversely affect the price from time to time. But it is factual that any of these people can acquire unlimited amounts of cotton in the form of actual cotton or actual grain without supervision, without any supervision whatever.

I think it would be better for them, better for the general market place, if they are allowed to acquire this with the supervision. Mr. Knell and I went through 2 or 3 rather bad experiences and Mr. ABERNETHY no doubt remembers what we refer to as the Jordan year when the price for cotton went down from 38 to 26.

At one time during that period we checked with all fo the brokers to determine whether or not the liquidation had been completed, and both of us slept that night because we were confident that the liquidation in the futures market had been completed, but the following morning when we arrived, there was about 300,000 bales of futures for sale that represented hedges against spot cotton that the banks had been financing that they wanted to protect.

We had not seen that 300,000 bales. We didn't see that position in the futures market. But it was there nevertheless. I think you made that point, sir, that it can be done now in spots. It cannot be done as conveniently or as easily as buying contracts but it can be done and these big positions can be accumulated in spots today without supervision and therefore unknown and unseen.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Knell, would you make your statement?

Mr. FRANK J. KNELL. There is one point that I would like to make in regard to differences between the Commodity Administration bill now proposed, and that proposed by yourself, H. R. 9333. I seem to feel that this provision that such purchases are made and liquidated in conformity with regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe may defeat the purpose that we are aiming at.

The question of accumulating any such line of long cotton or long commodities appears to have been approached on the idea that a mill or a spinner of any type is going into the market and is going to buy 50 or 100,000 bales at one swoop. That is not what we expect at all.

Some of the gentlemen who will testify will point out that their accumulations are arrived at piecemeal as the prices come to where they believe it reasonable to accept. And in liquidation it is much the same. When the price reaches a point where they feel that it is better for them to be in an even position in futures and take the spots, they are liquidated piecemeal.

It gives them a right to develop a position and if they need to hedge. It is very, very doubtful whether any such position is ever going to be liquidated in whole. And one of the big points that we are counting on in this, by allowing a spinner to take a position of this type, if he wants them to turn to spots, he can get a thousand bales from shipper "a" and a thousand from shipper "b" all around through the smaller trade, whereas, the assumption is made here that he is going to take 100,000 bales from one man.

Well, in that case he could only take it from a very large shipper and it would

react against the small man. We hope that this proposal will protect the small shipper. And we hope that there is some middle ground that we can get to that if there must be regulations, those regulations will be clear that the mills know before they attempt to go into a position, and will not prevent them in their liquidation, because the liquidation is just as vital to them as the accumulation of the position.

Further than that, in section 4 (A) 3, you have paragraphs A and B, both of which I believe are controlled and regulated at the present time by the Commodity Exchange Administration.

This proposal as proposed in the bill would be section C and it seems that that would be on the same restriction and same control that the Commodity Exchange have today under "A" and "B."

So I wonder why the need of this last sentence at all.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Knell, you or Mr. Henican, presented me with a copy of a draft I would like the other members to see, that you are submitting to someone over in the Senate for introduction.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you have a copy of that before you?

Mr. KNELL. Mr. Henican has.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. This is the suggested bill that was to be introduced in the Senate?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you confer with the Department officials?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; they have copies of that.

Mr. GATHINGS. They have seen this?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is this draft?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. This is quite length here. I wish you would point out the differences between the recommendation of the Department and this particular recommended draft.

Mr. HENICAN. I think that the intent is identical except that that is no provision that the Department will set up rules and regulations of how positions have to be liquidated. That is all. That is the only difference I see.

But the intent is exactly the same. The wording is maybe a little different but the intent is the same.

Mr. ABERNETHY. A casual glance at this indicates that what you are doing here, you write some regulations into the act itself. Is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. That is pretty clear.

Mr. GATHINGS. Requiring these reports. I wonder what Mr. Kauffman had to say about this. We did not discuss this with you when you were in the witness chair a while ago. I wonder what your feelings would be as to the effect of this?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I think there will have to be some regulations obviously with respect to the operation of it. I received a copy of this draft, I presume it is the same, the one that you have, and it just occurred to us that it would be better procedure to simply have the statute set forth the general principle and then have the Department promulgate regulations after conferring with the members of the trade concerned, rather than to try to spell out all of these details in the statute itself.

So for that reason we preferred the more general provision that is suggested in the Department's report of May 7.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Assuming you are not limited to the spelling out as it appears in this draft now before us, what is your opinion as to the contents of the draft but not limiting yourself to it?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. It looks all right to me; that is my curbstone opinion.

Mr. GATHINGS. Without the word "liquidation" being used?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. No; I was assuming that there would be regulations, that the Department would be required to promulgate regulations. I think there should be general regulations respecting the liquidation as well as the acquisition.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What you have said you say is a curbstone opinion, as you described it, you have approved of this language but you do not desire to be limited to it.

Mr. HENICAN. So far as it goes.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Mr. GATHINGS, I would just like to discuss this matter of liquidation with the gentlemen for a moment because I wonder if in arriving at their position, that liquidation does not need to be controlled, or probably, should not be controlled because they are not concentrating just a little bit on cotton, and forgetting some of the other or overlooking for the moment some of the other commodities that might be included and let us think specifically of oats where, I do not know, but I would just guess that in the oats business there are probably two or three manufacturers who use, let us say, a great proportion of the oats that goes into processed foods.

If we, by enacting this amendment, give these two or three persons or corporations the right to go into the futures market and make transactions, engage in them, which are far larger than those which can be assumed by any other trader in the market on a hedging position, do you not think that they ought to have some means of regulating the disposal of those blocks of contracts?

You assume, as I do, that in the normal course of business they will liquidate those things in an orderly manner as they conduct their business. But nevertheless, sometimes people do not always operate as we think they will or should, and if they have the perfect legal right for some reason or other to dump their entire holding overnight, it could be an upsetting factor, do you not think?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Heimburger, I think I admitted the fact that there is going to be people that don't play the game fair and they need to be regulated. We recognize that.

At the same time, I feel they are going to be in the minority, the great minority. They will be the exceptions. That the organizations that are going to make use of this amendment, are going to be the large national organizations that have a problem in acquiring their raw material and they consequently will conduct themselves in a very ethical manner.

It is beyond my imagination or belief that people I want to handle business for will do anything that is questionable by liquidation because if they go into a position and then, let us call it dump the position, they are going to defeat the purpose, the original purpose of why they went into the position.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. That is true, but it could conceivably be to their interest at the moment to defeat the original purpose, could it not?

Mr. HENICAN. Well, it is possible, yes. I don't think it is probable.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. No, neither do I. I agree with you that it is not probable and yet I am just questioning whether you believe it would be wise to remove all authority for the CEA to regulate liquidation. Perhaps it needs to be hedged and circumscribed. I just wonder if you believe it would be wise to give this unusual right to the trader without some corresponding power in the CEA to regulate the manner in which he exercises it.

Mr. HENICAN. I think I have admitted the necessity for supervision. I think possibly as Mr. Knell pointed out, maybe it did not strike you, but we are inclined to believe that the CEA has that power today in the act. It is in the act now. Now, as a broker, the CEA visits my office about on an average of once a year and if there are any unusual positions on my records they can go back to the principals to find out what it is all about. They are doing that now. And they have the right to make them liquidate if it is a violation.

So they possibly have that power right now in the present act.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. I certainly would not argue for a duplication of authority in this if there is adequate authority now in the act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAGEN. I want to ask a question that is probably quite aside from what you are talking about at the moment. But what elements in the cotton business, for example, normally engage in dealing in the futures starting with the man that grows the cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. The man that grows the cotton, the grower, the merchant, the shipper, the mill.

Mr. HAGEN. They all engage in futures operations?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; for various reasons. And I think you could say the same thing about any other commodity.

Mr. HAGEN. Including co-ops which market cotton for their members?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; the co-ops.

Mr. HAGEN. Are we going to hear from other elemnts in the cotton business on this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. It has been widely announced last Friday and has had broad publicity as to the meeting of this committee and we do not want to deprive anyone from the privilege of testifying.

Mr. HENICAN. There is one other statement I would like to make. I think that this amendment is important also from a tax angle, because the courts have consistently ruled that where the positions are a legitimate hedge, a future transaction is a legitimate hedge, the results therefrom are considered as ordinary income and expense. But when it is considered as a speculative transaction it is then thrown into a category of a capital transaction, a long-term or short-term gain or loss. That is a problem for the accounting angle.

I do not think that point has been stressed enough. The famous case, of course, that Mr. Kauffman mentioned is the Corn Products case and there have been two conflicting court decisions in the Corn Product case.

One court said it was a hedge and the other court said it was not a hedge. I do not think that point can be stressed too forcibly, namely, the problem of taxes. I think these gentlemen whose function it is to acquire raw materials and price their raw materials for their principals will bring that point home as far as the taxes are concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think so.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think Mr. Kauffman came to his feet back there just now to say something.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. If I may be permitted, I would like to make one observation with respect to my comments on the draft which I understand Mr. Henican left with you as a possible substitute draft. That is, that draft applies not only to processors and manufacturers but also to distributors. That is a very important difference which I overlooked.

Mr. HENICAN. No. May I correct you? That has been eliminated.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. In the draft I have before me that is in there. We never had any showing with respect to the need of distributors. I would not want to even give informal approval to legislation affecting the distributors as distinguished from processors and manufacturers.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. Distributing should be deleted in (C), line 3.

Mr. HENICAN. That was eliminated.

May I also make this observation, Mr. GATHINGS. That is, I think that the exchanges and the two gentlemen from the CEA see eye to eye on this whole thing. I think we are in agreement on the spirit and intent of what should be done. We are only about just a short distance apart on the question of this supervision; that is all. It is only a degree.

Actually, I think we recognize the necessity for supervision but the degree of supervision is questionable.

Mr. KNELL. The degree of supervision of acquiring the position.

Mr. HENICAN. And liquidation.

Mr. KNELL. The question I raise is mostly as to liquidation.

Mr. HENICAN. I think you asked Mr. Kauffman why the Senate turned down a similar proposal to amend the act some years ago. This is the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second District decision in the Corn Products case, that was handed down on April 13, 1956. Giving the legislative history of it it says this:

"An amendment introduced in the Senate by Senator Murphy to the bill which became the Commodity Exchange Act would have enlarged the definition of hedging so as to permit manufacturers and millers to buy futures in anticipation of futures manufacturing of milling requirements, even though they had no present offsetting sales. The amendment was opposed 'for the reason that it extends the power to hedge far beyond the definition contained in the original act.' "

Of course, that is what we want to do. We want to broaden the definition in the original act.

He also quotes Mr. Mehl who was the predecessor of Mr. Kauffman at the CEA. "Mr. Mehl, the Assistant Chief of the Grain Futures Administration, explained that the present definition 'of course, is not broad enough to cover the purchase of futures material against anticipated sales of a packaged good goods.' "

(Off the record.)

Mr. GATHINGS. It is 18 minutes to 12. How long would it take these representatives of the manufacturers?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is their testimony more or less in line? They might be seated at the table at the same time.

Mr. GATHINGS. That might be well.

Mr. EMMERT. My name is A. B. Emmert. I am vice president of Dan River Mills at Danville, Va.

Mr. KIRBY. My name is Q. B. Kirby, from Dallas, Tex., president of the Howard Cotton Co. The Howard Cotton Co. is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Dominion Textile Co. of Montreal, Canada. The Dominion Textile Co. probably manufactures 50 percent, slightly more than 50 percent, of the cotton goods made in Canada.

Mr. ROBINSON. My name is Ralph S. Robinson, member of the cotton committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Mr. GATHINGS. Would you care to make the first statement?

* * * * *

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any questions?

I just wondered now if we could not adjourn over until 10 in the morning and come back here then. Has anyone indicated to you, Mr. Kauffman, that they would like to be heard other than this? What about the oats people and wheat people?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the language of the bill would apply to all commodities, I should think that the grain exchanges would undoubtedly be interested in it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I say grain because they are the Chicago board of trade, particularly, which is the largest grain-futures market.

Of course, Kansas City board of trade and Minneapolis grain exchange rank second and third in grain futures.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think we want to hear from the grain folks, by all means.

Mr. HENICAN. In that respect, sometime ago I prepared what I thought was an explanation of the proposed amendment that maybe the Congressmen of the committee could use. I would like to offer it for the record.

May I offer this for the record?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Supplemental to your testimony.

"EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

"At the present time the Commodity Exchange Act defines a 'hedge transaction' as:

" 'Sales of any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any board of trade to the extent that such sales are offset in quantity by the ownership or purchase of the same cash commodity or, conversely, purchases of any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any board of trade to the extent that such purchases are offset by sales of the same cash commodity.'

"The definition is the classical dictionary one. It is very narrow and in the opinion of well informed persons, who are students of the Commodity Futures Markets, should be broadened. It is the thought that, if the definition is broadened to make possible the use of 'anticipatory herges' by processors or manufacturers, the Commodity Futures Markets will become more liquid and thereby be of more service to thosse who make use of them for hedge purposes.

"An 'anticipatory hedge' may be defined as to the purchase of a commodity futures contract in lieu of the raw commodity by an organization 'in anticipation' of its processing or manufacturing requirements during a stated period in the future.

"Thus, for example, the cotton mill that processes raw cotton bales into sheets, pillowcases, etc., and has on the average of the past 5 years consumed 300,000 bales of raw cotton per year, would be granted the privilege of purchasing cotton futures contracts against a reasonable percentage of 300,000 bales to be consumed during the year 'in anticipation' of purchasing its raw material requirements. Under the present act, such purchases of futures contracts would be considered as a speculation, simply because the cotton mill does not have, at the time of purchase of the futures contract, firm fixed sales of processed goods in equivalent quantity to offset the purchases of futures contracts.

"More frequently than otherwise, the cotton mill is quite satisfied with the prevailing price of raw cotton and, if it were possible, would purchase its full season's requirements at a given time at given prices. It generally is not possible to acquire a full season's requirements, at any given time, of raw cotton. Either the farmer has not harvested his crop, or the merchants or shippers do not have the particular quantities in inventory.

"In contrast, however, the commodity futures markets are a daily continuous trading affair, in which large quantities of contracts are bought and sold. Under ordinary circumstances, the cotton mill would be able to purchase sufficient futures contracts to hedge its 'anticipated season's requirements' and later to convert those contracts into the actual raw bales of cotton.

"Such a transaction is not a speculation, but sound business. It is exactly the opposite of speculation because it will allow the cotton mill to anticipate its season's requirements at prices assuring a reasonable margin of profit between the raw and finished goods and at a time when it would not be possible to acquire the actual raw bales in the quantities desired.

"Under the present act, a cotton processor is allowed to maintain a maximum of 30,000 bales in any position in any cotton futures market without having an offsetting sales commitment. The maximum of 30,000 bales is a statutory limitation. As said, the act is not sufficiently broad in this respect, and further such positions are designated as 'speculative positions.'

"The differential between 'speculative positions' and 'anticipatory hedge positions' is most important from an accounting angle. The Internal Revenue Department has consistently contended that a processor who purchases commodity futures contracts without an offsetting sales commitment, is speculating and that therefore the results from such speculative positions are considered for taxes as capital gains or losses. In contrast, however, Internal Revenue has consistently held that the results from 'hedge transactions,' be considered as 'ordinary income and expense.'

"Recently the Second Circuit Court of Appeals has held that the corn futures contracts purchased by a corn processor, despite the fact that there were no firm offsetting sales commitments, were an 'anticipatory hedge' and part of its actual inventory. The relationship of the raw and futures corn markets were so intimately related, and because the function of the particular organization was exclusively that of processing raw corn, there could be no differentiation between the raw and futures contracts as inventory, said the court. Thus, a United States court has for the first time given recognition to an 'anticipatory hedge' as a legitimate futures market transaction, and has taken it out of the speculative category.

"The necessity to differentiate between a speculative and anticipatory transaction is essential.

"1. Because of taxes.

"2. Because certain organizations will not and do not enter into transactions in violation of the laws, although on frequent occasions in the past the purchase of commodity futures contracts under certain conditions would have proven sound business.

"What has been said above about the cotton mill processor applies to all other raw commodity processors; the flour mill; the processor of cereals from grains the refiner of vegetable oils making shortening, margarine, salad and cooking oils, etc.

"Such an amendment would also be of assistance to the processor-distributor type of organization.

"For example, a large distributor of food at either wholesale or retail who, over a stated period will distribute through retail or wholesale stores 1,000 carloads of eggs or butter, or 5 million pounds of coffee, and so forth. Under certain conditions the processor-distributor would find it profitable to acquire the full period requirements, when available, at a given price in either the raw state or through purchases of contracts in the commodity futures markets. Presently such is not allowed under the act because there are statutory limitations as to position, which are generally very small, and further such positions are now considered as speculative, with all the implications above.

"Some may contend that the accumulation of large positions in the commodity futures markets by processors or manufacturers will cause wide and unnecessary price gyrations. First, when the positions are acquired prices would be forced to high levels and, later, when the positions are liquidated prices would be forced to low levels.

"When such positions are acquired, the reason for their acquisition is because of certain circumstances prevailing as to the attractive level of prices, availability of quantities, etc. Should there be an utter disregard of sound business practices in the acquisition of these positions, the reason for them will have been eliminated. It is most

unreasonable to assume that a processor who desires to initiate such a position will conduct his activities in a manner that would unduly advance prices. Such an advance of prices would eliminate the sound reason for such a position.

"In contrast, a processor holding an anticipatory position, that is with the ownership of a large quantity of futures contracts, would not endeavor to liquidate them in a manner that would unduly depress prices. Rather, the liquidation would be based on the acquisition of the equivalent raw commodity. Because it is rarely possible to acquire, for example, 300,000 bales of spot cotton in 1 block and at 1 price, the position in futures contracts would not be liquidated by indiscriminately selling 300,000 bales of futures contracts. Rather, the 300,000 bales of raw cotton would be acquired in small blocks—500 to 1,000 bales at a time—and the long futures contracts liquidated in the equivalent quantities, which certainly would not have an appreciable effect on the prices for the futures contracts.

"Neither the acquisition of an anticipatory position nor its liquidation will be handled in a manner to cause undue gyrations of prices by established nationally known organizations which are the organizations most likely to take advantage of such operations.

"In addition, the amendment proposed provides that such organizations which would use the anticipatory hedge must justify the reason for the positions through detailed reports to the Commodity Exchange Authority, and under the present law the CEA has full power of investigation and supervising such positions.

"Finally and most important these anticipatory hedge positions will be of considerable benefit to producers and farmers, because they would tend to stabilize prices at a time when stabilization is urgently needed. It is most likely that processors or manufacturers would take anticipatory positions only when prices of the raw commodity are considered by them to be cheap in relation to the prevailing finished-goods prices or when the difference in prices between the raw material and the finished goods assures them a reasonable margin of profit. Thus this buying of commodity futures contracts by processors or manufacturers in anticipatory of their season's requirements would most likely develop at a time when prices were under pressure and declining, and at a time when such a demand is urgently needed. In contrast, it is not likely that the positions will be liquidated only as the equivalent raw material has been acquired or when prices are advancing, thus again offering the possibility of a stabilizing influence. The producer or farmer because of these positions will thus greatly benefit through these stabilizing influences."

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that Mr. Henican would come forward and answer some questions.

Now, Mr. Henican, at the close of yesterday's session you submitted a brief, Explanation of Proposed Amendments.

Now, in that explanation you have given us the difference between speculative hedging and anticipatory hedging.

STATEMENT OF J. P. HENICAN, JR., NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that you would explain the difference between speculative hedging and anticipatory hedging.

Mr. HENICAN. It might take me 2 years to do that, Mr. Congressman. I do not think there is such a tranaction as speculative hedging. I think there is a speculative market position, but there is no such thing as speculative hedging, in my dictionary.

As to anticipatory hedging: the processor, or manufacturer, when he starts a year or a session is actually short of his raw material, even though he has not a written fixed-price sale. A national organization that has been in business for many years is going to process and manufacture a certain volume of raw material, so when he begins his season, or his fiscal year, he is actually short a certain percentage of raw material. This amendment is to allow him to acquire a percentage of his normal requirements—average requirements, by buying commodity futures contracts.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just wonder whether or not the actual goods would have to be in being.

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so. In the matter that we quoted yesterday with regards to the Corn Products Co. Over a series of many years their economists had only a 5-percent error in forecasting their annual average requirements of raw material even though there were no sales made at the time the forecast was made; consequently I think it is possible in these large national organizations for either the vice president in charge of purchases, or the vice preseident in charge of sales, or the economist, or the board of directors to pretty well forecast how much finished goods they are going to process and manufacture and distribute during the year. So, on that basis they can then estimate how much raw material they are going to have to acquire.

Mr. GATHINGS. Can you not do that under the present law?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. You cannot anticipate?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir. You must have a fixed commitment, a sales commitment in order to be long of futures contracts. As Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell explained yesterday, you must have a fixed commitment to buy beyond a certain number of cotton contracts, or require a certain number of contracts in the futures market; otherwise the position is considered a speculative position in the market, not a speculative hedge. I think a national organization that has been in business for a considerable period of time, that has had that experience in the past, knows the average they handle. As Mr. Kirby said yesterday, 200,000 bales of cotton a season. Unless we have a very deep depression in 1957, the Dominion Textile Co. is going to process around 200,000 bales of cotton. Therefore, when they start in 1957 they are theoretically short of approximately 200,000 bales of raw cotton. They want the opportunity when it presents itself, even though they do not have fixed sales on the opposite side, to take advantage of that opportunity, either in the futures market, or the spot market. They can do it in the spot market now, but they have not been able to do it in the futures market, which eliminated a certain amount of flexibility.

Mr. GATHINGS. Just try to explain to a layman how this thing works.

Mr. HENICAN. Let us go back to October 3, 1955, when we had a rather drastic decline in cotton prices. There is no use trying to decide why they declined, but they did. Cotton prices in the futures market were considerably below the Government loan at the lowest of the decline. Now, if one believed that the Government loan was going to continue, he had to assume that prices would eventually come back to the Government-loan level and that, therefore, they were at a discount under what the largest buyer in the world would pay for cotton—the United States Government.

Mr. GATHINGS. In dealing with these contracts you would have to figure whether it was going to be 90 percent of parity or 82½ percent, and so forth?

Mr. HENICAN. The percentage of parity loan had already been established and announced. The Department of Agriculture had already announced a 90-percent support program as of August 1, which support program was good for the balance of that season.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. HENICAN. So the facts were known when prices declined on October 3, 1955.

As I say, the prices on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at the lowest of the decline, that temporary decline, were about 2 cents to 4 cents under the 90-percent support loan as announced by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GATHINGS. For what month?

Mr. HENICAN. All months, practically all months.

Now, why did they go down? Your opinion is as good as mine. I think they were trying to anticipate a change in the program and a change in conditions.

Mr. GATHINGS. What effect did that have on the New Orleans Exchange in transactions handled?

Mr. HENICAN. Let us go back to your question. If the cotton mill that processes, say, 200,000 bales had sales with no raw materials, it could, under the present law, buy futures at that discount to cover its short position, and that would be a legitimate hedge. Assuming that it had no sales, it was prevented from taking advantage of that discount in price. There was no provision in the present law for an anticipatory hedge. If this amendment had been in effect, the cotton mill could have bought futures contracts at that discount under the Government loan in anticipation of the percentage of its requirements for the balance of the season. It could have taken advantage of that decline in price.

Mr. GATHINGS. What would that mean now to the producer of cotton and the stabilization of the price of cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. I think, Mr. GATHINGS, had this provision been operative, it is possible that we would not have had the decline to the extent we did at that time, because those buying orders for the account of anticipatory hedges would have been in the market place, and they might have prevented some of it, maybe not all of it, in my opinion. I personally contacted during those days—and there were 2 or 3 days of that decline—many mills, pointing out to them the cheapness, in my opinion, of the futures contracts as compared to the Government loan.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, you advised purchases?

Mr. HENICAN. I advised purchases, but the mills said they could not enter into the purchases because they did not have a legitimate hedge. They had nothing sold and therefore it would be a speculation on their part. However, if this amendment had been in effect, I think that a fair percentage of those whom I contacted would have purchased contracts that day and would have offset some of the selling that developed and therefore would have tended to stabilize the price to the benefit of the producer.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Henican, what happened to spots on those days?

Mr. HENICAN. Spots went down but not as much.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Did the millowners move in and buy spots?

Mr. HENICAN. I think that some did during that period, yes.

Do not forget, we are trading in futures contracts that endeavor to discount what is going to happen in the future, so therefore, futures are probably more sensitive to developments than the immediate spot price is.

There was a question asked of Mr. Kauffman about initiation and liquidation of these positions about which I would like to comment. We who are executives of exchanges want the positions to be initiated and also liquidated in as orderly and in as businesslike manner as possible, because we are very conscious of the fact that when there are unusual fluctuations we are subject to public criticism, congressional investigation, and so forth. We want these positions to be entered into and liquidated in as sound a manner as possible. We at the exchanges are going to see to it, or attempt to see to it, that that is done.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Henican, what kind of requirements does the New Orleans Cotton Exchange set up for those traders who go on your board and do business? What do you have? How do you become a member? How are you going to operate in the New Orleans Exchange?

Mr. HENICAN. How do you become a member of the New Orleans Exchange?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. We require an application for membership, a formal written application to become a member. The candidate appears before the membership committee and he must meet certain financial requirements.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. HENICAN. The application is screened by the membership committee through the usual banking circles, credit information bureaus, and so forth. The application must be endorsed and approved by two members in good standing who also appear before the membership committee to verify for the financial and moral integrity of the applicant.

Mr. GATHINGS. How often does your membership committee change in its composition?

Mr. HENICAN. I think most of the exchanges operate in the same way. We try to have overlapping members of the committee so that the policy and the customs and the habits are continued for 25 to 50 years.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you get a Dun & Bradstreet report on these applicants?

Mr. HENICAN. We get a Dun & Bradstreet report, a banking report, and a recommendation from 2 or 3 outstanding people in the cotton industry from the local communities. For example, if there is an application from Dallas, we communicate with members of our exchange in the Dallas cotton market and ask their opinion of the candidate. We try to maintain very high ethics and standards.

Mr. GATHINGS. You know these people. You are going to know whom you are dealing with?

Mr. HENICAN. That is pretty much of an unwritten rule of our exchange, though it is not in the books. The two individuals who endorse the applicant or the application of the new member, it is presumed know the applicant. One of the questions that the chairman of the membership committee asks the endorser is, "How long have you known this candidate?"

Mr. GATHINGS. How many actual members do you have?

Mr. HENICAN. We have 331 members in the New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many did you have 10 years ago?

Mr. HENICAN. About 400.

Mr. GATHINGS. Your requirements are more strict, or stringent?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; they are approximately the same. We are trying to maintain the same high standards. The membership has declined on the New York Cotton Exchange as well as on the New Orleans Cotton Exchange because we have not had a profitable volume of business due to the interference of the Government loan programs. We are in a squeeze.

Mr. GATHINGS. If you get this legislation passed, it is going to broaden out operations and you will get more business?

Mr. HENICAN. We hope that it might lead to some broadening in the market place; yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. What does a seat cost now?

Mr. HENICAN. In the New Orleans Cotton Exchange we have no seats. We are a corporation just like General Motors. When you join the New Orleans Cotton Exchange you must own a share of stock in the corporation.

Mr. GATHINGS. One share?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. How much is it?

Mr. HENICAN. The present market value on that stock is about $800. That gives you an interest in all the assets of the corporation. The assets of the corporation presently consist of the building with no mortgage and cash in the bank.

Mr. GATHINGS. How often do you change your members on the board of directors?

Mr. HENICAN. Usually every 2 years. It has been customary to elect a president and a board of directors for 2 years, 1 year, and a continuation for the second year if they behave. There is usually an overlapping of directors.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have a sort of a closed fraternity, do you not?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many applications do you ordinarily receive in the course of a year?

Mr. HENICAN. I am not posted on that figure. I can tell you what the record has been since the 1st of December when I took office as president of the exchange. We have had 8 new members and we have had 4 resignations of members since the 1st of December 1955.

Mr. GATHINGS. Have you ever expelled a member because of his bad financial standing or for any other reason?

Mr. HENICAN. For bad financial standing and bad business practice, attempting to manipulate markets, manipulate prices—anything they may have done that is not a good business practice. Yes, we have.

Mr. GATHINGS. Under your charter just how is he expelled?

Mr. HENICAN. I think that it is pretty well spelled out. We have what we call a business conduct committee that supervises the conduct of members. If there is a charge made by a member that another member is not conducting himself with proper ethics, the business conduct committee considers it. The member charged has the right of appeal and then he has further recourse to the board of directors.

Mr. MCINTIRE. All trading on the floor must be performed by members of the exchange?

Mr. HENICAN. At public outcry?

Mr. MCINTIRE. They operate on their own behalf as traders, trading members, and as representing customers in the capacity of broker?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes. There are 2 or 3 categories of members. Those whom we call ring traders, who trade for their own account in and out; then there are those who arbitrate between the various markets; that is, if the prices are out of line in Liverpool, Bombay, or New York as compared to New Orleans. Then there are those who perform dual functions representing customers and trading for their own accounts, and finally like my own firm, Merrill Lynch, we only handle customers accounts. We act exclusively as brokers. We do not take any position for our own account.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do the rules require that all margins and everything must be paid on the date of the transaction, or what lines of credit are extended to participating members?

Mr. HENICAN. Not only participating members. Under our rules, brokers are also allowed to extend a credit accommodation up to $10,000 based on $5 per bale against legitimate hedge transactions to cotton-trade accounts, members or nonmembers. In extending credit we are required to have a hedge certificate from the principal stating that any contracts that they enter in the market represent legitimate hedge transactions, but for Bill Brown, or Joe Smith, speculator, who may be an attorney or a doctor, he must deposit original margins within a reasonable time.

Mr. MCINTIRE. What is interpreted by the board as a reasonable time?

Mr. HENICAN. I'd say that a reasonable time is by the close of the market the next afternoon.

Mr. MCINTIRE. In other words, the following day?

Mr. HENICAN. The next afternoon, yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. If that happens to be the last day of the week, it would be on the next opening day?

Mr. HENICAN. Monday. In addition to that, we have just recently passed rules stating that margin funds must be "readily available." We have a practice that developed whereby customers would mail a check from a very distant point and it would not reach us for 2 or 3 days. It would be on a local bank and when we sent it back for collection it would take another 2 or 3 days. Now we say that customers have to make funds readily available and within a reasonable time.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Your trading rules do not permit one to come in in the morning and trade all day and close out at night without putting up any money?

Mr. HENICAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Not necessarily, but is that permitted to be done?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes. I think some brokers do it. Merrill Lynch does not do it in all instances. It depends upon the financial responsibility of the individual. In your case, Mr. Congressman, you do not have to put up margins right away and you can give it to me this afternoon. But in my case I put it up ahead of time. My financial condition is not as good as yours.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I think the record should show that I do not trade.

Mr. HENICAN. O. K., sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, the exchange is well fitted and able to handle these credit transactions?

Mr. HENICAN. Credit is a question of each individual broker, not the exchange.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let me ask you this: What regulations of the department would cover credit transactions?

Mr. HENICAN. Of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. I think they have no regulations covering credit. That is an exchange matter.

Mr. GATHINGS. Solely an exchange matter, and as far as I know, it never has been questioned.

Mr. HENICAN. I think so. Three or four years ago there was an attempt. Somebody introduced a bill to give the CEA control over margins and credit, but it was thrown out. I recall coming here and testifying against it.

Mr. MCINTIRE. On that point, you were dealing with two different things, you were dealing with margins and you were dealing with credit.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. And the bill that you referred to permitted the CEA to regulate margins as well as credit?

Mr. HENICAN. Right. Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Badnell can answer that.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Exchange Act confers no authority with respect to margin requirements. The point at which the Commodity Exchange Act confers any jurisdiction with respect to margins is after they are deposited with the broker. The statute requires that the broker must treat and deal with customer's funds and equities as belonging to the customer, he may not commingle them with his own funds, and he must use the funds deposited by customers for the benefit of the customers and not for the purpose of extending credit to customer B. But as to the amount of margin that is deposited,

the statute is silent and confers no jurisdiction whatever.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is not being considered here at all, and I do not want to raise the issue. I just wanted to get Mr. Henican's view. I just wanted to determine in my own mind how the exchange operated.

Mr. HENICAN. I agree with the statement you made yesterday that Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell and the personnel at the CEA had done an outstanding job. They have been very cooperative with the exchanges. I personally would have been satisfied with the language they proposed in the amendment yesterday if I thought Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell would be there for life. I do not know who is going to follow them and how the man who follows is going to interpret the amendment. We want that slightly clearer explanation to satisfy some of the people who feel the same way about it. If I could be assured that these gentlemen would be the heads of the CEA as long as I am alive, I would be satisfied to take their wording of the amendment. Exchanges can operate with these two gentlemen and have operated with them, and as far as I am personally concerned, we want them there.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. I read your explanation of the proposed amendment. I wonder if you would, in different language, give us an explanation in a few words.

Mr. HENICAN. I thought that I pretty well covered it before. It would be much easier if you would ask the questions.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that you would explain to the committee what benefits would accrue with respect to income taxes if anticipatory hedges are permitted as contained in this amendment.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I think the courts have pretty consistently ruled that the monetary results from a legitimate hedge transaction represent ordinary income and expense, but they have also ruled that the results from a speculative position in the market represent a capital transaction. A processor, or manufacturer that has a speculative position in the market really has two accounting systems, one for capital gains or losses and one for ordinary income and expense. As Mr. Emmert, of Dan River Mills, said yesterday, by eliminating that speculative result, or the capital gain result, and recognizing it is as ordinary income or expense, it would either reduce the cost or increase the cost of his raw cotton. Naturally, he thinks it will reduce the cost of his raw cotton by so handling it that way. That is one of the reasons why on October 3, 1955, some of the people that I personally contacted did not want to buy contracts at that time, even though the price appeared very attractive, because they would say, "That is a speculation." The results would be a capital gain or loss as far as our accounting is concerned. It would not be ordinary income and expense as the courts have recognized the results from a legitimate hedge transaction.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wonder what the Bureau of Internal Revenue would think about this matter? What would be your view on that?

Mr. HENICAN. We have consulted with them on it. What do you think, FRANK?

Mr. GATHINGS. I asked whether the Internal Revenue Bureau has been consulted about this amendment, and what they think of it.

Mr. KNELL. Well, I think that it is a confusing tax matter that we are trying to avoid rather than an evasion. It is a clarification of handling taxes that we are seeking.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I will make this observation: In all the tax decisions I have reviewed as to the commodity futures markets, the Judge has gone right back to the Commodity Exchange Act for his answer to the problem.

In other words, in this Corn Products case that we quoted yesterday, the judge quoted the definition of a hedge in the present act and then commented that the transaction involved was not a hedge—that it was an anticipatory hedge which is not recognized in the act.

If the act is amended to include this, I think the Internal Revenue Bureau will recognize it because, as I say, in all the tax cases that I have read that have to do with results from commodity market activities, the Judge has referred to the Commodity Exchange Act for his answer.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let us get back to the operations of the exchange. What are the benefits of an anticipatory future contract to a producer or to a shipper or to a cotton factor or to a manufacturer? I wonder if you would give us in a few words just what would be the benefits which would accrue.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, you have to eliminate the first three categories which you mention because this does not cover a producer, a shipper nor a factor. It only covers a processor and a manufacturer.

Mr. GATHINGS. All right.

Mr. HENICAN. It allows him to anticipate his normal or average season's requirements of raw materials. The other three categories are not involved at all.

Mr. GATHINGS. The testimony yesterday was to the effect that——

Mr. HENICAN. We think that because the processor and manufacturers are allowed to acquire these contracts in anticipation of the raw material which they need, that their activities will indirectly help the others by stabilizing prices, but the other three categories will not be able to use the markets under this amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. I believe it was stated yesterday that all segments of the cotton industry are interested in going in there and buying these futures.

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is not that right?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; only the processors and manufacturers.

Mr. GATHINGS. I will have to get that record and see just what they said.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am not sure that I have this clearly in mind. Without this legislation the average mill buyer is faced with the fact that he can go into the futures market and purchase up to 30,000 bales of cotton and any purchases beyond that have got to be shown that they have fixed sales or else it is considered speculative?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Now, if they want to go beyond that, they are perfectly at liberty to go to the spot market and buy as much spot cotton as they want?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. But a large consumer of cotton, if he considers going into the spot market to cover his needs to any substantial degree, finds himself faced with the problem of dealing with holders of cotton who may not want to deal in the quantities in which that manufacturer normally wishes to deal in on the spot market?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. If he were to press for that position in the spot market, he would likely be required to divide his total desire for purchases into a number of transactions with a number of individual holders of cotton in order to avoid what might be a premium if he were to place that order with one substantial holder who did not want to sell that much cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. This legislation would provide a vehicle of relief to him in that situation whereby he could move in on the futures market and accomplish that same objective and thereby naturally improve the volume of transactions on the futures board in which you are interested and would also provide for him a vehicle of avoiding the situation of paying premiums to cover himself on the spot market. Is that about what it would be?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, you made a misstatement. You said you did not understand the amendment. I do not see how I could describe it more perfectly. Your explanation is absolutely perfect.

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GATHINGS. I wonder if you would not follow through on a transaction which will furnish to us some additional information on this matter? I would like to have you take a hypothetical case and show us just how it is going to work out when initiated as well as when liquidations will take effect. I wish you would explain that.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, in answering your request, I am now thinking in terms of Mr. Kirby's statement of yesterday to the committee. I think he had made a very good explanation. So let's start. For example, the board of directors of a cotton mill decides that they are going to process through the next year 200,000 bales of cotton and they decide that the demand for goods is going to be such and the textile prices are going to be such that they can afford to pay 30 cents a pound for their raw material. Therefore they instruct Mr. Kirby that as soon as possible, or when market conditions will justify it, to buy 200,000 bales of cotton at 30 cents per pound or lower.

The mill buyer, Mr. Kirby, immediately gets busy and contacts all his sources of supply—the merchants, Mr. POAGE, of Dallas, Houston, or Muleshoe, Tex., or any market place else like that—and he buys some spot cotton, but he only buys a very small percentage of the 200,000 bales.

In the meantime the futures market is at or below the equivalent of 30 cents per pound. So in order to cover himself, he buys futures contracts up to whatever is allowed under the law, with the purpose of fixing the cost of his raw materials. In other words, the directors have said to him, "We think the goods markets are going to be such that we can buy raw cotton, process it, and make a profit on the basis of 30 cents a pound for our raw material." However, when buying futures contracts, that is done with the intent of eventually converting those futures contracts into spot cotton.

After the contracts are acquired Mr. Kirby is still contacting all the merchants, spot brokers, and f. o. b. people, as well as producers in the State of Texas, and is looking for the specific quality of cotton that he wants. Hence, as he acquires the quality of cotton required, he liquidates the equivalent in the futures market.

I do not think it is going to be possible for that processor or manufacturer to buy 100,000 bales of cotton in any one spot, not even from our mutual friends, Mr. POAGE, or Anderson-Clayton & Co., except at a premium. So he looks around and he buys it from several or many small merchants, shippers, farmers, and so on, in medium-sized lots.

As I say, as he acquires spot cotton he then liquidates his futures.

I cannot believe in this ghost that some talk about, that the futures position, once acquired, is going to be recklessly liquidated. I cannot believe that 100,000 bales of futures, for example, is going to be recklessly dumped on the market, because that would defeat the entire purpose of the transaction, in my opinion, and that it, therefore, is going to be liquidated in an orderly manner.

As these small blocks of spot cotton are acquired the comparable amounts of futures will be liquidated in an orderly manner.

Mr. GATHINGS. But only a small percentage of these contracts will be delivered upon; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; because with regard to deliveries against futures contracts, 100 years ago trading in futures contracts evolved as the best method of doing business that was

to be consummated at a future time. The trading has been substantially the same through this 100 years. There have been refinements. It should be perfectly obvious that I as a buyer of contracts cannot by 1 grade and 1 staple or 1 quality of wheat or 1 quality of corn or the 1 quality of any other commodity, because nature may not have given us that quality during that growth year.

However, as trading in these contracts evolved, they allowed delivery of a range of grades and staples or a range of quality so there would not be a squeeze, and so that there would not be an undue manipulation of prices. Thus a range of qualities are deliverable. It should be perfectly obvious that if I have in mind a particular quality when buying a futures contract, it is possible that it will not be delivered because it is not convenient for the seller to deliver it. He may not have that particular quality; that particular quality might not have been produced that particular year. But, deliveries are allowed of a wide range of qualities on the basis of premiums and discounts. The best quality or the better qualities are deliverable at a premium and lower qualities at a discount.

Mr. POAGE. I dislike having to start this class back in the third grade, but I pretty nearly need to do it if I am going to keep up with you gentlemen.

I am just wondering if you will not take this fellow who is going to buy 100,000 bales of cotton and go through the entire procedure? Of course, he is buying a lot of cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, he has consumed on the average of the past 10 years in excess of 200,000 bales.

Mr. POAGE. Not many of them do that.

Mr. HENICAN. We decided yesterday there was in excess of 100 mills which consumed in excess of 30,000 bales a year.

Mr. POAGE. Let us take the 100,000 bales of cotton which he is going to buy and follow through for me and tell me just what he does.

Assume that he goes out today and buys on the futures market, or that is what he would like to do, at least, as I understand it, and he buys it. Does he buy it for delivery all in the same month?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so. I do not think that would be a businesslike basis on which to do it. He is going to consume the 200,000 bales in probably equal monthly quantities over a 12-month period. So, he would scatter his purchases through, let us say, October, November, March, May, and July, probably in equal amounts.

Mr. POAGE. Let us assume that he has to have some cotton to go to work on immediately and that he has to buy spots of the quality which he wants. Of course, when he buys these futures, he just buys cotton, as I understand it.

Mr. HENICAN. He fixed the cost of his raw material. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. In other words, he buys that at 30 cents and that is probably on a fifteen-sixteenths Middling basis?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. But if he wants an inch and an eighth, he pays the premium on that?

Mr. HENICAN. Pardon me a second. You are familiar with the fact that beginning with the new season, August 1, 1956, the base of the futures contract is Middling inch, which is a change from Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch.

Mr. POAGE. Whatever the basis is, if he wants something better, he pays that premium for it; does he not?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. That is, if they deliver him something better. In other words, he does not have any choice over what he gets?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. He gets whatever they deliver.

Mr. HENICAN. Within a range as prescribed in the contract and under the rules of the exchanges.

Mr. POAGE. In a prescribed range, and within the differentials that are prescribed?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. But he has no choice as to what they deliver and they deliver whatever they want to.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. That, of course, is one good reason why he would not want to take delivery on that contract, because it may not be something which he can use.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Then, he might want short staple, or he might want seven-eighths, and get the benefit of the price on it.

Mr. HENICAN. He might want other factors, too, which do not show up in the contract, such as micronaire and other characteristics of the cotton, as well as textile characteristics, and so on.

Mr. POAGE. So he would go out and try to buy the cotton he wants, and he probably cannot buy it in any sizable blocks, as you pointed out.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, he would find a thousand bales of cotton at Muleshoe, Tex., that he wants, and he would buy that cotton and let us assume he has to pay something more than 30 cents for that cotton next week. Let us further assume that he is buying 1-inch cotton, and he is buying Middling. He would have to pay about 34 cents for that; would he not?

Mr. HENICAN. What grades or staple did you say?

Mr. POAGE. I said 1-inch Middling.

Mr. HENICAN. It is about 155 points premium over Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch—1.5 cents—or 31.5 cents would be the approximate cost.

Mr. POAGE. It would not be at 33 cents?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, he has to pay 31½ cents for that?

Mr. HENICAN. 31.5 cents.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. That is, under the present differentials between Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch and Middling inch.

Mr. POAGE. He has to pay 31.5 cents on that. Now, how does that hedge help him?

Mr. HENICAN. Well, obviously, it would not help him. So, therefore, he would not buy his futures at 30 cents. He would wait until they got to 29 cents, or to 28.5 cents.

Mr. POAGE. Well, he waits, but he does not have his hedge if he waits.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right. He would not enter into the position under those circumstances, and I think that is one of the controlling factors of the orderly manner in which these positions are going to be handled.

Mr. POAGE. Well, that is where you get me. You say he would not have to take a position. what do you mean?

Understand, I have never traded in these markets, and I do not know anything about it, except what I hear.

Mr. HENICAN. I think Mr. MCINTIRE can explain it better than I can. Jokes aside. What you describe is the reason I have not believed in this ghost in the closet. Let us go back to our original premise and that was to the effect that the board of directors told the mill buyer that they could use 200,000 bales of cotton profitably next year, provided those raw materials could be acquired at 30 cents. Then that mill buyer is going to use his very best efforts to buy that cotton at 30 cents a pound, and he is not going into the transaction until he can average about that price.

He is not recklessly going in and buy futures if the future price is above that level. Later the board of directors may change their minds and realize that cotton is not going to be available at 30 cents and say "go ahead and pay 32 cents for it," but the buyer is not going to recklessly buy a lot of futures contracts when the management has indicated that they are going to make a profit based on buying the raw material at 30 cents a pound.

Mr. POAGE. They are talking about 30 cents a pound cost to them for the grade of cotton they want?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. He does not go out and buy futures, then, at 30 cents a pound?

Mr. HENICAN. No; he does not. He would not buy them at 29.5 or 28.5 under this proposal.

Mr. POAGE. All right. Now, let us assume that he is able to buy and, of course, if he was able to buy any, I guess he would buy the whole 200,000 bales, would he not, on the futures market?

Mr. HENICAN. He probably would. I would imagine, however, he would now be able to buy some cotton at prices desired under those circumstances. So, he would not have to buy the entire 200,000 bales, but assuming he could not buy spots, he would probably buy all his futures——

Mr. POAGE. What I am trying to do is to follow it on through, and see just what he does. He does not actually buy the 200,000 bales of cotton on the futures market. He probably only buys a part of that?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. What would he buy, or what would we expect him to buy?

Mr. HENICAN. The amount he is going to be allowed to buy as covered by this last sentence in the proposed amendment: "In conformity with the regulations as the Secretary may prescribe." We do not know what that is as yet. We have discussed a "reasonable percentage" of his normal season's requirements with Mr. Bagnell and Mr. Kauffman and they, just thinking out loud, have indicated it might be 50 percent under certain conditions, and 40 percent under other conditions. I do not think that under any set of circumstances we would want a position of 100 percent coverage. Yet, on the other hand, a smaller operation—say for instance a mill that produces or processes only 20,000 bales or 15,000 bales—the situation would be different, and 100 percent coverage would not be unreasonable or unbusinesslike.

Mr. POAGE. He is not affected by this bill anyway, is he?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; I think he is.

Mr. POAGE. I thought some one said he could buy 30,000 bales.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right, but that is a speculative position, and we want to take it out of a speculative position because of the tax result. Such a mill with, say, a small consumption logically would not unduly affect prices either up or down. I can see no reason why he cannot buy 100 percent of his season's requirements.

Mr. POAGE. I understand this 30,000-bale deal, but if he bought more than 30,000 bales it is not considered speculative; is it?

Mr. MCINTIRE. It is considered a speculative position.

Mr. POAGE. Please understand, gentlemen, that I just walked in and I do not know this background information. Therefore, someone has to tell me about it.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. POAGE, according to the Commodity Exchange Act, a hedge is defined as a long future against a fixed sale or firm sale or a short future against ownership of a spot commodity. Those are what the CEA Act defines as bona fide hedges, and any contracts over that, not evenly balanced, are considered speculative positions either long or short.

Speculative positions are limited to 30,000 bales maximum.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot have more than 30,000 bales of speculative cotton; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. It is possible that a mill could have 100,000 bales long, and the equivalent of 100,000 bales sold in the form of processed goods, but beyond that, under the present act, he can also own only 30,000 bales, which is considered a speculative position.

Mr. POAGE. This would allow him to own more than 30,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. This would allow them to own a reasonable percentage of what they have normally processed over a series of years.

Mr. POAGE. When you say "a percentage," what percentage do you have in mind?

Mr. HENICIAN. That is what the CEA is going to tell us, or what they think is sound. The wording on the proposed amendment is, "It is a sound commercial practice."

Mr. POAGE. But except for that, if the man had 200,000 bales which he expected to use he could buy that now under the present law, and that is not a speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. If he has something sold against it; yes, sir. If there are no fixed sales, the positions are limited to 30,000 bales, despite the fact the mill annually processes 200,000 bales.

Mr. POAGE. Then he can turn around and except for that proviso, if the Department imposed any limitation, he could go ahead and buy another 200,000 bales without having anything sold?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. He could not do that without having sold against the 200,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir. Do you mean under this proposal?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, I do not think so. I do not think the Department is going to allow full coverage.

Mr. POAGE. I understand, but I said except for that provision, and unless the Department acted, he could under this bill buy another 200,000 bales without it being called speculative; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; if the maximum coverage is allowed, that would be correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. However, as the situation exists now, one cannot have but 30,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is, he cannot have but 30,000 bales at any one time?

Mr. HENICAN. Over and beyond the bona fide hedges; that is correct.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot have more than 30,000 bales without being in a speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. You can have more than 30,000 bales; can you not?

Mr. HENICAN. No; only if you have some offsetting transactions, Mr. POAGE.

Mr. POAGE. You mean you cannot buy but 30,000 bales and remain outside of the speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Then, it is not like I stated, the matter a minute ago. I think I was wrong. I said that he could buy under this proposal 200,000 bales and he could buy 200,000 bales against his sales here if he had to, and then he could buy another 200,000 bales and still would not be in a speculative position. However, he would, in fact, be in a speculative position in the second 200,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so.

Mr. POAGE. That is what I want to get straight. What difference does it make if he is not going to be in a speculative position because the 30,000 bales merely relates to the limit of speculative cotton he can hold; does it not?

Mr. HENICAN. May I ask you a couple of questions?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. HENICAN. Do you thing that such an organization as the Dan River Mills is going to continue in business?

Mr. POAGE. I assume they will.

Mr. HENICAN. They have been in business for a long period of time; have they not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. On the average they have processed, say, for the last 25 years, 200,000 bales of cotton per year.

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is, 200,000 bales of cotton per year.

Mr. HENICAN. 200,000 bales of cotton per season. Is it not normal to expect that if we do not have a severe depression or adverse economic conditions that during 1957 they will process around 200,000 bales of cotton? That has been their experience for, say, 25 years, and they should do it again next year.

When they start the year, they are theoretically short 200,000 bales of raw cotton on a normal expectation, or the anticipation of the goods which they are going to process. So, by buying that additional 200,000 bales that you mentioned, I do not think it would constitute speculation. I think they are merely insuring their price against that which they anticipated producing based upon sound facts and sound records.

Mr. POAGE. What I have said—and I want to go back over it again because I am not sure now whether I was right or wrong, because I am more confused now than I was when I started—was in an effort to get this clear in my mind. Let us assume that the Dan River Mills has succeeded in selling the equivalent of 200,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. That is they have contracts for their goods to that extent.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They go ahead and buy 200,000 bales, as I understand it, on the futures market, and that is not speculative?

Mr. HENICAN. Totally exempt.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I understand that, but as I understand it under this proposal if we leave out the proviso or if we assume that the department is not going to act on it, Dan River Mills can turn around and buy another 200,000 bales, which makes 400,000 bales, and that is not speculative either? Is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. In my opinion under the circumstances we are discussing, and if I understand them correctly, in my opinon, it is not speculation, because that second 200,000 bales is bought against what they anticipate processing during 1957 based on what they have done for the past 25 years, and they bought those contracts to insure the price level.

Mr. POAGE. I do not understand that, because they have already sold the 200,000 bales and they have contracts to sell another 200,000 bales because that is what they anticipate processing.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously, that is not speculative, and we understand that, but then, as I understand it, this second 200,000 bales which they could buy under the terms of this porposal would be declared not to be speculative under the terms of this bill.

I do not see how you can attribute to it the speculative feature when you already have contracts to sell. That would mean they would have to raise their position to 400,000 bales of goods or the equivalent of 400,000 bales of cloth.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me say this: I misunderstood your question. You were a little bit too much ahead of me. I am just a country boy, as you know. You were ahead of me. You put both transactions into one. I see it now. You put both the transactions into one year.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. That would be prevented, in my opinion, because I am pretty certain, or I am as reasonably certain, that the CEA is going to set down proposals or rules whereby the organization making use of the amendment will have to show a necessity to use it, and there is no necessity for the second 200,000 bales in 1957, and therefore that would be prevented.

Is that a fair answer?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I believe the answer is that that anticipated requirement would already have been filled by the purchase of 200,000 bales.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. It would seem that way to me.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. There would be no necessity for the second 200,000 bales and, therefore, they would not be allowed to purchase the second 200,000 bales in 1957, let us say, or in the same year.

Mr. POAGE. But that would depend upon the order which is issued by the Department; would it not?

I mean as far as this bill is concerned, they could buy the second 200,000 bales if there was not any order prohibiting it?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They could not?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. I was just reading this proposed amendment——

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Poage, may I refer you to the wording in section (c) there?

Mr. POAGE. You are looking at the printed bill, or this last one?

Mr. HENICAN. This last one. Under Section (c) in the third paragraph, the first word in the third line is "shall not exceed unfilled production for 1 year."

In the proposal that you made the anticipated requirements had already been filled for the year. Therefore, the second purchase would be out of order.

Mr. POAGE. I suppose that is right.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right; it would be out of order. In your case he sold on the average 200,000 bales, and he bought his 200,000 bales as futures, and he is finished for that year. He has no more unfilled requirements.

Mr. POAGE. All right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have one further question: I think, perhaps, the record ought to show what effect the placing of an anticipatory hedge would have under the 30,000 bale limit. What is your understanding of this legislation, Mr. Henican, if, for instance, I was a small-mill operator? Could I purchase my anticipated needs and have it classified, or have it defined for tax purposes if I were operating under the 30,000 bale limitation, as is contained in the regulations now?

I take it from what you have said that there is no thought that there would be some different interpretation for tax purposes on an anticipatory hedge as contrasted with a speculative hedge.

All of our conversation yesterday and today has been very largely at least dealing with these transactions which are above the 30,000 bale limit. I think perhaps the record will indicate at this point that that was where an anticipatory hedge started, and that up to the 30,000 bales, if a mill manager was buying in excess of their firm sales that that for the record ought to show whether under 30,000 it would be defined as an anticipatory hedge, or whether you were speculative in the 30,000 bales and beyond that point you can come into the definition of an anticipatory hedge?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not know. That is a very interesting question, of course, and it is a question that, frankly, I do not have the answer for. I would like Mr. Bagnell to answer it.

Mr. BAGNELL. I believe, sir, that this proposal comes in section (c) under 4 (a). You have two other forms of hedges, one being the growers hedge. You have under (a) the amount of such commodity such person is raising.

Mr. McINTIRE. What page are you on?

Mr. BAGNELL. Page 5 of the act.

Mr. McINTIRE. I have the same thing.

Mr. BAGNELL. Half way down the page is paragraph (a). Then you have paragraph (b) which covers another form of hedge, and now you bring in here paragraph (c).

Mr. McINTIRE. All right. What is your thought as to the interpretation on that point?

Mr. BAGNELL. My thought is that that would take the same form and start figuring it exactly the same as these other forms of hedges from zero on up but not from 30,000 on up. In other words, a grower is allowed a hedge. There is no limitation on it. It is regarded as a hedge against his growing crop.

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. BAGNELL. Then you have your second form, and now you take on this. I would assume that if a man in the category you mentioned, let us say he needed 15,000 bales.

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes.

Mr. BAGNELL. Heretofore he would not be in violation of the CEA if he were under the 30,000 bales. Now anything he did would be regarded as a bona fide hedge. At that time it might be regarded as a speculation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Well, then, to rephrase that in my own words, do I understand correctly there that under existing regulations that a purchase of less than 30,000 can be made and described as a hedge unless there are firm transactions against that?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. McINTIRE. Well, I would not think so.

Mr. BAGNELL. No; that is just it.

Mr. McINTIRE. However, it is your thought that this legislation would permit that?

Mr. BAGNELL. It would permit that; yes, sir. It would describe a transaction such as you have just mentioned as a hedge. Heretofore it would be a speculation.

Mr. HENICAN. However, Mr. McINTIRE asked a further question and that was whether this amendment, as I understand it, Mr. McINTIRE, whether under this amendment this account would be allowed to buy 15,000 bales which they could put under hedge, and an additional 30,000 as a speculation.

Mr. McINTIRE. He is always free to buy the 30,000 as a speculation; is he not?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; I would imagine so. You can do it as an individual now, if you wish.

Mr. McINTIRE. What I was getting at for the record was how as it stands now this would take place. It is my thought, if I understand it correctly, that a hedge must be, in order to meet the definition of a hedge, such that you have firm sales of goods to cover the raw material?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is regardless of any quantity?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. McINTIRE. And the 30,000, of course, is a speculative limit, but I was just wondering if this definition of anticipatory hedge would some into play below the 30,000 or whether it would be a speculation up to 30,000 and an anticipatory hedge above 30,000?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. May I answer that question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. sir.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Our thinking on that is that if a manufacturer has an unfilled requirement of 45,000 bales for an operating season, he can now purchase 30,000 bales. So, under this provision he would be entitled to an additional 15,000. In other words, he would not be given 75,000. He would be given a total of 45,000 including the purchase of the present limit of 30,000, because there would be no occasion to provide for any larger quantity than that. That is our interpretation of it.

Mr. POAGE. He could buy the 45,000 without any element of speculation entering into it?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. No. Understand, he has no season fixed sales commitments but based on his records he anticipates that he can dispose of the equivalent of 45,000 bales of cotton. He has no season previous sales commitments.

So, he cannot place a hedge order in the market or acquire a hedging position that will qualify as such under the statutory definition of bona fide hedging. So, the most he can do is buy 30,000 bales of futures at present. Under this provision he would be permitted to buy an additional 15,000 so that he would have a total long position of 45,000 bales, which would be equivalent to his unfilled anticipated requirements.

Mr. McINTIRE. Let me ask a question at that point if I may, for the matter of the record.

Does he hold 30,000 speculatively and 15,000 on an anticipatory hedge, or does he hold 45,000 on an anticipatory hedge?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Well, he undoubtedly holds 45,000 and he regards it as an anticipatory hedge and he probably would report it to us as such.

It would just be a matter of nomenclature.

Mr. McINTIRE. By the same token, he can hold 20,000 as an anticipatory hedge if he can show that is needed in his operation.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Yes; if he has to avail himself of this provision.

The important fact is that we would not start counting with the first bale, but rather after 30,000. The 30,000 bales which he already had under the present law we would assume would be included in the 45,000 that he needs, and would not be added to the 45,000.

Mr. McINTIRE. With reference to this tax business, can he declare now if he is under 30,000 and does not have the contracts to show against it? He cannot declare that now as a legitimate hedge?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Yes; but not as a bona fide hedge under the Commodity Exchange Act. However, in the Corn Products case, which was decided by the United States Supreme Court on November 7, 1955, the Corn Products Refining Co. against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that case involved that precise point. Both the United States Tax Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found that the Corn Products Refining Co.'s futures transactions, which they engaged in these anticipatory hedges, they found those transactions to be an integral part of its business designed to protect its manufacturing operations against a price increase in its principal raw material, and to assure a ready supply for future manufacturing requirements. Although those transactions did not qualify under the Commodity Exchange Act as bona fide hedges, both the Tax Court and the Court of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court held that they were for the purpose of price protection, and they were an integral part of the petitioner's manufacturing operations and, therefore, for the purpose of the Revenue Act they were to be regarded as true hedges and were subject to the provisions relating to ordinary losses and not capital gains.

Mr. McINTIRE. That covers the point. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Kauffman, I think it would be well to put the Supreme Court decision into the record at this point.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, there was a companion cause which I am sure would be of interest to the committee, and it bears even more directly on the purpose of the Gathings bill. That was the case in which the Corn Products Refining Co. was taking an exactly opposite position to what they took in the tax case. In the tax case they were contending that the positions were not hedging transactions, but in the CEA case against them they were contending that they were hedging transactions.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on April 13, 1956, handed down a decision sustaining the Department of Agriculture's position in the matter to the effect that those transactions do not qualify as bona fide hedges under the Commodity Exchange Act. I will also leave a copy of it here.

Mr. GATHINGS. If you would file copies of those decisions for the record, we would appreciate very much having them.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I will furnish the reporter a copy of the Supreme Court decision in the other case also.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions of Mr. Henican?

(No response.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Is Mr. Robert C. Liebenow present in the room?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Chairman, he was here earlier this morning, but he told me he had an engagement at 11 o'clock which he would have to keep.

Therefore, he is not present.

Mr. GATHINGS. I understood he desired to make a statement.

Mr. HENICAN. He did, sir, but he told me that he would be glad to prepare for the committee a letter setting forth his views with reference to this proposal.

Mr. GATHINGS. We would like to have such a letter from him on file, and any statement which he would like to make for the record.

Mr. HENICAN. I am a member of the Chicago Board of Trade, and he personally gave me authority to act for him. I know that that institution is in favor of this amendment that we have proposed, and that we have agreed to here. I would just like to get that into the record at this point.

Mr. GATHINGS. Have you received any communications from any other commodity group with respect to this legislation since it was introduced?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I have informally discussed this proposal with the executives of most of the Commodity Exchanges that are regulated by the Commodity Exchange Act, and in my opinion, they are all in favor of this bill. I have made it a point to discuss the matter with the president or the executives and vice presidents of substantially all of the institutions that are under the supervision of the act, and they are all in favor of it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is there anything further, gentlemen?

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have one more question. This matter of liquidation is one that I do not get too clearly and distinctly in my mind, but I would draw this thought from your testimony, Mr. Henican.

This legislation being somewhat restrictive in its use in that it is directed toward the manufacturers and processors and to other elements who may be participating in the futures transactions that in itself is somewhat of a degree of insurance on the pressure of liquidations and the fact that the mill management, through its representative, is in on a futures transaction as price insurance protection; that their relative position between the price in those futures transactions and the spot market is sufficiently closely related so that the pressure of a quick liquidation is not likely to occur. Is that correct?

Mr. HENICAN. That is the way I feel about it; yes, sir. In my experience it is not possible to cover the exact quality required in any commodity in large amounts which would necessitate immediate liquidation of a large volume of futures that may be in the market.

It could be done in small blocks as the spots are acquired.

Mr. McINTIRE. You cited this case of mill management setting a price of 30 cents a pound for cotton, and instructing their pur-

chasing representative there to use that as a guide in relation to the actual cost of cotton which goes into their manufacturing process and that 30 cents a pound may or may not be a controlling factor on the purchase of futures.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. However, you think that there is a close enough relationship between the level of the price of futures and the spot market, so that it will not distort these positions enough to serve as an incentive to get out of the futures in bigger blocks than would be orderely?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, those relationships get out of line once in a while, but I think on the average over a series of years they are pretty close together. We are talking about a business transaction and, in my opinion, it has to be conducted in a business-like way—otherwise, they would not be entered into or liquidated.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, we are spending a great deal of time in discussing cotton and using it as an illustration as to what this law would cover when we are actually covering other commodities.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. This type of close relationship between the futures pricing and the spot market would not necessarily hold true in other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, if you recall what I said yesterday, I am fairly familiar with most of the commodity markets but having been born in a cottonpatch I know that industry better. I think the relationship between the commodity markets and all commodities—that is, futures and spots—works substantially the same.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Well, could I ask your observation there as to whether you think the relationship in trading on such commodities as wheat, and cotton, and oats, and barley, are comparable to the relationships and the trading on onions, potatoes, and some of the other perishable comodities?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, when talking about the functioning—I break down the commodity industries into two categories, major and minor. I put in the category of major commodities those commodities which we produce in America in large surplus such as cotton, wheat, corn, and a few others, and in the minor commodities I put the perishable commodities such as onions, potatoes, and so forth—the smaller commodities. There probably should be a third category called "import commodities" such as cocoa, coffee, hides, and so on. Quite naturally, the volume in those minor commodity markets are not the same, and from a commonsense angle there is a larger volume of trading in the major commodity markets where those commodities are produced in big surplus in this country. Therefore, in my opinion, the relationship and the functions of those latter markets is much better and much more efficient than in the smaller commodities.

I am quite familiar with the situation in onions and also in potatoes. Personally, I am not in favor of some of the things that are happening there.

Mr. MCINTIRE. You have a lot of company on that point, in my opinion.

Mr. HENICAN. O. K. I know of some of the things you have in mind. As I told you earlier, Merrill Lynch does not take a position in any of these markets. What we are interested in is a fair and equitable contract for buyers and sellers because we know that if they are one-sided in either respect we cannot do business. We are interested in a large volume of business in order to get our percentage of it.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I was getting to the fact that our responsibility under this legislation is much broader than cotton, but that is what we have spent our time on, and I was just wondering about the other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me ask you this question:

I wish you would clear up some of my ignorance because you originate from that territory. Is there such a thing as an onion processor or manufacturer?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I do not know. I do not come from an onion territory.

Mr. HENICAN. Would he qualify under this?

Mr. MCINTIRE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HENICAN. I can see a possibility. There are potato processors and manufacturers.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Very definitely.

Mr. HENICAN. I have handled some long contracts for a potato-chip manufacturer where the potato price was such that he could fix his cost and fix his profits. I do not think there is such an organization as an onion manufacturer or processor. So, he would not qualify under this amendment; would he?

Mr. LAIRD. We do have these french-fry potato plants which are processors.

Mr. MCINTIRE. And, of course, there is likely to be more of it as time goes on. That is the direction in which marketing is moving in those commodities.

I am wondering, and I just wanted to get your thought, as to whether or not the discussion we have had here particularly on cotton has equal bearing and an equal relationship with the other commodities which are affected under this act?

Mr. HENICAN. I think so.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do you think this bill should be amended to include only cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; I am very strongly opposed to amending this to include cotton only. It should include all commodities because as you recall yesterday the gentleman from CEA mentioned the fact that the first time this came up was many years ago. It had to do with a Quaker Oats matter, and later the Corn Products matter, and it has only recently been involved with cotton.

There is another case in which I was personally involved which had to do with the Mexican Government in regard to wheat. I would be very much opposed to limiting this amendment to cotton only.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Henican, I just wonder if you gentlemen think that the record is complete or if you had any further suggestions?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is complete insofar as the Commodity Exchange Authority is concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

If there are no further questions, the subcommittee will stand adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock, noon, the subcommittee adjourned.)

New Cabinet Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and high hopes that we from New Mexico wish godspeed and success to the new Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton. As typical of the high regard in which former Senator Seaton is held by the press in New Mexico, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Albuquerque Journal, one of the leading daily papers in the State, on June 2, 1956, and which reads as follows:

NEW CABINET MEMBER

New Mexico has always been keenly interested in who holds the post of Secretary of the Department of the Interior because it has the guardianship of 400,000 American Indians as well as being classed as the custodian of the Nation's natural resources.

President Eisenhower has chosen Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, for his post as a successor to Douglas McKay who resigned to become the Republican candidate for Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Seaton, a former Member of the Senate, where he served a brief appointive term, has been a member of the inner White House staff. Although an old pro in politics, he is well known in Congress, and his nomination has been favorably received, even by such an ardent antiadministration conservationist as Senator MORSE, of Oregon.

The new Cabinet member will be the superior to New Mexico's Glenn Emmons, who was chosen by President Eisenhower early in his administration as Secretary of Indian Affairs. Mr. Emmons has done much to advance the educational and health status of the Indians in New Mexico and other States. Mr. Seaton's selection should assure continued cooperation with Mr. Emmons in this field.

Mr. Seaton also has an understanding of irrigation and water conservation, and especially of the public power issue on which Mr. McKay came under attack, whether justly or not. Nebraska more than 20 years ago dug into that issue, and State-managed and operated systems came to dominate that State.

The Seaton appointment does not signal a reversal of President Eisenhower's advocacy of a partnership policy with respect to Federal, State, and private power interests. Rather, it may mean that, knowing well the factors involved, he will be a balance wheel in carrying out the President's policy.

With his experience and background, Mr. Seaton ought to carry on the work of the Department of the Interior as well as any western man who Mr. Eisenhower could have selected.

Housing for Older Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Herald News, Passaic, N. J., under date of May 29:

HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS

This year's omnibus housing bill the Senate has sent to the House contains two unusual provisions. If they become law they may revolutionize current methods of handling housing for older persons.

One provision would allow FHA to insure 100 percent of mortgages up to $10,000 for those 60 years and older. Payments could be spread over 40 years. These liberal terms would be available either to the older folks themselves or to a third party desiring to build homes to rent to them. If the third

party were a local government, an official agency, or a nonprofit organization, it could get the full 100-percent guarantee. A private builder could get up to 90-percent mortgage insurance. This would not be apartment project money, but for single homes.

This would accomplish what social workers have long urged, respectable homes for the aged at reasonable cost.

The other provision would authorize some 15,000 units of public housing to be built in each of the next 5 years especially for persons over 65. The bill also would change the law that says no less than two persons related by blood or marriage may occupy a public housing unit. It would permit single persons over 65 to constitute a family.

The FHA provision has support from both parties and stands a good chance of passing the House. The same can be said for the public housing plan, though the number of units to be built may be trimmed. Regardless, these provisions indicate congressional concern for the problems of the increasing number of older persons.

Statement of Tom Pickett, Executive Vice President, National Coal Association, to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, May 28, 1956, Presenting the Views of the Bituminous Coal Industry in Opposition to the Gore Bill S. 2725

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the statement by Tom Pickett, executive vice president, National Coal Association, to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, May 28, 1956, in opposition to S. 2725, commonly known as the Gore bill.

Mr. Pickett's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Tom Pickett. I am executive vice president of the National Coal Association with offices in the Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. The National Coal Association is the trade organization of the bituminous coal mine owners and operators whose total production is two-thirds of all the commercial bituminous coal produced in the United States.

The bituminous coal industry is opposed to S. 2725 and similar proposals to adopt a crash program approach to the atomic generation of electricity, for the following reasons: (1) There is no current domestic need for the development of a new source of power. (2) The construction of a large number of nuclear powerplants with the Government paying all the costs would constitute a partial abandonment of the free-enterprise system and a long stride toward complete socialism. (3) The program called for by this bill would result in the construction of unnecessary plants, duplicating experimental plants, at high cost to the taxpayers, for the production of high-cost power. (4) Beneficial results can best be obtained by orderly research and development of nuclear power possibilities, with proper attention to the hazards affecting the public welfare, and with the least possible encroachment on the private-enterprise system.

The coal industry does not oppose the Government's present program for orderly research and development of experimental nuclear powerplants. The industry recognizes the need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear power through the experimental stages.

On February 15 of this year I presented to this committee the views of the bituminous coal industry with respect to the atomic energy program, and with respect to the report of the McKinney panel. In my statement at that time I quoted the resolution adopted on November 1, 1955, by the board of directors of the National Coal Association, setting forth the policy of the coal industry on atomic energy. I believe that policy statement is so important it warrants repetition here:

"Be it resolved by the directors of the National Coal Association, That the following facts and principles should be considered by the executive branch of the Federal Government, the Members of Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission and the American people, in determinating the role of the Federal Government in the development of atomic energy:

"I. In the progression of humanity, in furthering world trade, in advancing the cause of peace, and in maintaining the world leadership of the United States, there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy. To this end, the National Coal Association recognizes the need for the Government to support the national laboratories and to carry out the basic as well as applied research in the field of atomic energy.

"II. Future development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide power for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The National Coal Association therefore recognizes the need for the Government to continue the power demonstration program to optimize the conditions under which atomic power is generated.

"III. The public interest requires that atomic energy be utilized principally in whatever ways or processes it will contribute efficiently to the energy requirements of the United States and the world. The conversion of solid fuels to gas and to liquid fuels through the utilization of atomic energy promises great benefits to the people of the United States. The national laboratory effort should be directed toward minimizing atomic energy fuel processing costs, increasing the safety of reactor systems against the public hazards, and developing high temperature materials of construction to the end that all sources of energy will receive their fair share of the total effort to achieve progress.

"IV. The United States is one of the few nations of the world blessed with sufficient reserves of fossil fuels to meet the Nation's power requirements at low cost for centuries to come. In the United States the most economic source of steam-generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by coal, oil or natural gas. Under the competitive stimulus of our free enterprise system, the ingenuity of the American people will bring about the most beneficial results that can be obtained from all energy sources, including coal, oil, natural gas and atomic energy.

"V. The public interest demands dissemination of actual cost information with respect to nuclear fuels to the greatest extent compatible with national security. To the extent that Government subsidies are necessary in the development stages of the nuclear program, the public should be informed as to the magnitude thereof. There can be no reliable forecast of the comparative costs of power generation until nuclear fuel costs, and the cost of the safe disposal of radioactive wastes, are established.

"VI. The Nation's best interests are not served by unwarranted optimism about the early availability of low-cost nuclear power."

S. 2725 would direct the Atomic Energy Commission to construct six nuclear-power facilities, and would declare it to be the intent of the Congress "that the full resources of the United States should be made available to advance the art of generation of electric energy from nuclear energy at the maximum possible rate." For the reasons hereinafter set forth, we believe this crash program is entirely unwarranted.

The proponents of an all-out program for nuclear power advance a variety of reasons therefor, including the following: (1) It is required if the United States is to maintain world leadership in the atomic-power race. (2) The United States has an urgent domestic need for this additional source of power. (3) The vast expenditure of money and effort will be justified by the quick achievement of cheap power or quicker achievement of it than would result from the present program. (4) Private enterprise is failing to carry its share of the burden in the development of nuclear power. A close scrutiny of the facts will show that none of these reasons is valid. First, the proponents contend that a greatly accelerated program is required if the United States is to maintain world leadership in the atomic-power race. They point with alarm to Russia's 5,000-kilowatt reactor, and to England's construction program under which that nation expects to furnish substantial amounts of power from atomic energy.

All the known facts indicate that the United States is now in the lead in the atomic power race and will maintain that lead under the present program. Appearing before this committee on February 29, 1956, Admiral Strauss said "I know of no country that has been selling any reactors in the world except ourselves * * * I think we are well in the lead, and we will maintain it aggressively." In his testimony before this committee last week, Admiral Strauss reiterated with emphasis the same thought, and he emphasized other valid reasons for the Commission's opposition to the program proposed by this bill.

The atomic power race will be decided by quality, not quantity. For instance, if the United States is able to develop and offer for sale reactors which will produce electric power at about 10 mills per kilowatt-hour, we will maintain our lead over a country which offers reactors producng 15-mill power. The total cost of the power produced will determine which reactors will be utilized, and this will not be affected by the number and variety of reactors in operation.

Little is publicly known about the Russian nuclear power program. However, at Geneva it was made clear that the Russian reactor produces power at a cost substantially higher than the cost of conventionally produced power in that country. Since conventionally produced power in the United States is much cheaper than it is in Russia, the margin between Russian nuclear power costs and United States conventional power costs is even greater.

The British speak in hopeful terms of 7-mill power from their nuclear plants, but it is quite obvious that this is an arbitrary and unrealistic figure which will be reached only by crediting the power operation with heavy payments for the weapons plutinium produced. From the information available to the general public, it appears that authorities on the subject are convinced the British reactors presently being planned and constructed will not compete on a cost basis with the atomic power reactors which are being

designed in the United States, much less with conventional power in this country.

World leadership in nuclear power will not be maintained by the construction of a large number of full-scale power installations merely to enlarge the use of atomic energy for power purposes. World leadership will be maintained by exploiting atomic power "at a rate consistent with sound technological, economic, and public policy considerations," to quote the language of the AEC.

The second argument advanced is that there is an urgent domestic need for an additional source of power. Time and again the press quotes various spokesmen, including Government officials, to the effect that the world reserves of coal are very limited, and the United States' reserves of coal are being exhausted. These statements convey an impression which is a complete distortion of the truth. There are many nations in the world which do have an acute shortage of coal reserves. In the United States, however, we have abundant coal reserves to furnish low-cost power for centuries to come, even if requirements for power production increase as rapidly as indicated.

The McKinney panel report included official United States Bureau of Mines statistics about the coal reserves of this Nation. According to the United States Bureau of Mines, the United States has nearly a trillion tons of economically recoverable bituminous coal. That is enough to last a thousand years, even if we are called upon to double the current rate of production. Further analysis of the figures supplied by the Bureau of Mines shows that approximately one-fourth of those reserves are recoverable at or near present costs (enough to last nearly 500 years at the current rate of production). Again, the Bureau of Mines figures show nearly 300 billion tons more of those reserves (enough to last an additional 500 years at the current rate of production) could be recovered at from 1¼ to 1½ times present costs. There is, therefore, an ample supply of bituminous coal to furnish the energy demands on our industry not only for the next quarter of a century but for the next millenium.

In the face of these official Government figures, it is intellectually dishonest to imply that our coal reserves are rapidly vanishing. Centuries from now our coal reserves may begin to reveal a tightening supply, but that hardly implies any urgency for the program proposed in this bill.

We not only have the coal—we have the ability to produce it. Unlike the coal industries of many foreign nations, the United States coal industry has achieved, and is continuing, an astounding rate of technological improvement. In 1940 only 35 percent of underground coal production was mechanically loaded, and national productivity averaged slightly over 5 tons per man per day. At the present time more than 82 percent is mechanically loaded and national productivity averages 9 tons per man per day. The Bureau of Mines states that "Significant developments are expected in all phases of the coal economy, including mining, transportation, improvement in present utilization, and in new or expanded uses."

Countries less fortunate than the United States, faced with a power shortage, may be compelled to proceed now with the construction of nuclear powerplants which are far from satisfactory and whose product is of such high cost as to make it an impractical and unecomonic operation if used in the United States. Such a course should not be followed here. England finds itself unable to meet its present power requirements with coal, and is therefore forced to seek another power source immediately. For this reason, the British are unable to pursue the most efficient method of developing economic nuclear power. On October 26, 1955, speaking at the National Industrial Conference Board's Fourth Annual Conference on Atomic Energy in Industry, the Right Honorable Lord Citrine, Chairman of the Central Electric Authority of Great Britain, said England is faced with a "very acute shortage of coal," which would grow to a shortage of 10 million or 11 million tons by 1965. Lord Citrine said there was no indication of future improvement of coal output in England. He then stated:

"Now with this as a backgrround, it follows that our approach to the problem of utilizing nuclear power or electrical generation must be somewhat different from those in countries like your own, where you have vast resources, not mercly of coal but of water and natural gas.

"I think it is important to remember that what might be uneconomic in the United States might prove in Great Britain not only to be economic but absolutely imperative for the industrial life of our country. Britain must push out with the development of nuclear power, and it is with that consideration always before us that we have to view this problem. * * *

"The real problem is that there may not be sufficient alternative fuel available and in these circumstances the economic argument moves into a different field. Then the problem can be stated in the following terms: Is it better to scale down our industrial output and living standard to the amount of fuel that is available? Or should we bear the extra costs of nuclear power and, by a corresponding tightening of our belts in other sectors of our economy, maintain our industrial activity and our economic strength?"

As previously shown, the United States has no corresponding fuel deficit. For that reason, we are not forced to undertake the inefficient and uneconomic road to the development of nuclear power—indeed, it would be very extravagant of our tax resources to do so.

A third argument advanced by the supporters of the principle of this bill is the expectation that widespread construction of reactors will result in quick achievement of cheap power, or quicker achievement of it than would result from the present program. Competitive nuclear power, like world leadership in the nuclear power race, depends upon quality, not quantity. Construction of a large number of reactors to produce power at costs far in excess of power from conventional fuels is not the most promising road to accomplish the scientific developments necessary before nuclear power can compete with conventional fuels. There is no assurance that nuclear power will ever be as cheap as today's power from conventional fuels. Eventually, with the proper scientific research, utilized in the most efficient manner, the cost of nuclear power might be reduced to a point where it may be of some benefit to the economy after conventional fuels become scarce or greatly increase in price. Whether the crash program approach or the orderly scientific research approach is adopted, there is no indication that the result will be a power cost any lower than today's power from conventional fuels. Furthermore, the cost of conventionaly-produced power is expected to drop with improved technology in mining, transportation and utilization.

One of the limiting factors to nuclear power progress is the extreme shortage of qualified personnel. Progress in the nuclear power art should be achieved far quicker by using the available personnel on research and experimental plants, than by using such personnel in the construction and operation of a number of plants which admittedly are going to be unable to contribute to the Nation's energy supplies on an economic basis. The potential of scientific personnel will particularly be wasted where they are used on projects which duplicate other projects. Passage of S. 2725 would result in uneconomic utilization of scientific personnel by providing for the construction of projects which will duplicate other plants. We submit that no project should be constructed with Government funds or subsidy to produce power at a loss unless it is a new type of facility which is different from any other facility. Government subsidy of one of each basic type of reactor may be justified on the grounds that the knowledge and experience thereby gained advances the nuclear power art. To subsidize a plant which duplicates substantially a plant of the same type is to waste personnel and money. This viewpoint was well stated by AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss on November 9, 1955, when he said:

"The information paid for in this manner must, of course, be new information which will supplement existing knowledge, otherwise it cannot be said to contribute to the advancement of the art. This means that the Government, generally speaking, will not invest in projects which appear to duplicate each other. Under this philosophy the Commission could not justify giving financial assistance to research and development work on 2 or 3 reactors which are of the same type and size, and which, therefore, could be expected to produce the same or very similar data."

In this connection, it is important to note that S. 2725 provides that "The reactor-construction program authorized by this act shall be in addition to the reactor-development program being carried out by private or public groups under licenses authorized by section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954."

The Atomic Energy Commission recently stated to this Committee that it presently has eight major types of reactors which are currently under consideration. Listed were nine pilot-sized reactors which are under construction by the Government for the purpose of developing civilian atomic power. Listed was one full-scale plant (the pressurized water reactor at Shippingport) under construction by the Government. Listed were 10 reactors which will be built with Government subsidy. In addition, there were three reactors listed which will be built without Government contribution to the capital cost. Already duplication of effort is becoming a probability, because the Shippingport reactor, the Yankee Atomic reactor, and the Consolidated Edison reactor will all be of the pressurized water type, even though there is some difference in size.

At the present time it cannot be determined how many of these reactors will eventually be licensed under section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act. However, it seems quite plain that S. 2725 expresses the intent that the 6 new plants called for would be built in addition to the present program and in duplication of plants which will be constructed under the present program.

Information available makes it quite obvious that at least one of each type of reactor considered worthwhile will be constructed under the present program, with or without Government contribution to the capital cost. It follows, therefore, that each and every 1 of the 6 additional plants which would be constructed under S. 2725 would be a duplication of some other plant and would be an inefficient and wasteful use of personnel and money.

A fourth reason assigned by proponents of this crash program is that private enterprise is failing to carry its share of the load in the nuclear-power program. It is quite obvious to us that this charge is incorrect. We have been cited no instance in which the Atomic Energy Commission has failed to receive private enterprise cooperation in any type or size of reactor considered worthwhile. Commission officials have previously testified, in effect, that every type of reactor is proceed-

ing as fast as orderly planning and development will permit.

Private enterprise is contributing a great deal to the nuclear-power development program through the construction of experimental plants. Private enterprise should not be expected to waste their own or the Government's money on the construction of plants which will merely increase the consumption of nuclear power but which will not contribute to the nuclear-power art, because they duplicate other plants and will not produce new knowledge. Neither should the Government itself do so.

A recent publication of the American Enterprise Association, entitled "The Role of Government in Developing Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy," had this to say:

"If nuclear-produced power is to assume its proper place in the world economy, it must eventually do so on a basis of free and open competition with other power-producing fuels and not by subsidy, international or otherwise. * * *

"Shall we absorb atomic industry into the traditional framework of our society? Or shall we use the excuse of atomic-age problems to abandon the democratic processes? * * *

"If atomic energy is to become a part of our traditional economic and political structure, the next decade will require a continuation of the program begun in 1954–55, thus encouraging atomic energy to be assimilated by the competitive system.* * *

"Employing the highly efficient price system in the development of atomic energy is not something which can be accomplished immediately. * * * The sooner a maximum degree of freedom can be given to industry, including the freedom to lose money, the more likely we are to discover the most economical forms of reactors and the less likely we are to misuse our resources. It may also be the way we can contribute most to the economic advance of the world. In struggling to preserve civilization, freedom is our greatest asset; we ought to exploit it to the full."

The duplicate facilities called for by S. 2725, to produce high-cost electricity at the expense of the taxpayers, would increase the unknown, but potentially disastrous, public hazard. There is serious question whether Congress should subject the people of this Nation to such dangers even where the plants involved are true research plants which may eventually benefit the public. We very strongly feel that Congress should not impose these hazards upon the people merely for the construction of unnecessary plants, particularly when so little is known as yet about the full disaster potential.

I believe the following statement, which I made before this committee on February 15 of this year, warrants repetition here:

"On the basis of the known facts, we believe that in most sections of the United States the most economic source of steam-generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by fossil fuels. We believe that for the foreseeable future the maintenance of a dynamic and expanding economy will depend upon the availability of ever-increasing amounts of low-cost energy from coal. We have the coal reserves necessary to meet the Nation's needs. We have the know-how and the manpower to produce that coal. We confidently expect to meet the Nation's expanding energy demands within the framework of the free enterprise system, without subsidy, and we believe the Nation's dependence upon coal warrants close congressional scrutiny to the end that legislative inequities against the coal industry shall be eliminated. We do not fear inroads upon our market by nuclear power—we believe that for many years to come the atomic energy program will consume far more coal than is displaced by nuclear power."

Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the coal industry.

Raiding Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last year the Army tried to invade—and destroy—the Wichita Mountain National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma.

The Army wanted to take over the vital one-sixth of this refuge, the second most popular unit in the national refuge system, for its Fort Sill Artillery and Guided Missile School.

The invasion was repelled. And the Army is trying again.

In a timely editorial in the issue of June 3, the Washington Post and Times Herald had this to say of this new raid:

RAIDING REFUGES

National security has been advanced as a pretext for a good many absurdities but perhaps for none more pointless than the proposal by Representative VICTOR WICKERSHAM to transfer 10,700 acres from the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge to the Army. The Army wants the area as an addition to its Ft. Sill Guided Missile and Artillery Center for the testing of new types of rockets. The purpose is praiseworthy enough. But surely the Army can find a shooting range where it will do less damage to a vital national resource. Witnesses who appeared before a House Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee at hearings held last week suggested several inactivated areas under Army control which could be used for this kind of practice. There is no warrant whatever for a greedy grab at dedicated land for the mere sake of avoiding some measure of trouble and cost in reclaiming some other suitable site.

The Wichita Mountain Refuge, created by President Theodore Roosevelt, has the second highest visitation record of any wildlife refuge in the country. Nearly a million persons went to it in 1955—for fishing, camping, photography and nature study. It affords refuge to herds of elk, antelope, deer, longhorn cattle—and to more than 800 bison, symbol of the American frontier. It has contributed significantly to agricultural research through the restoration of erosion-resisting native grasslands. To destroy this oasis needlessly would be a wanton piece of vandalism. Conservation groups are unanimous in opposing the Wickersham bill. Their reasoned, disinterested and compelling objections ought to be respected.

Mr. Speaker, we feel this way out West, too. Following is an example of the correspondence I have received on this grab:

BILLINGS ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Billings, Mont., May 19, 1956.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: We believe wildlife refuges are one of the most important links in our public land system. We feel these are most essential to all our people for recreational uses that cannot be found elsewhere.

Refuges are needed for restoration and propagation of many of our most coveted and diminishing species of fish and wildlife resources. These refuges and the fish and wildlife they contain have a place in our American way of life, a heritage that should be preserved for all our people today and for the future generations. Also, we are losing something of the highest intrinsic value when even one acre of these lands is lost to the public, or when encroachment for exploitation for any purpose is imposed on these refuges. We feel the laws that set them aside should be strictly adhered to, and the purpose and program for which they were set aside should be fulfilled. The preservation of our country's natural resources, which we feel is most important of all, can be assured only if Government, in administering our public lands for their most beneficial uses, thinks of them as great vaults only to be opened for the most extreme-needed necessities.

To repulse tyrannical ambitions of the Armed Forces or others wishing to destroy or defeat the purpose of refuges or other public lands is the responsibility of our Congressmen, governmental departments and the spirited people of our Nation, who will use every means to deefat the ambitions of such foes, requests or opponents. The Armed Forces are important to this country, and their needs are gladly taken care of at public expense. Their purpose is to defend our country and defeat our enemies—not to destroy or defeat the public wishes in trying to preserve these areas of our country that are so urgently needed for our people. Instead, they should defend refuges and our public land systems for their many recreational uses that are so important today and for the increasing visits they will receive each successive year.

We are very much disturbed at the attitude some of our Congressmen and departments are taking when evaluationg public lands and refuges for multi-purpose use, or in trying to dispose of them any way possible through sales, leases or otherwise. I refer you to Secretary McKay's own words in a statement from the Billings Gazette of April 30, 1956, which is enclosed for your information.

It is our sincere belief that our Government, in the administration of our public lands, should take into consideration the important part these lands play in keeping the people strong, healthy, vigorous, alert and happy. Happy people are the most important asset any Government can have.

"Private lands—no trespassing" signs are becoming too numerous in many localities today. We vigorously oppose encroachment that would adversely affect these areas and acquisition of these lands to the Armed Forces or others who wish only to exploit these areas for selfish gains.

Sincerely yours,

AL JENKINS,
President, Billings Rod and Gun Club.

Mr. Speaker, when Douglas McKay was Secretary of the Interior, he refused to turn part of this refuge over to the big gun and rocket shooters for destruction. Presumably he did so after a discussion at the cabinet level—because the Department of Defense was justifying the request on the ground of national defense.

The same justification is being presented today. And once again, the Department of the Interior has voiced its opposition.

Congress should not override the administrative decision unless there is substantial new evidence justifying the Department of Defense request. No such evidence has yet been presented, therefore the Department of Interior should not be interferred with on one of the rare occasions when it is carrying out its lawful duty to protect the people's lands.

The Threat to the Textile Industry and to Cotton Growers in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and State have all failed to recognize the threat to the great textile industry of the United States and to the cotton farmers of this country through the increase of imports of cotton textile goods made from cotton grown in other countries and fabricated by low wage labor. The textile industry is one of the largest industries in the United States. It employs a highly intelligent class of workers and pays good wages. It purchases approximately two-thirds of all the cotton grown in this country and pays for this cotton the parity price or better. Foreign spinners will not pay the parity price for our cotton when they can purchase cotton on the world market for much less. So when the Federal departments and commissions refuse to put some limitation on the importation of cotton textile goods while GATT and other international organizations insist on lowering the American tariff on such goods, a great American industry is in extreme danger of being liquidated and the American cotton farmer is on his way out.

In support of this observation I beg to insert below a letter written by Mr. H. C. McClellan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, to Mr. Angus H. Macaulay, president of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce, together with the reply to Mr. McClellan by Mr. R. C. McCall, of Easley, S. C. Mr. McCall is an outstanding textile manufacturer who has made a very detailed and objective study of this grave situation.

The letters follow:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 7, 1956.

Mr. ANGUS H. MACAULAY,
President, South Carolina
State Chamber of Commerce,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR MR. MACAULAY: The Secretary has asked that I reply to your letter of February 28, 1956 in which you call his attention to the resolution of your chamber favoring import quotas on cotton textiles.

The concern of the cotton textile industry over imports is a matter which this Department has been considering for some time. Speaking quite frankly, we are not at all convinced that such quotas would be as helpful as they would be harmful to the industry and to the general economy of the South. Our questions regarding imposition of import quotas are based upon the following considerations.

In 1955 the United States industry produced an estimated 11 billion square yards of cotton textiles and it is estimated that approximately 542 million square yards of cotton textiles were exported during this period. For the year, imports of cotton textiles are estimated to have been 133 million square yards, equivalent to approximately one-fourth of the quantity exported. Our concern is based on whether imports, amounting to approximately 1.2 percent of our total production, justify jeopardizing exports which are equivalent to nearly 5 percent of our cotton textile output.

There seems to be no question but what application of quotas to our textile imports would result in steps being taken by foreign countries which would result in less favorable treatment for United States textile exports. The foreign reaction to news stories that quotas are being advocated makes such a result seem inevitable.

A corollary part of the import quota problem is the effect such quotas would probably have on cotton exports. The first concern in this connection is with the cotton in cotton textile exports.

In 1955 the cotton equivalent of textile exports is estimated at 530,000 bales, while the cotton equivalent of textile imports is estimated at 130,000 bales. If we take a step which jeopardizes our export market for textiles, we put in equal jeopardy an exchange in which our net market gain is equivalent to about 400,000 bales of cotton. An even more direct effect on our cotton market would result from the impact import quotas would have on Japan.

In 1955 Japan imported an estimated 647,000 of the approximately 2.5 million bales of cotton the United States exported. Japan was by far our best foreign market for cotton, taking over 25 percent of our total exports. Preliminary data indicate total United States exports to Japan in 1955 of $643 million, as compared with our imports for consumption from Japan which we estimate at $425 million. Earnings from textile imports were about $60 million. With the disparity in her trade balance, imposition of textile import quotas by the United States would bear heavily upon Japan and purchases of United States cotton most certainly would be affected adversely.

It is for the foregoing reasons that we are skeptical of United States resort to import quotas on textiles. I want to assure you that the Department of Commerce feels a strong responsibility to the textile industry. We have been in almost constant contact with representatives of the industry and have raised with them the same objections to quotas we have outlined in this letter. We are hopeful of finding an equitable solution to the import problem which will not put our foreign trade in cotton textiles and in cotton so much in jeopardy.

Cordially,

H. C. MCCLELLAN,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs.

Mr. H. C. MCCLELLAN,
Assistant Secretary for International
Affairs, United States Department of
Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCLELLAN: I am a member of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce and have recently seen your letter of March 7 to our president, Mr. Angus H. Macaulay, in which you give your reasons for opposing import quotas on cotton textiles. Frankly, I find your position in this matter very difficult to understand, particularly as I believe your letter to Mr. Macaulay overlooks some very salient facts. We have learned to expect such strained arguments from the Department of State, which is so obviously determined to transfer a portion of our industry to Japan. But it is indeed disturbing when a responsible official of the Department of Commerce takes the same line.

You state that in 1955 cotton textile imports were only one-fourth of cotton textile exports. However, you are referring to countable cotton cloth only. Statistics collected by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce show that in 1955 imports of cotton manufactures (dollar value), including countable cloth, apparel, towels, etc., were 51 percent as large as exports of cotton manufactures. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the import valuations are based on foreign wholesale prices while the export valuations are based on United States prices; this means that imports were actually far more than 51 percent of exports in 1955. But even if we do not take this into account, you have made an error of 100 percent in your statement because imports are actually one-half exports, not one-fourth. Incidentally, I would think it significant that imports from Japan of countable cotton cloth for consumption increased about 300 percent between January 1955 and January 1956—from 5.1 million square yards in the first month to 20 million in the latter.

You argue further that if the United States imposed an import quota on cotton textile imports this would reduce cotton textile exports. This is, really, a specious argument for the following reasons:

1. The whole idea of international trade is based on the assumption that countries export more of certain items than they import, in order to import more of certain other items than they export. Doubtless, there is no example in the whole gamut of United States foreign trade where exports of a particular item exactly balance the imports of that same item.

With respect to cotton textiles, the United States has been for many years an important exporter and, indeed, in view of the surplus of domestically produced raw cotton in the United States, the high level of clothing consumption of the American population, and the low level of clothing consumption in many areas of the world, this is to be expected in any logical world trade pattern.

2. Very similar is the situation relative to United States exports and imports of wheat flour. The United States produces a surplus of wheat, and its population's food consumption per head is very high relative to the rest of the world and exports of wheat flour far exceed imports thereof into the United States.

Indeed, since May 29, 1941, a strict import quota on wheat flour has been maintained by the United States Government precisely as it has maintained since that time a strict import quota on millable wheat. Both the wheat quota and the flour quota have been instituted under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act because wheat is a price-supported commodity and large imports of wheat or of wheat flour would imperil the success of the price-support program on wheat.

3. Under section 22 a strict import quota on American upland types of raw cotton has been maintained since 1939 in order to make possible the maintenance of a support-price program for raw cotton. Yet, no import quota has been imposed on cotton textiles under section 22 as has been imposed since 1941 on wheat flour, and imports of raw cotton in the form of cotton textiles are now of such proportions as to seriously undermine the raw cotton program. Present imports of cotton textiles now represent an amount of raw cotton several times larger than the raw-cotton import quota referred to above.

4. What is the relationship between the imports and exports of wheat flour? The global import quotas on wheat flour is 4

million pounds which is the equivalent of some 93,000 bushels of wheat. Over 90 percent of this quota is allocated to Canada and was filled in 1955 on May 29, the first day of the new flour quota year. Exports of wheat flour from the United States in the last crop year (July 1, 1954–June 30, 1955) were equivalent to 46,287,000 bushels of wheat. In other words, an import quota has been imposed on what flour for more than 14 years, yet imports of wheat flour are below 1 percent of wheat flour exports.

5. The import-export relationship with respect to cotton textiles has been stated above. Exports of cotton manufacturers are now but twice as large as imports while exports of wheat flour are 498 times as large as imports.

This fantastic discrepancy between the exports and imports of wheat flour concerns no one; it has not been suggested that because of this statistical fact the import quota on wheat flour should be abolished. And rightly so, for the fact that United States wheat flour exports greatly exceed imports has nothing whatever to do in law, in economic theory, or in logic with the need and desirability of an import quota on wheat flour.

And so also with respect to cotton textiles.

In arguing that imposing import quotas on cotton textiles would reduce cotton textile exports you say "that the foreign reaction to news stories that quotas are being advocated makes such a result seem inevitable."

To give the complete foreign reaction, it seems to me that you should have stated that the Japanese Government and the Japanese textile industry have both indicated to the United States Government and the United States textile industry that they recognize a serious problem exists and are ready to negotiate an equitable limitation upon their shipments to this market; that the United States textile industry is agreeable to this solution but that the United States Government refuses to effectuate it.

You also argue that import quotas on cotton textiles would jeopardize our export market for raw cotton and you cite certain statistics in support of this statement. However, you neglect to point out that in 1955, according to statistics collected by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce, United States imports of all textile fibers and the manufactures thereof from Japan exceeded exports from the United States to Japan of all textile fibers and the manufactures thereof. I am sorry that I must say to you in all frankness that this argument also seems specious:

1. Japan is the world's leading exporter of textiles and already has one-fourth of the total world cotton goods trade. Cotton will not grow in the Japanese climate. Therefore, Japan must import cotton. Quite clearly, Japan purchases her cotton where she can get it cheapest, all things considered. In 1955, while Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States were rising rapidly, Japanese purchases of United States cotton were declining sharply. Japan is importing increasing quantities of Mexican cotton despite the fact that Mexico places a virtual embargo on cotton textile imports from Japan.

2. The decline in United States raw cotton exports to Japan and elsewhere, which you apparently anticipate would follow upon adoption of import quotas on textiles, has already occurred, of course. And the explanation of the decline in raw cotton exports to Japan and elsewhere—a decline of 62 percent in the first half of the current crop year as compared with the first half of the last crop year is very simply and correctly explained by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the United States Department of Agriculture on page 398 of its March 26, 1956, issue of Foreign Crops and Markets as follows:

"The low level of United States cotton exports during the first half of the current market year may be attributed mainly to anticipation on the part of both buyers and sellers abroad during all of 1955, that prices of United States cotton for export would be reduced. Prices of foreign growths declined by around 25 percent while prices of United States cotton remained close to the loan level, roughly 5 to 8 cents a pound above those for similar quality foreign growths."

You are also aware, I feel certain, of the special programs, such as Public Law 480, through which the United States Government is financing most of the cotton now being exported from the United States to Japan. In short, the Japanese are buying declining amounts of United States raw cotton and increasing amounts of Mexican and other growths because of the price differential, and they would be buying still less United States cotton if it were not for special United States Government export programs. All of this has nothing whatever to do with the problem of controling cotton textile imports from Japan.

3. There is no Japanese dollar shortage; indeed, Japan is using United States dollars to buy cotton from Mexico. The facts are that, according to the Federal Reserve Board, Japanese dollar holdings increased from $794 million in September 1954, to $992 million in September 1955. I wonder if you also know that Japan's industrial production reached an all-time high in December 1955, almost twice the pre-World War II average and that her export trade is at an all-time high and is rapidly expanding? In fact, in 1955 Japan's international payments balance would have been favorable even if there had been no United States military or economic aid expenditures in Japan.

Very truly yours,

R. C. McCALL.

EASLEY, S. C.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 30, 1956.

Mr. R. C. McCALL,
Easley, S. C.

DEAR MR. McCALL: In your letter of April 16, 1956, you cover a broader range of questions with respect to textile imports than we felt was intended by the letter to us from Mr. Angus Macaulay and in our answer to him.

We appreciate having your point of view on these broader issues.

Cordially,

H. C. McCLELLAN,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs.

Mineral Leases in Superior National Forest in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on page A4177 of the May 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] called our attention to Warren Unna's excellent summary of Republican Giveaways in the current issue of Harper's magazine.

Mr. Unna devoted one section to The Gifts Already Given.

In this section he included a mineral lease now being developed by agencies of the Department of the Interior with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd.—Inco—for lands in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

Mr. Unna put it this way in his article:

(3) At least one parcel of the National Forest in Minnesota has gone into private hands through a secret long-term lease.

International Nickel Co., anxious to justify investing $56 million for nickel and copper mining in northern Minnesota's Superior National Forest, had asked the Democratic administration for a 99-year lease on 12,000 acres. It got nowhere. Once the Republicans came in, the company confronted the Forest Service with an Office of Defense Mobilization letter declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the mining were not permitted. International Nickel next visited the then Assistant Interior Secretary, Orme Lewis. In the presence of a former high-ranking Bureau of Land Management official, Lewis told the company officials:

"If you gentlemen draft the kind of lease you want, we'll be glad to look it over."

The 50-year option they gained is an irrevocable commitment by the Government. Yet Lewis E. Hoffman, top minerals official of the Bureau of Land Management says that as far as his records go International Nickel has only a 2-year prospecting permit, and that the memorandum of conversations with Assistant Secretary Lewis "is in the confidential file of the Secretary (McKay)."

Fifty-year leases in the national forest are unheard of, yet M. A. Hanna Co., formerly headed by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, and Kennecott Copper, have similar agreements pending with Interior for Superior National Forest land.

I have just addressed several questions on this lease to the Secretary of the Interior in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1956.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that agencies of the Department of the Interior are now developing a mineral lease with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd. ("Inco"), for lands in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

From what I have been able to learn of this proposal, it involves grave questions of national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal and the attendant injury to small business.

I will appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1. When will the lease become effective?

2. What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency such as we are experiencing now? I consider this a most important question in view of the allegations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in Document No. 4, 82d Congress, with respect to Inco's monopoly position in nickel production and distribution.

3. Has your Department had access to a copy of the Office of Defense Mobilization letter to the Forest Service on the desirability of stimulating nickel production in the national interest?

4. Has your Department examined the assays of samples from the diamond drillings by Inco in the Superior National Forest? If so, what did they show? Were minerals in addition to nickel and copper found in commercial quantity? What were these minerals? What royalty provisions for

all minerals involved are contained in the contemplated lease?

5. In view of the current emergency, has ODM been consulted with respect to the terms of the proposed lease?

6. Is Inco to have an undivided interest in the lease? If not, what other companies will have an interest and how much?

7. In view of the Senate subcommittee's finding that Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found," has the proposed lease been referred to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice for determination as to whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease?

8. Is there a requirement in the proposed lease that the plant, which will process this ore from public lands, be located in the United States?

In addition, I would appreciate a copy of the proposed lease.

In view of the importance and widespread interest in this matter, I intend to place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall do the same with your reply which I would like to have within 10 days.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

The introduction of Senate Document No. 4 of the 82d Congress read as follows:

The Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee has for some time been studying the effect of foreign strategic material monopolies on the preparedness program of the United States. One of the most severe shortages, both current and foreseeable, that the subcommittee has encountered has been in nickel. And one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found has been the International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd. ("Inco"), which produces over 85 percent of the free world's nickel.

The current shortage has resulted from the collision of a rapidly increasing civilian and military demand for nickel with the relatively fixed supply produced by Inco. The foreseeable shortage, however, is even more serious. Nickel has important alloying qualities which are indispensable in steelmaking and the production of certain types of aircraft engines. The large increases in the production of these industries, which have now become basic to our survival as a free nation, depend substantially on a similar increase in nickel production.

Yet Inco through the years has displayed, in the opinion of the subcommittee, a conservative approach to the expansion of its productive capacity. The glutted markets after World War I and the sharp decline in the demand for nickel during the depression appear to have been an important factor in shaping Inco's approach to expansion. Inco is now operating at full capacity and has professed to be unable substantially to increase its productive capacity because of vexing mining and metallurgical problems.

It is therefore essential to the preparedness program to stimulate the production of nickel from other sources. While this need has been recognized for some time by the responsible agencies of our Government, the subcommittee has observed a very leisurely approach toward accomplishing this program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the many grave questions—including national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal and the attendant injury to small business—make it imperative that this proposed lease be carefully scrutinized.

Features To Be Renamed on the Colorado-Big Thompson Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 5, 1956, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, issued a news release which I insert in the RECORD for the benefit of the Congress.

The Colorado-Big Thompson project, which is mostly in my district—Second Congressional District of Colorado—is one of the outstanding Bureau of Reclamation projects and is a monument to the great work of this Department.

One of the originators of the idea of such a project was the late Charles Hansen, Greeley, Colo., newspaper publisher and prime organizer of this multipurpose transmountain water diversion project.

Because of Mr. Hansen's vision, understanding, great leadership, and continuous and sacrificing service in the promotion and developing of this project, the Bureau of Reclamation has made it possible to honor the name of Charles Hansen by calling two canals the Charles Hansen Feeder Canal and the Charles Hansen Canal.

The Charles Hansen Feeder Canal is 13 miles long and connects the Flatiron and Horsetooth Reservoirs. The Charles Hansen Canal is 5 miles in length and carries water from the Horsetooth Reservoir to the Cache la Poudre River. This is an honor justly deserved. The news release follows:

FEATURES TO BE RENAMED ON COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

Two major features of the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project will be renamed to honor the late Charles Hansen, Greeley, Colo., newspaper publisher and prime organizer of the multipurpose transmountain water diversion project, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer said today.

The Horsetooth feeder canal will be known as the Charles Hansen feeder canal, and the Poudre supply canal will be the Charles Hansen Canal. The feeder canal stretches for 13 miles between Flatiron and Horsetooth Reservoirs, and the supply canal carries irrigation and municipal water from Horsetooth Reservoir 5 miles to the Cache la Poudre River.

The change in names has been approved by the various public and private groups concerned and will be formally proclaimed August 11, 1956, when northeastern Colorado plans to celebrate completion of the irrigation aspects of the project, Commissioner Dexheimer said. A monument will be dedicated at Loveland, Colo., at that time to the laymen leaders who urged, organized, and supported the project 20 years ago. Mr. Hansen's widow is expected to participate in the celebration.

Mr. Hansen was president of the Northern Colorado Water Users' Association from its organization in 1933 until it became the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District in 1937. He headed the latter until his death on May 24, 1953. The district contracted with the Bureau of Reclamation to repay irrigation construction costs and has taken over operation and maintenance of the works as units were finished.

Directors of the district recently endorsed the renaming of features in a resolution pointing out that Mr. Hansen rendered great leadership and continuous and sacrificing service to the community movement resulting in the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

"His leadership brought a needed and greatly beneficial perpetual supplemental supply of water into the Cache la Poude, Thompson, St. Vrain, and Boulder streams for farms, towns, and cities and of the whole South Platte Valley and has brought electric energy supply to other river valleys of the whole State of Colorado," the resolution said.

The Greeley Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution to similar effect. The 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado also called for memorializing the project pioneers, specifically including Mr. Hansen.

Approaching full operation during the last 3 years, the Colorado-Big Thompson project has been providing vital supplemental irrigation water during a current cycle of critical drought.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Boston Herald of May 26, 1956, entitled "Time for a Plan." It discusses a proposal regarding foreign policy made by two professors of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which is timely.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR A PLAN

Many Americans, including some highly placed in the administration, are convinced that our program of aid to underdeveloped countries is completely inadequate and should be expanded without delay. But Congress is balking at the size of the present program. The outlook for any immediate change is, therefore, dim.

The trouble is that the administration has no real plan of action. It is improvising, and improvisations don't inspire either confidence or interest.

This week the Comptroller General attacked the management of foreign aid funds and sharply criticized the Internation Cooperation Administration's planning. "A significant portion of the annual programs proposed to Congress for the past few years," he said, "has been beyond the capacity of the agency and the recipient countries to get underway during the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated."

How can we hope to sell Congress on a broader aid program if the present one is out of control? How can we inspire taxpayers to accept further sacrifices if what they now spend produces uninspiring results?

If economic aid is to continue, as apparently both the President and Mr. Dulles think it must, then it should be wrapped up in a more convincing package. We must have not just more of the same, but something attention catching and exciting—a new Marshall Aid or a refurbished point 4. We must, in short, have a plan.

At this moment the administration has before it a hard-headed, yet inspiring aid plan worked out by Professors Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, of MIT. The Tech men want the United States to take the lead in setting up a permanent international development agency which would feed capital to underdeveloped countries as fast as they could absorb it.

The agency would, however, set up rigid standards which the receiving country must meet before getting any money. The whole operation would be set up on a banking basis, not in the sense that every program must be economically self-liquidating, but in the sense that every undertaking must have a reasonable technical prospect of achieving the economic and social results desired.

There would be no political or military strings attached to the program, and the authors would be willing at least to consider the possibility of letting Communist countries participate as recipients and donors. The purpose of the program would be recognized as primarily one of creating stability in a part of the world which is now in dangerous ferment and not of buying friends either for us or for the Reds.

What would such a program cost? The professors say not more than $3.5 billion a year overall and not more than $2 billion a year of United States money. Eighty percent of all expenditures would be in recoverable loans.

We are not prepared to say that the MIT plan is the best possible one. Indeed all the details are not available yet for us to judge. But it is a plan. It is both realistic and comprehensive. It would appeal to the in-between peoples of Africa and Asia, who are now struggling to catch up with the modern world and who are not fussy where their help comes from, so long as it is compatible with their national pride. Properly explained, it might appeal to Americans, whose money would have to finance most of it.

Drift is the one thing we can't afford in the rapidly shifting world situation. We must reestablish a positive policy of some sort in this field soon. We must adopt some plan.

Since an aid bill is already before Congress, it is probably too late to withdraw it and substitute a new one this session. But a new long-range program could be worked out with congressional leaders, and the groundwork for an international organization could be laid this year.

Now is the time to make a start.

Fifty-three Thousand Eight Hundred and Ninety-two Illinois GI Loans Repaid in Full

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the following statement which, in my judgment, is a fine tribute to the veterans of Illinois and the Nation, which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of Congress who made it possible for the veterans of our country to own their own homes:

FIFTY-THREE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND NINETY-TWO ILLINOIS GI LOANS REPAID IN FULL

The 53,892d Illinois veteran has repaid his GI loan in full, Robert D. Beer, VA's regional manager for Illinois, has announced.

As of April 26, 1956, 53,892 loans for homes, farms, and businesses totaling more than $280 million had been repaid in full, or nearly 2 out of every 7 GI loans guaranteed or insured by VA.

In the 11 years of the program VA in Illinois has underwritten 176,002 GI loans totaling $1,348,060,479. Most of the loans, or 167,769, were for homes. Of the remainder, 1,906 were farm loans and 6,327 were business loans.

Of the 53,892 GI loans repaid in full, 47,909 were home loans totaling $263,528,537; 1,249 were farm loans totaling $3,993,988; and 4,734 were business loans totaling $12,288,464.

In addition to the $280 million repaid in full, Mr. Beer estimates another $200 million has been paid off in installments by veterans whose loans are still outstanding.

The Veterans' Administration has paid claims to lenders on only 761 loans for homes, farms, and businesses.

The net loss to VA has been $366,867, or slightly more than 28 cents for every thousand dollars borrowed. Mr. Beer said the net loss is subject to further recovery, either from the veteran or from the liquidation of tangible security.

Of the 761 loans on which claims have been paid, 359, or slightly more than one-fifth of 1 percent of the total number guaranteed, were home loans.

Allowing for repaid-in-full loans, amortization payments and claims paid, Mr. Beer estimates that $884 million of the original $1,348,060,479 borrowed by World War II and Korean conflict period veterans still is outstanding.

Presidential Gag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the following interesting editorial entitled "Presidential Gag" appearing in the Boston Post of May 24, 1956:

PRESIDENTIAL GAG

The transcript of the President's press conference concerning the differences of opinion and planning in the armed services, indicates that President Eisenhower has made all the decisions and issued orders as commander in chief, and that any general or admiral who publicly differs with him will get the ax.

What the President's decisions are and what weight he will give to the role of each of the armed services has not been clarified. This following colloquy in the press conference indicates that the Senators probing the Armed Forces are going to find the generals and admirals clammed up, on orders from the President.

"Mr. President, Senator CHAVEZ and Senator SYMINGTON have announced they will call some of the military 'brass.' Will those officers be permitted to tell their differences with their superiors?"

"I don't know what you're getting at," the President replied, "but I will tell you this: The day that discipline disappears from our forces, we will have no forces, and we would be foolish to put a nickel into them. Now, there comes a place in the military hierarchy where someone must make a decision, and that decision must stick. Now, the President, by Constitution, is the Commander in Chief, and what he decides to do in these things, in the form and the way you arm and organize and command your forces, must be carried out."

The President is right on every count, except one. He is obliged to tell his plans to the people, and explain why he considers these to be the right plans. He is not empowered to put the gag on all the professionals who differ, in this case a difference of opinion running counter to all the administration's handling of the problems of arms, organization and command.

The President said as plainly as he could that he had made the decisions, issued the orders, and that anyone who dares to question his judgment and command will incur the penalty of a breach of discipline.

Secretary Wilson had obediently taken the lumps for the generals and admirals who dared to raise their voices, and it is now quite clear that the President had issued orders what to do and say in the face of a searching Democratic inquiry into the armed services.

The President stated at the press conference that the Russians were giving their forces the same New Look treatment that was given the American defense establishment back in the days of the hapless "more defense for less money."

Some capable generals and admirals doubt that—but they will keep their doubts to themselves or get the ax. The President has challenged the power of the Congress to ascertain facts and seek justification for appropriations or for denying appropriations.

Our Attitude on the Trial of Young Rumanian Anti-Communist Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on the night of February 14–15 of last year a group of young anti-Communists, in utter desperation at being unable to contribute in any organized anti-Communist action, decided to act by themselves. They seized the Red-occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern, Switzerland.

They had information that the new political setup in the Kremlin was in the process of sending fresh instructions to their various organizations and agents in the free world, one of these being the MVD chauffeur of the enslaved Rumanian Legation. They thought a raid in that Communist den would surely yield valuable clues in that direction. In fact it uncovered the espionage activities of the Red diplomats. An entire arsenal was found in the legation: a shortwave radio transmitter, automatic guns, all kinds of projectiles, time bombs, rockets, and a large quantity of ammunition.

During the time the young men held the legation the tension and excitement

were at their height in Bern. The morning after the coup about 2,000 Swiss were gathered in front of the building and 200 Swiss police surrounding it. As the young patriots refused to surrender at first, the Swiss authorities, under heavy pressure from the Communists, organized a veritable siege against these lone anti-Communists, surrounding the premises with barbed wire and bringing up an infantry battalion and an armored tank.

The young patriots had made a vow to obtain the release of five men from Communist jails, a cross section of the persecuted leaders of the Rumanian resistance behind the Iron Curtain, among whom was the heroic Bishop Suciu. In these five men, they were symbolically asking the liberation of their people from the curse of Soviet slavery. It was a cry of these patriots which stemmed from the same source as that of a Patrick Henry, as it voiced the eternal struggle for individual freedom and national independence.

Finally, after 42½ hours, this action, which had caused such an impact on public opinion, came to an end. The young men, before entering the police car, in full view of the crowd, nailed upon the wall of the legation the insignia of Free Rumania. And inside they left a note saying, "We shall return."

As an immediate result of the Bern affair, the authorities in Sweden, alerted by this incident, on closer investigation uncovered also an important spy ring centering around the Rumanian and Czechoslovak Communist Legations in Stockholm, thus bringing an added proof of the results of the action in Bern. In a recent report by Newsweek, on information furnished by the young patriots, the Swiss police sized two fat dummy accounts in an obscure farmers' bank in the mountains of Switzerland. The Communists were using the money to run far-reaching spy nets in West Europe. The accounts have been traced back to Bucharest.

On information given by the League of Free Rumanians, the Armstrong Circle Theater gave a television show, the Five Who Shook the Mighty, the story of the Bern incident. It will be repeated June 26 with the latest additions, after the trial of the young anti-Communists, which will take place in Bern, Switzerland, from June 11 to June 21.

It is an experience of deep meaning to talk to the disinherited and to find in them an unshaken faith in the ultimate victory of freedom and its values, while many of those more fortunate around them in the free world seem indifferent to it and tired of everything, even the truth. The flame of resistance burns in the oppressed. Here we have fresh proof that this spirit cannot be killed. The miracle is that this seed of liberty is germinating in the youth who have undergone for 10 years intensive Communist indoctrination.

Reports from Rumania tell of anti-Communist resistance groups in high schools. One lad of such a group is one of the boys who are going on trial June 11 in Switzerland. These youthful heroes, members of the League of Free Rumanians, now in prison awaiting their trial, considered life no longer worth living in face of the complete oblivion and abandonment of their country by the free world. They were willing to risk their lives and liberty in a blow against their country's oppressors, themselves directly, as being the only way they could be useful; that is, by focusing world attention on the tragedy of Eastern Europe. It was a dramatic demonstration of the revolutionary spirit of freedom fermenting under the boot of Soviet despotism. These young men, who recently fled their country, were messengers of widespread popular feelings and of the embedded hostility to communism of that Latin country.

Let us help these youthful patriots who risked their lives and willingly took calculated risks to prove that the Soviet Union carries on against the free world constant espionage and subversion.

Let us encourage other patriots to bring out with them vital documents by aiding the cause of these young men and we will encourage others to perform like acts of heroism in the name of freedom and liberty, thus producing vital intelligence that will inform the free world of premeditated acts of treachery.

These patriots have a message for the still free world. Trials throughout history have altered the course of history, and this trial can insure a great victory on the side of humanity, Christianity, and freedom.

This action of the young anti-Communists has aided freedom wherever freedom still exists. Their cause is the cause of freemen everywhere. The moral drama of these patriots, their youthfulness, the eldest among them being 31 years of age, aroused the sympathies of Europe.

The right to liberty is the cornerstone of our civilization, of its very existence and of its progress. The right to resist oppression is inherent in the foundation and development of liberty. Parts of the world and notably eastern Europe are now under the rule of absolute despotism, which has replaced the concept of equality of men and the law which is the protection of all, by the inequality of men and the persecution of all at the hands of a tyrannical Communist oligarchy.

Men everywhere behind the Iron Curtain are fighting against tremendous odds for liberty through recurring acts of resistance at the risk of imprisonment, forced labor, deportation, and death.

Our civilization needs be solidly with this struggle for liberty or lose its spiritual and political roots and driving force, disintegrate through materialistic discords and fail in its universal mission. This solidarity should express itself through a positive policy recognizing the right of the enslaved peoples to self-determination and human liberty by every moral and material assistance the free can muster for this purpose.

Let us not forget that our own great country has been founded on the passionate desire for liberty which animated our forefathers and for which they willingly died. So let us not fail to extend a helping hand and sympathetic understanding to these patriots in their fight for freedom, so similar to the fight of the fathers of our country. For our country would not be free today if they had not fought, with whatever means in their power, as do their prototypes today in the anti-Communist resistance movements, against the foreign invaders and oppressors of the people.

Foreign Aid—It's Time To Adopt a Down-to-Earth Policy of Technical Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a gentleman who has had considerable experience abroad, part of the time working with our Technical Cooperation Administration. His letter is interesting and comes at a time when we are about to consider an authorization for continued foreign-aid spending.

The letter follows:

VICKSBURG, MISS., *May 27, 1956.*

DEAR FRIEND: My letter of the 19th was very hurried and I did not bring out fully the most important point I had in mind. You will recall that in our discussion of the aid program I stressed the fact that our missions were operating at an entirely too high level and the importance of a down-to-earth policy with our people working constantly in a friendly and helpful contact with the people themselves.

We have sent missions out over the world to cure the ills of backward countries and they have failed due to the lack of concepts of the basic conditions and needs of the people we were trying to help. The policy pursued has to a great extent been that the lavish gift of money and material things would solve the problems. This policy is terribly wrong. After centuries of exploitation in every conceivable form by conquerors and their own rulers, the people we are endeavoring to help live in a state of apathy and hopelessness. They are fearful and suspicious, not only of strangers but of their own governments. They question our motives and there is a wall between them and us that can only be broken down by establishing ties of friendship and understanding. The great and crying need is for spiritual uplift rather than for material things. Human relations are the most important phase of the problem we face in obtaining the good will and friendship of the little people throughout the world.

In the event you have not read it, I am enclosing an article by Mr. P. Alstan Waring, who spent 3 years on an agricultural mission in India. This article substantiates much of what I have advocated and repored—not only is it timely and informative of the condition to be found in all of Asia and some other countries, but implies the importance of God's part in our aid programs. The need of sincere Christian peoples is very urgent.

The fact that our aid program needs to be a complete reorganization is obvious and

the services of such men as Mr. Waring would be invaluable in effecting this reorganization. I wish that every Member of Congress would take time to read and study this article. It contains many basic facts that should be considered by all who have to do with formulating and administrating the aid program. I have been very critical of the policies and ineffectual administration of our several aid programs. My criticism has not been aimed at the program itself, but at the colossal and unnecessary waste of both the money and the time of the personnel. To me it is a tragedy, when the little people need so much. No matter how much of our money and time we donate, it will be small when compared to the needs of a billion people.

While I have stated that the program could be cut 25 percent and it should be cut this amount or more, until it is reevaluated to insure the funds reaching the masses, I would favor increased and continued spending if it were spent wisely and efficiently.

Take India as an example. By this time, she has approximately 400 million people. A billion dollars would mean about $2.50 per person. This amount of material things would be absorbed and forgotten in a very few days. Billions could be spent here and but a relative few of the masses would ever know about it. Yet, regardless of how we may feel about the present Government and its policies, India is the most important country in the world in the fight against communism, for us. We must therefore continue in our efforts to help her but should redouble them to reach the little people.

I planned to be in Washington at this time but have several business deals in the making that compel me to stay here until they are closed. I may be able to make the trip next month. If I do I will see you.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

C. S. ROBERTS.

Annual Memorial Day Program, Altoona, Pa., May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as principal speaker at the annual Memorial Day program at Fairview Cemetery, Altoona, Pa., May 30, 1956, under the auspices of the Blair County War Veterans Council, I delivered the following address:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, FAIRVIEW CEMETERY, ALTOONA, PA., 11 A. M., MAY 30, 1956

As a past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is an honor to join you, my fellow veterans, and my fellow citizens, in this Memorial Day ceremony.

Memorial Day places a serious obligation upon any speaker.

It is not an easy assignment to be our war heroes' spokesman.

Perhaps thoughlessly we have come to regard Memorial or Decoration Day mainly as a holiday, a day set apart for amusement and recreation.

But when we pause to give thought to its purpose and significance, we become conscious that it should receive a more fitting observance.

The men we honor today marched forth into the fire and hazard of battle to secure and safeguard the rights, privileges, and benefits which we today enjoy.

The holiday-minded public needs to be halted long enough to hear and heed the words uttered at Gettysburg: "That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Memorial Day is a day of memories and a day of rededication.

We Americans know that the man who dies in the service of our great Nation makes this sacrifice in order that the hopes and ambitions of our Founding Fathers might be realized, and that the Constitution upon which our form of government is based might stand today—strong and triumphant—and as the bulwark of our Nation.

We not only pay honor to those patriotic men and women who have given their lives for America, but we pay honor to all, living and dead, who unselfishly contributed their services in order that we, our families, our children, and posterity, might enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Let us not forget the thousands of disabled veterans—many still confined to hospitals—their dependents, and the widows and orphans of those deceased veterans whose lives were shattered in our Nation's behalf.

Let us pay tribute to the doctors and nurses in our veterans' hospitals whose work is often overlooked, but who are giving the best of their energies, their knowledge, and their skills in order to help and comfort our sick and disabled war veterans.

Those whom we honor were adequate to the challenges before them.

This is a day for the living to resolve that we will be adequate to meet the challenges which are before us in 1956.

Thereby can we best honor those who have gone before.

Our basic responsibility is to determine just how we can be adequate to meet the problems before us.

How can we with assurance go forward to preserve the priceless heritage which has been bequeathed to us?

Are we accustomed to accept the blessings of a free constitutional government as a matter of course?

Do we complacently use our freedom under the protecting arm of a great government as if we, by our own efforts, had gained it?

Do we forget that thousands of men gave their lives and other thousands of men and women suffered and sacrificed to establish and maintain our free institutions?

How often have we returned thanks and expressed appreciation or gratitude to those to whom we owe so much?

We Americans write and speak and think freely.

We may worship God as we please.

We are free from unlawful searches and seizures.

We enjoy freedom of elections through which we select those who are to administer and legislate for us, and we fix conditions and limitations to their authority.

We are secure in our legitimate property rights and in the making and carrying out of plans for our lives.

These great privileges, among others—far from being a matter of course—were never enjoyed by any nation until 169 years ago.

Are the fortunate and happy conditions in which we live entirely of our own making?

They are not.

Ought we not bow and bare our heads in grateful memory and reverent homage to those brave men who gave their lives that we might have these great privileges?

They are gifts from the dead—not entirely conquests by the living.

We properly set aside certain days to commemorate individual men whose deeds have justly placed their names high upon the rolls of the great.

Most of these men received honor and distinction during their lifetimes from their fellow citizens in recognition of their services and accomplishments.

Today we commemorate no single man, but the thousands whose names are not written on the scroll of fame, who gave their all without recognition or reward, and who served as devotedly as those whose names are sung and whose deeds are acclaimed.

Our debt to them is great.

Let us pause in the comfortable and secure round of our daily activities, at least a few hours in the year, to acknowledge it.

Let us not only acknowledge our debt, but let us try to pay it.

There is one way in which we can at least make some small payment on this great debt.

These men gave their lives for our Nation and the principles upon which it was founded.

We cannot preserve our way of life, our priceless heritage, unless we know precisely of what it consists.

Our Constitution, instituted 169 years ago, has stood the acid test of time.

It has been the symbol for all people who believe in opportunity, in freedom, and in tolerance.

What a breadth of vision our Founding Fathers showed when they wrote "We, the people."

Our long journey as a nation began with steps that were slow and laborious.

These first steps were taken by American patriots who wrote a document that history has proven to be a colossal monument to freedom and free enterprise.

We have been able to preserve not only the inherited words of the Constitution, but also the living laws contained therein.

We cannot forget that in our infancy we were a weak and struggling nation, exposed to external and internal perils of the gravest character.

Until 1803, we were hemmed in on the west; first by Spain, and then France.

Until 1815 our relations with the two greatest powers of Europe—Britain and France—were stormy.

We fought wars with both, were invaded by one, and saw our Capitol burned by a hostile British Army.

Sectional, party, and class divisions shook the fragible ship of state until its timbers seemed about to break.

Many believed that no popular government could prove durable.

Even the most hopeful found the experience of administering so huge a country full of difficulties.

Yet at an early date a hopeful sentiment began to develop.

As our Nation grew stronger, our self-confidence increased.

A pride in the United States as a world example grew up in the people.

Americans began to feel that their Republic was placed upon a stage for all mankind to observe and imitate.

In the Declaration of Independence we find an expression of this idea.

Jefferson had used the words "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind."

We began to develop that respect.

But it developed only when our individual citizens grew in their respect for each other, and in turn, their international neighbors.

We can honor America's dead by understanding our heritage, and further, by preserving unity among the living.

We known, as Lincoln knew, that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

Our heritage cannot continue to stand if we pay heed to those who cause dissension among us, wittingly or unwittingly.

There are those on the home front who would divide us, class against class, race against race, religion against religion.

There are others who would divide us from friendly nations, and who are blind to the consequences of their acts.

As we rededicate our lives to those we memorialize today, let us resolve that unity will prevail.

If ever there was a time in the history of the world that American needed to understand herself and to understand her friends and to be understood by them, it is now.

Just so long as we are vigilant toward those who would mislead us into surrendering our national heritage, just so long will we continue to be a free powerful America.

The example of suffering and sacrifice by America's sons and daughters who would not surrender our national heritage should help us to rededicate ourselves to the preservation of peace for this Nation and all mankind.

If our honored dead could tell us what reward they would wish of us, they would, I believe, with one accord say: "Continue the fight in peace for the cause for which we gave our lives."

Surely this we must be willing to do.

Let us, therefore, both for ourselves and in memory of them, pledge ourselves to the preservation of our institutions in their essential purity and integrity.

Once we in this land could sit back and rest in comparative safety.

Two oceans—one to the east and another to the west—protected us from invasion.

We felt secure in our isolation from the world.

But that was before the atomic age, before the age of aerial warfare.

London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Manila, Hong Kong, Tokyo are all but a short distance by plane from our own land.

Once Pittsburgh, Ceveland, Detroit could laugh at the thought of a threat from a foreign invader.

But no longer.

If ever an invader come to our shores again, it will be by air, and inland cities, as well as coastal ones, will be easy targets.

When we dropped two atomic bombs over Japan and thus blasted her out of the war, we proved that isolationism is dead and gone forever.

The world is at our doorstep for better or for worse.

Those who gave their lives while in the uniform of our armed services cannot return to protect us against new dangers.

We cannot again know the security of two oceans.

However, the courage of our war dead has made possible a way of life which gives us the opportunity to develop the peaceful use of rapid flight.

We who discovered and developed atomic power recognized its vastly greater and better side—the good it could do for humanity.

It is good for the world that this secret was entrusted to a nation that recognized a moral obligation in this trust imposed on it.

Atomic energy will change the entire economic life of the world.

Certainly when this great power has been subdued to man's will as it must be, man should reach a sort of economic heaven.

Certainly work will not be so difficult nor so tedious.

There will be few hours of labor.

Man will have more time for recreation, for play, for study, for further research.

He will have more time to educate himself, to broaden himself, to travel, to enjoy life.

Perhaps the cycle will swing back and the tempo of life will taper off.

Perhaps we will learn to take it easy with atomic energy.

But these things are of the future.

What of the moment?

We need a true, righteous, and just peace to bring this old world back to an even keel.

We need a lasting peace from war.

Here at home we need peace from internal strife.

Could all our millions or war dead around the world speak, what would they say?

Their language would be legion, but their message would be one little word—"peace."

Our heroes died to establish and maintain institutions where justice among freemen was the great objective.

They made the supreme sacrifice for the perpetuity of a government, the object of which is the freedom and welfare of the citizen, not its own power and greatness.

With the increasing complexity of our civilization, the problem of preserving the freedom of the citizen is of increasing difficulty.

This does not absolve us from our obligations to the honored dead whom we commemorate.

We cannot, with clear conscience, fail them.

The blessings of sound government, which the sacrifices of other men have provided for us, we must in all good faith and justice pass on unimpaired to those who follow us.

It would be little less than cowardly for us to provide comfort and safety for ourselves at the cost of ruin and destruction to those who are to come after us.

As good citizens and true men, we cannot rob the future for our own benefit.

Rather let us try to pass on a government better for our having lived.

Our Nation may be destroyed as thoroughly in times of peace as by ruthless enemies in time of war.

It may be destroyed in time of peace by subversive doctrine, by abandonment of fundamental principles, by surrender of the rights and privileges of the citizens, by an economy which denies to men their political freedom, or by a vicious and wasteful fiscal system which destroys individual initiative.

Perhaps it is easier to defend this fair land against alien enemies than against slowly creeping insidious doctrines, gradual surrender by a careless or inactive citizenship.

Against the armed enemy we rush forward to do our part in defense of our country.

Often peacetime undermining of our civic structure comes in such pleasing disguise as to lead many to give it welcome and encouragement.

We are apt to forget that history teaches that government by the people is not eternal and that such governments have fallen victim to internal decay due to careless and inactive citizenship.

In paying our debt to the heroes in whose honor Memorial Day is dedicated, let us be as vigilant in protecting our country against our own apathy as against foreign foes.

May we, as citizens of this great Nation, be inspired in peacetime with the same spirit of loyalty, service, and sacrifice which is demonstrated in wartime.

In our hearts, may we give assurance to our honored dead, that we make no distinction between wartime patriotism and peacetime patriotism.

The American form of government is only for those who appreciate it, who deserve it, and who are not only willing to fight for it, but also able to defend and maintain it against all enemies at home or abroad.

Let us resolve, that no matter what the cost, we will deserve our form of government, that we will protect it, and pass it on without impairment to those who are to follow us.

Tomorrow and tomorrow, next week, next month, let us take time to recall in grateful appreciation the services and sacrifices of those who have made possible for us the blessings of the free institutions which we enjoy.

Let us make Memorial Day truly a dedication day.

Jobs Go Hunting for College Grads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the economic condition of the country more thoroughly tested than in absorbing the 700,000 graduates who come out of high schools and colleges each year and go into the labor market.

At no time in history have the prospects for college graduates been as rosy as in 1956.

Some of us who graduated from college in the 1930's and found it tough to find a job look on this situation as the best indication of the future for college graduates.

I append herewith one article from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of Wednesday, May 30, 1956, on the job situation of the graduates of James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.

I append another article by Walter Bazar, which is the fourth of a series of articles in the New York Journal-American of May 31 with reference to jobs for college graduates.

The articles follow:

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of May 30 1956]

HIGHER SALARIES, MORE JOBS FOR JAMES MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY SENIORS

The employment picture for Millikin University's graduating seniors is one of higher salaries and more jobs.

This was reported yesterday by spokesmen for the business and teacher placement bureaus at the university.

The average starting salary for Millikin men students entering the business field will be $362.17 a month, compared with $348 last year, according to Glen R. Smith, director of the Millikin business placement bureau.

Dr. V. F. Dewald, head of the Millikin education department, said the average first year salary for graduating seniors entering the teaching profession will be from $3,650 to $3,700.

The average a year ago was about $3,550.

Both Smith and Dawald reported an increase in the demand for graduating seniors over a year ago.

More than 60 companies have interviewed senior business candidates at Millikin this spring, Smith said.

Most of the 49 seniors registered with the business placement bureau have received more than one job offer, he said, and some have been offered as many as 8 jobs.

Thirty-two men have taken business positions with starting salaries ranging from $310 to $430 a month.

The business placement bureau has six women registrants from the senior class and all have either taken jobs or are considering offers.

Starting salaries for the women range from $250 to $389 a month.

Business candidates who have not taken jobs include several who are planning to enter military service or graduate school.

"Engineering, accounting, and sales are the fields with the greatest demands for graduating seniors," Smith said.

Millikin seniors majoring in engineering administration will have the highest average starting salary of $401 a month.

Industry majors in the senior class will average $383 a month.

Sixty-two members of the Millikin graduating class are prepared for teaching careers and 45 have accepted positions for next fall. The other 17 do not plan to begin teaching next year.

Dawald said the starting salaries for the teachers range from $3,600 to $4,350.

The number of calls for teachers handled by the Millikin teacher placement bureau reached a new high this spring, he said.

[From the New York Journal-American of May 31, 1956]

JOBS GO HUNTING FOR COLLEGE GRADS—AGENTS OF BIG FIRMS SCOUT CAMPUSES FOR CAREER MEN

(Fourth of a series)

(By Walter Bazar)

One day recently, a small "bombshell" dropped on college campuses around the country.

It came in the form of letters to certain groups of June engineering graduates.

The letters were from the International Business Machines Corp. offering the students jobs. If they accepted, the letter stated, the grads would go on half-pay status effective last April 23.

They would remain on half-pay until they finish their studies and report to work after graduation. Then they would go on full pay.

The placement director of a leading university—he asked that his name be withheld—told what happened when the letters were opened by the students:

"The news spread like wildfire. Now the engineering and science students, who have been deluged with tempting job offers, are wondering what other inducements large companies will be offering."

ENGINEER SHORTAGE SPURS RECRUITING

Why did IBM make the offer?

"Like other companies dependent on engineers, we have a problem in hiring graduates," said L. A. Johnson, director of IBM recruiting.

"Our letters to a select group of graduates were prompted by a shortage of engineers. We wanted to know as quickly as possible how many we can count on to work here."

IBM doesn't stand alone in its needs. Firms which employ engineers, chemists, physicists, or mathematicians cannot get all such men they want.

Here are some sample comments:

Sperry Gyroscope Co., division of Sperry Rand Corp., Great Neck, Long Island: "We're looking for graduate engineers. A good number of third year engineering students are being taken on for summer jobs also. Graduates of technical high schools also will find our employment offices open to them."

Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, Long Island: "There is a prime need for engineers. We canvass about 60 colleges for them. We've got a summer training program for college graduates and students."

Esso Standard Oil Co.: "We plan to pick up 165 college engineers."

Remington Rand, division of Sperry-Rand, 315 Fourth Avenue: "We've got plenty of openings for engineers, mathematics majors, and accounting and business, sales personnel able to do an analysis job. We provide intense training programs for all these people."

JOB HUNTS THE MAN, SKY'S THE LIMIT

Ask United States Steel, General Electric, among others, and they'll all tell you they want engineers, scientists, and technicians.

Science and engineering grads don't have to go job hunting. Company representatives come to them on the campuses offering jobs.

Take Columbia University, for example. Samuel Beach, placement director, gave the following ranges of monthly starting salaries dangled before graduates with these degrees:

"Bachelor of science—$400 to $475; master of science—up to $550. For the doctors of philosophy the sky is the limit."

Good salaries aren't the only inducements. Graduates are invited to visit the firm's plant and—if married—"bring along your wife."

If the graduate "signs up," his moving costs are taken care of by the firm.

Some firms offer to help finance his education toward a graduate's degree.

In order to meet the demands, employers sometimes have to be less strict in their standards in hiring stenos, typists, clerks, file clerks, billing-machine operators, and comptometer operators.

UP TO $55 WEEKLY FOR STARTING STENO

The New York State Employment Service puts beginners' weekly wages thus: Stenos from $45 to $55, the majority starting at $45. Typists at $40–$45, most starting at $40. Clerk-typists between $35–$40 depending on typing ability. Clerks $35–$45. Bookkeeper assistants $40–$50. Office boys, pages or messengers $35–$40. Office-machine operators, $35 for trainees to $45–$50 for inexperienced business school-trained workers attaining necessary speeds.

Now let's turn to teachers. As we said, the need is great. New York City alone needs teachers in all departments.

Greatest need is in the junior high schools, especially in the math and science courses. There's a great need also for those who teach retarded children, shop classes, etc. Starting salaries are from $4,000 to $4,400 yearly, depending on the degree a candidate holds.

Nursing also has a critical shortage:

"Nurses are in demand in every State," says Dorothy Weddige, director of nursing service and nursing education of the Department of Hospitals.

"A nursing career guarantees a girl financial security. She can return to her profession at any time in her life."

Graduates of accredited high schools who want to enter nursing training schools should act immediately. Preference given to girls with academic diplomas. Applicants must be 17, have at least 2 years' high school science courses and/or 16 academic or college preparations credits.

Both city and private hospitals nurse training courses have an initial fee. It'll be at least $150. Staff nurses in city hospitals start at $3,500 a year and can make up to $4,800 a year.

Appreciation to the Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include a letter recently addressed to me by a young man who lives in Concord, Mass., and who recently attended a college in the district which I represent. He expresses appreciation to the Members of Congress. It reads:

MY DEAR MR. CURTIS: On June 3, 1956, through the generosity of my great country, I will graduate from Boston University. My entire formal education was provided for by the American people through the legislation organized and passed by Congress for veterans of the Second World War.

The purpose of this letter is to express my deep gratitude to the Members of Congress of the United States for giving so many of us this opportunity. * * *

It is with the greatest sense of loyalty and pride that I thank God for the right to be an American citizen.

Sincerely yours,

PETER BENTON.

Dedication of Kyger Creek Electric Power Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Beckley Post-Herald of June 1, 1956. It was written by Dr. Shirley Donnelly, whose daily commentary on historical events, personalities, and current news is very popular with readers throughout our part of West Virginia.

This description of Dr. Donnelly's visit to the facilities which are generating electricity for the atomic energy installation in southern Ohio is of interest to those of us who come from the districts which produce coal, the principal source of electric power. It is also a vivid picture of one important phase of the Nation's defense structure, which is of interest to every one of us. I comment it to the attention of my colleagues, for I believe that this column is eloquent testimony of the enormity of the physical structure and work that are necessary in order that the Atomic Energy Commission can fulfill its duties in the national-defense program.

TOUR OF BIG KYGER CREEK POWER PLANT

(By Shirley Donnelly)

On May 24, I was guest of Appalachian Electric Power Co. at the formal dedication of the great Kyger Creek electric powerplant in Ohio.

My good friend and fellow townsman, O. C. Hall, local representative of the Appalachian Power Co. at Oak Hill, had invited me some weeks ago. He was at Upson Downs on the dot at 8 a. m., Thursday to whisk me to the big doings in the Buckeye State that day at noon. Along with us went Paul Bavely, the public accountant of Oak Hill. It was a lovely day and the company was so congenial that I failed to note the rapid passing of time.

I always enjoy getting out on a jaunt with bright young men like these two fellows. Before we could attend the formalities in Ohio, we had to be given security clearance by the national powers that be. Evidence that we were to be trusted was a badge about the size of a saucer—a small saucer, I mean—with our names printed on it. This badge was worn on our coat lapel that the armed guards might see we were approved people. I never felt so important in all my life when I got that big badge on with my name printed on it. They even had my name spelled correctly; and that is something.

Maybe you'd like to know what the big Kyger Creek plant is all about. Well, it is an electric power enterprise that is so vast

that it rightfully takes two or more people to tell you just how vast it is. It was like this. In 1952, the United States Atomic Energy Commission decided to build a giant atomic plant in Pike County, Ohio. Now Pike County, Ohio, is in southern Ohio where there is a lot of water in the form of the Ohio River. Atomic plants like the Pike County one require whole heaps of electric power. This Ohio atomic plant wanted its electric power in one great big hurry, so the Atomic Energy Commission turned to the private electric industry of the Ohio Valley and asked, "Can you all supply us this power?"

Fifteen electric companies of the region got their heads together to see could it be done. They answered in effect, "Can do." Those 15 companies organized the Ohio Valley Electric Corp., and called it OVEC for short. It was chartered in Ohio on October 1, 1952. Then they formed a subsidiary outfit and called it the Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp.

This last named corporation they called IKEC. One of the 15 companies in OVEC is the Appalachian Electric Power Co. of our midst. The 2 plants are about 200 miles apart but both are on the Ohio River because they need more water than anybody. These plants cost around $385 million. Every single penny of this was provided by private financing. These two plants are the largest generating plants ever built by private enterprise. The one I saw at Kyger Creek was so immense that it staggered my mind and threw me into a tizzy.

Those two plants were built and completed ahead of schedule which shows what Americans can do when they have a mind to work. I can't begin to tell how much stuff they used in putting up those plants. You wouldn't believe me if I told you. One instance will have to do you, but that ought to hold you for a while. In building the 2 plants they used enough concrete to more than build a 2-lane highway all the way from Charleston, W. Va., to Columbus, Ohio. Can you imagine a thing like that? Oh, it's clear out of this world.

Philip Sporn, a native of Austria, heads up OVEC. He has more electric know-how than almost any man who has lived since the Lord God said, "Let there be light," way back there in the dawn of creation. These two plants have a total generating capability of 2,365,000 kilowatts of electric power. That slays me. Thus it is that the two plants can supply the Atomic Energy Commission in Pike County, Ohio, with full electric power requirements. This power is being used and will be used in producing U-235, the vital component of America's growing stockpile of atomic weapons for defense of the Nation. In atomic technology the key operation is uranium diffusion, a thing that requires worlds of electric power. Please don't ask me to explain this as I don't know a thing in the world about it. But it is something pretty deep, you know.

To run these two big plants they use coal. In 1952 OVEC signed a 15-year contract to buy 7½ million tons of coal a year, the largest single coal supply commitment in the history of the world. It is all to be delivered by river barge. What's more OVEC has signed a contract to deliver 1,950,000 kilowatts of electricity annually to the atomic plant in Pike County, Ohio. The contract is to run for 25 long years, too. Whew.

I forgot to say the Kyger Creek plant is at Cheshire, Ohio. Down the river at the United States Atomic Energy Commission plant at Portsmouth they have a sign that is pregnant with significance. It reads: "No cameras, no firearms, no intoxicants of any type allowed." That's up there at the Portsmouth, Ohio, project.

The two plants I have been raving about today have a total generating power of 2,365,000 kilowatts when they run at capacity. They tell me that only 10 of the 48 States in the good old United States of America, annually consume more power than the Portsmouth, Ohio Atomic Energy Commission plant. Those 10 States are New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and, of course, California. Next time you fuss about how big your light bill is, think of the electric bill the Portsmouth project will receive. It'll run way up in the tens of millions of dollars a year. The total generating capacity of 27 of our 48 States today does not add up to the block of power the Portsmouth deal requires. Wires that carry the big juice out of the Kyger Creek plant look to me to be as big as a man's wrist.

The Need for Action on Equal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has repeated his hope that the Congress will enact legislation to stop wage discrimination that is based upon the sex of the worker.

In his state of the Union message, the President said:

> Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice.

Again on May 24 the White House listed this legislation among the 28 bills which the President hoped would receive favorable action this year.

Both political parties favor such legislation. Each has had equal pay planks in their platforms for many years. In this, the 84th Congress, both Republicans and Democrats have introduced bills. Four identical measures were sponsored by Mrs. GREEN, Mrs. ROGERS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Mr. HAYWORTH. Identical bills expressing the administration's concept have been introduced by Mr. KEARNS, Mr. RHODES of Arizona and myself.

In my study of the similar bills I find wide areas of agreement among us. There are provisions in each which could lessen unfair competition among employers, raise living standards, contribute to maximum labor force efficiency and increase the prestige of the United States among the nations of the world. A meeting of minds would therefore not seem to be difficult.

These bills were proposed in good faith for the benefit of the women who work outside their homes. The principle of equal pay is generally accepted as a matter of simple justice. It is a basic principle of our whole free enterprise way of life, important to both employees and employers alike.

The benefit to employees, which is obvious, often obscures the gains to be made by employers if this legislation were enacted. It is to industry's advantage that workers be able to move freely, as the situation demands, from one job to another. But the artificial barrier set up by unequal wage rates prevents industry from employing workers on the most efficient basis. The widespread establishment of a rate for the job, irrespective of sex, would make a genuine contribution toward creating labor mobility and increased industrial efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, my belief that this legislation will be in the public interest prompts me to urge that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which these bills are assigned, scheduled hearings with all possible speed. The hearings will focus public attention upon the need for this legislation and will produce greater understanding of the subject.

I hope people everywhere—especially the leaders of those fine organizations which have worked so hard for this legislation in the past—will request their Members of Congress to act on equal pay before the close of this session.

Unprepared for 3 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I includes the following editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

UNPREPARED FOR 3 YEARS

The first paragraph of an Associated Press dispatch in yesterday's paper read as follows:

"There are signs that President Eisenhower's approval of the new farm bill largely caught the Agriculture Department unprepared to put the soil bank into effect this year."

The above illustrates the condition of the Agriculture Department since Secretary Ezra Taft Benson took over more than 3 years ago. The Department has been unprepared to administer the laws enacted by Congress.

There is always an excuse, but never a good one. When Mr. Benson took office he was unprepared to administer the laws on the books because he disliked those laws and was devoting his time and attention to trying to get Congress to pass new laws more to his liking. It was 1954 before he could persuade Congress to pass his flexible price support law and that law did not become effective until January 1, 1955.

By the time that date arrived, the people had elected a Democratic Congress, showing that the flexible support plan was not nearly as popular as Mr. Benson had thought it would be. Mr. Benson was then busy trying to decide on what changes in his own law he would be willing to support. He was then unprepared to administer flexible supports with any vigor or consistency.

Late last year Mr. Benson threw his support to a soil bank—completely reversing his former position. At first he wanted it to be effective in 1956, then favored a completely indefensible proposal to pay farmers in 1956 for what they might or might not do in 1957.

The Congress adopted the original Benson proposal without change, but Mr. Benson is still unprepared to administer it.

What the country needs is a Secretary of Agriculture who will be prepared to administer the law of the land from the day he takes office. The only way to get such an official is to elect a new President.

The Klamath Indian Termination Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress have made inquiry regarding the status of the Klamath Indian termination program as spelled out in House Concurrent Resolution 108 and the act of Congress, August 13, 1954, Public Law 587, 83d Congress, Sixty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 718.

Many of my colleagues have had inquiries from their constituents concerning this program. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I instructed a staff member of the committee to ask the Bureau of Indian Affairs for a progress report on this program.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report rendered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I do this so that this information will be available to the other Members of the Congress.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1956.

Mr. J. L. TAYLOR,
Staff Member, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: This will refer to your telephone conversation with Mr. Carl J. Cornelius of the program coordination staff on April 23, regarding inquiries you have received on House Concurrent Resolution 108 and the act of August 13, 1954 (Public Law 587, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 718).

Letters received in this office from those indicating interest in Indian affairs generally imply a misconception of House Concurrent Resolution 108. This resolution basically expresses the sense of Congress regarding the removal of Federal supervision over the affairs of the Indian people. A careful study of the intent reveals that the removal of Federal supervision is not to be carried out arbitrarily, nor through hasty action. Primarily the resolution directs the Department of the Interior to initiate programs with the Indians to terminate Federal supervision. The underlying purpose of resolution 108 is not a new or radical effort to change the status of the Indians. Rather, a review of records pertaining to Indians reveals that as early as 1876 studies and recommendations were made to remove Federal supervision. Similar studies and recommendations were made from time to time, including a recommendation on February 8, 1947, which categorized the readiness of all the tribes and which specifically named certain tribes that were ready for immediate removal of Federal supervision. The intent of resolution 108 is recognized by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and in the development of legislation to remove Federal supervision over the affairs of certain tribes, full consideration was given to the needs and readiness of the Indians concerned to assume the responsibility of managing their own affairs.

Planning for terminal and other programs involve extensive consultations with the Indian tribes concerned. The principle of consultation with the Indians which was originally established by President Eisenhower lies at the heart of the whole policy in the field of Indian affairs. It will be of interest to those studying Indians that there is a great variation from tribe to tribe in social and economic environment, economic maturity, demonstrated capacity for managing their individual affairs, and prospects for self-sufficiency. There is a corresponding variation, of course, in the degree of Federal supervision and assistance in the affairs of the different Indian tribes. Likewise, the States and communities are in different stages of readiness to assume the responsibilities of providing such community services as education, health, welfare, roads, etc. A number of States would be particularly hard pressed to meet such responsibilities because of inadequate financial resources, lack of facilities, and lack of personnel. In some cases, legal obstacles requiring legislative remedy would severely circumscribe any measure the State would be disposed to undertake. It is readily understandable that in addition to consultation with the Indian people, extensive consultations must be carried out with the State officials to properly coordinate plans for the removal of Federal supervision.

Termination of Federal supervision does not mean extinction of tribal organizations, nor does it preclude the Indians from the opportunity to continue to hold their property in tribal status. All the bills enacted by the 83d Congress involving readjustment of Federal Government-Indian relationship contained express provisions permitting the tribe, band, or group of Indians to form legal organizations under the State law to hold and manage tribal estates.

Essentially, the Klamath Act (Public Law 587) is a compromise between two internal groupings of the tribe, permitting those members who choose to do so to convert their interests in the tribal estate into cash and to withdraw from all membership in the tribe, and those who choose to do so to retain the residual tribal assets in common ownership, but under State law.

Much of the work leading to the partition of the tribal assets including management plans is set out in section 5 of the act.

Under date of May 9, 1955, the Secretary of the Interior entered into a contract with three management specialists. Since the approval of the contract the management specialists have:

1. July 29, 1955, entered into contract with Stanford Research Institute to (a) develop guidelines for selecting economic units, (b) determine equitable way of apportioning tribal assets among tribal members, (c) assist in formulation of a plan to stimulate tribal economy, (d) consider appropriate methods of managing residual tribal assets.

2. September 29, 1955, entered into contract with Stanford Research Institute for (a) mineral resources survey.

3. February 17, 1956, entered into contract with Western Timber Services for (a) appraisal and inventory of Klamath tribal assets.

4. April 12, 1956, entered into contract with Stanford Research Institute for (a) development of information as to appropriate number of economic units to be established as it relates to marketability.

Most phases of item 1 have been completed. The survey under item 2 has been completed and most of the work under item 4 has also been completed. Western Timber Services is making satisfactory progress in the appraisal and inventory of tribal assets.

Section 3 of the act provides that the tribe shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a proposed roll of the members of the tribe. This was executed by the tribe but due to objections raised by some members of the tribe concerning certain discrepancies in the proposed roll, such roll was rejected and the superintendent of the agency instructed to prepare the proposed roll. The proposed roll was published in the Federal Register on May 12, 1955. Appeals have since been received in the office which are currently being processed for submission to the Secretary for final action. Some delay was encountered in the processing of the final rolls for the reason that it was necessary to give priority to the California, Ute, Menominee, and western Oregon rolls.

Section 26 of the act provides that "prior to the issuance of a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of section 18 of the act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribe to earn a livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special services because of their status as Indians."

On March 10, 1955, the Bureau of Indian Affairs entered into an agreement with the State of Oregon for a special adult education program. Reports by the State education department indicate that considerable interest has been shown by the Klamath people in this program. Training in this program comes in two main categories: (1) Off-reservation training which includes any regular college or training school chosen by the student applicant; (2) on-reservation training centers around social economics and vocational training such as business management, insurance, bookkeeping, agriculture, and homemaking. The interest in the on-reservation training was at first very slow; however, current reports indicate that a keener interest has been taken by the Klamaths.

Pursuant to section 9 of the act effective February 13, 1955, State law was applied to the probate of all property, including trust and restricted property of Klamath Indians who die on or after that date. Probate of Klamath Indians who died prior to February 13, 1955, would be processed by the Federal Examiner of Inheritance.

It is not yet possible to determine whether additional time will be required other than the deadline set in the act. The work contemplated and accomplished under the act will be a determining factor as to whether any extension of time will be needed. We do not feel that this is an appropriate time to consider any extensions.

We trust the foregoing will serve to give you the information you have requested on the current progress under the Klamath Act. Should you need additional information, we will be happy to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. REID,
Commissioner.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the sudden and untimely death of my dear friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN, with whom I have been associated for many years. His contributions to the welfare of his district and the State of Pennsylvania are numerous and he will be greatly missed by his host of friends. We shall miss his friendly smile, his geniality, and his general statesmanship, for he was a fine example of kindness, integrity, and American citi-

zenship. His passing is our loss, but he has gone to his great reward.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan in her great sorrow, and I am sure she will be consoled by the knowledge that BILL is so kindly remembered by such a throng of good friends and the memory of a husband of such fineness of character and noteworthiness.

Eisenhower Scores With Choice of Interior Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal in the newspapers with reference to the choice by the President of Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior.

Fred Seaton has been a member of the Ike team for several years and thoroughly understands the Eisenhower philosophy of government. He has demonstrated his administrative ability in many ways and his choice as Secretary of the Interior is a good one.

Mr. Seaton is a member of no faction of the Republican Party. As he has always said he is just doing the best job that he can for the President and the country.

If he continues to do that, he will have received the acclamation and the best wishes of all of the people of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald and other Lindsey-Schaub newspapers of Thursday, May 31, 1956, commending the President on the choice of Fred A. Seaton as Secretary of the Interior:

EISENHOWER SCORES WITH CHOICE OF INTERIOR SECRETARY

Since this is a presidential election year the Senate probably will push around briefly President Eisenhower's nomination of Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior.

Confirmation is assured. Seaton, now a Deputy Assistant to the President, is a former United States Senator from Nebraska, and the Senate almost always takes care of its own.

The Seaton appointment has been endorsed by Senate leaders on both sides of the aisle. Most important of all, it has the "enthusiastic endorsement" of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the Republican turned Democrat after a brief transitional career as an official Independent.

Senator MORSE is one of the most outspoken advocates of public power and conservation of natural resources. He has been bitterly critical of Department of the Interior policies under the direction of Secretary Douglas McKay who resigned from the Cabinet to challenge the MORSE bid for reelection. McKay has administration backing in the Oregon senatorial campaign.

The choice of Seaton was a surprise. Most speculation had centered around the chances for promotion of Clarence Davis, Interior Department Under Secretary who had worked closely with Secretary McKay.

Secretary-Designate Seaton already is a member of the Eisenhower team. He enjoys the President's personal friendship and has worked closely with him in the White House executive offices.

He says he will carry out the Eisenhower administration's power and water policies, that is, he upholds the President's policy of partnership between public and private interests in developing power resources for public use.

The general approval of the Seaton appointment is further endorsement of President Eisenhower's personal popularity.

Those who denounced the actions of the Interior Department in dealing with power and public lands called them policies of Secretary McKay, not of the Eisenhower administration which was and is responsible.

General approval of the Seaton appointment is endorsement of the Eisenhower partnership approach which has taken much of the politics out of what had been expected to be a major power issue in the campaign. As Seaton has said, "the partnership idea makes sense and means progress."

The Middle East Burns While Dulles Fiddles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joseph Alsop, written from Amman, Jordan, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 3, 1956. It contains important information, well known to almost all of the world except our State Department. Or am I wrong? Is it some more information Secretary Dulles has been sleeping on?

MATTER OF FACT
(By Joseph Alsop)
THE YOUNG MEN

AMMAN, JORDAN.—In this time of the old men, when 80 is no more than a ripe age for national leadership, it is a bit odd to find the leadership of any nation entirely in the hands of a boy of 20, and his friend aged hardly more than 30. Yet this is now the state of this little country of Jordan, where all power has suddenly been centered in young King Hussein and his new-made commander of the Arab Legion, Gen. Ali Abu Nuwar. Moreover Jordan now has an importance out of all proportion to its size. For if Jordan finally gives full allegiance to the Egypt-dominated bloc of Arab States, the effects will be downright volcanic, both in western-orientated Iraq, and in the vital, oil-rich sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf. It was an experience to ponder, then, meeting the two young men almost at the moment when they concentrated supreme power in their own hands. Of the two, beyond doubt, Ali Abu Nuwar is the greater enigma.

He is a handsome fellow who seems always to be tense with an excess of energy. Ambition burns in his dark Arab eyes, which have a hyperthyroid cast that perhaps explains both the ambition and the energy. And these qualities also explain why Gen. Sir John Bagot Glubb sent Ali Abu Nuwar off to Paris as Jordanian military attaché; for Glubb Pasha had a habit of providing this kind of comfortable exile for young officers who had the look of potential troublemakers for Jordan's long-established British-controlled regime.

Unluckily for Glubb Pasha, the Paris post gave Ali Abu Nuwar the perfect opportunity to make friends with Hussein when the young king visited France. King Hussein, who already had no liking for the role of figurehead, then, insisted, over Glubb's protests, that his new friend return to Amman as his chief aide-de-camp. Lt. Col. Abu Nuwar was already installed on the palace staff when Gen. Sir Gerald Templar was sent to Amman to bring Jordan into the Baghdad Pact.

Along with most of the older generation of Jordanian leaders, the young king was himself convinced that Jordan should join the pact. But the Middle Eastern Troika—the Egyptian propagandists, the Saudi Arabian bribe givers and the Communist organizers—rallied the enraged, embittered mass of Palestinian refugees. In the crisis of the ensuing riots, with Ali Abu Nuwar's strong encouragement, the Baghdad Pact project was hastily abandoned.

That paved the way for the young king's personal coup d'etat, when he ordered Glubb Pasha's summary dismissal. Beyond question, Ali Abu Nuwar was Hussein's chief adviser in this momentous step. As Glubb Pasha departed, Ali Abu Nuwar and his allies among the younger officers also took over the real power in the Arab Legion. And now the logical next step has also been taken. The young king is openly ruling through a puppet cabinet, and Ali Abu Nuwar has assumed open command of Jordan's armed forces.

Besides ambition, then, what are the guiding motives of this young officer who has played such an enormous role in altering the political pattern in this region of the Middle East? There are those who say that he used to be one of the young intellectuals of the violently antiwestern, passionately pro-Egyptian Ba'th Party. In the course of a very long, very frank talk with him, I formed the impression that this might well have been true at one time.

Today, at any rate, Ali Abu Nuwar is still deeply suspicious of the British, warmly friendly to Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, and strongly inspired by the surge of Arab nationalism that Nasser has come to symbolize. But will Ali Abu Nuwar be led by these emotions to accept for Jordan the kind of dependent and colonial relationship to Egypt that has transformed the Egyptian Ambassador to Syria into a sort of viceroy?

The answer to that key question seemed to be far less certain. All his enthusiasm for Arab unity has visibly not converted Ali Abu Nuwar to taking orders from anyone, even including Egypt's Nasser. And if he and the young king maintain their established partnership, the chances of Jordan entering the Egyptian bloc will be still further reduced.

Although Hussein is a boy in years and in appearance, and although he still gets pleasure from such boyish pursuits as driving his fast cars about the countryside at appalling speeds, the King does not make a boyish impression. Except for his Circassian guards in their old Cossack uniforms, the atmosphere of his palace is singularly colorless and businesslike, seeming to assert the young King's decision to carry on his country's business in person. When I saw him, he had just come from a meeting hastily called to soothe senior Arab Legion officers who were displeased by Ali Abu Nuwar's sudden promotion to command them. Yet in these fairly tense circumstances, he showed no trace of nervousness.

He spoke, rather, with considerable quiet decision. "Jordan's role," he said, "was to form a link in the Arab world between Iraq, on the one hand, and the Egyptian bloc on the other hand." Therefore he was opposed to entering either grouping and would refuse to do so. When he was asked about the active Egyptian interventions in Jordanian politics and the flood of Saudi Arabian money pouring into the country, he answered

calmly, but a sharp resentment glittered visibly in his eyes.

"Yet all Arabs," he said, "must work together for the solution of the palestine problem." He added, moreover, "that matters had now reached a stage where a solution of the problem on the basis of the United Nations 1947 partition frontiers for Israel would no longer be acceptable."

Such are the views on the main problems confronting them of these two your men who now rule Jordan together. As there is reason for deep disquiet in their extreme view of the Palestine question, there is also reason for encouragement in their seeming conception of Jordan's future role among the Arab states. But the full power of Egyptian propaganda is still beamed at Jordan. The Saudi money still pours in.

The pressures, in short, are very terrible and the dangers are commensurate. And despite the young King, Jordan is eventually likely to join the Arab procession into the anti-Western camp unless the United States rapidly takes the lead in developing a coherent Western policy in the Middle East.

Reasonable Flood Insurance Protection Is an Imperative National Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this point a very timely editorial appearing in the April 21, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, explaining the vital importance of at least beginning a flood-insurance plan at the Federal level to prevent a recurrence of total economic catastrophe descending upon hundreds of thousands of American homeowners and small businesses.

Let us hope that the Congress will soon adequately deal with this flood-insurance problem that will contribute so much to the continuing economic health of millions of American taxpayers who cannot otherwise obtain any protection against the colossal damage periodically coming from nature's unrestrained elements.

The article follows:

FLOOD-INSURANCE PLAN

All of us hope there will be no need for any flood insurance this coming summer. At the same time, we hope that, when and if new floods do come, there will be some kind of flood insurance for homeowners and for industrial plants.

Flood losses were enormous last August. In Southbridge, the American Optical Co. saw thousands of dollars swept under the swirling waters—and no insurance. The New Haven Railroad lost more than $15 million—and no insurance. Hundreds of small-business men watched helplessly as the waters inundated their years of savings and effort.

And tales were heartbreaking about the number of small homeowners who saw their houses washed away—and no insurance.

It's encouraging that Uncle Sam is making progress toward setting up a flood-insurance program which, while relatively small, is at least a beginning. The Senate Banking Committee recently completed work on such a program, to be presented to Congress.

This bill would have the Government pay up to 40 percent of premium costs, and would limit coverage to $250,000 on business property and $10,000 on a home. The $250,000 limit, while small when applied to large industry, would at least offer protection to smaller companies.

The most significant feature of the new bill is that it would deny flood coverage to property in areas subject to frequent flooding, and to property that was built in areas which had been zoned as restricted because of fear of floods. True enough, much property would be denied coverage under such clauses, but the banking committee's plan does at least mark a beginning toward a flood-insurance plan, so badly needed.

No; Our State Department Does Not Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Joseph Alsop, from Damascus, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 30, 1956.

If the facts set forth are not contained within the reports filed during the last several years from the Middle East, then all of our diplomats in that area, who omitted them, should be fired. If the facts are in those reports, then our Secretary of State should be fired.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Joseph Alsop)
COMMUNISTS AND NATIONALISTS

DAMASCUS.—Here in Syria, which is a small country, the diverse elements that make up Soviet middle eastern policy stand out in sharp relief. Since this policy appears to be completely misunderstood at home, it is worth listing the elements, item by item, and then seeing what they add up to.

Item: Damascus is still agog over the aftermath of the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to London. This was the revelation to the Syrian and Egyptian Governments, by the Soviet Ambassadors here and in Cairo, of the alleged main theme of the Soviet leaders in the Downing Street talks. According to the Ambasadors, Khrushchev and Bulganin flatly declared that the progressive and peace loving bloc would be squarely behind the Arab States in the event of a renewal of the Arab-Israeli war.

The Soviet diplomats alomst certainly misrepresented what passed in London. But their version of the London talks has of course been delightedly accepted here, and is reportedly credited in Cairo as well.

Item: In the last month, Soviet diplomats here, in Cairo and in other Arab capitals have begun to talk with Arab leaders about the possible terms of a settlement with Israel. The Arab response may be easily imagined. It is a fair bet that these Soviet feelers are the prelude to a solid indorsement by Moscow of the United Nations 1947 plan for the partition of Palestine, as the only fair solution of the Arab-Israeli problem.

A return to the U. N. plan of 1947, which was put forward, remember, before the Israeli victory over the Arabs, could mean reducing the area now held by Israel by almost 40 percent. It is what the Arabs have been asking for. Any such Soviet move in the U. N. Security Council will leave the American and British Governments as gasping and helpless as hopelessly beached salmon. We shall be made to seem the enemies; the Soviets will appear as the special friends and protectors of Arab nationalism.

Item: On the subdiplomatic level three kinds of activity are being carried on concurrently. The local Communist parties have been given a very special mission, not to increase their own strength, but to reinforce in all ways possible the strength of the non-Communist, anti-Western forces here. The Syrian Communist leader, Khaled Baqdash, has been using all his considerable charm to convince the more conservative elements in Syria that he is just another nationalist bourgeois at heart. His organizers, in similar false whiskers, are being sent out to assist any political grouping or movement with an anti-Western tendency.

Item: The nationalist apparatus is being powerfully backed up, in turn, by a commercial appeal. All sorts of Soviet and satellite trade missions are swarming through this country and the other Arab lands, making tenders on locally important projects of every sort. Because of the wages paid the workers in the workers' paradise, it is possible that many of these bids are quite honest. In any case, they are almost invariably much lower than bids by Western firms. Meanwhile, great efforts are also being made to persuade local business, political, and cultural leaders to visit the Soviet Union and the satellite States for the full red carpet treatment.

Item: The desire of the Arabs for more and more arms against Israel is constantly being exploited. Besides the new arms deal that seems to be in the making with the Chinese in Cairo, the Syrians here are completing negotiations to purchase another $25 million worth of surplus Soviet arms through the Czechs.

What, then, is one to make of the complex pattern of diplomatic, economic, propagandistic and underground action? The first point that sticks out a mile is that, for the present, the Kremlin is making no serious effort whatever to promote communism as communism in this part of the world. Gamal Abdel Nasser has sternly suppressed the Communist Party in Egypt, but here in Syria the local Communists are more pro-Nasser than Nasser himself.

The second point that also stands out a mile is that the Kremlin is making the most desperate efforts to capture the Arab nationalist movement which Colonel Nasser symbolizes and effectively leads. The aim, of course, is to use Arab nationalism to destroy every western position in the Middle East, and to substitute Soviet influence for western influence everywhere throughout this strategically vital region.

This is the aim, in turn, because the whole western alliance can be brought down in ruins here in the Middle East. Let the oil which is Britain's and Western Europe's lifeblood once be shut off, even for a very short period of time, and the ensuing economic catastrophe in Britain and Western Europe can be counted on to break the Anglo-American partnership, to destroy NATO, and to achieve, almost autoomatically, pretty nearly every other Kremlin goal on this side of the Atlantic.

If this brilliantly conceived operation succeeds, it will be time for the Kremlin to deal with the Arab nationalists, who will then have about the same chance of survival as a naked man in a dark room with a grizzly bear. But here in Damascus, as in Cairo, the emotions that are driving these Arab patriots to serve the Kremlin's purposes are so strong and so inflamed that they never pause to think soberly about the dangers ahead. And as long as the British middle eastern policy is largely based on despair, while American

middle eastern policy is a minus quantity, the Kremlin's plan for the Middle East can be expected to go forward from success to success.

Economic and Political Unity Must Be Fostered if the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Is To Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial appearing in the April 26, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram explaining the vital necessity of expanding the NATO organization into economic and political unified activity, as well as military.

The article very pointedly reminds us that unless there is a firm basis established of economic and political unity among the 15 nations of NATO, the military cooperation will increasingly deteriorate in the face of the persevering Russian attempt to gain economic control over Western Europe.

The article follows:

ECONOMIC UNITY UNDER NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has always emphasized its military aspects. It has been built, primarily, as an alliance of collective military defense.

But the Soviet Union is now trying to bypass this military grouping by an economic offensive. The United States is countering by the announcement that, from this point on, there will be more stress on economic unity among the 15 NATO partners. Secretary of State Dulles in May will meet with foreign ministers from other NATO countries to outline the United States plan in more detail.

The treaty which established this collective security organization makes broad provisions for just such a policy. Article 2 of the NATO treaty provides that members "will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

There has been some progress along these lines, too, but it has not been easy. It took years to arrange the coal and steel pooling arrangement among France, West Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) has had bumpy going from the start. The proposed European Defense Community failed to come into being, and economic disunity of Western Europe was one of the reasons for failure. But there can be no let-up in the effort.

In his first annual report at NATO's supreme Allied commander in Europe, Dwight D. Eisenhower pointed out that "all human progress in the military or other fields has its source in the heart. No man will fight unless he feels he has something worth fighting for. Next, then, is the factor of the strength of the supporting economy. Unless the economy can safely carry the military establishment, whatever force of this nature a nation might create is worse than useless in a crisis. Since behind it there is nothing, it will only disintegrate."

If NATO is going to hold up under the Soviet economic drive, it must certainly look to its own economic strength and unity. This view was the principal theme of the address by President Giovanni Granchi, of Italy, during his recent visit in the United States. A glance at the most recent economic indexes shows why.

Of the world's total manufacturing capacity, North America accounts for 40 percent, Western Europe 30 percent, and the Soviet bloc 20 percent. It has been pointed out that, as long as North American and Western Europe stick together economically, they have a 7-to-2 lead over the Reds. But if the Reds win economic control of Western Europe they will have a 5-to-4 advantage over North America.

These are the considerations behind the new NATO policy Dulles is talking about. We cannot afford to let the Soviet Union get the upper hand economically.

House Resolution 303

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1956, points up the necessity for the adoption of my resolution, House Resolution 303, which I introduced on July 7, 1955:

SPROUL FAVORS BANKING INQUIRY—SEEKS BROAD STUDY BY UNITED STATES OF SYSTEMS

ATLANTIC CITY, May 24.—Allan Sproul, retiring president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, called today for a broad national inquiry into the banking and monetary system of the United States.

Addressing the opening session of the 53d annual convention of the New Jersey Bankers Association in the Haddon Hall Hotel here, Mr. Sproul told the 1,500 banking executives that "to serve such a purpose I should think a Presidential commission of somewhat the same general character as the so-called Randall Commission * * * would be a useful device."

The Randall Commission completed a study of United States foreign economic policies in January 1954.

CREDIT POLICY

Answering recent criticism of the credit policy of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Sproul pointed to the rising trend of prices, that "may have reflected strains upon existing capacity in some instances, and then upward push of costs on prices in others that it was not something to be facilitated and encouraged by too easy access to reserve funds at too little cost."

"There has been no shying away by the Federal Reserve System from its responsibility to supply the reserve funds needed to meet necessary demands for bank credit," he continued. But he noted that "with this responsibility goes the equal responsibility of trying to see to it that bank reserves are not so readily or cheaply available as to foster and promote expansive efforts which are temporarily beyond our physical capacity for balanced growth."

The most recent rise in April of the discount rates of the Federal Reserve banks, which has received much public comment, was intended to give public notice * * * of the pressure being exerted on the commercial banking system by business demands for credit. In this way the banks would be further encouraged to make adjustments within their own loan and investment portfolios to meet these credit needs, and to screen more carefully the necessary demands for credit from speculative or fringe demands.

COSMIC JEST?

Mr. Sproul described as "a sort of cosmic jest" the recent claim that the Federal Reserve's policy of credit restraint had contributed in part to difficulties in the automobile industry. He attributed the difficulties to a misuse or abuse of one form of credit during the lush days of 1955, and suggested that we are paying for it in 1956.

However, he conceded the possibility that criticisms of Federal Reserve policy made in behalf of small business might have some validity.

"Although I doubt if categorical proof can be produced, I suspect that the impact of a policy of credit restraint is greater on small business than on big business," he said. But he also expressed grave doubts about the value of recent surveys purporting to support the criticism.

"The social and political implications of this problem have troubled the country for a long time, and need some new thinking based less on emotional and inherited dislike of business than has been the case in the past," he observed. "The Federal Reserve System, the instrument chartered by the Federal Government to exercise general credit control, should not be blamed for discharging its responsibility, even though it may seem at times to add to this problem."

Soil Bank No Answer for Area's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial from the May 28, 1956, issue of the Tupelo Daily Journal, Tupelo, Miss.:

SOIL BANK NO ANSWER FOR AREA'S PROBLEMS

The farm bill recently approved by Congress will probably become the law of the land this week.

And with it will come into being President Eisenhower's now-famous soil bank, a proposal which has caught the imagination of the Nation as a sort of cure-all for whatever ails American agriculture.

In spite of the hundreds of millions of dollars to be paid to farmers who put their land in the bank, however, we doubt that northeast Mississippi will benefit materially from the new plan.

And there is a possibility that we will lose more than we gain from the Republican farm program.

A few of the reasons why the soil bank is likely to be of only limited values—and possible long-term detriment—to this area can be listed as follows:

1. As a general rule, only the larger farmers can afford to take still more land out of cultivation in addition to that already stripped from them by acreage allotments.

The man who, for example, has only 8 acres in cotton is barely eking out a living from his crop now. And he can't afford to

take another couple of acres out of production to put into the soil bank.

And a farmer already down to a net cash income of $800 or $1,000 a year can't stand a reduction of even another $100 without suffering seriously.

He has only his labor to sell. And if he puts a portion of his already limited cropland in the soil bank he causes himself to be unemployed an even higher percentage of the time, as he is unlikely to be able to get part-time seasonal work in town.

The farmer who needs help most—the man over 45 years of age who is cropping only 8 or 10 acres—is unlikely, therefore, to benefit materially from the soil bank.

As a result, most of the millions to be spent under the farm program will probably go to larger farmers who employ hired labor and can come out fairly well by accepting small payments for retiring from production some of their acreage.

2. Our area of the country consists chiefly of two economic groups—the farmers and the small towns which service them.

When land is put into the soil bank, it ceases to produce commodities which require the sale of fertilizer, tractors, seed, etc., and it requires the services of gins, oil mills, banks, compresses, and similar institutions.

As a result, the economy of the typical small town in this area will probably suffer almost as much under the soil-bank program as it would if farmers had merely been given another acreage cut without the soil-bank feature.

3. There will be a serious temptation for farmers participating in the soil bank to let their land wash away after it is put in the Government program.

The typical hill farmer won't get enough out of the new farm program to justify his fertilizing and seeding properly the land he puts in the soil bank; hence, he will be tempted merely to pocket whatever money the Government passes out and let his land lie unprotected.

In theory, the Government's new farm program no doubt has an answer for this problem.

But the soil bank is not a program designed to help the small hill farmer of northeast Mississippi. And whatever benefit we get from it is likely to be of a fringe nature, perhaps even being outweighed by the cutbacks in our overall economy which it will bring.

We must not, therefore, assume that our area's farm problems have been solved by enactment of this new law.

We will still need as badly as ever—and perhaps even worse than ever—industrial jobs to provide full-time employment for rural residents who are being caught in a squeeze where they can no longer make a decent living from the soil.

And we should not wait until the soil bank proves its ineffectiveness before doing our utmost to meet our problems through increased payrolls in town for those who are seriously underemployed in the county.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened at the death of my esteemed colleague and good friend, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN. His loss will be keenly felt.

BILL earned the respect of his colleagues and the people of his district for his outstanding ability and devotion to duty, and their deep affection for his sterling personal qualities. He was a truly effective Member of Congress because of his ability, sincerity of purpose, trustworthiness, and dependability. It was a privilege to know BILL GRANAHAN, and his passing is a personal loss to me. My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan and the other members of the family.

Urban Renewal Promotes Local Improvement and the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an excellent editorial appearing in the April 19, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, pointing up the substantial civic gain that accompanies well-planned urban redevelopment programs and the resultant contribution to the national welfare.

A great many cities have been enabled to eliminate these unhappy breeding places of juvenile crime and delinquency with the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Let us hope that every community in the Nation will take advantage of this opportunity to rid their localities of slum areas in order to afford opportunity to every American family to live within a healthy, Christian atmosphere.

The article follows:

WHAT URBAN RENEWAL CAN MEAN

What is the most profitable financial enterprise ever proposed to American cities? Experts gathered by Architectural Forum magazine say it is urban renewal.

That term covers two activities. One is the complete redevelopment of rundown neighborhoods. All buildings are torn down and a fresh start is made. That is what Worcester plans to do in the Salem Street project.

The other is the sprucing up of sagging neighborhoods. This involves tearing down buildings that are beyond repair, and coaxing or forcing property owners to fix up the rest. The term "urban renewal" is sometimes applied specifically to this process.

Both bring large returns for property values rise sharply when whole neighborhoods are set back on their feet.

Worcester is trying redevelopment; it hasn't tried rehabilitation. Other cities are attempting it. Cambridge is working out a program. Quincy is considering something of the sort. Portland, Maine, has made substantial progress.

If a formal plan of rehabilitation is adopted, Worcester can qualify for Federal financial aid. This works on the same basis as does redevelopment. The Federal Government pays back two-thirds of any net investment the city has to make.

The city could spend money to take over dilapidated buildings and tear them down. It could spend money for street and utility improvements, and for other purposes. But this has to be done within a specific area and for the purpose of elevating the whole physical character of that neighborhood.

The key to it all is systematic enforcement of housing regulations. Worcester doesn't quite have that now, although there are many inspectors on the job.

Two full-time fire department inspectors checks fire hazards, and report violations of the building code or other regulations. So do about 100 officers in the department, on a part-time basis.

The bureau of public buildings has four building inspectors to enforce its code. It also has plumbing inspectors and elevator inspectors. The bureau of wires has three wiring inspectors.

The health department has a housing code adopted just 1 year ago. It has a staff of sanitarians who help enforce it, when they have time.

By coordinating and concentrating all these efforts, the city probably could do much to improve decaying neighborhoods. Cities like Chicago and St. Louis have found that the public investment is tiny compared to the civic gain. When certain property owners are forced to repair and paint old but usable buildings, other property owners often voluntarily make such improvements to their buildings.

Some neighborhoods are beyond redemption in this manner. Then redevelopment becomes the only answer, as in the case of the Salem Street project. It is partly because of that project that no formal rehabilitation effort has been undertaken here. Proponents of the project didn't want to confuse the issue.

But that danger is past. A start on the redevelopment project awaits only final court clearance. It is not too soon to begin thinking of rehabilitation and renewal of other areas before they, too, reach the point where complete redevelopment is necessary. Worcester cannot afford to pass up this most profitable financial enterprise.

Fluoridation: A Vital Defense Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES P. NELSON
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article entitled "Fluoridation: A Vital Defense Measure," by Dr. Alonzo H. Carcelon, director of the division of dental health of the Department of Health and Welfare of the State of Maine:

FLUORIDATION: A VITAL DEFENSE MEASURE

We live in an age of peril. We know that Soviet Russia now has the capability of atomic attack upon us. We know that this capability will increase with the passage of time.

In the last two great wars, our European allies bore the brunt of the early stages of the conflict. Their lands were overrun, their cities destroyed, their industries ruined; their social, civic, religious, and family activities were disrupted. But we escaped these calamities, thanks to the Atlantic Ocean and to the precious time bought at such a price by our allies. Never again will we have the time we had after the start of World War II to mobilize our resources.

Either we get ready now, or we will wake up to the fact that there are certain things

we could have done which it will be impossible to do because of the terribly swift pace that will characterize any war of the future.

Because of our imminent danger the warfare world, not the welfare state, accounts for most of today's Government expenditures and for most of the increase in Government expenditures during the past 40 years. War and defense costs dominate the budget of the Federal Government and the combined expenditures total of the Federal, State, and local governments. In 1953, 58 percent of all American Government expenditures was devoted to national defense and veterans.

Distribution of all American public expenditures, 1953

Purpose:	Percentage
National defense and veterans	58
Education	8
Social welfare and health	8
Interest	7
Agriculture and national resources	6
General government and miscellaneous	6
Highways and streets	5
Protection	1
Trust funds, debt retirement	1
Total	100

Yet, despite the urgency of our mobilization needs, not all of our defense dollars can go into direct defense. During fiscal year 1953, for example, it was necessary to divert more than $100 million from defense to provide dental services for the Armed Forces, veterans, and other direct Federal beneficiaries.

When we talk about cutting dental decay by two-thirds, through fluoridation, think of how much we could do in the way of defense with two-thirds of $100 million. Better still, think of how much we could do with two-thirds of $100 million cut off our tax bills.

But, if it is stupid to waste money and material, it is treasonable to waste manpower. Yet, that is precisely what we have been doing.

Among the first 2 million men examined for selective service in 1941, 900,000 were rejected for physical and mental disabilities. Dental defects were the leading cause for rejection.

Distribution of rejections, first 2 million examined, 1941

Cause:	Percentage
Dental defects	21
Eye defects	14
Cardiovascular diseases	11
Muscular-skeletal defects	7
Venereal diseases	6
Mental, nervous diseases	6
Hernia	6
Ear defects	5
Foot defects	4
Lung defects	3
All other defects	18
Total	100

In Maine dental defects always have been a serious manpower problem. In World War I, for example, only two other States had higher rates of rejection for loss of teeth. Among naval recruits in 1934, the average number of decayed, missing, and filled teeth was higher in only seven other States. Among aviation cadets in 1943, the average number of decayed, missing, and filled teeth was higher in only one other State.

The seriousness of this problem becomes apparent when we remember that the War Department Mobilization Regulations of August 31, 1940, only required six serviceable opposing teeth and normal gums.

That we should have found ourselves in this position in 1941 is all the more tragic when we consider what Sir James Crichton-Browne told the British Dental Society in Cambridge, England, on June 22, 1892: "It is clear that a supply of fluorine, while the development of the teeth is proceeding, is essential to the proper formation of the enamel and that any deficiency in this respect must result in thin and inferior enamel. * * * I think it well worthy of consideration whether the reintroduction into our diet * * * of a supply of fluorine * * * might not do something to fortify the teeth of the next generation."

Today, two generations later, with the clock on the wall ticking off precious minutes, we still are haggling over whether or not we will strengthen our defenses with this simple fortification. We are letting what the Hartford Courant has called "one of the greatest aggregations of quacks and medical phonies in history" scare us out of solving our No. 1 military manpower problem, rejections for dental defects.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, Government research conclusively demonstrated that, where the water supply contains the right amount of fluoride, dental decay rates are two-thirds lower than in areas where the drinking water contains no fluorides.

Once this decay-inhibiting effect is established, it continues, undiminished, throughout life.

Careful, scientific studies of men taking physical examinations at Armed Forces induction centers, in 1943, demonstrated that there are no harmful effects.

More than 3 million people, in the United States alone, have been drinking water containing up to 27 times the recommended amount of fluoride all their lives.

More than 7,000 technical articles have been written on fluorides, in the scientific literature, and not 1 of them ever has demonstrated that the continuous consumption of drinking water containing the right amount of fluorides has harmed or can harm any living thing.

Those who oppose the efforts of the American people to improve their physical fitness keep screaming that fluorine is a cumulative, toxic poison that will kill you from heart disease, cancer, or afflictions of the brain, kidneys, or liver. They even have some trick statistics to support their claims. But careful scientific investigations have demonstrated, repeatedly, that there is no truth to these assertions.

The also scream that fluoridation is a violation of their constitutional rights, despite the fact that the constitutionality of fluoridation has been upheld in the courts of 13 States, and that, on 3 separate occasions, the Supreme Court of the United States has refused to review fluoridation cases because there was no Federal question involved. We must never get to the place, in this country, where any individual is denied a fair trial of his case, on its merits. But, on the other hand, we cannot let phony claims of the violation of constitutional rights, and a never-ending succession of appeals, so tie our hands that we become the helpless victims of our own civil liberties.

Then, in what is probably the master stroke of deception, these people, who are trying so desperately to prevent us from strengthening our manpower potential, warn us to look out for Communists. "With one turn of a valve," they say, "the Communists could wipe out the entire population, with an overdose of fluorides."

The fact is that sabotage is technically impossible. In order to sicken, not kill, an adult with an 8-ounce glass of fluoridated water, a saboteur, for example, would have to sneak 108 freight-car loads of fluoride into the New York City water supply, all at one time.

As a result of the studies of men at the Armed Forces induction centers, and other investigations, the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local authorities, began an investigation in Grand Rapids, Mich., before the end of World War II, to determine the feasibility of fluoridating community water supplies. Separate studies were undertaken by State and local authorities in several other places.

More than 10 years of intensive investigation has demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that fluoridation is safe, effective, economical, and a constitutionally permissible public health measure under our form of government.

Fluoridation has the endorsement of the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Water Works Association, and every other professional and technical organization that speaks with authority on health matters.

Fluoridation also has the endorsement of the Department of Defense, the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Air Force, and the United States Public Health Service.

Today, the average boy graduating from high school in Grand Rapids and entering the Armed Forces costs the Federal Government at least one-third less to put into fighting shape, so far as dental work is concerned, and the savings to taxpayers will continue to mount up.

Moreover, it makes no difference whether he plans to make the service a career, or to return to civilian life. That boy will have better teeth throughout his entire life. His sister, too, will have fewer cavities, fewer toothaches, fewer dental bills, a more attractive smile, thanks to fluoridation.

This has not been an easy victory, however. When the Armed Forces planned to begin fluoridation of the water supplies at military establishments, the opponents attempted to secure the passage of the so-called Weir bill, which would have prohibited such action. Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens wrote and Maj. Robert W. Hobson appeared before the Wolverton committee, representing the Department of Defense, to make it plain that, in the opinion of the Department of Defense, fluoridation of water supplies is a public health asset, and that prohibiting fluoridation would be detrimental to the public interest.

As a result of the efforts of the Department of Defense, and others, this proposal was killed, and the Armed Forces have been able to go ahead with fluoridation.

The United States Air Force has approved fluoridation for its bases. The big Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, and the Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana have started to fluoridate. In addition, 14 other bases are now installing fluoridation equipment and are obtaining the compound.

The United States Army has approved fluoridation for all military installations throughout the world. Installations have already been started for Schofield Barracks, Fort Shafter, and Wheeler Field, in Hawaii, and plans are underway for the fluoridation of Alaskan posts.

The United States Navy has started fluoridation at the Naval Air Station at Lakehurst, N. J., and is completing the installation of equipment at its huge Great Lakes Naval Training Center.

In addition, as of April 1, 1956, 1,140 American communities have begun fluoridating civilian water supplies serving more than 22 million people. More than 74 percent of the entire population of Rhode Island, for example, has been using fluoridated water since February 1955. The District of Columbia water supply has been fluoridated since June 1952.

However, in a number of communities, local officials have resorted to what the New York Times calls "an evasion of the responsibility of high office, a knuckling under to a minority whose assertions receive no confirmation in scientific circles," by submitting fluoridation to a referendum. We never have voted on compulsory vaccination against smallpox, compulsory immunization against diphtheria, compulsory vaccination of dogs against rabies, chlorination of our water sup-

plies, or any other similar health measure. In the case of fluoridation alone, the opponents insist upon having a referendum. They are certain they can successfully destroy public confidence in our recognized scientific authorities as easily as they destroy the confidence of our municipal officials in State and local health departments, and in State and local medical and dental societies, when they intimidate these officials into placing fluoridation on the ballot.

But, thanks to the patriotic support and vigilance of organizations like the American Legion, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, more and more communities are being awakened to the true nature of the opposition to fluoridation.

As Chemical Week, the business magazine of the chemical-process industries, has pointed out, the hard core of resistance to fluoridation rests with a relatively small handful of people who have caused a stir out of all proportion to the merits of their arguments.

The fundamental question at stake is this: "Shall we permit a few individuals, who can't get any authoritative professional or scientic organization to believe them, to continue to deprive future generations of Americans of better health? Or, shall we stand shoulder to shoulder with the Department of Defense, the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Air Force, the American Legion, and 22 million Americans throughout the length and breadth of our land, who sincerely believe that strengthening our defenses with fluoridation is in the public interest?

As we listen to these people rant and rave against what the Department of Defense has called "a public health asset;" as we listen to them try to break down our confidence in American institutions, to make us believe that our health departments are engaged in some fantastic plot to poison us, to make us believe that the American Medical Association and all the other scientific authorities do not know what they are talking about when they say fluoridation is safe, to make us believe that all the research workers in the United States and Canada have juggled their figures for pay; we should ask ourselves two questions, "Who stands to profit by keeping dental defects the largest single cause of rejection for military service? Who stands to profit by undermining public confidence in our American institutions?"

When we see that, however, well intentioned some opponents may be, opposition to fluoridation accomplishes objectives the Soviets dearly love to achieve, we will waste no time in getting on the same team as the United States Army, the United States Navy, and the United States Air Force, and adopt fluoridation. It is a winning team, and with God's help we're going to keep it that way.

The Late Miss Lucinda Rayburn

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of loss that I learned of the untimely passing of Miss Lucinda Rayburn, sister of our beloved Speaker.

During a long and fruitful life, Miss Lou, as she was lovingly known, was a constant companion and helpmate to Speaker RAYBURN. For many years Miss Lou was the Speaker's official hostess and during her visits to Washington endeared herself to all who came to know her. Hers was a life of devotion and good works and she will always be remembered among the great women of the Southwest.

Mrs. Kilgore and I join with Mr. RAYBURN's many friends in the 15th District of Texas in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to our Speaker and to his family and pray that our Lord will sustain him in his hour of grief as He has guided him throughout his life.

Improvement of Our Security Program Is in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 27, 1956, is deserving of the attention of our colleagues:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)
AN R. S. V. P. TO SENATOR CAIN

President Eisenhower gave one of his rare one-syllable answers during his press conference last week. Usually he is more outgiving; usually he amplifies, and it is his amplifications which contribute so much to the insight which the White House press conference yields. But this time, the very brevity of the President's reply was revealing. It was a 1-word answer to a 42-word question. The authorized transcript records it as follows: "Question: (Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star): Mr. President, former Senator Harry P. Cain said recently that he had been trying unsuccessfully, to get directly to you his views about the Government security program. And I am instructed to ask if Senator Cain can see you if he wants an appointment?" The President: "Yes." Behind this unusual instance of a White House reporter asking whether an official of the Eisenhower administration could have an appointment with the President is a very human, a very understandable, and a very regrettable story.

The President said "Yes"—Senator Cain could see him if he wanted an appointment. It was an affirmative answer, a carefully courteous answer, but every correspondent knew that it was not an enthusiastic or even a very cordial "Yes."

Here is a lifelong Republican, a former Senator from the State of Washington, an Eisenhower appointee to the Subversive Activities Control Board, where he has rendered able service for several years.

Senator Cain knows what real Communist subversion is, how the real Communists work, how they try to penetrate and disguise their penetration. He isn't fooled by them; he isn't soft on them.

This is why it is so regrettable to see a veil of miasmic misunderstanding, bordering on hostility, let down between Senator Cain and the President.

Obviously, Senator Cain has annoyed some officials of the administration because he has become the most articulate, the most widely heard, the most effective advocate of changes in the employee security program. There were some in the administration who simply didn't want the shortcomings, the injustices and the unfairnesses of the program brought sharply to the fore. They didn't actually deny that there were shortcomings, that a number of bad mistakes had been made, but they preferred not to have them mentioned above a whisper on the ground that in due time everything would be ironed out.

The truth is that needed corrections in the employee security program have been very slow in coming. There are important reforms which still need to be made, and it is my considered judgment that Senator Cain's earnest, able, documented, respected advocacy has been indispensable to much of the progress that has been made.

Senator Cain is not talking about weakening the program. He seeks changes which will strengthen the program by guaranteeing fuller and quicker justice to everyone affected by it.

He advocates (1) confrontation of witnesses; (2) greater speed in reaching decisions, employees being at present kept dangling sometimes 8 to 14 months with the most grievous charges hanging over them; (3) the shifting of security-questioned employees to nonsensitive jobs until a decision is reached; (4) greater specification of charges to preserve due process of law, and (5) a more prudent use of the Attorney General's list of so-called subversive organizations as a means of testing loyalty and security.

In the concrete cases of miscarriage of justice which he has publicized—and nearly all of which have subsequently been corrected—Senator Cain has been proved right again and again.

Senator Cain has, I think, been a faithful, loyal, intelligent, worthy ally of exactly the way President Eisenhower would like to see his security program conducted. I am convinced that if the President lends an open mind to the appointment with Senator Cain—putting aside some of the prejudiced things which have been said to him—the interview will usefully clear away the misunderstanding.

The Last, Best Hope of Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a very pertinent article entitled "American Freedom Was Born in Blood," appearing in the April 19, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, containing a most timely reminder that the substantive virtues marking a great beginning must be ever practiced if the end is to be "the last, best hope of earth."

The article follows:

AMERICAN FREEDOM WAS BORN IN BLOOD

On the quiet green of Lexington stands a monument inscribed with a brief list of names. These are the men who died 181 years ago today in the first battle for American liberty.

The years pass and memory fades, and the raw anguish of those deaths so long ago is dulled. In its place is a romanticized glory, which clings imperishably to the events of that famous day in history. The American pageant, moving impressively down the long road of the years, casts a reflected splendor

that would amaze the people who were present at that simple, brutal scene.

For to them, it was not sudden glory with a happy ending. To them, it was shock, fear, suffering, defiance and in some cases—death. It was uncertainty, remorse, and despair—and the hope of eventual victory.

But those are the substances of which great beginnings are made. And April 19, 1775, marked one of the greatest beginnings in all human history. On the day before Lexington, America meant one thing; forever after Lexington it meant something radically different.

On that day the American dream of freedom, justice and equality was born. It was born in blood, violence, and fear, but it has grown to be what Lincoln was later to call it, "the last, best hope of earth."

Address by Hon. Frank Chelf, of Kentucky, Before the Lebanon, Ky., High School Graduating Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consen to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcribed ad lib speech made by my colleague, FRANK CHELF, on Monday night, May 28, 1956, to the Lebanon, Ky., High School graduating class, of which his oldest daughter, Caroline, was a member.

The speech follows:

Superintendent Johnston, distinguished members of the school board, members of the faculty, you fine graduating class of Lebanon High School, my old and dear friends of Lebanon and Marion County, and you good ladies and gentlemen who have honored us tonight by your presence from the adjoining counties, I have had many thrills in my time, believe me, certainly many, many more than I have ever deserved. I can recall not too many years ago—but certainly enough, at that—when I was a barefooted, ragged, dirty-faced youngster out in an orphanage, and I never shall forget the greatest thrill that had ever come—the first real thrill of my lifetime. It was when Babe Ruth came to see the youngsters at the home and he was knocking fly balls out into the outfield, and as a youngster and member of the team I put my heart into catching one of those balls, because the rule was if you caught a ball you could come in and Babe would autograph it and shake your hand. Well, I want you to know, boys and girls, that I caught one of those balls. I made it my business, Jim, to catch one. And you talk about a fellow rocking, rolling, wheeling, and dealing—I really came in from that outfield into that infield and got in there and shook Babe Ruth's hand. He autographed that ball, and today I have it as one of my most prized possessions in a glass case there on my desk in Washington. Someday, if little Frank behaves himself, I might pass it on to him. That was a great thrill.

Then, you know, 30 years ago tonight I graduated from high school, and that, too, was a real thrill. Of course, I was so young when I graduated—fact is, I was only round about 9—well Jack Benny is only 39. Well, Caroline looked at me pretty closely, so maybe it was twice 9, Caroline. At any rate, it was a happy occasion, believe you me.

And then later on, as my good friend Denny pointed out here, I had some other wonderful things happen to me—when you good people here elected me as your county attorney and later when Miss Lou agreed to walk down the aisle with me; and later on, it was a real thrill when Caroline, our first baby, came, and then Bonnie and then Frank—oh, what a wonderful thing it was. Later, yes, I had my shingle hung out; the war came thereafter and I did what I could to help win it. I shall never forget the thrill that came to me the day of our graduation from Officers Candidate School when I got my commission, and when I was promoted to a captain and later to a major. When I came back, you good people rallied around me here in Lebanon and Marion County and throughout this great fourth congressional district and you gave me the nomination and elected me as your Representative in Congress. Oh that was a thrill—that was the high-water mark in my life, make no mistake about it.

Then still later on, by hard work, I was permitted to serve as the chairman of a subcommittee that won some national prominence and they were kind enough to me to let it be called the Chelf Investigating Committee. All that was wonderful. It was fine, my friends, when I was permitted to meet the great Franklin Roosevelt, shake his hand and to serve with him in his Congress and later, President Harry Truman and now President Eisenhower. They were wonderful things to happen to me but I want to say to you from the bottom of my heart, the greatest thing that has ever happened to FRANK CHELF is to be permitted to come here tonight and to address this fine graduating class in our hometown—56 fine young men and women representing one for each year from the beginning of the 20th century. I think it is a good omen, Mrs. Johnston—I do indeed and I am so happy, so pleased, and I am so proud that you were able to hold your line and to keep them all together. I understood that one dropped out but later one more came and took the place. I was happy and I know that all of you thrill because of that. To me, I repeat—that is a good omen—believe me it is.

What I have to say to these fine young men and women tonight probably will be old stuff to you fathers, mothers and you loved ones and certainly to the members of the faculty and you teachers. It will be old stuff, yes, and so if you want to tune me out, go to sleep or drive out to the Parkette, it is all right with me; we will go right ahead here with this thing. I know there have been times when you wanted to say something to the youngsters but maybe they were going to a dance, going to that football game or that basketball game, or maybe they were headed out the door to class and maybe what you had to say to them didn't quite register at the time. Then on the other hand, maybe you were too busy to get it over, as I have been, and it really is a shame that I haven't had more time with my family. If you haven't seen me at home as much as I feel that I ought to be, just bear with me and please understand that you good people elected me to represent you in Washington and there are certain things that go with public life that you must make in the way of sacrifices. My family have borne the brunt of that sacrifice by not being with them as I would like to be. My dear friends, tonight we have this happy senior class here on the stage. They can't run out on us tonight, Mrs. Johnston, they can't go to any dance and they can't get away from us until they hear my plea. We have got them cornered tonight—they can't leave us tonight—so on behalf of your fathers, mothers, and you loved ones and the members of the faculty, I am going to tell them off for you tonight for just a few moments—bless their hearts.

Yes, this is the first appearance that I have made in the way of a commencement address in 12 long years and the reason for that is when there is a rollcall in Washington that means something to our people—to our farmers—and there is a vacant seat there where CHELF sits—I think that that is just about the most inarticulate and just about the worst representation that people can have. That's the reason I have tried as best I could to stay there and be on the job when legislation that you needed most was before the Congress for action. I was trying as best I could to set an example for other youngsters who came along behind me because I shall never forget, Pauline, when I was elected to Congress that a lot of my dear friends voted for me with their tongues in their cheeks. I know they thought this boy is too young, he is a good boy, but he is too young, and they were afraid. I know in their hearts they worried about me, and that was probably the thing that drove me and made me work as hard as I have worked—certainly to my own detriment from the standpoint of my health but, nevertheless, it did drive me on and on to prove that a young man or a young woman could do a job if it was entrusted to them. I had in mind the fine young men and young women who were coming on behind me. I knew that if I didn't make good, then the people might not consider opportunities for those who followed me. Therefore, it was incumbent upon me to make a success and I had to do it.

Tonight I have no prepared speech. I am going to talk from the bottom of my heart, what's in my heart and on my mind. I don't have a prepared speech because I remember the story of Senator Barkley many years ago when he said that he was honored when he was a young county attorney to make the commencement speech to one of the little high schools in McCracken County. He worked so hard, oh, he stayed up several nights preparing his speech and he thought that he had a masterpiece when he had finished and so, on the day in question, he delivered the speech. When it was over, he waited for the congratulations and the applause and none came. He was rather disappointed; he waited a little while longer and no one came to congratulate him and even the superintendent of the schools stood by and said nothing. So finally he couldn't stand it any longer and he said: "Superintendent Jones, how did I do—did you like my speech?" The superintendent said: "Do you want the truth or do you want me to tell you something that you want to hear?" He said: "I want the truth." The superintendent then said: "Well, it was terrible. There were three things wrong with it. You read it, you read it poorly, and it wasn't worth reading to begin with." So, tonight, I am just going to tell you what is on my mind and in my heart.

I was fortunate, I guess, after all was said and done. I don't claim any credit for anything that I may have been able to do because I think that those things are in the cards. Sometimes, I think that what is to be, most generally will be, but certainly we want to try to help things along, as best we can. The point I am making is this—I can remember when I was just a little fellow around about 5 years old, and shortly before Dad died—my dear, sweet old Aunt Lucy took me into the courthouse where my father was circuit judge and I saw him there on the bench (ill though he was) and I made up my mind then and there that I wanted to be a lawyer. From then on, I worked hard because I knew what I wanted to do; I knew where I wanted to go, and I charted my course and I set my sails and I worked hard for it. Well, it is something that helps and I don't think there is any doubt about that. I believe that young

folks sometimes by not having their minds definitely set upon the thing that they want to do, who are willing to let it ride along until after they have graduated from high school before they will even discuss it or talk about it—sometimes these young folks allow the other fellow to get a jump on them. I believe this sincerely—that deciding early in life what one's goal is to be keeps to a minimum, shall I say, at least confusion, indecision, and certainly delays.

I am reminded of a story—speaking of confusion—about when I was a youngster working on a farm, during the summer months, a friend of mine with whom I was staying that summer asked me to go over to the neighbor and borrow a clock. He said that the clock he had there had quit running, his neighbor had three, and they were all running pretty well. So I went over to the adjoining farm, borrowed a clock, and brought it back. Well—the clock didn't seem to do so well. After about a week, everybody in the Woodward household was really in a state of confusion and almost shock over that clock. Finally, Mr. Woodward asked me to take the clock back, thank the man for its use, and tell him that he would take his own clock into town as soon as he could and have it repaired. I took it back and told him what Mr. Woodward had said. He thanked me for bringing it back but he said, "FRANK, I will tell you something, that is a good clock and it runs; it does all right but the trouble with it is, I forgot to tell you about its peculiarities and idiosyncrasies." He added: "You know, that clock runs well but I forgot to tell you that when both hands stick up to high noon and it strikes 3, that means it is 6 o'clock." When you fine young men and women have both hands up at high noon, I don't want you striking 3 and saying it is 6 o'clock. That is most confusing.

There are five things that I would suggest here tonight. Your parents have traveled the road before you. I have no secret formula to offer to you for success, though I wish I could give you one. I know that the teachers do not have a secret formula for you. We can't wave a magic wand. If we could save you one tear or one disappointment, we would be delighted to do it.

While I am talking, I want to congratulate you fathers and you mothers tonight, for raising such fine young men and young women. I know of the heartaches and the sacrifices a lot of you have made. I know of those things and I am sure this fine class does, too. By the same token, I want to congratulate the members of the faculty—each and every one of the teachers—for the wonderful, magnificent contribution, the selfless devotion to duty given throughout all the years that this class has been in school and other classes who have gone before and the ones who are yet to come. I, personally, want to thank them on behalf of you good people assembled here tonight for the love and the devotion given and the sacrifices that they also have made. Young men and young women, you may not realize it now but the time will come when you will appreciate them all the more and with each passing year, they will become more dear to you. I know that maybe you haven't thought about it, but I am sure that you realize that every one of them, with their qualifications, their intelligence, their ability, and their integrity, could go to Louisville and get a job there with almost any organization or company and make twice, three times, maybe four times the salary that we are able to pay them here. This is not because we don't feel that they are not worth it here but because after all is said and done, the tax dollar can go only so far. I want to say this to you—and thank heaven, I am not on the ballot tomorrow and nobody can say it is politics. I do think you are entitled to know that I have always been for some form of Federal aid to education. I am for it now and I shall continue to be, because I think that you good people are the most underpaid and, sometimes, I am afraid the least appreciated folks that we have—and you are the ones who mold the character of our future citizens. I have not forgotten you and I know that these parents here will always remember what you have done for their loved ones.

Yes, I repeat, young men and young women, that I can't give you a magic formula but if I can save you one heartache or one tear—just one—I will be grateful for this opportunity tonight. I know that when Caroline last fall wanted me to take her out to Columbia, Mo., to see Christian College which she hopes to attend this fall, we became lost—hopelessly lost. We got off the main road and we were floundering. I pulled into a filling station and I asked the man if he had ever been to Columbia, Mo., and he said yes, he had traveled the road before. I asked him to get me straightened out and get me on the right road. He did and we went on without losing any more time at all. It was just that simple. As you travel life's highway, if you become doubtful, if you momentarily lose your bearings, if you get a wee bit "off stroke," or if you feel that you need some advice or counsel, don't hesitate to go to your father, to your mother, to your grandmother, or to some member of the faculty, or even write me. I would be delighted and would consider it a real privilege, an honor, and a pleasure to try to advise and counsel you even by mail, to try to help you, to guide you.

As you travel along life's highway—or any highway, for that matter—if you watch your guideposts and signposts, you are not as likely to wreck or to get into trouble or to get hurt, if there is a sign that says "dangerous curve ahead," "slow down," "deadend street," "roadblock," or a "one-way bridge." Those suggestions that I would make would be five—and only five—and the first roadsign that I would suggest is that you take the Lord into your confidence; let Him be a part of your life, let Him be a partner in your business and always remember the golden rule and say a prayer each day. Youngsters of 18, 19, and 20 in World War II prayed and they did it unashamedly, too. No. 2, I would suggest to you that you work hard, work very hard. There is no, absolutely no, substitute for hard work. Speaker RAYBURN of the House of Representatives has often said that he doesn't want the most intelligent man from a given congressional district to come to represent his people in Congress but has said: "Give me the man with average intelligence, just average intelligence, but one who will work hard—real hard and I'll show you one of the most successful Representatives in the United States of America."

As you will remember, I told you good people when you elected me 12 years ago to Congress that there were, probably 350,000 people in Marion County and in the Fourth District who were smarter than I, but that I guaranteed you one thing—if you would send me there, nobody would work any harder or as long as I would to try to give you the representation to which you were entitled and to try to make up the difference in what I may lack in the way of experience, training, brains or talents. No. 3, I would say not to hold grudges, not to hate. That reminds me of a story about the old gentleman who was at a revival meeting, sitting there, 105 years old—Uncle Jim, by name. The minister said: "Is there anybody here in the sound of my voice in the church-house tonight that can truthfully stand up and say to all mankind and everybody here assembled that he loves everybody, that he has no ill-will toward anyone, that he holds no grudge against anybody?" Finally old Uncle Jim stood up, tottered on his cane, and said: "Parson, I love everybody and I don't hate anybody." The minister said: "Tell everybody—we want to know the formula, Uncle Jim, because we all need to know." Uncle Jim said: "I've outlived all of the dang rascals." Now, you don't have to do it that way—you don't have to feel like Uncle Jim. You want to do it honestly from the bottom of your heart.

The fourth road sign is to be honest, be fair, keep your word—let your word be your bond. Then you won't have to explain—you won't get caught in any lies. Elbert Hubbard says: "Never explain, your friends don't need it and your enemies won't believe you anyhow." You know that I have developed a theory over the years, and I would pass it on to you for what it is worth. I have often said—never ask a friend to do something that will hurt him spiritually, morally, mentally, physically, socially, financially, politically, or any other way. A man just doesn't ask his friend to do something he knows in his heart is going to hurt him. If you will remember that, I think it will help a little bit, too.

Last, but not the least, of the five signposts—let us be courteous, kind, and sympathetic—to the blind, to the lame, the halt, the widow, the orphan, the aged, the infirm, the sick, the indigent, and to the downtrodden. You do that, and you just don't know the real deep down satisfaction and joy that you will have. I was in Washington the other day, walking down the street, and a man came up to me. I thought he was a typical panhandler. He tapped me on the arm, and said: "Mister, can I have a little money for some food?" I gave him some money, and then I turned to walk away. He stopped me, and said: "My friend, I appreciate this very much. I am down on my luck now—I haven't got a dime but I am going to remember what you did for me tonight, and when I am back in my luck I am going to pass this on to some other poor unfortunate fellow." That stopped me in my tracks. I turned around and I looked at that man—it really impressed me. That was the first time in all of the years that I have been trying to help folks that I had had that kind of an answer. I guess the reason it startled me was because it was that sort of thing that I wanted to do myself—to try as best I could, with my limitations, to help others. Be kind, be sympathetic, be understanding, say a kind word to people. Courtesy is the least investment that you will ever have to make on anything and it will pay you the greatest dividends. The fact is, courtesy costs you absolutely nothing and the dividends that come back to you are wonderful. It reminds me of the story about the preacher who had been away because of an operation for quite some time. He was gone about 2 months, and when he came back he gave a rousing sermon that morning in church. When it was over everybody was impressed, and one of the members of the congregation came to him and said that it was a wonderful sermon, that it was magnificent, the finest he had ever preached. The preacher said: "Now, listen, save those compliments for the young minister who took care of you while I was away—it will give him some incentive, some inducement, and some encouragement to go ahead and to develop; why, those compliments for us old duffers is just like pouring water on a duck's back." She replied: "Yes, parson, but the ducks, they like it."

The ducks—we all—like a compliment, and it doesn't cost us anything. Let's hand one out occasionally as we go along. I am told by a fine old gentleman, Mr. Ancil Basham, of Louisville, Ky., now in his late eighties, that some 60 years ago my father, Caroline's grandfather, made this statement: "It is never too soon to do a kindness because you never know how soon it will be too late." That is really something to think about. I appreciate very much this grand old gentle-

man's writing me and telling me about that phrase which my father had coined.

Don't ever let anybody tell you that you are living in terrible times in the atomic age. You ought to thank God that you were born when you were because all the world is looking to America today for leadership and for guidance. We are one of the few countries that are left that have freedom, decency, democracy, and Christianity—that haven't been gobbled up behind the Iron Curtain. Those poor people who are behind the Iron Curtain are looking, praying, and hoping that some day, somehow, praise God, America will show the way to those who have no freedom. How can we show the way, Jim? We can't show the way unless you youngsters who are coming on now will take over because the job is going to be yours. You graduates of high schools, and, later on, of college—it will be your job. You stand on the threshold of life—young, eager, able, and sincere, and you want to do a job. You have it within your power this minute to make it a good life, a decent life, and a better life—a Christian life, on the one hand, or you can make it a bad life, a sorry life, a miserable life—a complete failure, on the other hand. It is within your grasp. Your parents and your teachers have done all they can for you. You are just about to be on your own.

Remember one thing more, please. Kentucky is the second State in the Union to grant to you at the age of 18 the right of suffrage. Tomorrow is election day. I am not on the ballot and I thank the Lord that I am not because, as I say, I don't want to be accused in any way, shape, form, or manner of bringing in politics, but I do think that since you are about ready to cast your first vote, no matter whom you vote for, vote for somebody tomorrow. Please do that and always set aside and dedicate an election day as a memorial day to our forebears who at Valley Forge, Yorktown, and New Orleans fought and won for us our liberty—and for those fine young men and women who gave their all in World War I in St. Mihiel and the Argonne Forest—and for those brave young men and women in World War II who gave their lives at Guadalcanal, in Sicily, Italy, and at the Normandy beachhead, so that we could be free and could vote—and later on, in Korea, to the tune of a million casualties in blood and $200 billion in gold and in treasure in order to preserve and protect the integrity and the decency and the Christianity of this freedom that we have. Oh yes, we inherited it but we have to fight this day and age in order to preserve and protect it. Tomorrow, please go vote for somebody and, as I say, every election day, dedicate that day as a memorial to those who willingly gave their lives that we—you and I—may be free.

And now I want to take this opportunity, once again, to recap the five road signs: (1) Take the Lord into your confidence; (2) work hard; (3) don't hate anybody; (4) be honest, be fair—let your word be your bond; (5) be courteous and kind. If you observe these, I will certainly have no worries about your success.

I want you to know that this night has been for me a decided honor, a real privilege. It has been a real thrill to have been able to come here to be with you on this occasion. In conclusion may I say—make friends and keep them always. As a lad, I learned this little poem:

"Making friends is a lot of fun,
Shaking hands with everyone,
Hearing what each has to say
As we meet them—day by day
Swapping smiles and trading cheer
Makes us happy while we're here
'Cause all the joy of life depends
Just on the art of making and keeping our friends."

I want to congratulate you for the splendid job that you have done and I hope and pray that the Master above who holds in the hollow of His hand the destiny of all men, all lodges, and all nations will keep you, that He will cause His face to shine upon you and give you peace, happiness, prosperity, contentment, long life, and success. Good luck. And may the Lord of Hosts bless you always.

The Mounting Pressure of Nationalism and Mr. Khrushchev's Toast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the Congress had the pleasure of listening to the stimulating and sound address of His Excellency President Sukarno, of the Republic of Indonesia. In this address several powerful observations were made on the natural force of nationalism as it has developed into full bloom in much of southeast Asia. As President Sukarno put it:

For us, nationalism means the rebuilding of our nations; it means the effort to provide equal esteem for our peoples; it means the determination to take the future into our own hands. For us, nationalism is the love of country.

No American patriot could disagree with this succinct description of the essence of nationalism. Yet many, for one reason or another, still fall short in appreciating the fact that within the Soviet Union, an empire in itself and the worst in recorded history, this force of nationalism is the most powerful threat to the continuance of Moscow's dictatorial and colonial rule—that is the greatest source of weakness in the Russian Communist preparation for world conquest. This patriotic and nationalist force, as represented by the unyielding struggle of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union to regain their national independence, is undoubtedly our greatest ally at the very base of Moscow's farflung colonial empire.

This vital matter receives expert treatment in the recent publication of The Great Pretense, prepared by our Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee is to be highly commended for its valuable contribution to American public enlightenment on the significance of the 20th congress of the Communist Party in the U. S. S. R. In this work, the significance of that congress from the viewpoint of non-Russian nationalism is skillfully developed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in the essay titled "The Mounting Pressure of Nationalism." Because of the striking importance of this essay and the objective reflection of its contents in the excellent editorial of the New York Times on Mr. Khrushchev's Toast, on Monday, May 21, under leave granted I insert in the RECORD the two writings:

THE MOUNTING PRESSURE OF NATIONALISM
(By Lev Dobriansky)

(Lev E. Dobriansky studied at New York and Fordham Universities. He has taught at New York University and is now professor of Soviet Economics of the Georgetown University Graduate School. He has written extensively on Soviet affairs and was president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in 1949. Dr. Dobriansky has testified extensively before various congressional committees and has written over 200 articles, book reviews, and pamphlets on Soviet politics and economics.)

This analysis of developments in the Soviet Union since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party has been developed primarily on the bases of the Caucasian demonstrations, the colonial captivity of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, and the portent of these phenomena for American policy and operations.

It appears almost in the nature of an empirical law that every Moscow crisis, turning point, or shocking development worthy of world attention is attended by serious reverberations and reciprocal effects in some non-Russian country in the U. S. S. R. This is not difficult to understand once the basic duadic character of the Soviet Union is grasped.

Since the formation of the Soviet Union by force in 1922, practically all critical changes have been accompanied by tensions or political cross-tides in the non-Russian nations. The death of Stalin, for example, encouraged a workers' rebellion in East Germany, disturbances in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Ukraine, and strikes in the slave labor camps of Karaganda, Vorkuta, and Norylsk where, typically the inmates are predominantly non-Russian nationals. It will be recalled further, that the gravest charge lodged against Beria was that he had "activated bourgeois-national elements in union republics." Years of intensive campaign against Trotskyism will remain only episodic and minor in comparison to the permanent Moscow campaign against inextricable non-Russian nationalism.

The recently reported demonstrations in Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijen also support the expansive pattern of persistent non-Russian opposition. They cannot be construed as evidence of pro-Stalin sentiments, any more than the mass Ukrainian welcome given to the invading German armies in World War II was pro-Hitler. Whether under Stalin or the dictatorship of the present collective leadership, the Caucasian environment has always been a smoldering, hostile anti-imperialist and anti-colonial caldron for Moscow. Almost immediately after the 20th Congress—the period in which the third anniversary of Stalin's death occurred—a most opportune occasion offered itself for a further display of non-Russian dissent and resistance to the imperialist Moscow Government. It was only natural that students bred in the antiquities of independent Georgian history and workers, rather than functionaries or bureaucrats, led the demonstrations in Tiflis. Also, it was highly significant that the intense press campaign against bourgeois nationalism was not confined to the Caucasus but was extended also to the Baltic areas and Turkestan which likewise are important strategic parts of the broad non-Russian periphery of the Soviet empire.

It is quite understandable why Georgia was the most eligible center of such anti-Soviet Russian demonstrations; and it was here that swift action was taken by Moscow. For failure to suppress "elements of nationalism" the Tiflis University rector, Viktor D. Kupradze, was immediately placed under severe censure and the party leader at the institution, Sergei M. Dzhorbenadze, was dismissed. About 15,000 trained agitators descended on Georgia to expound not only the sins of the Stalin "personality cult" but even more the sins of "bourgeois nationalism." This conformed completely with the Moscow propaganda line, developed by Stalin and perpetuated by the present

dictatorial oligarchy, which denounces non-Russian nationalism as "another remnant of bourgeois ideology"

At the same time, the controlled Georgian press, led by the party newspaper, Zarya Vostoka (Dawn of the East), counterposed local nationalism with proletarian patriotism and complained vigorously about the lack of party diligence in "vigorously suppressing the slightest manifestation of elements of nationalism." Significant, too, was the overflowing output of published adulation for Georgia's "Russian elder brothers."

In the Moscow lexicon this usage is an oft-used expression of the totalitarian "big brother" myth cultivated by traditional Russian political racism which, in this case, is pointedly betrayed by the historical fact of Georgia's long national preexistence to the late emergence of the Russian nation.

Under Moscow's economic colonialism the relative material condition of the non-Russian nations has been conspicuously low and poor. But this cannot be regarded as a direct cause of the unrest and periodic uprisings in these areas. The real cause is the continuous and unabated struggle for national liberation and independence of these formerly free countries. The House of Representatives may well take pride in having created the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, which, in a monumental way, officially uncovered the basic forces at work in the monolithic structures of the Soviet Union.

The significance of the 20th Congress can be perceived only if the organization of the Soviet Union itself is understood.

Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijen—as, indeed, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Turkestan, ond others—are no more minorities or areas of "local nationalism" than is Poland or Hungary in terms of the entire totalitarian Russian Empire. Each of these constitutes a separate conscious nation with its own distinctive culture, language, history, customs, mores, and religion, all of which are supported by a geographical contiguity. Each has tasted national independence; and each has been fully exposed to most, if not all, of these Moscow-sponsored barbarities contained in the Trojan Horse of international communism: Genocide, manmade famines, purges, Russification, lingual defacement, anti-Semitism, deportations, political racism, and distortion of national histories.

The non-Russian nations constitute a clear majority of the population of the U. S. S. R. It is no wonder, then, that in the living spirit of Noah Jordania, the great president of independent Georgia whom Stalin both hated and feared, every Georgian patriot, at the mere mention of Stalin, is seized with this consuming thought—"Whatever history may say about him, to Georgians and Georgia he will always remain a traitor to his native country and a man who denied and rejected all that Georgia and Georgians have always stood and fought for."

Non-Russian nationalism, considered in terms of population, geography, tradition, and aspiration, is undoubtedly the most powerful single anti-Communist force in the empire, and is unquestionably one of the factors responsible for the supposed anti-Stalinism launched at the 20th congress.

On the surface, the deglorification of Stalin seems aimed at moderation and reasonable treatment in the interest of accelerated socio-economic activity. Another, but less important, reason is the satisfaction delivered to the army for the purges sustained in the 1930's. The role of the military has increased, but it is naive to think that its type of leadership can be converted into a target of governmental cleavage. The third and most pressing immediate factor is the use of desanctification by those engaged in the inner struggle for individual power. As in numerous other actions, this has followed a zigzag course since the death of Stalin, with resanctification utilized as late as last December. If the dynamics of historical leadership in relation to dictatorships are observed, its future long-run course should indicate the level of the indefinite contest before the tactic of desanctification falls into complete obsolescene.

Outside the Soviet Union, the exhibition staged at the 20th congress is intended to gain support for popular-front movements, and serve as an appeal to neutral nations, while further confusing the anti-Communist countries. However, taking into weighted consideration both the internal and external aspects of this apparent change, one cannot help concluding that substantively no real change has occurred; the basic Stalinist matrix remains.

While recognizing the limits to which even the collective leadership can go without seriously imperiling the foundations of its own dictatorship, and that of the empire, the present rulers are in pursuit of the same goals and are employing substantially the same basic means to achieve them. In this process they are resorting to the margin of opportunism that the institutional framework of totalitarian rule affords and which, at different times, even Stalin availed himself of. When it was convenient or necessary, the Stalin regime likewise made recourse to popular front techniques, peaceful coexistence, the temporary placation of non-Russian nationalism, appeasement of the military, and adjustments in doctrinal interpretations. It is this margin that accommodates the zigzag patterns of action which so frequently confuse and disarm various circles in the free world. Current examples of the utility of this margin in Moscow's propaganda efforts are the various types of planned tours, moderately reduced censorship, state visits, economic offers, and the like. This margin evaporates, however, at the thought of abolishing, for example, the Iron Curtain which is an institutional necessity for the type of Russian totalitarian rule which holds the Communist empire together.

The essential Stalinist character of the present oligarchy is seen clearly in relation to the force of non-Russian nationalism. First, it should be noted that A. I. Mikoyan, a Kremlin leader who was born in Armenia, initiated the main critical attack upon Stalin. The propaganda inference that Moscow clearly wished to be drawn is that one non-Russian Kremlin leader commenced the attack upon another, but from the patriotic non-Russian viewpoint, both Stalin and Mikoyan, as lifelong advocates of Russian imperialism stand as traitors to the nations of their birth. Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, and other non-Russians cannot be expected to accept such men as being reasonable and without criminal liability. Khrushchev's reputation in Ukraine is summed up in the title "Hangman of Ukraine." As Moscow's chosen satrap in Ukraine during the thirties and after World War II, Khrushchev built his record which brought him to his present position. That record is dominated by criminal responsibility for mass murders, deportations, induced famine, and bloody purges. Kaganovich's liquidation of millions of peasants resisting collectivization and de-Ukrainianization could scarcely be forgotten. Mikoyan's leading hand in the Caucasian purges of the twenties cannot be erased from the Caucasian mind.

Despite the criticisms of the 20th congress, Stalin is still being praised for his "fight against the hostile grouping of Trotskyists, Bukharinites, and bourgeois nationalists." Whatever subsequent action might be taken on the first two, one can be certain that even the greatest allowable margin of propaganda luxury cannot possibly include dispraise of Stalin on the third count.

The portents of the 20th congress may be summarized as follows:

(1) The oligarchical dictatorship remains substantively Stalinist with little risk assumed in its present desanctification approach. The political maneuvers are being effected within safe margins of totalitarian rule which precludes any genuine liberalization of the basic institutional framework. However, the margins are adequate enough to allow for a variety of flexible tactics, including disarmament concessions. These presently pose an even greater threat to the vigilance, security, and anti-Communist unity of free nations;

(2) In the shortrun, secure in itself, the collective leadership is skillfully playing for time to achieve the consolidation of its vastly expanded empire, a substantial increase in industrial output, marked advancement in military armament, and disunity in and among free nations through deeper infiltration and the exploitation of regional rivalries;

(3) In view of these general conditions, supported by the Communist-induced passivity of the free world, the prospect of any widespread revolt in the Communist empire is exceedingly remote. Manifestations of national patriotism as demonstrated in the non-Russian nations, which Moscow dubs as "bourgeois nationalism" but which we in America respect as the love of God and one's native country, will constantly reappear in diverse forms. Underground activity, which recently received further substantiation by the Red Banner, an organ in Ukraine, calling for the surrender of "armed anti-Soviet bands" in the Rovno region, will continue;

(4) The effect of the desanctification campaign on the Communist Party in the United States will be minimal. The shock produced by the Stalin-Nazi Pact was incomparably greater, but this arm of Moscow remained largely intact for the continuance of its conspiratorial work. With the revival of the popular-front technique and growing public relaxation fomented by the illusory spirit of peaceful coexistence, the danger of its activities may increase; and

(5) In our operational incapacity to meet adequately the challenges and twists of Moscow we are increasingly exposing ourselves in the short run to a peril of psychological isolation based on "too little and too late." The developments following the 20th congress are a case in point, where the maneuvers are unmasked. Moscow floods Asia and Africa with issues of the propaganda magazine Soviet Union, showing pictorially a framed paradise of nations in the U. S. S. R., while we fail to implement the McCormack resolution passed by Congress for the purpose of bringing to full light the colonialism and imperialism of Moscow since 1920. These and numerous other important cases point to the pressing need for moral strength and imagination that would release the energy of our rich traditions and render progressively insecure the hold of Moscow on the captive nations in its vast and aggressive empire.

Mr. Khrushchev's Toast

People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, the ancient proverb tells us. Nikita S. Khrushchev, a proverb quoter himself on occasion, would seem to disagree. Such was the plain import of his toast Saturday night in Moscow to the Arabs and all others who are struggling for national independence.

Mr. Khrushchev undoubtedly meant to affront French Premier Guy Mollet and hint at Soviet support for Algeria's rebels. But perhaps it was the evening's conviviality and the freely flowing supply of liquid refreshments that made him forget that he was throwing a rock at France while living in a most transparent and brittle tenement himself.

If Mr. Khrushchev is so concerned about peoples struggling for national liberation, he

has a great opportunity to show that solicitude right at home. Why should not the Ukraine be independent, or Byelorussia, or Latvia, or Lithuania, or Estonia, or Uzbekistan, or Kazakhstan, or Tadzikistan, or Turkmenistan, or Kirgizia, or Armenia, or Georgia, or Azerbaidzhan? Why should not the Finnish-speaking people of the Karelo-Finnish area be given freedom to unite with Finland? Or even just slightly in a wider area, why does not Mr. Khrushchev liberate from his domination Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, or Bulgaria? If Mr. Khrushchev wishes to be known as a liberator, why does he not give these peoples opportunity to decide freely whether they wish to be governed from Moscow or to govern themselves?

But perhaps Mr. Khrushchev's unconscious self, aided by liquid refreshment, gave us the answer to these questions last Saturday night, too. Mr. Khrushchev told his guests the story of the czar who went in bathing, lost his clothes, and when naked could convince no one he was czar. Mr. Khrushchev concluded the tale by saying, "In the bath you cannot tell the difference between a czar and Khrushchev."

On the contrary, it is often hard to tell the difference between the two anywhere or any day of the year. The czars ruled a prison house of nations for centuries. Every action of Mr. Khrushchev shows that he wishes to continue ruling a similar prison, but one now far exceeding that of the czars. It is only other people's colonies Mr. Khrushchev wishes to see freed for a while until he can take them over. His own colonies, forming one of the largest colonial empires the world has ever seen, he proposes to maintain by every force and wile at his disposal.

My Obligation as an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an essay entitled "My Obligation as an American Citizen," by one of my young constituents, Miss Mary Varney, of Ronceverte, W. Va., which won second place in the West Virginia State contest sponsored by the American Legion in the spring of 1956. I believe that the fine ideals expressed by Miss Varney on the subject of citizenship will be an inspiration to all of us. Her essay follows:

MY OBLIGATION AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

There are those who say the most important part of citizenship is voting; others who say the most important part is paying taxes; still others who say the most important part is going to church, but these are only facets to the great gem of citizenship.

Let me compare citizenship to a diamond ring. Just as the diamond is composed of many facets, so is citizenship composed of numerous obligations that have fashioned it into the great institution it is today.

To name all of the obligations it is composed of would be too great a task, but I would like to list a few that center around my own life as a citizen.

I feel that the first and most important of my obligations is the privilege of worshipping in the church of my choice. My predecessors have established this country for religious reasons and they have embedded these reasons into my life to make it truly dedicated to the church.

Secondly, I feel my obligation to my home. To honor and obey my parents for giving me birth and shelter, for clothing me and for providing for my needs.

And, with this obligation, I can class a third of my obligations—to my school. As my parents prepare me for education, the Government maintains the schools and colleges I choose to attend.

My fourth obligation as a citizen is to love my neighbor. So doing, I must be a good neighbor. I must be a friend in need, I must be patient and kind, I must have respect for my elders, I must be fair and just in my relations with others, and above all, I must set good examples for the youth of tomorrow.

Fifth, I must uphold and support the Government. I must do my part in voting and paying taxes. Just what would our country be like if no one had to pay taxes? There would be no public schools. There would be no food inspectors to guard health. There would be no protection of property. Travel would not be safe. There would be no Armed Forces to defend our country.

I can only hope I will never be a part of a move like that to do away with taxes for I live off taxes just like every one else and I feel very much obligated to pay my taxes.

My sixth obligation is to accept responsibility, be it great or small. From closing an important business transaction to making a bed, I must be depended upon to accept responsibility. To illustrate this fact: Irénée du Pont, a struggling worker, founded the powder works factory around 1800. An explosion caused the complete devastation of the factory. His life's work was ruined in 1 second. Not being discouraged, he sought money from the bank with no collateral whatsoever. The bank loaned him a tremendous sum of money because of his honesty and integrity. He went on to found the billion dollar industry known today as the E. I du Pont de Nemours.

His courage and dependability in the face of disaster gave him a new start in life. There is nothing more satisfying in this world than to have an honest and upright character. I can feel proud to try to achieve this goal, but to do so I must bring in a seventh obligation.

I must have a cooperative spirit. I must be willing to work with other people and accept their ideas as well as express a few of my own.

As an eighth obligation, I must supply what material expense I can. I feel obligated to donate to the Cancer Fund, the Heart Fund, and the March of Dimes, for I never know when one of these diseases will hit me and I will need help from other contributions. I must do my part to keep the highways safe, have acceptable working conditions, and keep up the recreational facilities.

Ninth, I must have confidence in myself. A long time ago the American poet, Walt Whitman, said:

"There is no week, nor day, nor hour when tyranny may not enter upon this country if the people lose their supreme confidence in themselves."

I have confidence in my country. I have faith in the power to improve it, to make it grow, to forge ahead, and I have faith that someday I can be a part of bringing the fruits of our science within reach of all Americans.

My 10th obligation is to have ambition. If I fail to be ambitious, then I let all the opportunities of life pass me by.

To have ambition reaps great rewards.

There is a story of three boys who agreed one day to see who could make the straightest path with his footprints in the snow across a field. After each boy had done his best, it was found that the line of one boy's footprints was almost straight, while the footprints of the other two boys were very crooked.

When asked how he managed to walk in so straight a line, the winning boy said:

"When I started out, I fixed my eyes upon the big tree which was at the end of our stunt. I kept looking at the tree every second and paid no attention to my feet."

The other boys had been watching their feet.

So, in order for me to succeed, I must fix my eyes on my goal and not look at my feet as I walk toward it.

In abiding by these 10 obligations I can make America strong, beautiful, and proud.

To quote Herbert Hoover:

"My whole life taught me what America means. I am indebted to my country beyond any human power to repay."

Piatt County Journal, Monticello, Ill., Celebrates a Century of Service and Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of the House from a rural area who does not realize the importance of the weekly newspaper in the creation of public opinion.

These newspapers come out each week in the towns not served by daily newspapers. The people in the community look to its columns each week in order to know the happenings of yesterday and to anticipate the things that are going to occur tomorrow.

Such a community is Monticello, Piatt County, Ill., a town of approximately 3,000 people.

In November 1856, at about the time Lincoln and Douglas were having their famous debate, Monticello was a town of 250 people. In that month was born the Monticello Times, the first newspaper in the town, as well as the county.

Later, the Monticello Times became the Sucker State and later on the Piatt Democrat.

In 1861, the newspaper was renamed the Conservative. Later the newspaper became the Independent and then, as the community became Republican, so its name changed to Republican, and in 1876 it became the Piatt County Journal. This newspaper passed through many hands and finally, in 1936, it was sold to George H. Chitwood, who is still the editor.

Mr. Chitwood is the typical weekly newspaper editor and publisher that you would find in most any community in the United States. This is an editor who realizes his responsibility to the community and accepts it willingly.

George Chitwood, as editor and publisher, sums up his philosophy of service to his community and his fellow man in this editorial of his anniversary issue of May 17, 1956.

I am sure the best wishes, not only of myself, but of all of this House, go out to George Chitwood and the Piatt County

Journal on the completion of 100 years of service which has indeed made history.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial of May 17 is herewith appended:

A century of service in Piatt County is a thrilling accomplishment. The past has brought many rewards and satisfactions.

We are proud of our heritage—of those far-sighted, pioneering, hard-working editors and publishers, many times working under adverse conditions. They were men of vision, hope and courage.

Their century of service challenges us to new achievements and commands greater toil and intelligence in leading Piatt County forward.

Today the Piatt County Journal and its corps of workers is ready to plunge into the tasks and problems of a second 100 years. We pledge you that we will strive henceforth as in the past to bring you a live, well-edited, pictorially alert and complete weekly newspaper, one supported by and interested in the development and prosperity of Piatt County.

We promise you a newspaper ever striving for accuracy and fair play, anxious to praise where praise is earned but willing to criticise or condemn when either is believed justified for the common good.

We trust that these will be the principles you would have us follow in the years ahead.

For the past we say "Thank you" on this anniversary to our loyal friends, readers, and subscribers, to our advertisers, and to our growing wealth of new friends.

For the future, our prime hope is that we shall continue to merit your interest and readership.

Only with this can we strive for another century of progress.

The Offer of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. NELSON

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a speech delivered by former Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine, at Colby College on May 3, 1956. This speech was delivered as one of a series of Gabrielson lectures on the general subject Issues Confronting the American Voter in 1956:

THE OFFER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

I am happy to join in the tribute Maine may well pay to the Honorable Guy G. Gabrielson for instituting this series of lectures here at Colby College to refresh Maine citizens each year with a balanced presentation of the problems of the present.

In view of the all too frequent references to our democratic institutions I may be pardoned at the outset for pointing out that our Constitution in Article 4, section 4, provides that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

I am not suggesting that our opposition should be pronounced unconstitutional, but only that we should remind ourselves that our founding fathers had very much in mind a distinction between a republic and a democracy. This accounted for the phraseology of the Constitution and the fact that Jefferson called himself and his party Republican. It should, however, in justice to academic neutrality, be pointed out that Jefferson then believed and feared that his opposition were really planning a monarchy with Washington as king.

Jefferson demonstrated his political acumen by adopting the role of a moderate or "middle of the roader" in those days between the exponents of a highly centralized and, as he believed, an autocratic central government (led by Alexander Hamilton) and the advocates of a pure democracy.

Jefferson thus became a champion of local self-government and eventually of State's rights. "The less government the better"—so far as the National Government was concerned.

Later, in Jackson's time, the party of Jefferson became known as the Democratic-Republican Party and eventually as the Democratic Party.

Let us all as Americans recognize and do our part to preserve the system of two-party government.

The stability of Anglo-Saxon governments all over the world under a two-party system is in glittering contrast to the paralysis of responsible government that brings complete frustration to all too many of the peoples of Europe under the bloc system.

Groups, in their parliaments, form and reform from day to day under the leadership of one or another popular leader. Deals are the order of the day—like a glorified poker game, and frustration is the inevitable result.

We have a right to expect of political leaders in office and in the party organization some sense of loyalty to the principles of their party—not necessarily to the interpretation of those principles by someone else.

That is the minimum requirement for responsible party government.

The rank and file are in a different situation and enjoy a much greater freedom to choose their candidates and their party—subject only to what we may hope will be their recognition of the grave importance of maintaining, so far as practicable, a two-party system.

With an electorate of one hundred million voters it is only through the medium of some sort of responsible party government that the individual American can give effective expression to his views.

Conceive of America without a two party system or with the multi-party bloc system of France which must ultimate as have all pure democracies in a dictatorship—and already this is being talked of in France.

But you may properly ask, What does the Republican Party stand for? Perhaps one of the best statements is found in the answer of President Eisenhower on April 17, 1956, to the question: "Why did I enter political life as a Republican?" Here is his answer from the New York Times of April 18, 1956:

"No party has a monopoly on brains or idealism or statesmanship. We—Republicans and Democrats alike—are motivated by the same loyalty to the flag; by the same devotion to freedom and human dignity; by the same high purposes for the Nation's security and its people's welfare. Within our hearts and minds in all things that are vital to the Republic, we cannot be partisans. We are all Americans. But in the practical pursuit of national objectives, we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of government's responsibilities.

"As a Republican, I share my party's deeply trust in what free men can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

"I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy;

"Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans;

"Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom;

"Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared;

"Best keeps economic decision-making in the hands of the people and out of the hands of Government;

"Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs;

"Best assures our children, and their children's children the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

"I so believe because the Republican Party remains true to its heritage.

"Our party was born to vindicate the equal dignity of all men, their equal right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The dedication of its earliest days still animates our party in this age when world-wide corrosion eats away at freedom, and justice, and opportunity for men.

"The Republican Party has fostered the development of an economy, dynamic in its challenge to release men's energies. Vast, unfettered production for vast, unfettered consumption is the economic expression of our political belief: All who work to produce should share equitably in the fruits of their labor.

"Today, under the policies of the Republican Party, our economy is more immense than ever before its productivity, more bountiful in its widespread benefits, more dependable and more creative.

"The Republican Party, by all its traditions, is committed to support men's aspirations and convictions as individual citizens. We reject any attempt to treat them merely as members of pressure groups or as serial numbers in the files of a Government office. The individual—in his God-given talents, in his limitless potential—is the source of every advance in the material and intellectual good of humanity.

"That fundamental principle in the Republican credo has a corollary—every American is equal before the law and the conscience of Government."

EIGHT REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES

President Eisenhower then goes on to develop eight principles to implement what he calls his "Personal testament" as to why he is a Republican.

These eight principles of Republicanism are as follows:

1. The individual is of supreme importance.
2. The spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation.
3. America does not prosper unless all Americans prosper.
4. Government must have a heart as well as a head.
5. Courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom.
6. Their purpose of Government is to serve, never to dominate.
7. To stay free we must stay strong.

THE OPPOSITION

The opposition cry that this is now a government of the rich, by the rich and for the rich and that the ordinary person is the forgotten man.

The only difficulty with this argument is that it collides with the facts.

To be sure we have a greater prosperity in this country than we have ever known in peace or war. We have a greater national income. Is it not fair and important to ask who is benefiting by this larger national income? Today, labor is receiving a larger share of that income than it ever received under any Democratic administration.

In 7 years under Truman labor received 65 percent of the national income.

Under a Republican administration in 3 years labor's share of the national income has risen to 69 percent.

On the other hand, the corporations whom the opposition love to attack have seen their share of the national income (after taxes) decline from nearly 8 percent to 6 percent—a shrinkage of 25 percent.

Labor income has averaged about 75 percent of "personal income" under Eisenhower, while it averaged about 71 percent under Truman.

In 1952 the income of individuals less taxes averaged $1,508. Under Eisenhower this average has risen to $1,630.

THE RECORD

The Bible tells us that we shall be known by our fruits. Let us then look at the record. What has happened to America in 3 years under a Republican President?

More Americans are at work today, producing more, earning more, spending more, investing more and building more than ever before in our history.

Under a Republican President working men and women are enjoying the unprecedented combination of higher wages, lower taxes, and a stable cost of living, all at the same time.

Under a Republican President the millions upon millions of Americans who have savings-bank accounts, savings bonds, building and loan shares, life-insurance policies, and pension rights are no longer seeing the value of their savings shriveled by inflation.

Under the Eisenhower administration the largest tax reduction in our history was enacted, and of its $7.4 billion in benefits nearly $2 out of every $3 went directly to individuals.

Under a Republican President the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established to give these vital concerns of our people permanent representation in the President's Cabinet.

Under a Republican President 10 million additional Americans, including farmers and farm workers, have been brought into the social-security program, and retirement benefits for all have been increased.

Under a Republican President unemployment-insurance coverage has been extended to 4 million additional workers and, as a result of the President's initiative, 34 States have already increased maximum weekly benefits.

Under a Republican President the minimum wage was increased from 75 cents to $1, a move of great advantage to New England in its competition with the South, and a move long stymied under a Democratic administration dominated by the South.

Under a Republican President a board program is for the first time being formulated to help any American community blighted by chronic unemployment to help itself attain a better share of the Nation's good times.

Under a Republican President forward-looking programs have been presented to Congress, and will be presented again to help meet such pressing problems as the shortage of classrooms and the high cost of medical care.

Under a Republican President the inherited farm program, on the verge of total collapse from the weight of over $7 million of unmarketable surpluses which it helped generate, is being vigorously and conscientiously rebuilt.

Under a Republican President a 15-point rural-development program has been launched to attack on an organized basis for the first time the problem of helping our 1½ million farm families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year to better their position.

Under a Republican President a plan has been advanced to equip this Nation for the first time with a first rate Interstate Highway System adequate to meet the needs of our millions of car owners as well as the pressing requirements of defense and economic development.

Under a Republican President local groups, public and private, have been encouraged to help supply the Nation's electric power needs which will at least double in the next decade.

Under a Republican President enforcement of the antitrust law is today both vigorous and fair-minded. In the year ended September 30 last, the Justice Department brought 52 antitrust actions, nearly half again as many as were started in the last comparable period before the President took office.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGES AND PERFORMANCE

Let us look at the record of a Republican administration in implementing its campaign pledges. Surely this is the best way of determining whether the Republican Party is worthy of your confidence.

In 1932 the opposition was elected on a platform pledging the cure of the depression by reducing taxes 25 percent and by cutting the cost of our national defense "Now reaching the enormous total of $1 billion a year."

Eight years and $40 billion later the depression—with 8 million still unemployed—was ended (if that is the proper word) by our involvement in the Second World War.

PLEDGES

The present Republican administration has had the challenging opportunity to show whether a high level of national income and productivity could be maintained without war.

How well this Republican administration has succeeded is written in records that all may read. They have succeeded because they have taken seriously their contract with the American people expressed in their party platform of 1952.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REPUBLICAN RECORD IN FULFILLING THE PLEDGES OF 1952 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Peace

Promise: "We dedicate ourselves to wage peace and to win it."

Performance: "The 3-year-long Korean war was ended in July 1953. We kept out of the fighting in Indochina. Settlement of the Iranian oil dispute, Trieste problem, and Suez question and the ousting of the Communist regime in Guatemala have strengthened the cause of peace. The raging waters seem to be calming in the troubled Middle East."

Inflation

Promise: "The best assurance of preserving the benefits for which the worker has paid is to stop inflation which causes the tragic loss in purchasing power, and that we propose to do."

Performance: "Inflation has been stopped and the cost of living stabilized with an increase of only one-third of 1 cent on the dollar in nearly 2½ years."

Spending and taxes

Promise: "We advocate * * * * reduction of expenditures by the elimination of waste and extravagance so that the budget will be balanced and a general tax reduction can be made."

Performance: "Federal Government spending has been reduced $11 billion in the first 2 years. Progress toward a balanced budget was made by cutting the deficit two-thirds in the first year, from 9 to 3 billion dollars. Taxes were reduced $7½ billion in 1954, the largest cut in history.

"In this current fiscal year—ending on June 30, 1956—the budget seems certain to be balanced with a surplus in immediate prospect of between 2 and 4 billion dollars. This means a long step toward an honest dollar."

Tax revision

Promise: "We advocate * * * a thorough revision and codification of the present hodgepodge of internal revenue laws."

Performance: "The Tax Revision Act of 1954 completely revised and made some 3,000 changes in the tax laws, including benefits for working mothers, parents with working children, retired people over 65, families with high medical expenses, and persons receiving stock dividends."

Social security

Promise: "We favor amendment of the old-age and survivors insuranace system to provide coverage for those justly entitled to it but who are not now receiving it."

Performance: "The 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act extended protection of old-age and survisors insurance to 10 million more persons and increased benefits to all covered."

Labor

Promise: "We favor retention of the Taft-Hartley Act * * * We urge the adoption of such amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act as time and experience show to be desirable, and which further protect the rights of labor, management and the public."

Performance: "The Taft-Hartley Act remains in full force. President Eisenhower proposed 14 amendments to the act in 1954, many of which were favored by labor, but his program was killed by the solid vote of 48 Democrat Senators to recommit the bill."

Agriculture

Promise: "We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market places. * * * Our program should include commodity loans on all nonperishable products supported at the level necessary to maintain a balanced production."

Performance: "During 1953 and 1954, the 90 percent of parity price support program for basic crops was continued as provided by law. The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for 1955 price supports for basics between 82 percent and 90 percent of parity and variable supports for other commodities through loans, purchases, and other operations. Support levels are being geared to supply conditions with the purpose of adjusting production to the Nation's needs, alleviating the problem of high surpluses which have depressed prices, and enabling farmers to achieve parity of income without severe restrictions on operations which are inevitable with a rigid system of price supports."

The President's veto of the farm bill has saved Maine farmers $5 million in their feed bill this year.

Collective security

Promise: "We shall support the United Nations. * * * We shall encourage and aid the development of collective security forces in Europe, as elsewhere."

Performance: "The administration has worked through the United Nations in ending the Korean war, in opposing Communist aggression moves, and in proposing an international agency to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"We have contributed to the steady buildup of NATO forces in Europe—protecting Western Europe through the last 10 critical years—and approved the end of the occupation of West Germany and its admission to NATO with limited power of rearmament. Collective security in Southeast Asia was established by the Manila Pact setting up SEATO. Mutual security pacts have been concluded with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea, and Japan and also with the Republic of China for the defense of Formosa.

"We are seeing a complete change of tactics by the Communists as a result of their former policies and our program is now in process of reorientation to meet this changed approach.

"The suggestion from certain partisan sources that our military posture is deteriorating under the leadership of one of the greatest military leaders of our generation is not likely to impress the American people."

Communism and internal security

Promise: "We will overhaul loyalty and security programs. We pledge fair but vig-

orous enforcement of laws to safeguard our country from subversion and disloyalty."

Performance: "A new loyalty-security program for governmental employees authorizing the dismissal of persons found to be "security risks" was put into force in May 1953 and about 7,000 'security risks' have been weeded out. Twice as many Communists have been convicted under the Smith Act and three times as many alien subversives deported under Republicans as in a comparable period under the Democrats. Thirteen new legislative aids to Communist prosecution were enacted by the Republican 83d Congress."

Civil rights

Promise: "We believe * * * the Federal Government should take supplemental action within its constitutional jurisdiction to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin."

Performance: "Through executive action, racial discrimination has been abolished or reduced in every area possible, such as the District of Columbia, schools on military reservations, in V. A. hospitals, at naval installations, and the armed services generally. A Committee on Government Contracts is headed by Vice President NIXON himself, to prevent discrimination in Government contract work. The Justice Department appeared before the Supreme Court to argue that the Court had power to outlaw segregation in public schools, which it did in a unanimous decision on May 17, 1954."

I shall not apologize for accepting, with due humility, your complimentary invitation to discuss the offer of the Republican Party in 1956.

After 12 years as a legislator and Governor of Maine, and 18 years representing Maine in Washington as a Republican, I feel some confidence in my understanding of Republican principles.

In 1946 and 1950, I served as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee in those 2 off-year elections.

In 1946, to the surprise of everyone, we won control of the Senate for the first time in 14 years only to lose the 1948 election when Truman defeated Dewey.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that Guy G. Gabrielson, the generous benefactor of these lectures, was chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1946 and cooperated wholeheartedly with the leaders in the Senate and House in the so-called off-year campaign.

In 1950, it was facetiously suggested that it would be better to fall just short of control. That is exactly what we did. I should certainly claim no credit for so happy an outcome. As my grandson says: "That is the way the ball bounced." However, this was followed by a resounding sweep for the Presidency in 1952.

My credentials to speak as a Republican may claim, however, a rather august approval and thereby hangs a tale.

After the debacle of 1948, Republican hopes were at an all-time low. The exuberance engendered by the election of a Republican Congress in 1946 had descended to the depths of despair in the utterly unexpected defeat of Dewey by Truman 1948.

A statement of Republican principles to take the place of the evidently unappealing Republican platform of 1948, was an imperative necessity as we went into the off-year election of 1950.

Senator Taft as Republican leader of the Senate and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate asked me to act as chairman of a subcommittee to draft a Republican statement of principles and designated as my associates the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, representing the more conservative Midwest wing of the party, and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, representing the more liberal eastern wing.

Senator Taft outlined my duties as developing a statement acceptable to these two Senators representing the extremes, commenting that if that could be achieved our troubles might be over.

House Members and national committee members were called in to assist in the preparation of the Republican statement of principles issued under date of February 6, 1950.

Two years later when Dwight D. Eisenhower retired from the Army in June 1952 and announced his entry into the political arena, he declared that the best statement he had seen of Republican principles was this statement of February 6, 1950, drafted by a committee of which I was chairman. I shall not submit this here because of its length. It contained something over 2,000 words and was criticized on this score by the only lady Member of the Senate, my colleague, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Senator SMITH said the statement should make its 10 points in under 100 words. I suggested she try her hand.

The result was, undoubtedly, the most succinct, and yet comprehensive, political program ever proposed in this country.

Furthermore, in the language of Senator SMITH, this document in 89 words not only stated the Republican position, "but also constituted an indictment of the Democratic Party on 10 counts for the Democratic Party has not only failed miserably on each of these points, but also has made it clear that it opposes each of these points."

I do not conceive I can do better for a Maine audience than to give the concept of Senator SMITH as to "what the Republican Party stands for and what the Democratic Party is against":

1. Reducing taxes.
2. Balancing the budget.
3. Fighting deficit spending and Government waste.
4. Fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it.
5. Making foreign policy truly bipartisan, instead of merely rubber-stamped.
6. Fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be so-called socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes.
7. Preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public.
8. Maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity, nor discourage initiative and saving.
9. Opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits.
10. Smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

And Senator SMITH adds: "No other political party can make that statement—much less the Democratic Party. Only 89 simple words to show the basic issues between the Republican and the Democratic Parties—to tell the difference between the parties."

Water Can Top Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the World-Telegram of May 25, 1956:

WATER CAN TOP OIL

Oil is so intimately associated with the Middle East in western eyes it often is forgotten that for the people who live there water is far more valuable and important. They could live and prosper without oil—but not without water.

A dispatch by Scripps-Howard writer R. H. Shackford discusses the Jordan River development project which not only would create more than a quarter million acres of new arable land for both Arabs and Jews, but also would offer resettlement opportunities for about one-third of the 900,000 Palestinian Arab refugees.

The Arab nations and Israel could contribute greatly to stabilization of the area if they would forget their feud long enough to give a final go-ahead.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate cleared Interior appropriations bill for President and passed Labor-HEW appropriations and D. C. appropriations bills.

House sent highway bill to conference and passed sundry bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8519–8567

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3994–S. 4001; and S. J. Res. 178.

Page 8524

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2827, 2864, 2959, 3000, 3009, 3100, 3208, 3402, 3579, private bills (S. Repts. 2103–2111, respectively);

S. 374, to provide for extension and suspension in cases of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections, with amendment (S. Rept. 2112);

S. 2069, 2793, 2805, 2943, private bills (S. Repts. 2113–2116, respectively);

S. 3617, to amend the U. S. Code to authorize enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, with amendment (S. Rept. 2117);

S. 782, to prevent citizens of U. S. of questionable loyalty to U. S. from accepting any office or employment in U. N., with amendments (S. Rept. 2118);

S. 2294, 2954, 3212, 3235, H. J. Res. 565, 581, 590, 535, 555, 566, 580, 472, 533, private bills (S. Repts. 2119–2131, respectively);

H. R. 7763, to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, to expedite the final determination of the claims, with amendments (S. Rept. 2132);

H. R. 7225, social security amendments, with amendments (S. Rept. 2133);

S. Res. 263, extending greetings to the German Bundestag, with amendment (S. Rept. 2134);

H. J. Res. 607, to authorize the disposal of Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. (S. Rept. 2135);

S. 3778, to amend the act for the protection of walruses (S. Rept. 2136);

S. 3698, to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, with amendments (S. Rept. 2137);

S. J. Res. 178, authorizing an appropriation to provide certain costs for participation by the U. S. in the International Bureau for Publication of Customs Tariffs (S. Rept. 2138);

H. Con. Res. 232, extending congressional felicitations to the American Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary (S. Rept. 2139);

H. J. Res. 501, to authorize participation by the U. S. in parliamentary conferences of NATO (S. Rept. 2140);

S. 3527, authorizing State Highway Commission of Maine to construct and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (S. Rept. 2141); and

S. 3581, to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service, with amendments (S. Rept. 2142).

Pages 8520–8521

Information and Educational Exchange: Senator Eastland withdrew motion entered on May 14 for reconsideration of vote by which Senate passed S. 3638, to promote the foreign policy of the U. S. by amending U. S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

Pages 8527–8528

Interior Appropriations: Senate adopted conference report on H. R. 9390, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Interior Department and related agencies, clearing bill for White House. In connection with this action, Senate agreed to House amendment to Senate amendment No. 18 respecting receipts for fiscal year 1957 from operation of McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska.

Pages 8568–8571

D. C. Appropriations: Senate passed with amendments H. R. 10003, fiscal 1957 appropriations for the District of Columbia, after adopting all committee amendments en bloc, and Dirksen amendment to increase by $5,440 funds for D. C. regulatory agencies.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Stennis, McClellan, Johnson of Texas, Bible, Frear, Dirksen, Young, and Beall.

Pages 8571–8575

Patent Rights: Conference report on H. R. 6143, to amend the Internal Revenue Code with regard to income-tax treatment of transfer of patent rights, was adopted.

Pages 8590–8591

Labor-HEW Appropriations: Senate passed with amendments H. R. 9720, fiscal 1957 appropriations for

Appendix

The Bricker Amendment and the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the James Monroe Memorial Foundation is rendering a patriotic public service in maintaining the James Monroe Law Office in Fredericksburg, Va., and in collecting and preserving other property of the sixth President of the United States. The foundation is also engaged in educating the American people with regard to the ideals which prompted the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. Perhaps the most important objective of the foundation is the promotion of friendship and understanding among the American Republics.

On April 24, 1956, my legislative assistant, Mr. Charles A. Webb, addressed the board of trustees and the board of regents of the James Monroe Memorial Foundation at their annual meeting in Fredericksburg. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Webb's address, entitled "The Bricker Amendment and the Monroe Doctrine," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

It is a great honor and a real pleasure to address the board of trustees and the board of regents of the James Monroe Memorial Foundation. In his first inaugural address, in 1817, President Monroe said:

"We must support our rights or lose our character and with it perhaps our liberties. A people who fail to do it can scarcely be said to hold a place among independent nations. National honor is national property of the highest value."

This foundation is dedicated to giving James Monroe's words a real and lasting application. Your job is not easy. We live in an age of excessive industrialization, extreme urbanization, and practically instantaneous communication. We travel so fast in this jet age that many of our sacred traditions are left behind, in a cloud of dust. The bulldozer is no respecter of ancient landmarks.

We live in an age of superficiality, some say decadence, marked by frivolous neglect of the deep and vital wellsprings of our freedom. James Monroe has not escaped the debunking of arrogant historians—historians who paint the past as bad, the present as good, and the future as inevitably better, with paradise on earth just around the corner. These historians speak of Monroeism as the reflection of a narrow patriotic and nationalistic spirit which is virtually outmoded.

Ideals should not be ridiculed merely because they are old. Wisdom did not spring full blown in the world with the signing of the United Nations Charter or at the first inaugural of the second Roosevelt. The Nation that does not cherish its history must fear its future. Or, as Edmund Burke, the great British statesman, so well said:

"People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors."

That is why James Monroe said we must recur frequently to fundamental principles; why we must go back often to our own beginnings.

My assignment today is to relate the philosophy underlying the Monroe Doctrine with that underlying the Bricker amendment. The philosophy underlying each is the same, although essential differences exist. The Bricker amendment deals with treaties and with other international agreements. The Monroe Doctrine, on the other hand, was not promulgated in the form of an international agreement but as a unilateral declaration of United States foreign policy.

In some quarters today the word "unilateral" has become a term of opprobrium. At least, in foreign affairs, many people subscribe to the theory that on all important issues we must act in concert with scores of foreign powers, never unilaterally. In his famous message of December 2, 1823, President Monroe said, in effect, that the independence of our good neighbors to the south is essential to the peace and security of the United States, and that their independence is not an appropriate subject for negotiation with countries outside of the Western Hemisphere. These words appear in the message:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Despite the debunking of internationalist historians, the Monroe Doctrine, except for the Constitution itself, is still the most vital state paper of this country.

In a full-page advertisement in the New York Times on December 2, 1923, the 100th anniversary of Monroe's message, Mary Baker Eddy said:

"I believe strictly in the Monroe Doctrine, in our Constitution, and in the laws of God."

Even today, there are few more unqualified faiths than the faith of the American people in the Monroe Doctrine.

Adoption of the Bricker amendment would be in the nature of a unilateral declaration by the people of the United States that their constitutional freedoms are not to be made the subject of haggling at international conference tables. The key section of the Bricker amendment merely provides:

"A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."

At this point, we might consider the difference between a treaty and an executive agreement. Former Senator Gillette, during the debate on the Bricker amendment in the 83d Congress, explained the difference. He had been informed by the Department of State that an international agreement which the President submits to the Senate is a treaty, while an international agreement which the President decides not to submit to the Senate is an executive agreement. This unsatisfactory distinction between the two types of international agreements was illustrated by Senator Gillette by this story:

"At that time I stated to the Senate that the reply of the State Department reminded me of the time when I was a boy on the farm, and asked the hired man how to tell the difference between a male and a female pigeon. He said, 'You put corn in front of the pigeon. If he picks it up, it is a he; if she picks it up, it is a she.' "

A dangerous loophole in our Constitution has developed from the construction placed on article VI, paragraph 2, in recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Article VI, paragraph 2, reads as follows:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

With your intimate knowledge of American history, I am sure you understand why the Founding Fathers could not say that treaties, like laws, must be made "in pursuance" of the Constitution in order to become the supreme law of the land. At the time of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 several treaties were already in force, having been concluded under the Articles of Confederation. These treaties were obviously not made "in pursuance" of the Constitution.

Nevertheless, for almost 130 years American judges, lawyers and the general public assumed a treaty in conflict with the Constitution would be null and void. It was not until 1920 that the loophole in our Constitution became apparent.

In 1920, the Supreme Court decided the famous case of *Missouri* v. *Holland*. In that case, the Court assumed, erroneously in my judgment, that an act of Congress was unconstitutional except by reason of the fact that it was enacted to carry out the terms of a treaty. The Supreme Court upheld the statute, and in the course of the opinion Mr. Justice Holmes noted that whereas laws to be valid must be made in pursuance of the Constitution, it was "open to question" whether the phrase "under the authority of the United States" means more than simple compliance with the formal requirements to make a treaty.

In 1942, the Supreme Court extended the doctrine of the Holland case in *United States* v. *Pink*. In the Pink case, the Supreme Court held that an executive agreement, not ratified by either House of Congress, became, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land. The effect of the executive agreement involved in the Pink case was to override the law of the State of New York and to deprive a group of creditors of property contrary to the command of the fifth amendment. Because of the holdings in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, *United States* v. *Pink*, and other recent cases, Mr. John Foster Dulles, in an address before a regional meeting of the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., on April 11, 1952, issued this classic warning on the danger of treaty law:

"Treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away

from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights."

Beginning in 1946, the United Nations and its specialized agencies have attempted to exploit the loophole in our Constitution. Consider, for example, the following statement made by a former director of the U. N.'s Division of Human Rights:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and, therefore, a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."

The Bricker amendment merely provides that a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. The issue raised by the Bricker amendment can be stated in this way:

"What provision of the Constitution do opponents of the Bricker amendment want to violate by treaty or by Executive agreement?"

We know that some opponents of the Bricker amendment want to use treaties and other international agreements to abridge the constitutional rights of the American people or to surrender to some form of world government essential attributes of American sovereignty. For example, Prof. Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago urges ratification of the U. N. draft statute for an international criminal court. This proposed treaty would make Americans subject to trial before an international criminal court sitting outside the United States, and not recognizing the right to trial by jury. That treaty is clearly in conflict with provisions of the sixth amendment. Nevertheless, Professor Wright has observed:

"Recently the Supreme Court has refused to review convictions by the Tokyo and Nuremberg tribunals on the ground that international tribunals established by treaties do not exercise the judicial power of the United States. Consequently, if an international criminal court should be established by treaty, its procedure would not be limited by provisions of the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Mr. Clark Eichelberger, executive director of the American Association for the United Nations, has urged that the United Nations be converted into a world government either by a series of treaties or by a "liberal interpretation of the charter." The Bricker amendment would make null and void any treaty or executive agreement authorizing United States participation in world government or any treaty or executive agreement which cut across the constitutional rights of the American people.

If James Monroe were with us today, I am certain that the debate on the Bricker amendment would remind him of the debate on the Constitution and Bill of Rights. At the Virginia Convention called to ratify the Constitution, James Monroe was a delegate from Spottsylvania County. He voted against ratification of the Constitution along with George Mason and Patrick Henry. Monroe was concerned because the Constitution did not then have the first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights. In the absence of a Bill of Rights, Monroe sided with George Mason who said:

"Treaties can be used to dismember the American empire."

He also appears to have been disturbed by the following statement of Patrick Henry:

"Sure I am if treaties are made infringing our liberties, it will be too late to say that our constitutional rights are violated. Suppose you be arraigned as offenders of a treaty? Will you plead a right to trial by jury?"

I doubt if James Monroe would be persuaded by arguments to the effect that "we must not tie the President's hands." Every action in the splendid career of the sixth President tends to prove that he agreed with the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson expressed in the following statement:

"In questions of power let no more be said of confidence in man but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

James Monroe, if he were with us today, would also be concerned about the vitality of his famous doctrine. One of the main reasons why the Senate rejected the Covenant of the League of Nations was because of the fear that the covenant would undermine the doctrine. In the debate on the League of Nations, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge pointed out that if we try to have a Monroe Doctrine everywhere we may be quite sure that it will not exist anywhere.

It is still uncertain to what extent, if any, the United Nations Charter has made the Monroe Doctrine a dead letter. The possible conflict between charter and doctrine was disclosed by the Guatemalan revolution in 1954 which was considered by the U. N. Security Council. Secretary Dulles had described Communist infiltration in Guatemala as "a direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine." Our U. N. ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., was unsuccessful in preventing a Security Council meeting on the ground that the dispute in Guatemala was the responsibility of the Organization of American States. At the meeting of the U. N. Security Council, Russia vetoed a resolution referring the Guatemalan question to OAS.

The Security Council passed a resolution calling for "the immediate termination of any action [in Guatemala] likely to cause bloodshed," and requesting "all members of the United Nations to abstain * * * from rendering assistance to such action." Fortunately for the United States, Colonel Armas, leader of the Guatemalan patriots, ignored the U. N. resolution and drove the Communist regime from office with machine-gun bullets.

Few Americans will deny that the world is becoming increasingly interdependent. Nevertheless, some subjects are so vital to the safety and the well being of the American people that they should be forever removed from the field of international negotiation. We do need a strong treaty power to deal with the life and death issues of American foreign policy, but international cooperation abroad should not be permitted to undermine liberty at home. We do need a strong network of mutual defense arrangements to stem the tide of Communist aggression, but it would be tragic to undermine the Monroe Doctrine by permitting European and Asiatic powers to intervene in matters which are the peculiar concern of countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day Patriotic Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a Memorial Day address I delivered on May 30, at the De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF MEMORIAL DAY, 1956: MORE B–52'S, B–47'S, GUIDED MISSILES ESSENTIAL NOW FOR OUR DEFENSE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance, May 30, 1956)

Today, we decorate the graves of America's heroes of its past conflicts.

We lay flowers—in fact and in spirit—on the final resting places of those who made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic might endure.

We witness the proud marching formations of America's uniformed servicemen—the minutemen of defense of the atomic age.

HONORING HEROES WITH DEEDS

But I know that all who are in this audience would agree with me today on this: If we are truly to decorate the final resting places of our honored dead, if we are truly to cooperate with our Armed Forces, we must do so with constructive deeds, and not mere words, however sincere as truly those words are.

The challenge is, therefore, for everyone who is grateful to the heroes of Memorial Day—to rise to his or her own responsibility to help defend our beloved land.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

I should like to suggest a 4-point program by which we may prove worthy of the tradition which they left us.

1. Our first step is to protect this Republic from the menace from within.

That means promoting real brotherhood in America. It means strengthening the legislation by which we cope with the subversive, troublemaking forces in our midst.

Thus, a number of important anti-Communist bills are now pending before the Congress, including legislation to tighten penalties against seditious conspiracy (which I personally have cosponsored). This legislation must be enacted before Congress adjourns.

2. As a second step, we must fulfill our deep obligations to the Nation's 22 million exservicemen, and their families. Calvin Coolidge once stated, "A nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten."

We must make sure that the compensation and pensions which our veterans have earned by their deeds of valor remain intact and are improved. We must make sure that pensions are brought up to date, are modernized wherever inflation may have so depreciated their purchasing power, as to make them currently inadequate.

3. Our third step is to make sure that we are today thoroughly informed of the Soviet military danger to our country, and (4) that we are thoroughly prepared against it.

In past times, as you and I know, we do not need to concern ourselves with what was occurring beyond the broad Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—on foreign shores.

We Americans are, after all, not meddlers. We do not and did not believe in interfering in other people's problems.

OUR NEARNESS TO THE ENEMY

But in 1941, a ruthless enemy streaked thousands of miles across the Pacific, and, on a quiet Sabbath morning, blasted the American flag at Pearl Harbor. And so, with World War II, the age of America's isolation drew to a close.

Today, every single newspaper, every radio broadcast and telecast confirms our nearness to the world—our nearness to a still more ruthless foe, the atheistic force of aggressive communism.

Already, 900 million people are in its iron grip, and it reaches hungrily for the one-third of the world which is still free and

which is committed against it. It reaches as well for the so-called neutral one-third of the world.

COMMUNISM'S LETHAL CLAWS

Its reach has deadly claws—super-modern intercontinental bombers, 400 submarines, fast developing missiles, the largest ground forces in the world.

Under these circumstances, it would be tragic folly if we lagged in our own defense. We must and will therefore step up our production of B–52's, of B–47's, of guided and ballistic missiles and every other weapon of offense and defense, including protection devices for our own cities.

OUR DEFENSE PACE MUST BE SPEEDED UP

We are definitely not doing enough right now. Despite the best of intentions and the best of military leadership, we are not advancing our defenses and our research at the necessary pace.

Remember, at this very minute, we here in De Pere are but a half dozen hours away from jet bases in Soviet Siberia. Moreover, the Communists are on their way to developing an intercontinental guided missile which will bring us within 30 minutes time of the Red rocket launching sites.

Under these circumstances, we dare not be uninformed, and we dare not be unprepared—or second best.

PRESERVE OUTER RAMPARTS

Throughout the world, we have erected outer ramparts of defense. Why?

So as to protect the weak and helpless. Moreover, our aim is simultaneously to keep the potential battlefield as far from our own shores as possible.

I am sure that everyone in this audience will agree, that if war should come, we would prefer not to have to fight it on our own continent, if possible. We would prefer to fight it at far distances from our own land.

And so we have erected these outer ramparts of our defense—far-flung ramparts on Formosa, on Okinawa, Iceland, Greenland, North Africa and elsewhere in the world. These ramparts are today threatened—not only from without but from within. In many places, Communist agitators are at work trying to stir up hatred so as to kick us out of our outer defenses. The Reds are trying to force us back to our own land, so as to reduce our overseas air bases and so as to make us more vulnerable to direct attack.

But, in cooperation with our friends, we must protect our outer ramparts. Our bases must remain intact.

Consider this analogy: There is no one in this audience today who has not seen fire engines rushing across town in order to put out a blaze before it reaches our own home.

So, today, we and our allies have set up an international fire department to try to put out blazes before they get to our shores. We have made military pacts with 45 nations to protect them and to protect ourselves from the Communist arsonists. Only a fool would sit back in his own home and ignore a fire, simply because it seems small and because it is still on the other side of the town. Once a fire breaks out, however small—once it goes unchecked—then every house everywhere is endangered.

COMMUNISM HAS NOT CHANGED

Today, communism—despite Joseph Stalin's death and the so-called Soviet new look—is still a form of deadly arson. Communist arsonists firebugs are lighting flames in north Africa, in south Asia, and elsewhere.

Meanwhile, they are spreading the false line that Soviet communism has actually changed for the better. They have denounced the memory of Joseph Stalin, but they have not denounced Stalinism.

They have not denounced the slaughter of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest or the mass murder of millions of Russian peasants in the mania for collectivization.

Moreover, they have not freed Poland or East Germany or the Balkans or the Baltics.

Why then should we accept their sirupy words at face value. Why should we be so naive as to swallow their lies?

We dare not be; we must not be; we will not be naive.

CONCLUSION

And so, under these circumstances, we must be both well-informed and well-prepared against the Communist menace.

By fulfilling a comprehensive program of defense, we will, in truth and in action, honor America's war dead.

If our heroes of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, of World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, could arise, they might say this: "We are grateful for your remembering us, but do not honor us with lip service; do not simply praise us with words. Praise us by your deeds. Preserve the Republic for which we died. Give to it your all, as we did. Make any sacrifice, financial or other, so that Old Glory will keep flying. Support the National Guard; support the Reserve; support the Armed Forces of our country—keep the Stars and Stripes proudly aloft forever."

This then, is the message of the heroes of Memorial Day in the year 1956, the 11th year of the Atomic Age.

Our Pledge to Our Dead—Memorial Day Address by James M. Landis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a Memorial Day speech by the Honorable James M. Landis, former dean of the Harvard University Law School, at the Memorial Day exercises in the town of Harrison, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PLEDGE TO OUR DEAD

Our observance of Memorial Day is now a tradition of American life. It is right that this should be so. For today we honor the dead—men who died that you and I might live.

These men are legion—men of all races, all creeds, and all faiths. Their history, their deeds, roll down through the ages. They were there at White Plains, at Valley Forge, at Yorktown, at New Orleans. Under the newly born flag of a newly born nation they sailed on the *Bon Homme Richard*, the *Chesapeake*, the *Constitution*. Years later they carried that flag with its ever-growing stars into battle at Antietam, at Gettysburg, through the bloody slaughter of the wilderness, to the final victory at Appomattox. Years later again the thunder of their guns was heard in the Argonne and at Chateau Thierry. And only a short decade ago, on land, on sea, and in the air, thsese men, scattered over the five continents of this globe, fought once again that we might live.

What names those are. Kasserine Pass, Anzio, Omaha Beach, the Bulge, Guadalcanal, Peleliu, Okinawa, Inchon. There is music in them—the music of battle, fierce, raucous, thundering, dying to a dirge as the smoke slowly clears. There are undertones of stillness in that music that tell of the isolation of the night fighter, of pilots, and bombardiers winging toward their distant targets, and of men under the sea searching for the enemy above them. There is pain and homesickness in that music; and the sudden, quick, sharp stab of death.

Yes; they have died. We live. The Star-Spangled Banner still waves. It is grief, of course, that we feel, but also pride—pride both in their achievements and in the country they have left us as their heritage.

One wonders always why they fought so well—men who a few months before knew nothing of military discipline, even nothing of the handling of modern military weapons. Unlike the enemy, they had not been conditioned through the years by the temptation of new worlds to conquer. They were not trained to a gospel of hate, to a belief in the divine superiority of their race. Instead they fought to preserve for themselves and for us a dignity, to which our history bears yearly more eloquent testimony—the dignity of man.

Because of them we have a heritage that is our dream, our promise of American life. True, America is dogwood and the greenery of spring: it is rolling prairies and the cornfields of the West; it is cotton and desert and deep forests and wide ranges; it is copper and steel and cities humming with trade and industry. But the men we honor today did not fight for a town, a region or a State. Whether they came from San Diego or from Maine, they fought equally as valiantly, equally as bravely, for the cause that is America.

We must therefore, today again examine that cause and rededicate ourselves to its preservation. What is this America? Poets have sought to describe it—Walt Whitman, Vachel Lindsay, Robert Frost, Carl Sandburg. Orators and statesmen have put it in their own terms—Webster in his reply to Hayne, Lincoln in his Gettysburg address, Wilson in his State papers, Roosevelt in his 1933 inaugural and his enunciation of the four freedoms.

Failing both poetry and oratory, I propose to put to you that cause in very simple terms—terms to which both you and I have again and again sworn our faith. They are the simple oath of the soldier, of the new citizen, of the civilian who in times of peace or war chooses to serve his government. These are the terms:

"I swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. So help me God."

No political document in the history of mankind deserves so unreservedly the allegiance of a free people. Welding together in 1789, the dividing forces of our Thirteen Original States, it made of us a nation. But in building the national power, through its system of checks and balances, the Constitution restrained the power if created so that we need never fear the menace of dictatorship.

More than this, it made of freedom an inalienable right, buttressed and guarded not only by the moral sense of mankind, but by the force of law. John Adams spoke truly when he said of the American way that its end is a government of laws and not of men.

Where would we be today without these freedoms? Suppose a majority gathered together in a State legislature or a village council could wipe out, directly or indirectly, our freedom of expression, would this be America? Or should a village council make burdensome and impracticable our freedom of religious worship, would this be America? Or should the Congress or the State deny to men accused the right of a fair trial, would this be America? Or if law at any level should draw distinctions between black and white, foreign born or natural born, Jew or Christian, Protestant or Catholic, would this be America?

The beaches at Leyte, the hedges at St. Lo, the foxholes of Korea, knew no such

distinctions. The Constitution knows none.

These are the freedoms that are America. This is the heritage of the men who died that these freedoms might live. That heritage is ours—ours in this little town, either to betray or to preserve.

Each one of us is surrounded by personal and petty considerations, particularly in these days of plenitude. But if we would rise above a pettiness of spirit, a fear of fear; if we would forget personal considerations in behalf of an ideal and a faith; we will then make real the promises of American life.

This is the challenge of our honored dead—to hold fast to that for which they died. And so, once again, in their absence but in the light of their eternal presence:

"We, of the town of Harrison—legatees of our immortal dead—swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic. So help us, Almighty God."

Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Presents 20-Point Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by me over radio station WGN, Chicago, June 3, 1956, in connection with my 20-point legislative program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, PRESENTS 20-POINT LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—URGES BACKING OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER WITH REAL DEEDS, NOT PHONY LIP SERVICE

Senator WILEY. Your United States Congress has but 2 months or so before it recesses its current session. During these next 60 days we must, therefore, act on a great many important issues. These issues affect the 48 individual States, affect the Midwest and other areas, and, most important of all, contribute to the well-being of our entire country.

I believe that each Senator and Representative should offer his own ideas of a constructive program for the Congress to enact during these remaining 2 months. And each of us legislators should not only have such a program, but we should and must fight for that program.

And so I would like to use the next few minutes to describe what I regard as an essential 20-point program.

I am going to urge my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to enact what I regard as this vital program before Congress' adjournment.

Now, friends, I am going to answer some questions about this 20-point program. And I want to invite you, my listeners, to write in and give me your personal reactions to it.

Tell me what you frankly think—about peace, about our efforts against communism, about tax reduction, etc. It will be a pleasure to hear from you.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN PLANKS ESSENTIAL

Question. Senator WILEY, broadly speaking, what are the major parts of the program?

Answer. They are very simple—two in number. First, the program consists of enlightened action on our own domestic front—for a prosperous, sound, healthy America. And, second, there must be action on the world front on behalf of the great goal of peace—avoidance of atomic war.

AN EISENHOWER PROGRAM FOR AN EISENHOWER-MINDED AMERICA

Question. How would you characterize this program in general?

Answer. Basically, this program is an Eisenhower program.

It is not a partisan program. It is designed to carry out the type of clear, American, middle-of-the-road thinking, as well as the specific suggestions, of the great President of the United States.

I personally have pledged the President my continued loyal support. Of course, I don't believe in mere lip service—in emptily praising our President in words and not backing up with deeds. I believe in carrying out my pledges. And I think my record proves it.

But some people do believe in mere lip service for the President. They believe in giving only token support. They pretend to be Eisenhower supporters in their words, but they try to sabotage him with their actions. In particular, they try to sabotage his great efforts for world peace.

We've got to combat such sabotage.

We've got to rally behind Ike in the fight to avoid war. We Americans hate war.

Question. That, then, is the first point on your program—the sincere promotion of President Eisenhower's efforts for world peace.

WHAT MODERN WAR COULD MEAN

Answer. Absolutely. We must avoid war, avoid it with honor, with strength, not with dishonor or appeasement.

That, then, brings us to the second point of my program—invincible military strength.

Question. How would you define this strength, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I am referring to invincible strength in the air, with our long-range and medium bombers; invincible strength on the sea, with atomic submarines and surface craft; invincible strength on the ground. As regards our land forces, I don't want to see obsolete mass armies, armed with "pea shooter weapons." I want our men equipped with the strongest, most modern weapons in the world, so that they can be effective against the Communist menace, if ever it should strike again.

Question. Peace and invincible military strength against the Communist menace—points 1 and 2. Now, what is the third point on your program, Senator WILEY?

DON'T BE BLIND TO ANY PHASE OF RED THREAT

Answer. I have referred to the Communist menace abroad. That brings us to the Communist menace at home, because it is part and parcel of the worldwide threat. I say, enact every needed bit of anti-Communist legislation. Complete action on the Wiley bill for more effective registration of Communist foreign agents.

Use every law which we already have on our statute books, including the Smith Act, for an unending crack-down on the 22,000 Reds in our country and on fellow travelers.

Question. Peace, combatting communism abroad, combatting communism at home. What are the other elements of your program, Senator?

SPEED UP SEAWAY CHANNEL WORK

Answer. In the few remaining moments, I am going to just run down a few of them, briefly.

The next point—the fourth—is to complete as speedily as possible the 2,300-mile St. Lawrence seaway, and to complete action on the Great Lakes connecting channels—the chanels to the upper lakes.

Question. That is certainly an immensily important point. Now, how about other issues, Senator, on the home front? How about the farm problem?

Answer. Yes, indeed. Point 5 on my program is to halt the serious decline in farm income, the drop in agricultural purchasing power. This is June Dairy Month. Dairying provides the greatest single source of cash income of American agriculture as a whole.

The city man cannot prosper unless the farmer prospers. And so, I am taking action in this June Dairy Month and in every month to help the farmers of America's Dairyland—my own State—and to help the farmers throughout America.

I am glad that at least we are beginning to get some action under the new soil-bank law. It is unfortunate, however, that provision was not made to provide for prepayments to farmers this year who cooperate with the soil-bank program. But this is only part of our program.

What we must do is, of course, to increase our citizen's consumption of farm products. That means—eat and drink more wholesome, nutritious dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, nonfat dry milk solids.

VETERANS, OLD FOLKS, SMALL BUSINESS

Question. Now, turning to other groups in our population, Senator, how about the veterans, how about the old folks, how about the small-business man?

Answer. Yes; how about them?

Congress must assure a square break for them. Taking the old folks first, Congress must and will liberalize the inadequate social-security system. Inflation has seriously depreciated the purchasing power of old folks' pensions. Not enough people are covered under these pensions. Elderly women are not provided a fair break. And so we must strengthen the pension system.

Now, as regards our veterans, the 22 million Americans who have saved this country on the field of battle with their heroism, Congress must reject—I stress—reject the unwise recommendations made by the Commission which would slash veterans' benefits.

Instead, Congress must take action as I have repeatedly recommended, to strengthen the program, particularly for combat-disabled veterans.

I have mentioned old folks and veterans. Now, I want to turn to another group which has also been having a hard time. That is, of course, the small-business man. I am a cosponsor of legislation to ease taxes on them. Right now, they are hit by a terrific 52 percent tax which prevents them from expanding and competing with bigger business.

If we are truly to prevent the dangerous growth of monopoly in our country, if we are to keep small business alive—small business which is the real backbone of our free enterprise economy—then we should enact this amendment to ease the taxload on on small business.

Question. Those are three additional points. How about taxes, generally, Senator?

Answer. Well, as a ninth point of my program, if we have sufficient surplus in the Treasury, I see every reason for us to provide a tax break of our people this year.

We should ease taxes particularly on the low-income brackets to the greatest extent possible. We should enact various liberalizing deductions.

Question. Thus far in your program, Senator WILEY, you have mentioned 9 points of your overall 20-point program. You have discussed the battle for world peace, the battle to support President Eisenhower, rather than simply giving him lip service.

You mentioned your fight against communism abroad, because of the desire of the Reds to conquer the two-thirds of the

world which is still not Communist ruled. You have turned to communism on the home front urging action on the WILEY and other antisubversive bills. You have mentioned the St. Lawrence seaway which is appropriately titled the Wiley seaway law. You have referred to the battle for fair dealing for old folks, for veterans, for the small-business man, and for 50 million American taxpayers.

Now, would you mention some of the other points in the program?

Answer. Yes. Here they are:

10. Floods: Complete action on legislation to provide insurance against flood disaster which have taken a terrific toll on our country.

11. Roads: Complete action on the Federal highway bill to modernize our horse and buggy interstate road system which is choked with 60 million cars and trucks.

12. Schools: Ease the terrific crowding of the Nation's classrooms by expanding school construction.

13. Health: Expand health research. Strengthen our hospitals and medical schools, so as to improve the health of our people.

14. Conservation: Strengthen our program to preserve the United States outdoor heritage—its wildlife refuges, its national parks and forests. Protect these beautiful national assets from being despoiled.

Question. What are the remaining points on your program?

Answer. Here they are.

15. Fair dealing: Pass civil rights legislation, legislation to assure a fair break for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color. But to do so with reason, with judgment, and with maximum voluntary—I emphasize—voluntary cooperation by men of good will.

16. And now, the mighty atom. Spur domestic development of atomic energy. That means providing insurance, so as to help cover the risks which are inevitably involved in dealing with this powerful nuclear force.

17. Here is point 17. Combat the underworld. Fight the hoodlums, the racketeers, the thugs who, for example threw acid in the face of columnist Victor Riesel. Pass the Daniel-Wiley bill against the terrible narcotics evil, the dope problem in our country.

18. Housing: Liberalize Federal credit so as to expand United States housing construction. This year, 1.2 million homes will be built, but with proper sound credit, that figure might well be increased.

19. My next to the last point is for clean elections legislation. The present bill before the Senate must be amended to include clean primaries, honest primaries, with all campaign contributions fully reported. In that way, the people will be aware of any dishonest lobby dealings.

20. And finally, my last point relates to governmental streamlining, Federal efficiency. I mean economizing whenever possible, by genuine reorganization and improved businesslike management.

CONCLUSION

Question. Senator, you have mentioned your 20-point progam for Wisconsin, for the Midwest, for all America. I know that your listeners have enjoyed your remarks. And I know, too, that they will take you up on your invitation by giving their reactions to your program.

I know that you mean this program and that you intend to carry it out. That it is not simply a paper program, but one which you will fulfill with all possible effort.

Answer. That is indeed my purpose in presenting it tonight. This is an action program, a battle program. I will be helped on it by hearing from my listeners.

I want to thank station WGN for its kind courtesy in carrying this broadcast. And I want to thank each of you for listening to it, and I hope, for giving me your reactions.

This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Memorial Day Address by Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a Memorial Day address delivered by Mr. Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the Veterans' Administration Center, Dayton, Ohio, May 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH, MAY 30, 1956, VA CENTER, DAYTON, OHIO, BY HARVEY V. HIGLEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

We are gathered here today, on this day of solemn commemoration, to honor our war dead.

Deep emotion surges through our hearts as we look out over the graves of these gallant heroes. Yes; deep emotion, as we recall the many decades of noble service of this domiciliary in Dayton and recognize that it has been a silent witness to those who have fallen in the most devastating wars that have shaken our world.

For on this Memorial Day, we remember that we, the living, owe those whom we honor a debt of gratitude that is eternal.

Memorial Day brings to me a feeling of great inadequacy.

How can I—how can any of us—express in words so much as an iota of the love, the honor, the tribute that overwhelms us?

Each passing Memorial Day finds us even more deeply beholden to those honored dead. For, in commemorating their supreme sacrifice, we, the living, gain renewed determination from those timeless words of Abraham Lincoln, that "These dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The freedom and liberty each of us enjoys today is a heritage preserved for us at the expense of life itself—the lives of those who lie silently here, unto eternity.

We must never allow the passage of time to obscure the fundamental fact that our Nation exists today free, proud, unafraid because of their willingness to fight, their willingness to die for the American ideals we hold so dear.

Since the founding of our country nearly 200 years ago, we have endured 9 wars to preserve our Nation and our way of life.

And how great a bond between past and present is this domiciliary in Dayton. Still standing today is the uncut stone that marks the grave of indomitable Mrs. E. L. Miller, the Little Mother of Soldiers, who, nearly 90 years ago, set out for Dayton in horse and wagon from Columbus, bringing with her the first 7 disabled veterans to receive care on these grounds.

In the domiciliary today are the gallant men who served so effectively in the Spanish-American War, more than half a century ago, as well as those who saw service in later conflicts in which Americans were engaged.

Yes, this domiciliary ties past and present, and serves to heighten the meaning of the more than 30 million Americans who, over the years, have answered the call to arms. Nearly 1 million of them never returned from battle. Other millions did return alive, but maimed and disabled for life, bearing lasting mementos of their service in war.

We owe our greatest and most profound debt of gratitude, of course, to those who laid down their lives * * * and to those who suffered disabilities in service, and still bear the marks.

But we must not, and cannot, dismiss as of no consequence the service in behalf of the preservation of our Nation, made by the millions of young men fortunate enough to return home alive and unscathed * * * men who can always be depended upon as a bulwark of defense, in times of national stress.

For these lucky ones, we must remember that they * * * like their less fortunate brothers-in-arms * * * engaged in a knowing gamble with the hazards of conflict. No man could tell, during those first bustling days of military service, who would live and who would die * * * who would return as whole men and who would return bearing the marks of battle.

The wheel of fate turns * * * and before it all men are equal.

So we gather here, on this Memorial Day in 1956, to remember the dead and to pay tribute to the contributions of the living * * * on this Memorial Day 91 years after the end of the Civil War, 58 years after the end of the Spanish-American War, 38 years after the end of World War I, 11 years after the end of World War II, 3 years after the end of the conflict in Korea.

I am more than a little saddened as I look out over these graves and think: How short is the memory of man.

I can recall as if it were yesterday, and I am sure most of you can too, the tremendous surge of gratitude toward our veterans that swept over this Nation immediately after World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Americans were stirred with deep emotions of praise, of thanksgiving, of a sense of eternal debt to the veteran.

I wonder: Is that spirit as strong today as it was then?

Certainly we cannot, and we do not, expect heightened emotions to burn brightly forever. We cannot, and we do not, expect a feeling of gratitude to remain at an abnormally high pitch through the years. We do not expect it, and veterans would not want it.

But do you get a feeling that perhaps the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction?

Today I hear statements, and you probably have heard them as well, to the effect that bearing arms to defend your country in time of war is merely one more duty of citizenship; that it ranks no higher than paying your taxes, exercising your franchise by voting, and stopping your car at red lights.

Of course, we must never forget that every citizen in our land has the right to speak his mind on these things. But I wonder if they have reasoned matters out, in the light of fact?

Can any right-thinking man look at these graves, row upon row, and sincerely believe that the men who lie here have made nothing more than a usual contribution of citizenship? Can any man equate death with routine obligation?

Many of these men entered service, and took the same risks, as all the rest. Yet fate

decreed that theirs would be the supreme sacrifice.

Can any right-thinking man visit a Veterans' Administration hospital—any hospital—and see the sick and the wounded and the maimed and sincerely believe that their sacrifice is a routine contribution of citizenship? Can any man tell them that the pain and hardship they undergo is expected of them?

Yet these men too took the same risks as all the rest, when they entered into service for their country. And Fate's decree for them was the mark of battle, to be borne forever.

How can any right-thinking man consider the sacrifice of any veteran as routine? Is it a routine duty of citizenship, involving no more hardship than paying taxes, to leave your family, your loved ones, your home, your job, with the frightening knowledge that you may never come home again? Is it routine to lose valuable years out of your life—years that can never be recalled?

No, my friends; it is not routine.

Military service to country in time of peril is something more than a normal duty of citizenship.

Veterans have done all that their fellow citizens have done, plus something more. They served in the Armed Forces in time of desperate peril for this Nation. It is immaterial to say that others might, could, or would have served, had things been otherwise.

The fact remains that veterans did serve—that, by virtue of their service, they are deserving of extra considerations as veterans.

Let us never forget it. Even though war fades further and further into the distance of history, even though the first flush of joy of peace becomes but a vague memory, let us never forget it.

Let us always keep faith with our veterans—the living and the dead.

Let us keep faith in another way, by doing all within our power to maintain peace upon this troubled earth. For the sacrifices, the tragedies, the loss of life, the loss of limb would lose all meaning, were our Nation plunged into another war.

Peace—peace with honor—does not come by wishing for it. It must be forged by intelligence, by realism, by sacrifice, by the will to see it achieved.

Peace is part of human progress, and like progress it must be pursued. Like progress, it requires everlasting work.

Peace requires strong, dynamic leadership, the maintenance of adequate armed strength. Peace cannot be won when a nation's self-interest is permitted to smother its world role. It can be lost by surrender to doubt. It can be sold out by suspicion.

Unless we are willing to work with all our hearts and with all our minds, we shall not find peace. Unless we are willing to pay the costs of peace, it will continue to escape our reach.

By this time we should have learned that no one is richer by war. All are the poorer, especially the victors.

If war is costly, so also is peace. Until nations know that peace demands its price, they shall risk future conflicts.

These dead have already shown us the cost of war. By their death they have made it possible for us to strive for peace that may banish war.

To give anything other than our full share in the achievement of this peace is to break the faith we hold with them.

Let us make a solemn pledge within our hearts—each one of us—that we will not break the faith.

Let us pledge that each of us, in his own way, will work for peace in the world, just as we will work at home to prevent the sacrifices of our war dead from being tarnished by the slurs of the thoughtless.

Let us remember our dead forever, and what their sacrifice has meant to us, the living.

For their sake and for ours let us this day, under God, dedicate ourselves anew to building a world in which men may live in freedom without fear.

Soonerland, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, next year the State of Oklahoma will celebrate the 50th anniversary of its admission to the Union as the 46th State to have its white star added to Old Glory. The year 1957 will mark a historic milestone on the path of history along which our pioneering State is marching with giant and never-faltering strides.

An outstanding editorial in connection with this coming semicentennial celebration has been written by Mr. Howard Bonham, editor and publisher of the East Oklahoma Tribune at Sallisaw, Okla. This editorial, which I should like to insert into the RECORD as a part of these remarks, has caught and drawn with remarkable clarity both the inherent greatness of our State and the vision and spirit of its people.

I take pride in this fine editorial, just as I take great pride in Oklahoma and its progressive people. In paraphrasing Shakespeare's words as they appear on the National Archives Building, "What is past is prologue," Mr. Bonham aptly quotes a phrase which indeed applies to Oklahoma: "For its colorful history is but the threshold of its bright and promising future."

The editorial follows:

SOONERLAND, U. S. A.

As Oklahoma approaches its 1957 semicentennial celebration, those of us who are its citizens would do well to take inventory of our State's extraordinary wares.

Blessed with a vast store of natural resources, Oklahoma has moved forward at an almost unbelievable pace during the last 50 years. Here, indeed, is a commonwealth which knows no peer in all the land for progress. It has grown from teepees to towers in less than a man's average lifespan. In a little longer period of time, Oklahoma has emerged from the tragic end of the Trail of Tears among its Cherokees to national renown.

In recent years, Oklahoma's leadership in business and finance, in education and culture, and in water resources and recreation, has left many other States, twice its age, far behind. And now, its stepped-up road-building program as well as its ever-increasing appeal to industry, bids fair to give it a national ranking undreamed of by its early pioneers. From the presses of its smallest weekly newspapers to the halls of Congress, Oklahoma's many virtues are being extolled. At long last, it is receiving growing recognition which it so richly deserves.

Soonerland means many things to many people. A sizable number of unenlightened strangers are still apt to associate this State only with Indians on the warpath, oil wells, and incomparable gridiron squads. To be sure, it has the latter two assets, and also its Indians. But, far from overdrawn Hollywood versions of them, Oklahoma's tribesmen are a proud and peaceful lot, who form an integral part of this State's citizenship.

Today, Oklahoma is forging ahead in a dozen different fields with the gait and spirit of a thoroughbred. In its long-range planning, occasional obstacles, such as a drought or an unexpected freeze, have checked its development here or there, but only temporarily. On the long pull, this State overcomes such setbacks because the fiber of its people is sinewy and strong.

To those of us who are its native born, Oklahoma means far more than just another proud, white star, which was sewn into Old Glory's symmetrical field of blue a half century ago. Oklahoma is truly a state of mind or a way of life, cherished most by those of us who know it best.

Here is a State humming with enterprise, yet very simple in its tastes. A State which is economically sound and aggressive, yet as friendly and as casual as the boy next door.

Here we know that there is sound reason back of every historical marker along the way. Here we know that something more than economic status gives a man high courage and fortitude in the leaner years. The answer lies, not on the surface, but deep in Oklahoma's rich heritage. This kaleiodoscopic view of progress on parade tells a compelling story of Soonerland.

Let us pause here long enough to look behind the tapestry—to share a panorama of this ever-changing Oklahoma scene.

Here are things that we either sense or see as we peer out over Oklahoma's vast countryside:

A field of ripened grain waving in the breeze.

The rig of a wildcat well or a gusher rising in the distance.

Long ribbons of concrete unwinding before the eyes of a million weekend travelers.

Smokestacks belching the news of industry at full tilt.

A teeming metropolis stretching its fingers toward the sky and offering culture as well as gayety to its visitors.

A packed stadium echoing the pride and thrill that only national champions can feel.

School bells heralding another day of classes, or perhaps vacationtime.

Medical centers, equipped with the greatest advances known to men of science.

A picnic spread upon the good earth for young and old alike to enjoy.

A rodeo with a hundred cowpokes, reflecting Oklahoma's true western lore.

A cowboy hall of fame to help strangers understand a Sooner's heritage.

Indians at a stomp dance chanting in unison, with their lithe bodies silhouetted majestically around an all-night bonfire.

A score of alluring lakes, blue against the sky and flanked with State-owned facilities which match the finest in the land.

A laughing fisherman, holding high his string of fresh bass or crappie for a coaxing cameraman.

A melon patch with a barefoot boy thumping the finest specimen on the vines.

Berries ripening faster than the pickers can clean the field.

Dogwood trees, jutting out irregularly from other native growth, along a picturesque, matchless trail.

A covey of native quail, fluttering across the rural scene.

And at each county seat and in the capital, a courtroom where right and justice prevail.

Newspapers, large and small, chronicling the changing times.

The whimper of a newborn baby.

The reverence of a funeral procession, slowly worming its way to a graveyard.

A boy and a girl and wedding bells.

Children playfully romping in a gentle winter snow.

The unforgettable, early morning smell of freshly mown hay at harvesttime.

The aroma of hot biscuits, homemade sausage, and country sorghum, reaching a weary traveler down the road.

A sublime sunset, sending up its shafts of light that defy the finest artist's brush.

Motor trucks and diesel-powered trains, crawling across the countryside, with ever-increasing cargoes of merchandise.

And finally, a fun-loving people who have learned to relax.

Happy people, banded together, because they are Oklahomans.

All of these scenes, multiplied a thousand times, make up this State's growth and development as well as its pulse and heartbeat.

For these are genuine closeups of Oklahoma, my native land—where the past is prologue. This is Soonerland, U. S. A.

All's Well With the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, an informed and active electorate is vital to a functioning democracy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial on this subject from the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colorado. This editorial highlights some of the causes of present disinterest on the part of many people with regard to politics. I recommend this analysis to the Members of the House:

ALL'S WELL WITH THE WORLD

Columnist Marquis Childs thinks people are too busy to be bothered with politics. That may be one reason. Another could be that they are too confused by the varied pronouncements that come out of Washington to try to develop opinions of their own. Or could be they are lulled into complacency by the optimistic statements of the President and other administration officials.

The President bemoans the fact that there is too much pessimism about the state of the world and about fluctuations and changes on our national scene. He infers there is nothing to be concerned about. And AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss thinks Americans are prone to overestimate the Russians. While General Gruenther, head of NATO, says in one speech that "NATO's present ability to retaliate almost assures that no war is imminent" and "NATO will be fully effective against possible Soviet aggression within 3 or 4 years." (So take your choice as to NATO's defensive ability.)

One day Secretary Wilson takes great satisfaction in the fact that the military services are squabbling among themselves. The next he is warning that any military man who raises unpleasant questions had better keep his head down.

Harold Stassen expresses the belief the Russians may be sincere in wanting to reduce armaments, but Secretary Dulles scoffs at Stassen's idea. (There are times when we suspect that the Eisenhower team is not working very well.)

And since we shall not know for some time the effects of the hydrogen-bomb explosion, there is no need to think about that. And why should busy people take any note of the staggering amount of private debt that is piling up; or of the unemployment that abounds in the auto industry; or of the never-publicized fact that Government expenditures are constantly increasing, and there is no prospect for any cut of taxes in any near future?

Congressman Carroll D. Kearns Reports on His Mission to the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following report on my recent mission to the Far East:

CONGRESSMAN CARROLL D. KEARNS REPORTS ON HIS MISSION TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to take this opportunity to pay high tribute to the United States Air Force and its capable Secretary, the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, for good discretion in sending the United States Air Force Symphonic Band to the Far East on a mission that was cosponsored and approved by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The mission was not only timely but will prove to be a great investment in the years to come.

I want to pay special tribute to Col. George S. Howard, his staff, and the members of the band—whom I call our music ambassadors—for the marvelous performances they gave on this mission.

I know that each and every Member of Congress, and each and every citizen of the United States, would have been happy and proud if they could have seen these representatives abroad. In fact I find it is practically impossible to envision any American product which, when presented for the consideration of foreign nationals, could meet with such an overwhelming unanimity of acclaim.

The band's tour of the Far East—and unfortunately I could not accompany the group on the first part of their tour—began in Hawaii on April 12 where a concert was heard by 25,000 people, breaking all previous attendance records for a musical event in Honolulu. The impression that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band made in Hawaii will last for a generation. Mrs. ELIZABETH FARRINGTON, the Delegate from Hawaii, suggested that this band should repeat its tour of the Pacific and Far East, and emphasized that its friendly efforts are in a different but supplementary field from those of previous international aid programs.

Next stop was Japan and the tour there was a colossal success. Besides playing for nearly 100,000 people, and turning away almost an equal number because of inadequate seating capacities, the band had a radio audience of 32 million and a television audience of close to 5 million.

Thus practically everyone in Japan either heard—or heard of—the United States Air Force Symponic Band. Press coverage of the events was the widest and most prolonged ever accorded a visiting artist or cultural group, and the concerts proved even greater than anticipated.

In Hiroshima, for example, where the memory of the atom bomb is vivid 11 years after the war, 6,000 Japanese jammed into Peace Memorial Hall that normally seats 1,800. Another 15,000 had to be denied tickets and were turned away for lack of standing room.

Mayor Watanable, of Hiroshima, who previously had never attended a concert by foreigners, wrote to an Embassy official: "The band certainly brought music nearer to our hearts than has any other great orchestra visiting this city and thereby has brought the hearts of our nations closer together."

Throughout Japan the band set startling attendance-breaking records. In Kyoto, cultural capital of Japan, the largest crowd ever assembled for a single event turned out for the band. 20,000 crowded into an open-air theater that normally would hold only 5,000. Outside, students perched in trees; old men clambered to high places to see inside; and women with babies on their backs (traditional Japanese style) pushed and jostled to get inside. The overflow was so great that the mayor, as a last resort, got up on the stage and announced that thousands of people would have to leave before the concert could proceed because serious injury might result to the mass assembled.

In Fukuoka, where the concert was held in one of the largest indoor arenas in Japan, a capacity of 10,000 secured seats. They were the lucky ones; they had stood outside in queues 3 blocks long, 5½ hours before concert time.

Press comments throughout Japan, all of them favorable, filled hundreds of columns of newspaper space. What amazed the critics most was the versatility of the band. "They have something for every musical taste," one said.

Marcel Grilli wrote in the Nippon Times: "In its physical makeup this 84-piece combination is a purely military band, though its spirit is far from martial. In its musical conformation it is a far cry, too, from the days of such stalwart bandmasters as John Philip Sousa and Arthur Pryor. * * * From romantic music to jazz, and from operatic arias to folk songs, this ensemble can elicit the special flavor of different musical styles."

Masato Yamamoto, chief of band music of the Tokyo Academy of Fine Arts, wrote: "We who are concerned with band music certainly learned much from the performance of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. From now on we should give up our old concept of band music, stop imitation, and bend our efforts toward the development of this new form of band music."

The newspaper, Nishi Nippon Shimbun (circulation 452,000), cosponsor of the band in Nagoya, reported for days after the concert that letters of appreciation were flooding its offices. Commented the official in charge of special events: "We have never had this kind of response before to any project."

Our Ambassador to Japan, the Honorable John M. Allison, said in a letter to me that the cultural acumen of the members of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band, coupled with their great professional ability and polished manner, generated a good will towards the United States, particularly to our military units in Japan, that would have far-reaching developments in Japanese-American understanding. Mr. Walter Nichols and Mr. Robert M. Allen of the United States Information Service in Japan made a great contribution to the success of the tour.

Following this phenomenal and unprecedented reception in Japan, the band took to the skies for its next stop, Korea. 50,000 people turned out for the concert at Seoul. Colonel Howard told me afterward that in his very wonderful conference with Syngman Rhee, the veteran President informed him that more Koreans went out and attended the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band than any public performance heretofore held in Korea. Public Affairs Officer, John P. McKnight, cabled the State Department: "This concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was received with even more enthusiasm than the NBC Symphony of the Air concert last spring. Korean audiences, normally undemonstrative, received the symphonic band with great enthusiasm and insisted on several encores."

Next on the itinerary was Okinawa, our supreme fortress of the East, where everyone, our military personnel, the Okinawans, and even the schoolchildren were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the band. The visit there was beautifully summarized by Father Kevin Smyth of the Catholic Mission at Naha

who wrote: "Being in close contact with the Okinawan people, I can say that such concerts do more to promote good will than many other direct methods. Here representatives of our Government meet the Okinawan people in mutual respect and share the riches of culture in a language that all can understand."

The next stop was Taipei in Taiwan, known to us as Formosa, where a 1-night concert was scheduled. That was where I joined the tour. Our distinguished Ambassador, Mr. Rankin, very graciously met us upon our arrival, and at 5 p. m. I had the pleasure of accompanying him on a visit to the President, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The Generalissimo and his lovely wife told me that this visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band marked a new milestone in our cultural relationship that had not previously existed. The response to the concert that evening certainly upheld Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's evaluation. Although rain fell all day long and into the evening, 15,000 people crowded into the semisheltered Armed Forces Stadium (again breaking all existing attendance records), and despite a leaking roof that made it necessary for the performers to wear raincoats—I recall loaning mine to one of the trumpet players—the concert was played to one of the most genuinely enthusiastic audiences of our entire tour.

The next morning found the band boarding our C–124 Globemaster bound for Hong Kong, the international city of the Far East, and probably the most fabulous city in the world. The first of our three concerts there was a VIP concert in honor of His Excellency, the Governor of Hong Kong, Sir Alexander Grantham, Mrs. Grantham, and our American Consul General, the Honorable Ernest F. Drumright and his wife. This VIP concert was held at the beautiful Empire Theater, with appropriate appointments for a concert of this type, and was attended in formal dress. The program began at 9:30 p. m. with a definite understanding that His Excellency, the Governor, had to leave at 11:23 p. m. The music proved so tasteful, however, that the Governor decided during intermission to abandon his 11:23 p. m. departure. He stayed for the entire program, and even remained an hour on the receiving line following the concert.

The other two concerts at Hong Kong were public concerts and were played for capacity audiences of civilians and schoolchildren. Here is the reaction of the Hong Kong Standard music critic, Mr. K. C. Harvey: "My few hours association with the United States Air Force Symphonic Band has confirmed my original belief that in this somewhat unique combination of symphonic and military band, chamber music and instrumental group, dance and rhythm band, lies a near perfect answer to music for every occasion." The United States Air Force Symphonic Band will long be remembered in Hong Kong.

From this international city we headed skyward for a visit to Clark Field, which is located on the large island of Luzon in the Philippines. There the band played to 5,000 wildly cheering military and civilian employees of the base.

The next morning, Sunday, May 6, at 8 o'clock, Colonel Howard and I greeted Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, Commander of the Far East Air Forces, who arrived from Baguio with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations assembled at Clark Field to inspect the Air Force equipment of their countries. The inspection took 4 hours and was followed by a luncheon at the officers' club, after which I flew to Manila with General Kuter and the chiefs of staff in the general's private plane. General Kuter was kind enough to tell me on our flight to Manila that the repeated presence and sustained interest of a long-time Member of the United States Congress like myself was a source of inspiration to the members of the band and to all the members of the Far East Air Forces. In his opinion the fact that I traveled right with the band and personally conducted some of their brilliant numbers added greatly to the national stature and public acceptance of the Air Force Band.

At Manila that afternoon the greatest air show since World War II was given, participated in by all 12 nations of the Far and Near East, and witnessed by nearly everyone in the Philippines. One of the highlights of the show was the exhibition put on by Gen. Tiger Wang, of Taiwan, Commander of the Chinese National Air Force, who had his pilots do acrobatic stunts 10,000 feet in the air.

As the shadows of evening started to fall, thousands of people began to stream to Luneta Park in Manila, and by 6:30 p. m. some 200,000 had assembled to hear the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. On the stage was the Vice President of the Philippines, together with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations, in full dress; and, of course, our boys were in full dress too. It was a most glorious concert, and all numbers were intermittently interrupted by wild applause from the crowd, indicating their approval of the repertoire which Colonel Howard had selected for this important concert. Following the concert, President Magsaysay entertained the chiefs of staff, Colonel Howard, and me at a formal dinner at his mansion. During my conversation with him at dinner, President Magsaysay expressed his gratitude to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Donald Quarles, and the State Department for sending this marvelous musical organization to the Philippines. He said it had written another chapter in the great sincere feeling between the Philippines and the United States, which had been expressed in the afternoon in the might of the military, and in the evening by the beauty of music.

From Manila we flew to Saigon in South Vietnam, a country that just recently obtained its independence. The concert site was at the city hall, where stands had been erected and an audience of 20,000 heard the concert. It may be said here that the visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band during the early days of the independence of South Vietnam was highly significant and really made a terrific impression. President Diem was loud in his acclaim of the band and personally expressed his deep appreciation to Colonel Howard and me for this visit of the music ambassadors from America, saying it had had a wonderful effect upon his people.

The next morning, because of transportation difficulties, only part of the band could go to Phnom Penh in Cambodia. The others left in our C–124 for Bangkok in Thailand. The concert at Phnom Penh was most unique inasmuch as it was given at the Royal Palace with the royal family in attendance, along with a record-breaking crowd of 50,000 Cambodians. Here Colonel Howard was awarded the highest decoration ever given to any foreigner, with the exception of Vice President NIXON. Colonel Howard, in accepting the honor, was most gracious and told the people how pleased he was, but explained that he accepted it not for himself but for every citizen of the United States of America who would share the honor with him.

Next was Bangkok, Thailand (often called the Venice of the East), where the band was reunited and a VIP concert was given the first night, which was attended by the Prime Minister. It was his first appearance in his box at a concert given by foreigners. Seated with him were members of the royal family, Ambassador Max Waldo Bishop and his lovely wife, and Col. Ben Garland, the United States air attache, who had assisted with arrangements, and Mrs. Garland.

Our Ambassador, in introducing the band, praised the United States Air Force for sending their music ambassadors to Thailand and paid tribute to Colonel Howard and me for our musical talents and abilities. He stressed that there is much to be gained in the way of understanding, and mutual respect and regard, through cultural exchanges such as this—good things in life that come to us from our strength and from our freedom.

The people of Thailand obviously had not had much opportunity to hear classical music and seemed especially interested in the music of a lighter vein, particularly, American jazz; however, they were most enthusiastic about the numbers they liked and we evaluated our mission to Thailand as one of a pioneer nature which can be effectively developed in the future.

The Prime Minister told me later that he had never attended a concert that he enjoyed as much, and he though the band had brought to the people of Thailand a new concept of appreciation of the works of American composers. The Princess also expressed delight at the concert and said she had spent one of the most enjoyable evenings of her life.

We had two public concerts at Bangkok, attended by 25,000 people each night, and then returned to Tokyo for a command performance, which unfortunately was rained out. So the band left Tokyo on Tuesday, May 15, for the United States.

In all, 32 concerts were given, and the total personal attendance was 500,100, making an average attendance per performance of 15,625. In all cases admission was free of charge. Of the 500,100 persons who heard the band, 200,000 were Filipinos, 91,500 were Japanese, 50,000 Koreans, 50,000 Cambodians, 34,000 Okinawans, 22,000 Hawaiians, 20,000 South Vietnamese, 18,000 Thais, and 12,000 Chinese. Wherever they went, they made friends for America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the annals of American history will show that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was the pioneer organization in what may be known in the future as "Cy-War"—that is, fourth dimensional or psychological warfare.

The role the Air Force Symphonic Band played exemplifies our boy in uniform—his rearing, education, specialized training, and many talents and gifts. He, by preference, enjoys sharing his talents and performing so that he can bring happiness to many, many people, not only at home but abroad. In the need of combat, however, he is just as affective and willing to perform. Thus there was a double significance to this great symphonic band, in full dress military uniform, putting aside military tactics to play the national songs of the countries they visited.

As a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to have one of the greatest experiences of my life, and I wish that each and every one of my colleagues would consider sometime during their tenure in Congress accompanying Colonel Howard on a tour like this so that they could fully realize the appreciation and affection overseas for our famous Air Force musicians.

The personnel of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band on this highly successful tour of the Far East is as follows:

Col. George S. Howard, conductor.

Maj. Samuel Kurtz, project officer.

Capt. Robert L. Landers, director, The Singing Sergeants.

Lt. Harry H. Meuser, assistant conductor.

M/Sgt. Michael R. Mudre, advance representative.

M/Sgt. Floyd E. Werle, arranger.

Clarinets: Russell A. Mitchell, Charles T. Foster, Oscar A. McGregor, George L. Dietz, Anthony J. Grado, Harold J. Rigg, Glenn J. Valmont, Leslie R. Ticknor, Bertrum S. Glick, Robert E. Gerken, Jay Hauenstein, James B. Preus, Robert C. Barker, Alan A. Dore, Raymond E. Stahura, George D. Yeatman, Robert J. Luther.

Cellos: Boleslaw D. Zukowski, Bert Kuschan, Chester G. Wood, Charles A. Baker, Carleton B. Spotts.

Harp: Phillip M. Young.

Flutes: Robert E. Cray, Erich R. Seehafer, Warren F. Halt, Jack V. Tuk, Thomas P. Perazzoli.

Oboes: Oscar Ghebelian, William J. Weber, Roger W. Sutherland.

Bassoons: Franklin M. Biskey, Stanley D. Petrulis.

Cornets: Arthur R. Will, Ivan D. Genuchi, Joseph A. Latinski, John A. Malocco, Delbert A. Dale.

Trumpets: Robert J. Markley, Charles J. Gorham.

French horns: Joseph Freni, George E. Roberts, Frank A. Dearstyne, John I. Strylowski, Edward E. Searle, Jr., Peter W. Siverson, Robert N. Drake, Harrison C. Raper.

Baritones: Edward J. Whitfield, Robert A. Sadler, Karl T. Humble.

Trombones: Edward J. Zeman, John A. Velke II, Alexander Nichiporuk, Bruce C. Whitener, Harry S. Beltz, Jr.

Percussion: Robert F. Moore, Paul M. Dolby, Frank D. Rinaldi, Jr., Ronald K. Holmstrand.

String basses: William J. Zschunke, Frederick Sollner, Jr., Edward C. Skidmore.

Tubas: Edward G. Grace, Glenn Orton, Raven E. Corn, Robert J. Chab, Jr.

Soloists: William K. Dupree, tenor; Thomas M. Edwards II, harmonica; Joseph R. Soprani, accordian; Robert D. Kerns, baritone; Edward G. Grace, typewriter.

Singing Sergeants: William S. Brower, Jr., Paul V. Hull, Howard J. Ruff, Harry H. Haywood, Jr., Henry E. Gerhart, Robert L. Conforti, Donald L. Boothman, William S. Jennette, Jr.

In conclusion, Colonel Howard and I, and each and every member of the band, are most grateful to the fine crew that piloted us safely on this tour of the Far East. Under the command of Col. Hollis B. Tara, this C–124 operation was a model of efficiency, safety and dependability. The fact that they were operating the world's largest production model transport did not concern them in the least. They handled their Globemaster at gross weights up to 190,000 pounds just as if they were flying an ordinary transport aircraft. The names of this efficient crew are as follows: Col. Guy Cooke, Jr., Maj. William E. Shelton, Capt. Henry G. Henderson, Capt. Wilbert C. Oltman, Capt. Wilkes A. Wilk, Lt. George R. Adams, T. Sgt. Marshall Purcell, S. Sgt. Glen Moore, S. Sgt. Garry Wilson, S. Sgt. Ted Grosshopf, S. Sgt. Harold E. Kozee, A1c. Terry Cassidy, A1c Robert Cantrell, A2c Thomas J. Wilson, Jr.

Heart of the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Thursday, May 31, 1956:

HEART OF THE FARM BILL

In signing the revised farm bill, President Eisenhower apparently decided accepting the features he opposed was not too high a price to pay for what he called the heart of the bill—the soil bank.

If the soil bank will match the President's hopes for it, perhaps even the taxpayers in the long run will come to regard the costs imposed on them by this bill as a useful investment.

Mr. Eisenhower says the soil bank can turn out to be "the most significant advance in the conservation field in many years." He predicts it will improve our use of soil and water on a lasting basis, that it will enlarge our supply of now short forest products, that it will reduce soil erosion and make for better use of land in the Dust Bowl.

And, if it lives up to its purposes, it will slow down the enormous accumulation of farm surpluses and help dispose of those already on hand.

Altogether, it's a big order. But it offers the promise of some return on the taxpayers' huge investment, in contrast to the billions of dollars paid out in farm subsidies which won no benefits for the taxpayers and created the unmanageable surpluses which depressed farm prices.

Moreover, if the politicians in Congress will give the program time to show its effects, and if they will stop trying to bolster farm prices through a futile system of Government handouts, we may have some hope of getting out of this mess. It is a long-shot hope, perhaps. But even that is something.

How Not To Save Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jeffersonian Democrat of Thursday, May 10, 1956:

HOW NOT TO SAVE MONEY

A needed $400 million hydroelectric project on the Niagara River in New York has been delayed for years for purely political and ideological reasons.

A group of taxpaying, publicly regulated private utility companies has long been ready to go ahead with it. But these utilities have been blocked by interests which want either the Federal Government or New York State to do the job. A bill favoring private enterprise development has been given an enormous amount of support by newspapers, and by commercial, agricultural, labor, and civic organizations. It once passed the House of Representatives by a wide margin, but that Congress adjourned before the Senate acted; and since then the blockaders have been successful in their delaying tactics.

An advocate of New York State development recently said that the power could be sold at about 3 mills by the State as against 4½ mills if private enterprise produced it. This claim was at once effectively answered. The 1.5 mill difference would result in a theoretical saving of $12 million a year on the 8-billion kilowatt-hours of power the project would produce. But, against that, private enterprise would pay water rentals and taxes totaling $23 million a year, whereas public development would be tax free. So the question arises: "Where is there any public interest in benefiting certain groups to the extent of $12 million a year and then penalizing others to the extent of $23 million a year?"

This tax factor is vitally important everywhere. The electric industry paid more than $1.6 billion in taxes last year, about $1 billion of it to the Federal Government. Every time a socialized, tax-free project comes into being, it means that the rest of us must pay higher-than-necessary taxes to compensate for the loss. Some saving.

An American Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of June 5, 1956:

AN AMERICAN CONGRESSMAN

There is grave danger that the independence of the United States may be lost through treaty promises to other nations.

Representative FRANK BOW (Republican, Ohio) is a Member of the Congress who sees this threat clearly.

Bow has been working to get a revision of the status of forces agreements between our country and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries. He opposes a provision which subjects United States troops overseas to the jurisdiction of foreign courts.

This issue has been before the Congress for many months. The Eisenhower administration is opposed to making any change in this commitment.

Supporters of the foreign policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles say that this provision must not be changed.

They argue that "sovereignty conscious" allies are hostile to any move which would deprive them of legal authority over any one of our servicemen charged with offenses while off duty and off of the United States military base at which he is stationed.

Eisenhower administration officials say that to denounce this provision would be to invite NATO countries to withdraw their permission for us to use bases on their soil.

But what about our "sovereignty"? And what about the constitutional rights of our men in service?

As citizens of the United States they are entitled to the protection our Constitution gives them as free men. This includes a speedy and public trial by jury, with witnesses to confront them.

Article 8 of the Constitution says: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Contrary to these constitutional rights, our servicemen are turned over to foreign courts by treaty agreement.

If our President and our United States Senate which approved this treaty can get away with this definance of an American citizenship rights, what is there to prevent millions of us living at home under constitutional law from being deprived of our liberties by treaty arrangement with one or more foreign governments?

Sovereignty is a big word that means supreme authority.

We have delivered our United States servicemen into the authority of foreign governments by treaty. And we recognize that foreign power as supreme in court action against our servicemen.

And why do we do it?

Because Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have told our Senators that we must make this sacrificial concession to appease foreign officials who might otherwise throw us out

of their country and revoke the leases by which we have military bases.

It is our country that pulled some of these foreign peoples from enslaving disaster in two World Wars. Today we stand guard over their homes and their families in addition to supporting their bankrupt governments with billions of dollars poured out in a steady stream since 1948.

Representative Bow believes further economic aid should be denied any country which insists on exercising criminal jurisdiction in their courts over our young men stationed abroad for mutual military protection.

The Congress needs more Members like Bow.

Respect for the rights of our citizens has reached low ebb when we barter American liberty for temporary use of plots of foreign soil.

Dr. Robert T. Oliver, State College, Pa., Discusses the Editorial Attack on Dr. Syngman Rhee Entitled "The Stake in Korea," Appearing in the May 8, 1956, Issue of the Washington (D. C.) Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Syngman Rhee, President of Korea, was denounced in an editorial in the Washington (D. C.) Post which was answered in the May 28, 1956, issue of the Washington Post by my constitutent, Dr. Robert T. Oliver, State College, Pa.

Dr. Oliver's letter to the editor of the Washington Post follows:

THE STAKES IN KOREA

Just what are the stakes in Korea discussed in your editorial (May 8), the letters from Dr. Frederick Brown Harris (May 14) and Miss Dorothy Allan (May 21), and in the speech by Senator WAYNE MORSE?

If the debate is over whether the Republic of Korea is an obedient satellite of the United States, then the measuring rod of "intractability" cited by Miss Allan is proper. If the question is whether the United States and the free world (as well as the people of Korea) profit from the maintenance of an independent and free government in Korea, then the inquiry returns to the grounds established by Dr. Harris.

The loose charges presented (as questions, and without any shadow of evidence) by Senator MORSE and Miss Allan, are answered with summary directness by the New York Times editorial of May 21, which declares that the election in Korea "has given a strong demonstration of patriotic democracy in action. It should have silenced the thoughtless charge of dictatorship in Korea."

Most significantly revelatory of the real political situation in Korea is the successful evolution of a workable party system. In 1946 there were 410 "political parties" registered with the U. S.-U. S. S. R. Joint Commission—which means there were none at all, in a real sense. In the election of May 15, 3 parties emerged with widespread support—and as a result of the election of Dr. Rhee by a plurality of 3 million votes and the election of Dr. Chang Myun on the opposing Democratic Party ticket, the result probably will be a stabilization of a 2-party system. This is a truly phenomenal development, with two highly significant consequences:

First, it insures the continuance of a stable Korean Government after the retirement from politics of Dr. Syngman Rhee. Of course he will be greatly missed, but with two strong parties about equally matched, the Republic of Korea demonstrates greater stability than is evident in many older democracies.

Second, the emergence of a genuine party system is absolute proof of the falsity of the loose charges of "dictatorship" indicated in several of the questions asked by Senator MORSE. There are many dictatorships around the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but they do not hold free elections marked by vigorous campaigning and producing a divided result. This Senator MORSE is politically mature enough to know.

Some of Senator MORSE's questions are already answered by the election results. Others are so startling as to require at least minimal attention.

"Why has President Rhee so frequently altered the constitution?" He has never altered it. He cannot do so. It has been amended by "due process of law"—but thus far less frequently than was our own Constitution in a similar span of years. The major amendments provided for direct election of the President by the people, for establishment of a bicameral legislature, and for protection of free enterprise. Are those moves in the wrong direction?

"Does he (Rhee) directly control the press?" Sixty precent of the metropolitan press in Korea supported one or the other of President Rhee's opponents. This simple fact should put such a question to shame.

"Has the Rhee administration discriminated against American businessmen?" In fact, President Rhee has been criticized because he insisted upon purchasing aid supplies in the United States, rather than in Japan. There was a dispute over taxes levied upon Americans doing business in Korea—but this was settled to the satisfaction of the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea, and the American businessmen are still there—doing a profitable business.

"Is there a heavily financed Korean lobby operating in the United States?" Registration of all lobbyists is required by law; none is registered; none exists. There is a public information office for Korea—the Korean Pacific Press—which I have the honor to direct, as a part-time activity. It's very modest financing (far less than that available to most foreign governments in America) is reported quarterly to the Department of Justice.

It is unfortunate that from a few very vocal sources there emerges a continuous barrage of criticism of President Rhee and of the Republic of Korea—America's staunchest ally in Asia. Of course President Rhee does not always support our policies. As a matter of fact, the steady advance of communism in Asia indicates that our policies have not been notably successful. Naturally he opposes the truce—just exactly as we Americans would do if our own Nation were divided and half-occupied by a foreign Communist army.

The freedom of the May 15 election is encouraging. So is the economic recovery now becoming manifest. So is the staunch defense maintained in Korea against Communist inroads. Let us disagree with our Korean allies, when we must, in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding.

ROBERT T. OLIVER,
The Korean Pacific Press.
STATE COLLEGE, PA.

Fifty Years of Growth—Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an address by Mr. Reuben B. Robertson, president and board chairman of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C. The address of Mr. Robertson was delivered at the annual meeting of the Canton-Bethel-Clyde Chamber of Commerce honoring Mr. and Mrs. Robertson. Mr. Robertson gives an interesting review of the 50 years of progress of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. and of Haywood County, N. C., since the year 1906 when Champion first came to western North Carolina.

Mr. Robert's address follows:

I happen to be among the few remaining ones who participated in early Champion operations back in 1906. It is said that after a person has been a half century in a particular activity, if he is not in his dotage, he is almost sure to be in his anecdotage—so, I hope you will bear with me if I dwell somewhat heavily on anecdotes of the past.

In these 50 years we have run the whole gamut of human experience. We have enjoyed the sunny skies of prosperity, endured the cloudy days of adversity. We have survived floods, financial disturbances, epidemics, two world wars, a host of political campaigns, and, more recently, the aggressive advance of world communism. But, through it all, there has developed here in Haywood County a balanced relationship between industry, agriculture and other activities that have placed our county among the top counties of the State having the highest standard of living.

Our county has come through its years of trial and has maintained progress largely through the fine character, the stability, the earnestness and the Christian spirit of our native mountain folk.

Champion came to Canton only a few years after its name had been changed from Pigeon River to Canton. Its population had been about 100 in contrast with its present population of nearly 7,000.

After construction of the mill got underway, great difficulty was experienced in getting a working force adequate for the job in hand. Very few of the men, native to the community, had, up to that time, engaged in what they called public works. They were accustomed to working as free agents and naturally felt a bit uneasy working under a boss.

At that time, immigration laws permitted admission of far more men of foreign origin than are allowed to come in today. Italians and Bulgarians were available, so, in desperation, the contractor engaged a large crew of these foreigners who were brought to Canton and housed in a camp located close to the mill pumphouse. With their large outdoor, plastered ovens constructed to produce their favorite brand of bread, European style, they made quite a unique and somewhat colorful addition to the community life.

Some of you will remember that at that time it took about as many engines as there were loaded cars to bring a freight train into Canton from Turnpike. Quite a contrast to

the mile-long, diesel-drawn trains that come into Canton today. That old method was good enough when our daily tonnage was 75 tons of sulfite pulp and 75 of soda pulp, but it would have collapsed completely under today's conditions when we produced over 10 times as much finished product as we did then.

I came to Canton at the beginning of a financial panic: Champion's mills were unfinished, and insufficient funds were available for either completion of construction or operation of the processes. During the first few years of my stay in Canton, my principal responsibility was to stave off creditors until we could get our plant into production, and profits began to come in. We did escape bankruptcy, but by an uncomfortably narrow margin. I believe, however, that the experiences of those early days provided for all of us valuable lessons in caution and in resourcefulness. And that enforced resourcefulness resulted, ultimately, in our developing many new and profitable lines of production. We have to our credit a number of firsts in the paper industry. Our mill was the first large pulp mill in the South. It was the first to make spruce sulfite in Dixie. It was the first to successfully convert chestnut chips into soda pulp. It was the first to make southern pine into bleached kraft capable of use in fine white papers. It was the first to install an electrolytic bleach plant in a southern mill—the first to develop biproduct power on a large scale through the use of high pressure steam boilers with exhaust steam withdrawn from turbines for process use. We also installed the largest and fastest fourdrinier paper machine in the industry, of that day, and disappointed our competitors and the prophets of gloom by making it work profitably.

Near the lodge at Lake Logan, there is a bronze tablet commemorating the fact that Champion cooperated with Dr. Schenck, the famous forester, in keeping alive the first forestry school in the United States of America.

In the field of human relations, we were the first pulp mill to organize a safety committee, first to establish a credit union, first to provide an old-age bonus, wage incentive plan, and, more recently, the first to establish profit sharing.

Many years ago, Champion adopted and has sincerely and conscientiously tried to apply in daily life, the principles of fairness, friendliness, and faith, which have been summarized in our shorter slogan, "Cooperation and Good Fellowship." Our intention was, and is, to apply this philosophy not only in our dealings with the workers who permanently risk their future with Champion, but to our customers, our stockholders, and, above all, to our neighbors. The response, especially from our workers and from our neighbors, has been magnificent and has given us the courage and confidence to plan for continued progress on into the distant future.

In these days of another cold war, we hear much of the dangers of communism. We know that democracy and communism have only one word in common—that word is "equality"—but it has different meanings. In democracy, it means equality in liberty and prosperity. In communism, it means equality in servitude and poverty. Communism divides, it cannot multiply. It distributes not wealth, but misery.

Here in Haywood County, through the mutual respect, consideration, and deep sense of civic responsibility that prevails in unusual degree, we provide a splendid example of democracy on the march.

Everyone enjoys the benefits of people's capitalism, and when such conditions exist, we need have no fear of subversive influences getting anywhere in our country.

There are no more helpful groups than this very valuable Canton-Clyde-Bethel Association which sponsors today's meeting.

The objectives outlined by Oliver Wendell Holmes—

> "One hand, one heart
> One land, one Nation
> Evermore."

may well be used as the watchword of this community.

Let us earnestly hope that it will be our guiding light as we move forward together into the problems and opportunities of an unseen, but challenging, future.

Agreement on an Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are a large number of Americans, of which I am one, who believe our policy in the Near East is confused and indefensible that Israel is being permitted to become the football of big power politics with oil as the dominating influence.

In my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of June 6, 1956, entitled "Agreement on an Illusion," a justifiable, critical editorial of a Security Council resolution that the editorial correctly states "finally filtered through the Arab and Soviet objections."

In a democracy in particular, when principle is sacrificed for material values, harm is the ultimate result.

AGREEMENT ON AN ILLUSION

Unanimity on the next steps in the Middle East dispute has been purchased in the United Nations at the expense of a resolution so watered down as to be almost meaningless. The Security Council resolution finally filtered through the Arab and Soviet objections authorizes Secretary General Hammarskjold to continue his good offices to obtain compliance with the 1949 armistice, but pointedly omits any reference to settlement. In effect, Mr. Hammarskjold will be permitted to urge peace as an objective so long as he avoids all mention of specific means for bringing real peace about.

The performance of the Arab states in the U. N. debate set something of a new low. The Arab delegates persistently refused to acknowledge the fact of Israel. Syria established the pattern by asserting that Israel was really a southern extension of Syria. The Syrian Ambassador to the U. N. also insisted that all U. N. actions on Palestine must be reversed and Israel in effect be legislated out of existence—a logical companion piece to the disgusting television performance in which the Syrian Ambassador in Washington demanded the erection of a screen between himself and the Israeli Ambassador.

But this performance, while deplorable, was not surprising. What made the difference was the capricious Soviet support of the Arab position. The deleted section of the British resolution, citing consciousness "of the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis" would be possible, was adapted almost word for word from the Eden-Bulganin communique at the conclusion of the Soviet visit to London. Have the Russians now repudiated their announced willingness to work for stabilization in the Middle East? Does their continued whetting of Arab intransigence mean that they want a little peace but not too much?

Their articles on the British resolution certainly would indicate as much. That being the case, the question is whether an essentially phony agreement has not been purchased at a high price, and whether it might not have been better for the Western Powers to hoist the Russians on the inconsistency of their own words.

Soil Bank Plans Need Clarifying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, most members of the Oklahoma delegation are deeply concerned by the uncertainty in the Department of Agriculture concerning the soil-bank program.

Yesterday we read in the press a report on Secretary Benson's speech in Wisconsin which indicated that only limited use of the soil bank could be expected in drought and flood damaged areas. The reason given was the Secretary's desire to get a dollar's worth of value out of every dollar invested in the soil bank.

Today we read that the Senate Majority Leader has been advised by the department that no soil bank applications will be accepted before June 15, although we had been promised "immediate" inauguration of the program once enacted.

A Member of this House on the minority side, who has read the full text of the Secretary's Wisconsin speech, today assured me that Mr. Benson did not in any way intend to curtail the soil-bank program in drought or flood areas, but merely stated it was not intended as a "relief" program.

According to this colleague, a farmer in a drought or flood area will be given the same opportunity to participate in the soil bank as any other farmer—and can do so by all the means provided for by the law, so long as he signs up for the full period required in the acreage reserve.

I earnestly hope this is true, and the farmers who are victims of drought or flood are not to be discriminated against in the new program. It is not so much a question of "relief" as it is a matter of equal opportunity without penalty due to adversity.

The farmer who lives in a drought or flood area, and who puts land in the soil bank, should get the same "normal yield" credit as the farmer in a more fortunate section of the country—and to provide otherwise would surely be unfair and discriminatory.

Yesterday seven members of the Oklahoma delegation wired the Secretary of Agriculture to urge that he clarify at once his position in this regard.

We hope for an early answer to this wire, the text of which follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 5, 1956.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Under provisions of Public Law 540 as enacted last month you were given clear mandate to put soil bank in effective operation this year and all allotted acreage was made eligible by law for participation in soil bank. Legislative history clearly indicates intent to include farmers who are victims of adversity, as evidenced by remarks of Congressman POAGE and others on floor of House may 23. Associated press now quotes you in Wisconsin speech with remarks indicating soil bank plan will not be offered in drought or flood-damaged areas where full value in conservation or crop reduction not available to government. Please reply by wire clarifying your intentions in drought and flood disaster States and sections. We are reluctant to believe you intend to penalize farmers already victimized by disaster by reducing or limiting in any way their opportunity to participate in soil-bank program. This would deprive farmers most in need of assistance at critical time, and certainly would violate intent of Congress in passing this legislation. Under your reported interpretation soil bank would be reserved only for prosperous or fortunate farmers while denying farmers who are victims of natural disaster a chance to participate.

ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senate.
ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.
CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress.
TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.
JOHN JARMAN,
Member of Congress.
VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Softening Up for Brainwashing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Edward Hunter, of Port Washington, N. Y., replies to a contributor to National Review under date of June 6 so effectively on the question of brainwashing, I quote his letter for the RECORD:

I wonder if your contributor M. M. G. (May 16) who foresaw the type of mind that invited Hiss to Princeton next thinking up a movement called "Future Brainwashees of Communist Slave Labor Camps," fully realized how precisely he hit the nail on the head?

I have just returned to the United States after 2 years in Asia, studying the war for men's minds. In my new book, Brainwashing, I tell the pattern to preserve a brain against these totalitarian atrocities. I have probably talked with a bigger cross section of brainwashed individuals, of various nationalities and races, than anyone else. On the basis of what they told me and my research generally, I can say that no man can be broken until he is first softened up. I can also point out, not with any desire to be harsh on those young men and their faculty leaders who permitted Hiss to make his glamorful appearance at Princeton, the following basic fact:

The men and women who have broken under brainwashing pressures, and who created great and unnecessary suffering for their buddies, country, and themselves, were in a pathetic number of cases softened up for their crackup by just the state of mind exhibited in the Princeton episode.

This is a matter our schools, colleges, and universities should consider of critical importance, so that they no longer are manipulated into a position of weakening minds, for all their pretentious buildings and superduper equipment. This is a matter, too, for home and church to study and act upon.

EDWARD HUNTER.

PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y.

Your Assessment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the followig editorial from the Daily Press of St. Marys, Pa., for Friday, May 25, 1956:

YOUR ASSESSMENT

Pennsylvanians would kick like steers, justifiably so, if they were assessed to help build New Jersey, New York, Delaware, or Ohio highways.

Yet the taxpayers of this State have to pay annual Federal taxes for the Tennessee Valley Authority that brings not one penny return to them—because it was a federally financed program and has to be financed yearly by residents of all 48 States in the Union because it does not earn its own way.

The proportionate share of States in TVA appropriations of $1,950,000,000 in the fiscal years from 1934 to 1955, saw Pennsylvania's share of this costly enterprise fixed at $145 million.

New Yorkers have been called upon to pay 290 million; Ohioans 118 million; Illinois 148 million; Michigan 100 million; faraway Texas 82 million; West Virginia 15 million; New Jersey 66 million; California 170 million. Those are the States called upon to kick in the biggest kitty.

Tennessee, where the TVA is located and has its headquarters, over the same length of time, paid in $24 million, the State most benefited by its construction. The State of Washington about as far removed from the Tennessee Valley as you can get, paid better than $31 million, $7 million more than the State directly affected.

One would think that Tennessee with the balance of United States paying a substantial part of the cost of producing electric power within the State, would be leading the parade of Southern States in business expansion; wouldn't you?

But such is not the case. It is far from being in the lead—as a matter of fact is next to last in the procession.

The Chattanooga (Tenn.) News Free-Press in a recent editorial had the following to say about TVA:

"All Tennesseans ought to be proud of their State and anxious to see it progress. That is why it is disturbing to note the low rating of Tennessee in southern business progress as rated in a recent Kiplinger Letter.

"The Kiplinger survey rates the States of the South in order of business progress during the past 5 years. This is the order of standing and the percentage of expansion, according to the rating system:

"Florida, 28 percent; Louisiana, 18 percent; Georgia, 18 percent; North Carolina, 16 percent; Alabama, 15 percent; South Carolina, 13 percent; Arkansas, 12 percent; Virginia, 8 percent; Kentucky, 6 percent; Tennessee, 3 percent; Mississippi, 1 percent.

"It's distressing to find Tennessee next to the bottom of the list, above only highly agricultural Mississippi.

"Of course, the Tennessee Valley Authority has made a habit for two decades of claiming credit for everything good that has happened in Tennessee, as though there would have been no progress without TVA. Perhaps TVA wants to claim credit for seeing Tennessee rank 10th in the 11 Southern States in business progress. The leading States don't have the blessings of TVA and seem to be doing very well with the American free-enterprise system.

"We hope progress isn't passing Tennessee by because of the socialism that has been established here."

Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter written by Mr. L. W. Turner, Jr., president of the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, of Nashville, Tenn., to the Washington Post and published under the heading of "Letters to the Editor," in the June 5 issue of the Post as follows:

TEXTILE IMPORTS

Our attention is called to your editorial of May 27 to the effect that the Senate Finance Committee takes the position imports of textiles and apparels from Japan are not offering sales competition to domestic industry. The Tariff Commission apparently has little grasp of the ruinous effect of these imports. Total imports of women's blouses and men's and boys' shirts alone in 1955 and thus far in 1956 seriously approach domestic production figures.

Japanese imports of men's and boys' shirts and ladies' blouses were several million dozen. What the Tariff Commission evidently does not understand is that it takes only a relatively small quantity of cheaper priced goods or articles to set the market price in a given market. In other words, 1,000 dozen men's and boys' Japanese shirts and ladies' blouses can set the market price for all American competitive garments in the city of Washington.

It is in this manner that Japanese imports of apparels and textiles are setting the market price for such domestic-made goods, thus pulling down the price structure with consequent discouragement to American producers. This we have seen happening right along for more than 1 year. Some plants are closed, the owners say, because of Japanese competition and some are running on short time for the same reason their owners say.

The Tariff Commission has rendered disservice in not getting the full facts and ascertaining the effect of Japanese compe-

tition on the textile and apparel industry which we have herein briefly explained.

There is reason to wonder whether textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government.

L. W. TURNER, Jr.,
President, Southern Garment Manufacturers Association.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

This letter is very timely and has my wholehearted approval.

I too wonder, as Mr. Turner does, whether or not the textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government and by that I mean the administrative branch of the Government and not the Congress.

The Congress has, refused to pass the OTC bill which would, in effect approve all that GATT has done in strangling the American textile and garment industry. Because we have not had the backing of the textile industry in our efforts to get legislation passed to prevent the destruction of this great industry, we have not been able to get such legislation reported out of committee. We can and will continue to fight OTC which, as I say, would be a ratification of the GATT agreements.

Apparently the administration believes the textile industry is expendable for the benefit of the steel, automobile and other huge industries which want all tariff barriers removed. They too are calloused and unconcerned just as the executive department of our Government is about the problem of the textile and garment industries.

The Tariff Commission, now dominated by the executive department although it is allegedly an arm of the Congress, has refused to get all the facts about the effects of Japanese competition on the textile and apparel industry and has apparently abandoned these industries to their fate.

It is often said that because Japan buys some of the American farmer's cotton, the cotton farmer of the Nation ought to support the disastrous agreements which permit the imporation of texiles from countries where wage scales are so low that our own textile and apparel industries simply cannot meet the competition. However, if the textile industry in America is destroyed, 60 percent of the farmer's market for his cotton will go down the drain with the textile industry.

It is encouraging to see now that Mr. Robert Jackson, the president of the ACMI, has learned the lesson that he cannot expect any help from the administration although rumor has it that most of the industry supported Mr. Eisenhower and his party. We Members of Congress who are so vitally interested in the preservation of the textile industry have been trying to convince Mr. Jackson and the ACMI of this fact so that we might get the necessary backing for legislation that would do what the administration fails and refuses to do. It is rather late now for any such legislation to be passed. It is understanable, however, that the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute was loathe to turn to the Congress for protection before all avenues of relief in the administrative department had been explored and found closed. We have at least been successful in holding up action upon the bill which would create a super-duper international organization in which the United States would have only one vote to control our foreign-trade policies.

Proposed Transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by local 1, Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, on the proposed transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Previous testimony before this committee and before the House Appropriations Committee has touched on the proposed transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University. Local 1 of the Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, the only employee organization to which a large number of the employees of the hospital belong, has given careful attention to the proposed transfer and holds the following views.

Local 1 supports the transfer only if the civil-service status of the civil-service employees now employed at the hospital is preserved. A careful study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown that in almost every particular employees of Howard University have working conditions inferior to those under the classified Federal civil service. The particulars include: Salaries, leave, insurance, retirement benefits, counseling service, and others.

A majority of the employees at Freedmen's Hospital are long-term Federal workers with 10 years or more service. Our local recently conducted a careful poll of employees at the hospital. Of 390 responses to the questionnaire, only 13 (3⅓ percent) indicated that they would be willing to continue in their jobs at the hospital without civil-service status. Yet, unless special legislative action is taken, all hospital employees, no matter what their civil-service status, will lose their civil-service rights and become new employees at Howard when the transfer is effected.

From a practical point of view, the purposes of the transfer would not be served if the vast majority of employees preferred to take jobs in other Federal agencies in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, where they would retain their civil-service rights. Indeed, it would be virtually impossible to operate the hospital under such circumstances. But equally important, it would be a breach of faith with the employees. These men and women have looked at their jobs at the hospital as careers. In so doing they have been responsive to the call of their Government for career employees. Having bought their homes, established roots in the life of the community, and made their plans on the basis of a reasonable expectation of the benefits which a grateful Government bestows on its loyal employees, it would be a blow at the entire concept of a career civil service as well as at 700 individuals and their families if they were now to be arbitrarily separated.

Either the legislation authorizing the transfer should include a guaranty of continued civil-service status for the present Freedmen's Hospital employees, or the legal structure of Howard University should be altered—by making it, for instance, a Federal or District institution—so that all its employees fall under the Federal civil service. We trust these alternative courses will be intensively studied and appropriate language drafted prior to consideration by the Congress.

Disabled Veterans Are Frightened and Worried by the Bradley Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Gerald S. Kelsey, national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans in my city of Portland, Oreg. This letter, I think, is an eloquent and forceful statement of the concern being felt by many of our veterans. I am receiving many similar letters almost daily. Reports available to me cause me to feel a similar great concern as to the report of the Bradley Commission. I hope the President, in the recommendations he intends to submit to the Congress based on this report, will give careful scrutiny to the dislocations in our present veterans' programs that it entails and will take account of the many protests from our veterans organizations.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE OFFICE,
VA REGIONAL OFFICE,
Portland, Oreg., May 23, 1956.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am a service officer for the Disabled American Veterans in the State of Oregon. My office represents better than 15,000 power of attorneys on claims that are on file with the United States Veterans' Administration.

Most of our service-connected, disabled veterans have had the contents of the Bradley Commission report brought to their attention. I want to tell you that we service-connected, disabled veterans are frightened and worried. I do not believe that the contents of the Bradley Commission report has anything to do with Democrats or Republicans. I believe that the report of the Bradley Commission is strictly the radical ideas and opinions of a minority group in both parties.

It is a terrible thing to face these disabled veterans day after day and see the worried expressions and concern that they are feeling since the Bradley report has been made public.

I cannot believe that Congress, either the House or the Senate, would do anything detrimental to the service-connected veteran. Because of this reasoning and in order that the veterans' faith may be restored, I respectfully request that you give favorable consideration to H. R. 11310.

I realize that the supporters of the Bradley report will howl like wounded tigers but at the same time the feelings of the service-connected veteran and his confidence are all-important.

Very respectfully,

GERALD S. KELSEY,
National Service Officer.

The Civil-Rights Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 12, 1956, in Washington, D. C., Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, delivered an address before a dinner meeting of the ninth annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action. Among the other speakers upon that occasion were Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oregon, and other speakers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an edited copy of Mr. Wilkins' address, which is entitled "The Civil-Rights Crisis."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present sharpness of the civil rights issue is not, as some suggest, a result of a decision of the United States Supreme Court, or of the policies of the New Deal-Fair Deal, or of the activities of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Gov. Allen Shivers, of Texas to the contrary.

As Dr. Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia University, writing in the New York Times magazine asserts: "* * * the changes that have left us all so breathless * * * have been the results of social revolutions that have been coming to a head for a hundred years or more, of wars, of shifts in the structure of our families, churches, and businesses and, most of all the breakneck revolutionary development of military and industrial technology."

We, all of us, then, are faced today with the task of adjusting to these changes, of meeting the crises induced by them, and of fashioning a world in which men can live at peace and in the hope, at least, of a measure of justice and dignity.

There is no gainsaying the crises everywhere about us; political, economic, moral, sectional, national, and international. A short rollcall brings them readily to mind and calls up a dozen tangents: Moscow, the West and the Middle East; England and Cyprus and Ceylon; France and north Africa; Communist China, Formosa and the United States; the U. S. S. R. and her satellites; oil, uranium, sealanes, food disease; national sovereignty, public power, security and freedom, and a dozen others.

Here and now, for 16 millions of Negro Americans, for several times that number of white Americans, and for scores of millions of white and nonwhites over the globe a crisis revolves about America's attempt to make the theory of democracy work out in practice, across the color line.

These strivings toward democratic living, the successes and failures, are one of the concerns of this convention of Americans for Democratic Action. It is one of the reasons you are gathered here tonight, not primarily in the interest of Negro citizens as such, but in the interest of the examination and strengthening of Western democracy.

It has become a cliché to state that this pattern of living represents the hope of mankind for personal and group freedom, for dignity, equality of opportunity and justice. It is difficult, in the light of what we know of the principalities and democracies of the past, not to believe this cliche a truism.

Have we of the West not reared the most glittering superstructure of civilization known to man? Do not both entrepreneur and workman reap more for their toil and skill and daring than ever before in history? If there were ever wealthier men were there not more slaves? Do we not fly over the earth, talk and send pictures through the air, and perform, as a matter of course, dozens of other miracles each night and day?

Is this not sufficient vindication for the cliche? Is not the tractor the triumphant answer to the bullock and the wooden hoe? Well, not quite. In other days and in other regimes men sailed the seas, spanned rivers with bridges, built roads, reared beauty to the skies, and conquered continents.

The difference, we like to believe, lies in our concern for man and his spirit. We said here, borrowing some from the French and the English, the Greeks and the Romans, from the Jews and the Christians, we said: "* * * all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

Stubbornly, often tenuously, we have clung to this ideal, through doubts and trials, fears, challenges, trickery and wars; even through the manifold temptations and dangers of success.

We stand today stronger both in spirit and in body, yet faced with a challenge hitherto unmatched except, perhaps, in the tests of our fledging years among the great powers of the world.

Shall all men, of whatever color, be free and equal in this land of the free? If the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution underwrite equality and freedom for whites only, will they not soon guarantee these for the strong, or the rich, or the cunning only?

What then shall become of America and of men who looked to the West? For, as we debate our whims and caprices, a strong, wily, and ruthless foe presses us upon every hand. We dare not take a leisurely generation to change our course. At stake is not the American who happens to be a Negro, for his fate, except to him, is incidental. At stake is all we have dreamed and built—not merely our wondrous material being, but our freedom and our souls.

We are caught between the social revolutions from within to which Dr. Frankel referred, and the emergence in the past 40 years of a gigantic social revolution from without. Fantastic as it may seem, what we do about freedom and equality for one-tenth of our population may determine the success or failure of our adjustment to our own revolution and our success in meeting the challenge from beyond our shores.

Appomattox ended a bloody war, but bringing order and justice out of its aftermath demanded soul-searching of such an agonizing kind—while the Nation was faced with the major task of binding up both its physical wounds and its economy—that we were relieved in 1876 to accept a "compromise" which gave the Southern States back their slaves, now called freedmen, to do with as they would.

A life for our Negroes was rigged within the United States, and the description is used advisedly.

First of all, they were denied the basic right and weapon of democratic freemen—the ballot. Thus the local and State governments were kept safely in the hands of former slaveowners and their descendants, to be joined later by the hitherto unnoticed whites who never had owned land or slaves.

The representatives of these lily-white State governments in Washington then combined their numbers and not inconsiderable talents in an increasing crusade to reverse the verdict of Appomattox. With cajolery, demagoguery, threats, parliamentary skullduggery and political blackjacking, they built and perpetuated an empire of exploitation—political, economic, and social.

The manifesto condemning the Supreme Court signed by 100 southern Senators and Congressmen is completely in character with the pattern of the past 90 years, a pattern which has insisted that first-class citizenship shall not be enjoyed by Negro Americans in that region, regardless of any opinion, or precedent, or authority, no matter how high.

It cannot pass unnoticed that this declaration comes at a time when both the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government have taken successive steps forward in the matter of nondiscriminatory citizenship.

In addition to political disfranchisement, and to make certainty doubly certain, the Negro was crippled by being denied education, and chained down by ruthlessly imposed economic handicaps.

Thus, voteless, uneducated, and economically throttled, he was helpless before sheriffs, judges, governors, and mobs alike. His protests and his citations of the Constitution were of little avail.

As we look back, we realize now that our problem was enormously complicated by our acceptance of the formula of 1876. For that formula not only continued slavery under a different name, not only invalidated the Declaration of Independence and mocked the Constitution, but implanted and nurtured in the minds and hearts of millions of otherwise normal citizens the neurotically false notion that whiteness alone is a mark of greatness; and that whiteness carries with it an inherent right to special privileges and to domination over nonwhites.

For the disturbing fact is that the intervening 80 years have seen the minority, under the lash of hardship and injustice and inequality, legal and illegal, grow in every dimension, including dignity; whereas great sections of the majority in the region concerned have stood still, psychologically and emotionally.

Opposition to the 1954 Supreme Court ruling outlawing public school segregation stems largely from the refusal of the diehard areas to accept, or from their inability to comprehend, the concept of equality of citizenship.

They had their 1876 agreement. They had, in 1896, their *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* opinion establishing the separate-but-equal doctrine. On these foundations they built their way of life and they are bewildered and angry to see the foundation swept away.

In his lone, but notable and accurately prophetic dissent to the Plessy ruling, the late Mr. Justice Harlan wrote:

"I am of the opinion that the statute of Louisiana is inconsistent with the personal liberty of citizens, white and black, in that State, and hostile to both the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States. If laws of like character should be enacted in the several States of the Union, the effect would be in the highest degree mischievous. Slavery as an institution tolerated by law would, it is true, have disappeared from our country, but there would remain a power

in the States, by sinister legislation, to interfere with the full enjoyment of the blessings of freedom; to regulate civil rights common to all citizens, upon the basis of race; and to place in a condition of legal inferiority a large body of American citizens."

Ignoring the "equal" in the Plessy separate-but-equal doctrine, the Southern States proceeded forthwith to do exactly as Mr. Justice Harlan predicted. Upon the basis of race and race alone, they enacted legislation to regulate the civil rights "common to all citizens" in practically every area of living.

They did this, I strongly suggest, because at that time they could not conceive of the Negro as a citizen with rights as such to be respected and safeguarded by the States. Much of the thinking expressed today—60 years later—indicates that time and its changes have had little influence upon that conception.

The southern political leaders and lily-white State governments today are commanding time to stand still. A profitable, comfortable, and ego-feeding way of life has been dealt a body blow and the beneficiaries of the system have thrown into the breach every possible argument, including some that seem to have been disinterred from proslavery debates. They have utilized every tactic, no matter how reprehensible. They have massed economic and political power against a minority armed with little more than the conviction that it is right and that the higher law of the land is on its side.

Cowardly economic reprisals have been visited upon men and women for merely holding an opinion, belonging to an organization, or signing a petition. Whites as well as Negroes have paid a price for dissent from the segregationist view, with the result that in many areas of the South virtual thought control is in effect.

With newspapers and some governors and some United States Senators, to say nothing of mayors, sheriffs and chiefs of police all shouting defiance of the courts, it is not to be wondered that the hoodlum element has felt free to act. Threats and attacks have been made. Shootings have occurred. A mob has taken over a university campus and nullified a court order. Murder has been done.

State legislatures in Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi have enacted punitive legislation against their Negro citizens and with Virginia have adopted measures designed to circumvent or defy the Nation's highest court.

In this hysteria we come into election year. Through their ballots Americans reveal their feelings and indicate their choices of men and parties. In many ways, directly and indirectly, they decide issues.

Today the civil rights crisis is properly under scrutiny and the factors that have contributed to it, as well as the possible solutions to it are being weighed.

It is a serious thing, for example, for Government of, by, and for the people when only 8,000 Negro citizens out of a voting-age population of 497,000 are permitted to register to vote, as was the case in Mississippi last year. The system by which this deprivation was accomplished is a proper subject for investigation and action by the Department of Justice of the administration in control of the Government—the Republicans. Yet nothing has been done, despite the plain indications on nearly every side that illegality on a racial basis is the unashamed and unconcealed handmaiden of the election machinery in several of the Southern States.

To be sure, the Democratic Party is in control in these States. To be sure, these States cite their right under the Constitution to see the qualifications for voters. But neither they nor the Republican Central Government denies that this right is exercised in such a manner as to result in purely racial disfranchisement; and neither pays any attention to the 15th amendment which prohibits disfranchisement on the basis of race and color.

The ballot is a basic and vital weapon in the democratic state. He who is deprived of it may thereby be deprived of his right to earn a decent living, to secure an education for his children, to be accorded due process of law, to have access to recreation and public accommodation—in short, to enjoy "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In States where they can vote, Negro citizens are certain to consider this year the failure of the Republicans to even attempt to break up this massive conspiracy to deny several millions of citizens their right to vote.

The Negro voter is certain, too, to judge the Republican administration's failure to give leadership to the movement to implement the ruling of the Supreme Court in the school cases. The impact of the decree has affected our national life and has posed grave questions of national policy, indeed, of the stability and integrity of the American way of life.

Our highest Court is branded as being composed of fellow travelers. Nullification resolutions are shouted through State legislatures. There is ponderous and nonsensical talk about the powers reserved to the States as though any of these conferred the right to deny to citizens within their borders guaranties embodied in the 1st and 5th articles of the Bill of Rights, and in the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

This mud-slinging attack upon the majesty, honor, and prestige of the Government and upon the hallowed traditions of the Nation have evoked only a few cautious words from the President. A substantial segment of the white population of the South and the entire Negro population wish to observe the law and desire to work out ways and means of complying with the Court's opinion. But the loud mouths and the hoodlums hold sway and the troubled citizens of the region, desperately seeking guidance toward peaceful and just methods, have received no encouragement or leadership from their President.

None of the many ways by which government can move to ease and resolve a crisis has been employed. It has been well said that this is no longer just the Negro's fight. It has become a question of rule of law, of the observance of traditional American procedures established to preserve the freedoms of all of us. The lack of leadership in the White House in this crisis has contributed mightily to the unhappy state of ugly tension in which many areas of our land find themselves.

But if he has been derelict in setting a firm tone against intolerable reaction with reference to school desegregation, Mr. Eisenhower has acted in his capacity as Chief Executive to eliminate racial discrimination in several important areas. In the District of Columbia, in naval installations, in schools, on military posts, and in the Veterans' Administration commendable advances have been made.

And the Democrats have failed, too, in the civil-rights field. Their party controls the State governments which have disfranchised and otherwise demeaned the Negro citizen. It is their State legislatures which have enacted restrictive, vindictive, and insulting legislation directed against a population solely because of its race and color. It is they who have standardized the filibuster as a tactic to destroy majority rule in the Senate.

It is their Representatives in the Congress, safe from retaliation because of the shackled Negro voter back home, who have vilified the Supreme Court and throttled civil-rights legislation through their seniority and their committee chairmanships.

It is past this obstruction that Negroes and their friends must try to move the civil-rights bills in the Congress, and the Federal judges who will be expected to dispense color-blind justice, and the attorneys who will prosecute violations of Federal laws.

The Democratic Party machines in the hard-core Southern States have done little to extend the franchise to the Negro citizen. Instead, many party leaders and legislatures devote their time and effort to devising new ways and means of perpetuating disfranchisement. And the national party organization seems obsessed with the idea of purchasing what they call unity with silence and inaction on the civil rights of Negroes. Only a handful of men in the northern wing of the party has refused to bow to the holdup tactics of the southerners. And no mention of this small band is conceivable without naming the two men on our platform tonight, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and that grand warrior for decency, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York.

The civil-rights bills in the Congress, particularly H. R. 627, the omnibus bill embodying the recommendations of the administration and many of the points covered by bills proposed by Democrats, offer both the Republicans and the Democrats an opportunity to alleviate some of the disappointment of voters who had hoped for much more than the zero they have received thus far.

The votes are here to pass H. R. 627 in both the House and the Senate if it is permitted to reach the floor. The present roadblock in the House is the Rules Committee. The sincerity and good faith of both parties and of each Member of the House can be measured by the action taken on this legislation. Over in the Senate the bill can be pushed through a filibuster if both the Republicans and the Democrats want to make good on civil rights.

In the superheated atmosphere engendered by the reaction to the Supreme Court's decree, both parties are on trial as never before. The hard and revealing language of revolt has made it much easier for the voter to discern the ambiguous phrase and the meaningless movement that heretofore have served so well as smoke screens at election time.

In similar fashion the Negro voter will weigh more carefully than in the past the civil rights planks in the platforms of both parties. The mere declaration that the Supreme Court has set forth the law of the land and that it must be obeyed will not suffice. Compliance does not materialize out of thin air. The Government and its elected servants cannot escape their responsibility for affirmative action to see that the law is obeyed.

Make no mistake about it, as far as the Negro American is concerned, desegregation is the topic of the day. In it is bound up his status as a citizen and the aspirations of himself and his children. If he had not thought too much about it (and what Negro could not think upon his daily lot?), those extremists who today declare he shall never come into his own—not in a hundred years—have forced decision upon him. No candidate or party equivocating upon his rights and upon his right to begin the enjoyment of them without discriminatory delay can command his allegiance.

We have heard much in these last months about "moderation" from both Republicans and Democrats, from editorial writers, and from candidates who declare, with fine impartiality, that they will go neither to the right nor to the left. Pronouncements, too, have been made on so-called extremists. Well, the Negro has been the soul of moderation. He has been patient to the point of resignation. It is almost 93 years since Abraham Lincoln signed the Emanicipation Proclamation, yet it is declared solemnly that the Negro is "going too fast" and "pushing too hard." He is warned even by many who have been his friends to be moderate.

As he looks back upon his painfully slow pace, at the mean obstacles he has had to overcome, at his crawling gait through the courts, winning one by one the citizenship rights that are automatically bestowed upon others, he wonders what moderation can mean. Does it mean movement more slow than his creeping of the past? Does it mean movement at all? Must he await a referendum of his fellows before he dares to speak a word or take a step? Is it extremism to go to court, win your rights, and ask satisfaction of the verdict? Is it moderation to organize mobs, throws eggs and rocks, burn crosses and incite to murder? Is it extreme to demand of the elected officials of Government and the aspirants to office that they say the words and do the things that will protect and secure freedom and equality for all citizens?

These are the questions and this is some of the history running through the minds of Negro Americans in 1956, 90 years after Appomattox.

These are some of the issues, the resolving of which will shape their decisions on candidates and parties to carry on the American dream. Skepticism and realism have their place, but in the end it is moral concern for man's spirit that constitutes the real America, that makes it somehow different from the materialistic regimes of other times. So, American dream it is.

These questions are also running through the minds of many millions of Americans who are not Negroes. How else could it be with issues so weighty that—like those of war and peace, security and individual liberties, wealth and poverty—they command the indivisable concern of all who value their citizenship?

They must, in short, be the concern of every man who would preserve and glorify this country, through these fateful years, as the refuge and the laboratory of free men at work under the verities that keep men free.

What Happened to Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Wednesday, May 30, 1956:

WHAT HAPPENED TO COTTON

"Cotton decided to fight its battles in the legislative halls, while soybeans decided to fight in the market place."

Thus accurately did Secretary of Agriculture Benson point up, in a speech to margarine manufacturers, the real reason for the sad state to which King Cotton has fallen. And the contrasting prosperity of the other principal source of margarine.

At the time of the Civil War, probably no American farmer ever had seen a soybean, much less considered growing them. Even 25 years ago, United States soybean acreage was only 1 million.

In the last quarter-century, cotton acreage has had to be reduced from 43 million to less than 18 million, because American cotton growers preferred to cut their acreage for the sake of a high support price, rather than take their chances on a free market.

Meanwhile soybean acreage grew to 19 times what it was 25 years ago, making it the fifth crop in terms of farm income, because soybean growers did take their chances or a free market.

Cotton growers were "afraid to live with abundance," as Mr. Benson put it. They believed, and induced a gullible Congress to believe, that the Government could fix an artificially high price for a product and make it stick.

What happened is a lesson—for the taxpayers an expensive one—in the futility of trying to interfere with the iron law of supply and demand. Cotton remained high in price, only because the Government bought at the fixed "90 percent of parity" all the market would not take. (It owns 15 million bales now, the largest carry-over in history.)

Meanwhile, United States cotton was priced out of so much of its normal foreign market that exports are less than a third what they were 25 years ago, and foreign cotton production has doubled in the same period. United States cotton lost much of its home market to synthetic fibers, again because of its high price. Synthetic production today is 18 times what it was 25 years ago.

Fortunately, more enlightened cotton growers are coming to realize the deadly harm this fantasy has done to cotton. But some politicians still want the Government to carry on this ridiculous practice again—and the people to pay for it.

Defense in a Pigeonhole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defense in a Pigeonhole" which appeared in the Tuesday, May 22, 1956, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE IN A PIGEONHOLE

The great unanswered question of American defense is still unanswered after 7 years. Even yet we do not know what role the Navy should play in strategic bombing.

That rather than the new outbreak of interservice rivalries is the disquieting implication of recent events in Washington.

Consider what has taken place. First, we had the testimony from General LeMay of the Strategic Air Command that the Soviet now has more intercontinental jet bombers than the United States and will surpass us in bombing power in the period 1958–60.

Thereafter, President Eisenhower and Secretary of Defense Wilson both stated that the Navy could make an important contribution to strategic bombing.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, General Twining, however, insisted that the Navy's potential contribution was small.

And, finally, we have the publication in the New York Times and the Herald of the Air Force staff study belaboring with devastating data the contention that carrier-based aircraft could operate effectively against major targets inside Russia.

From all this we may deduce two things: (1) The present policy is to rely on the Navy to make up any deficiencies in the Air Force's strategic bombing capacity, but (2) the ability of the Navy to fill a strategic bombing role is still undetermined.

In other words, an uncertainty is the backstop for the vital Strategic Air Command.

Now the President is quite correct that this country ought not to try to match plane for plane with Russia. The numbers game when applied to defense makes no sense. But it is simple wisdom to demand that we know the value of the other elements in our total defense balance. And it appears that we do not know one of the most crucial of those elements, the Navy's role in strategic bombing.

Moreover, this is an old, old failure of defense analysis that stretches back into the Truman administration; back even to the B–36 squabble in 1949 and the famous revolt of the admirals.

In 1953, the publisher of this paper queried the then Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy on the relative cost and effectiveness of land- and carrier-based planes and learned that not only had no evaluation been made, but that none was planned.

Yet evidently nothing was done, for in the following year, 1954, Thomas K. Finletter published an unmistakable warning on exactly this subject in his book "Power and Policy."

"There is duplication in the planning for the NATO air atomic mission," he wrote. "The United States Air Force regards itself as having the whole responsibility. The Navy also is preparing to take part in the operation but its responsibility is not fixed. There are two disadvantages in this. It duplicate forces for the same task, and therefore wastes money—and this duplication runs into billions of dollars every year. * * *

"Now the point about this problem is not that a wrong decision has been made as to the respective roles of the Air Force's land-based planes, but that no decision at all has been made."

That from a man who had headed the President's air policy commission in 1947 and was Secretary of the Air Force from 1950 to 1953.

Yet the policy of no policy on the Navy-Air Force roles, the policy of temporizing with a basic issue of national defense is still with us. We do not know if carrier-based bombing planes can replace missing intercontinental bombers in the final resort, but we are gambling that they can when we fix on them the responsibility for backing up SAC.

There are a flock of interservice rivalries breaking out into the open—the Army says the Air Force has too many bombers at the cost of adequate ground forces, the Air Force says the Army's Nike air defense missile is no good, the responsibility for the development and use of all the various missiles is still undetermined. These, too, are urgent matters calling for decision and clear enforcement of decision.

But the issue of strategic bombing missions as between the Navy and the Air Force has been disgracefully evaded. It is defense in a pigeonhole.

The Late William T. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on my return to Washington I was shocked to learn of the death of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, William T. Granahan.

Words are inadequate on such occasions. The Nation has lost an able legis-

lator and a fine American. I had a deep feeling of friendship and respect for Bill Granahan. He will always be remembered by those who served with him because of his kindly disposition. He will be missed by all of us here in the Congress and his passing is a distinct loss to the people of his congressional district.

To his loved ones left behind and to the people of his district, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Six Poll Results for the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have been conducting a poll of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey. This was done to ascertain their opinions on the many important issues facing the Nation on which Congress will be called upon to make decisions.

This poll was mailed to a cross-section of the voters in my district representing all shades of political opinion. The response was quite good, indicating a freshening of interest in national political issues in this election year. Significantly, of those answering the poll, the two questions receiving the greatest number of "Yes" or "No" answers as opposed to "No response" were those dealing with the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to Trenton from Philadelphia and the question of governmental sponsorship of a flood-insurance program. The question on which those polled showed least interest was that dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act.

I feel that the results of this poll will be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I include as a part of my remarks the questions which were asked, together with a breakdown by percentages of the responses I received. These percentages are based on a total return of 5,387 questionnaires. The results follow:

Questions	Percent							
	Total		Democrat		Republican		Independent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you think Congress should set up a system of flood insurance for so long as private companies are unable to provide it?	78	22	87	13	71	29	76	24
2. Charges have been made that Federal and State authorities have been lax in preventing the denial of civil rights for minority groups, including preventing Negroes from voting. Do you think Congress should establish a bipartisan commission to investigate these charges?	72	28	73	27	62	38	81	19
3. Do you think Congress should investigate possible abuses of union welfare funds to see whether legislation is needed to protect the contributors?	89	11	88	12	90	10	91	9
4. Do you think Congress should support the President's recommendation for a 1-cent increase in 1st-class mail rates to reduce postal service deficits?	62	38	54	46	67	33	64	36
5. What policy should Congress follow toward immigration:								
(a) Reduce present yearly quotas?	34	xxx	38	xxx	31	xxx	33	xxx
(b) No change in present law?	19	xxx	20	xxx	24	xxx	14	xxx
(c) Increase in present quotas along the lines recommended by the President?	25	xxx	15	xxx	33	xxx	28	xxx
(d) Replace present quota system with one not based on national origins?	22	xxx	27	xxx	12	xxx	25	xxx
6. Farm prices and income have been dropping. Do you think Congress should increase Federal spending this year to help farmers cut back surplus production?	55	45	70	30	49	51	47	53
7. What policy should Congress follow regarding the Taft-Hartley law:								
(a) No changes?	31	xxx	18	xxx	40	xxx	35	xxx
(b) Remove injustices claimed by union leaders?	21	xxx	29	xxx	11	xxx	23	xxx
(c) Put greater restrictions on labor unions?	30	xxx	20	xxx	49	xxx	29	xxx
(d) Repeal the law?	18	xxx	33	xxx	9	xxx	13	xxx
8. Do you think Congress should establish a Presidential fund for sending outstanding representatives of American culture—art, music, literature, education, industry, etc.—abroad on good-will tours?	54	46	59	41	47	53	54	46
9. What policy should Congress follow on public housing for low income groups:								
(a) Build less public housing?	11	xxx	06	xxx	12	xxx	14	xxx
(b) Build more public housing?	36	xxx	49	xxx	25	xxx	36	xxx
(c) Stop building public housing?	15	xxx	08	xxx	21	xxx	15	xxx
(d) Continue to build public housing at the present rate?	38	xxx	37	xxx	42	xxx	35	xxx
10. Do you favor reduction of the national debt, even if it means no tax cut this year?	83	17	70	30	90	10	90	10
11. What policy should Congress follow on economic aid to other countries?								
(a) Increase aid?	14	xxx	15	xxx	10	xxx	18	xxx
(b) Decrease aid?	32	xxx	32	xxx	35	xxx	29	xxx
(c) Keep aid at present level?	38	xxx	38	xxx	42	xxx	33	xxx
(d) Stop all aid?	16	xxx	15	xxx	13	xxx	20	xxx
12. Do you favor deepening the Delaware River Channel to Trenton?	91	09	95	05	86	14	90	10

NOTE.—Party percentages for those answering poll: Democrats, 43 percent; Republicans, 32 percent; Independent, 25 percent.

Peaceful Use of the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Toward Peaceful Use of the Atom," written by Neal Stanford and published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD PEACEFUL USE OF THE ATOM
(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Is the United States or the U. S. S. R. going to lead the world into the land of atomic power plenty?

That is the nub of the hearing and debate now going on on Capitol Hill over the Gore bill—a bill that would direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build six power-reactors to demonstrate the practical value of atomic power for commercial and industrial purposes.

Strangely enough, it is a subject that is getting little public attention and less public interest—though it may well decide whether the United States or the U. S. S. R. becomes the mecca of the world in peaceful use of the atom.

What Senator GORE wants is some drastic, impressive, Government action to reclaim American leadership in this vast and important field. He is convinced that you can't get it by relying on private industry or private investment. The Government must step in and underwrite it—just as it did the Manhattan project in the war. This is not a hot-war necessity, but a cold-war necessity; for either the United States does something like this or it appears likely to lose the race to the Soviets.

Senator GORE has a worthy supporter in AEC Commissioner Thomas Murray, who earlier this year publicly urged a crash program of Government reactor construction. But he was outvoted by the other Commission members including the Chairman, Adm. Lewis Strauss—and his program died aborning. Now, however, the battle has been transferred from the executive to the legislative—and is out in the open, which gives Senator GORE at least some hope that he can get action on the matter.

While perhaps no once can say positively (though some do) that the U. S. S. R. is leading the United States in this field and moving ahead faster every day, there are accumulating reports to that effect. The United States, while it has five power projects on paper, has only 1 in the works—and that only under construction: the 60,000 kilowatt reactor being built at Shippingport by the Government.

There are four other reactors under consideration, involving industry participation, that can produce another 700,000 kilowatts of atomic power—but that is not only counting your chickens before they are hatched, but before the eggs are even laid.

By contrast the U. S. S. R. has an atomic powerplant already operating and has plans for producing 2,500,000 kilowatts by 1960. The British will begin delivering atomic power this year, and their blueprints call for development of an atomic-power capacity of

more than 2 million kilowatts in the next decade. Yet all Washington can point to is a hoped-for 750,000 kilowatts by 1960.

What makes the situation confusing is that despite these facts, which no one at least denies, Chairman Strauss continues to insist that the United States is still leading the world in this field, and that America has a weakness for overrating the capabilities of the Russians. And he does this in face of conflicting testimony by Mr. Allen Dulles, Chief of Central Intelligence, that the Soviets are undoubtedly ahead of the United States in this field. At the same time he opposes the Gore proposal for Government construction of six large-scale reactors even through private industry.

The Gore proposal is not premised on the belief that the United States needs this atomic power—a factor which plays a great part in Britain's drive to develop atomic power—but on two other postulates: that the cost of atomic power can only be reduced to competitive levels by Government experimentation in reactor construction; that the Nation which accomplishes this first is going to have all the underdeveloped and backward countries and areas of the world beating a path to its door.

Thus the question becomes for America not only can atomic power become economically available, but is it not a political necessity? Can the United States afford to let the U. S. S. R. dominate this field?

There are plenty of reasons why now is not the time for the Government to start a crash atomic-power program: Private industry should do it; it is totally uneconomic; there is a skilled manpower shortage; the AEC is too busy now to take on new assignments. But they do not reach to the heart of the issue—which is rather whether the United States should deliberately and publicly allow the U. S. S. R. to forge ahead in this field that is so big with hope the world over.

The psychological defeat the United States would suffer from a clear Soviet lead could be disastrous. So the question becomes not whether the country can afford a crash program, or needs a crash program as a power source, but whether it can afford to not have one—for global rather than national reasons.

Government Assistance in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Peter Benton, 27 Peter Spring Road, Concord, Mass., in which he expressed his appreciation to the American people for the education he received through veterans' legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCORD, MASS., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: On June 3, 1956, through the generosity of my great country, I will graduate from Boston University. My entire formal education was provided for by the American people through the legislation organized and passed by Congress for veterans of the Second World War.

The purpose of this letter is to express my deep gratitude to the Members of the Congress of the United States for giving so many of us this opportunity. A copy is being sent to the other Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is with the greatest sense of loyalty and pride that I thank God for the right to be an American citizen.

Sincerely yours,

PETER BENTON.

Facts Versus Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there appeared in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader newspaper under date of May 31, 1956, an editorial entitled "Facts Versus Lies," which I consider pertinent to our current relations with the Soviet Government, and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

This editorial brings to us a sharp reminder of the kind of people the Communist leaders really are, and it should serve us as a guide in our Nation's consideration of any proposals made by the Soviet Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS VERSUS LIES

Stalin once said: "Words are one thing, action another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

Today the United States and Western civilization are in greater peril than at any time in their history because the Communist goal of world domination is shrewdly concealed. Kremlin propagandists have been amazingly successful in making out Khrushchev and Bulganin as men who were never really bad.

Let's set the record straight—former United States Ambassador to Moscow William C. Bullitt recently supplied this true story to a House of Representatives committee's report on Communist activities. The story deals with Soviet President Voroshilov.

At a vodka-drinking banquet in the Kremlin in 1934 when Mr. Bullitt sat between Voroshilov and Marshal Budenny, Voroshilov said: "I think the most extraordinary thing we (Voroshilov and Budenny) ever did together was to capture Kiev without fighting."

"What happened" Bullitt asked.

"Well," said Voroshilov, "there were 11,000 czarist officers with their wives and children in Kiev and they had more troops than we had, and we never could have captured the city by fighting. So we used propaganda and we told them that they would be released and allowed to go to their homes with their families and treated as well as possible by our army. They believed us and surrendered."

Bullitt: "What did you do then?"

Voroshilov: "Oh, we shot all the men and boys and we put all the women and the girls into brothels for our army.

Bullitt: "Do you think that was a very decent thing to do?"

Voroshilov: "My army needed women and I was concerned with my army's health and not with the health of those women. And it didn't make any difference, anyhow, because they were all dead within 3 months."

Yes; let's keep the record straight. Here is proof indeed that Russian leaders are liars, and, more than that, lying fiends. Yet they continue to have their appeasers, and worse, in the United States.

Are American women and girls to be herded into Russian brothels?

For Safer Boating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, May 30, 1956, entitled "For Safer Boating." This thoughtful editorial emphasizes the fact that because of an increase in the number of boating tragedies throughout the country several large boating organiations have joined in urging Congress to study the problem, with a view to promoting water safety.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind I would like once again to call attention to the fact that I have been very concerned about this problem for some time. In fact on July 21, 1955, I introduced H. R. 7536 which is designed to require certain ships and vessels carrying passengers for hire to be fitted with radiotelephone installations.

Those Members of the House from coastal States surely recall instances in which tragedy or near-tragedy was influenced by the absence or presence of radio communications. In my own State of Massachusetts, I would refer you to the case of the vessel *Pilgrim Belle*. On June 22, 1955, this ship struck a rock in Boston Harbor. On board were 272 passengers, mostly teen-agers, out for a carefree trip. Immediately help was needed. It was unavailable because of one stark, outrageous fact. The *Pilgrim Belle* had no radio. The captain managed to run his ship aground on Spectacle Island.

Fortunately, people on that island were able to call for help, and other vessels arrived in time to rescue all who had been on board. How easy it would have been for the story to have been different. But for the incredible luck of the sea which permitted this profit-making vessel to wallow to shore before sinking, there would have been black headlines in the newspapers and black despair in hundreds of families of Massachusetts. You also remember the tragedy which occurred here on Chesapeake Bay last summer, as a result of which many per-

sons lost their lives due to the fact that once again help could not be called due to lack of proper communication facilities. A similar tragedy occurred off the shores of Long Island, N. Y., last year. These are only typical tragedies that occur during the boating seasons throughout the United States.

There already exists legislation to provide communications safeguards for the large vessels which sail the high seas and even for most of the ships of the Great Lakes. Despite the fact that many thousands, yes, tens of thousands of boat owners are voluntarily adding radio telephones, there remains a gap in communications protection. My proposal is designed to fill this gap. Imagine, if you will, the diversity of craft, approximately 7,000 which presently carry passengers for hire on a permanent basis and yet are without radio telephones. The provisions of communications to meet distress needs are, in my opinion, as basic a requirement as the carrying of life preservers, life rafts, running lights, buoyancy tanks, and the rest of the other common requirements for vessels.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will report out my bill in order that it may be acted upon by the House at an early date. In this way, we will have done our utmost to insure that reasonable safety measures have been taken to make this boating season and subsequent seasons free from disaster and death.

The editorial follows:

FOR SAFER BOATING

The remarkable development of small-boat activity in recent years—especially in the power-craft category—has been accompanied by an increase in the number of boating tragedies throughout the country. The situation has become so serious that two of the larger boating organizations have joined in urging Congress to study the problem, with a view to promoting water safety. The move is timely, for it is predicted that more inboard and outboard pleasure craft will be operating this summer in salt and fresh water recreational areas than ever before.

It has been estimated that there are now about 25 million small-boat enthusiasts who spend their weekends or vacations enjoying their favorite sport. Many of these are novices whose unfamiliarity with vagaries of weather and water and with elementary rules of navigation and boating safety may be expected to result in more accidents and drownings in the next few months. There is no regulation of small boating by the Coast Guard, and few local authorities exercise any effective control. But as Chairman BONNER of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee remarked, the rise in serious boating mishaps indicates "a possible need for greater precautions to be taken by both State and Federal Governments" in the small-boat field. The program might well include an extension of safety inspections by the Coast Guard to include boats smaller than the 16-foot-and-under group (now exempt) and tightening up by State and municipal authorities on safety requirements in recreational waters under their jurisdiction.

The proposed inquiry has the support of the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers as well as of the Outboard Boating Club of America. This teamwork between industry and customers is logical, for both groups have an interest in making boating safer and more popular.

Woman Veep in Our Time Seen by Martha Griffiths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article about the Honorable MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, one of the most distinguished of the Members of Congress. The article is entitled "Woman Veep in Our Time Seen by MARTHA GRIFFITHS, and it was written by Marian Trainor. It appeared in Labor's Daily for Tuesday, June 5, 1956, and is as follows:

DETROIT.—The "coffee break" has become an integral part of the working day, but the first person to utilize it as a political weapon was a woman who wanted her district to send her to Congress.

When MARTHA GRIFFITHS decided to run for the House of Representatives after serving in the Michigan State Legislature, where she was acclaimed one of Michigan's 10 best legislators, she hitched up her trailer to her car and went into the 17th District, where she was seeking election, and invited the housewives to come to the trailer for coffee and political discussion.

While she drove slowly up and down each block, women volunteers who preceded her rang doorbells, soliciting to make sure MARTHA had a capacity audience. This method enabled her to reach 40,000 persons personally. The first time around in 1951 she lost the election by a narrow margin, but 2 years later, using the same device, she won.

In the meantime she was to enjoy the distinction of being the first woman judge to sit on the recorder's court bench in Detroit in its 112-year history, first as an appointed judge by her former law partner, Gov. Mennen Williams, and then as an elected candidate to fill a short term.

MARTHA GRIFFITHS first became interested in law when her husband was attending the University of Michigan law school. MARTHA met and married Hicks Griffiths while they were both political science majors at the University of Missouri. Hicks was so enthused over his classes that he wanted his young wife to share his pleasure and talked here into joining him as a law student.

One of their classmates was a young student named Mennen Williams. The three became fast friends, a friendship that still endures. To this day Williams frequently turns to the Griffiths for help. His first act on becoming Governor was to insure Griffiths' post as Democratic chairman.

MARTHA'S first political victory came when she made a successful bid for the Michigan House of Representatives in 1949 on the slogan, "Make Democracy a Living Force."

NO EASY LIFE

When she was defeated in her first bid for the United States Legislature, Governor Williams proved his gratitude to MARTHA and Hicks—who had organized the first rallies to nominate Williams for governor in their basement—by naming MARTHA to serve out the term of Judge Maher, who had died in office. The post had already been filled for the coming term but a peculiarity in Michigan election laws required MARTHA to run for election in November to complete a term which would end in late December. She won that election.

The life of a judge in recorders court is not an easy one for a woman. Judge Griffiths would try as many as 94 cases at a time—drunks, family trouble, petty thievery. In her nine months as judge, she passed on 2,400 cases including 450 criminal actions.

She matched wits with some of Detroit's best attorneys and gained a reputation for studious attention to the law and constant sense of fair play. Some were dubious of her ability. One attorney, stalling admittedly for time in a difficult case, asked for a written legal opinion from the lady judge, expecting a respite of several days. Judge Griffiths retired to her chambers and came forth 10 minutes later—with the opinion.

One of Dtroit's distinguished jurists, Judge Gillis, said of her, "You have brought to us a woman's instinctive and offtime intuitive approach to the many problems that perplex mere men like us."

Of herself, MARTHA said, "Sometimes as I sit on the bench and find it my duty to pass sentence on my fellowmen, I wish I had been judge before legislator. It is at least an unusual experience to assist for 4 years in making laws of state and then sit as a judge of people charged with breaking those laws."

FIRST WOMAN FROM DISTRICT

In her second bid for election to the United States Legislature she was victorious and became the first woman ever to be sent from her district to the Congress.

As she had won acclaim in the State legislature and as judge, so was she to win commendations in her national post. In 1953 she was cited by the Detroit City Council as 1 of 12 women of achievement and she also won the Ruth Houston Whipple award for women in policymaking.

As a Member of the 84th Congress, she introduced a bill to increase the pay of postoffice employees, pointing out that they earned less than hot-dog vendors; waged battle with SAM RAYBURN to put Congress on TV; sponsored a measure to establish Federal rural libraries; requested Federal aid to build housing units for single persons over 60, and demanded better facilities for care of the 4,500,000 mentally handicapped children in the United States.

She was drafted on the House Public Works Committee for two important assignments—a roadbuilding program and legislation to deepen the Detroit River and Great Lakes in preparation for the St. Lawrence seaway. She was assigned to the House Committee on Government Operations and Banking and Currency Committees.

On her holidays home, she is apt to be found urging groups to pressure Congress to act on pending bills for solution of juvenile-delinquency problems (crime costs the United States $20 billion a year, or $1.86 for every $1 spent on education); visiting high schools to answer senior classes' questions so that they may enjoy their graduation tours of Washington more, or encouraging women's groups with such predictions as there will be a woman Vice President in our time.

Her own unfulfilled dream is to write a book on the history of law.

The American Merchant Marine: Key to Trade and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper entitled "The American Merchant Marine:

Key to Trade and Defense," written by Francis Fallon, 46 Glen Road, Roxbury, Mass., for which he has just been awarded a national prize in the 1956 Harold Harding memorial essay contest.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE: KEY TO TRADE AND DEFENSE

(By Francis Fallon, age 16, Mission Church High School, Roxbury, Mass.)

The story of America's merchant marine is one marked by long declines, spurts of wartime building, the creation of huge fleets, and the passage of these fleets into a state of rest. Nevertheless, our merchant marine is needed today as much as ever before. Its purposes are twofold—first, the maintenance of our defense, and secondly, the preservation of our economy.

During the shipbuilding spurt caused by the start of the First World War, American shipyards constructed 1,774 large merchantmen in 5 years, mostly too late to help in the war. During the 4 years of World War II, our shipyards astounded the world by launching 4,915 merchant craft, nearly all of them in time for the overseas drives to victory. When the Korean conflict broke out, Congress hastily passed a bill providing for the expenditure of $25 million to recondition 134 ships. This action boosted the merchant marine to 1,390 vessels, enough to handle a localized war but hardly a full-scale war, such as a world war. If another world war comes, in which we will most likely be the main target, will America be able to build the ships on time as in the Second World War, or shall we be too late, as in the First World War? The answer to this question may mean the difference between whether the battle is fought on American shores or not. The two questions that now occur are: How badly will we need the ships? And how have the recently built ships been used?

First, the routes used in a new war will probably resemble those used in previous encounters—across the Atlantic to Europe or across the Pacific to the Far East. The Korean war has shown that, even with the advent of huge transport planes, the bulk of the transporting of food, supplies, and troops remains to the cargo ship, as the fighting to the infantryman.

Secondly, the active merchant fleet today numbers some 1,300 ships, mostly newer type ones. Approximatley 2,150 other cargo craft are in the reserve fleet, tied up in some back port. The sad fact is that 70 percent of these ships have the old-time reciprocating engines, installed only because modern turbines were not available at the time of the war rush. With the advent of the newer and faster submarines and destroyers, not mentioning the atomic submarines at all, these ships would be like sitting ducks waiting for attack. An idea of the disaster can be realized when we observe that 1,554 ships were lost during the Second World War when the ships were on slightly more even terms.

The shipbuilders and operators and the Government are once again troubled by the same problems that have been with them since the beginning of the merchant marine. High American costs, standards, wages, and insurance have made an American Merchant Marine an economic liability. However, experience has shown it to be an awfully necessary one. The problem is how much money is the Government willing to spend on it.

Presidential committees of businessmen have recommended that subsidies of 50 percent of construction costs be paid by the Government for the building of 46 passenger ships, including two 50,000-ton express liners, at a total cost of $600 million, plus an unspecified number of dry-cargo freighters and tankers as first replacements for wartime ships already obsolescent, such as the Liberty-type ships.

The need is evidenced by the following facts:

1. Before the war the United States had 127 passenger ships capable of carrying 38,000 persons. Today there are 36 ships in its service or prospect with a capacity of only 8,333 persons. In this respect the United States has yielded its supremacy to Great Britain and is lagging far behind other countries who are working diligently to improve their fleets.

2. Presently there is a serious shortage of ships suitable for coastal and intercoastal routes in the domestic trade.

3. There are not enough of the bulk-cargo ships for commodities such as wheat and ores.

4. Right now there are over 1 million tons of needed raw materials stacked in Indian and East African ports waiting for a ride to the United States. Because of shortages like these, the price on these materials will rise when there is actually no need for it to rise.

If these measures are not soon taken, the shipbuilding business will be completely extinct. Already, 19 out of every 20 workers used during the war days have been laid off. Of the remaining few, only a small number are engaged in the actual building. The rest are either repairing or reconverting ships. This work will keep only a small part of the staff at their jobs. As in the aircraft industry, the problem is not only of the business itself but also of the loss of the engineering and working skills that cannot be gathered as easily as they are dispersed.

On the operator's side, decisions must also soon be reached. Before the operators are willing to purchase ships they must be assured not only of 50 percent of construction but also of an annual subsidy so that American ships can compete with foreigners. This was in the power of the Maritime Commission but was dispensed with during the war. A bill for this grant is now before the Bureau of the Budget and must soon be passed if the American fleet is to survive.

The United States Ship lines have also in a quiet way lined up quite a few markets abroad for our products and by selling the foreign goods here have increased the purchasing power of allies.

With the current building drive going on in other countries and American wages and standards being what they are, there will soon be an era of sharp competition among countries. To combat this our Government must soon take some important steps, such as the passage of the bills now before Congress, in order to retain such a valuable asset as the American merchant marine.

Congressional Investigations of Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Michigan State Bar Journal, our former colleague, Kit Clardy, a graduate of the University of Michigan Law School, a former assistant attorney general and chairman of the Michigan Public Utilities Commission, and who served with such outstanding distinction as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, expressed certain views which deserve repetition and permanency.

These views were written in response to an article by Prof. Paul G. Kauper entitled "Government of Laws—Not of Men" in the August 1954 issue of the Michigan State Bar Journal.

Mr. Clardy's views are expressed in the following words:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF SUBVERSION—A DISCUSSION OF THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY, THE WORK OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND THE CRITICISM LEVELED AGAINST IT

(By Kit Clardy)

"A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion against the Government."—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Communist Party in the United States is an integral part of the worldwide Communist conspiracy. Stalin said that it is one to which "history has given decisive tasks from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement." [1] The only law it recognizes is that of force and violence. It is not a political party.[2]

An American Bar Association committee brief, prepared by a group of eminent lawyers, says that "while all members of the Communist Party of the United States are conspirators, all Communist conspirators are not members of the Communist Party. The most important, dangerous and influential Communists or fellow travelers may be forbidden by their leaders to hold official membership in the party. They may and do have special work to do."

"The safety of constitutional freedom in the United States demands, first, an exposure of Communist tenets and objectives—Marxism-Leninism—and, secondly, resistance to the advancement of their principles and the promotion of these objectives by any person, party, group, or organization." [3]

The Supreme Court of the United States, in recognition of these truths, has held that communism represents a clear and present danger. Most thinking Americans understand this challenge of the Communist movement, which invokes the freedoms that prevail in a liberal society in order to destroy it.[4]

There are those, however, who contend that all questions about communism relate to purely political beliefs or affiliations or heresy and unorthodox beliefs. They have invented a new civil right—the right to absolute immunity from congressional investigation—for Communists and others having knowledge about subversion. They plead that an overt act must be committed. They would not lock the barn door until after the horse is stolen.

Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto in February 1848. But it was not until Lenin emerged from the sealed railway compartment in which he had been transported across Germany and into Russia that this revolutionary proclamation really took root. Even then it achieved success only through conspiracy, stealth, and force.

Since 1917, these same methods have crumbled the defenses of country after country. Fifth columns have softened the will to resist and spread a deadly haze over the eyes of even the patriots, until today it has become difficult to distinguish between the true and the false, the real and the sham.

Practically all the rest of the world has succumbed to the siren call of socialism—the prelude to Communist dictatorship. Even this country has sampled that cup of hemlock. But despite the never ceasing ef-

Footnotes at end of speech.

forts of the fifth column in our midst, until now we have remained the chief obstacle in the path of this world-conquering conspiracy. We must be destroyed if its final success is to be achieved. That is why the last quarter century has witnessed a fevered campaign by the left to undermine our institutions and break down our will to fight.

Increasing national awareness of these efforts caused the House of Representatives to create a committee to combat this fifth column. The present House Committee on Un-American Activities grew out of that first step. It is now a permanent committee. The Congress fully understands that no matter how many skirmishes or battles it wins, the war will go on so long as a single cell of this cancerous growth remains.

More than 50 statutes have been enacted as a result of the committee's work. Its very success is in large part the cause for many of the attacks upon it. These efforts to destroy or at least impair the usefulness of such committees range all the way from the clear Communist demand for instant abolition to the indirect and much more subtle approach of those who say "investigating committees are perhaps necessary, but."

Some time ago, an article of the "yes-but" class appeared in the Michigan State Bar Journal.[4] That article is subtitled "A Comparison of Congressional Investigative Procedures and Judicial Procedures with Reference to the Examination of Witnesses." It singles out the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on which I had the honor of serving for particular criticism. Since that article is typical of those in this class, I have made it the basis for this discussion.

The basis for all of the objections this article raises appears to be the serious charge that this committee is guilty of "abuse of power." The article says that this "abuse" stems from the addition of a new objective defined as "exposure and discrediting of people" the committee believes to be subversive. The entire thesis is built upon this unsupported claim. Having served on the committee, I can categorically deny this assertion. The committee has not declared "exposure and discrediting" to be an objective. The professor has confused result with objective.

If I correctly interpret Professor Kauper's article, his real objection is more far-reaching than this claim of abuse of power. Every argument in it is directed against congressional investigations of subversion per se. The objections are such that only complete abandonment of such investigations could satisfy or remove them.

There is nothing startlingly new in the article. It makes the standard contention that committee hearings are trials—that witnesses should not be questioned about subversion. It is based on the same misconceptions, and voices the same objections found in nearly every critical approach. It proceeds on a totally mistaken conception of the nature of the Communist conspiracy. It treats this treasonous organization as just another political party. All objections are rooted in the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

This House committee functions in the same manner as other congressional committees. Its methods and its procedure are identical; it calls witnesses and questions them; there is no other way to operate.

The Kauper article is concerned only with those known as fifth-amendment witnesses—those who refuse to answer all questions about their knowledge of, or participation in, the Communist plot to destroy us, on the ground that to do so would expose them to social consequences they do not like. The article is not concerned with those who willingly help their Government.

It is not the actions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which causes this exposure or the discrediting—unless we assume that the mere act of holding hearings on the subject of the Communist conspiracy pins the blame on the committee. Basically, that is the real objection of all those crying out in vague, general terms about committee methods.

There are but two classes of witnesses—those who have real knowledge about the Communist conspiracy and those who do not. Only those with guilty knowledge can properly invoke the fifth amendment. Chief Justice Marshall has said that improper invocation of the fifth amendment is "as much a perjury as if he had declared any other untruth upon his oath." (*U. S.* v. *Burr* (25 Fed. Cas. 38, 40 (1807))).

No one can be exposed or discredited if he has nothing to conceal. It is significant that critics have yet to name a single witness who has been exposed without cause. If a witness without knowledge about the Communist conspiracy insists upon perjuring himself by employing the fifth amendment, is it a violation of his civil rights to call and question him?

If a witness does have guilty knowledge about the Communist conspiracy, are his civil rights invaded by committee questioning? Is it an improper exposure to subpena and question such witnesses? Is it an abuse of power to require witnesses to admit, deny, or refuse to answer committee questions about the Communist conspiracy? The article affirms that it is—that is the basic objection to congressional investigations.

Exposure is caused by the voluntary act of the witness in invoking the fifth amendment to avoid disclosing his knowledge about subversion. I cannot work up much sympathy for anyone who, when asked whether he has ever been part of a conspiracy to overthrow this Government by force and violence, pleads that an honest answer would incriminate or bring him into public disfavor. Nor can I believe that the American public will accept this as reason for ending congressional investigations.

The "discrediting" is no more chargeable to the committee than the "exposure." It is the direct result of the actions of the witness. The public understands that the use of the fifth amendment means that the witness is probably possessed of information which might lead to his incrimination.

There are but two ways to avoid these "results." The witness could be left to go about his plotting undisturbed, or he could give honest answers to the questions. The first solution would mean an end to congressional efforts to uncover the facts about subversion. That is the results most critics desire. The second would help his Government and would not bring about the consequences the professor deplores. For witnesses who assist their Government have almost without exception found that America's capacity for understanding and forgiveness is without limit. And no such witness has been prosecuted or punished. This is a "straw man" argument.

We may analyze the problems, therefore, with the sure knowledge that the criticism leveled against the committee is based on a deep concern for only those witnesses who invoke the fifth amendment. It is the assumption of all such critics that it is better to end these congressional investigations than to have witnesses, who do not wish to reveal their knowledge of the conspiracy, subject themselves to the social consequences he decries. And this regardless of whether or not there is justified fear of incrimination.

Through a reasoning process I cannot follow, these critics of committee investigations into subversives argue that this constitutional guaranty against self-incrimination may be properly invoked by those who have no guilty knowledge—that it may be used to avoid answering questions by those who could not possibly be incriminated. This stand reflects the "liberal" line that the tough anti-Communists who demand really effective security measures are undermining our civil liberties. It weighs the national safety against the imagined and theoretical possibility that some fifth-amendment witnesses may be wrongfully prejudiced in the public eye and casts its vote for that witness. It would, therefore, abolish congressional investigations into subversion. The article is a restatement of these ideas in quasi-legal form.

The portion of the fifth amendment causing all the trouble is that part which reads "no person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." The meaning and application of those few words have been greatly expanded and now cover many situations not contemplated at the time of its adoption. Eminent lawyers have traced its history and observed that there were strong arguments against its being included in the Constitution.

Chief Justice John Marshall, in the trial of Aaron Burr, said that "the principle which entitles the United States to the testimony of every citizen and the principle by which every witness is privileged not to accuse himself can neither of them be entirely disregarded." This basic conflict is at the bottom of today's controversy. Professor Kauper has argued long and well for what he believes are the rights of the witness, but he has not brought out the other side of this controversy—the counterbalancing public interest and safety.

He admits that ordinarily it is improper to compare committee investigations with court trials. He concedes that he would not do so, except where subversion is the subject under investigation. He claims that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has "declared its objective to be the exposure and discrediting" of people. Had he sought citations to support his claim, he would have discovered his mistake. He confuses the effect—the social consequences of a witness' appearance and refusal to testify—with committee objective.

Looking at his point as objectively as possible is it not clear that regardless of whether or not "exposure" is a stated committee objective, the "result" he suggests will flow from any congressional inquiry into any unpopular subject? Will not these results accrue whether or not it is a stated committee objective? And is it a really tenable, legal proposition to argue that the social consequences of exposure justify his criticisms and conclusions? If sound, is this not an argument against all congressional investigations? Can exposure be prevented by anything short of abandonment of such investigations?

Instead of applying his test, should we not first task ourselves whether there exists a criminal conspiracy to destroy us which demands legislative attention? And if that conspiracy does exist, has any citizen the right to withhold vital information—information that will help devise a defense—just because his standing in the community may be impaired if he testifies truthfully? Rather, is not Chief Justice Marshall correct in saying that the United States is entitled to "the testimony of every citizen"?

He does not claim that the committee has abandoned its proper objectives, he merely makes the unsupported assertion that it has added this new one. His entire argument depends upon the fragile contention that a claimed addition to proper committee objectives converts the hearings in unfair trials and amounts to an abuse of power.

How could the Congress obtain information upon which to base proper legislative acts to check the Communist conspiracy without holding hearings and "exposing" the witnesses to public condemnation if they resort to the fifth amendment? And is not

Footnotes at end of speech.

the resultant education of the public as well as all of Congress a desirable result?

Woodrow Wilson had something to say on this subject which bears repeating. He said that it was the duty of Congress to investigate because otherwise "the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served." He went on to say that unless Congress did investigate, "the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct * * *The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

Mr. Justice Black, while yet in the Senate in 1936, in defending his really rough "methods" had this to say: "This power of the probe is one of the most powerful weapons to restrain the activities of groups who can defy every other power." The late Senator George Norris summed it up when he said: "Whenever you take away from the legislative body in any country the power of investigation, you have taken a step that will eventually lead into absolute monarchy and destroy any government such as ours."

These outcries against congressional investigations of subversion bring to mind the old adage, "it all depends upon whose ox is being gored." When I hear "liberals" denouncing today's committee "methods and procedures" as all wrong and destructive of "civil rights" it has a most familiar sound—only this time the "liberals' have switched sides.

Today's "liberals" have forgotten, or never knew, of the Walsh and Wheeler investigations. There was an example of really rough-shod tactics. Every false accusation against today's committees would have been really merited in those days—when graft and corruption was the subject of inquiry instead of the criminal subversion of today. Then it was the "liberal" who rallied to the defense of the committees and their methods while roundly denouncing the "malefactors" invoking the fifth amendment and thus "impeding" the work of the committees.

It was Felix Frankfurter who in 1924 said that "the procedure of congressional investigation should remain as it is." It was he who said that "no limitations should be imposed by congressional legislation or standing rules. The power of investigation should be left untrammeled, and the methods and forms of each investigation should be left for determination of Congress and its committees as each situation arises." And it was he who said that any attempt to make congressional investigations conform to the rules of law and evidence applied in courts "would make effective investigations almost impossible."

The "liberal" mind has never been noted for consistency. Yesterday, the fifth amendment was denounced because it was employed by men whose actions met strong disapproval of those who called themselves intellectuals or liberals. Those liberals brought fourth no finespun theories then in defense of the civil rights of the witnesses under vigorous examination. The methods and procedure were all right then because the liberals of the day approved the objective of exposing and discrediting those they disliked.

An eminent and able New York lawyer, Mr. C. Dickerman Williams, authored an article which appeared in the Fordham Law Review some time ago in which he discussed the fifth amendment.[6] He put it extremely well when he said, "When businessmen and crooked politicians were under fire, comment on the fifth amendment in the law review and periodicals read by the intelligentsia was very hostile. Since the amendment has come to be invoked by intellectuals in the last few years, there has been a flood of highly sympathetic comment in the same publications. Would so many law professors of today be so highly indulgent toward those who invoke the amendment today if they did not resent, at least subconsciously, investigations of behavior which in their opinion was inspired of idealism."

The American Bar Association brief on communism commented on the "widespread ignorance and the confusion throughout the United States concerning the nature of communism and concerning the objectives and purposes of those people in this country and elsewhere who embrace and follow the Communist teachings. * * * The advancement of the Communist movement in America depends for success upon a general misunderstanding of communism and of Communist aims on the part of those outside the fold. If the real purposes, aims, tactics, and practices of communism were as clear to all Americans as they are, undoubtedly, to the Communists themselves, the popular revulsion of patriotic Americans against all who follow the conspiratorial cult and the Communist line would stop this subversive movement in its tracks."

President Eisenhower, in speaking of communism and freedom, said "these two ideas are as opposed as danger is to safety, as sickness is to health, as weakness to strength, as darkness to light. Great truths can, at times, be startlingly simple. This is one of that kind. It is so simple a truth that it seems almost obvious, almost stale. But let not our memories be too short. Only a few years have passed since many moved among us who argued cunningly against this plain truth. Their speech was persuasive, and their vocabulary clever. Remember? It went like this: 'After all, while we stand for political democracy, they stand for economic democracy. Fundamentally, these are but two slightly different roads to the same goal. We both believe in freedom.' We must all remember that sophisticated lie."

After some considerable discussion about the inroads made by this conspiracy, he made the significant observation that: "The Bill of Rights contains no grant or privilege for a group of people to join together to destroy the Bill of Rights. A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion against the Government."

The fifth amendment has now become the privileged sanctuary of those who would destroy us. Most critics conveniently overlook this obvious fact. One writer goes so far as to argue that the privilege may be claimed even though there is no fear of prosecution.[7] As in the article under discussion, he feels that a witness with knowledge about communism may invoke the amendment if he merely dreads the social consequences of an honest answer.

The Kauper article expresses the fear that "the general public may infer conclusions that are not warranted." If invoked because of fear of prosecution, no wrong inference is possible. If improperly invoked, it is perjury. In either case, the fifth-amendment witness has no justified complaint.

An eminent authority on evidence[8] has said that "a due respect for the privilege is perfectly consistent with a strict contempt for the guilty offender, and does not require or condone his protection. * * *" Witnesses are accorded the protection of the Constitution, but that should not mean complete immunity from questioning. Certainly not when the witness has knowledge which cannot incriminate. Nor does the existence of the amendment carry the implication that Congress should not interrogate anyone about subversion.

I subscribe to the statement of Chief Justice Marshall who said that the invocation of the fifth amendment by someone who had no fear of criminal prosecution was "in conscience and in law as much a perjury as if he had declared any other untruth upon his oath." And I subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals which, in an opinion dealing with a civil case arising out of the Teapot Dome prosecutions, said "Why is the plea of self-incrimination—one not resorted to by honest men—the refuge of (the witness)? * * * Men with honest motives and purposes do not remain silent when their honor is assailed." This is as true when before a committee as when in court.

Another illuminating discussion on this subject is to be found in the published remarks of President John Dickey, of Dartmouth. He said, "A man who exercises this privilege (under the fifth amendment) either genuinely believes his words may incriminate him, or he is using the privilege improperly."

"On the first assumption, he, by his own action, avows the existence of what can reasonably be regarded as disqualification for service in a position of respect and responsibility; on the other hand, if he has invoked the privilege without truly believing that he needed protection, he has acted falsely toward his Government."

Professor Kauper's argument leaves out of account President Eisenhower's point, and asks us to accept the thesis that adherence to the Communist cause is on a par with membership in the Democratic or Republican Parties. It speaks of "questions relating to political affiliations, such as membership in the Communist Party."

The real issue has been described as freedom versus slavery. For the first time in history, the world is confronted with a conspiracy which leaps national boundaries and has set up functioning fifth columns in almost every country. More than one thousand fronts are at work in this Nation alone. Shall we allow them to proceed to undermine our faith and our fredoms without interference?

It was in 1922 that Lenin gave us communism's blueprint for our destruction. He said, "First we wil take eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States. * * * We will not have to attack, it will fall like overripe fruit in our hands. We must secure the good will of teachers and professors in schools and universities, of liberal ministers of religion, and of the pacifists and reformers of the world in order to create a mental barrage in the minds of capitalistic youth which shall forever bar them from participating in a carnal conflict with the Communist order."

Congressional investigating committees are engaged in the thankless task of digging out the details of this plot. Should we allow this conspiracy to claim "civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion against the Government"? Should we put out the eyes and ears of Congress and the Nation so that the conspiracy may enjoy the luxury of surprising us? Should we allow the social consequences which follow committee efforts to get at the facts outweigh the Nation's safety?

The critics rarely cite specific cases of "abuse" of power. Let's look at the record. Here are three typical questions and answers from the official record[9] of one of the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Question. Witness, do you belong to any organization dedicated to the proposition that this Government should be overthrown through the use of force and violence?

"Answer. On advice of counsel, I decline to answer that queston on the previously stated ground.

"Question. Have you ever belonged to an organization of that kind?

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Answer. I decline to answer that question in that it is an invasion of my freedom of belief and association under the first amendment and on the basis of the fifth amendment (pp. 5347–5348).

"Question. During the period of time you worked in connection with projects of the Chemical Warfare Service, were you a member of the Communist Party?

"Answer. I decline to answer that on the grounds that the question is an invasion of the freedom of speech, belief, and association guaranteed by the first amendment of the United States" (p. 5333).

The witness invoked the privilege 49 times. He was followed by another faculty man who sought the shelter of the first amendment 54 times. Hundreds of similar examples can be supplied.

William Z. Foster, when asked by the committee, "In the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia, would your allegiance be to the United States or Soviet Russia?" called it a hypothetical question, but finally said, "If the United States entered the war on an imperialist basis, I would not support it." He was obeying the Communist directive to "utilize a political trial to help the revolutionary struggle."

This attitude has continued down to the present. Communist tactics have not changed. On March 1, 1956, two former high Government officials were before the committee.

The committee was seeklig information about Communist methods of infiltration into government. One admitted having distributed Communist germ warfare literature even as American boys were dying in Korea. When asked if his conscience had not bothered him, he answered "not in the slightest." He and the others hid behind the amendment when asked whether they had been Communists while in important government positions.

This is a typical performance. Yet such things furnish the basis for the critics' claim that the committee is invading the civil rights of witnesses. It is this so-called exposure and discrediting which forms the basis for the critics' attack upon committee methods. Generalized assumptions and conclusions are resorted to rather than specific cases for the very practical reason that citations of actual testimony would be fatal to their position.

In conclusion, since the fifth amendment is at the root of the controversy, a report by the American Bar Association committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives is decidedly in point. The report said "Communism is not a mere political belief—it is a continuing conspiracy against mankind and against free nations * * * Communism is the gravest menace to our Nation.

"We have considered it to be beyond questioning that any member of the bar in this country who avails himself of the fifth amendment of the Constitution to refuse to give testimony before a propertly constituted committee of the Congress, or before the courts, as to possible Communist affiliation or other subversive activities thereby automatically disqualifies himself from the practice of the profession in any State or Federal court." [10]

I subscribe to these views. If communism were no more than a political belief—if it were mere dissent or unorthodox thinking—instead of a criminal conspiracy, the situation would be entirely different. But this question is no longer debatable. The critics are highly illogical when they voice approval of committee actions so long as ordinary crimes are under investigation, but charge "abuse of power" where treason is involved. They do not appear to be aware of their inconsistency.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In the last analysis, therefore, it comes down to a question of how we shall best defend ourselves. We cannot have a "government of laws" if we do not hold hearings—so that intelligent legislation may be enacted. Hearings mean witnesses and witnesses mean questions. Facts about the conspiracy can only be obtained in this fashion from those who have knowledge. Accept the argument that questioning such persons will produce unwanted social consequences and therefore is an abuse of power, and we reach a dead end—we are stymied.

Having been on the firing line in this contest between despotism and freedom, I know at first hand something of the problems and the seriousness with which they are approached by the committee and the Congress. If we lose this fight for freedom, then indeed will we have a government of men and not of laws. When and if the Communist tyranny takes over, there will be no academic discussion—there can be no argument with a firing squad.

---

[1] May 1929 message to American Communist delegates to Comintern.

[2] *Dowd's* case (339 U. S. 382; 94 L. ed. 925, 956); *Schneiderman* v. *U. S.* (330 U. S. 118; 87 L. ed. 1796); *U. S.* v. *Dennis* (183 Fed 2d 201; 341 U. S. 494).

[3] Brief on communism by the American Bar Association, p. 32 (1952).

[4] Heresy, Yes; Conspiracy, No, p. 18; Sidney Hook (1953).

[5] Government of Laws—Not of Men, August 1954, by Prof. Paul G. Kauper.

[6] "Problems of the Fifth Amendment," Fordham Law Review, volume XXIV, No. 1 (Spring, 1955).

[7] The Fifth Amendment Today, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard (1955).

[8] 8 Wigmore, Evidence 2251 (3d ed. 1940).

[9] House Committee on Un-American Activities hearing, Lansing, Mich., May 10, 1954.

[10] Report of Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, August 16, 1954.

Theodore Roosevelt Centennial 1858-1958: A Call to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission has been established by the Congress to decide upon appropriate plans for the celebration of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial in 1958. It is our hope that through this centennial, we may recall for the American people those standards of personal and public conduct that Theodore Roosevelt established for himself and for our Nation, and to recapture his inspiration and guidance as "the greatest teacher of the essentials of popular self government the world has ever known." As a first step, the Commission has prepared a statement of purpose which I take great pleasure in stating herewith:

The Commission which has been charged by the Government of the United States to direct the observance in 1958 of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt recognizes that this is a time less to indulge happy recollections of an earlier age than to summon the resources of the past to help men face the challenge of the present.

For us in America that challenge is to live America's answer to the question dividing the world: whether man has the capacity, under God, to govern himself, and to use the liberty that is his to build a civilization that shall endure. Hear Theodore Roosevelt's prophetic words: "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent."

Seeing in this perspective the responsibility and the opportunity laid upon it, the Commission is convinced that Theodore Roosevelt may be fruitfully commemorated only as that commemoration is related to this basic summons of our time. Mr. Roosevelt's achievements as political leader, statesman, and Chief Executive were epoch making. The personality which charmed his contemporaries with its gaiety, warmth and vigor, and dazzled them by the diversity of his interests and his instinct for action, was the very stuff of which legends are made. But richer in meaning to us and to all men struggling to achieve or to maintain free institutions is the man who demonstrated in his own life this basic truth of free government: that surpassing public service requires no surpassing gifts of intellect, only ordinary abilities raised to extraordinary power by those personal qualities that constitute character, and by the fire in the heart to give and to serve.

Closer to us than the President who cut an interoceanic canal or the mediator of a war between rival empires, is the citizen who showed in action his responsibility toward his city, his State, and his Nation, and inspired in others a devotion akin to his own; the summoner of men and women to live for something greater than themselves; the prophet thundering through the land the moral laws underlying a free society.

It is upon this shaper and molder of the soul of a free people that the Commission proposes to focus the commemoration.

Hear, above the strains and stresses of our time, this authentic American voice: "We know there are dangers ahead, as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but, stout of heart, we see, across the dangers, the great future that lies beyond, and we rejoice as a giant refreshed, as a strong man, girt for the race. * * * The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. * * * There are in store for our people, and for the causes we uphold, grander triumphs than have ever yet been scored."

Thus, Theodore Roosevelt speaks to us all.

To kindle in the American heart today the kind of fire that burned in Theodore Roosevelt's—his passion for his country, his faith in her future, his longing that the quality of American citizenship might become an inspiration and a beacon to mankind—that is our purpose in asking you, our fellow Americans, and, indeed, freemen everywhere, to join in the centennial observance.

Saving the Capitol's Front Lawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I

desire to include an article written by Mr. Earl S. Williams, of Washington.

The article follows:

SAVING THE NATIONAL CAPITOL'S FRONT LAWN

(By Earl S. Williams)

If you are one of the thousands of tourists who will visit Washington, D. C., this summer, you will spend most of your sightseeing time in what is probably the best known, most visited, and most significant place in this country—the central Mall and adjacent parks. This area, which may rightly be called the National Capitol's front lawn, extends from the Capitol to the Potomac River and southward to include the Tidal Basin and Potomac Park. Few Americans need to be told of the governmental and cultural center along the Mall nor of the magnificent memorials and and monuments so well placed around the parks. They know of the spacious beauty of these parks and of their rare simplicity so becoming in democratic America.

Here is neither a formal garden or a tangle of underbrush, but a natural blend of well-kept fields, groves and landscaped waterfronts. Here is a place for the education, recreation and relaxation of as many American citizens as can come here. The value of this area is inestimatable.

But how accessible is it? During the cherry blossom season this spring policemen were given special assignments around the Tidal Basin to keep traffic moving. Long lines of cars full of would-be sightseers were urged on past the Jefferson Memorial and other points of interest. Meanwhile hundreds of cars belonging to Government employees stood all day on both sides of the roadways around the Tidal Basin and Potomac Park. They are there on weekdays throughout the year, and for a good reason. These workers have no other reasonably convenient way to get their jobs.

Yet even more crowding is to be expected. Pressure is mounting to use this and that part of the Capitol's front lawn to build additional facilities to handle the growing flood of automotive traffic. Many plans are being made and proposals offered for construction work which will, in the opinion of many, do at least some damage to the attractiveness of downtown Washington. For example, it is proposed that public parking garages be built under a large section of the Mall; that the spacious grounds around the Washington Monument give way to new driveways and parking areas; that Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River provide part of the footing for a new bridge that will block the view of the river, overshadow the Lincoln Memorial, and reduce the Lincoln Memorial Bridge to a secondary role; that Independence Avenue be made part of a 50-mile-an-hour inner loop to speed traffic around the downtown area; and that part of upper Potomac Park be used to build connections from a new Highway Bridge to the proposed Southwest Freeway.

There is unquestionable merit in most of these plans and some of them should and, indeed, must be adopted in view of the critical traffic situation. But will the fabulous $400 million worth of proposed new construction solve the traffic problem? Many experts say no. It will simply mean more people can and will drive to work, the downtown area will became most congested and more parking space will be demanded.

As the population of the metropolitan area continues its unprecedented growth it is obvious that a great many people will have to depend on public mass transportation. This fact is stated often in the local press and the planning sessions, but apparently few suggestions are made as to how, when, and where to start building the rapid transit system that will surely be needed. An extensive study of the transit need is now in progress, however, and it is predicted that a start at some kind of rapid transit operation will be recommended. Meanwhile, suggestions that a subway be built are rightly rejected as costing too much, and existing commuter facilities are not depended on because Union Station is not located so as to serve the downtown area effectively.

The investigators of the transit situation will probably find a great deal that could be done between these extremes. Most of the major suburban centers are reached by railroad and some have stations easily reached by local transit buses. Between the small towns there are large areas that could be obtained for parking lots near possible station sites.

In the downtown area a station could be built in the southwest section near several large Government agencies and in an area now being planned for intensive redevelopment. Short line bus service could provide efficient distribution of passengers across the Mall to the larger business and Government centers. Eventually a railway link under the Mall might become desirable or even essential, and then a convenient station could be located near the busy Federal Triangle area. The Pentagon Building is already reached by a rail spur. If a station were built here and a rail loop completed, another huge employment center could be provided with rapid commuter service.

There are, of course, many obstacles in the way of a well-integrated transit system. The jurisdictional problem is complicated by the fact that the railways extend into 2 States, 4 or more counties, and several small towns beyond the District line. But financing the necessary construction and equipment is the major problem. Rapid transit equipment is expensive, stands idle a large part of the day, and does not usually make money. The high initial cost might never be regained through revenue from the operations here. It appears to be a job that only the Federal Government could do.

The Federal Government now recognizes its responsibility to build the necessary highways and bridges for automotive traffic. What is needed now is an amended policy under which money could be provided for a rapid transit system for the same reasons that highway money is appropriated.

The operation of an effective rapid transit system in the Nation's Capital should greatly reduce the need for expensive freeways, parkways, traffic interchanges, and bridges. It should save time and money for the commuter and parking space for those who must drive. But above all, it should save our parks and make our priceless showplaces and institutions around the Capitol's front lawn more accessible to all Americans. And here, I believe, is justification for a national investment in Washington transit.

The New Sod: Ireland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Herbert D. A. Donovan, a distinguished scholar and historian whom it was my privilege to have as my history teacher when I attended Commercial High School in Brooklyn:

THE NEW SOD: IRELAND TODAY

The traditional loyalty of Irishmen to the land of their ancestors has made its name universally known as the Ould Sod. But Ireland, like the rest of the world, has changed and is changing radically in recent years, and, while the characteristics that memory and story have associated with its name are by no means gone, new developments have come on such a scale that the Green Isle is becoming a very different place from the land of whitewashed cottages and primitive living that most Americans picture it to be.

When the Irish Free State started, 30 years ago, on the course that eventually led to its present independence as the Republic of Ireland, it was faced with economic and social burdens inherited from generations of dependence and exploitation. Its forests were destroyed, its harbors neglected, large areas of its soil unproductive. Housing conditions were primitive in rural districts, and congested and unsanitary in the cities. Agriculture lacked organization and the application of modern science, electric power was undeveloped. Emigration absorbed the young manhood of the country to the extent that Ireland was the only civilized country whose population had declined steadily for 75 years. Manufacturing and banking were in the hands of English and Scottish capitalists, and industries offering profitable opportunities for Irishmen were almost nonexistent. The new government was faced with a heavy burden of debt and an unfavorable balance of trade from which to obtain revenue. Political conflicts had left such bitterness that cooperation in starting reforms was not easy to obtain. In view of these handicaps, the progress of Ireland in a single generation is one of the bright spots of our time.

The Republic of Eire is a little country, little more than half the size of New York State, and with a population about equal to that of the Borough of Brooklyn in New York City. The notable decrease in population has been stopped, but no significant increase has yet begun. Obviously, what has been accomplished here is not the result of natural growth or of the influx of foreign capital. Rather, it is due to the removal of unnatural burdens, the determination of the Irish people, and the intelligent direction of their leaders.

A foremost concern of the Irish Government has been the improvement of farming and of rural life. Ireland has always been predominantly a rural country, and expects to remain so. While a majority of its people live in the country, the tendency to move into the cities is alluring there as elsewhere. To counteract that tendency, careful plans are underway to aid the farmers in every way possible, and the results are gratifying.

In 1948 an economic cooperation agreement was signed with the United States, under which Ireland availed itself of aid under the Marshall plan. The counterpart fund thus established was to be used in Ireland for special projects to aid the Irish economy; the sum eventually amounted to nearly $18 million. By agreements approved this year, the projects helped include making ground limestone available to Irish farmers, to aid soil fertility; eradicating bovine tuberculosis; furnishing creameries with equipment for pasteurizing milk and sterilizing containers; aiding Irish agricultural societies; and, finally, about $5 million to set up an Irish Agricultural Institute—"which the Government plans to make as good as any in the world"—and $1,400,000 to establish an educational exchange program with the United States. Ambassador William Howard Taft, Jr., an outspoken lover of Ireland and things Irish, has enthusiastically supported all these projects.

Reclamation projects, too, are a prime concern in the new Ireland. Work was begun, last year, on the draining of some 52,000 acres in the counties of Galway, Mayo, and Roscommon, which will lead to the development of 22,000 acres of virgin bogland. The scheme provides for the deepening and widening of

about 125 miles of main rivers, besides the alteration or rebuilding of over 1,500 bridges, reconstruction of weirs, etc. The work will take about 10 years to complete, and is estimated to cost about $6 million, entirely defrayed from state funds.

The acreage of cereal crops in 1954 was 1,193,300 acres, as against 1,117,500 the year before. Wheat, in particular, showed a gain of 137,900 acres. The growing of sugar beets has had a remarkable development. In 1926 the first beet-sugar factory was built, at Carlow. Three additional factories have been built since, in other localities, with extensions in 1952. All belong to the Irish Sugar Co., which contracts with the growers, through their organization, for the season's price. Cooperative groups—of which there were in 1954 157, a gain of 35 in 1 year—are buying the most modern farm machines, to be used by the small farmers. The 4 factories can handle 1 million tons of beets, yearly, producing 140,000 tons of sugar. Last year, records were set in the amount of beets produced—808,625 tons—in average yield per acre and in sugar content. Beets are now the third largest money crop—surpassed only by wheat and potatoes—and seventh in acreage. The retail price of sugar, 7d., is estimated the lowest in any country, except Norway.

Probably no Irish product is better known in this country than bacon. Hence it is interesting to read that during the first quarter of 1955, the bacon factories received 297,895 pigs, compared to 277,348 and 219,855 in the 2 previous years. The figures furnished by the Irish Minister of Finance show, too, a remarkable gain in the export of cattle last year, rising to 216,000 cattle, valued at $35 million compared to 141,000 valued at $21 million the year before. Agricultural prosperity is reflected in the wages of farm workers, the index of which stood at 313.8 in July 1954, against 299.1 in 1953. This has halted, at least temporarily, the decrease in farm workers; and the industry is hoping that the changing trend may continue. During 1954, also, purchases of agricultural machinery from abroad increased 40 percent, including 5,377 tractors, against 4,360 the year before. In the fall of 1954 a meeting of 1,200 farmers from all parts of Ireland laid plans for a new national organization, to promote the efficiency of Irish agriculture. It is gratifying to know that each summer recently, boys from American 4–H Clubs and corresponding Irish clubs have traveled to each other's countries and observed each other's methods of work and ways of life.

Next to farming, the traditional occupation of the Irish has been fishing. Familiar to American audiences through the Man of Aran and other films, deep-sea fishing off the rough west coast, and salmon and other game fishing on inland lakes and streams plays a prominent role in Irish life, and has attracted to the country multitudes of visitors. Every effort is being made to improve and stabilize the fishing resources of Ireland. In 1952 a sea fisheries board was established by law, to take over the work of a cooperative association started in 1931, whose problems had been intensified by World War II, causing difficulties in procuring proper boats and tackle. The board has recently launched a new power trawler, better than heretofore in use. Last year, the Government made an appropriation for furnishing new boats to fishermen, who, if they are "competent, able, and willing to work hard," can obtain the new boats without prepayment or deposit. A survey of salmon and sea-trout fishing is being sponsored jointly by the Government and Guinness Brewers.

While it is not intended that Ireland will or should become industrialized to the degree that England is, it is realized that, for her own safety as well as to reduce the unfavorable balance of trade, the country's resources ought to be handled so as to make her people more self-dependent, and to increase her sales of manufactured goods, especially to the dollar area. Many avenues are being explored, with gratifying results. During recent months contacts have been made and markets opened in various countries for the sale of Irish goods. These include gypsum wallboard, to the U. S.; transformers, to India; cornflakes, to Portugal; lightweight tweeds, jams, and chocolates, to Canada, besides Waterford cutglass, the whole exhibit of which, at the Toronto Fair, was bought by one firm. A trade mission just returned from the British West Indies reports that a display held in Port of Spain, Trinidad, was opened by the Minister of Commerce, and awakened wide interest. Agents were appointed for more than 60 Irish firms. Irish products most in demand are meat and dairy products, stout, and prune wine. New contacts were arranged for confectionary sisal matting, Irish mist liqueur and Waterford cutglass.

In Ireland itself, factories recently established include a cotton mill in Sligo, a tannery in Kerry, and a factory for substitutes for sole leather in Cork. The Government has announced that an oil refinery is planned, three companies agreeing to join in its direction and operation. As a result of such activities, the industrial output of the country rose from $323 million in 1951 to $352 million in 1954. The number of factory workers—about 228,000—set a new high, and the index of their wages rose from 249.7 to 253.1. "Wholesale prices fluctuated little, and the index of retail prices was unchanged since August," stated the minister of finance, in introducing the budget in the Dail (Parliament), in May 1955.

As previously noted, Ireland is a debtor country, and hence makes every effort to reduce her trade deficit. Her success is shown by figures cited by the minister, viz, "Imports, last year, amounted to * * * almost $8,400,000 less than in 1953, while exports were $2,800,000 more * * *. We earned a slight surplus with the dollar area, which though it may be purely temporary, is a phenomenon without precedent in our records. * * * There is obviously much room for expansion of direct trade with the dollar area."

The promotion of industry and the expansion of trade involves the improving of means of transportation; and toward this end the Irish Government and people are devoting their best efforts. Ireland has numerous good harbors, including the magnificent harbor at Galway, the nearest European port to the United States. The chief ports at present are Dublin and Cobh, the harbor of Cork. The port of Dublin is being constantly remodeled, its deep-water berthage being now five times what it was as late as 1939. This improvement cost over $3 million and the work of deepening the bar, which took 2 years, was completed in 1951, at a cost of $1,400,000. Cork harbor is being provided with a new turning basin at the North Kuays, through a grant of $1,200,000 from the National Development Fund. To modernize the railway system, a new public loan was floated this year by the CIE (Gaelic for the Irish Transportation System), to provide money for 94 diesel engines, and the first of these have already been installed. It is intended to have all CIE rail services operated by diesels by June 1956.

Progress in air transportation is steady and encouraging. The airport of Dublin, from which the Aer Lingus Lines fly to Britain and all parts of Western Europe, and the great port of Shannon, the first eastern point of contact for Americans going to Europe, are a source of pride to the Irish, and statistics show that they are immensely successful. Aer Lingus carried 297,000 more passengers in the fiscal year 1954 than in the year before, and collected about $4¼ million in fares. Its freight increased 28 percent, its expenditures 4 percent, and its gross revenue 6 percent. It still operates at a loss—which is borne by the Irish Government—but the loss declined to only $175,000 last year. In May of this year, weekly services to Biarritz and to Barcelona were begun. Better known to Americans is the Shannon Airport, close to the historic city of Limerick. The number of landings at Shannon grew from 4,993 in 1951 to 8,208 in 1954; the number of passengers practically doubled, and the business transacted showed a healthy increase, including a good volume of typical Irish goods. The Esso organization has just installed there a hydrant refueling system, the largest and most modern in Europe. The Minister of Commerce says that the Government prides itself on the service furnished to passengers and on the technical assistance to aircraft; it is now studying the possibilities of developing the customs-free facilities of this port. An interesting example of the growing importance of Shannon was the beginning there, in January last, of transatlantic service by the German Lufthansa.

Ireland's recent progress is due in large part to the energetic development of her power resources, both from water and from the peat bogs, which exist in many parts of the country. While these bogs have always furnished a main source of fuel in the country districts, it was realized only recently that the peat is a valuable source of power. The Bord na Mona (Peat Development Board) has been entrusted by the Government with the task of milling peat into briquettes, which was first tried at the Bog of Allen in 1933. The work has been so successful that the whole future program of using peat in power stations is to be based on it. The Board proposes to use some sixty to seventy thousand acres of bog for developing electricity, thus changing the bogs from permanent distressed areas into a source of strength to the country, furnishing employment and helping the rural electrification program. This program, according to the Minister for Industry, speaking in the Dail in the spring of 1954, is "The most ambitious * * * development ever undertaken in this country." It began 8 years ago. The number of rural homes electrified each year is some 33,000, and it is hoped to complete the scheme in 6 more years. As of last year, it was announced that 36 percent of the rural population had access to electricity, and that in the completed areas 67 percent of the dwellings were connected. Most of it was used for domestic purposes, and a steady rise in demand for the larger appliances, such as cookers, water heaters, and washing machines, is shown. One of the four national power stations, that at Ferbane in Offaly, uses only milled peat for fuel. The peat is obtained from the bog of Boora, nearby, which not long ago was a treacherous swampy waste, but in which more than 3 million yards of drains and narrow-gage railways have been laid. When in full production the plant will have its own railway system, with about 35 miles of track, over 400 wagons and 400 tractors. Nearby a whole village of 104 houses has been built to house the married workers.

Housing is under the care of the Irish department of local government, and, thanks to its initiative, many of the picturesque but outmoded dwellings that used to draw unfavorable attention have disappeared. In their place we find new modern houses, of which about 42,000 had been completed between March 1947 and May 1955. Six thousand more were being built, 3,000 bid on, and over 10,000 sites were available. Even in remote parts, such as the island of Achill off the west coast, modern villages have been built up. The money spent on housing during 1952 was about $19 million—a substantial sum for so small a country. Aiding in the success is the fact that in 1954 Ireland

became self-sufficient in making its own cement.

Health and hospitalization have made spectacular advances in the country since independence came. Irish hospitals have received considerable publicity in America, on account of the Sweepstakes plan which partly supports them; hence, it will not be surprising to learn that the country is well equipped with hospitals of most modern construction and equipment. Under a new building program started after the late war, 11,000 beds in new or reconstructed hospitals are being installed, and in the 6 years, 1947–53, over $32 million was provided by the Government from the hospitals' trust fund for construction of hospitals; an example is the new Galway Regional Hospital of 486 beds, costing over $4 million.

Less talked about, but probably of greater permanent importance, is the striking gain in the control of diseases which formerly took great toll in Irish lives and efficiency. Due in part of the climate, in part to bad health habits, and not least to lack of care, the Irish people always suffered heavily from tuberculosis. Between 1947 and 1953, the death rate from this national scourge fell nearly 70 percent, the mortalities in this latter year being 1,900, or four-tenths per thousand. The numbers undergoing treatment have increased steadily, and many of the counties now have enough beds to take prompt care of all cases requiring institutional treatment. The total number of patients in institutions rose from 5,444 in 1950 to 6,870 in 1954. Tuberculin testing, BCG vaccination of the young, mass radiography, and blood banks are spreading.

Dental care, long neglected in Ireland, is stressed in the schools. Nearly 107,000 pupils received dental treatment in 1953, and pressure put on local authorities to increase their dental staffs led to the engagement of 24 new dental surgeons, which, of course, is only a beginning. Mental health service and reduction of infant mortality are other activities which are setting new records for the country. As concrete evidence of all this, the lowest death rate ever recorded in Ireland—11.8 per 1,000 population—was returned for 1953. The cost of the local authority health services was estimated at $31,496,400, one-half being paid by the Nation, the rest by local taxes.

Education, including the school system and all media of information, is progressing satisfactorily. School attendance in 1954 registered 476,000, an increase of 8,500; secondary schools 50,000, a gain of 2,000; there are about 20,000 in vocational schools. One of the early acts of the Irish Government was the appointment, in 1924, of a commission to inquire into and advise upon technical education for the country. Swiss and Swedish experts served on this commission, which issued its report in 1927. Legislation followed, resulting in two technical schools in Dublin, and the city of Cork also provides courses. University College and Trinity College, both in Dublin, conduct summer sessions, for which modest scholarships are offered to foreign students. Radio Eireann provides a comprehensive program of entertainment, sports, education, and news, which is heard over the whole country, and, in cooperation with the British Broadcasting Corp., is available in the other island. It is worthy of note that during 1954, 7,500 miles of additional trunkline telephone cable were laid in Ireland; and that the telephone traffic increased by 10 percent over the previous year.

Despite this strenuous domestic program, the Irish people and Government—no matter which party is in power—are showing on every possible occasion a healthy and vigorous interest in world affairs, to which they feel that they have much of value to contribute. While Eire has thus far been vetoed from the United Nations, and while she is prevented from joining NATO by the requirement of accepting the validity of the British occupation of her northern counties, she maintains the most friendly relations with all the free world. It is not forgotten that her great leader, Eamon de Valera, made his mark as President of the former League of Nations. Ireland is affiliated with many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, especially with the WHO. Within the past 2 years, many international bodies of scholars and businessmen have met in Dublin—among them the European Broadcasting Union, the World Medical Association, an international optical conference and the International Astronomical Union. Irish delegates go regularly to similar meetings in other countries, such as the TB Conference in London, the Iserlohn Festival and the recent bicentennial of Columbia University. Next to England and Scotland, both of which countries have large groups of Irish residents, Ireland's closest ties are, as they have been for over a century, with the United States. Thousands of Americans, mostly of Irish descent, visit Ireland each year; on 1 day—December 11 of last year—10,000 bags of Christmas mail arrived in Dublin from America. But the hospitable Irish people have a strong desire to have non-Irish Americans go to see for themselves the Ireland of today.

An English economist who was for years London editor of the Montreal Daily Star recently made a very keen observation on the present position of Ireland, comparing her opportunities with those of Canada of a few years ago. He pointed out that the process of change from an agricultural economy to a balanced one does not eliminate recessions and other problems. But, "every recession in Canada has been followed by a spurt into a new high level of prosperity;" yet, "Ireland today is paradise to the eye of the constructive economist who has seen the growing pains of Canada." He said that it is only lately that practical men have fully realized the great advantages that Canada, a young nation, enjoys, and that to many of them the discovery came too late. He warned that this should not be true of Ireland, "a land of tomorrow," offering to young men especially great advantages, which will benefit most those who first seize them. In view of such facts as are here presented, it seems obvious that Ireland is destined to enter upon an era of prosperity which will come as a just reward from the vision, energy, and resourcefulness that have made her in these past 30 years the "new sod."

Government Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Clark R. Mollenhoff before the Washington chapter of Sigma Delta Chi Fraternity on May 23, 1956, relating to the work of the House Government Information Subcommittee.

Mr. Mollenhoff is a distinguished correspondent for the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. He is a winner of many newspaper awards, the most recent being the coveted Raymond Clapper award. He has been following closely the work of the House Government Information Subcommittee, which is headed by Representative JOHN E. Moss, of California.

As a former newspaper editor, I, too, have followed the excellent work of Mr. Moss' subcommittee in exploring the very important question of the availability of information from Federal agencies.

Mr. Mollenhoff's speech follows:

The Moss subcommittee has performed a great service for the press. With a minimum of politics, the subcommittee has accomplished these things:

1. It has put Government agencies on record on their information policies, and has compiled a book containing the answers each agency has given to a questionnaire.

2. It has served as a place for the press to register complaints, and has given the authority of a congressional committee to the follow-up on those complaints.

3. It has heard witnesses from the press, the scientific fields, the legal field and from the agencies on the specific problem of Government information policies.

4. It has obtained some changes in information policies in such agencies as Treasury, the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Agriculture Department, and the General Services Administration.

There is enthusiasm for what the Moss subcommittee has done among many who have been active for years in the fight against Government secrecy. Among those who have felt the Moss subcommittee has made a substantial contribution are Red Newton, head of the SDX freedom of information committee; Russ Wiggins of the Washington Post; Jimmy Pope of the Louisville Courier Journal; Kenneth MacDonald, editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune; and Harold Cross, attorney for the A. S. N. E.

The enthusiasm these men express is not an endorsement of all of the committee's actions, it is merely an appreciation for an official body working toward the same basic end that they have worked for. These men have battled against Government secrecy for years. They know the frustrations of fighting to stay even in the fight against big government. They know the press needs all the help it can get if it is to make any real progress.

Some of these men while applauding the Moss subcommittee, have at the same time criticized it for not doing more about opening up more of the secret sessions of congressional groups. Measuring the Moss group against the ideal, we might find much to be desired. Measuring it against reasonable standards, I do not think it is overstating the case to say the Moss subcommittee has performed a great service for the press.

If the Moss subcommittee on public information never does another thing from this day forward, it will deserve our thanks. That thanks should be extended not only to Representative JOHN MOSS, the chairman, but to all of the members of the committee and to the staff members. Politics has been kept to a minimum, as it certainly should be when a committee goes into such an important problem as the rights of the public, the press and the Congress to information from our executive agencies.

Both Representative HOFFMAN and Representative DAWSON have been around Congress a long time. They have had personal experiences where executive agencies headed by Democrats or Republicans have sought to bar the Congress from access to information on Government operations. Both men have been infuriated by what they considered to be arbitrary action by the executive agencies that interferred with their rights to information. They have been aware of the way

the press has been frustrated in its quest for facts.

I think that an examination of the statements of Representative HOFFMAN and Representative DAWSON on the right of the public and press to access to Government information will find them both in essentially the same position. Although they are poles apart politically, both favor this general position:

The Government is meant to serve the people, and is not the property of those who happen to be in control of the executive agency at any given time. The people, the press and the people's representatives are entitled to the maximum of information on how laws are being administered and enforced, and what factors are influencing the administration and enforcement of those laws. The burden of proof should be on the executive agency to give good and sufficient cause in those cases where it is felt information should not be made available to the public, the press or the Congress.

Fortunately, the Moss subcommittee has been able to take up the problem of information policy outside of the framework of any of the philosophical disputes that tend to split Democrats and Republicans into opposite camps and cloud any basic problem of the public's right to know.

I am hopeful that the nonpolitical atmosphere will continue, and that the Moss subcommittee will do even more worthwhile work. However, this is an election year and anything can happen to a congressional probe in an election year.

I would be hopeful that all members of the subcommittee would continue to handle this subject on the theory that "The best politics is no politics." I would like to see the Democrats keep any criticism of the Eisenhower administration in perspective, and avoid any partisan overstatement. I would like to see the Republicans on the committee take the farsighted approach, and try to convince the administration to make the reasonable changes in information policy that Republican Congressmen would like to see set as a precedent for any future Democratic administrations to follow.

Out of it all, I would like to see the Sigma Delta Chi or the Moss subcommittee come up with a policy statement on public information that could be made a part of both the Democratic and Republican platforms in this election year.

Platforms may not mean anything, but I would like to see both major political parties stuck with a comprehensive information policy. I'd want it specific enough in its pronouncements, that it could be jammed down the throat of any public official who sought to hide his errors, his frauds or his policies behind some vague claim that his actions are "confidential."

I don't believe that this unqualified "confidential" claim can be properly asserted by anyone except the President in his relationship with his Cabinet and other members of his immediate staff.

Moving from what the Moss subcommittee might do to what it has done, I again assert that if the Moss group does another thing from this day forward, it will be deserving of a thanks from the press.

It is possible to name several agencies that have changed or modified their policies on information as a result of the Moss subcommittee action. In some cases, the agency had considered a change but the lethargy of big government slowed action to a walk or had even stopped it. In other cases, agency heads weren't just sure what their information policies were until they came under the scrunity of the Moss subcommittee. They had to be put on the spot.

Momentarily leaving aside the specific changes in individual agencies, I would like to discuss the one thing the Moss subcommittee has done that I know will have lasting value. The subcommittee sent a questionnaire to every Government agency requesting answers to basis queries on the agency's information policies. The answers given by the agencies have been put together in one printed volume that should be required reading for the Washington Press Corps.

If you don't care to search through it for stories on the information policies on the agencies with which you are familiar, it should be kept as a handy reference book when an information problem presents itself.

The accumulation of the statements of the agencies on their information policies was a starting point for the Moss subcommittee. It should be our starting point when a Government agency refuses us information that we feel we should have.

This volume does not solve your information problems, but it gives you something concrete. It gives you the agency's own position as related to the Moss subcommittee. It is something in black and white to use in comparing with the views of officials who seek to frustrate your requests for records.

Many of the things the Moss subcommittee has done, or will do, we could probably have done for ourselves if the press had been industrious enough and single-minded enough on one issue.

However, it took a congressional committee to put authority behind the questionnaire.

In answering the questionnaire, the executive agencies have been forced to go on record. If the answers they have given present a reasonable information policy, the press can use their own position against them if they seek to be arbitrary and change the position at some future time.

If the answers to the questionnaire show an unreasonable or public-be-damned information policy, the agency has made itself a fixed target for criticism until it changes those policies.

It is important that our targets be fixed. Most of you have had the experience of going to a governmental agency for information and having the request turned down on one ground. And if you have been successful in demolishing the law or logic put up at the first refusal, you have undoubtedly seen the agency shift to a new defense against giving up information that might be embarrassing.

This is what I call the shifting target approach of some public information folks that I think the Moss subcommittee has done a lot to nullify.

Another important function of the Moss subcommittee has been the accumulation of testimony from experts in the scientific field to give their views on the impact of Government secrecy on the exchange of information and scientific development.

Legal experts appeared before the Moss subcommittee in the last 2 weeks to discuss secrecy in the executive branch of the Government, the legal rights to keep certain things secret, and the court decisions and opinions of the Attorney General on this subject.

I was particularly impressed with the testimony of the legal experts, and I think that every reporter here would benefit from reading that testimony. In fact, I will go so far as to say I think every newsman in Washington owes a duty to himself and his publication to read that testimony.

I would suggest that you first read the April 27, 1956, report of the House Government Operations Committee entitled "The right of Congress to obtain information from the executive and from other agencies of the Federal Government." The report was prepared by Associate General Counsel William Pincus.

We must always face the fact that the right of the press to obtain information can never be any better than the rights of the Congress, and that our rights in this field are necessarily tied to theirs.

After reading that report, read the testimony of the lawyers who appeared before the Moss subcommittee. I would call special attention to the testimony of Prof. Bernard Schwartz, of New York University, and Harold Cross, attorney for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, who has specialized in the field of press access to information in Government agencies.

In my opinion, this report and the testimony of these lawyers completely demolishes the Justice Department's recent assertions that executive agencies can arbitrarily treat any intra-agency or interagency communication as confidential and outside of the range of congressional subpena or the inquiries of the press. The only explanations I have received from the Justice Department have been vague and unsatisfactory.

In fairness, I suggest that you then go to the Justice Department and seek an opinion—preferably written—with an explanation of the reasoning and law behind the doctrine that the public has no right to any more than the final decisions of executive agencies and cannot go behind those decisions.

There may be a few stories that would develop out of an examination of what the Moss subcommittee has been doing, but if you never write a word about the testimony or the report the study will be worth your while.

The least that can be expected of us is some little understanding of the laws and the court cases that effect our access to information. Here you will find much of it bound up in a handy package to read and to use. It is the kind of equipment that I don't think a Washington reporter can afford to pass by.

I have taken several secrecy problems to the Moss subcommittee, and have been pleased with the follow-through. The major problem involved the May 17, 1954, letter sent by President Eisenhower to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson during the Army-McCarthy hearings.

The letter was used to authorize Army Counsel John Adams to refuse to testify about conversations he had with Sherman Adams and Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers. Many of you are aware how this letter has since been used by other agencies as authority for broad secrecy doctrine. In essence, this doctrine is:

The press, public and Congress can be barred from access to any intraagency or interagency communiation the agency feels is confidential.

This broad secrecy doctrine has been used from Dixon-Yates to the Chotiner memo. It is my feeling that in each case, the administration would have been better off to take the brief embarrassment and open the records, rather than engage in a long fight that is certain to end with the records being brought into the open.

Senator John McClellan stated recently that Attorney General Herbert Brownell or Deputy Attorney General Rogers had sent a memo to Justice Department attorneys stating that they should deal "cautiously" with Mr. Murray Chotiner.

Rogers has declined to give me this memo, or to state the circumstances that caused the Justice Department to urge "caution" in dealing with Mr. Chotiner. This is confidential executive department business, Mr. Rogers says. He states that such a memo is protected from scrutiny by the press or Congress by the doctrine of separation of powers.

If the department were to apply the same principle to the communications involving T. LaMar Caudle, his superiors, and Matt Connelly, those matters—now the basis for

criminal charges—would also be "confidential."

I don't believe the communications between Connelly and Caudle should be regarded as secret executive agency business. I think there is as little logic behind the secrecy surrounding the Chotiner memo.

Within the last couple of weeks, the Government Operations subcommittee of the House made a report stating that Brownell was wrong on some of his assertions on executive secrecy as set out in the May 17, 1954, letter. That report states there is no legal support for Brownell's assertions on a broad executive secrecy.

The Moss subcommittee has brought out testimony from other agencies showing they did not share the views of the Justice Department on the arbitrary right to withhold any interagency or intraagency communications.

The compilation of reports from various agencies showed how many agencies were relying on the May 17, 1954, letter as justification for secrecy, and how many were not.

As this subcommittee is helping to bring this matter to a head, it can also help bring your problems into focus. I would suggest that you take your problems to Chief Counsel John Mitchell, Staff Director Sam Archibald or Senior Consultant Lacey Reynolds.

This subcommittee must rely upon the press to bring cases of unreasonable secrecy. We should avail ourselves of this opportunity to solve some of our problems and learn some of our rights.

The Small Farmer Is the Modern Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire that there be included copies of two letters which I have recently received from small, family-size farmers in my district.

These letters were unsolicited responses made to a letter which I wrote to small cotton farmers explaining the provisions for cotton acreage allotments which were included in the farm bill just enacted. They speak for themselves, very plainly and very tragically. These farmers want the answer to their problems, but I frankly cannot offer them any encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, when you receive letters like this it makes you wonder if we here in Washington are not living in an ivory tower of heartless indifference to the human problems and concerns.

With names and addresses omitted, these two letters follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am or was farming on a small scale, a one-man farm or family farm, but not any more. This sliding scale has already "slid" me and many others out. When the big acreage was cut the little acreage was cut, so I am out with several others and 1957 and 1958 will get the rest of the little fellows. So what are we going to do?

I am 59 years old, plenty able to work, but when I fill out an employment application and go in for an interview the first thing they do is look at my age and then say you are too old. If I was to ask for a pension, they would say you are too young. So, it's beyond me. I am too old and too young, so they say. So what?

I am an American, paid taxes all my life, raised two sons that went to the war. We could all have an equal opportunity in this land of yours and mine, but now I am out because I was a small farmer and out in the employment line because they say I'm too old. I have debts and responsibilities and, above all, I have to eat. But how?

Mr. BASS, I am waiting to hear from you on the solution.

DEAR SIR: I was sure proud to get this letter from you and to think that you have got feeling for the poor people. But for me it is too late to help me and my children in farming.

I had 40 acres of land and I had to sell some to live. I did not owe a penny on the land. It was all paid for. All we have now is truck patches. If something isn't done we are going to lose all that we have worked so hard for. This farm program has brought us down to truck patches. Give me the answer to this problem.

Indian Bureau Does It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial which appeared in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal on May 26, 1956. This article calls attention to the irresponsible attitude taken by the Indian Bureau in regard to the welfare of the Indians and its arrogant disregard of the regulations to which it is supposed to adhere:

INDIAN BUREAU DOES IT AGAIN

Officials of the North Dakota Public Welfare Board and the United States Indian Bureau were all set for a conference last week when, without any apparent reason, the Federal agency called it off.

Selene Gifford, Assistant Indian Affairs Commissioner, was to meet with the State welfare board, the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission and legislative representatives to clarify Indian policies.

Only the Indian Bureau can adequately explain why it suddenly got cold feet and refused to go on with the discussion. However, as has often happened in the past, the Bureau has no explanation for its actions.

Those of us who live near Indian reservations continually wonder at the justification for the actions of the Bureau. Nothing in that agency is done with a view to having either the Indians or the non-Indians understand its purpose.

There was poor public relations, both with the Indians and the adjoining communities, in the closing of the Fort Totten Hospital, which has now been replaced by a small clinic.

Fort Totten almost lost its school until the undercover efforts of the Bureau toward that end were brought to light.

Law and order came belatedly to the reservation, but only to end up with the Indian Bureau dictating who should serve as judge, rather than complying with reservation regulations, which provide for approval by the tribal executive committee.

Even the United States Indian Commissioner apparently has no explanation for the failure to keep faith with the people on the reservation. One of the first requisites in setting up instruments for law enforcement should be to abide by regulations. Unless the Government sets a good example, how can it expect the Indian people to have much respect for the law.

Authorities have enough trouble with law enforcement on our Indian reservations as it is without planting the seeds of disrespect for the law.

Has the Indian Bureau become so entwined in bureaucratic red tape that it has lost touch with the American citizenry? Does it have the right to flout regulations or to call off conferences without giving an explanation?

It would seem that the Indian Bureau stands as an example of what happens when an agency becomes too big and lacks a spirit of responsibility to the people it is supposed to serve.

For some reason, the Bureau has a different regulation for practically every Indian tribe. Actually no one knows what are its guiding principles.

Under the circumstances, perhaps it was too much to expect that it would be possible to get an official from the Bureau to sit down for a discussion. It could prove embarrasing.

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and honor to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant aim to serve my constituents in the very best way possible. As their Representative in Congress it has been my constant policy to keep in close contact with the people of the Third District so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

Our Third District is the largest congressional district in Ohio and one of the largest in the United States. Its great importance, however, is not dependent on size alone, but rather on the outstanding contributions of its fine citizens to the general welfare of our Nation. Not only is it the birthplace and cradle of aviation, but many of its other products and inventions are serving people throughout the world. Our people are highly skilled in many ways, and we have a district in which scientific projects, manufacturing, and agriculture are developed to an unusually high degree. As the Representative of this great district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Five years ago I initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences through-

out our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the United States post office building, in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington, attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these "grassroots conferences" throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton post office, room 314: September 10 and 11, 9 a. m., to 4 p. m.

Miamisburg City Building: September 13, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Germantown City Building: September 14, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Hamilton Court House: September 17 and 18, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Middletown American Legion, 116 South Main Street: September 19 and 20, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Oxford Municipal Building: September 21, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Fairfield, Butler County, City Building: September 22, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Brookville City Building: September 24, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Each year an increasing number of our folks have visited with me at these conferences, and the attendance has been most encouraging. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of national concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date an at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through those "grass roots conferences" will help me to render better service—both legislative and personal—to all of the people of our important Third District here in the Congress of the United States.

Telegram From Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, Concerning Federal Aid Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the immediate attention of the House conferees on the proposed Federal aid highway bill and the House as a whole a telegram received today from Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey. In this telegram the Governor vigorously supports the Fallon bill formula supported by the New Jersey congressional delegation.

The telegram follows:

TRENTON, N. J., *June 5, 1956.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nation felt that the proposed Federal aid highway bill was to have a logical and sane approach to the ultimate completion in 13 years of the National System of Interstate Highways, not only as a means of economic improvement of the States and the Nation but also as a most important facet to the defense of this Nation. The elements of the Fallon bill would have accomplished this with its basis of need and a provision to periodically review expenditures for purposes of balancing funds to meet the needs of the States. It is indicated that the formula method of the proposed Gore bill would find some 30 States receiving more funds than are required and 18 States and the District of Columbia receiving much less money than is necessary to complete the System within their jurisdiction. This is neither a statesmanlike nor a businesslike approach to a serious problem nor a forthright one. A review of the National Good Roads Association's analysis of the two bills reveals some startling facts.

For the most part the Midwest industrial States and the Pacific and Atlantic seaboard States, sources of materials and products and export areas in time of emergency, are, under the Gore plan, left without sufficient funds to complete the system of highways necessary to this Nation's well being. Under no condition will the roads of the Nation provide adequate service, if the roads of the States producing our war potential, and the roads of the States from which these products are distributed, are not completed and integrated with the remaining system. These very States, by reason of their development, are the ones which produce the highest traffic volumes in the Nation. New Jersey being 2d in population density, 6th in industry, 8th in motor vehicle registration and 45th in size has a traffic volume 7 times the national average, 5½ times that of Pennsylvania, and 2½ times that of New York with 200 million vehicles crossing its borders each year. It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand how Congress, representing all the people of this Nation, can approach this problem and solve it on any basis other than actual need and keep faith with the people they represent. The controversy arising from the difference in original figures submitted by New Jersey and Pennsylvania is one that has not been, on the surface, carried on by Pennsylvania for a very good reason. New Jersey when requested by the Bureau of Public Roads to submit its estimate of highway needs, undertook the assignment as a serious responsibility. Pennsylvania on the other hand apparently erred and submitted an estimate of needs which produced an average cost per mile of $577,000. We all know that a dual highway on interstate standards could not be constructed for this cost in their areas. Our State stands by its estimated needs and to demonstrate the cost of urban improvements on the interstate system a section of the Passaic Bergen expressway, relocated route 46, will average some $7 million per mile. Realizing the importance of your responsibility I earnestly hope you gentlemen will give due consideration to this factual presentation. Any influence you can exert with the Senate and House conferees will mean much to New Jersey.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor of New Jersey.

Proposed Changes In Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means today resumed consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. As I have done in the past, I will insert in the RECORD at this point a release which I issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the action taken by the committee today.

The committee will meet in executive session on Friday, June 8, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee's report, as set forth in the press release:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, 16, and 17, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for May 10, 15, 16, and 17, 1956, and appear on pages A3818, A3918, A3965, and A4020, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 8, 1956. A table of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report, beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

1 through 3. The committee deferred further action with respect to these para-

graphs until Friday, June 8, 1956, at 10 a. m.

4. Cigar manufacturers should be authorized by the Treasury Department to shift over to a daily return basis for reporting receipts. This should be optional with each manufacturer and should be effective July 1, 1956.

5. Refunds or credits for the tax attributable to losses of distilled spirits, beer and wine in a disaster, as declared by the President, should be made available directly to retail liquor and beer dealers as well as to manufacturers and wholesalers.

6. The phrase limiting refunds or credits in the case of alcoholic beverage or tobacco product losses attributable to a disaster, to the tax paid on products condemned by a "duly authorized health official of the United States or of a State" should be broadened to include health and police officials of cities and towns.

7. Refunds or credits in the case of the tax paid with respect to losses of alcoholic beverages or tobacco products in the floods and hurricanes on the east coast of the United States in 1955 should be made available in the same manner as is proposed for the future where a disaster is declared by the President. In addition, the committee adopted an amendment to allow refunds for beer lost, destroyed, or condemned as a result of the Mississippi and Missouri Valley floods of 1951, along the line of the refunds already allowed as a result of those floods in the case of distilled spirits.

8. The committee deleted the subcommittee recommendation which would have disapproved a proposal included in the ATTD revision which would extend to breweries operated by different corporations the right to transfer beer from the plant of one corporation to the plant of another corporation if the controlling interests in each of the corporations is owned by the same person or persons.

9. Under present law a drawback is provided under the distilled spirits tax with respect to $9.50 of the total tax of $10.50 in the case of spirits used in the manufacture of medicines, medicinal preparations, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts which are unfit for beverage purposes. The language of the drawback provision should be changed to provide a refund of all but $1 of the distilled spirits tax, so this provision will not need to be changed with each change in the distilled spirits tax.

10. Provision should be made for the tax-free withdrawal from bond of alcohol for any pathological laboratory exclusively engaged in making analyses, or tests, for hospitals or sanitariums.

11. The right of the Treasury Department to waive the application of any internal revenue provisions relating to distilled spirits (except the taxes) where the Secretary of the Treasury deems it desirable from the standpoint of national defense expires July 11, 1956. The committee acted to extend this authority for 3 years to July 10, 1959.

XII. ADMINISTRATIVE

Action by the committee with respect to recommendations 1 through 3 of the subcommittee was deferred pending receipt of a report from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the information covered by these recommendations. It is expected that this report will be available by June 15, 1956.

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The committee took no action at this time with respect to matters referred to in this section of the subcommittee report.

XIV. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES

The committee acted to reconsider its previous action with respect to recommendation 11 (f) under Section I, Manufacturers' Excises. This recommendation as previously approved by the committee would impose on tubeless tires a tax rate 1 cent a pound higher than tires requiring separate innertubes. The effect of the committee's action today is to delete this recommendation.

The committee adjourned to meet again in executive session at 10 a. m., June 8, 1956, at which time consideration will be given to recommendations 1 through 3 in section XI of the report pertaining to tobacco and alcoholic beverages taxes. Following the consideration of these recommendations, the committee will give consideration to those recommendations which had previously been passed over by the committee.

The Ambidextrous Dictator of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, in the past 6 years we have sent more than a billion dollars to Yugoslavia under the delusion that such assistance would make Marshal Tito a friend of the West. Today, with Marshal Tito in Moscow, warmly reaffirming his undying loyalty to communism, I trust we are not going to reenact our fantastic annual ritual by voting more funds to him and his compatriots in Yugoslavia. If Tito qualifies for our foreign aid, why not all the other Iron Curtain countries? And if Tito now qualifies, then what is the purpose of the foreign-aid program? I, for one, will vote to prevent any funds going to the Yugoslav dictator.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the June 4 edition of the Buffalo Evening News on this point:

WHITHER TITO?

The United States has spent a lot of money—$1,100 million in 6 years in military and economic aid—to try to keep Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia in the Western camp. Now this shrewd operator is in Moscow being given the red carpet treatment by the Kremlin gang. Khrushchev and Bulganin are competing for his allegiance with the same bait—money.

Soviet Russia and the satellites haven't yet matched our gifts to Tito but they have been lavish. From the Kremlin treasury and satellite nations the Yugoslav leader has piled up about $300 million in credits at the ridiculously low interest rate of 2 percent and is avid for more. He'll probably get it, or the promise of it, on his current visit to Moscow.

In addition to United States handouts, Tito is getting substantial economic aid from Britain and France and the World Health Organization of the United Nations is contributing to his economy-on-the-dole. While accepting everything he can get with both hands, Tito piously protests that he doesn't accept the thesis that the world is "divided between East and West." That division, he says, is an "unhappy thing." Well, it hasn't been unhappy for Yugoslavia. He has blackmailed both sides and can be expected to continue to do so.

There is no sign from Washington that the generous flow of money and aid from the United States to Tito is about to dry up or even be curbed. His name is down for a big slice of the current foreign-aid appropriation whatever it turns out to be. It should not be out of place to suggest that we keep a sharp eye on his actions and words while he is hobnobbing with the Moscow conspirators. Any sign that he proposes to crawl back into the Kremlin fold should mean a prompt shutdown of his American pipeline.

Foreign Aid Rebellion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of today has an editorial which is pertinent to the issues raised on the foreign aid bill which is about to be considered by the House. The editorial follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE FOREIGN AID REBELLION

The administration's $4.9 billion foreign aid bill comes up for debate and vote in the House beginning today. More than $1 billion has been sliced from the request by the House Foreign Affairs Committee because Congressmen are rebellious about some of the foreign aid programs.

In his book The Hoover Report Mr. Neil MacNeil tells a story that illustrates pretty well why the rebellion has come about. His story has to do with a postwar project in Italy investigated by the Hoover Commission. The United States Foreign Operations Administration had moved a group of Italians out of hillside caves into a modern-style American village. The village was a fine one, but the Hoover Commission investigator learned that there might be a final item of expense. That was for cement to plug the caves to prevent the people from moving back into them. The people had lived in the caves for almost 20 centuries and they liked them.

That, one may say, was a long time ago, and if it was a wasteful error it was committed by FOA and not by the International Cooperation Administration, which now conducts our foreign-aid economic programs. Also, one may say, some waste and some foolishness was bound to occur in America's haste after the war to give aid and comfort to distressed people. Surely, as time went on, the lessons would be learned.

Have they, though? ICA took up where FOA left off, and the 1953 road project in Iran followed much the same foolish, if comfortable, pattern as the village in Italy. ICA spent $1.2 million on a road leading to a dam that never was. ICA defended the expenditure on the ground that Iran's economy was failing, and the road supplied an urgent need in money and employment, even if there wasn't any dam at the road's end.

But is it a fair criticism to make a lot over such mistakes as the Italian housing project and the Iranian road program? Surely some mistakes may be forgiven and some waste forgotten as America works with quiet dedication to save countries' economies and raising living standards. Surely these are isolated instances of unsound planning.

Egypt provides another clue. Just the other day the General Accounting Office sent to Congress a 72-page report on aid to Egypt. Although the GAO said ICA showed improvement during the past 2 years, it also said that foreign aid was plagued by unrealistic planning, by conflicting policy decisions, by inordinate delays by United States officials, and by Egyptian reluctance to cooperate.

There was the survey of Egypt's industrial potential, financed by ICA in 1953 at a cost of $535,000. Nothing has been done about the survey except that Egypt had filed it away.

There were the 3 projects planned in 1954 for research and investigation in mining, at a cost of $175,000. The projects are at a standstill because neither ICA nor Egypt has the technicians to do the research.

And there was the 1954 case of the 12 bulls and the 30 rams sent to Egypt at a cost of $19,000 to improve the breeds there. When the bulls arrived they were underweight and some were ill, and so all were useless for breeding. After the rams arrived they developed a disease unknown in Egypt, and so all were destroyed.

These expenditures are, it is true, but a small part of the total of $55.8 billion spent in foreign aid since 1945, but they are indicative of the foolish ways in which we have spent our money. And they are indicative also of the sort of activities which Congress and the taxpayers want no more of.

There is one way to make sure that there is no more of this. That way is for the Congress to put an end to our quaint American way of trying to make over an unready world, and to limit foreign aid to activities essential to the West's security.

A survey that gathers official dust in Egypt, a road that leads in Iran to a dam that isn't there, a village in Italy the people don't want to live in—such endeavors contribute nothing but danger to that security.

Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, Secretary of Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to insert an editorial that appeared recently in the Alliance (Nebr.) Times-Herald.

Fred Seaton is well known to Members of Congress and a large segiment of the American public. Born in Washington, D. C., and reared in Kansas, he has lived his adult life in Nebraska. Mr. Seaton has distinguished himself in many fields of public service. He is the owner of a number of newspapers in the Middle West. He also owns three radio stations and 1 television station with headquarters in Hastings, Nebr. He served as a member of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature for two terms in 1945 and 1947, where he was well known and respected for the thorough and conscientious service he gave to the people of his legislative district and Nebraska.

Following the death of the late Kenneth S. Wherry, Fred Seaton was appointed to fill the vacancy created thereby in the United States Senate. It was during his term as a United States Senator that he first became acquainted with then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. After the 1952 election, President Eisenhower called on Mr. Seaton to serve as the Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of legislative matters. From there he was brought to the personal staff of the President as his special assistant. In all his career of public service, he has conducted himself honorably and devotedly. I am sure he will continue to do so in this very important Cabinet post.

In becoming Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton joins the ranks of two other Nebraskans who, in the history of our great State, have had the honor and privilege of serving on the Cabinet of the President of the United States. I should like to join with many other Americans who say that the President's choice of Fred A. Seaton as Secretary of the Interior was a wise one.

The editorial from the Alliance (Nebr.) Times-Herald follows:

SEATON CHOICE FORTUNATE ONE AS INTERIOR SECRETARY

The popularity of President Eisenhower's choice of Fred A. Seaton as the new Secretary of the Interior is understandable to his fellow Nebraskans. It is doubly so as to the publisher of the Daily Times-Herald, who has known Secretary Seaton for more than 25 years—first as a young newspaper contemporary in Kansas, later as a boss for 2 years on the Hastings Tribune, and for the past 7 years as a business partner in the Daily Times-Herald.

Fred Seaton has done an outstanding job at every task he has tackled and his success, we believe, can be traced to a thorough grounding in the fundamentals of journalism, politics, and life, in general. Fred was born in Washington while his father, the late Fay N. Seaton, was serving as an assistant to a Kansas Senator. Later, when the elder Seaton bought the Manhattan Kans., Mercury, his life meant that Fred and his younger brother, Dick, were to be brought up in the newspaper business. And their father was a great teacher, whether the subject was journalism, politics, or citizenship. The Seaton boys weren't given the boss' son treatment that we saw on many another Kansas newspaper. They dug in and learned the business from the ink fountains up. Fred Seaton can operate a linotype machine today and can find out what's wrong with a balky press. We suspect Dick can, too.

Before he left Kansas to take charge of the Hastings paper in 1939, Fred Seaton had tried his hand in politics as a Young Republican leader and a campaign staff member for Alf Landon in 1936. At Hastings, he served two terms in the Unicameral to fit himself for an appointment to the United States Senate upon the death of the late Ken Wherry. The legislative work—plus a keen business sense developed in enlarging the family holdings to include eight daily papers, a farm magazine, 3 radio stations, and a television outlet—add up to a lot of valuable experience in the person of the new Interior Secretary. He knows Nebraska's public power system inside out.

We have watched Fred Seaton operate from a ringside seat and can understand, possibly better than the Washington press corps, why President Eisenhower chose him for this highly important post.

Fred Seaton can best be described in one word as "quick." Whether the problem is political or on the newspaper, his mind is analytical. He is a keen student of a situation and is uncanny in coming up with an early answer. Once arrived at, Seaton stays put. And he can afford to because he has quite a batting average for coming up right.

We happen to know that President Eisenhower recognizes these traits in Fred Seaton. We know, too, that Seaton wouldn't be the trouble-shooter he has been for anyone else but President Ike. He has more pleasant ways to make a living but is dedicated, like so many others in the administration, to giving the American people the program they deserve and so sorely need in these troublesome times. He'll give the Interior post the same devotion he gave the Unicameral, the Senate, and his previous assignments in the Pentagon and White House.

Here are some editorial reactions which add to our testimony that the appointment is a fortunate one for the people of America:

"[From the Rocky Mountain News]

"MR. SECRETARY SEATON

"In a political year, the Interior Department of our Government is a hot spot.

"For one thing, regardless of which party is in office, it is a whipping boy for one side or the other in the perennial dispute over the Government's role in supplying power and controlling our natural resources.

"President Eisenhower now has appointed Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to head this Department. Even Senator WAYNE MORSE, the incesstant rebuker of the Eisenhower administration, says this is a good appointment.

"Seaton is a publisher, farmer, ex-Senator, knowing politician, troubleshooter, and long-range planner. He thinks first and shoots later. He has a smart sense of proportion.

"He looks like a man who could keep his Department on the beam, the pressure groups in their place and his foot out of his mouth."

"[From the Lincoln Star]

"SEATON IS NAMED

"The weeks of speculation on who shall succeed to the post of Secretary of the Interior, made vacant by the resignation of Douglas McKay, are over.

"The new Secretary is Nebraska's Fred Seaton.

"Hastings publisher, presidential aid, schooled both in administration policy and in the realities of his new responsibilities Seaton is an admirable choice for the Cabinet post. Nebraska has cause for gratifying pleasure for the Nation is well served.

"Seaton has made his mark as a publisher, a businessman, and a forward-looking Republican. His citizenship is recommendation enough. But perhaps even more important are his special qualifications for an understanding administration of the vitally important functions of his Department—the wise, prudent, and construction cherishing and development of the Nation's resources. No one in Washington is better prepared to define the importance of reclamation, of conservation and development of the resources as the man from Adams County who has watched, lived with, and participated in this State's conspicuous advance in flood control, irrigation, and public power.

"The climate in Washington has been cool toward the historic responsibilities of Interior thus far in the Eisenhower administration. It is to be expected that Seaton with his grasp of realities and his dedication to national welfare will change that. It is to be expected that the great cause will move forward again unvexed by diversions and distractions.

"For that Nebraskans and all conservationists have cause for rejoicing."

Atomic Power Supremacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Atomic Power Supremacy," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of June 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Addressing the graduating class at Memphis State College on Friday, Senator ALBERT GORE, Tennessee Democrat, emphasized the fact that an international struggle for supremacy in atomic power is in progress. If the United States is to win, Senator GORE declared, the victory will be gained through coordination of the vast powers of the Federal Government with the might of private industry.

In analyzing the role private interests may be expected to play in building reactors for industrial uses, Senator GORE estimated they would spend around $300 million in 5 years, and we agree with him that this can hardly be regarded as an "adequate sum." It seems to us obvious, too, that development of atomic power at satisfactory speed will require the assistance of the Government.

Senator GORE designated the United States as in an also-ran position at present in the race for the development of atomic power. He put both Great Britain and the Soviet Union ahead of us. Britain already has an atomic powerplant in operation at Calder Hall and it is expected to provide electricity to the national grid.

According to the Senator's estimates, the Soviet program calls for the building of plants that will provide between 2,400,000 and 2,500,000 kilowatts of capacity between 1956 and 1960. The American program foresees 689,000 kilowatts of power generated by atomic energy by 1960. The lag is not one we can safely tolerate.

It is natural and dangerous for us that there should be less sense of urgency here than in Great Britain and the Soviet Union as to the need for developing facilities for creating power from atomic reactors. Both these nations are much less bountifully endowed with waterpower, coal, and oil than the United States. Our sources of energy are cheap as well as plentiful and prudent use of them will forestall any serious power shortage.

At the same time, however, we cannot afford to fall behind in the pursuit of means whereby the atom can be usefully employed. Senator GORE has no idea whatever of excluding private enterprise from the program, but he does desire to expand its part in the program. The meat of the matter is that satisfactorily rapid expansion demands cooperation between Government and private agencies.

In the successful prosecution of a program such as Senator GORE has in mind and which the best interests of this Nation and the free world demand, only the Government can command the resources and eliminate the obstacles. Apparently intensified effort is needed to get us abreast of the parade of progress.

Need for North-South Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Highway Bill Will Accomplish Much, But North-South Route Is Big Need," published in the Charleston (S. C.) Gazette of June 1, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate passage this week of the interstate highway bill meant that a bright new era in road construction is about to dawn. Only minor differences have to be smoothed out between House and Senate versions of the legislation before it goes to President Eisenhower for his signature.

West Virginia will get approximately $275 million for interstate construction as the measure now stands, most of it for use on U. S. 60 between Huntington and White Sulphur Springs. The remainder will be spent on short stretches of U. S. 40 in the Northern Panhandle and U. S. 11 in the Eastern Panhandle.

Citizens of this State are pleased, for the most part, that this generous slice of the Federal highway grant will be made available for their highway system. But they're disappointed, as Senator LAIRD pointed out in Congress Tuesday, that they have no North-South interstate allotment similar to that for U. S. 60.

"It is interesting to note," the Senator said, "that North-South routes are provided on the interstate system East and West of the Appalachian Mountains. However, there remains a wide corridor through these mountains that is currently void of any interstate North-South route."

Senator LAIRD asserted that failure to designate such a route on the 40,000-mile interstate system will force heavy Great Lakes traffic created by big developments in the area to "by-pass this natural southeast movement which leads direct to the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida."

He called for an early congressional study of the interstate program to locate shortcomings similar to the one he outlined. By interference, he said, weaknesses might be uncovered that could seriously impair traffic movement in time of national emergency.

We wholeheartedly support Senator LAIRD in his study proposal, for we have advocated for sometime that a link from Cleveland to near Columbia, S. C., be built as part of the interstate. It would be strategic from an industrial as well as a national defense standpoint.

Some groups interested in better highways are rather cool to the idea because they believe traffic is insufficient to warrant spending Federal funds on it. They fail to take into account the fact that the interstate mileage was doled out 10 years ago and that since then industrial development has been tremendous in Ohio, West Virginia, North and South Carolina.

A route such as we have in mind would become increasingly popular after Cleveland becomes a major port on the St. Lawrence seaway * * * after billions now being spent transforms the Ohio Valley into an industrial empire without peer * * * and after construction blueprinted or planned makes the Kanawha Valley not the biggest chemical center in the Western Hemisphere but in the entire world.

No single section in the United States has enjoyed a decade of phenomenal industrial growth like that of the region through which an interstate would run southward from Cleveland to the Carolinas. Traffic surveys previously made, or any that could be made today, would be obsolete a year from now as a result of factory construction currently under way in the area.

This American Ruhr is the fountainhead for much of the Nation's coal, steel, chemicals, timber, textiles and foodstuffs * * * and in another 3 years it will gush forth a generous portion of the Nation's aluminum production. An expressway cutting through its heartland is an economic and national defense must.

Senator LAIRD in his Tuesday statement officially notified Congress of this great need. We only hope that he and other West Virginians interested in the project will press it forward by generating support in Ohio, Virginia, North and South Carolina.

Our junior Senator's voice was but one in a wilderness when he addressed Congress on the subject. But the voices of all Congressmen from five States would compound into a cry that could thunder through the halls of Congress if given the backing of an informed and interested electorate back home.

Home of Congressman Madden, a City Without Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Defender saluting the city of Gary on its 50th birthday. Gary is the home of our able and popular colleague from Indiana, Mr. MADDEN, who has been a powerful influence in creating the municipal climate and spirit of brotherhood that today stamp Gary, in the words of the editor of this great Negro daily newspaper, as a city where "no public facility practices discrimination" and "minorities without regard for color, religion or national origins are integrated in industry, in public office and in education." The editorial follows:

A SALUTE TO GARY

A generation ago, Carl Sandburg sang of Chicago, the city of the broad shoulders, bustling, hog butcher of the world.

Today, some native son of Indiana might sing thus of Gary, the city of the iron sinews, bustling, vibrant, steelmaker for the world.

The city of Gary, 50 years old, largest raw steel producer in the world, already the second city of the State, celebrates its Golden Jubilee beginning Saturday. And with it unfolds one of the most remarkable stories of progress and industrial growth in American history.

Gary was literally hewn out of the sand hills and tangled scrub growth of the Calumet, to become a great city. Great dunes were leveled, a river was turned about in its course, railroads were shifted, and the wild country growths were pushed back to establish the site of the new United States Steel Corp. works.

Then came the people, the driven thousands from Europe, from the Americas, from the Southland, with renewed hopes and vigor to work and build. The monument to their hopes and their building is the huge industrial giant sprawling at the foot of Lake Michigan, dominating all north Indiana, feeding shops, factories, and whole industries with steel, the backbone of American enterprise.

Today, there are 150,000 people in Gary, 56,000 of them Negro. The city is facing up to the problems of urban growth—and urban redevelopment honestly. In its mushroom growth, there developed slums, and blight producing conditions. These are being dealt with through private and public housing, and the city has recently qualified for Federal aid to urban renewal.

In the absence of established institutions and planning agencies, group misunderstandings and racial tensions developed.

The turning point was reached some 10 years ago, with the full integration of public schools. Today, no public facility in Gary practices discrimination. Minorities, without regard for color, religion or national origin, are integrated in industry, in public office, and in education.

Gary can look forward to a future of accelerated industrial growth under the impact of the Cal-Sag development and increasing need for steel. It can look forward to increased population attracted by high wages and improved living conditions. And it can count on the full use of the abilities of all its citizens in its future progress because of the spirit of dynamic democracy that is its outstanding feature.

The Defender salutes Gary on its 50th birthday.

Let's Support Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, in accordance with the consent granted by the House, to include as part of my remarks a short address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, imperial assistant rabban, AAONMS, at the Aad Temple breakfast, Kitchi Gammi Club, Duluth, Minn., March 29, 1956.

The standing of Mr. Stringfellow is well known as one of the most patriotic and progressive citizens of the State of New Jersey. His speeches of a patriotic character have had wide publicity throughout our Nation.

The address of Mr. Stringfellow, to which I have already alluded, reads as follows:

LET'S SUPPORT OUR WAY OF LIFE

Illustrious Sir Clesson H. Wiles, potentate of Aad Temple, members of your gracious divan, heads of units, past potentates, and fellow Shriners. I am grateful to you for having me as your guest for breakfast and for extending to me the privileges of your palatial club.

This is my second visit to your fair city and I appreciate mightily your reception. Six years ago, accompanied by my good friend Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, chairman of the board of Eastern Air Lines, Inc., I witnessed a most interesting ceremonial staged by Aad Temple, which is one of the oldest and one of the most respected Shrine Temples in North America. The class of that ceremonial was named in honor of Captain Rickenbacker, who led the parade and gave an inspiring address at the ceremonial. Captain Rickenbacker, in my opinion, is one of God's nobelmen. I know of no one who has a better understanding of America or who has a better conception of what makes our way of life tick than Noble Rickenbacker, and I know of no one more loyal to our way of life or who is a greater patriot than Captain Eddie, as he is called by his friends, who are legion.

While I am on the subject of patriotism and loyalty, I know of no group of men in America who, because of their heritage, have a greater responsibility to keep America American than we Masons and Shriners, for, as you know, our way of life was to a large extent conceived and implemented by Masons.

Within the last few years our way of life and our form of government have been subjected to severe and I think unwarranted criticism. This criticism comes largely from two sources. They are (1) the fuzzy-minded, egg-headed, self-styled liberals, who are in many instances totalitarians, and (2) the Communists.

The negative and unfair criticism has raised the blood pressure of loyal Americans, as it should.

In answering some of this criticism of our Government and our way of life, we might point to a few of our many assets. For example:

1. Our standard of living is the highest in the world.
2. Nowhere else in the world do men enjoy the liberty that we have in our country.
3. Our span of life is rapidly increasing.
4. Our mechancial genius has taken much of the burden from the backs of men.
5. We have 6 percent of the world's population and about 50 percent of the youth in institutions of higher learning.
6. We have more libraries and more serious printed words than the other 94 percent of the people of the world.
7. We have more hospitals and charitable institutions than the rest of the world combined.

We might also mention that we fought in two World Wars and we asked for (1) no indemnity, (2) no acquisition of territory, (3) no dominion over other nations.

We have given billions of dollars to save millions of persons in foreign countries from famine. We have given billions of dollars to foreign governments to prevent their collapse.

We might remind our critics that we in America have made more progress in the the last 170 years under our form of government than any other people have made under any other form of government in the past 6,000 years. Let us therefore support our way of life with enthusiasm and let us hold tenaciously to the basic principles that made ours a great country. In so doing we can help to preserve our liberties and thus be worthy of our great heritage.

The Challenge to the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there have been many speeches made on the floor in recent months against the Supreme Court. Charges have been hurled of its unconstitutional usurpation of power. For the most part, the attacks had their roots in the decision of the Supreme Court which in effect required desegregation in public schools, decisions in which I wholeheartedly agree.

The clearest answer and refutation of the charges made appeared in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 24, 1956, by Mr. James L. Morrisson, of Washington. I am pleased to attach it to my remarks so that Members of Congress may have the benefit of Mr. Morrisson's scholarly and reasonable argument:

THE CHALLENGE TO THE COURT

The recent "Declaration of Constitutional Principles," joined in by more than 100 Members of Congress, appears to challenge not merely the correctness of the Supreme Court's decision on school segregation—as to which lawyers can and do differ—but its constitutional authority to render the decision—which ought to be beyond dispute. The declaration characterizes the Court's decision as not merely erroneous but an act of "naked power" without "legal basis."

In part this challenge appears to rest on an assertion that the Constitution and the 14th amendment do not "mention education," from which it is apparently sought to be implied that the subject of education is not a proper subject of Federal constitutional concern.

The suggestions ignores the fact that the Court did not assume any power over education as such; it merely declared that in the conduct or suport of education, as in anything else it does, a State must act in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Constitution, including the express requirement that no State may deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. It thus applied the settled principle that on those matters on which it does speak, the Federal Constitution, as the "supreme law of the land," overrides any State action inconsistent with its provisions.

This principle, applied as early as 1796 in *Ware* v. *Hylton*, received its definitive formulation in 1819. In *McCullough* v. *Maryland*, Chief Justice Marshall declared that "if any one proposition cculd command the universal assent of mankind we might expect it would be this—that the Government of the Union, although limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action. * * * The Nation, on those subjects on which it can act, must necessarily bind its component parts."

Any suggestion that the subject of education has a special immunity from the operation of the proposition thus stated by Chief Justice Marshall finds no support in principle or in constitutional history. The power of the Supreme Court to protect constitutional rights where education is involved was exercised as early as 1819 in the "Dartmouth College case," in striking down a State act amending a college charter to provide for additional State-appointed trustees.

It has since been exercised, for example, to prevent appropriation of funds of a land grant institution (*Vincennes University* v. *Indiana*, 1853); to render invalid a State constitutional provision requiring a test oath of any teacher in any educational institution (*Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 1867); to invalidate a prohibition against teaching modern languages (*Bartles* v. *Iowa*, *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 1922); to protect the property rights of parochial schools against compulsory public school attendance laws (*Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 1925); to protect the religious liberty of students who were members of a sect conscientiously opposed to flag salutes (*West Virginia* v. *Barnette*, 1943); and to prohibit use of tax supported property for religious instruction (*McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 1947, *Zorach* v. *Clawson*, 1952).

On like grounds the Court has entertained and rejected on the merits attacks on State laws reducing teachers' salaries (*Head* v. *University of Missouri*, 1874; *Dodge* v. *Board of Education of Chicago*, 1937); an order prescribing instructions in military science (*Hamilton* v. *University of California*, 1934); and legislation aimed at excluding from employment as teachers persons deemed subversive (*Garner* v. *Los Angeles Board of Education*, 1951; *Adler* v. *Board of Education of New York*, 1952).

Indeed, the very cases on which the Declaration relies, *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (1896) and those which followed it, all rest on an assumption of the power of the Supreme Court to determine the scope of the constitutional right to equal protection as it relates to State action in various fields, including education. The signers of the Declaration would, it may be assumed, not contend that a State could constitutionally afford public education only to whites—or only to persons with red

hair—nor would they contend that a State could openly discriminate between two races in the quality of education afforded. Yet these admitted restrictions on State power derive from the authority of the Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional State laws relating to education which in its judgment violate the Federal Constitution.

A second argument implicit in the declaration is that the Court lacked power to overrule settled precedents. It is said that in doing so the Justices "substituted their personal political and social ideas" for the established law of the land. Quite apart from the question of how "settled" the prior Supreme Court precedents were—as to which there is room for debate—the proposition that the Court lacked power to reconsider them must be rejected.

The Supreme Court has never felt itself estopped from correcting constitutional interpretations, however long established, which upon reexamination appeared erroneous. As Mr. Justice Field stated in *Barden* v. *Northern Pacific Railway Co.* (1894): "It is more important that the Court should be right upon later and more elaborate consideration of the cases than consistent with previous declarations. Those doctrines only will eventually stand which bear the strictest examination and the test of experience."

The same view was expressed nearly 50 years earlier by Chief Justice Taney, who said, The Passenger Cases (1849) that he was "quite willing that it be regarded hereafter as the law of this Court, that its opinion upon the construction of the Constitution is always open to discussion when it is supposed to have been founded in error, and that its judicial authority should hereafter depend altogether on the force of the reasoning by which it is supported."

In footnotes in *Burnet* v. *Coronado Oil & Gas Co.* (1932) and *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944), there are assembled over 40 cases of direct overruling of prior decisions, not to mention innumerable other instances in which prior doctrines have been substantially modified. Indeed, only through the Court's responsiveness to changed conditions and deeper understandings—such as the conditions and understandings referred to in the school segregation decision—can the Constitution remain a living document.

It therefore appears that the Court's authority to determine the scope of the constitutional guaranty of the equal protection of the law and to declare invalid any State action which infringes that guaranty is not seriously open to question. The declaration reduces itself to a disagreement with the correctness of a decision which the Court had authority to render, and which it rendered after the fullest opportunity to all interested parties to be heard. Such a disagreement, however deep and sincere, affords no warrant for disregard or disobedience of the decision.

JAMES L. MORRISSON.

WASHINGTON.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and shocked by the untimely passing of our colleague and my dear friend BILL GRANAHAN.

BILL and I were both elected to the 79th Congress in 1944, and we became close, personal friends. He was a fine gentleman and a true friend. His death is a personal loss, and I shall miss him very much.

BILL was a man of integrity and ability. He served his constituents conscientiously, and I know his unselfish and devoted service to them will be greatly missed. Our State of Pennsylvania, as well as the Nation, has lost a very able, capable and outstanding legislator.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Kathryn, in her great loss and sorrow.

Radio Corporation of America Dedicates Enlarged Plant in New Jersey Expanding Capacity To Aid National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Radio Corporation of America has made an enviable contribution to the cause of science by its continued and far-reaching research over a period of many years. Its numerous and varied activities in advancing the art of communications and related subjects has been of incalculable value to our Nation and its people in time of peace and war.

In its ever-expanding program and creation of new and additional facilities, to enable it to give even greater assistance in the cause of science, the RCA on Friday, May 4, 1956, dedicated a major enlargement of the RCA missile and surface radar engineering plant at Moorestown, N. J., representing an important expansion of RCA's capacity to aid national defense.

The ceremonies, which included demonstrations of some of RCA's latest developments in military electronics, were witnessed by military and Government guests, representatives of the press, and more than 1,500 employees at the RCA plant.

During the program Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the RCA board, announced RCA activity in the new defense missile program, as well as development of RCA's abilities to design and produce complex electronic systems for the military services.

General Sarnoff said RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the Talos guided missile, a defense weapon designed for use against enemy aircraft. This surface-to-air guided missile is being built for the United States Air Force by RCA, which also has the responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy.

RCA'S GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

RCA's growing responsibilities in guided-missile activities were commemorated by meetings at the Moorestown plant of the board of directors of RCA, the National Broadcasting Co., and RCA Communications, Inc.

General Sarnoff presided at the meetings and later joined with Frank M. Folsom, president of RCA, and other executives to welcome Government and military guests who included Maj. Gen. F. L. Ankenbrandt, director of communications-electronics, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and myself as a Member of Congress.

Also present for the dedication were New Jersey State Assemblyman C. William Haines, Chairman W. J. Hall, and Moorestown Township Committee Members Thomas Cunningham, Irving Hollingshead, and J. Aubrey Sutton; Donald Dunn, administrative manager of Moorestown, and the Reverend Mr. Victor S. Griggs, pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Moorestown and president of the Moorestown Council of Churches, who delivered the invocation.

Climaxing the ceremonies General Sarnoff unveiled a plaque which officially commemorates the RCA Moorestown plant as a missile and radar systems center.

In accordance with the consent granted by the House, I now wish to include as part of these remarks, the address of General Sarnoff, and that of General Ankenbrandt, Dr. Engstrom, and T. A. Smith.

General Sarnoff, in his address, declared:

During the past decade, developments in electronics have revolutionized the ancient art of warfare. Foremost among these has been the development of the guided missile to a stage of perfection that makes it awesome in its capacity for destruction.

The German buzz-bombs that rained from the skies of Britain during World War II were as BB-gun pellets, compared with our modern guided missiles. The sobering fact is that our vast oceans and Arctic wastelands have been converted into highways for weapons that can destroy cities and their populations on a scale never before experienced by man.

The Soviet leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev have openly boasted of their "mighty guided missiles." We in the United States have no rational alternative but to meet the menacing competition whereby world communism has perverted science and technology to its evil purposes. For the sake of our own security and the survival of our civilization, we dare not permit the Kremlin to gain even a temporary monopoly on such appalling weapons.

The Radio Corporation of America has long been dedicated to the principle that our prime responsibility is to serve the Nation—by providing the Armed Forces with equipment vital to the success of their operations.

In line with this principle, we recently concentrated the engineering and production of military equipment in an operating unit devoted exclusively to this mission. This is our defense electronic products unit, and the organization here at Moorestown is a part of this unit.

"TALOS" PROJECT

General Sarnoff, in announcing the "Talos" project, stated:

RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the "Talos" guided missile. We have as partners in this program the American Machine & Foundry Co. "Talos" is a surface-to-air guided missile developed by the John Hopkins applied physics laboratory for the United States Navy Bureau of Ordnance. The initial land-based "Talos" system was developed by RCA under contract with the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

RCA is building land-based "Talos" systems for the United States Air Force and has responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy. This "Talos" project at the Moorestown plant represents one of the most comprehensive of all electronic systems, and utilizes the latest techniques developed by RCA.

This plant, and the people who give it meaning and significance, symbolize RCA's effort in the fulfillment of our foremost responsibility—to serve the Nation.

And so it is with a deep sense of pride in RCA's work on behalf of our national defense that I unveil this plaque, dedicating the RCA Moorestown engineering plant as a missile and surface radar development center.

REMARKS BY GENERAL ANKENBRANDT

In his remarks, General Ankenbrandt declared:

For some time it has been recognized by the military that the essential elements for true national defense includes far more than the Department of Defense and the military departments themselves.

This realization has grown from a very small beginning in the years leading up to World War II, on through that war and the succeeding days to the present, when all of us in the military are very conscious of the essential part being played by our partners—science and industry. That this realization has grown to its present proportions has been due in considerable measure to the expanding activities of such fine organizations as AFCEA (Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association), NSIA (National Security Industrial Association), IRE (Institute of Radio Engineers) and the like. Parenthetically, as most of you know, the theme of this year's AFCEA annual convention in Boston later on this month is "military and industry: partners in progress."

However, in greatest measure, this realization has come from the positive results which have accrued to the military from this partnership—the tremendous outpourings of scientific, engineering, production, and servicing assistance from American industry, without which our present day advanced weapons systems for defense would not exist or could not be operated efficiently.

It is with this background that I take great pleasure, on behalf of all of us in the military, in participating in the dedication of this new and great facility here in Moorestown of the RCA, devoted as it is to the creation of highly sophisticated systems for the defense of our Nation—systems involving as most now do—heavy radar and complex electronic fire-control elements for missiles and weapons of all types—ground, sea, and air based.

I congratulate you, General Sarnoff, the board of directors of RCA, and all the members of your company, and this city who had a part in providing this forward-looking facility—a splendid testimonial to the teamwork of industry and military working together for our common national defense.

REMARKS BY DR. ENGSTROM

Dr. E. W. Engstrom, senior executive vice president of RCA, in his remarks preceding his introduction of General Ankenbrandt and General Sarnoff, said:

I am honored to participate in these ceremonies; for today we dedicate not merely a building, or a facility, but a major national resource in the field of missile and surface radar operations—one that is probably unequaled in the world. In these critical times, the significance of this operation to our Nation and to our traditional way of life cannot be overestimated.

RCA's pioneering in radar has contributed much to the extraordinary growth of this primary instrument of national security.

Our work in radar has continued and is continuing for the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force.

On this occasion, I think it is appropriate to point out the extent of RCA's engineering and productive capacity not only here in the Delaware Valley, but also throughout the State of New Jersey. Our activities here, for example, are closely integrated with the corporation's David Sarnoff research center in Princeton, N. J. We also have important plants and associated activities, for military or civilian goods, in eight other major locations in the State—Camden, Cherry Hill, Harrison, Jersey City, Woodbridge, Rockaway, Somerville, and Clark Township.

Total RCA employment in New Jersey, excluding Princeton and Clark Township, is 26,700 persons. The annual payroll is more than $135,000,000. As a former resident of Camden County, now residing at Princeton, I believe I can speak for all RCA employees in expressing deep pride in the contributions that we make to the economy of our State.

REMARKS BY T. A. SMITH

Theodore A. Smith, vice president and general manager, RCA defense electronic products, who welcomed guests to the dedication ceremonies, declared:

It seems only yesterday that we stood at this location to dedicate the original buildings in December 1953. At that time we expressed the hope that this was only the beginning of our expanded program in the broad field of radar, and that we would grow and flourish with the community.

Now, 2½ years later, much of that healthy growth has been accomplished. Our engineering capacity has been virtually doubled. From an employment standpoint we have grown from 600 to more than 1,500 persons. Far more important than physical statistics, however, is the fact that we are now equipped to make substantially increased contributions to national security.

DEMONSTRATION OF MILITARY ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

To symbolize RCA's varied research and development activities for national defense, a program of demonstrations disclosed three major RCA developments in the field of military electronics:

A portable electronic detector for "nerve" gas—developed by the Army Chemical Corps and RCA. The first such detector accepted for military use, the unit not only can serve as a field alarm for military personnel and installations, but also can be utilized for gas-detection protection of population and industrial centers. It has possibilities as a detector for hazardous industrial and commercial gases.

An RCA-developed wide-spaced image orthicon tube, or television camera tube, which can be used for televising scenes and objects under light conditions as low as those of a moderately cloudy moonlit night.

Noise-canceling microphones and headsets for aircraft intercommunications systems, which RCA has developed and is producing for the United States Air Force. The highly selective and sensitive equipment provides clear communication under noise conditions which would make intelligible conversation virtually impossible by other known means.

The electronic "nerve" gas detector was demonstrated by special detachment of the Army Chemical Corps under the command of Lt. Col. Oliver R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Maryland.

Described, but not demonstrated at Moorestown, was the RCA "cat eye"—an electronic light intensifier which is capable of seeing objects in the dark to produce sharp and clear television pictures. The Air Force has announced that the "cat eye" enables airmen to see in the dark with almost daylight clarity and that it is expected to become a valuable aid to the Air Force as a reconnaissance device.

SERVICE GUEST LIST

In addition to General Ankenbrandt, officers of the armed services attending the Moorestown dedication included:

Army: Maj. Gen. V. A. Conrad, commanding general, Ft. Monmouth, N. J.; Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, commanding general, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.; Brig. Gen. H. V. Gaskill, Office of Chief of Research and Development, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Colin Hudson, Office of Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Col. C. A. Poutre, Signal Corps Supply Agency, 18th and Locust Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Col. H. M. Murray, Frankfort Arsenal, Bridge and Tacony Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lt. Col. Q. R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.

Navy: Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. R. L. Taylor, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. A. C. Packard, Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Rear Adm. H. C. Bruton, director, Naval Communications Division, Office of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. D. O. Lacey, United States Navy Aviation Supply Office, 700 Robbins Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Air Force: Maj. Gen. G. R. Acheson, commander, Middleton Air Materiel Area, Olmstead Air Force Base, Pa.; Brig. Gen. I. L. Farman, Assistant for Electronic Supporting Systems, deputy commander, Weapons Systems Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, Post Office Box 1395, Baltimore, Md.; Brig. Gen. S. T. Wray, ADES Project Officer, 220 Church Street, New Work, N. Y.; Col. A. R. Shiely, Air Research and Development Command, 220 Church Street, New York, N. Y.; Col. Jay Jaynes, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.; Col. W. J. Adams, Eastern Air Procurement, 1411 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRESS ATTENDANCE

Newspapers, wire services, magazines, and television stations represented at the RCA Moorestown program included: The Associated Press, Unted Press, Tele-News, station WRCV, station WRCV-TV, station WFIL-TV, the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Wall Street Journal, Aviation Age magazine, Tele-Tech magazine, Popular Mechanics magazine, Radio and TV Daily, Aviation Week magazine, Electronic Design magazine, Research and Engineering magazine, Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia Daily News, Philadelphia Afro-American, Philadelphia Tribune, Camden Courier-Post, Pittsburgh Courier, Moorestown News Chronicle, Mt. Holly Herald, American Aviation magazine,

Electronics magazine, Popular Science magazine, Broadcasting magazine, Aeronautical Engineering Review, Radio Electronics magazine, Electrical Engineering magazine.

The 730th Air Force Band, under the direction of Chief Warrant Officer Dieter, Maguire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J., participated in the ceremonies.

A Reappraisal of the Life of Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 last a memorable occasion was held at Fort Monroe, Va. At that time the dedication ceremonies were conducted by the United Daughters of the Confederacy dedicating the Jefferson Davis Memorial Park.

On that occasion an outstanding citizen of the South, my distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, was the principal speaker. This was most appropriate since that great southern leader of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, was a Mississippian.

In view of the wealth of information concerning this truly great man contained in the address, it is appropriate that the remarks of Senator STENNIS on that occasion be given wider circulation. The address itself was a splendid one honoring this Mississippian, the leader of the Southern States in that unfortunate fratricidal strife.

Senator STENNIS' address is as follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE LIFE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

The United Daughters of the Confederacy do well to honor the spot where the very last drops of the lifeblood of the southern Confederacy were drained off, and the one man who was the symbol of that mighty cause suffered the ignominy and torture of chains and imprisonment.

The ironing of Jefferson Davis at Fortress Monroe, where at first he was thrown to the stone floor and held down by four soldiers while a blacksmith riveted heavy shackles on his ankles, was as a cup of vinegar to the South, as much as it was a mortifying and painful attack on the body of the President of the Confederate States of America.

But even the rigors of this Gethsemane never daunted the spirit of Jefferson Davis.

There he was:

That great and good man from my own home State of Mississippi; that gallant soldier who had been the outstanding military figure of the Black Hawk and Indian wars; that renowned hero who had given luster to American arms in the War with Mexico at Monterey and Buena Vista; that calm and dispassionate scholar who had been the friend and confidante of America's great military captains, and friend and advisor to three Presidents of the United States; that wise and provident counselor who had stood on the floor of the United States Senate with Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and plead for measures of justice and conciliation that might have saved the Union and saved it without bloodshed; and finally that stalwart towering, and lonely figure, called by 13 American States to share their brilliant but tragic destiny in their second war of independence.

What could the stone walls and iron bars of Fortress Monroe do to a spirit like this?

In spite of chains, imprisonment, and utter defeat, the President of the Confederate States of America was no lost leader of a lost cause.

The South was fighting, not for slavery, not for any white-pillared aristocracy, not for its own independent economy. She was fighting for a principle as old as the hills and as sacred as the covenants of all God-fearing peoples. She was fighting for autonomy and local self-government, something that men call freedom, something known as liberty, which men had fought and died for since the dawn of civilized man.

The truth is, the frightful and bloody fratricidal war she was called upon to wage in defense of her soil and rights to self-government, was merely a single engagement in the still greater and continuous war, which has been waged for centuries by freemen everywhere for freedom, for the right of self-determination, for local self-government, and for freedom from colonialism and empirical controls.

For his spirit to live, Jefferson Davis had to be a great man. And he was.

Governor Brown of Mississippi in proffering him a seat in the United States Senate referred to his military career in these words:

"The people will never cease to remember with pride and gratitude that to you, sir, and the brave Mississippians under your command, is our State indebted for honors as imperishable as the soil on which you won them; honors which shall last as long as chivalry is respected or valor has a place in the hearts of men."

Perhaps, as one who occupies the honored position of a successor to Jefferson Davis in the United States Senate, and as one who has as his desk on the Senate floor Jefferson Davis' own desk, my own mind dwells with singular propriety on the great career the Mississippian carved out for himself as a statesman in that body.

Davis was only 39 years old when he first took his seat in the United States Senate. In a few brief years, he came to rank well up with such towering figures as ex-President John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and John C. Calhoun. When Calhoun, the acknowledged Southern spokesman, died in 1850, Davis was immediately recognized as his successor.

His spirited defense of Daniel Webster, a political enemy, when for cheap partisan advantage Webster's integrity was challenged in the Senate, his tireless efforts, as member and chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to enlarge and strengthen the Armed Forces of the United States; his wise and courageous battle against the Wilmot Proviso; his lengthy, brilliant, and arduous debates in behalf of a strict construction of the Constitution as to powers ceded to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States; and his magnificent resentment of the abolitionists and their attacks on the South, in and out of the Senate—all these marked Jefferson Davis as undisputed leader of the South and Southern thought.

But Davis was far and above the position of a mere sectional or partisan leader. He was well in the forefront of the national expansionists. It doesn't seem necessary more than merely to mention in passing the hiatus in Davis' Senate career when he went home to run for the Mississippi governorship and was defeated by 999 votes. For, when Franklin Pierce came to the Presidency in 1853, the Mississippi ex-Senator was literally drafted for renewed public service as Secretary of War in the new Democratic Cabinet. He became one of the outstanding War Secretaries in United States history.

With the termination of the Pierce administration, on March 4, 1857, Jefferson Davis resumed his career in the United States Senate, 24 hours after he had ceased to be Secretary of War, and 4 days before the Supreme Court rendered the Dred Scott decision.

From this time to the day when he had to rise in the Senate and announce the secession of his own beloved Mississippi, Jefferson Davis strove in every honorable way possible to find some way to preserve the Union as well as southern rights.

Jefferson Davis returned to Mississippi and offered his services to the State, and was made a major general of the Army of Mississippi.

But he had a rendezvous with an uncompromising and relentless destiny which was not to be denied; for on that fateful day of February 10, 1861, a messenger from Vicksburg arrived in hot haste with a telegram notifying him that he had been unanimously chosen President of the Confederate States of America. He thus became the leader, commander-in-chief and historical standard bearer of the most bloody, costly, and devastating revolution of modern times.

The whole life and career of this man, it would seem in historical retrospect, had been a schooling and preparation for such a climax. As Senator Yancey said, "The man and the hour have met."

Certainly, he had been one who never turned his back but marched breast forward.

I shall certainly not here pursue all the brilliant strokes of genius and doubtless grievous errors of judgment, of his tenure as President of the Confederacy. I do want to point out now that, on assuming the exalted office of President of the Confederate States of America, President Davis said:

"I come with diffidence and distrust to discharge the great duties devolved on me by the kindness and confidence of the Congress of the Confederate States. I will devote to the duties of the high office to which I have been called all that I have—of heart, of head, and of hand."

History records that in every sense of the word Jefferson Davis lived up to that pledge.

As he left the city of Richmond that he had so long and so magnificently defended, he had the right to look the world in the face and say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course. I have kept the faith."

Today a bronze statue of President Davis, presented by my State of Mississippi to the Federal Government, stands in the Vicksburg National Park, which surrounds that heroic city. Also, his likeness stands in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol as the greatest Mississippian. By his side stands the great and peerless Gen. Robert E. Lee, placed there by a grateful Virginia. These men live on forever; their greatness inspires us with patriotic pride. Our southern way of life will continue inspired by the thoughts and deeds of the heroic men of Davis' day.

For nations, as with individuals, times change. Old problems are solved, or pass off the scene. New ones arise. But principles live and remain the same.

As worthy descendants of our illustrious forebears of the time of Jefferson Davis, we must turn our faces not to the past, but to the problems of our own future. To these problems, we must apply the same high principles of public trust, personal honor, and devotion to duty, as were applied by that generation. We must have the courage of heart and mind to do more, regardless of the odds against us, for the great principles of government which we believe are sound and essential to our Nation's welfare.

Jefferson Davis, a man of vision, saw the necessity of preserving the powers of the States. Otherwise and inevitably a strong centralized government would eventually destroy personal freedom.

That truth was never better expressed than in the following words of the late Raleigh C. Minor, formerly of the University of Virginia Law School, and truly one of the great law teachers of our Nation:

"If a power is one reserved by the States, and, after long and patient trial and experiment, the States prove incompetent to exercise it properly and it is essential that it be so exercised, then let the power be transferred to the Federal Government by amendment to the Constitution. If the necessity is not great enough and evident enough to induce the legislatures of three-fourths of the States to assent to the transfer, it may be fairly assumed that the transfer is not so essential after all.

"But in any event let it not be accomplished by a forced construction of the Constitution. This is even now the canker that is slowly but surely eating away the reserved rights of the States and sapping their powers. If the process be not checked, the time must certainly come when the sovereign States will be nothing more than mere municipal corporations with only such powers left them as their Federal Government may choose to allow. God save the fair fabric of the Constitution from such a fate."

These words, written in 1913, were applicable in the days of Jefferson Davis, and they apply as well today.

If we would truly honor our forebears of that generation, we will face the responsibilities that come to our generation.

If liberty and freedom and sound principles of Government are to be preserved, it will be through the efforts of our generation—not the generation of Jefferson Davis nor the generation that is to follow us, but those of us who are living now.

God give us the insight to see our duty and our opportunity, and the courage to act.

Thus and thus only can we preserve constitutional government.

Governor and Mrs. Leader Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William H. Sylk, of the Sun Ray Drug Co., Philadelphia, presented on May 28, 1956, honoring Governor and Mrs. Leader, of Pennsylvania, on the occasion of the Leader Woodland dinner sponsored by the Jewish National Fund. A woodland in Israel is being named in honor of Governor and Mrs. Leader in recognition of the friendship between the State of Israel and this country:

This magnificent gathering tonight, of good, purposeful and dedicated human beings, gives me something of the same feeling I had as a youth, absorbing highlights of the human drama, from a little professor who possessed a feeling for historical events.

It was many years ago, hidden far back in the corridors of time, that I recall a class at college. The professor was lecturing on momentous occasions in history. I can almost hear his voice now saying "with the Magna Carta, the great charter of freedom, mankind took a giant step forward and grew a head taller." The Magna Carta was in line with the universal brotherhood theme of the Hebrew prophets.

I wish I had this professor's historical gifts, for then I could grasp more fully, the grandeur and meaning of tonight and thereby, do more justice to my immediate task which is simply to present our distinguished guests and to tell you briefly why the Jewish National Fund is proud to honor them.

Long ago, I reached conclusions about events, and how things happen to be what they are, and at this moment, I see an affirmation of my experience. If I were asked I would say that in the life of an individual, success or failure is never determined by luck or an ominous fate. I would say, moreover, that triumph and disaster are not the slide rules with which to measure the worth of any one of God's creatures. I would say that high office or great wealth or social prestige are paltry things as compared with high purpose—a great heart or a vision of social justice. The ones mankind truly honors are the pilots who chart paths of hope and courage in the wilderness of cowardice, doubt, and despair.

We live in an era where a new and joyous prospect for humanity unfolds. We have split the atom, conquered problems of energy, and we stand on the threshold of space. The 20th century, the century of the common man is glorious, but what above all will be our century's legacy? It is, I suggest, the immediate prospect of bringing the benefits of modern technology; the benefits of modern civilization to the whole human race, regardless of color or creed or geographic location, and who will do it? It will be done by men and women like our honored guests whose genuine social and religious concern for ordinary people are the key to our highest hopes.

The narrow outlook and provincial greed are out of step. They must die with the age that is dying. A new age of universal motherhood is coming to birth and new affirmations are required.

I often think that the miracle of our America is our ability to produce men of stature in tune with the times. Men whose vision embraces the slowly rising sun of human motherhood. Men who truly believe that America is still an undiscovered continent, to be lovingly explored for the fulfillment of age-old dreams. America where the need arises, gives us men as the poet says:

"Tall men, sun browned
Who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

I recall a conversation, 2 years ago, with a sophisticated and cynical elder statesman. He was discussing the Pennsylvania gubernatorial election and he said: "this is in the bag."

Actually, it was in the bag, but not quite as he understood it. Events, as I indicated before, had predetermined the happy ending. A fighter had been turned loose in the political arena whose humility and concern for human beings were not affectations. His vigor, sincerity and determination had been tested in legislative halls, his principles, as in his courageous stand against the Peecham loyalty bill and for fair employment practices were unwaveringly in accord with his religious beliefs in the worth and dignity of every living human being.

Youth, personality, intelligence, humility, principle and respect for American traditions are the radiant symbols of this man's ascent to the highest post this commonwealth offers.

His grandfather, on to the fifth generation, was in the first contingent of troops from west of the Hudson, to join Washington's Continental Army. His honored father and mother are such people as make America invincible. He himself has given proof, again and again. His gracious wife, a well of joyous strength and quiet counsel, mother and sharer of the future, whose name as well, adorns this life-giving woodland in Israel.

During the last few years, our guests have demonstrated often, their regard for the vision of the people of the book, Israel, is to them, a living and permanent reality, and if I may say so, tonight, Israel with its memories of 5,000 years, affirms that this man and this woman shall always be remembered in the majestic woodland of life-giving trees in the once barren land of our fathers.

The Bible tells us that Moses called unto Joshua and said unto him, "Be strong and of good courage; for thou shalt bring the children of Israel unto the land which I swore unto them. And thou shalt cause them to inherit it." On this promise rides not only the hope of Israel, but also the hope of America and of all mankind. For this is a promise that people shall labor in the vineyard, and they shall eat the fruit thereof. This is a promise that wherever men dream dreams for all humanity, these dreams shall come to pass.

And if you think carefully, you will believe with me that this biblical song of strength and courage and the promised land is truly the American dream shared by every illustrious name in the book of our country's life.

Tonight, I feel that these words are here in this room, uniting in mysterious ways the ancient aspiration and the modern dream, the promised land the free world's hope I feel that the human chain of greatness from the prophetic Jews of the Bible to the noble men who built America has acquired a new and sturdy link. I believe that our honored guests are in the noble tradition of the Jewish vision of justice and mercy, and of America's hopes for a brave new world.

It is for this that a multitude has here assembled to proclaim its regard and it is for this that we salute and memorialize with pride and joy an eternal woodland in Israel, henceforth to be known as the Leader Woodland, named for George Michael and Mary Jane Leader.

Ancient Order of Hibernians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions unanimously adopted at the county convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, New York County, held at the American Legion Hall, 155 East 88th New York City, on May 17, 1956:

Resolved, That we the delegates to the county convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, county of New York, meeting at the American Legion hall, 155 East 88th Street, New York City, citizens of the United States, who are interested in this country's independence, future prosperity and greatness, representing thousands of men and women of Irish blood, many of whom are veterans of recent world's wars, declare anew our allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the institutions of Government founded thereon; and we declare our spiritual allegiance to the sovereign pontiff, Pope Pius XII, and implore God to shower His blessings on him ,and to give him health and strength to discharge the duties of his great office for many years to come, and we pledge our whole hearted support to the viscar of Christ in his efforts for world

peace based on the moral law, without which there can be no lasting peace; and be it.

Resolved, That we renew our denunciation of Communism, not alone in Russia and its satellite States, but in any place or country wherever it displays its poisonous fangs, because communism everywhere is engaged in a war on God and His sacred law, and in an effort to enslave the souls of human beings and destroy all religion; and be it

Resolved, That we again arraign the government of England in the court of public opinion for having arbitrarily dismembered the ancient Irish nation by the partition act passed in the Imperial Parliament in 1920 and for having set up a puppet government in Belfast which it persists in subsidizing and supporting for the evil purpose of fostering sectarian hatered among the people of different religious beliefs in that area for English Imperial purposes; and be it

Resolved, That we denounce the Imperial Government of England for the uses to which it is putting, and continues to put, millions of the American taxpayers' money, part of which has been used to keep the inhabitants of northeastern Ulster of different religious beliefs from uniting among themselves in Christian unity and with the people of the rest of Ireland for their mutual advantage and for their country's best interests; and be it

Resolved, That we request the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to report out, for the consideration of both Houses of Congress, at an early date, a resolution which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite determine and declare to the contrary, and we urge the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to vote favorably on the declaration of principles, contained in the resolution when it comes up for their consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That we again pledge ourselves, in cooperation with all the other American-Irish organizations to continue our support to the people of Ireland in their just demand for the abolition of the boundary which the English Parliament set up in northeast Ulster and for the complete political and territorial unity and freedom of Ireland and we promise this support until the right of the Irish people to the ownership and control of an undivided Irish nation is established and recognized.

JOHN J. SHEAHAN, *Chairman*.
MICHAEL CARTY.
JOHN BLAKE.
MARTIN A. MACNAMARA.

A Much Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a well-deserved tribute to our Nation's outstanding labor leader—John L. Lewis.

In an editorial, on the occasion of the dedication of a group of miners' hospitals in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette speaks highly of the achievements of Mr. Lewis in establishing and completing this great welfare project, and extols his many other achievements in the field of labor management.

The editorial follows:

UMW HOSPITAL PROGRAM IS SYMBOL OF STRIDES AHEAD FOR COAL MINER

A distinctive milestone in labor-management relations was passed in Beckley Saturday when dedication ceremonies officially opened a $27 million chain of 10 hospitals owned by the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund.

Prominent at the affair, with his eloquence of demeanor and speech, was UMW chieftain John L. Lewis, who did more than anyone else to bring to fruition an idea in worker welfare that he first mentioned publicly back in 1924. Lewis, it was easy to see, was proud of the achievement, and well he should be.

The hospitals—spreading their influence into 3 States—were but a masonry and steel symbol of a program that has given hope and comfort to more than a million people in 27 States, has helped stabilize employment in what was once an unstable industry, and has provided a blueprint for hospital service that is probably the best answer this Nation has for socialized medicine in other parts of the world.

Lewis has done many things for the workingman in his long and colorful life. He fathered the CIO, one of America's largest labor movements until its merger with the AFL last year. He lifted the miner from second-class citizenship to first-class standing, with the highest industrial wage scale in the United States. He also helped the miner to gain stature as a skilled worker by forcing mechanization on what was a horse-and-buggy industry when he started as a digger more than a half century ago.

But Lewis' program of worker welfare has not been helpful only to his card-carrying miners. Strange though it may seem in this State which has borne the brunt of many union-operator contract fights, it has helped others, too.

In 8 years the mine worker wage scale has climber an average of $5.25 a day, welfare-fund royalty payments have increased 30 cents a ton, and fringe benefits have given him comforts enjoyed by many so-called white-collar workers. Yet, in this same period, mechanization and mergers made necessary by these higher costs have permitted leaders in the industry to sell coal cheaper while still making a profit.

Coal mine employment in the United States has declined in 10 years from 400,000 to 250,000, and Lewis is bitterly blamed by his severest critics for this cutback. In some respects, perhaps, notably his ruthless use of the strike weapon, he deserves criticism. But by calm reflection we find that all is not grim that looks black.

Prior to World War II the miner was paid $5.30 a day, and West Virginia then had approximately 125,000 miners. Today, there are just about half that number working, yet the State isn't so bad off.

Miners are paid four times their pre-World War II wage * * * they are buying homes, farms, and small businesses which they operate during their hours away from the mines * * * and the State has taken steps to strengthen its economy by mounting a broad-scale find-work program for the unemployed through industrial diversification.

Those miners who have survived the cutback are the industry's best, they contribute substantially to the State's economy, and, by producing an average of more than 10 tons of coal a day as against 1.3 tons in the world's second biggest producing country, Great Britain, they are helping the American industry to locate a ready market abroad.

At the same time, thousands of pre-World War II miners are on pension, drawing $100 a month that a decade ago was going into the pockets of many absentee operators as profit, and living satisfactorily as respected citizens instead of as charges of the State.

Saturday's dedication in Beckley was, as past history shows, the capstone of Lewis' career. Younger men are challenging him for supremacy in the labor movement. They might well dethrone him before long, but challenging his record will be far more difficult than challenging the aging monarch of American labor.

His is a job well done for the workingman, and for the industry he obliquely served while sitting as its arch foe at the other side of the bargaining table.

The Fight for Fairer Prices Must Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clarence Poe, editor and board chairman of the Progressive Farmer publication, which appeared in the June 1956 edition:

THE FIGHT FOR FAIRER PRICES MUST GO ON

(By Clarence Poe)

The farmers have lost one fight. But now they must make another. The farm bill the President vetoed clearly had some unsound features, but most of these could have been corrected now or later. We lost because neither the President himself nor enough farmers, townspeople, or Congressmen fully understood the farm situation. As we start a continuous battle to get fairer prices for farmers, let's first of all see what misconceptions brought loss in this recent fight and how to win the next one.

I

"It's just a bill to help farmers," was the feeling of the general public. Actually, of course, the manufacturers, merchants, laborers, and all classes of people with whom the farmer spends his money almost as soon as he gets it would have benefited almost as much as farmers. All, too, will suffer by reason of the bill's defeat.

II

"I just don't understand parity," many said, and all too few tried to understand it. As everyone should know, a "parity price" means a price which will enable a given quantity of cotton, tobacco, corn, pork, milk, eggs, or any other farm product to buy 100 percent as much goods as that quantity would have bought in some base period of years when farm prices were supposed to be fair. Originally, this was the 5 years, 1909–14, for all crops. While this has been raised in recent years, the period is still one regarded as fair to farmers and the public.

III

Many voters have thought 90 percent parity would virtually mean riches for the farmer—"all this and heaven, too." No sooner had this Congress started than a distinguished magazine, usually very fair, spoke of farmers as riding around in Cadillacs while begging for more price supports. The facts are that in 1949 farmers had 99 percent of parity, and in 1951, 107 percent of parity—and yet the average 1951 net income of farm workers and industrial workers compared as follows:

For farm workers	$1,718
For industrial workers	3,416

Actually, 100 percent parity would give farmers only a fairly decent income. And the term "90 percent" on its very face indicates not an increase but a decrease in some desirable goal. It takes a parity price—which is itself only fair—and then makes a straight, full 10 percent cut before the farmer gets it as a guarantee. On products for which any "variable price-support formula" is set up, it should be at 85 to 95 percent of parity—not 75 to 90.

IV

The two-way character of our farm program of recent years was all too often overlooked or ignored. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY said that Secretary Benson never seemed to realize that (1) in return for a guarantee of reasonable prices (2) the farmer was expected to cut his acreage or production to fit market demands. This two-way requirement has not been observed in all cases, but should be. Of course, the farmer can never be sure when he plants a crop whether he will get 50, 100, or 150 percent of a normal yield. Still, the price supports the farmer receives should be offset by programs which over the years might reasonably be expected to keep production in line with demand.

If farmers follow such programs as set forth by Government and burdensome surpluses nevertheless occur, should they not receive just and reasonable price supports until the surplus can be gotten rid of? Frequently, of course, this may not take just 1 year but several years. If this two-way feature of the program has been imperfectly carried out in the past, we should not end the program, but mend it. Last year's bumper cotton crop, for example, was in no way due to overplanting by the farmers. The farmers did what the Government asked, but the bumper crop came from record-breaking acre yields given by the Almighty.

V

The Department of Agriculture and some farm organizations seemed at times to be willing to see how little could be given the farmer and still keep him satisfied. To them the doctrine, "What is good for the country is good for the farmer," seemed sound, but didn't seem to work both ways. We never expect to see the Department of Labor trying to see how small a wage labor can be made to accept. Nor do we ever expect to see the National Association of Manufacturers trying to see how much tariff reduction manufacturers can possibly stand. Certainly now, at a time when labor's wages are the highest ever and the manufacturer's profits the biggest ever, the Secretary of Agriculture and our farm organization leaders should be the farmer's retained attorneys to fight for his full share of the country's prosperity.

VI

Whether or not he was badly advised and however good the intentions we give him credit for, we cannot escape the feeling that President Eisenhower himself should have consulted with plain, often hard-hit farmers. They would almost certainly have reminded him of his pledge as given in 1952 and in these exact words at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4: "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90." Furthermore, without questioning the highly religious character of Secretary Benson, we cannot escape the feeling that he should have strictly supported the explicit pledge which the President gave.

VII

The lack of unity on the part of farm organizations hurt. Even though they could not have agreed on a general farm policy, we believe they should have made much greater efforts to find areas of agreement. We also think that there is too much demand on the part of some top farm organization leaders for uniformity of thought and action by the general membership. North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Texas Farm Bureau members, for example, strongly favored 90 percent price supports for cotton, but the appeal for uniformity kept most of them silent to their own hurt. As we have said before, "We believe it is equally the duty of a farm organization member to support it when it is right and to try to correct it when it is wrong." A healthy and outspoken, conscientiously questioning minority is a fine thing for a farm organization—as it is in State or National Government—and frequently in our churches.

VIII

Finally, the plight of the small farmer, the little man, should have more attention. We hope we did not misjudge him, but we heard a nationally known farm leader say, in substance, "If farm prices go down, I can stand it until they come back again. The efficient farmers will survive and be better off with less competition." Unfortunately, however, we cannot even be sure that it's always the efficient farmers who survive. Does the man who survives always do so because of his superior efficiency? Or may it not often be because he is more fortunate in his inheritances, marriage, investments, or friendliness of financial connections? Or that income tax opportunities enable him to charge off his farm losses? On the other hand, are not many young farmers who are producing as efficiently as larger farmers nevertheless being bankrupted by low crop and livestock prices, and especially by mortgages and debts they incurred when such purchases of land or equipment seemed justified? They have simply had the rug pulled out from under them. More such struggling young farmers and small farmers should be put in places of leadership in farm organizations. Also, more farm leaders and farm organizations should get religion and acquire more concern for the man at the bottom—for the "needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper."

Can Egypt Be Appeased?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article which appeared in the New Republic magazine of April 16, 1956. It is most enlightening:

CAN EGYPT BE APPEASED?

(By Walter Z. Laqueur)

President Eisenhower left Washington for his third vacation this winter without explaining his bewildering admission to a press conference that he knew nothing about the urgent message on the Middle East crisis sent him by Sir Anthony Eden. The world, therefore, remains in doubt as to whether the United States, like Britain, has become sufficiently disturbed by recent actions of Colonel Nasser to think twice before investing too much confidence in Egypt as an ally. The provocations for such a reappraisal, if it is taking place, are abundant.

When, in July, 1952, a military junta overthrew King Farouk, its action was generally welcomed, for corruption under the deposed monarch had been widespread; conditions of anarchy (culminating in the "Black Saturday") had assumed dangerous proportions. Even the Communists welcomed the intervention of the army; they were soon to change their line, however, and for 3 years, up to the Czechoslovak arms deal, Naguib and Nasser were "Fascist hangmen" as far as the Communists were concerned. But otherwise there was much optimism in Egypt and elsewhere; a "Kemalist solution" for Egypt seemed a distinct possibility; in the Israeli parliament Mr. Ben-Gurion expressed his hope for a speedy peace treaty with Egypt.

Under the Naguib-Nasser regime feudal became the worst invective, and the fat and boorish landowners the favorite target of Egyptian cartoonists. The political notions of these young army officers were extremely vague; they were not Socialists though most called themselves so; many had a record of Fascist and Communist fellow traveling (in that chronological order). They believed that the country would have to be given more efficient government, that the army should be strengthened, that certain social reforms would have to be carried out. But they had no knowledge of the working of the modern state and tried their luck rather clumsily, adopting as far as possible army methods to civilian life and exploiting the army mystique in every area. They were undoubted achievements, from the deposition of King Farouk to the agrarian reform (however fragmentary) and the dissolution of Muslim brotherhood which had been a purely destructive factor in Egyptian politics. But the new regime raised far more hopes than it could possibly fulfill. The workers and peasants expected immediate improvements, and the intelligentsia (especially the students) had hoped for more than obligatory, universal military training.

Weeks and months went by and life was little different for the Fellaheen, the worker, the urban middle class. There was, of course, a new style, not dissimilar to that of the French Revolution: Patriotism, the appeal for unity against separatist trends, brave phrases about social equality. But style, after all, is not enough. To recruit mass support, Colonel Nassar established a state party, the "Liberation movement." Within a few weeks it claimed more than 5 million members, making it one of the largest political parties in the world outside the Iron Curtain. But, in reality, the movement never became a political factor of any consequence.

By early in 1955 the junta, headed by Colonel Nasser, had succeeded in downing all its competitors; the Wafd and the other political parties were dissolved, the officer corps had been purged of deviators from General Naguib downward. But by last year, it had become clear that the opportunity for carrying through far-reaching domestic reforms had been missed. There was no lack of good will, but good will, like style, was not enough. With the dissolution of the old political parties the military movement had spent most of its momentum; there was to be no Egyptian Kemalism; for once Kemal Ataturk had won his battle against foreign intervention, he began to carry out his program of internal reform; he did not engage in vainglorious dreams about the reconquest of the old Ottoman Empire. For Ataturk the primacy of domestic policy was self-evident. Colonel Nasser, on the other hand, was to follow a different course, opting, as he did, for the primacy of foreign policy.

A curious situation had arisen in which a country like Egypt, however backward and internally weak, could almost attain great power status—at least tempararily. During the last 12 or 18 months Colonel Nasser and his colleagues have had several important successes. England agreed to evacuate the Suez base; Iraq, Egypt's main competitor in the Arab world, has been effectively isolated; Israel has been put under great pressure as a result of Egypt's purchase or arms from

the Communists; unscrupulous broadcasts of the "Voice of the Arabs" radio station have hammered home, day after day, Egypt's support for all anti-Western movements from Morocco to Pakistan to Kenya. Algerian rebels, according to French sources, call Gamal Nasser "Big Brother"; Bahraini newspapers overflow with praise of "Giant Salah-ad-Din Nassar"—an allusion to the great ruler who united the Arabs in the fight against the crusaders. Western and Eastern diplomats stumble over each other in their offers of assistance to Egypt and their courtship of the country which has emerged as the leader of a new axis in the Middle East.

However, Colonel Nasser's successes to date are, we are told, merely the first act in the drama of glory which is to come. The Cairo press envisages an Egyptian empire surpassing the realm of the Pharoah's and the conquests of Mehemed Ali. Egypt as the leader of all African national movements down to the Sambesi is one of the elementary articles of faith: It is the historic mission of Egypt to "liberate Africa" and to gain a supremacy similar to the one attained by China in the Far East. War against Israel is a very minor consideration to ambitions which now span whole continents: "A single Egyptian moudirieh [province] will be able to destroy Israel." The present Iraqi Government is to be overthrown; other reluctant Arab States (Lebanon and Jordan) will be drawn into a new axis headed by Egypt, to be joined at a later date by Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria. The West will be brought to its knees by cutting its fuel lifeline: Cairo radio calls for the removal of American and British oil companies from Iraq, Saudia Arabia, and Kuwait: Aden, a British crown colony, is to be liberated, and the Red Sea closed to Western vessels.

All this and more is vividly described in detail in the leading Cairo weeklies, such as Al Tahrir, Rose al Yousef, Al Mussawar (from which we have quoted). Close observers of the Cairo scene, not unsympathetic to Colonel Nasser, already report that Spain and Sicily are included in the blueprint for the new Egyptian empire (London Times, March 19, 1956).

There is of course an element of fantasy in all that. But it would be dangerous to dismiss it as the harmless product of the imagination of people living in a dream world. Chances that the Cairo junta will ever achieve its foreign political aims are indeed dim: A minimum social and economic basis is needed on which to build empires, and this basis simply does not exist in Egypt: Colonel Nasser may profit from studying the lesson of fascism in Italy. But even if the Egyptian attempt to attain great power status should fail, as most believe that it will, it may in the process cause immeasurable damage.

In these circumstances there are two schools of thinking—diametrically opposed—as to how the West should handle Colonel Nasser. The one school, to which, according to many reports, Mr. Henry Byroade, United States Ambassador in Cairo belongs, argues that Colonel Nasser and his colleagues are essentially reasonable men, mainly interested in domestic problems. The main obstacles to understanding between the United States and Cairo are (a) the existence of Israel, and (b) French and English policies in North Africa and the Middle East. Support for Israel has been a mistake anyway, they say, the sooner the Jewish State is reduced or disappears, the better. America should also support Egypt's aims elsewhere in the Arab world and North Africa: These are, after all, just national aspirations; Western policy should support national movements throughout Africa and non-Communist Asia. Once these disputes are satisfactorily settled, Colonel Nasser will calm down; his more ambitious projects should not be taken too seriously; it will be possible to restrain the junta and direct its activities into more peaceful and constructive channels. There may be risks involved in such a course of action, but the only alternative (according to them) is to antagonize the Cairo junta completely, to push it into the Communist camp, thereby risking the eventual loss of the whole Middle East.

Such views deserve to be closely scrutinized. Of course, support of national movements in non-Communist Asia and Africa is an admirable principle. If Western statesmen had provided a larger measure of political sympathy and economic help for countries such as India, Burma, or Ceylon, the position of the West would be better than it is now. But very much depends on the manner in which support is given. The recent grant by the World Bank for the Aswan Dam is a perfect example of how it should not be done, for this grant was made out of the fear that Russia would steal a march upon the West, and there is an Arabic proverb to the effect that "if you give to a fool, he will say—this is because they are afraid of me." Western help to Egypt in these circumstances has been accepted as a matter of course, as some form of indemnification for the many "sins of the West." Not only cynics claim now that the only way to get speedy American help is to blackmail the West with the threat to play with the Russians.

But the ill-timed grant of Western economic help is trivial compared with the basic mistake committed by those who advocate Western backing for the political aims of Colonel Nasser—the equation of Asian and Middle Eastern nationalism. There is a profound difference between the two. In southeast Asia (as in Turkey, and possibly in Tunisia now) the struggle for independence went hand in hand with a general national renaissance. Indians and Pakistanis may quarrel over Kashmir, Indonesia may demand Dutch New Guinea, but territorial aggrandizement on a vast scale is not contemplated by any of these countries. They are not empire minded.

Egypt at the present stage of its development is unappeasable, to use a harsh word. Western collaboration with countries like India, Burma, or Ceylon is possible, indeed highly desirable, because the aim of these governments is to strengthen their newly won political independence, develop their countries, and have peace. The West has no other aims than these in Asia. No such common ground exists with Egypt's present rulers, whose single preoccupation is empire, who wish to prevent the West from taking part in the economic development of Africa, who wish to cut off the supply of oil—not just to cut the profits of the oil companies, who want to "liberate," for all we know, the European parts of former Arab, Saracen, and Mameluke empires.

Congressional Secretaries To Visit New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, June 8, 9, and 10, the Congressional Secretaries Club, which includes the secretaries of nearly all Members of Congress, are making their annual trip to New York City. This annual pilgrimage has become traditional with our secretaries. Since I have the honor to represent a sizable portion of our fair city in the United States Congress, and since a large number of the secretaries making this trip are my personal friends, I want to extend a very hearty welcome to them and my sincerest wishes for a most enjoyable visit in New York.

I am naturally very proud of our great city of New York. I think it is about the greatest place in all the world, and there is no equal to it. I am also very proud of our employees here at the Capitol who assist us so ably in taking care of the needs of our constituents back home. Therefore, it is my distinct pleasure to welcome the "best" to the "best."

Mr. Speaker, as you and all our colleagues know, the Congressional Secretaries Club was formed in 1935 for the purpose of helping to obtain information so that the secretaries could better serve their Congressmen. The organization has grown from 25 members at the first meeting in 1935 to over 1,200 members last year. Practically every congressional and senatorial office is represented in the club by one or more of its staff members.

This year's trip has been arranged with the kind of cooperation of my good friend Milton H. Berger, one of the most outstanding public relations men in New York, whose efforts have always been directed towards the public good and the welfare of the Nation. He has been extremely helpful in setting up part of the itinerary, particularly the visit to Steeplechase Park in Coney Island, which is often described as the "Playground of the World."

The visit to Steeplechase Park is scheduled for Sunday, June 10, and this means fun in the sun, hot dogs, cotton candy and the like for the entire party. Mr. Berger has reserved combination tickets free for the entire group, including the amusement rides, food, and soft drinks.

I believe it is of interest to note that Steeplechase Park, which opened on May 19, is now in its 60th year of existence. It was founded by the late George C. Tilyou, one of America's greatest showmen. This amusement mecca for millions covers 25 acres in Coney Island and employs a crew of over 350 men to operate the park and its numerous rides and other attractions.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert at this point the itinerary of the Congressional Secretaries Club during the coming weekend:

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES ANNUAL TRIP TO NEW YORK, JUNE 8, 9, 10

This is the complete itinerary as to the time of each of the planned functions. The time given is the departure time and it is suggested that you be a few minutes early on each occasion in order not to be left.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8

9:45 a. m., District of Columbia time: Special train will leave by B. & O. from Union Station. Sign will be on gate. Mr. Bob Petzold, of B. & O., will be with us the entire trip for any service he can render. Luncheon will be served on the train.

1:45 p. m.: Arrive at Jersey City. Board buses for transportation to Hotel Governor Clinton, 7th Avenue at 31st Street. Hotel rooms will be assigned on train and it is

urged that each person mark their name and room number on the baggage stubs which will be given them on train in order that bag may be placed in room on arrival at hotel.

3:30–5 p. m.: Cocktail party by Frank L. Sundstrom, of Schenley Industries, Inc., on the 37th floor of the Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue. Tickets for the observation tower of the Empire State Building will be available for those who wish to visit the observation tower through the courtesy of Mr. Sundstrom. Transportation will not be furnished as Empire State Building is only 3½ blocks from Hotel Governor Clinton. Arrive at your leisure.

5 p. m.: Leave by bus from Empire State Building for Whitehall Club, 17 Battery Place, Manhattan, for cocktail party as the guests of the United States Lines. Busses returning to the hotel will leave at 7 o'clock from the Whitehall Club.

Rest of Friday evening open.

SATURDAY, JUNE 9

8:30 a. m. Buses will leave Hotel Governor Clinton at 8:30 for B. Altman's Department Store for breakfast and style show for ladies only. The show and breakfast will be in the beautiful Charleston Garden Restaurant at 9 o'clock. Charge of $1 addition is required for payment of breakfast. Corsage and door prizes will be given. After style show you will have free time for shopping, etc., until 12. Independent transportation back to hotel.

12:15 p. m.: Buses will leave Governor Clinton for pier 1, North River, Manhattan, to embark on Coast Guard cutter for cruise around Manhattan Island, and luncheon. Lt. Cmdr. Frederick Goettel will be acting commanding officer. Those having tickets to Perry Como dress rehearsal will debark by tug at pier 9. Others will continue to pier 1 and debark. Buses will take both parties to their destination.

Rest of Saturday evening open.

SUNDAY, JUNE 10

11 a. m.: Brunch at Governor Clinton Hotel.

12 noon: Those in party desiring to do so may visit Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, through the courtesy of Mr. Milton Berger of that company. Tickets have been reserved for our entire group and should be requested upon arriving at the ticket office at Steeple Chase Park. They are being given a complete list of members and guests on the trip. To get to Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, walk east to 33d and Broadway. Take BMT downtown express to Coney Island (ask subway cashier for route number of train). It is estimated that it will take 45 minutes each way. It is suggested, therefore, that those going to Coney Island leave by 3:30 in order to check out of the hotel and board last bus which leaves at 4:45.

4:45 p. m.: Board bus for Jersey City. Train leaves at 5:45. Dinner will be served on train and is included in your ticket.

9:45 p. m.: Special train arrives in Washington, D. C.

Those having tickets to Steve Allen show, "Tonight," Friday night, are required to be in the Hudson Theater, 141 West 44th Street, at least by 10:45. The shows lasts 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Those having tickets for the Perry Como dress rehearsal Saturday afternoon are required to be at the Century Theater, 57th Street and 7th Avenue, by 4:45. As we only obtained 100 tickets to each of the above shows, members can choose which show they wish to attend as long as tickets last. Tickets for these shows will be distributed by Bob Petzold at the Whitehall Club cocktail party.

Tickets to Radio City Music Hall and Roxy Theater will also be available when we get to New York.

Your tickets cover cost of hotel room. However, upon checking out please see cashier and pay incidentals such as telephone calls, room service, etc.

We will see that your bags are placed in your room upon arrival, but it is up to you to see that your bag is placed on bus when you check out. Customary tip is 25 cents per bag.

Busses are furnished to us by the courtesy of Mr. John E. McCarthy, president, New York City Omnibus Corp.

LONG-RANGE WEATHER FORECAST

New York City temperatures will average near or a little below normal. The highest temperature will be near 80° and the lowest near 63. Friday will be warmer, turning a little cooler late Saturday or Sunday. Scattered showers Saturday or Sunday. Not more than one-fourth inch precipitation expected.

Will Soviet Union Confess the Katyn Massacre?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I presented before the political action committee of the Polish-American Congress at Philadelphia on Thursday, May 31, 1956:

WILL THE SOVIET UNION CONFESS THE KATYN MASSACRE?

Again and again my voice and my petitions have been heard crying out in my own country, to the nations of the world and to the high heavens, against the enormity of the crime perpetrated by the Soviet Union and known in the catalog of international outrages as the Katyn massacre. It may be asked of me in the Department of State in Washington, or they may ask it in the United Nations, or in the Kremlin itself: When will I forbear raking up old wounds, when will I cease the clamor for justice and the law? My answer, I am pleased to avow before this, the Polish-American Congress, is as simple, and as fair, as devoid of rancour and vindictiveness, and as righteous as the facts testify. My answer is that neither I, nor the Congress of the United States, nor any international tribunal in the United Nations, can shut its eyes to the horror of the calculated mass murder of the Polish officers and civilians in the forest of Katyn until the truth shall have been acknowledged by the perpetrators or their associates and successors and due contrition observed. For me or for any just official, or for any government in the free world, not to press for adjudication in this wise of an atrocity so enormous, is to make one's self a kind of passive accessory to the crime after the fact.

This I shall never be and thus I stand here today symbolizing, if you please, the conscience of the Congress of the United States and the people of this country. It is not enough that the select committee of which I was a member found unanimously in its investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre that there was irrevocable and conclusive proof that this horror had been committed by the Soviet NKVD or People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. It is not enough to establish the date as not later than the spring of 1940. It is not enough to conclude as the select committee unanimously concluded that the "Soviets had plotted this criminal extermination of Poland's intellectual leadership as early as the fall of 1939—shortly after Russia's treacherous invasion of the Polish nation's borders." I am quoting House Report No. 2430, 2d session of the 82d Congress, which goes on to say: "There can be no doubt this massacre was a calculated plot to eliminate all Polish leaders who subsequently would have opposed the Soviets' plans for communizing Poland."

I say it is not enough to have probed for the truth, unearthed it, exposed it, proclaimed it. For what is involved here is the very heart of the moral values for which World War II was fought, a war that cost mankind 40 million lives and $2 trillion. If we merely find the truth, as we have here, and then tell it and let it pass into history like a forgotten page in a book that is out of date we shall have performed a disservice to western civilization and the free world. For that is only half of the task. We shall have acted weakly and ineffectively and in a manner destined to make us look vapid and hypocritical in the eyes of posterity and pusillanimous before the bar of world opinion. It is one of the major prides of my career in the Congress of the United States that I have not permitted this matter to sleep in the archives of government. Nor could I rest comfortably in my conscience knowing that the job of the select committee, magnificiently accomplished both on American soil and in Europe, might evaporate without a fixed result, like a case tried adequately before a qualified court but without the resultant improvement to society that litigation is expected to yield.

If there is genuinely a new policy in the Kremlin since the death and desanctification of Stalin, I was determined to put it to the acid test.

Thus it was that on May 3 of this year—1956—I wrote Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asking that he transmit to the Polish Government the report of the select committee which is now a public document of the United States. I asked also that the Secretary of State transmit to the United States delegation of the United Nations the same report "so that all members of the United Nations," my letter to the Secretary said, "may be officially aware of the existence of this public document." And finally I asked Secretary Dulles that the report and hearings record of the select committee be placed in all our embassies and libraries overseas through the Secretary's efforts and that of the United States Information Agency.

Since then I have heard from Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, indicating that the Voice of America had broadcast my statements and that of my colleagues in the House to Poland and other Iron Curtain countries, in connection with Polish Constitution Day. Likewise Director Streibert in that same letter of May 18, 1956, informed me that on last April 13 they had broadcast a special commentary on the anniversary of the Katyn massacre. Other broadcasts, the letter said, were forthcoming that might be useful should the Polish Government initiate an investigation of its own into what may be termed one of the outstanding atrocities of the Soviet Union in World War II.

On May 18 of this year the Department of State in response to my letter informed me by letter that they had given practical effect to my suggestions. I was informed that the Department had even before my letter instructed Ambassador Lodge on January 30, 1953, to transmit to the Secretary General of the United Nations 70 copies of the select committee's report. Ambassador Lodge was

instructed to send a note, the Department's letter to me said, to the Secretary General of the United Nations describing the work of the select committee and asking him to transmit a copy of the report to the representatives of each member of the United Nations. This was done, and other steps were taken to reveal definitely before the pertinent body of the United Nations the details of the outrage which concerns us here.

As for the possible establishment of a Soviet or joint Soviet-Polish commission to examine the Katyn Forest massacre; that, the letter from the Department of State informs me, is still in the rumor stage with nothing to confirm the rumor's authenticity.

And that brings me to the issue of the day.

What we are in fact asking for is a second and a honest investigation from behind the Iron Curtain of all the facts behind the Katyn Massacre. The first investigation made by the Soviet Government yielded findings which perpetuated the fraud that sought to absolve the Soviet Union from guilt. We know, and the Russians know, and the Germans know—all the world now knows—that the Kremlin has murder on its hands for the Katyn Massacre. What justice and history, what the ethics of a religious society demand, is that the alleged new masters of the Kremlin who repudidated Stalin, now stand up and be counted. They are asked to give mankind for all time on the basis of a thorough investigation of their own the confession of guilt without which this case cannot be said to be closed. Abundant evidential materials and witnesses still exist. And on the basis of this confession the guilty should be asked to make whatever retribution is yet possible.

It is to this end that in my letter to Secretary Dulles on May 3, of this year, I asked that the Polish Government be furnished anew the report and hearing record of the Select Committee. It is easy enough to make the findings we made, powerful and conclusive as they are, and to now drop the matter. But this course of placid acceptance of a frightful wrong does violence to the most elementary precepts of justice that have evolved in our civilization since the dawn of time. We did what we could in the circumstances, but we must not stop now. The issue before the United States and the world is a strategic one and can be lifted now to the highest vantage point of international drama. It can be lifted to this exposed area because the Kremlin has professed to reform. Whether this is true or just another Communist fraud may now bluntly be determined by a simple question from the President of the United States to the so-called collective leadership of the Soviet Union. The eyes and the ears, the heart and the conscience of mankind, are riveted on these two mighty centers of executive power: the Kremlin and the White House. If Khrushchev and Bulganin mean what they say then let the President ask him to admit forthrightly the guilt of the unspeakable Stalin—on the corroborative evidence they must have in their archives—of this atrocity that brought the record of crime, even in war, to a new all-time high. This crime of crimes must be exposed for what it was just as world society had at Nuremberg condemned the overwhelming crimes of Hitler and his unmentionable associates.

But this time it should be done by confession arrived at by authenticated evidence, from within the Kremlin's own walls, not because the crime needs further authentication, but because this proposed open confession, voluntarily arrived at, is one of the basic penalties communism should be willing to pay in the interests of justice and as proof of the sincerity of its protestations of reform. We have to remember that when the Soviet Union sat in as a judge during the international military trials held in Nuremberg after World War II it came with blood on its hands and guilt in its heart. The adjudications of that court, in my judgment, were the adjudication of the outraged conscience of mankind and were valid, sound, and merited. But the Soviet Union, on the basis of its conduct in the forest of Katyn, came to the judgment table with an unclean soul. Moreover, the 20th century has been the special victim of the type of national fake by which the perpetrator of murder, arson, and torture fabricates the evidence and then the propaganda blaming his crime on the enemy.

The solution of the Katyn crime, in accordance with my suggestion, will help conclusively to nail this type of lie to the masthead of international publicity, so that in the future it will be more difficult to perform this kind of international fraud. Khrushchev and Bulganin must not be invited to come to the United States. They must first be persuaded to go to Canossa in contrition and in penance. Unless a world of justice and righteousness rubs the nose of mankind's ruthless enemies in the ghastly evil of their own deeds, what chance is there for moral progress? I ask you, the Polish American Congress, to join with me in an unrelenting and persistent determination to keep this crime alive in the conscience of the world until the Soviet Union shall have confessed and made amends even at this late date for an outrage that is beyond atonement.

Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following item which appeared in the National Jewish Monthly of May 1956:

NON-JEW ASKS ISRAEL AID

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter, sent in by one of our readers, appeared in the Dallas Times Herald. It was written by the conductor of the Oak Cliff Symphony Orchestra.)

I am a Christian, but I would like to express my admiration for a people who from time immemorial have contributed so much to our civilization and enriched our lives with their culture. Though now surrounded by formidable enemies and forsaken by the very nations which have benefited by their culture and morality and adopted their religion as their own, they now stand alone to defend their new-born liberty with heroism reminiscent of Thermopylae and the Alamo.

Can we Christians accept the Bible and forsake the people who gave it to us? Can we live by the teachings of Christ and not lift a finger to help the Israelis? The Communists are arming the Arabs to exterminate the Jews. Is it too much for liberty-loving Christian America to give the Israelis a few guns in order to defend themselves? Give the Jews a break. They deserve it.—ARMAND DEMOND, DALLAS.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Racine Education Association Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday night, May 28, 1956, it was my privilege to speak at the Racine Education Association dinner at Racine, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES EDUCATION AS KEY TO PROGRESS; URGES SEAWAY FUNDS, SUPPORT OF ENLIGHTENED EFFORTS AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, before the Racine Education Association dinner at Racine, Wis., May 28, 1956)

Good evening, I'm delighted to be here.

I'm always inspired, and challenged, when the opportunity arises to speak before an educational group, such as is assembled here tonight.

You, and the multitude of educators you represent, play a unique role in the development and progress of our citizens and our country.

Our future hinges, to a great degree, on your success in the field of education.

EDUCATION LEADS THE WAY

As you so well know, education leads the way for each of us, and for all mankind. Its guiding light pierces the dark mystery of the unknown—in the physical and the social sciences. By knowledge, we find a path among the "sticks and stones" of life's travels and among the world's dilemmas.

Our teachers and schools make an outstanding contribution to the welfare of our Nation. Our educational institutions give us scholars, teachers, scientists, engineers; undergird our industrial and technological progress; sustain our cultural pursuits; contribute knowledge through research in chemistry, biology, physics, yes, or—in psychology, sociology and the other social sciences, as well as in all other fields essential to our national progress.

Upon the graduates of our educational system we depend for the skill and vision to guide us through the future, to hurtle obstacles in our path, and to strengthen the foundation for continued peace and progress.

WE NEED MATURE AMERICANS

Upon your shoulders lies the burden of developing truly educated citizens. They must not simply be people with vast stores of facts, but, far more important, as you know, people who are genuinely mature—physically, socially, intellectually mature—grownup adults in every sense of those words.

REDUCE THE NUMBER OF IRRESPONSIBLES

You and I can see occasional instances of immature people around us—people who have unfortunately not fulfilled their adult responsibilities. These include shiftless people, lazy people, negligent parents; yes, these grown-ups include lawbreakers and alcoholics.

These are immature people whom society has failed and who, regrettably, have failed society. They are fortunately few in number, but they are nonetheless a drag on society, a burden wherever they live.

You, as builders of men and women, are determined, as I am, to help reduce the numbers of such unfortunates in time to come. It is your aim to develop the finest type of citizen—wide-awake, well-informed, responsible, wholesome, constructive.

A bit later on, I shall refer briefly to the problem of law enforcement and juvenile delinquency.

BUILDING CHARACTER, BUILDING AMERICA

But for now, I simply want to point up the contrast of the decent mass of law-abiding, worthy Americans versus the unfortunate ne-er-do-wells whom we occasionally see.

Real education, real building of character—that is your goal and mine.

But now let me turn to another phase—the building of America—building it, for example, through the St. Lawrence seaway, the type of outstanding project which all thinking Americans support.

COMPLETING THE SEAWAY JOB

Happily, the major battle for recognition of the value of the seaway is won. The Congress has authorized its completion and acted for the deepening and improvement of the connecting channels to 27 feet, for the accommodation of deep-sea vessels the whole 2,300-mile route. Our major task now is to secure the actual channel funds, in accordance with the authorization, and then to negotiate the toll arrangements for the liquidation of the seaway's costs.

There will be tremendous economic benefits. The seaway power phase is estimated to turn out 12.6 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year—more than all the powerhouses of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The trade channels, it is estimated, will carry from 50 to 85 million tons of cargo annually—far more than the Panama Canal.

This reflects only to a smaller degree, the tremendous effects, direct and indirect, which the seaway will have for us.

EXPAND WATERWAY'S CAPACITY

We cannot, however, wash our hands of this and say, "We have won the congressional battle. Now let somebody else carry out the project."

The President, my colleagues, and I in the Congress have fought too hard and long to abandon thought of this tremendous tradeway, just when it is reaching its final stages of completion.

Our effort now must be directed toward resolving the problems of completing the job. You can depend on it; I will be in there pitching: until the last shovel of earth is moved; until each lock is open; until our harbors have been deepened and improved; and until our trade is expanded to the capacity of the seaway.

For example, one problem that we face is that the Welland Canal on the Canadian side of the border is going to be a seaway bottleneck—a serious limit on traffic capacity unless and until its existent locks are doubled.

And here on our side, a great many harbors must be deepened and improved so as to assure fullest seaway benefits.

FULLY UTILIZING THE SEAWAY

The real success of the seaway will depend, to a large degree, on how successfully we utilize this less expensive route to domestic and foreign markets. We must establish new transportation and trade patterns to take advantage of the fullest opportunities offered by this farsighted project.

We must develop and construct a more modern Great Lakes merchant fleet, sailing under American flags and American trade. We must modernize ports and terminals, warehouse facilities, and sidings.

SELLING THE SEAWAY

This requires a selling job. We must sell the seaway to our companies, industries, and people. All must be aware of the tremendous opportunities that will be opened by the seaway.

Agriculture, manufacturing, and other industries—and the related services—can expect to share in the economic boost that will result from full utilization of the seaway.

This will result in a development of existing industry and the movement of new industry into our State. Tremendous opportunities will open in terms of more jobs, better payrolls, and accelerated industrial development. Too, the construction and improvement of highways, railroad, and even airlines to handle the increased traffic will be an economic "shot in the arm."

SEAWAY WILL CONTRIBUTE TO FOREIGN POLICY

The seaway also can contribute greatly to the new philosophy of our international relationship. This new concept means trade instead of aid, for friendly countries. It means meeting the economic challenge of communism in this so-called era of competitive coexistence.

RED DANGER GREATER

Unfortunately, as we are all so well aware, the dark cloud of communism still looms large on the horizons of the free world. Our domestic and foreign policies must—unhappily—continue to be based on combating the serious threat of communism.

There is no turning back in our efforts. There must be no slackening. The danger today is actually greater, because it is more subtle; the Reds are more cunning, more adroit, more skillful, less crude and heavy-handed in their aggression.

Our way must prevail against theirs.

THE INDIVIDUAL—THE STRENGTH OF THE NATION

Our way of freedom, our search for truth, our valuing of human dignity—all this must prevail.

The great strength of our Nation, of course, is the development of the individual, possessing a rich heritage of human ingenuity, imagination, and character.

This is in sharp contrast to the Communist climate, in which—as Khrushchev at one point inadvertently admitted—the price of nonconformity is a bullet in the head.

The recent attempt of Soviet leaders to heap all the crimes of Communist policy upon the dead Stalin has resulted in failure. Exploding the myth of Stalinism—changing him from a Godlike sympol to an ogre of infamy, crime, murder, is supposed to cleanse the bloody hand of the Kremlin. But it will not. Stalinism still lives on. The current regime of communism is built upon, and

carries on, the traditional brutal concepts and tactics of the deposed villain.

As for ourselves, fortunately, for the most part, we have succeeded in blocking the efforts of communism to militarily take over new lands of the world. However, we must continue to stave off these aggressive tactics.

REAPPRAISE OUR POLICIES TOWARD NEUTRALS

As necessary our policies must be constantly adapted to meet new Soviet economic, military, and political challenges. We must reappraise, for example, our policies in dealing with the vast uncommitted, neutralist bloc of the world—a bloc ably and eloquently described by our current visitor, Dr. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia. He is learning about us, and we, fortunately, are becoming better acquainted with him and his people and their way of viewing the world.

Like us in 1789, they want to avoid what they feel are entangling alliances.

But unlike us in 1956, they do not realize that they are menaced actively, just as we are menaced today, but as we were not back in the days of our colonial isolation.

Somehow we must more effectively bridge the gap between our thinking and theirs. But this will take patience and understanding not as some people immaturely recommend—bluster or threats or attempted orders to them.

These neutralists are proud, independent peoples, deserving respect and understanding. That is what they are entitled to, and that is what they will receive from us, just as we, in turn, expect and hope for fair respect and understanding from them—from India and Ceylon, and Burma, and Indonesia, and the other neutral powers.

This can, indeed, come about.

CHALLENGE TO NATO

So, too, the challenge to NATO, now only a military alliance, to become a real political and economic instrument of the free world, offers great promise.

If this is successful with NATO, then SEATO—the alliance of South Asian nations—may also similarly operate effectively against communism in the political and economic sphere, as we are hoping it may be able to in time to come.

In other words, our foreign policy is not and will not be rigid or frozen. Rather we must be flexible and adaptable. That doesn't mean that we will compromise it or abandon principle. But it does mean that we recognize that the world scene is changing with breath-taking speed.

As you know, we have military security pacts with more than 45 other nations.

We must be realistic, however, by acknowledging that pacts are only as binding as the good faith of the member nations, and only as they are capable of fulfilling their commitments.

CRITICAL TIMES AHEAD

We face critical times ahead. Currently, the Mediterranean area has become a particular flaming cauldron. For example:

1. Algeria resounds with gunshots and the cries of dying men.

2. The Middle East is a tempest—with Israeli and Arabs sniping at each other.

3. Cyprus is aflame with nationalistic riots, resulting in serious bloodshed.

We must, of course, be alert to dangers, not only in the Middle East, but all around the world—in Asia, Latin America, Europe.

To cope with the dangers, we must maintain a strong America. This means that we must iron out whatever shortcomings exist—in domestic or international fields—to meet the present and future demands of our country.

WE NEED OPEN MINDS

Sound action will require sound thinking—the thinking of open minds, enlightened minds—not closed, bigoted, immature minds—not minds which fail to realize that we are living in the 20th century, in the jet-atomic age, when we are but 6 hours away from Soviet bomber bases.

You realize these facts, of course, but there are some Americans—yes, Americans who are nominally very well educated, who have nonetheless closed their minds to the facts of life. They ignore the facts which emerge from the ominous results of the H-bomb test explosions in the Pacific—explosions of perhaps 15 million tons of TNT power. They ignore the significance of jet flights of 1,500 miles per hour speed. They ignore the meaning of the NIKE sites around Milwaukee.

And so we need to strengthen American education—adult education and youngsters' education.

We Americans cannot expect to play our full role in world affairs, or to be strong in our domestic affairs, if we fail to adequately solve such problems as now face education in our local communities. Many of our areas, as you know so well, have found themselves continually handicapped by the shortage of trained teachers, and a lack of modern classrooms and equipment.

But, as you well know, too, there is legislation pending in the Congress which may have a vital effect upon our educational sytem and the future role of education in America.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IS CONTROVERSIAL

The topic, of course, is controversial. As we are all aware, many of the folks in our own State—right here in Wisconsin—feel very strongly about some of the features of the present bill before the House of Representatives.

Principally, of course, I think we can all agree that, whatever steps are taken, we must be careful—very careful—to prevent the long arm of Federal control from extending into our school system.

Second, we know that there have been objections as regards the increased cost of the program, if administered through the Federal Government.

None of us, of course, want unnecessary increases in our already heavy load.

KEY QUESTIONS ON EDUCATION

So, the questions are: How fundamentally is necessary Federal construction aid? Can the States be relied on to meet their challenge? Are the States now doing all that they should do, or are they passing the buck to Uncle Sam? And—Could the States pay our underpaid educators more, without undue financial hardship to the respective State treasuries?

These are far from easy questions to answer. But answer them we must.

And our general task is clear. We must get the facts. We must iron out the difficulties and the misunderstandings. We must weigh a program which will not jeopardize the independence of our school system, and yet which will provide adequately for the education of our children, particularly in very low-income States.

How do we do this? That is the challenge which will soon confront the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

A few of the facts of the situation are:

1. We do need new and more schools, and we need them badly.

2. We must provide these in the most economical manner.

3. We must achieve this without Federal control of our school system.

In effect, we must adhere to the fundamental principle, as outlined by President Eisenhower. That is: "Control of education should be as close as possible to parents and citizens in local communities."

CRISIS NOT TEMPORARY

The critical shortage of teachers and facilities is not just temporary. We face increasing demands on our school system, as you are aware.

According to studies made by the Bureau of the Census and other agencies, it is expected that the United States will grow from about 165 million in 1955 to about 190 million in 1965. The school-age population (ages 5 to 17) will increase from about 39 million to over 48 million—an increase of almost one-third of the present total.

OUR WISCONSIN NEEDS

In Wisconsin, for example, it is estimated that 5,975 classrooms will be needed by 1965—at an estimated cost of about $209,125,000. This is an average of $21 million per year.

We, of Wisconsin, rightly pride ourselves in our splendid school system. It is excellent, especially in comparison with that of a great many other States. It is a pacesetter—thanks to you—and you—and you. And yes, to a great and good man who recently passed on—our universally respected friend, John Callahan. God bless his immortal soul.

May we always be inspired by the wonderful innovations he devised, particularly to improve rural education.

The educational pattern in our State, and in America, of course, must constantly adapt to the needs of our changing times. There are many new requirements such as providing facilities for learning on the part of the mentally retarded, the handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, and meeting other special needs.

That includes the needs of the truant, the delinquent, the so-called troublemaker.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

We must carefully analyze too, the present pattern of meeting the needs of higher education—including scholarships, fellowships, loans and grants-in-aid, gifts—in addition to the students' efforts to "pay his own way." This is becoming an increasingly important problem and requires a national reappraisal.

IMPROVING RACIAL RELATIONS

We are all aware also of the difficult problem involved in racial relations, especially in the South, both in institutions of higher learning and in primary and secondary schools.

Fortunately, cool heads, sensible heads, understanding heads, will, I believe, prevail over the "hot-heads" in meeting this problem.

Integration is now the law of the land. The Supreme Court has spoken decisively and unanimously. But it has also spoken for gradualism, for steady but careful handling of the problem at the local level, under the guidance of Federal district courts. Under these circumstances, Congress would be ill-advised to approve the arbitrary Powell rider to the school bill—which would instantaneously—without gradual adaptation—ban outright all funds to unintegrated schools. However well intentioned, this amendment would violate the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision, and it would probably cause an endless filibuster in the Senate, in any event, thus serving to kill the school bill, entirely.

The Yellowtail Dam Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a press release I issued yesterday

concerning Senate Joint Resolution 135, the Yellowtail Dam resolution, and the vacating of the hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the nomination of Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

The article on the D'Ewart hearing and Yellowtail Dam resolution appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald under the byline of Warren Unna, staff reporter, is absolutely without foundation in fact. I am surprised that a newspaper with the reputation of the Washington Post would carry such pure fiction as a news story.

The Yellowtail Dam resolution will stand on its own merit and President Eisenhower, I am sure, will have the advice of his deparment heads as to whether he should sign or veto the resolution. I have not discussed the President's action on the bill with any member of his administration and no one can produce any evidence that I have done so. Certainly I would not be a party to any attempt to imply that the President of the United States would enter into a cheap political deal or horse trade as the Post terms it.

I repeat there is not an iota of truth in the allegation.

As a result of this false charge I have no choice but to vacate the hearing that had been tentatively set on Mr. D'Ewart's nomination. After the President has acted on the Yellowtail Dam resolution I will consult with members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as to what procedure should be followed in connection with the D'Ewart nomination.

Statement of Policy by the American Chemical Society on Matters Relating to Education

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in this technological age many of us are deeply concerned over the possibility of a future shortage of scientifically trained individuals. Much is being said and written on the subject. Many organizations and individuals are taking positive steps to effect changes in this situation.

I have just received from Mr. Alden H. Emery, executive secretary, American Chemical Society, a reprint of an article appearing in Chemical and Engineering News. The article is an official statement of the policy of the American Chemical Society on matters relating to education, and I believe will be of interest to every one. The American Chemical Society is a federally chartered organization with more than 77,000 individual members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY THE ACS ON MATTERS RELATING TO EDUCATION

The United States can be proud of its educational heritage. In accordance with democratic principles, it has placed educational opportunities before all its citizens, a situation that exists in few other countries of the world. Paradoxically, this sound basic philosophy and the general availability of facilities are not meeting the educational requirements of our Nation.

Our great country was founded by people who believed in freedom. Many others who shared those beliefs have been drawn to our shores. Freedom of thought and the development of mental skills to their limits were traits of our forefathers. Yet, as the privilege of formal education has been extended to an increasing number of people, appreciation of the value of and need for a disciplined and rigorous education has decreased. Many who now crowd our schoolrooms are capable of absorbing better training. They do not do so because of lack of motivation or lack of opportunities. Parents and teachers alike are at fault if they do not vigorously and enthusiastically urge every pupil to develop his mental growth to the utmost. Roadblocks to educational opportunities must be eliminated.

In the past several years, there has been a sharp decline in the number of scientists and engineers graduating from our colleges and universities. The decline has been more rapid than the dropoff in the size of college graduating classes. Also, it has come at a time when demand for persons so educated to meet the needs of national defense and an expanding civilian economy greatly exceeds past requirements and promises to rise still higher. The situation imperils the prosperity and security of the United States because both depend on unceasing advances in science and technology.

Although many factors have combined to cause the drop in science and engineering enrollments in colleges and universities, it is generally agreed that one of considerable importance is the current status of science instruction in the secondary schools. Recent surveys have revealed the following disturbing facts:

1. There is a nationwide shortage of qualified high school science teachers.

2. The proportion of new teachers of science has been declining more rapidly than in other fields of specialization.

3. Only about 1 student in 11 enrolled in high school elects chemistry, approximately 1 in 16 elects physics, and the proportion who elect various mathematics courses has been on a decline for nearly a half century. About 1 student in 3 who graduate has taken a course in chemistry.

When high school science, including mathematics, receives so little attention, relatively speaking, it is scarcely surprising that the number of students who major in science and engineering has fallen off. If continued, this trend could have serious consequences to our Nation. Entirely apart from the shortages of specialists whose skills are needed, the situation is unfortunate for high-school students in general. All are destined to live in a world dominated, in peace or war, by the impact of scientific and technological progress. If they are to enjoy useful and satisfying lives in such a world, they must have some understanding of the goals, methods, and importance of chemistry and other basic sciences. If they wish to help mold their own futures, they must have an appreciation of these disciplines. Indeed, such an acquaintance with science is an essential mark of culture in our times.

From a national viewpoint it is eminently desirable that the voters of tomorrow possess some understanding of science. In a democracy the ultimate power rests with the people and they can use it wisely only to the extent that they comprehend the great issues confronting them. Many of these issues inevitably will be created by the march of science and technology.

Assuring chemistry and her sister sciences of proper recognition is but one of many problems facing our high schools. The shortage of qualified teachers afflicts many disciplines. Construction programs have not kept up with soaring school populations. The school tax rate in many districts is imposing a burden on its citizens. Any attempt to improve the position of science and mathematics in the high school is likely to fail unless it be a part of a broad effort to strengthen education as a whole.

Therefore, in the interest of the immediate and long-range needs of our Nation, it is the opinion of the board of directors of the American Chemical Society that every step feasible should be taken.

1. To provide increased educational opportunities for all, particularly those known to have unusual ability.

2. To encourage precollege training which will provide a sound educational foundation for higher education in all fields.

3. To assure maximum and uninterrupted growth of scientific developments by promoting a strong educational system at all levels which will provide an adequate flow of qualified, specialized personnel.

The board is of the opinion that these broad objectives are not being met with the vigor they deserve.

Therefore, it recommends that—

(a) The American Chemical Society strive for the improvement of our educational system as a whole through the efforts of its—

1. Members, who should assume personal responsibility for keeping informed of the current status of problems relating to education, and as citizens and professional people they should do all they can to improve situations in their own communities.

2. Local sections which should continue effective and useful projects and expand their programs to include such activities as vocational counseling, teacher and student aids, awards, continuation courses, lecture series, improved science instruction, and other projects especially appropriate for local sponsorship.

3. Divisions, which should continue, and wherever possible expand, those projects which are now being carried out such as improvement of instruction and the sponsorship of publications, tests, awards, conferences, institutes, and meetings related to education; and

4. Staff, which should accelerate its activities such as coordinating the programs of various society units, encouraging the cooperation of other interested organizations, publicizing educational matters, and studying problems of special importance to the profession.

b. Elementary schools increase their efforts to provide the important initial training in science and mathematics needed as a foundation for secondary school education and for understanding of the technological age in which we live.

c. Secondary schools increase their efforts to provide sound college preparation and that those advising students capable of higher education vigorously urge them to pursue the college entrance curriculum.

d. Secondary schools increase their efforts to provide sound science and mathematics courses for those who are not preparing for a higher education.

e. Colleges and universities increase their efforts to provide an adequate flow of qualified graduates in science and engineering

to supply the needs for uninterrupted growth of technological development.

The board realizes that the responsibility for carrying out these recommendations is as broad as the Nation and that the American Chemical Society is only one of many organizations interested in the educational problems of our country. It is confident that it has the support of its entire membership in pledging the cooperation with the Federal Government, State, and local governments, school systems, indivduals and organizations whose aims are consistent with those of the American Chemical Society. It hopes that all with an interest in solving these critical problems will take active steps toward rectifying current shortcomings and meeting future needs.

Kremlin Holds Onto Stalin's Loot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of June 6, 1956:

KREMLIN HOLDS ONTO STALIN'S LOOT—REDS CRITICIZE DEAD DICTATOR'S CRIMES BUT AREN'T FREEING SLAVE NATIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

We have now entered the second phase of our relationship with the U. S. S. R. The cool war is replacing the cold war. The difference for the time being is that smiles and reassuring words are taking the place of threats and saber rattlings.

The fact is that none of our policymakers, despite their willingness to resume "cultural" relations with the U. S. S. R. can point to a single change in Moscow's fundamental objectives. American politicians who pretend to detect a change of heart in the Kremlin are practicing Coueism. So did the late British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and his cabinet associates in their dealings with Hitler and Mussolini.

How sincere are Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev in their anger toward Stalin? It is noteworthy that violent portions of the denunciations of Stalin by his once faithful subordinates at the 20th Communist Party Congress released Monday by the State Department were intended more for international than national consumption. The label of "murderer and torturer" affixed on the late dictator have not been widely published in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. The "leaks" first to the foreign press in Moscow and now through foreign diplomatic channels indicate some deliberate "planting."

If Bulganin and Khrushchev were honest in their revulsion toward the "criminal" Stalin, they surely would have followed the standard pattern still in effect in the Soviet Union and made their statements in Pravda and not behind locked party doors. Hence the belief that the bitterness toward the dead dictator was more for the foreign than domestic market.

The same thing can be said about the recent "spectacular" change in the Moscow Foreign Office. The old Bolshevik, Vyacheslav Molotov, who served Stalin as faithfully as he has served the present rulers, was replaced by Dmitri Shepilov. The former editor of Pravda is expected to be even tougher than his "frozen face" predecessor. They are both past masters of intrigue and double-talk, with the possible difference that Shepilov is more so.

People who do not want to be fooled by the make-believe attitude, such as Senators WILLIAM KNOWLAND and STYLES BRIDGES and many others in both Houses of Congress, still insist that before embarking on extensive bouquet tossing with the Soviets we must have some deeds to prove their fine words are not all lies. They point out that so far the U. S. S. R. has shown no tendency whatsoever to relinquish any of Stalin's loot.

Free elections in Poland, Czechoslovakia and other satellites have never been mentioned. The tortured Baltic States (which, incidentally, we still recognize as independent republics and which have a full diplomatic representation in Washington) still are held incommunicado.

What the B. and K. team is now doing is to follow the pattern set by their criminal predecessor, but through other means than saber rattling. The NATO, shaky as it was from its inception, did prove a thorn in the side of the USSR. Now France, Britain and the lesser members of that coalition have told us that they want the military signpost removed from that alliance.

Actually, the Soviet general staff has not been particularly worried about the military potential of the two main American allies because of the neutralist winds in both countries. But they are worried about Germany, even partially rearmed. Stalin, before his death, offered the moon and stars to the Bonn government on condition that it would not reorganize militarily as a member of the NATO. The German government and German people had, however, at that time full confidence in America's determination to have a "peace with honor and justice" in Europe and in Asia.

The Bonn government, confident that we would not rest until Germany was unified, decided to join America rather than Western Europe in the struggle for preservation of western civilization. That was the time when we refused to be deceived by any of the Soviet gestures and insisted officially on "deeds not words."

The recent visits of American legislators, churchmen, artists and farmers (with some Soviet men returning them promptly) have depressed the German spirit. The recent announcement that the Air Chief of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, was going to Moscow—the first high ranking American military man since General Eisenhower visited that city in 1945—caused more than alarm in Bonn.

From the technical viewpoint, it is immaterial whether American and Soviet generals and admirals visit each other. From the point of view of the effect in Europe we have everything to lose and not a scrap to gain.

Address by the Ambassador From Brazil to the Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able speech, brilliant in every particular, delivered by His Excellency, Ambassador João Carlos Muñiz, of Brazil, before the 16th annual banquet of the Fourth Degree General Assembly of the Knights of Columbus, in the main ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on April 26, 1956. In the opinion of the guests who, for many years, have had the good fortune to attend this event, the address of Ambassador Muñiz was a masterpiece in content and in style. I am glad to make this insertion at the request of my good friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The responsibility for my being here tonight falls first upon the chairman of your Pan American reception committee, Mr. John H. Van Vleck, who invited me to be your guest at this dinner, and secondly upon my dear friend Ambassador Hector Castro, of El Salvador, who was instrumental in setting me up as the spokesman for my Latin American colleagues. As such, it is my pleasant duty at this time to express our collective thanks to the Honorable Robert C. Hill for his kind and expressive words of greeting.

I ask also to be permitted to make a few remarks of my own. As for these, I believe that my audience will be relieved to know that it is my intention to avoid dimming the genial mood of the time and place by too long an address.

The Catholic world must surely rejoice at the progress which has been achieved by the Knights of Columbus since the organization's modest beginning in 1882 until the present day, when its members are to be found in every State of this great Union, and even in neighboring countries to the North and South. In the present crisis of Western civilization, a society like yours, based on the Catholic faith and inspired by its guidance, can do much, if properly oriented, as a factor for moral and spiritual resistance to the shock of disintegrating forces.

The majority of my listeners here probably know that the countries which make up that part of our Western Hemisphere known as Latin America were guided since birth by the principles of the Catholic faith, which have inspired also their political and social institutions. Their cultures, though varied in outward form, are nevertheless closely bounded to that one faith, from which they cannot be separated without doing violence to nature itself.

My country, Brazil, with a population of 59 million, is today the greatest Catholic nation. Last year, we celebrated in Rio de Janeiro an Eucharistic Congress which surpassed all others ever held, in the number of devotees attending its ceremonies. Close to one million pilgrims made their way to our Capital, coming from all parts of the Catholic world. Those who had the opportunity to be there during those days kept a deep impression of a great spiritual force, uniting, comforting and creating a yearning for a better life under the inspiration of Christ, the Redeemer.

The need for a return to religion possibly has never been so great as in these times. There is a trend toward the abandonment of moral and spiritual values and toward the replacement of those values mainly by materialistic objectives. The discovery of America by Columbus opened new horizons to the world of those times, an abundance of fresh resources and a vastness of living space. It is my belief that destiny has called again upon the New World to come to the aid of humanity with a leadership based upon the principles of Christian order, to counteract the disruptive forces which threaten the spiritual foundations of man's existence.

While the progress of technique opens on one hand immense possibilities for enlarging

man's conquests over the material world, it carries on the other hand a grave risk of dehumanizing him by depriving him of the essential characteristics of personality, liberty and a sense of the divine. It is urgent, therefore, that we adjust our technical civilization to the great currents of spirituality which constitute mankind's most precious heritage. The Americas, by the very quality of their formative principles, are best fitted to carry out this mission.

The current crisis can be overcome only by the strengthening of spiritual values; in other words, by a return to transcendency. The uneasiness and unrest which are rife today throughout the world are proof that man cannot disregard his relationship with the Creator without denying and betraying his own nature.

There are indications, however, of a growing awareness on the part of the present generation that the uncertainties of the times do not come merely from economic and social contradictions, but rather from a deeper cause related to the spiritual nature of man. This is the explanation for the outbreaks of religiosity and mysticism which we notice occasionally here and there. Despite the grossness of some of these manifestations, they nevertheless denote a search for the Divine. The science of physics itself, which was the first to try to sever man's relationship toward his Creator, now is showing a reverse trend by the attitude of some of the most outstanding figures in that field, that the universe and the constitution of matter itself can only be explained as the work of a creator. The founder of modern physics, Planck, affirms that the creed of the religious man is perfectly compatible with the findings of physical science. Another great modern physicist states that the discovery of a natural law is a meeting with God. On entering his laboratory, the research worker can, with all propriety, repeat the words of the Mass: ad introibo ad altare Dei. To his eyes, the great adventure of scientific research, patient and thrilling, is a search for God and His thought. Science, in its modern form, thus constitutes a formal denial of the materialistic premises of communism. The alleged scientific bases on which Marx built his doctrine are obsolete today.

In spite, therefore, of the forces which act to subordinate man more and more to technique, to the detriment of the spirit, there are, fortunately, other factors at work for the reinvigoration of spiritual values.

Tte very excesses of materialism are of a nature to provoke reactions in favor of a revival of spirituality. This fact has been proven in the historical record of periods of materialism succeeded by eras of greater spirituality.

It is in this sense that a society like the Knights of Columbus, ever alert for the defense of the values of Christian life, deserves all encouragement and the determined support of men of good will.

Cut May Help Allies Face Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the June 5 edition of the Saginaw News entitled "Cut May Help Allies Face Responsibilities":

CUT MAY HELP ALLIES FACE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Eisenhower administration called NATO boss Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther to Washington where testimony of the "big gun" before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is calculated to persuade the House that it made a mistake in slashing the foreign-aid bill by nearly $1.2 billion.

General Gruenther is an articulate, persuasive advocate. He has expressed fear that Congress is taking the Russian smiles, happy talk, and gay receptions too much at face value. He warns that the Russians haven't reduced their capability of launching an attack one iota by cutbacks in their standing armies.

We agree with the general. But we don't agree with the course of defense NATO allies have been taking, altogether too much at American expense. Back in 1953 when Gen. Matthew Ridgway was NATO commander, he too flew to Washington to testify on the need for continuing foreign aid. He warned that if aid were cut sharply the Allies might lose confidence in us.

Frankly, we've lost some confidence in the single-purposed determination of our allies. German rearmament has been discouragingly slow. The West Germans understandably prefer to put their economic gains into civilian enterprises—but so do we. The French have been apathetic about contributing to NATO defense. They have their hands full at home, where their Government is tottering precariously, and abroad, where their colonies are in open revolt. They've even taken NATO forces and diverted them to North Africa. Great Britain also has been slackening off its defense efforts in this so-called joint undertaking.

The United States, first, has underwritten the economic restoration of its friends and some former enemies; now it is underwriting the military defense of these friends who were supposed to be standing on their own two feet by this time.

The countries we've aided are directly "under the gun" of any Soviet aggression. If they haven't the will to sacrifice for the protection of their own freedoms, an American begins to wonder whether it is worth all the cost for the day that they will make up their minds.

Other than a growing American impatience with the footdragging tactics of our allies, this country's taxpayers needn't be made to feel guilty over any cuts now under consideration by Congress. It isn't as though the United States were pulling out of Western Europe, letting the defense system go by the boards after years of buildup. The foreign aid budget asked is for $4.9 billion. The cut under consideration is $1.2 billion. But in addition to this current appropriation there remain large unspent balances.

As recently as Monday the Council of State Chambers of Commerce released a study showing that the mutual security program would have available for expenditure in fiscal 1957 more than $10.5 billion, enough to carry the program 2½ years at the present rate of spending.

The council suggests, and we heartily concur that Congress make a thorough critical reexamination of the entire program. Congress has had to lean on testimony offered by those in the thick of the program. They aren't going to paint a picture that would invite cutbacks, so Congress doesn't have all the information it needs to deal intelligently with the program, present, and future.

A congressional investigation of the program would benefit both Congress and the American people. We'd all have a better knowledge of where this thing is carrying us, and a chance to weigh ultimate goals against further costs.

As it stands now, there appears to be ample foreign aid money appropraited, even after the contemplated budget cut this year, to carry the United States' share of the program while this study is being made. Then, 2 years hence, let's look at the new findings and see what is necessary. We've a suspicion our allies need a sound jolt from us before they will wake up to their own responsibilities. And apparently no one short of Congress is going to take the bull by the horns.

Darkness All Day Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1956:

DARKNESS ALL DAY LONG

The text of Nikita Khrushchev's sensational anti-Stalin speech reads, in large part, like something extracted from Arthur Koestler's Darkness at Noon or George Orwell's 1984. Although it probably is an abridged version, and although the State Department does not vouch for its authenticity, there is little reason to doubt that it says essentially the same things as were said last February to the Moscow Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

As far as substance goes, the charges made in the speech have been known to the world for many weeks past. But the text greatly increases the original impact of the story. For the statements attributed to Mr. Khrushchev (he has yet to deny them) add up to as damning an indictment as anybody could deliver against Josef Stalin and the terrible decades of his one-man rule. Here we have a spine-chilling picture of a tyrant gone beserk with power—a supremely vain and evil man, a psychopath of the worst kind, who imposed a reign of terror on all of Russia. His will was law, and to carry it out he resorted unrestrainedly, and at times insanely, to lies, plots, counterplots, torture, blood purges, absolute oppression and merciless mass murder. And he came close to wrecking his country with his military judgments and decisions, including his refusal to listen to advance warnings against Hitler's attack.

When he told this story to the secret Moscow session last February, Mr. Khruschev merely confirmed what most free men had assumed for a long time before that. But he did not answer—nor does the purported text of his speech—a number of big questions that still puzzle even the best of our Soviet experts. He has failed, for one thing, to explain why he and Russia's other new "collective leaders" apparently did nothing to restrain Stalin but instead acted as his most fawning sycophants until the day he died (or was he murdered?). He has suggested that they were all too terrified by the man, but this is hardly explanation enough to absolve them of their own large measure of guilt for all that happened under his rule, not excepting the Korean aggression. Nor has anybody made clear as yet exactly why these men have decided to undertake so large and so risky a task as Stalin's deglorification from synthetic divinity to unspeakable devil.

Director Allen W. Dulles of our Central Intelligence Agency has said that this decision has been motivated only in part by the Kremlin's desire to acquire international respectability. The major reason for it, in his view, is that Mr. Khruschev and his col-

leagues have found it expedient, and perhaps imperative, to placate a large body of anti-Stalinists at home, and to that extent the development may mark the start of a significant liberalizing trend. But still, all of us had better keep in mind Mr. Dulles' warning that "the final and real test of the Soviet leaders will remain their willingness to accept those basic institutional changes that can give the Russian people and the world in general genuine assurance that a one-man or three- or four-man dictatorship cannot again plot in secret the massive domestic and international crimes" of Stalin's day.

As matters stand, such institutional changes—including particularly the creation of opposition parties, an independent judiciary and a free press—seem as remote as ever in the Soviet Union. Accordingly, unless or until they take place, the free world must continue to reckon with a dangerous Russian tyranny. The deglorification of Stalin has yet to alter that fact in the slightest. There is still darkness all day long in the Red empire.

Address Delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., on June 1, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to meet with this club which has served as a forum for discussion of public affairs for so many years. I think most people seek something the Commonwealth Club helps to provide—new knowledge and understanding of the changing world about us.

In fact, within the life of this club over the past 53 years, there have been startling growth and change in America—growth and change unmatched by any other major country in history. In this period we have increasingly shifted from an essentially agricultural basis to an industrial basis—with all its economic and social adjustments. We have grown in population from about 80 million people to over 167 million. The number of workers has increased from about 32 million to about 64 million. In terms of constant dollars, the national product has increased more than four times. In the same terms, in actual purchasing power, the average income per man, woman, and child has more than doubled. And most important of all, in all these material advances, we have not neglected the strengthening of the freedoms and moral fiber of our self-governing society.

Nowhere has growth and change been more evident than here in California. In many ways, you in California have been in the forefront of the national advance. As business and professional men, many of you here have demonstrated the essentials of progress—imagination, hard work, a venturesome spirit, a willingness to invest funds and effort in research, in new ways of doing things, in new plants and new products. In your growth and progress, you have shown faith in forward movement. You have not been intimidated by the past; you have grasped the promise of the future.

Because the world is more complex and is changing more rapidly than ever, one thing is clear. If we are to continue to progress as a people, we must keep one eye on today's operation and the other eye on tomorrow's problem. We must not let the tide of changing conditions and new problems sweep over and beyond us. We must plan in the present to keep abreast of the future and meet new problems as they arise. In short, we must make a larger investment in those measures which give us vision and help us build for tomorrow.

The strange notion has been expressed in some quarters that the administration in Washington is interested solely in tidying up the Government and seeing that it operates smoothly and without waste. It has been suggested that the administration is standing pat and not recognizing needs and advancing new proposals to meet them—that forethought and planning are, somehow, the exclusive virtues of others.

To be sure, this administration does think that economy and efficiency are important—and I doubt that anyone will be foolhardy enough to label these qualities as sins in operating the people's business. But we believe something more. We believe that effective self-government demands imaginative and fruitful planning for human welfare in the future.

Acting on this belief, we in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are advancing a wide range of new proposals which we believe will contribute to the future well-being of the people. The administration is earnestly seeking to strengthen, to expand, and improve many of the Federal activities through which individuals may attain improved health, better education, and more economic security. To help achieve these goals, we are proposing a 24-percent increase in the Department's appropriations for the coming fiscal year, including $450 million in new legislation. And this is within the framework of a balanced budget.

This is the largest dollar amount ever sought for these activities in any one year. We are seeking this expansion because we know these programs build a firm foundation for the future. They advance the welfare of the individual human being. As the individual advances in health, education, and economic security, not only is his own life enlarged but the Nation as a whole is enriched. For progress in these fields is fundamental to progress in our expanding economy, our national security, our system of self-government, our very way of life.

In strengthening these programs, the aim is to bring to them a new emphasis, a forward look. We recognize that simply spending more money is far from the answer. We are seeking to emphasize the more constructive aspects of these programs—those activities which are most particularly concerned with the future. The proposed expansion involves new or improved research in every field in the Department. We want to explore some of the hard-core problems that have beset health, education, and welfare for many years. We want to look ahead and head off other problems before they become acute.

One of the best hopes for improving the level of health lies in constantly advancing medical research. Largely through progress in medical research, within the past 10 years the death rate has dropped more than 50 percent for pneumonia and influenza and about 73 percent for tuberculosis. The threat of paralytic polio is being lifted from millions of children. And yet, disease and disability still exact a terrible toll. Cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, for example, still present enigmas to medical science.

Federal funds for medical research, to be sure, have increased greatly in recent years. But they are still too low in relation to the need or the dramatic opportunities for the future. The administration, therefore, has asked Congress for the largest increase in funds for medical research ever recommended in 1 year. The proposal called for appropriations of $126½ million, an increase of $27½ million, for the national institutes of health, the principal research arm of the public health service. A major portion of these additional funds would be used to increase by 47 percent the Government's grants for research conducted by medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and scientists throughout the country.

In this connection, the number of medical research grants to California scientists already has risen from 140 to 300 over the last 5 years, and the amount of these grants has increased from $1.5 million to $3.7 million.

Clearly, medical research cannot be expanded and improved without adequate laboratories and trained men to do the work. And yet, today, there is a critical shortage of modern buildings and equipment for medical research and training. We have proposed, therefore, a new, emergency program of Federal grants to medical schools and other nonprofit research institutions for the construction of modern research and teaching facilities. Under this program, over a 5-year period, $250 million would be provided in grants, to be matched by the institutions. The program not only would provide more and better facilities for research but would help train more scientists and physicians to fill a critical need.

Those of you who are familiar with the Stanford Medical School in this city will know precisely what I mean. The staff is of the highest quality, and if they had more adequate physical facilities they would be able to make a greater contribution to the Nation's medical research program.

The administration's program in the field of health includes many other steps. Proposals are now pending before Congress:

To expand and improve the training of practical nurses, professional nurses, and public health personnel.

To establish a continuing national survey to develop sorely needed basic information on the nature and extent of sickness and disability in the population.

To strengthen the effort to control the pollution of streams and rivers.

To provide grants to finance special demonstration projects to develop improved methods of caring for the mentally ill.

And to encourage the expansion and improvement of voluntary health insurance to help meet the rising costs of medical care.

We are hoping for early congressional action on these and other proposals which are designed to improve the Nation's health.

One of the best examples of constructive action for the future is the Federal system of old-age and survivors insurance, one of the Nation's strongest bulwarks against human distress. It is a program built on the principle that to relieve poverty is good, but to prevent it is better. I recall that at the outset of this program many people, including many businessmen, voiced fears that the social-security system would bog down in staggering administrative costs and redtape. But today the administrative costs are remarkably low—less than 2 percent of the contributions. Fears were expressed that the social-security system would dampen individual initiative, industry, and thrift. But today, after 20 years of social security, individuals on the whole have built more economic security for themselves—through private means—than ever before.

I recall the fear that political pressures would increase social-security benefits all out of line with a sound program. But the fact is that when this administration took office, we found benefits were too low. They had failed to keep pace with wage increases and living costs.

One of the President's first recommendations to Congress was a major expansion and improvement of the old-age and survivors insurance system. Benefits were increased for everyone under the system, and protection was made available to an additional 10 million workers. Today, 9 out of every 10 American workers can look forward to social-security benefits in their retirement. Should death take the family breadwinner, 9 out of every 10 families are protected with survivors benefits.

It is important to bear in mind that the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance is to provide basic protection—an economic floor upon which workers can build additional security. In the past 20 years, private pension plans have developed rapidly, and they should continue to expand and improve. If it were not for the social-security system and private pension plans, millions of additional persons would be forced to turn today to the public assistance programs to meet their essential human needs.

This administration is following a policy of keeping the social-security system as sound and fair as possible. We look forward to continuing improvements in this program, including extension of coverage to those groups who are still excluded. But we must be especially careful that proposals for new benefits are equitable and can be soundly administered—that they are actually in accord with changing conditions of our times. And we must remember there is a limit to the social-security taxes which should be imposed on the people if we are to retain public support for the system in all the years ahead.

Despite our progress in old-age and survivors insurance, and our prolonged and unprecedented prosperity, about 5 million people in this country today are receiving public assistance. These are the needy aged, the needy blind, the totally disabled, and children deprived of parental support. Under our system of government and the concept of Christian ethics, this assistance should be provided—efficiently, equitably, and with warm consideration for the individual.

But we have a deeper duty to those receiving public assistance than the mere payment of dollars to relieve distress. For those who can benefit, we should invest in services that will help them to build toward independence and a full and richer life. These are the services on which the administration is now placing new emphasis, and they hold the promise of human and economic rewards for the future.

The administration is proposing amendments to the public assistance laws to emphasize that their purpose is to provide services designed to increase self-support and self-care when this is possible. We are asking for Federal funds to help relieve a critical shortage of workers trained to deal effectively with the basic problems of people on public assistance. And we are urging funds to support new research and demonstration projects to shed more light on the factors that cause dependency and to show in actual practice effective ways of helping people overcome dependency.

Already there have been examples which give promise of what may be accomplished with this approach. In Allegheny County, Pa., for example, a demonstration program concentrated on 285 families who had received public assistance funds for as long as 10 years continuously or intermittently. At the end of 11 months, 64 families no longer needed assistance, and 53 families no longer required as much assistance. The other 168 families were receiving vocational rehabilitation services or other special forms of aid. One supervisor and 4 trained caseworkers, whose salaries totaled about $16,000, comprised the staff of the project. The reduction in public assistance expenditures achieved during the 11 months alone was $27,960—and this saving will continue.

In New York City, a skilled welfare staff undertook a 3-year program along similar lines. There were 2,700 cases involving people who had been unemployed from 1 to 19 years. As a result of services supplied in the experiment, 616 persons were restored to independence. The savings in the actual cost of assistance has been $616,000 a year. But far more important than the saving of tax dollars is the promise of a richer life for these men and women.

One of the most striking examples of the wisdom of investing in human resources is the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation. Under this program, the Federal Government and the States share the cost of restoring disabled persons to productive lives. A few years ago, the number of disabled persons restored to productive employment was declining. The President proposed and Congress unanimously adopted a major expansion and improvement, providing more funds, more facilities, more research, more training of personnel. Now there is a steady increase in the number of persons who are conquering the handicap of disability and finding new hope and dignity in a productive life. We are planning still further expansion and improvement in this program, which brings such rich humanitarian and economic rewards for today and for the future.

In California alone, 1,618 disabled persons were returned to employment and a self-sustaining life through vocational rehabilitation last year. These people were earning less than $186,700 a year when they started on the road to self-support. The first year after their rehabilitation, their earnings were estimated at more than $4.4 million. An unusual aspect of California's record is that 438 of those rehabilitated were receiving public relief payments as their major source of income. That is 27 percent of the total. Many others were receiving some public assistance payments.

In the Nation as a whole, more than 11,000 of those rehabilitated last year had been receiving public assistance payments. It cost about $8 million to rehabilitate this group—but it would have cost almost $10 million each year to maintain them on relief. Relief costs generally were stopped and earnings and tax payments were started, but the richest reward from this program is the conversion of misery and despair into hope, dignity, and a productive life.

Many factors must be employed to assure a bright future. None is more important than the education of children. For in education, we have at stake the quality and character of tomorrow's citizens and, thus, tomorrow's America.

A weakness in education, a failure to achieve full intellectual attainment, is more than a deep personal loss to the individual. the effects of inadequate education cannot be quarantined to a person, or a household, or a community, or a State. Poor education anywhere inevitably weakens our general welfare and retards our national progress.

In any age, it is foolish economy—penny-wise and pound foolish—to neglect the education of children. In this age of increasing challenge to our society and our way of life, it is doubly dangerous. Surely, as we increase our investments in those programs which enrich the future, we must increase our investments in education.

One out of every four Americans today—almost 40 million—is a full-time student in school or college. We have spent some $30 billion in the physical plant for their education, and we spend about $14 billion each year to operate our educational system, from kindergarten to college. And yet, in view of the fundamental importance of education, in view of the tremendous scope of the educational system, it is a shocking fact that the Federal Government has been investing annually less than half of $1 million in research to help make our educational system more efficient and more effective.

And so this year, President Eisenhower has urged upon Congress a major increase—from about $3 million to about $6 million—in funds for operating the Office of Education. This program would increase many services now provided by the office to schools all over the country, but the bulk of the funds would be employed to provide a comprehensive and far-reaching program of cooperative educational research for the first time in our history. Most of the research would be performed at colleges, universities, and in State departments of education throughout the country. A doubling of funds for the Office of Education may seem to be a big step. But a big step is needed if we are to illuminate some of the hard-core problems that have been retarding the progress of education for many years.

One of the problems we hope to study is waste of the Nation's young talent. Every year about 60,000 of the best students drop out of high school before graduation. And of those who do graduate, about half of the students in the upper half of their class do not go on to college on a full-time basis. We want to end this waste—to find a way to keep students in school until they have reached their highest potential. We need more study and more facts on the critical problems of housing and staffing our schools and colleges. We need research to help find the way to meet the educational needs of families with low incomes. We want to study how schools, having direct daily contact with children, can help detect and prevent juvenile delinquency; how schools can help the retarded child to learn more; and how they can help the child with exceptional mental ability to make the most of it.

Our investment in the future also is short-sighted and inadequate when we fail to provide proper physical facilities for the pursuit of learning. Today, close to a million children are attending half-day school sessions because of the critical shortage of classrooms in some communities across the country. Several million other children are preparing for tomorrow's complex world under the handicap of schools that are too old, too shabby, or too cramped.

One essential fact is clear and unmistakable. The classroom shortage has got ahead of us. And the shortage is acute in many communities.

During the depression we lacked funds for school construction. During World War II materials were not available. On top of this legacy, we are now in the midst of a rapid and sustained enrollment increase which far exceeds any in our history. Every 5 minutes, day and night, a new classroom of children reaches school age. Probably more than 12 million children will be added to our school population within the decade from 1950 to 1960—a 50-percent increase.

The States and communities by themselves have not adequately met the shortages accumulated from the past and the swelling tide of new students. Certainly the States and communities have the major responsibility, and certainly they must increase their efforts. But the fact is that they have already increased their building programs notably. Six years ago, they spent about $1 billion to build 36,000 new classrooms. This year they are spending about $2½ billion to build about 67,000 classrooms. But even so, they are still falling far short of needs.

President Eisenhower for many months now has been urging enactment of a sound and effective emergency program of Federal assistance to help needy communities build more classrooms for our children. The proposal has been designed to avoid any Federal interference whatsoever with State and local control of education. The program has been anchored to the basic principle that Federal assistance should encourage even greater efforts by States and communities. It has been devised so that Federal assistance would be distributed where the needs are greatest and local financial resources are weakest, so that Federal aid would return the greatest benefit not only to the needy local districts but to the Nation as a whole.

But another issue—unrelated to the merits of the school-construction proposal itself—has become an obstacle to progress of the school bill in Congress. This is the issue of racial integration in the public schools.

The commingling of these two issues profits neither school construction nor integration. They are separate issues, and they should not be confused. The problems of integration can best be solved under the procedures and the spirit set forth in the Supreme Court's opinions. The proposal to help wipe out the classroom shortage can best be solved on its own merits.

Children cannot wait. Children of all races need schools now. If we fail to meet this emergency now, the problem will only be compounded for the future. We are hopeful that Congress will act—within the next few weeks—to help build more schools for the Nation's children.

In the meantime, the administration has moved with forethought on another aspect of education—the increasing pressure on our facilities for higher education. Within 10 years we must meet the needs of 5 students in our colleges and universities for every 3 who are there today. While higher education is the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions, comprehensive planning on a nationwide basis is needed. To encourage a broad-scale attack on the problems of education beyond the high school, the President recently appointed a group of distinguished citizens to make studies and proposals in this field.

Our education, our health, and our economic welfare cannot be static elements of our national life. They are, in fact, always on the move—in one direction or the other. As you in California have demonstrated, our direction must be forward. For if we fail to move ahead, problems only multiply; one unanswered problem begets many others. And so there is great prudence in progressive investments that look to the future.

Memorial Day Address at Annual Memorial Day Services, Post No. 591, the American Legion, Houtzdale, Pa., May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the annual Memorial Day program conducted by Freeberg Post, No. 591, the American Legion, Houtzdale, Pa., at 2 p. m., May 30, 1956, at which time I delivered the principal address.

My address follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY PROGRAM, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 591, HOUTZDALE, PA., MAY 30, 1956, 2 P. M.

For the past 88 years it has been our custom—on the 30th day of May—to honor the memory of those who sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom.

Memorial Day is, therefore, a day of reverence and prayerful meditation.

Memorial Day began in the year 1868 when Gen. John A. Logan, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his famous order No. 11.

In that order he made official the example set by the women of Pennsylvania and Virginia when they decorated the graves of the Union and Confederate Army dead.

That is how Decoration Day—or Memorial Day—began.

And thus it has been ever since.

On this one day in the year we put aside, momentarily, our prejudices and our important and trivial tasks, to pay tribute to those who have successfully defended our right to think as free people.

Memorial Day is in honor of more than one million Americans who have died in combats waged since the Revolutionary War of 1775.

That is a mighty number.

It is greater than the populations of Boston, Baltimore, Cleveland, or San Francisco.

Those are the heroes of our land.

They gave everything they possessed—and we are the beneficiaries.

So we give them these few moments each year to express the gratitude that fills our hearts.

Our tribute is not lavish.

The words we use are very simple.

The poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, described the whole process in these lines—

"Your silent tents of green,
We deck with fragrant flowers,
Your's has the suffering been,
The memory shall be ours."

Yes, our memories extend far back into history—and they span great distances.

Our tributes—are to the Americans—who have died in all the wars of history.

That takes us back more than 180 years and through more conflicts than most of us can recall.

The mortal remains of our honored war dead lie at rest in our homeland and at far distant places.

The American dead—are buried—around the earth.

The sun never sets upon them.

More than 100,000 of them lie under the American flag in Europe and Asia.

Some 30,000 others are buried beneath the waters of the seven seas.

Many of those—are the unidentified dead—known but to God.

Their memories are perpetuated in symbolic fashion by the tomb of the Unknown Soldier erected on the green slopes of Arlington National Cemetery.

Standing before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, one becomes aware that there are no strangers among our honored heroes.

There the inscription reads—"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier—known but to God."

There is no name upon the tomb.

The constant presence of a lone guard pacing silently, smoothly, briskly, back and forth before the tomb—day and night—signifies our Nation's mighty reverence.

The wreath at the base of the Unknown Soldier's tomb is silent except for an occasional stirring in the wind.

The Capital City in the distance is like a painted backdrop.

The tall slender spire of the Washington Monument and the domed Capitol building represent strength, vision and the law of our land.

Collectively—the whole setting stirs the blood and memories of all Americans.

This setting has great power because it reaches the innermost recesses of our hearts and makes us feel the kinship we have as fellow Americans with the Unknown Soldier.

Then comes the realization that the Unknown Soldier represents every lost comrade who gave to his country the last full measure of devotion.

Truly, there can be no unknown among our honored dead.

We can name each man clearly.

He represents the sons and brothers who have gone—all the schoolmates and comrades who joked and laughed with us.

He is each of them just resting there waiting for us to join him—as surely we shall when we have finished our earthly tour of duty.

This is truly a day of memories.

Some of them are vivid despite the passing years.

Every living man who has lost a comrade in war remembers the particular person, place, and moment of parting.

We are reminded of this when we read the lines written by the World War II soldier who described his experience on the island of Okinawa.

He recalls that following one hard battle he walked silently along the lines of American dead—just before their burial.

And later he wrote these words:

"Yes, I had known them.

"I remembered our intense conversations—our idle talk.

"I remembered their hopes, ambitions, and plans.

"When I have returned to the States there will be times when their voices shall echo across the miles of water to remind me that I had known them—to remind me that they were the price of my future."

Those were one man's memories.

Now we are living that future—in freedom, in peace, and in debt to the millions of friends who did not come back with us.

We are indebted also to the many others who did return—suffering the wounds of war.

Having this special day—this Memorial Day—makes it easier for us to remember those to whom we are indebted.

Surely nothing else in our daily lives can sharpen our recollection or appreciation as clearly as does Memorial Day.

We remember the victories because we were there to cheer and to celebrate the battles won.

Those were the battles for which we took credit.

But if we think that the victories were ours alone, then we have forgotten and our eyes have failed to see the men for whom the poet, Alfred Noyes, spoke when he wrote these lines:

"God, how the dead men grin by the wall,
Watching the fun of the victory ball."

What of the victory?

Have we won it with no strings attached?

Unfortunately not.

There is no absolute victory.

Because the transition to peace is not easy nor is it final.

We who have fought America's wars brought back with us the memories of our tortuous struggles up the steep road to victory.

And we remember those who were lost on the way.

We express eternal gratitude for their spirit, their courage, and their brawn, which enabled us to gain our goal.

Without them we could not have gained victory.

Without this hard-earned victory we would not be enjoying peace today.

We would not have saved our freedom except for the sacrifices of our fallen comrades.

The solemn atmosphere of Memorial Day reminds us of our eternal obligation to these honored dead.

Do we pay our debt to them in full, merely with our thoughts, our flowers, and our eulogies?

The answer to those questions is that the debt is never fully repaid.

The value of a single life cannot be measured with praise, flowers, or monuments.

Only through most worthy deeds can we express in small degree our humbleness and devotion to those who gave so much, so that we could retain the right to live in freedom.

The men we honor on this Memorial Day represent a true cross section of the America we love and cherish.

Even though we cast them in the single role of the dead, they were the vibrantly living youth of our land.

They were the boys who came from our cities, towns, and local neighborhoods; from our schools, churches, and playgrounds.

They were from families rich and poor.

They were the educated and the self-taught.

They were the Protestants and the Catholics, the gentiles and Jews, the native sons and the foreign born.

They were as different as you and I, but in the final analysis they were fellow Americans.

They had the same fine qualities of courage and loyalty.

They fought shoulder to shoulder with us to defend American security, honor, and freedom.

Because of that powerful unity in purpose and strength, binding all the men of our fighting forces, we were able to defeat the enemies of our land.

As a result today we are enjoying continued freedom.

Because of this freedom on this Memorial Day we are paying loving tribute to those who did not return.

But what of the future?

Is our security as a nation assured forever?

Frankly, freedom can never be taken for granted.

We must keep on guarding and fighting for it constantly.

We must remain ever alert to the call to duty—always willing to pay the price of freedom.

Most of us remember 3 ghastly wars waged for freedom within the past 39 years—World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

As a result of these devastating wars we know that dictatorships can never be trusted.

Yes, we know too well that we dare not leave American ideals unguarded.

We know we must protect them boldly, positively, and will full awareness of the constant threats to our liberties—otherwise we fall victims to aggression—as have so many other nations of the world.

Truly—freedom is at a premium today.

There are nearly 3 billion people living on the face of the earth.

Less than half of the world's population enjoy individual liberties, which are the birthright of every American.

Those millions now living in virtual slavery have been deceived, overpowered by ruthless foreign aggressors.

Their pitiful plight is a warning so clear and so terrible that we dare not ignore it.

What has happened to the enslaved peoples of the world can happen to us unless we exert constant vigilance in guarding our precious liberties.

These should be our thoughts on this Memorial Day of 1956.

They should impress upon us the costly price of our freedom purchased in the blood of over a million American patriots.

On this day of memories we can hear the voices of those men, reminding us that we knew them and that we should not forget the great contribution they made in freedom's cause.

Finally, on this Memorial Day we should think more clearly of the past and of the future filled with challenges to the American way of life.

With hearts filled with loyalty and gratitude for the legacy of liberty and freedom, let us resolve on this Memorial Day to keep faith with those who gave their all in defense of Old Glory and who by their sacrifices have made it possible for us to utter the prayerful exclamation:

"Thank God, I am an American."

Channel Years, Channel Quarters, and Channel Crossings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LAW OFFICES, H. C. CHURCHMAN,
Council Bluffs, Iowa, May 16, 1956.

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: Looking toward a single governmental source and to avoid requests for free copies of my channel years, I enclose a photostat copy and not only authorize but request you to have the same inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This chart and description originated from my study at Longview Farm, beginning in 1945, and is, with generous aid from hundreds of sources, a product of my own funds. The channel chart is not a calendar. It is not a replacement or reform of any calendar. It may be used by anyone, including accountants, CPA's, businessmen, and governments in avoiding the 53d weekly payment in some years (52 in all years). It would avoid the 53d pay-as-you-earn (England's PAYE) withholding- and insurance-tax deduction and other nuisance products resulting from use of the weekly pay installment. It is amazing the number of businesses in the United States of America using a 7-day pay period other than the common Christian week. This chart aims to bring order out of chaos, to unify all these efforts around the earth, by starting the seasonal year with the mean southern solstice day, and 7-day periods with the first day following it.

A gradual, free, and voluntary enlargement of its use will result in 52 weekly paychecks and withholding-tax installments in all years of the Gregorian common calendar in all countries where that calendar is either officially approved or its use is legally permissive. It might be used commercially in Israel, in India, in China, as well as in Moslem countries throughout the world, without the slightest disparagement of their own religious and other cultural calendars, and with no amendment or displacement of their calendars.

It permits commonly numbered quarterly comparisons and reports, with each quarter in every tropical solar year containing the same number of 91 days throughout the earth. It might be used by the United States Government at some future date for payroll and other purposes. Its use in State workmen's compensation cases is possible, to determine from annual or quarterly or monthly wages the amount of a person's weekly wage.

Channel years and channel quarters are friendly toward the weeks of Hebrews, Christians, Moslems, Hindus, and all others. They are impartial among them, espousing or destroying none of them. All governments might successfully follow the channel year, displaying no partiality for or against any religious group. Each nation and each religion would still retain the right to enjoy, and actually to follow, its own calendar, its own week, its own holidays. Nobody would lose a holiday or birthday anniversary—each gains a second landmark for all anniversaries. Lincoln, for instance, was born on the 53d, Washington on the 63d, and you [Hon. BEN JENSEN, Member of Congress] on the 361st day after the mean southern solstice day, come what changes may to the length of Gregorian common calendar months.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY CLARENCE CHURCHMAN,
Lieutenant Colonel USAR Retired.
LONGVIEW FARM, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA.

CHANNEL YEARS, CHANNEL QUARTERS, AND CHANNEL CROSSINGS

(By Henry Clarence Churchman)

In view of the increasing need for a shorter period of accounting which is related, like the month, to the solar year and to quarter years, it was thought appropriate to publish Churchman's Channel Years, Channel Quarters, and Channel Crossings.

1. The days of every regular tropical solar year, beginning with the mean southern solstice day, are numbered forward from 0 to 364, both days inclusive; and in leap years from 0 to 365, inclusive. The cipher day is matched with the present Gregorian common calendar day of December 21, the mean southern solstice day. The channel year, consisting only of consecutively numbered channel days commencing with cipher, is the simplest annual counting method conceivable. The channel year is correlated with the seasons as follows:

Channel day shown 0 equals mean southern solstice day, cipher day of the channel year.

Channel days Nos. 1 to 91 after 0 equals first quarter: London winter, Sydney summer.

Channel days Nos. 92 to 182 after 0 equals second quarter: London spring, Sydney autumn.

Channel days Nos. 183 to 273 after 0 equals third quarter: London summer, Sydney winter.

Channel days Nos. 274 to 364 after 0 equals fourth quarter: London autumn, Sydney spring.

Channel day No. 365 after 0 equals supplemental day in every Gregorian leap year.

2. The channel year of 1956 begins at midnight with the mean southern solstice day, December 21, 1955, of the Gregorian calendar system. It contains the same sum total of days as the Gregorian calendar year of 1956. Its initial day, cipher day, occurs 11 days before January 1 of all Gregorian calendar years.

3. Each day of the channel year is placed in one of seven impartial channels. The first day after cipher day each year is placed in the red channel, the second in the orange channel, the third in the yellow channel, the fourth in the green channel, the fifth in the blue channel, the sixth in the purple channel, the seventh in the white channel, the eighth in the red channel, the ninth in the orange channel, the 10th in the yellow channel, and the 11th day after cipher is always placed in the green channel, year after year after year. Every multiple of 7, between 7 and 364, both dates inclusive, is found always in the white channel. This gives us 52 channel periods of 7 days each, 13 in every

seasonal quarter, year after year. See chart for the seven impartial numerical channels described as red, orange, yellow, green, blue, purple, and white, in that order of succession, and note their permanent relationship to all seasonal solar years.

4. What business needs is not 12 months or 13 months (each has certain suitable advantages) so much as a seasonal solar year of 52 periods, divisable into 4 equal quarters of 91 days each. These channel periods are not weeks, but are a substitute for the present months. Like months and quarters, the 52 periods also have no relationship whatever to the historical weeks, but are tied to the seasonal solar years. Weeks change their position in each succeeding year and would continue to do so. The 52 channel periods equal the tropical solar year in length, and ride with it permanently. They in no way affect present holidays or holy days of any nation or group. The 52 account periods of 7 days each might be called prismos, from the Greek word prisma; sawed across, or, plain cross-channels or channel crossings.

5. The channel year is not a calendar. It is not in competition with or a modification of any present calendar system. Its reproduction is not permitted excepting alongside or in correlation or comparison with some ancient or current calendar. The last 7 days of the channel year will attach an extra day as the 365th day after cipher, in all years which contain a Gregorian leap year's day. These last 8 days of a channel leap-year will include the per diem for the 365th day if the employee is paid on a per diem basis. For one paid on an annual or quarterly wage base, one fifty-second part of his annual pay will be the compensation for each channel crossing or prismo, including the last 1 in leapyears, and the first 1 in all years. The per diem of the initial or cipher day (December 21) will be added to the first 7 days of the first quarter if one's earnings be computed per diem.

6. If employees be paid whatever is due them or one fifty-second part of their annual wages on, say, each of the orange channel days of the channel year, one such payday will fall on December 30 in every year, yet none will be taxed upon 53 weeks of earnings paid to him during any 1 calendar year. The same rule might be applied to weekly insurance premiums or deductions. Thus, your tax-year base may continue to follow the period between December 31 midnight and the next December 31 midnight, but, notably important to all, your total sales or your payroll per annum increase may be compared each year, by simple addition, within the accuracy of 1 penny. And you can tell in what season, and in what channel crossing or prismo the change began. In any week or year in which a channel payday would occur on a local or legal holiday in any part of the world, the payday is advanced to the next preceding workday, as now happens under similar circumstances if one is paid semi-monthly or monthly. In the next following channel crossing or channel year, the originally selected channel paydays are resumed.

Churchman's Channel Years, Channel Quarters, and Channel Crossings Chart

Gregorian Calendar Year 1957, AND ALL REGULAR YEARS, from preceding Mean South Solstice Day.

	Red	Ora	Yel	Gre	Blu	Pur	Whi
Mean South Solstice Day, Dec 21							
London Winter: Sydney Summer							
Dec	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	31	1	2	3	4
Jan	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	26	27	28	29	30	31	1
Feb	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	23	24	25	26	27	28	1
Mar	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
London Spring: Sydney Autumn							
Mar	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	30	31	1	2	3	4	5
Apr	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30	1	2	3
May	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Jun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
London Summer: Sydney Winter							
Jun	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	1	2	3	4	5
Jul	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30	31	1	2
Aug	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
	31	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sep	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
London Autumn: Sydney Spring							
Sep	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
	28	29	30	1	2	3	4
Oct	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	26	27	28	29	30	31	1
Nov	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	30	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dec	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

Days of the CHANNEL years 1956 and 1957, OF ALL PRIOR AND OF ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS

	Red	Ora	Yel	Gre	Blu	Pur	Whi
Mean South Solstice Day,							0
First Quarter							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
	36	37	38	39	40	41	42
	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
	57	58	59	60	61	62	63
	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
	71	72	73	74	75	76	77
	78	79	80	81	82	83	84
	85	86	87	88	89	90	91
Second Quarter							
	92	93	94	95	96	97	98
	99	100	101	102	103	104	105
	106	107	108	109	110	111	112
	113	114	115	116	117	118	119
	120	121	122	123	124	125	126
	127	128	129	130	131	132	133
	134	135	136	137	138	139	140
	141	142	143	144	145	146	147
	148	149	150	151	152	153	154
	155	156	157	158	159	160	161
	162	163	164	165	166	167	168
	169	170	171	172	173	174	175
	176	177	178	179	180	181	182
Third Quarter							
	183	184	185	186	187	188	189
	190	191	192	193	194	195	196
	197	198	199	200	201	202	203
	204	205	206	207	208	209	210
	211	212	213	214	215	216	217
	218	219	220	221	222	223	224
	225	226	227	228	229	230	231
	232	233	234	235	236	237	238
	239	240	241	242	243	244	245
	246	247	248	249	250	251	252
	253	254	255	256	257	258	259
	260	261	262	263	264	265	266
	267	268	269	270	271	272	273
Fourth Quarter							
	274	275	276	277	278	279	280
	281	282	283	284	285	286	287
	288	289	290	291	292	293	294
	295	296	297	298	299	300	301
	302	303	304	305	306	307	308
	309	310	311	312	313	314	315
	316	317	318	319	320	321	322
	323	324	325	326	327	328	329
	330	331	332	333	334	335	336
	337	338	339	340	341	342	343
	344	345	346	347	348	349	350
	351	352	353	354	355	356	357
	358	359	360	361	362	363	364
Leap Years' Day							365

Gregorian Calendar Year 1956, AND ALL LEAP YEARS, from preceding Mean South Solstice Day.

	Red	Ora	Yel	Gre	Blu	Pur	Whi
Mean South Solstice Day, Dec 21							
London Winter: Sydney Summer							
Dec	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	31	1	2	3	4
Jan	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	26	27	28	29	30	31	1
Feb	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Mar	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
London Spring: Sydney Autumn							
Mar	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	31	1	2	3	4
Apr	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	26	27	28	29	30	1	2
May	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
	31	1	2	3	4	5	6
Jun	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
London Summer: Sydney Winter							
Jun	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
	28	29	30	1	2	3	4
Jul	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	26	27	28	29	30	31	1
Aug	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	30	31	1	2	3	4	5
Sep	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
London Autumn: Sydney Spring							
Sep	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30	1	2	3
Oct	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Nov	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30	1	2	3	4	5
Dec	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Supplemental Day,							20

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, Thorp, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 27 it was my privilege to speak at the 75th anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, at Thorp, Wis., at which people of different faiths gathered. It was a great occasion, at which many oldtimers came from near and yonder to attend the little church. I am happy, at the request of those who were present, to ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES NEED FOR STRONG, SPIRITUAL FAITH TO COPE WITH NEW PROBLEMS OF ATOMIC-NUCLEAR AGE—URGES CHURCH-MINDED AMERICANS TO WAR ON IGNORANCE, PREJUDICE, INDIFFERENCE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Chippewa Falls, at 75th anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, Sunday, May 27, 1956, at Thorp, Wis.)

I am happy to be here today.

I deem it a real privilege to join you in this inspiring celebration of the 75th anniversary of your church.

It is always gratifying to observe progress in the spiritual world. This is one of the most basic fields of human endeavor, in which we need to maintain full strength to meet the needs of the atomic-nuclear age.

ROLE OF CHURCHES ACROSS THE LAND

The hundreds of thousands of churches, of all denominations, erected across our great land are symbols of the "Living Faith in God" of the American people.

Dedicated to the higher things of spirit, we have learned that a church is not just an architectured mass of stone, cement, brick, steel, wood, or glass.

The real church is the living spirit of God within each of us.

Ultimately, in time, the mortar and stone will crumble. But the spirit of God, breathed into human life, will live on forever.

It is refreshing for a few hours, to withdraw from material problems, and to meditate upon the enduring values of spiritual life.

Here, in the sanctuary of God, we have the opportunity to explore spiritual problems; and to commune with our souls, with God, and with each other.

SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGE: FULFILLING OUR CREED

One of the most significant challenges for each of us, however, is the problem of relating our spiritual lives to the realities of the outside world.

We face the need for demonstrating modes of conduct which reflect characters of high-spirited principle.

Faith is not a thing apart. What a man really believes, be it good or evil, will be reflected in everyday acts of living.

"By a man's works, ye shall know him."

By the deeds of the members of the Thorp Methodist Church, this community has been enriched. And the name of this church has been honored, through three-fourths of a crowded century, crowded with service to God and man.

STRONG FAITH IN 1956

So, too, the critical year of 1956 is not a time for mere superficial gestures in religious life. We live in a crucial age in the progress of mankind in which the utmost faith, the most profound religious and spiritual understanding, are required.

The church has provided us with great and much-needed source of inner strength, wisdom, understanding to cope with the tremendous problems facing us.

PROGRESS BROADENED HORIZONS

The scientific and technological progress of the world has broadened our outlook, our view, our horizons.

Long ago, man often was hemmed in by the boundaries of his local community, or of his country.

Now, we are familiar with all the areas of the world. Indeed, we are peering curiously into "outer space"—millions of light years away. Soon we will have earth-satellites in the sky—to record the mysteries of the universe.

OUR NATIONAL ATTAINMENTS

Meanwhile, as a nation, here at home, we are making tremendous strides, of course. We possess streamlined automobiles, push-button homes, TV, radar, and supersonic air-travel.

We have changed the face of the earth—by moving mountains, and redirecting the course of rivers.

For example, during the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway—mountains of earth—billions of cubic yards—have been displaced; islands have been removed or cut up; the gigantic flow of river waters has been changed and controlled; a river stairway of locks is being built to lift ocean vessels up the 600 feet between the ocean and the Great Lakes.

We have harnessed atomic and nuclear power—first, for war; and now, we hope for peace.

RELIEVING MAN'S TENSIONS

We have harnessed the mightest forces of nature. But we have yet to harness and put to constructive use the mightiest forces in man himself.

Peace of mind for man, relief from tensions, freedom from worry and anxiety—all this cannot come from men's push-buttons. They must instead come from men's hearts and souls, attuned to the everlasting leadership of God.

THE MIRACLES OF PROGRESS

In the material world, the great advances of today are what seemed, yesterday, to be miracles—just wild flights of the imagination of our prophets and dreamers.

Tomorrow, there will be even greater and more wonderful discoveries.

Yet, we need to realize: "None of this is new." Atomic and nuclear power has existed since God created Heaven and Earth.

EACH NEW AGE UNVEILS MYSTERIES

The people of each new age, however, are discovering more of the mysteries of the universe. Within the potential of the world about us, I believe, there are even greater miracles to be discovered by succeeding generations. Time and progress will unveil these new mysteries.

THE CHALLENGE TO MAN

For each man, the challenge is, within his lifetime, to adjust to the historical era in which he finds himself.

He must mature, as a human being.

He must develop an intellectual and spiritual understanding of himself in relation to the changing world, and he must establish a relationship with God.

THE STRENGTH OF PRAYER

This is not a simple task. It can be accomplished only with the utmost of sweat, study, thought, imagination, and above all, prayer.

Faith, without communion with God, is nonexistent.

We need prayer—the Lord's Prayer, and the voice of our own hearts—rising to God in the spirit of humility, compassion, and love. This means all men in all walks of life—whether you be a farmer, mechanic, storekeeper, musician, and yes, even—or especially, a man in political life.

POLITICS AND RELIGIOUS FAITH

Unfortunately, many people doubt that there is an intimate relationship between politics and religious faith.

However, I can assure you that—to a great many of us—a spiritual faith is a tremendous reserve of strength upon which we must often call.

Our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, often has emphasized, by his own conduct and by his public remarks, the need for a strong moral and spiritual fiber in the life of America.

Too, the prayer—with which each session of the Senate and House of Representatives opens—is not an empty gesture.

It is our realistic acknowledgment of the need of divine guidance in reviewing and resolving the problems facing our Nation.

GODLESS COMMUNISM

We are all aware of the tremendous challenge offered by godless communism throughout the world. Unfortunately, it has a significant effect upon all our lives, because of its constant threat to the freedom of all people.

Currently, the new tone of Russian propaganda, the new siren song of so-called peaceful coexistence, is no cause for us to relax or to lay down our arms. The lamb can still not lie down with the bear.

However, a few, little publicized, but comparatively important things have been occurring. These may contain a promise of more change in the Communist world. There is first, the recent report that, for the first time since 1926, Bibles were rolling off the presses within the Soviet Union. And second, the entrance of more western travelers, including clergymen, within the Soviet orbit may bring more of a touch of the free spirit which will leave its indelible mark upon the imprisoned people.

These may contribute greatly to a force which will require the leadership of the Kremlin to modify its totalitarianism.

COMMUNISM WILL NOT PREVAIL

Of course, whether the Politburo changes or does not change its plans, its wild dreams for world domination are doomed to failure. As a matter of fact, there are hundreds of millions of us who are dedicated to the Kremlin's failure.

In their individual lives, the Kremlin's atheists are forfeiting their souls by committing the unforgivable sin: That of denying the existence of God. By their swallowing of Marxist dogma, they have denied themselves the fruits of Heaven.

Based on inhumanity and utterly disregarding the dignity of individual humans, it it inconceivable that their brutal ways, so contrary to the aspiration of the human heart, could triumph over the moral efforts of mankind to live a free and fruitful life.

BIBLICAL PROPHECY OF WAR

But the Biblical prophecy of "wars and rumors of wars," unhappily, is still applicable to our time. The bullets are flying, and men are dying, in conflicts around the world: In North Africa, Cyprus, the Middle East, and in southeast Asia—in the embattled jungles of Malaya.

WE MUST STRENGTHEN FRIENDS

We are left with no alternative, therefore, but to be strong and to help keep our friends strong.

That is why we want to strengthen the United Nations—to strengthen NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, the Rio Pact, and other instruments.

Yet we must be realistic in acknowledging that agreements are only as good as the real faith of the signers of the pact.

With that faith, we can keep life in these pacts; without that faith, they become dead letters—scraps of paper.

What we need therefore, and what our friends need, is a revitalized awareness of our responsibilities. We need a revitalized awareness, too, of the presence of the living God.

We should recognize that a bold application of ancient principles based on love of God and humanity would wipe out many of the problems confronting the world. It would provide food for the needy, halt aggression of godless nations, stamp out ignorance, and achieve many of the other worthwhile goals we seek.

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

Here, then, is a challenge to every churchgoer to fulfill his highest responsibilities, as Albert Schweitzer is fulfilling them in the heart of darkest Africa.

It would be unworthy of the churchgoers, of the Christian, to assert:

"What happens in Africa or Asia or Latin America is no concern of mine."

Rather, the Christian must say, as Schweitzer says, in effect:

"I am, indeed, concerned. I am my brother's keeper. I am not a meddler, but neither am I a shirker. In this shrunken world I will not close my eyes to reality, or to suffering, or to hunger, or to disease, or to insecurity, whenever it exists. My first responsibilities are to my own people—my own kinsmen. But I will not close my eyes to the atheistic, aggressive challenges beyond our shores."

There is ignorance, and we must fight it; prejudice, and we must combat it; indifference, and we must alter it.

No true Christian can turn his back on mankind. No true Christian can believe that we should "live unto ourselves alone," callously ignoring the fate of the world, as some "blind followers of the blind" would have us do.

Such heedlessness would not only be un-Christian; it could prove to be suicidal. For all the rest of the world would then gradually be grabbed up piece by piece by the hungry Soviet bear. That must not and will not happen.

MESSAGE THE WORLD NEEDS

And so the message the world needs is the message which is exemplified by the celebration of the 75th anniversary here in Thorp—a rededication by men of the world to higher things of the spiritual life.

The 75th anniversary testifies to the fact that for 75 years there has been a strong faith, a great spiritual strength in Thorp.

Over the years, the members of the congregation, the ministers, the deacons, the Sunday-school teacher have kept and maintained and fulfilled the mission of the house of God.

The world needs this kind of dedication—to give it the spiritual and intellectual strength so as to handle the great responsibilities which time, progress, and world conditions have placed upon our shoulders.

Over the years, this church has had a profound effect upon the life of the community.

It has been many good things to many people, bringing peace and spiritual guidance, solace and comfort; it has been a place of religious training for the youth, sanctuary of God, and a house of communion and prayer. What higher praise can anyone give of any building which has been constructed? How better can we serve our children in particular than by supporting this type of noble institution?

The greatest gift that we can give our children—the children of all America—is a knowledge of the Bible and the teaching of spiritual values.

Whatever the complications of life they face, they will always be able to use these immortal wisdoms.

FAITH FOR THE FUTURE

And now we must look forward optimistically to the future. To keep faith with our forefathers, we must have the vision to preserve this rich heritage bequested to us. This can be done by maintaining the following: Faith in God, faith in ourselves, faith in our churches, and faith in the future of a great free America.

With this type of deep belief we can go forward to peace and prosperity.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to talk with you.

Thank you, and may God bless you.

Traffic in Narcotics—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent investigations of the traffic in narcotics by committees of Congress and the current discussion of the subject in congressional circles, I want to insert into the RECORD a very interesting and informative article which appeared in the April 21, 1956, issue of The Nation.

The article, Traffic in Dope: Medical Problem, is written by Alfred R. Lindesmith, professor of sociology at Indiana University, who made a study last year of England's methods in controlling narcotics.

It was brought to my attention by my dear friend Judge Jonah J. Goldstein of the Court of General Sessions in New York. Judge Goldstein is a noted jurist, civic leader, and one of New York's most prominent citizens. He has long been interested in this field as a jurist and humanitarian and has advocated a system of controlled legal distribution of drugs to certain users.

Professor Lindesmith's article reads as follows:

TRAFFIC IN DOPE: MEDICAL PROBLEM

(By Alfred R. Lindesmith)

For 40 years the United States has tried in vain to control the problem of drug addiction by prohibition and police suppression. The disastrous consequences of turning over to the police what is an essentially medical problem are steadily becoming more apparent as narcotic arrests rise each year to new records and the habit continues to spread, especially among young persons. Control by prohibition has failed; but the proposed remedies for this failure consist mainly of more of the same measures which have already proved futile.

The number of heroin and morphine addicts (the use of marihuana, cocaine and other drugs is a separate problem not included in this discussion) is conservatively estimated by Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau, at 60,000. This figure is a guess; its main virtue is that it is the lowest offered. Even so, the contrast with European countries is spectacular. For example, the English Government reports slightly more than 300 addicts known to the authorities in all of Britain, with a population of over 50,000,000. There are probably more addicts in the United States than in all of the other western nations combined, and more juvenile users in New York City than in the whole of Europe. Almost all English addicts are reported to be over 30 years old, while close to half of ours are under 25. What is even more significant, European users appear to add to the crime problem in only a minor way, and the illicit traffic there is feeble compared to ours. The American market is the hub of the drug traffic in the Western Hemisphere.

In recent years there has been a growing interest in the English system of control. General Sessions Judge J. J. Goldstein of New York mentioned it recently in connection with his advocacy of a system of controlled legal distribution of drugs to users. Dr. Hubert S. Howe, of New York, has also long urged such a plan, adopted by the New York Academy of Medicine, and has made references to the apparent success of the English system. Since about 1940, the writer himself has periodically suggested that an adaptation of the British idea be tried in this country.

The crucial difference between the American and British control systems is that the English physician is permitted to prescribe drugs regularly for the morphine addict while the American doctor is not. The decision as to whether or not regular prescriptions are to be given to the English user is left to the doctor, usually after consultation with another medical man. He does not have to report on the addicts under his care, but records must be kept both by him and by the druggists who fill the prescriptions. Through these sources the British Home Office and the police can secure information about addicts and keep close watch on them. Addicts are arrested for obtaining supplies from ilicit sources or from two medical sources simultaneously. The addict cannot be coerced into taking a cure, but there is pressure on the doctor to do everything in his power to persuade the user to quit the habit.

The British addict under medical care is included in the doctor's panel of cases under the National Health Act. Apart from the taxes he pays under this act along with the rest of the population, the addict's expenses for maintaining his habit consist only in the shilling (14 cents) paid for each prescription. It is therefore unnecessary for him to engage in criminal activities to get his drug. The black market is small, limited primarily to London and a few other large cities, and caters to users who either don't know that they can place themselves under a doctor's care or don't wish to do so. Sometimes an addict will refuse medical care because he is afraid his addiction will become known, or because he does not want to try to cure himself of the habit. All black-market activities are, of course, prohibited by law, and and the addict who patronizes peddlers risks arrest and punishment. In 1954 about 30 addicts were arrested, most of them for forging prescriptions or obtaining supplies from two doctors at once, and the majority were punished with fines up to a maximum of $280. The smoking of opium and the possession and use of marihuana are completely prohibited.

The obvious advantages of this system are that it removes the major motives for peddling narcotics and for the creation of new users, puts pressure on the addict to seek medical care and removes his incentive to engage in crime. And even though the addict is not treated as a criminal, addiction has not spread. The plan, in fact, has the opposite effect by making the doctor rather than the peddler the prime source of drugs. Another of the great advantages of the system is that a mantle of decent privacy is thrown over the unhappy details.

In this country the history of opiate-drug control has been very different. Because American patent medicines in the 19th century often contained opiate derivatives which were not controlled, relatively large numbers of addicts were created who were not, however, generally regarded or treated as criminals. The problem then was in no way as serious as now. Criminal addicts were few, the illicit traffic minor in nature and addiction was largely confined to adults (about two-thirds of them women). Because drugs were legally available at low cost the user did not have to become a criminal to support his habit. Even so, an increasing concern with the dangers implicit in the unlimited availability of drugs led to the trial of measures of control late in the 19th century and in the first decade of the 20th. Given time, this experimentation, guided by growing medical knowledge of the opiate drugs, might well have led to the establishment here of something like the English system. This did not happen because of the intervention of Federal authorities imbued with the prohibition mentality.

The present system of drug control began with the passage of the Harrison Act late in 1914. This act made no mention of addicts nor did it in any way indicate how they were to be treated. It was a revenue measure designed to bring the flow of dangerous habit-forming drugs into the open through the exercise of the Government's taxing powers. All persons and firms handling such drugs were required to obtain licenses and to keep records of supplies received and dispensed. Penalties were provided for violations. An exemption was made for the prescribing of drugs "to a patient by a physician * * * in the course of his professional practice only." The interpretation of this part of the law become crucial in the early years of enforcement because on it hinged the whole matter of whether the addict was to be placed under the care of the physician or turned over to the police.

Between 1919 and 1925 a number of test cases—the Webb, Jim Fuey Moy, Behrman and Linder cases—were brought before the Supreme Court. The first three involved doctors who had flagrantly violated medical ethics by dispensing large quantities of drugs at high prices to addicts. Rufus King has pointed out in the April 1953, issue of the Yale Law Journal that these cases were in effect rigged by the Government. The prosecution wanted a court ruling which would prevent addicts from obtaining drugs from doctors. They evidently hoped that the unprofessional action of the doctors in these three cases would influence the court to decide against them, which it did. From the language of the indictments the Government was then in a position to argue that these rulings had established that any administration of drugs to addicts by medical men, even when done in good faith to achieve a cure, was illegal.

The Linder case was designed to clinch the Government's position. Unlike the three earlier ones, it involved a doctor who had prescribed small quantities of drugs to a single addict in good faith and in what was clearly a professional manner. The Government attorneys asked the court for a ruling against the doctor on the basis of the precedent allegedly established by the earlier decisions. In this case, however, the court reversed itself by ruling against the Government. Despite this reversal, Federal narcotics authorities have continued to operate under a Treasury Department regulation which states that "a prescription issued to an addict * * * to keep him comfortable by maintaining his customary use, is not a prescription within the meaning or intent of the act; and the person filling such an order, as well as the person issuing it, may be charged with violation of law." Threatened with criminal prosecution, the majority of doctors naturally ceased to treat addicts; the minority found themselves in trouble with the narcotics agents, and in many instances were sent to prison.

In 1920 a radical change in the Government's attitude toward addicts became apparent after the enforcement of the drug laws was turned over to a newly formed unit in the Bureau of Internal Revenue which was also charged with liquor-law enforcement under the Volstead Act. From 1915 through 1919, the annual reports of the Collector of Internal Revenue included expressions of sympathy for the drug user and concern over the fact that previously respectable addicts were being turned into criminals by the operation of the law. The 1919 report notes that various local health authorities had been encouraged to consider the possibility of setting up clinics in which drugs could be dispensed legally to such persons. The 1920 report, however, reversed this stand. It deplored the fact that some 44 local clinics had already been set up and announced that they were to be closed down. Neither the 1920 report nor any subsequent one expressed concern with the fate of the once-respectable user who was being forced to the underworld to maintain his supplies.

It is a current myth that the clinics which operated between 1919 and 1923 demonstrated once and for all the perniciousness of any legal system of drug distribution and that they were closed solely because they failed. The facts are quite otherwise and more complex. It is true that the New York City clinic was generally admitted to have failed, but its failure was guaranteed in advance by the manner in which it was set up and operated. The stories of the other clinics vary. There is considerable reliable information extant about the clinic in Shreveport, La., established under Dr. W. P. Butler, which is discussed in some detail by Drs. C. E. Terry and M. Pellens in their book, The Opium Problem, a monumental and authoritative study. This clinic was originally set up by the Louisiana State Board of Health in 1919. In 1921 the board, after consultation with Federal narcotics authorities, withdrew its support and the institution was continued under the authority of the Shreveport City Council. In the same year it was unanimously endorsed by the Shreveport Medical Society; other medical groups and the local police also expressed their support. However, in 1923 the clinic was finally closed by order of Federal authorities in Washington. Dr. Butler reluctantly agreed to the closing after a conference with Federal narcotics agents who said they had been sent to shut down the clinic "because it was the only one left in the United States." When a Los Angeles clinic had been similarly closed in 1921, Dr. L. M. Powers, then health commissioner of the city, had remarked, "I have not been able to realize the actual purpose of the closing of our clinic for there has been some unseen motive prompting much opposition to clinics which I have not been able to comprehend."

The disappearance of the clinics marked the final triumph of the prohibition idea and the complete removal of the control issue from the medical domain. The drug problem is what it is today as the result of these moves by the Government. The huge illicit traffic, directed for profit by nonaddicted lords of the underworld, has become the focal point of new infection. These men are rarely apprehended or punished; it is the user, exploited by the system, who suffers the major portion of the heavy penalties that are imposed. Police suppression, by increasing the danger of distribution and reducing supplies, keeps up prices and profits.

It is a popular misconception that the increase of drug use among young people is entirely a postwar phenomenon. As early as 1921, Dr. E. Bishop, a noted authority on drug addiction, commented on the trend toward juvenile addiction and ascribed it to the prohibition control technique. Statistical evidence of the trend itself can be found in Uniform Crime Report of the FBI over the last 24 years. In 1932, for instance, only 15 percent of narcotic law violators were under 25 years of age; in 1940, the figure had reached 26 percent; today it is a little under 50 percent.

In 1930, drug-law enforcement was separated from liquor-law enforcement with the establishment, within the Treasury Department, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. Federal narcotics officials, both before 1930 and since, have combined their policing functions with an active and effective campaign in support of the punitive conception of drug control. The expression of dissident opinion was discouraged. How well their campaign has succeeded in mobilizing legislative and public sentiment is indicated by the fact that Congress, in 1951, passed laws that more than doubled the average prison sentence of Federal narcotics offenders. In January of this year a preliminary report of a Senate subcommittee indicated that the present Congress will again be asked to increase penalties, enlarge the budget of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and generally add to the punitive nature of the existing program. The report expressed sympathy for the addict but makes no distinction between him and the peddler. It admitted that the real culprits, the big profiteers of the traffic, are rarely caught, and proposed to deal with them by legalizing wiretapping. Although the report explicitly stated that the number of addicts in this country probably exceeds the sum total of those in all other western countries combined, no reference appeared in it to the control systems adopted abroad.

The treatment and cure of opiate drug addiction under the best of circumstances is very difficult. The main hope of control must be based on prevention. The punitive program now in operation neither prevents nor cures and it actually nullifies the rehabilitative measures that are being attempted. The addict belongs in the hospital, not in the prison. If we recognize that punishment cannot cure disease, if we want to take the profit out of the illicit traffic, we need to return the drug user to the care of the medical profession—the only profession equipped to deal with him.

Traffic in Narcotics—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with an article by Prof. Alfred R. Lindesmith on the traffic in narcotics, which I am inserting into the RECORD today, there appeared several interesting letters in the Nation of May 19, 1956. These letters discuss the pros and cons of Professor Lindesmith's views on the subject.

As a supplement to the article, I am also inserting into the RECORD the several letters so that readers may have the full benefit of these views:

PRO LINDESMITH

DEAR SIRS: Professor Lindesmith, whom I missed meeting in London by a day last year when I was on a similar study mission in England, has described accurately the narcotic situation in this country (April 21 issue).

Narcotic addicts are citizens like the rest of us. The punitive legislation which we employ must continue to fail because it has been erected on a fallacious foundation: That drug addiction is a crime. It is, instead, a symptom of psychical disorder, as the article emphasizes.

Appreciation of the addict as a sick man will permit his rehabilitation in hospitals or clinics without drugs where it is humanly possible to do this, and with them where no other course is feasible.

In accepting this responsibility medicine is acting in the highest spirit of altruism because the very nature of the problem will demand, for the most part, government hospitals and clinics.

The Senate subcommittee report which arrived in the mail almost simultaneously with Professor Lindesmith's article shows that our legislators are continuing the impossible task of trying to legislate morals; of seeking to cure disease with policemen's billies. It is another milestone down the unfortunate punitive path which we have been following all these years.

HERBERT BERGER, M. D.,
The Berger Clinic.
TOTTENVILLE, STATEN ISLAND, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: The damage done by the interpretation given to the Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914 in preventing physicians from treating narcotics addicts and turning over to the police what is essentially a medical problem can be undone if the lawmakers are made to understand the nature of the problem as Dr. Lindesmith describes it so well.

N. H. COOPER, M. D.,
Welfare and Health Council.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: I enjoyed the article on drug traffic by Professor Lindesmith in the April 21 issue and think it poses an interesting problem. My own belief is that taking drugs is no more a criminal matter than overindulgence in alcohol. I feel that unless there is a crime committed by the addict, addiction itself is not a matter for the police, the district attorney, or the courts. All too often, in my experience with judges, district attorneys, and probation officers, there has been an air of embarrassment as to what to do with a drug addict who is being charged with taking drugs. This I feel definitely is a matter for doctors, psychiatrists, clinics, and other specialists. I would not, however, advocate the use of drug clinics except on a nationwide basis.

CHARLES B. BRADLEY,
Youth Counsel Bureau.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

CON LINDESMITH

DEAR SIRS: It was disappointing to me that Alfred Lindesmith missed the most important point. Opiate drug addiction is not, at bottom, an essentially medical problem, but an essentially sociological one. It is the more disappointing that Mr. Lindesmith, himself a distinguished sociologist, should have missed this.

Are we to draw no inferences from the fact that addiction has become a serious problem in our own highly secularized, competitive, unstable society, while it has remained a minor problem in the relatively more secure society of Great Britain? Is there no significance in the timing of the trend toward juvenile addiction, which, as Mr. Lindesmith points out, began during or shortly after World War I, and accelerated during the great depression and World War II? Were these not times when old ideals were crumbling, cynicism, disillusion, and despair grew fashionable and adolescents were given little besides inconsistencies to live by? Is it merely coincidental that drug addiction is most widespread among the portions of our population to whom we ration

or deny outright those prerequisites we define as the good things of life?

In his preroration, Mr. Lindesmith states: "The main hope of control must be based on prevention." No one, I think, would demur. But I fail to see how he reasons from this proposition to the conclusion that the medical profession must be our rod and staff in the matter. The medical profession is, almost by definition, limited in philosophy and practice to therapy. Treatment of drug addicts? Perhaps. Prevention of drug addiction? I cannot follow.

Nor is a medical education currently producing physicians competent to the task Mr. Lindesmith assigns them. Total preventive medicine will require that the physician be, to an extent, a social psychologist, applied anthropologist and social worker, as well as epidemiologist, psychiatrist and internist. It is conceivable that the arts and sciences of biological man and social man can be thus fruitfully combined and mastered by an individual with sufficient interest, talent and training. I believe the revolution of "social medicine" will, in fact, occur within a lifetime, perhaps within a generation. But I prefer not to make a solution of the addiction problem (read also the divorce problem, suicide problem, etc.) contingent upon the consummation of this revolution.

Mr. Lindesmith is much too impressed with the present capabilities of medical science. He is much too modest concerning the capabilities of social science. My hope (and my hunch) is that the social sciences are not quite so impoverished as social scientists, along with most of the rest of us, may think.

PAM ANDERSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

DEAR SIRS: The article by Professor Lindesmith makes two rather strong assumptions: (1) That the punitive attitude of the Government has increased addiction and (2) That only the medical profession can do anything about it. It will be hard to prove either.

Drug addiction has increased among young people only in a few places like New York and at no greater rate than juvenile delinquency. Generally, many contend that the withholding of punishment has caused such increase while Dr. Lindesmith holds that too much causes it. They cannot both be right. As a matter of fact, neither view is entirely correct.

While we hesitate to admit it, there are deepseated trends in our American civilization towards dependency and indulgence and away from self-reliance and self-denial, stimulated possibly by the action of Government during and after the depression—e. g., see the increase of relief rolls during high employment and prosperity, for one bit of evidence, and the Kinsey report for another.

As to Professor Lindesmith's second point, recent history demonstrates that mere hospitalization is no cure for a confirmed drug addict. Judged by results so far, both the fantastically expensive Brothers Island Institute in New York and the Federal hospital at Lexington, Ky., are failures.

No profession should claim the exclusive right to treat a social malady until it has a cure for it. In the same way that the cure of drunkenness and sex deviation is a compound of sociomedical and authoritarian effort, so it is with drug addiction. Psychiatrists who have especially studied this distressing phenomenon tells us that drug addiction is not a separable disease—to be isolated and cured—but a symptom of a general psychiatric disorder applicable to alcoholics and sex deviates, too.

Free dispensing of narcotics under doctors' orders may be a necessary and human palliative but it is not a cure. The trouble lies deeper in our complex social structure.

Here are some things we might do: Insist on international conventions reducing shipment of opium; prevent smuggling by employment of more Treasury inspectors; punish severely the pushers; stop whetting the appetite of some of the inquisitive young people in our less privileged areas by talking too much about a subject which 99.44 percent of them know nothing about and care less. I sincerely question whether "A Hatful of Rain" or even "The Man With the Golden Arm" has any beneficial effect in preventing addiction. Diversion of our young people into wholesome and healthful activities is, I would guess, more effective than sending a Robert Mitchum to jail for addiction and then headlining him in the movies on his release.

SANFORD BATES,
Former Director, United States Bureau of Prisons.

PENNINGTON, N. J.

MR. LINDESMITH'S REPLY

DEAR SIRS: Because my discussion of the drug problem was intended to be practical, I stressed a definite program which has been found to be effective abroad. This program, which places uncured addicts under the care of doctors, is also an attack upon the economic basis of the illegal traffic. As such, it is designed to supplement, not to replace, control measures of the type now directed against the black market which Mr. Bates mentions. Both Mr. Bates and Miss Anderson, in their concern over relatively remote historical and social factors in the drug problem about which little or nothing can be done, neglect the factor of availability of drugs about which something can be done.

I had uncured addicts in mind when I emphasized the central role of the medical profession. Only doctors can write prescriptions. It is true, as Mr. Bates says, that there is now no effective cure for addiction and that turning over uncured addicts to medical men is only a human palliative. It is, however, a vital step which would remove the stigma of criminality from addiction, besides undercutting the illicit traffic. I am surprised that Mr. Bates seems to attach so little importance to it. Once this vital step is taken, I will concede Miss Anderson's point that curing addiction is much more than a medical problem.

If one is to judge from arrest rates, Mr. Bates is definitely in error when he says that the increase of addiction in young persons has been confined to "a few places like New York." The figures in the Uniform Crime Reports, which reveal a trend toward increasing involvement of young persons, also show rising arrest rates in almost all sections of the country and in cities of all sizes.

ALFRED R. LINDESMITH.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.

Story of Red Cross in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the wonderful work done by the American Red Cross during great disasters, but very often these are far removed from our personal experience and are forgotten as tomorrow's headlines replace today's on the pages of our newspapers.

For this reason I submit the following article from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald News of June 2 that tells the story of the Red Cross humanitarian service when a disastrous fire in that city made homeless 28 families:

RELIEF FOR VICTIMS OF FIRE: STORY OF RED CROSS IN ACTION

Passaic residents, who have contributed for years to various Red Cros relief drives, are now being given a heart-warming first-hand view of how a Red Cross disaster program operates. A relief program for the benefit of the families who were burned out in the Monroe Street fires is now in full swing.

John Hopkins, of Butler, Red Cross national field representative who is in charge of the Passaic program estimates that the final cost will be about $10,000. So far, he said, 26 families have registered for assistance, and a total of $6,400 has been committed to help them get started again in new homes.

"The Red Cross uses the funds it has been given by the American people, not to replace luxuries such as television sets and radios, but to replace the essentials without which the families would be unable to exist," Hopkins said. Detailed interviews are conducted with the families to find out their circumstances, what their financial resources are, and how much they can reasonably be expected to do for themselves.

"The Red Cross tries to fill the gap between what the family can do for itself and what it needs to live," Hopkins said.

PRICES CHECKED

Careful safeguards are imposed to stop anyone from going overboard with what he mistakenly regards as a bonanza, Hopkins said. Average prices for various household items are obtained from local merchants and none of the families is allowed to go beyond that figure. They are, however, allowed to make the purchases wherever they have been in the habit of buying. The average prices are far from lavish, ranging from $20 for a wooden double bed to $55 for a studio couch.

The awards to individual families range around $600 to $700, Hopkins said, and usually include clothing, household furniture, and sometimes even an initial food order and a first month's rent.

Of the Passaic families who have registered with the Red Cross, Hopkins said, only two were insured and only one had any substantial savings. In all three cases, he said, the Red Cross assistance was held to a basic minimum. The heads of all of the families are employed, he said, and all have signified their intention to remain in Passaic. Hopkins praised the work of Mayor De Muro's emergency housing committee as a good example of community coordination. The Red Cross itself is navigating carefully in difficult waters, he said.

"We feel a dual responsibility to the disaster victims and to the American people who gave us the money for the job," he said. "We try to be fair to both."

Why Work in a City?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by Mr. Louis B. McCarthy, general manager and treasurer of the Macallen Co.,

which appeared in Dun's Review, May 1956, entitled "Why Work in a City?"

WHY WORK IN A CITY?

(By Louis B. McCarthy, general manager and treasurer, the Macallen Co.)

It's quite possible that someday the historians of our economy may decide that the tide of urban industrialization, which flowed so strongly through the earlier years of our era, turned back at the century's midpoint. At any rate, there's a sizable number of us newcomers to upper New England in general, and New Hampshire in particular, who appear to support this premise.

That early drift to big city markets and big city labor had been further aggravated, in this neck of the woods, by departure of the textile industry to the South, beginning with cottons in the 1920's and followed by woolens in the 1940's. It was seduced by promises of public financing, tax concessions, and, at least temporarily, cheaper labor. Textiles were unraveling for fair. Along many a stream or river, whose damned-up power had whirled a thousand spindles or moved a hundred looms, many a fine old brick or stone mill stood empty. As one Manchester bank president put it, not profanely, "There are more New Hampshire plants vacant, by a dam site, than there are occupied."

Yet, by 1950, northern Massachusetts, New Hampshire and southern Maine were already gaining new industries. In the intervening years this trend, steady, though as yet slow, has become increasingly apparent.

What leads a manufacturer to decide to move out of a city or a congested industrial area into the more or less wide open spaces? What are the things to look for in this kind of relocation? Most of all, how do the advantages and drawbacks stack up for employees as well as employers after the period of shakedown? As one who has recently been through this particular mill, along with many of his corporate neighbors and friends, I may be in a position to supply at least some of the answers.

At the beginning, it is well to recognize that hard and fast advantages do not automatically follow the transfer of a plant from city to small town. Whether such relocation is desirable for you, and where, depends on what you make, the number of workers and the kind of skills you need, the sources of your raw materials and the location of your market. My own commentary, of course, focuses on New Hampshire. Other areas and other States may well prove more desirable for your firm. In any event all relevant facts about any contemplated community should be pondered before choosing it.

In the majority of instances the factor that motivates a move is the outgrowing of existing plant and layout. This was undoubtedly the biggest single reason with us here at Macallen, as it was with a number of other New Hampshire recent arrivals such as Gates, Inc. of Antrim (makers of chests and boxes for percision tools), Sanders Associates of Nashua (electronics), Hudson of Franklin (overhead doors), and Armstrong & Botsford, of Bath (machine parts). It is also a reason why little relocating is done except in periods of general prosperity when volume is expanding and labor and desirable space are in limited supply. A concern will put up with bad plant conditions for years, through force of habit. It usually moves only when it must.

Broadly speaking, desirable plant space in great cities and heavily industrialized areas is not easily found. City ordinances and zoning codes restrict most manufacturing to industrial slums out of which all but the least skilled and lowest paid labor has migrated, thus posing, among others, growing problems of public transportation and private parking. Bars and taverns,, always cheerfully willing to cash pay checks, surrounded us in our former Boston locale, contributing their share to Monday morning tardiness and absenteeism. Land, for building, is scarce, sometimes prohibitively priced, and heavily taxed.

REAL ESTATE IS CHEAP

In towns and villages well out of such metropolitan zones, however, not only is real estate cheap and construction costs a little less, but where vacant plant space already exists it can often be bought or leased at a fraction of the cost of urban facilities. This is especially true where a factory can be shared by a number of smaller tenants who can jointly use its main powerplant, elevators, loading ramps, sidings, warehouses, and other features.

Almost all these firms who have come up to New Hampshire and southern Maine in the last few years report some tax savings. Indeed, taxes appear to be the second most important reason for moving. Fred Chamberlin, of Hudson, for instance, reports material savings. In our own case the tax on property is about one-third of what we paid before the move—a saving of one-fifth in State taxes, by no means inconsiderable. Tax laws of other States, along with local assessments and rates, should be examined before deciding where to relocate.

A third reason for moving that I've heard frequently mentioned is traffic congestion and the fact that it's darn near impossible these days to get adequate parking space near plants in metropolitan districts. This was a big reason for the move of the Insuline Corporation of America from Long Island to Manchester, N. H.

But let me warn you that though there's a lot of gold in "them thar hills, way out yonder," there's a lot of tailings, too. Take the training of new labor. Country people learn pretty fast and up here in Yankeeland they're traditionally versatile—but even so, the training period is apt to stretch out longer than you think. If your experience runs parallel to ours it's unlikely you'll be worrying much about excess profits, or any profits, the first year or two. On the other hand, once this is over, the slightly lower wage scales of smaller communities, plus the increased efficiency and loyalty of small-town workers, compensate for this initial cost.

You'll find insurance rates higher, on the average, unless your new building is sprinklered and you're more than apt to end with a larger inventory tie-up. Local dealers don't carry much stock of spare parts, office supplies, and other such items on which you've been accustomed to prompt delivery.

If you're a large consumer your utilities rate will be about the same. If you're small or only fair-to-middlin' it's apt to be higher, as are oil prices, too, the further you get from a basing point. Or you may have to use bottled gas, which is more expensive, though pipe lines are spreading fast. Also, you're apt to have more power failures than in the city, due to overhead lines.

On the other hand, if your plant can use river or lake water, you will have little trouble finding all you want at a marked saving. Freight rates have no relevancy to the problem of city versus country but rather to markets and raw materials.

What of the workers? What are their gains or losses in this matter of town and country?

Well, there's no universal yardstick. What's one family's Arcadia is another family's Siberia. But it's my observation that our own employees enjoy a higher standard of living now than before. Take housing. Nearly 10 percent of our folks made the transfer up here from the greater Boston area. As the truckers who moved them put it: "Seems as if we moved everybody into a better place than we took them out of." In terms of cost, space, light and general surroundings, rural community housing is apt to be better.

WORKERS AS FARMERS

On the score of food, prices run considerably lower for locally raised staples. Most of our people have gardens and a lot of them keep chickens or a cow. Quite a number, with the help of their families, even go in for small-scale farming. Rural communities are often in or near hunting and fishing country and this adds spice and variety to the larder. In this respect, our location at Newmarket is an especially happy one.

Our plant is located on a meandering little river called the Lamprey. A lot of our people have homes along its banks, almost within a stone's throw of their work. There's pretty good fishing in the Lamprey, and in fall and spring it's popular with migrating Teal and Mallard. You may have glanced at the picture that shows our mill and the wide pond below our dam where the river broadens before merging with Great Bay and the Atlantic. Here the tides ebb and flow and here a lot of our folks keep skiffs and small craft, as you can see, for clamming and lobstering and salt-water fishing. The State Game Commission keeps adjacent fields and coverts well stocked with pheasant, and in a dry year the deer can be as much of a nuisance to our gardeners as they are a joy, in season, to our hunters. In fact there are almost as many hunting licenses among our force as there are driver's licenses.

This brings up an interesting aspect of the situation. As I believe I mentioned earlier the Yankee employee, hereabout, is a rather versatile and self-reliant character. For several generations the Portsmouth Navy yard sort of set the pace of employment and wages around the area. When the yard wanted carpenters, most everyone showed up as a carpenter. When it was hiring plumbers and steamfitters, the local talent just left their tool chests at home and appeared with a Stilson wrench and a lead pot.

I've already mentioned that nearly everyone has a garden or a farm of sorts, and the number of nimrods and Waltons runs about 12 to the baker's dozen. The point of all this is that if your business is subject to wide seasonal or cyclical fluctuations, laid-off workers suffer far less hardship and return with far less resentment than city dwellers. A week or two off in spring or late summer can be very useful in sowing or harvesting. Chicken houses and barns always need roofing and houses, painting. A few days with a power saw can turn hurricane windfalls into a winter's supply of firewood.

TREATING BUCK FEVER

It took us a year or two to learn, but we make sure that some of our official holidays, when we close the plant, fall within the hunting season. We might just as well; they'd be taken unofficially anyway. The personnel manager calls this virulent and contagious malady, which results in a marked increase in out sick reports for a few weeks each fall, buck fever.

Our friends Armstrong & Botsford are a good example of what I mean. They moved upstate to the little village of Bath, N. H., from Stamford, Conn. They make machine parts, chiefly for dirt moving and road equipment. Their main reason, like many others, was cheap and suitable space. They found it in an abandoned church with a concrete basement and reinforced hardwood floor that would support heavy machinery. They've rebuilt what were the balcony and choir loft into general offices. The two principals brought only a foreman with them when they moved up. The rest of their handful of employees, all machinists, they hired in the area—including one machinist, struggling along as a farmer, who had served an apprenticeship under his father, a master

mechanic with a prominent firm in Glasgow, Scotland.

A couple of years after they established themselves in Bath, the recession of 1953 hit them with cancellations. They explained the situation to their small force who, knowing that the two owners had plans for certain eventual alterations to the premises, volunteered to work on these property improvements until more orders came in. A couple turned out to be excellent carpenters and 2 or 3, stonemasons. Another, who had a tractor, brought it along. As a result, floors and partitions were constructed, ground leveled and drained and a 4-foot retaining wall raised along one side of the property. When things picked up, they all went back to their machines. It's hard to imagine this happening in any large city.

THE GOOD LIFE

School conditions vary widely. Our New Hampshire schools rate well above the Nation's average but in many towns they're below it. In general, smalltown instruction runs fair to good and overcrowding is definitely less.

On the score of medical care, emergency and specialized clinical facilities are not usually available, as in cities. General hospital care, however, is almost always within reach, as are good general doctors, and fees run below urban charges.

Only in the area of entertainment and cultural life does the city offer marked advantages. Theaters, art galleries, lectures, good music, and music instruction are lacking in the country unless you're fortunate enough to be located in or near a university or college town as we are. While TV is bridging the general entertainment gap, there is no doubt that very talented children desiring to pursue the arts are handicapped in their development. Average kids find a healthy, truly American cultural and moral environment in the country. Chores at home and the nearness to woods, fields, seashore, streams, and ponds, all keep growing youngsters occupied and happy.

FRIENDLY FOLKS

In conclusion, there's one thing which all of us who have moved up here from the city, managers and workers alike, have noticed and commented on. It might be termed friendliness or neighborliness and, just as taxes and plant investment, it has a tangible value. On the individual side I'll just cite one incident which is typical of what I mean.

One of our folks, a mother of several children, cut her hand badly and was rushed to the hospital. Everyone in the plant knew about it and by the time the first shift went off at 3 o'clock that afternoon an informal ways and means committee had been organized. Volunteers took the children into their own homes. When the mother returned a week or so later, badly shaken, her right hand bandaged, relays of neighbors cooked, cleaned, baby-sat, and generally ran the house. In the city her close friends might live blocks or miles away, and her apartment-house neighbors might never even have heard about her accident.

These small-town and country folks take a real interest in their jobs and they value them. This slows down turnover and boosts productivity. It extends to the community, too. Officials and local organizations are glad to have you and show it in their cooperation, in many ways, for you bring in desirable income that is considered a community asset. Every hundred employees represents hundreds of thousands of dollars more personal income per year to the community. They also add proportionately to local bank deposits, hundreds of thousands more in retail sales, and actually add over 200 more folks who will vote, swell the tax rolls, support churches, charities, and clubs—in short, strengthen the country community.

How a Boy Sat With a President 66 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on this past Memorial Day there appeared on the front page of the Cleveland Press an extremely interesting account of Memorial Day—1890.

This is the personal story of Mr. James H. Griswold of Cleveland, Ohio, a neighbor and friend of mine for many years, an outstanding member of the Ohio bar, and the father of Erwin N. Griswold, Dean of the Harvard Law School.

It is my privilege to call this article to your attention.

MEMORIAL DAY—1890: HOW A BOY SAT WITH A PRESIDENT 66 YEARS AGO

(Sixty-six years ago a farm boy from Ashtabula County came to Cleveland to view the Memorial Day parade and witness the dedication of the monument to the memory of President Garfield. It is about this visit that James Griswold, veteran of 54 years in the legal field, writes on this Decoration Day. Griswold is one of the honored citizens of Greater Cleveland. He is 83 and visits his law office in the National City Bank Building daily. This is Griswold's story in his own words.)

(By James H. Griswold)

I was born on a small farm in Ashtabula County and attended district schools where teachers were frequently paid $25 a month and often "boarded around."

When I reached the age of 16 my parents decided that I should go to New Lyme Institute, an academy 10 miles away.

The principal was Jacob Tuckerman, who also taught many of the subjects. He was my greatest teacher and incidentally was the grandfather of Florence E. Allen, a classmate of mine at the institute and now judge of the United States Court of Appeals.

Professor Tuckerman conducted chapel exercises for the whole school, consisting of about 180 pupils.

He also kept the students informed on many current subjects, and in April and May of 1890 he mentioned that on May 30, Decoration Day, in Cleveland, about 80 miles away, the great monument to the memory of President James A. Garfield was to be dedicated.

Many older people in Ashtabula County had known General Garfield personally as their Congressman, and all, including the academy students, had come to know much of his greatness.

So when Professor Tuckerman suggested that it would be a great event in the life of any student who could find it possible to attend the dedication, I immediately began to figure how it could be done.

I did not dare to write home (remember there were no telephones) for fear my parents, who were sacrificing to send me to the academy, would think the expense too great.

In my boyish thinking I remembered that I had an uncle and aunt (my mother's oldest brother and his wife) living in a suburb of Cleveland. With that in mind I decided to make the trip, the only expense now being the railway fare.

I got permission to go from Professor Tuckerman, and without notifying either my parents or my uncle and aunt, I took the train from New Lyme on Thursday morning, May 29, 1890, for Ashtabula, where I changed to the old Lake Shore Railway for Cleveland, and arrived at the home of my uncle before supper time.

They were surprised but glad to see me. I told them why I had come to Cleveland; they were surprised, as their son somewhat older than I had made no preparations to attend the great celebration.

The next day I left the house rather early, although the procession was not due to start from Public Square until noon.

I thought I might possibly get a sight of President Benjamin Harrison, for I had never seen a President before. I had heard that the parade was to be very large but I had not the faintest idea of its size.

I was all alone. I did not know a single person in Cleveland besides my uncle's family, and I did not see a single person that I knew from the time I left my uncle's home in the morning until I returned exhausted at night.

The parade was entirely beyond me, but I was bound to get everything I could from it. Every State in the Union sent a representative. More than 5,000 men from the Grand Army of the Republic, local and State militia, and civic organizations took part and marched from the square to Lake View Cemetery, about 5 miles out Euclid Avenue.

There were bands it seemed from every city one could think of. I was told 30 or 40 in all. Perhaps the group that attracted the most attention was the veterans of the 42d Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Infantry, Garfield's old command, consisting of over 100.

The procession was so long that it took nearly 2 hours to pass a given point. I managed to start with the head of the parade, for I did not want to miss a thing.

When I left my uncle's home I had supposed I would take a streetcar from the square to the cemetery, but I soon found out that all the streetcars had been taken off Euclid Avenue just before the parade started.

So I walked, and often ran, keeping up with the head of the parade all the way to the cemetery and then up the long rise to the location of the monument. And now came my greatest disappointment.

STUMPED BY STAND

A wooden stand had been erected close to the monument, about 20 feet in the air, which would seat possibly 150. In order to see all the great personages and hear the speeches, one just had to be up on this platform.

To get to this very reserved section, one had to have a ticket.

What was I to do? Had I come 80 miles and at large expense, for me, only to stand at the foot of the speaker's platform with thousands of others and hear and see very little?

Greatly distressed, I began to circulate around the monument and particularly about the speaker's stand. On one side, where the notables came on to the platform, I discovered that boards had been nailed to the studding, leaving openings of an inch or two between them.

I saw no policeman or guard on duty, so I proceeded to put my fingers and toes through the openings and quickly climbed to the top, where the notables were beginning to assemble.

No one paid any attention to me and I took a chair. Almost immediately there came on to the platform ex-President Rutherford B. Hayes with President Benjamin Harris at his side.

As the personages were introduced from time to time, I learned that I was seeing and hearing not only President Harrison, but Vice President Morton, Postmaster General John Wanamaker, Secretary of Agriculture

Jeremiah Rusk, with his long whiskers, Governor Campbell, of Ohio, United States Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, and William McKinley.

There were many others, some of local fame, but when President Hayes introduced Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, the applause from everywhere was terrific.

REMEMBERS PRAYER

The great orator of the day was ex-Gov. Jacob D. Cox, of Ohio. I do not remember a word that he said, but I do remember the prayer at the beginning, offered by Bishop William A. Leonard, of the Cleveland Diocese of the Episcopal Church.

Quite likely this was because my father was a loyal Episcopalian and it was at least one thing that I could with good grace report to him when I should next get home, and explain why I had made this trip on my own.

I do not remember a word of any of the speeches, but I was tremendously impressed in seeing and hearing this great array of distinguished personages.

One thing I do remember vividly after these 65 years. Just before President Hayes was apparently ready to dismiss the memorable gathering there came great shouts for "McKinley," "Bill McKinley."

McKinley responded with great dignity and solemnity, in the same earnest manner everyone remembers who heard him thereafter until his final address in Buffalo in 1901.

And so with simple formalities, there ended the dedication ceremonies of the Garfield Monument.

I know of no person still alive, besides myself—although of course there may be 1 or 2—who was privileged to be present on this momentous occasion.

The splendid memorial still stands, refurbished and visited by large and enthusiastic numbers from all over the world every year.

Unidentified Flying Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter speaks for itself and in my opinion, if accurate, poses both a question and a problem in which we should all be most interested:

LOEW'S WASHINGTON THEATRES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1956.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Due to the great deal of response from the public via phone calls as a result of our showing of Unidentified Flying Objects at Loew's Columbia Theatre, I respectfully request that the following statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress.

Fourteen solid unidentified flying objects were seen over our Nation's Capital in July 1952. They showed up on radar screens at the Washington National Airport and Andrews Field while radar crews and military intelligence aides watched. Everyone, official and unofficial, was quite excited about these visitors. Tension ultimately was eased by the explanation that heat inversion caused this strange phenomenon.

A documentary motion picture produced by Clarence Greene explains now that this was incorrect, and was injected into the incident to get an already overheated National Capital back to normal.

Even though the Air Force sent up jet interceptors in pursuit resulting in visual as well as radar sightings the correct information was kept from the White House and the truth suppressed in the newspapers.

Military officers and Government officials had a hand in making this motion picture. It brings out the one indisputable fact that flying saucers are here. The incident as shown in the movie is overwhelmingly. With these questions still to be answered, "Why wasn't the White House correctly informed and why weren't the people of Washington given the full information on the presence of the unidentified flying objects?"

Kindest regards,
Cordially,

JACK FOXE.

Texas Paper Hits Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Houston Chronicle of Tuesday, June 5, suggesting that it is time the voters demanded a drastic slash in foreign aid funds.

The editorial follows:

The foreign-aid program has reached such a point of absurdity that even recipients of the lush American dollars are suggesting that the United States politicians quit making fools of themselves by throwing out the billions in direct giveaways.

Despite the fact that top officials of such recipient nations as Yugoslavia and France have publicly scorned the American giveaway program, the Eisenhower administration is still pressing to try to get its $4,900,000,000 foreign aid bill through Congress. Instead of reducing foreign aid, the administration is trying to increase it.

The administration is upset because the House Foreign Affairs Committe cut $1 billion in military assistance and $109 million in economic aid. It is using all its influence to get the House to restore these cuts when the bill comes up Wednesday.

Chairman RICHARDS, Democrat, South Carolina, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee pointed out that the administration already has an unexpended balance of $5,200,000,000 in military aid and $1,800,000,000 in economic aid. The administration wants to pile $4,900,000,000 of the American taxpayers' dollars on top of that.

Ample evidence has been shown that the foreign-aid funds are so loosely handled that Congress and no one else in the Government, unless it's the bureaucrats who squander it, have any real accounting for the expenditure of the funds.

The public should demand a drastic reduction in foreign aid. No aid of any kind should be given to neutrals, like India. No aid should be given to countries which are reducing their own military forces or show a lack of interest in allied defense measures, like Britain and France. In fact, no aid should be given except where the United States is going to get direct benefits from it, as it did in securing naval and air bases in Spain. This aid would be in terms of millions, instead of billions.

Russia is now appealing to Latin America for collaboration in trade, pointing out that the United States offers only aid of an economic and military character.

Like the Truman administration before it, the Eisenhower administration is a captive of the internationalists, who want to continue to squeeze the American taxpayers for every possible dollar, so the money can be thrown away abroad. The same design suits the purpose of the American Socialists, who want to level the wealth in this country to pave the way for socialism.

Members of Congress just don't seem to have the courage to buck the internationalists and halt the asinine waste of billions of dollars which is threatening the solvency of this Nation.

If the voters in November will throw out some of the bleeding-heart advocates of foreign aid, the other Members of Congress may get teh idea and stiffen their backs a little.

Trade With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Fulton Lewis on Tuesday evening, June 5, 1956:

Last night, ladies and gentlemen, I called your attention to a standard line of propaganda that is being put out by groups in behalf of the so-called GATT program—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—under which the jobs of thousands of American workers in scores of American industries are being exported to Japan and other low-priced labor areas of the world.

Reciprocal trade agreements reduce the tariffs on foreign goods coming into the United States in return for the foreign countries reducing their tariffs against our goods. "If we want customers for our exports, we must be customers for imports. Other nations must sell their goods, to earn dollars to pay for our goods." And so forth.

All of which sounds very reasonable and very convincing, and it has taken in a great many people. And it's definitely true that considerable benefit, all around, is to be derived by increased trade between nations.

The question at issue is not whether there should be a program of mutual tariff reductions between us and foreign countries, but a question of degree, and the little matter of whether we're getting a fair break in these trades.

In the first particular, there is certainly no objection to Japanese goods—textiles and tableware and jewelry and the other specialties they produce—coming into the American market on a fair competitive basis, in reasonable quantities. Only the worst sort of high-tariff extremist would argue about that.

The point here is that these intense little men who make up the American GATT teams, who sit in secrecy in far-away Geneva, Switzerland, with life and death power to make these tariff reductions and give away these American markets are so extreme and violent in their surgery. As you go down the list of items in the GATT treaty which was negotiated at Geneva with Japan last summer, and which went into effect last September 15, you find item after item that represents an important segment of American industry and, therefore, an important

segment of American jobs for our own families here at home, in which the tariff has not been reduced 10 percent, or 15 percent, or even 25 percent, but 50 percent. And there are some cases in which this is the second GATT reduction, over the last few years. The point is, why is it necessary to make the reductions so extreme as to put out of business whole industries here in our own country.

The other point is about this reciprocity business, and what we get in the way of Japanese tariff reductions on our goods, in return for our reductions on Japanese goods. Because that's the theory behind this wonderful program, and that's the basis for any mutual good that is going to come from it. And that's what you, the public, have been led to believe is happening. That's what the State Department, and the League of Women Voters and the other ultraliberal groups behind this program claim, and who's to know how to get hold of these GATT agreements, which mount up into the thousands of pages, and pore through those pages and digest and analyze what's in there?

Except that that's what I have done—personally, not through staff or any third person—over a matter of many days—and a tedious job it was, let me say—and what those studies show is almost unbelievable. It is one of the most gigantic hoaxes that has ever been perpetrated on you, the public, and I'm morally certain that Mr. Eisenhower doesn't know what these little men in Geneva have been doing, and that he has never studied this GATT agreement with Japan, for instance, and that neither has Secretary of State Dulles, because they could not possibly condone what has been done, if they had studied it.

Maybe the summary—yes. I doubt that, but maybe.

What you get there, however, is a lot of this glamorous language, such as this:

"For the United States, this marks a notable achievement in the President's foreign economic program, and a fulfillment of arrangements taken last year, when the 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act was sought and obtained.

"Japanese participation in the general agreement will help United States interests in a variety of ways. Expansion of Japan's foreign trade, which participation in GATT will promote, is essential if Japan is to have a sound, self-sustaining economy, capable of providing adequate living standards for the Japanese people. By offering Japan expanded trade opportunities, participation in GATT also will give the Japanese people a concrete basis for continuing their alinement with the free world, thus lessening the danger of enforced Japanese dependence on Communist-dominated areas of the mainland of Asia."

Now, listen to this reciprocal-tariff-reduction business, and, remember, this is from the State Department's own analysis of the GATT agreement with Japan:

"All United States duty reductions combined covered imports from Japan valued in 1953 at $81 million while duty bindings or duty-free bindings were offered on a trade of $53 million. That is a total of $134 million.

"In exchange for the concessions granted by the United States, assurances were obtained from Japan as to future tariff treatment on products of which United States exports in 1953 were valued at 397 million (Japanese statistics), or more than half of total United States exports to Japan."

Now that sounds like a fine deal, doesn't it? Japan grants concessions to us on $397 million worth of business, and we grant concessions to Japan on $134 million worth of business.

But that's just the outside package, because there's quite a catch in that word concession, and there's quite a catch in the amount of Japan's reductions.

Under the trick terminology of these GATT agreements, the word "concession" is a very broad word. To you, and any normal individual, it means a reduction in the tariff rate. Not so under this agreement.

There's a little gimmick whereby if Japan has a 10-percent tariff on such and such, and they promise, in this GATT agreement, not to increase that tariff during the life of the agreement, that is rated as a concession on the part of Japan. They don't reduce their tariffs at all, but they get credit for a concession.

And I've undertaken to analyze for you this entire GATT agreement with Japan, and to tabulate the concessions on both sides, and to find out, in each case, how many of the concessions were actual tariff reductions, and how many of them were these phony bindings as they call them, and you will find the figures very enlightening.

On our side of the picture, we granted Japan a total of 238 of thees so-called concessions. Of that 238, 212 were actual tariff reductions, and as I have already reported to you, they were very drastic reductions, as is being demonstrated by the sudden flood of Japanese goods, pouring into our markets.

Now, what did our GATT team get in return on this reciprocity deal? Out of a total of 288 so-called concessions which Japan made to us, exactly 95 of them were real tariff reductions, and the others were not reductions at all. The rates remain the same. The concessions consist of Japan promising not to raise the rates in the future, and in some cases even that promise is qualified and has escape clauses.

Let me repeat those figures to you. The total number of items on which we made concessions to Japan was 238, out of which 212 were legitimate, drastic tariff reductions. The total number of items on which Japan made concessions to us was 288, out of which only 95 were legitimate.

Now, as if that's not scandalous enough, even the tariff reductions which were real reductions on Japan's part, have a further phony angle to them, because most of them are on items which Japan herself does not produce, and thus the tariff is purely a tax-revenue measure, and the alteration of the tariff rate doesn't affect us for better or worse.

For example, tallow, which Japan has to import from the outside and buys at world prices on the world market. Lubricating oil, which is in the same category. Four-motored airplanes—and this report says that our business with Japan in 4-motored airplanes in 1953, the measurement year, was $3 million. That is one 4-motored airplane, so in return for the wreckage of our domestic industries in one line after another, Japan reduces her tariff against our 4-motored airplanes from 15 to 10 percent, so we can improve our exports of 4-motored airplanes to Japan.

Medicines which Japan does not produce, particularly antibiotics. Condensed milk and skimmed milk, which she does not produce and which she is importing from us, at cutrate prices, for her own school-lunch program. And soybeans, on which she voluntarily removed all tariffs because she needs them so desperately. She gets credit for that reduction, too, as a concession, and the same situation prevails in the case of corn for feedstuffs.

That is the reciprocal trade agreement—the GATT agreement with Japan—which is going to be of such monumental mutual benefit to us both, by way of increasing our sales in Japanese markets, in return for Japan increasing her sales in our markets.

A cut from 15 to 10 percent on 4-motored airplanes.

Letter to President Eisenhower From the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a copy of a recent letter sent to President Eisenhower by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, and others.

This organization states that ther exists a pressing need to enlighten some circles in our Government on the anti-Communist attitude and struggles for independence of nations enslaved in the Soviet Union, and I think that there can be no question about that fact.

I am sure that the President and the State Department will give every possible attention to the problems of liberation, because beyond a doubt these are the problems that will have to be settled before lasting peace can be established.

There can be no lasting peace so long as millions of honest, God-fearing, religious-minded, democratically oriented peoples are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. There can be no lasting peace so long as corrupt colonial systems continue to hold men, whatever their race, in bondage and deny them their God-given rights. Red imperialism is just as morally unjustified as white colonialism.

These are facts which fully must be obvious to the leaders of the free world. If they are considered with reference to the principles of freedom, it should help to crystalize and clarify not only our objectives but the measures we should adopt in order to reach them.

The letter follows:

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. President: The following organizations of American citizens submit for your studied consideration a few remarks relative to the joint declaration issued with Prime Minister Eden in Washington on February 1, 1956: American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, American Council for Independent Georgia, Azerbaijani Union in the United States of America, Byeloruthenian Congress Committee of America, Cossack American National Alliance, Idel-Ural Association, North Caucasian Association, Turkestanian Association, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The organizations listed above are mindful of the threat to American security posed by Communist aggression and subversion centered in Moscow, and at the same time have at heart the fate of their former homelands presently enslaved within the Soviet Union.

We wish to note with satisfaction and appreciation certain points contained in the joint declaration. Among the points which we wholeheartedly endorse are:

Point 1 of the declaration upholding "the basic right of peoples to governments of their own choice";

Point 2 reaffirming the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the U. N. Charter, the Potomac Charter and the Pacific Charter which proclaim a dedication "to the goal of self-government and independence of all countries whose people desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence"; and

Point 3 which refers to economic independence and which offers assistance to struggling people "not to dilute, but to enrich and secure their freedom."

We wish to state here, however, that we are reluctantly compelled to take exception to some aspects of inadequacy and incompleteness of the joint declaration, notably to such inadequacy and ambiguity contained in point 4.

Whereas the opening paragraph of point 4 states, among others, that: "Millions of people of different blood, religions and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have in fact although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Communist block," the next paragraph proceeds to restrict this bold statement merely to "10 independent nations" in the following words: "In Europe alone, some 100 million people, in what were once 10 independent nations, are compelled, against their will, to work for the glorification and aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist State."

The last-quoted paragraph appears to be inconsistent not only with the one preceding it, and not only with the factual political conditions of Eastern Europe, but even with their interpretation recently expressed by the political leaders of the United States. For example, our own Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, stated last October that: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is itself a multinational state consisting of 16 so-called Republics, several of which were once independent nations" and that "we do not believe that nations and peoples who want to be independent should be forced into unwelcome dominance by others, merely to produce monolithic power. We do not believe that such artificial unity will last or that it will produce genuine sincerity."

In similar vein, the eminent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, pointed out on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence on January 22, 1956, "It is my hope that the time may soon come when the peoples of formerly independent states, such as the Ukraine and the Baltic States, will have the opportunity freely to choose their own governments and thereby to give full expression to their national aspirations."

Point 4 of the joint declaration, which contains a qualification and restriction of the European area of aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist state merely to 10 nations, has all the appearances of an attempt at continuation of the thoroughly and sadly discredited concepts of the policy of containment and coexistence, concepts readily subscribed to by the ruling group of the Kremlin itself.

We also wish to refer to the findings resulting from voluminous testimony and thorough studies made by the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, known as the Kersten committee, in 1954, which collated and published irrefutable proof of the fact that "the pattern of Communist aggression and seizure of nations engaged in by the Kremlin * * * began to develop as early as 1918 [and] was in most important respects identical with that used by the Kremlin to seize and occupy the Baltic States, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and other nations during and following World War II."

As conclusive evidence of the fact that the nations constituting the present U. S. S. R. are unwilling partners constrained to remain within a Soviet Empire, it is sufficient to recall that their incorporation into the Soviet Union was the result of armed conquest, and that their former independence was real and subsisting. Thus, the pre-Soviet Independent Republic of Armenia was formally recognized by Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby on April 23, 1920; Ukraine and Byeloruthenia have continued to exert a centrifugal pressure upon the Soviet Union which led to their admission as original and equal members of the United Nations in 1945; and these three nations, as well as Georgia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, and Turkestan existed as sovereign states for periods ranging from 2 to 10 years and were duly recognized as equal members of the comity of nations by a preponderant number of sovereign states of various parts of the globe.

The interests of the 10 independent nations mentioned in point 4 of the joint declaration, as indeed the interests of the entire free world, coincide with the interests of the nations constituting the so-called Union Republics of the Soviet Union, and we perceive an urgent need for the political leaders of the free world to recognize that these nations are all allies of the free world in the just cause of liberation.

Only after their liberation shall become an accomplished fact will there be a new era of trust, peace, friendship, and prosperity for the entire world.

Respectfully submitted.

American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, American Council for Independent Georgia, Azerbaijani Union in the United States of America, Byeloruthenian Congress Committee of America, Cossack American National Alliance, Idel-Ural Association, North Caucasian Association, Turkestanian Association, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 15, 1956.*

Congregation Shaare Hatikvah and Its Rabbi Emeritus, Dr. Siegmund Hanover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the great contribution toward humanity, religion, and Americanism made by the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah and its rabbi emeritus, Dr. Siegmund Hanover.

Dr. Siegmund Hanover, rabbi emeritus of the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah, 4290 Broadway, New York City, is celebrating his golden jubilee as a rabbi. He was born in Wandsbeck, a suburb of Hamburg, Germany, where his father was the officiating rabbi. The deep religious spirit of his environment followed him throughout his whole life. He studied at the Rabbiner Seminar of the University of Berlin, an institution of world renown at that time. An outstanding student, he was chosen to become the assistant to the officiating rabbi, Dr. Rosenthal, of the Jewish congregation of Cologne, Germany. More than any other city on the Continent, Cologne was the center of the spiritual Jewish youth movements in this era. His office was interrupted when World War I broke out and he was serving as a chaplain in the German Army.

Soon after the war and his return to Cologne, he was installed as rabbi of the county and city of Wuerzburg, a well-know city in northern Bavaria. Unfortunately, the Nazi put an abrupt end to his career in Germany and after a short stay in England, he came to the United States where he became a citizen in due time.

Shortly after his arrival in New York City, he was called upon by the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah—Gates of Hope—which was founded by a small group of refugees, to be its spiritual leader. Under his guidance, the congregation developed into one of the largest and leading traditional immigrant congregations. Its members held a testimonial dinner in the honor of their very esteemed rabbi on May 27, 1956, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City. At the specific request of Dr. Hanover, the proceeds of the dinner will go toward the building fund of the congregation. The construction of a new Jewish center and synagogue is already underway at West 179th Street near the George Washington Bridge. The new building will be dedicated as a monument to those who have perished during the persecutions of our time.

Press Urges Elimination of Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, when the press across the country, in one editorial after another, calls for reduction or elimination of our postal deficit and when the press calls our present postal-rate system out of step with the times, I believe it pretty well reflects the general feeling of the country on the Postmaster General's recommendation for slightly increased rates.

I have before me editorials bearing such headings as "Users Should Pay," "Out of Step," "Commonsense Plan," "Eliminate the PO Deficit," and "PO Should Be Self-Sustaining."

These editorial comments are so pertinent to this legislation, I submit them for your consideration.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of April 20, 1956]

FOR HIGHER POSTAL FEES

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is urging Congress to adopt the administration's program for postal rate increases so the postal service will more nearly meet the costs of operation.

It is said that an election year is a poor time to expect passage of a bill to increase the cost of postage, but we wonder if those who fear to vote for an increase are properly informed. It seems to us that the people are in a mood to help the post office meet its deficit.

At a time when inflation fears are prompting measures to slow down the economy, Uncle Sam should cease giving subsidies to some of the larger users of the mails.

The idea that a postal rate increase would slow down business is on the silly side. Humphrey has the answer to that argument. It is that a $400-million increase in postal rates is not likely to have any effect at all upon a $400-billion-a-year economy.

If a boom period is a good time for a balanced national budget it is also a good time for a balanced postal budget.

[From the Ontario (Oreg.) Argus Observer of April 16, 1956]

PO SHOULD BE SELF-SUSTAINING

The House of Representatives Post Office Committee has been holding hearings for 3 weeks on a proposal by Postmaster General Summerfield for rate increases sufficient to erase a deficit that has averaged $450 million a year for the past 10 years.

Proposed is an increase of 1 cent an ounce on first-class and air mail and a boost of about 30 percent in rates on second- and third-class mail, principally newspapers, magazines, and direct-by-mail advertising. We've noted no proposal for departments and Members of Congress should be approved, and the department which contributes much to the deficit. Many millions of dollars worth of free service is rendered annually by the Department.

In our opinion, Summerfield's proposal should be approved and the Department put on a balanced budget. It is a vast business enterprise which ought to pay its own way. Most of the newspapers appear prepared now to accept the rate increase proposed for them, and several publishers so testified at the hearing. Letter rates are still 3 cents, the depression rate, and only 50 percent above the rate of half a century ago, when a workingman got 10 to 15 cents an hour and most living-cost items were in proportion.

The only argument we know against eliminating the postal deficit is that this is an election year, and it doesn't sound convincing.

[From the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce of May 1, 1956]

USERS SHOULD PAY

Much discussion is current regarding changes in rates and policies of the Post Office Department. The pros and cons are being heard, but among the claims and counterclaims it might be well to consider the proposals made by the Hoover Commission as to one of the Department's services—parcel post.

The Commission simply recommends that all costs—direct or indirect—be taken into consideration in fixing parcel-post rates. The idea was to make sure that parcel post is supported by those who use it—not by taxpayers through subsidies. The Commission would put the service on a businesslike basis.

The Hoover Commission is not alone in urging parcel-post reform. A policy declaration by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States states: "Charges for parcel post should be sufficient to cover all costs incurred by the Government in handling the service. These costs should be determined under sound commercial accounting practice." It is further recommended that charges for land parcel post be periodically studied and fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and those for air parcel post by the Civil Aeronautics Board. These are reasonable proposals. Thorough surveys show that, over period of time, parcel post has often been responsible for large deficits that the general taxpayer must meet under present conditions—the taxpayer who seldom uses parcel post. This should not be allowed to happen in the future.

[From the La Grange (Ga.) News of May 8, 1956]

POSTMAN'S RING SHOULD BE HEARD

Certainly the News would at this time be hypocritical if the fight for increased postal rates went unnoticed editorially. The post-office deficit is increasing annually, and since World War II has reached the phenominal multi-billion-dollar stage. Government support of this Department is—anyway you look at it—subsidy to those firms which do a high volume of business with the mail service.

The national trend toward Federal Government giveaways has been effectively deterred by those persons who have any notion of genuine economy. Whatever the advantages of farm supports, postal supports, and other Federal subsidies, they are overshadowed by the big disadvantage, to wit: a leaning toward socialism.

The present administration has taken up the gauntlet most emphatically. A balanced budget is hardly feasible until the shirttails are tucked in and not tugged on for millions by farmers, post offices, and others operating in red.

President Eisenhower now backs the long-time pleas of Postmaster General Summerfield. Currently, Summerfield is seeking a $406 million annual increase that would bring his Department within sight of black ink.

The taxpayer, logically enough, should not be burdened with the operating expenses of others. Those who use the mail service most should pay most. This reasoning follows through with roadbuilding, farming, or any other phase of United States business and industry.

Summerfield wants first class (letter) mail and airmail increased 1 cent, second class (magazine and newspaper) mail raised 30 percent over 2 years, and third class (advertising circular) mail raised 30 percent in 1 year.

Big clip in mail hikes would be in the first-class category. The Postmaster General hurries to show, though, that 75 percent of the $295 million would be paid by business houses.

Comparative figures pulled out by Summerfield, who has spent many exasperating hours trying to get congressional action, shows that while postal costs have soared 107 percent since 1932, third-class rates have risen only 38 percent, and second-class rates a net of about 3 percent in that period.

The News believes it as unfair and unhealthy for the Nation's economy to require taxpayers to finance part of the mailing cost of magazines and newspapers as it is to continue supporting any other industry.

The big pulp and slick magazines which consistently rave out about Government socialistic practices are the same ones who turn right around and lobby in Washington to prevent rate increases which would force them to bear at least a portion of their taxpayers subsidy.

Politicians have learned to tiptoe around in the Capital during a big election year. Hence, unless enough sensible Members of Congress step to the forefront, there will be little chance for action on this long-neglected measure.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Evening Statesman of April 19, 1956]

OUT OF STEP

As has been the case with most busnesses, the Post Office Department has experienced a tremendous upsurge in public demand for services during the last 20 years.

But unlike most businesses the Post Office Department has not been able to adjust its charges to the increased load of work it is handling. In this respect it differs even from other public services such as education which have financed their expanding operations through whopping tax increases.

The population of the country has increased about 27 percent in the last 20 years and the use of the mails has increased more than 150 percent in the same period. Nevertheless there hasn't been a single post-office building put up with Government money since 1938. Some are being built under lease-purchase arrangements, but for the most part the physical properties of the Department are in a woeful state of obsolescence and disrepair.

Most of the existing buildings were built as public monuments in the first place and not as business offices. They aren't suited for the installation of modern office equipment and most of them are keyed to rail operations rather than the truck or plane deliveries that came along later.

The Department's difficulties in keeping its physical plant abreast of the times are financial, of course. Its deficits are chronic and Congress for political reasons has refused to increase postal rates sizably. This administration has whittled the postal deficit somewhat, but the Department still is losing a million dollars a day. Congressional concern with the subject is centered mostly on the wage demands of the postal workers rather than the Department's building needs.

In the circumstances a post-office building crisis is shaping up. The Post Office Department probably is the only large scale enterprise of either public or private character in the country that hasn't spent a dime of its own money on construction in nearly 20 years.

[From the Miami Beach (Fla.) Sun of April 29, 1956]

COMMONSENSE PLAN

For years there has been a misconception that the United States Post Office system is operated with cheap postage.

It may be true that the mailing rates are low, but the mailing rates have been far from sufficient to defray the operating expenses of the mail service.

There is a proposal in Congress to raise the rates. First-class mail would jump from 3 cents to 4; airmail would go from 6 cents to 7. Second-class matter would jump 15 percent, and third class (often referred to as "junk") 29 percent.

The present rates result in an enormous deficit which has to be made up from the general treasury. That means the income-tax payers, besides paying their own postage, must bear a heavy cost of the postal deficit.

The Sun favors the commonsense plan of raising the postal rates so that the users of the mail will come more nearly paying their own postage.

[From the Savannah Morning News of May 6, 1956]

ELIMINATE POST OFFICE DEFICIT

If the United States Post Office Department is to continue to afford efficient mail service something must be done to terminate its annual $500 million a year deficit, and that is why Congress should respond at its next session to the fight President Eisenhower and Postmaster Arthur E. Summerfield have decided to renew for higher postal rates.

This Nation is the richest in the entire world, yet it is the only Nation in the world, with the possible exception of Argentina, that does not run its post office service on a reasonably break-even basis. It seems ironic that this rich and powerful country cannot conduct its postal service on a profitable basis, but an analysis of postal service and

charges explains why the continuing deficits occur.

The service rendered by the American postal service is the finest in the world, but that service is on a much higher plane than the charges made. Postage rates are virtually the same as they were in 1932. Any business in the world would go broke if it continued for any time to pay 1956 costs for the things it buys and charge 1932 prices for the things it sells. The Post Office is no exception to this rule, but public disinterest and congressional opposition have prevented action to remedy the situation.

The taxpayer has an obligation to himself to insist that this deficit situation be corrected. By utilizing cheap postal rates now we are only building up greater tax burdens for ourselves and future generations. The Post Office deficit becomes part of the national debt and this phase of the debt since 1946 has amounted to more than $100 million a year.

Proposed rate changes would go a long way toward eliminating this deficit. It is proposed that first-class mail charges be changed from 3 to 4 cents. The extra penny of postage would not be an added burden to the individual because 80 percent of this mail comes from business. Small increases are asked for second-class mail and a 30 percent increase will be asked for third-class mail. These increases and a few minor others would produce more than $400 million annually. Congress should act favorably on this matter and get this burden off the American taxpayers.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of May 11, 1956]

REASON, NOT POLITICS

Efforts by the Eisenhower administration and many in Congress to make the Post Office Department pay its own way have made progress. But the cause is hampered by both apathy and an impression in the minds of some Democrats that it is a purely "Republican" idea.

That is far from the truth.

Increases in postage rates to make the service self-supporting have been advocated by James Farley—the best known Democrat ever to be Postmaster General—and Jesse Donaldson, who held that position under President Truman.

Postmaster General Summerfield is a Republican, to be sure, and his campaign to get his Department out of the red has been vigorous.

But taxes are paid by everyone. And everyone, regardless of his party preference or affiliation, has a stake in this effort to make the mail service pay its way by charging what it costs to operate it.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel of May 3, 1956]

BUSINESS SPEAKS

Business establishments are the principal users of the mail service. And the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is composed of representatives of all kinds of American business.

So it is significant that the chamber at its annual meeting, just concluded in Washington, resolved that the Post Office Department should be a "nonprofit but self-supporting" agency, and that postal revenues should be adjusted to bring that about.

When the people who use the mails the most—and who will have to pay most of the cost of any increase in postage rates—express their willingness to bear the burden, it should alert Congress to face up to the situation.

Postage rate inicreases are long overdue. And as long as the postal service runs in the red, the taxpayers as a whole will continue to pay part of the postage bill of those who use the mails heavily.

Salesmanship or Sense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, many of us have watched with concern the increasing tendency of this administration to rely on salesmanship as a substitute for talking sense to the American people. There may be some domestic partisan advantage to obscuring the state of our foreign relations under the rosy phrases of salesmanship, but this is no service to our country. We have had recently a conspicuous example of this unfortunate technique of salesmanship by the President himself. Because they express so well the dangers and the harm done by such partisan excesses, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD two recent thoughtful commentaries on this subject:

[From the Washington Post of June 4, 1956]

LEADERSHIP ON ORDER

President Eisenhower got quite a horselaugh from some Democrats with his assertion that American prestige abroad has never been higher since World War II. There was reason for the scoffing. Mr. Eisenhower's own personal prestige is tremendous—in other countries scarcely less than in the United States. But this prestige has not rubbed off on Secretary Dulles or on American foreign policy generally. Leaders in the Allied Nations, not to mention the uncommitted countries of Asia and Africa, make no bones of their discomfiture over the effects of American braggadocio, over the foreign-policy vacillations liberally mixed with domestic politics, over the reliance on military solutions and on purchased friendship.

Much of this discrepancy is attributable to the curious detachment and the lack of steady leadership on the part of the President himself. Perhaps the main trouble with the Eisenhower leadership is that it takes so long to get cranked up. When the President asserts himself, speaking his own thoughts from the heart—particularly in the quest for peace—he finds a ready audience, and there is no one more effective. But when he hesitates, when he listens to the counsels of timidity clothed in Madison Avenue fortitude, he allows others to do his speaking for him. The effect often is to contradict the very policies in which Mr. Eisenhower believes—and it is scarcely enough for him to wonder why they don't do something about it.

There are several immediate case in point. Senate Democrats have made it plain that if the President expects to get the foreign-aid bill through Congress without substantial cuts, he will have to intervene personally. The congressional warning has long been on the wall. There are many misgivings about the meaning and techniques of American aid; there is questioning about the military emphasis in Asia and about whether loans and removal of trade restrictions would not be more effective in many instances than grants. United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold has advocated the internationalizing of economic aid through the U. N.—a policy recommended by several studies and indorsed at least in part by Ambassador Lodge. Let the administration shows little sign of any comprehensive effort to digest these criticisms. The new private advisory counsel selected by the President to help sell American ideas abroad will have to have more than platitudes to grapple with if it is to be anything but an exercise in luncheon-club diplomacy.

Or take the matter of foreign trade. In many respects an equitable, enlightened trade policy would be the most effective kind of help this country could give the free world. The authorization for American participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, however, is still languishing in the House, and the administration has done relatively little to advance this practical token of its own objectives. It will take more than a polite expression of interest to put OTC across.

Finally, there is the reelection campaign of Senator WILEY in Wisconsin. No one has gone down the line for the Eisenhower foreign policies more than Senator WILEY. A friendly word from the President would have meant a great deal in the Wisconsin Republican convention which denied Mr. WILEY its endorsement. Yet it was not forthcoming, and the administration now faces a real danger that Mr. WILEY may be ousted by a McCarthy-supported challenger. Why?

These are a few of the reasons, beyond the verbal sand traps of Mr. Dulles, why American prestige abroad does not correspond with the glowing picture painted by the President. Mr. Eisenhower himself holds the key to improvement.

[From Edward P. Morgan and the News of June 1, 1956]

According to Webster's, the word prestige means "the power to command admiration; hence eclat; renown; ascendancy derived from general admiration or esteem; commanding position in men's minds."

In case you are experiencing a trace of vertigo, a slight dizzy spell, it could be due to the fact that it has just been made official that the country is viewing the world from that exalted height. "The prestige of the United States since the last world war," President Eisenhower said yesterday, "has never been as high as it is this day."

Even after discounting the fact that it was made in the exuberant atmosphere of a political rally, the Citizens for Eisenhower "convention," that remains a colossal statement because it comes from the man in whom the country seems most passionately eager to believe and be reassured by. There are those cynics who will argue that the statement was timed to quiet the mounting criticism by Democrats of the administration's foreign policy. Be that as it may, the question is will it react on the population like a benzedrine tablet or a sleeping pill? Will it stimulate us to a fresh awareness of the world's complications in the newly-found confidence that our prestige will help us win through? Or will it lull us into more complacency despite the fact the President said that word had no place in his vocabulary?

Of course, the President could have discouraged the use of the word by the rest of us if he had just had time to enumerate some of the things on which we're going to have to bring the massive prestige he ascribes to us fully to bear to make them budge. But somehow, in a political rally, as any politician of either party can tell you, the virtues of the partisans and the sins of the opposition fill so much of the program that there is little or no space for anything else.

So it might be well to list as a kind of addenda some of the outstanding items we still must grapple with from our "commanding position in men's minds":

There is the question of the weakening of the western alliance. Not a day goes by but what brings news of disturbing developments. West Germany is neither rearmed nor reunited with East Germany. French divisions instead of beefing up NATO are fighting natives in North Africa. Britain, Greece, and Turkey stare daggers at each

other over Cyprus, and the American position (if not the American prestige) in the slashing quarrel is uncertain. While our honor and esteem may not be at stake, nevertheless we are asked to get our American NATO troops out of Iceland.

United States prestige in Saudi Arabia would seem to be measured almost exclusively by monetary returns on oil to the royal treasury, and even that measure seems to fluctuate at the whim of the royal court. It may well be that our prestige and the support we have lent United Nations' peace efforts have steadied for the nonce the precarious situation in the Middle East but who at the moment wants to take a reading on our renown, on our power to command admiration in Cairo or Jerusalem or Damascus?

Do the peoples of Africa and Asia smile up at us on our pinnacle of eclat as they face their massive struggles? Can we convince Ceylon, New Delhi, and Singaporé that our prestige is benign and not benighted? Are we going to be able to cement our ties with Japan by spurning her textiles and telling her she must not exploit trade with the Communist bloc either?

It isn't that the administration caused the situations from which these questions arise. It's that the situations are inescapably there. It's not that the administration doesn't recognize that they're there. It's that it seems to want the public to worry about the fact that they're there.

It's nice to hear that our prestige is at the highest point in a decade but one has to wonder whether it's not too good to be true.

VFW Loyalty to America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Loyalty Day celebrations were held recently in numerous communities across the country. Observance of this occasion, dedicated to the theme that "loyalty means liberty," was spearheaded by members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who worked hard and successfully to promote consecration of this day to the ideals and heritage of America.

Loyalty Day is but one aspect of the vast and worthy program of loyalty to America that the VFW has undertaken. In the coming months we will be hearing much from them in their campaign to get out the vote. Their slogan this year, "We fought for your right to vote; please us it" is extremely appropriate and deserves wide circulation.

The VFW is to be commended for its fine efforts to promote the appreciation and understanding of our American heritage. I urge them to keep up the good work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on this subject by Louis G. Feldman, chairman of the VFW Loyalty Day program, which appeared in the June issue of the VFW magazine:

PATRIOTS ON PARADE

(By Louis G. Feldmann)

Pending receipt of detailed reports from 48 States, it is impossible at this early date to quote specific figures on the total number of Loyalty Day program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary during the weekend prior to May 1. But the fact remains that the VFW National Loyalty Day Committee this year received advance requests for program material from the greatest number of posts and auxiliaries in the history of this Loyalty Day project.

The tremendous expansion of the VFW Loyalty Day program is most gratifying. The records of each passing year disclose that an increasing number of posts and auxiliaries are finding ways to make their respective communities increasingly conscious of the importance of a patriotic observance that constitutes an eloquent counterattraction to the traditional celebration of May 1 by Communists throughout the world.

From coast to coast this year, thousands of VFW Posts and Auxiliaries sparked demonstrations in appreciation of the American concept of human liberty. Parades, flag presentations, patriotic programs, radio and television performances, and numerous other events were dedicated to the theme "Loyalty Means Liberty" in communities large and small. In the metropolitan areas, the VFW was joined with enthusitsm by societies composed of foreign born citizens who were delighted with the opporunity to publicly proclaim their loyalty to America by taking part in VFW Loyalty Day demonstrations.

Much of the success of our 1956 efforts must be credited to the accomplishments of the department Loyalty Day chairmen in nearly all of the 48 States. As a result of their labors, we again received Loyalty Day proclamations from nearly all governors. They are clearly instrumental in persuading a greater number of posts and auxiliaries, in their respective States, to stage appropriate programs dedicated to the Loyalty Day theme.

We must not rest upon our laurels. We must look forward to the day when the observance of Loyalty Day shall become so widespread that the public will demand legal designation of this day as an official holiday, thus permitting the great majority of our 160 million citizens to participate personally. With the continued support of our organization, I predict the day is not far off when the true significance of Loyalty Day will be officially recognized on a permanent basis.

The proclamation of endorsement that was issued by President Eisenhower in 1955 gives us reason to hope that one day in the future the Congress will set aside May 1 of each year for the purpose of dramatizing the importance of citizenship loyalty.

As a patriotic organization, we must continue to lead the way in a continuous campaign dedicated to the promotion of loyalty to the American flag. The opportunities are endless. For example, during the next few months VFW members must do their part to help remind the American people that it is the privilege, as well as the duty, of every good citizen to register and vote.

The slogan, "vote as you please, but vote" has become very familiar on the American scene in recent years. This year the VFW will introduce a new slogan, one that is particularly appropriate for an organization such as ours when we say, "We fought for your right to vote. Please use it."

Plans are being formulated to popularize this appeal through every available channel. Effectively illustrated, this message will be featured on window posters that will be made available to all posts for distribution on the community level.

The right to vote is one of the basic freedoms that have been at stake in every war in which this county has been engaged. The people of Soviet Russia, and the satellite countries, go to the polls on occasions, but not to enjoy the privilege of voting for the candidates of their choice. They see only one list of candidates, a group of handpicked political puppets named by the Red dictators. They vote for these, or else. "Else" can mean exile to Siberia or to a labor camp.

Millions of Americans have earned the right to tell their neighbors "We fought for your right to vote. Please use it." No group of citizens is better qualified than the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to stress this dramatic appeal.

I hope every VFW post will adopt an active campaign in support of a drive to persuade an increasing number of Americans to take part in the general elections this year. We must help make our people conscious of their duty to be concerned with the type of men who are elected to office in their communities, counties, and States, as well as those who represent them in the United States Congress.

The character and quality of those whom we elect to public office will always be determined by the concern which we, as individual voters, display in our right to vote for the candidates of our choice.

This is one phase of the American way of life that the Communist countries are afraid to adopt. It is the people's weapon against tyranny. In America, the right of the ballot is our mightiest weapon in the fight against ignorance, poverty, corruption, and those evils that would pave the way for the destruction of our liberties.

The Meaning of Decoration Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point in the RECORD, an extremely inspiring Memorial Day address by Grace B. Doering before the Knights of Pythias, Palacky Lodge No. 317, at Highland Park Chapel, Cleveland, Ohio.

The address follows:

THE MEANING OF DECORATION DAY

(By Grace B. Doering)

Memorial Day is one of the most significant and beautiful occasions of the year. We pay tribute to those who gave their lives, as dear to them as ours to us, for a patriotic cause. We do honor, at this season when nature is joyful with life, to the memory of those we love.

The formal observance of Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, as it was popularly called for many years, dates from 1868. The graves of the soldiers killed in the Civil War had been decorated with flowers before that year, especially in the South.

It was the women of those war years who initiated this expression of sentiment. For example, it was the women of Columbus, Miss., who laid flowers on the graves of both Union and Confederate dead in 1863, 5 years before a day was set apart to revere them. The New York Tribune saw fit to print a paragraph on it.

In September 1867, 2 years later, a touching little poem by F. M. Finch first appeared in the Atlantic Monthly, commemorating the noble action of these women for strewing their flowers impartially.

William Holmes McGuffey, one of America's first and foremost educators, incorporated it in his Fifth Reader. Some of you may remember it. The third, fourth, and last stanzas read:

"From the silence of sorrowful hours,
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers,
Alike for the friend and the foe;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the roses, the Blue;
Under the lillies, the Gray.

"So with an equal splendor,
The morning sun rays fall,
With a touch impartially tender,
On the blossoms blooming for all;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Broidered with gold, the Blue;
Mellowed with gold, the Gray.

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever,
When they laurel the graves of our dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears, for the Blue;
Tears and love, for the Gray."

Again a woman took the lead. On April 26, 1865, Mrs. Sue Vaughn, a descendant of John Adams, the second President, directed some women to the cemetery in Vicksburg and decorated the soldiers' graves there.

And in May of the same year some women in Winchester, Va., founded the Stonewall Jackson Memorial Association. On June 6, 1865, they went to the Confederate cemetery in Winchester, said to be the first cemetery laid out especially for the soldier dead of the South, and decorated the graves with flowers.

Early in May 1868 Adj. Gen. N. P. Chipman of the Grand Army of the Republic, the organization of Union veterans, suggested to Gen. John A. Logan, the commander in chief, that arrangements be made for the organization to decorate the graves of the Union soldiers on a uniform date throughout the country.

General Logan approved the plan and designated the 30th day of May 1868, "for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the late rebellion." Special exercises were held in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., across the Potomac River from Washington, constituting the first formal and official observance of the day.

And who was the orator of the occasion? Our own Gen. James A. Garfield, born on S. O. M. Center Road in Orange, Ohio, and who later lived in Mentor, Ohio, then a Member of the House of Representatives and later President of the United States. Here in our own city we point with pride to the impressive Garfield Monument erected in his memory.

The following is one of the significant passages from his address that day. The profundity of his thoughts are of moment event today. He said:

"Eight years ago this was the most unwarlike Nation on earth. For nearly 50 years no spot in any of these States had been the scene of battle. * * * The faith of our people in the stability and permanence of their institutions was like their faith in the eternal course of nature. Peace, liberty and personal security were blessings as common and universal as sunshine and showers and fruitful seasons; and all sprang from a single source, the old American principle that all owe due submission and obedience to the lawfully expressed will of the majority. This is not one of the doctrines of our political system—it is the system itself. It is our political firmament, in which all other truths are set, as stars in heaven. It is the encasing air, the breath of the Nation's life."

For many years the celebration in the North was devoted to an oratorical glorification of the victory of the northern armies. But as the years passed, the hearts of men were mellowed and the note of triumph died out from Memorial Day oratory. The feeling was well expressed by Thomas Bailey Aldrich when he wrote:

"The earlier sorrow has faded out of the hour, leaving a softened solemnity. It quickly ceased to be a local commemoration. While the sequestered country churchyard and burial places near our great northern cities were being hung with May garlands, the thought could not but come to us that there were graves lying southward above which bent a grief as tender and sacred as our own. Invisibly we dropped unseen flowers upon these mounds."

The day established to honor the memory of those who died in the Civil War has come to be observed in memory of the dead of the succeeding wars. The Spanish War veterans and the veterans of two world wars and of the Korean conflict now participate in the exercises.

The last of the survivors of the boys in Blue was hospitalized at the age of 108 in April of this year. There are three survivors of the southern army.

The State of Ohio made May 30 a legal holiday in 1881. Today ours is a Nation with a fine combination of energy and ingenuity. But while we are a mighty people busied with great enterprises, we do not forget—cannot forget—the brave, both men and women, who purchased peace with their unfaltering valor and blood. Often they were the flower of American youth.

May 21 was Armed Forces Day. We heard of our aim to devise a long-range missile capable of spanning the ocean. Our leaders are pointing to the great strides of Soviet air-power. At the same time they are planning a meeting at the summit level to end this cold war of tension and race in armaments.

The mayors, convening in New York City this past week, after discussing foreign policy and international affairs, considered gravely the aspects of Civil Defense. They were aware that among them sat a mayor from Formosa, whose town is just 10 minutes away from the enemy.

As we place laurels on the graves of our heroes, remembering that wherever they died—in Korea, France, Italy, or executed by subversive forces—they gave their all that, in the words of our immortal Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," is it too much to hope that sacrifices of men everywhere, whether in one country or another; whether in the U. S. A. or U. S. S. R.—United States of America or Union of Socialist Soviet Republics—may have been made to bring about that ultimate goal, the entering into that important union, the truly united people of the world? That as in death, so in life, we may all be tolerant of each other; that whether a man be of one race or another, of one creed or another, or be of one color or another, we allow him his sentimental conviction. Brotherhood is not such a wild dream.

If you availed yourself last evening of the invitation of Case Institute of Technology to peer through its world-famous telescope, then you are still overwhelmed with the magnitude of this fascinating universe, where worms and stars live together.

We do not know, but some persons believe and hope that our loved ones stand about us unseen and unheard as we join to honor their memories. The naked human eye is not made to disclose the presence of the myriad forms that exist about us, and the human ear is not attuned to note the solemn symphonies which the bard Shakespeare called the music of the spheres.

Did it ever occur to you that Shakespeare prophesied the coming of radio? In one of his last plays, the Tempest, his spirit-character whom he called Ariel, and who enchantingly filled the air with song and music, boasted that he could put a girdle round the earth in 40 minutes. Today we turn a dial. We tune in. The magic of it all.

But whether we tune in with the departed or not, certainly their memories present a challenge to each of us—to be worthy of their handclasp, the touch of which we long to feel just once more; to be worthy of their dreams and expectations for us; and to be worthy of their great love; to contribute to the understanding and appreciation of the cultural history they left us.

In this respect, we who are Americans of Czech descent are particularly richly endowed.. Whether our forebears be interred on this side or the other side of the ocean, in this hour may we pay heartfelt tribute to those who gave us that valuable creative heritage, of which we may be justly proud.

There is another poem in McGuffey's Fifth Reader, entitled "What I Live For," presumably written by the author of the famed readers. Incidentally, 3 years ago the McGuffey Societies throughout the Nation dedicated a McGuffey museum at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, where the renowned teacher did much of his writing, sometime before the turn of the century. Here is his thought:

"I live for those who love me,
Whose hearts are kind and true;
For the heaven that smiles above me,
And awaits my spirit, too;
For all human ties that bind me,
For the task my God assigned me,
For the bright hopes left behind me,
And the good that I can do.

"I live to learn their story,
Who suffered for my sake;
To emulate their glory,
And follow in their wake;
Bards, patriots, martyrs, sages,
The noble of all ages,
Whose deeds crown history's pages,
And time's great volume make.

"I live to hail that season,
By gifted minds foretold,
When man shall live by reason,
And not alone by gold;
When man to man united,
And every wrong thing righted,
The whole world shall be lighted,
As Eden was of old.

"I live for those who love me,
For those who know me true;
For the heaven that smiles above me,
And awaits my spirit, too;
For the cause that needs assistance,
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that I can do."

This afternoon we pay especial honor to those dear members of Palacky Lodge No. 317, Knights of Pythias, and to the Palacky Ladies of the Temple who were among us but last year. May they rest on this lodge's great heart, entombed in this lodge's great love.

And, in conclusion, may peace, liberty, equal rights and justice be the heritage of the descendants of all who have gone before us everywhere.

Ike Will—Will Not Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following very interesting item appeared in the April 9, 1956, issue of the New Republic magazine:

IKE WILL CAMPAIGN

We are saving up a list of statements by Eisenhower that he isn't going out to campaign this fall out of respect for his high

office—because we expect that he is going out. Maybe we are dead wrong but we don't think this election is yet in the bag for anybody and we suspect the strain will just get too much for Ike and that he will give up some of those proposed back-porch TV speeches for trips out to see the voters. He has changed his mind before. He wasn't going to campaign actively in 1952—and he did; he was against active campaigning again in 1954—and did. He was against making communism an issue in 1954—and commended NIXON for his speeches doing just that. Ike loves to win, and he is persuadable. He thought he wasn't going to run this year but powerful men around him said he would, and he is. In the tariff fight last year Ike thought he would make no concessions, but did; he thought he would hold on to the Dixon-Yates contract—he didn't. Flexibility is a fine thing, and the President has it. We expect to see him out on the hustings.—T. R. B.

Stalin Overtrumped by Tito in Duping West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

STALIN OVERTRUMPED BY TITO IN DUPING WEST

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Recently I pointed out that although communism—as President Eisenhower said—has been a gigantic failure as a social system, Communist regimes have been gigantically successful as power centers.

To that I would add that leading Communists have been gigantically successful as double-talking despots.

Outstanding among such totally unlamented Communists are, of course, the late Joseph Stalin Djugasvili and Dictator Marshal Josip Broz Tito.

For a former czarist police spy on Russian Communists—as Isaac Don Levine has pretty convincingly demonstrated Stalin to have been—to have become Fuehrer of all the Russians and the Pope of Red fascism, to have added almost a third of mankind to Communist conquests, to have headed the state that—with Western assistance—defeated Hitler Germany, to have fooled his wartime allies into giving him "help without strings," and finally, when his policy of conquest had ceased to pay off, to have buncombed them unto giving the U. S. S. R. a breathing spell of "peaceful coexistence"—these are remarkable triumphs.

But in one respect Stalin was overtrumped by Tito.

For here is a Communist tyrant who has been kept alive and in power by the very country whose system and policies it is his purpose to overturn. I refer of course to the United States.

DUPED AMERICANS TWICE

Tito also achieved the miracle of duping his American backers not once but twice. The first time was when, after being armed by Britain and the United States, he fled from the island of Vis in the Adriatic to the advancing Russian armies and with their help eliminated democracy, freedom, and Western influence from Yugoslavia. Just to show how little he valued his Western helpers (without whose arms he could never have got anywhere) he later ordered his fighters to shoot down unarmed United States planes that had accidentally strayed a few miles over his precious territory.

That would normally have put a man on the FBI's most wanted list. But not Tito.

A few years later, when Tito's independence got him kicked out of Mother Russia's Communist family, who should jump to the rescue but the same Americans. Not mind you, in order to make Tito drop communism in Yugoslavia or get out. No, in order to let him become the prize piece in the new school of neutral countries that manage to milk Uncle Sam while opposing his policies.

Economically and in human terms, communism in Yugoslavia is as much a failure as everywhere else. Tito made of his country, a steady prewar exporter of food, such a famine area that—it is common knowledge—without United States assistance the hungry Yugoslavs would have risen and eliminated Tito. Yet one must admire his independence. While eating our bread, he steadily refused to promise anything except that if attacked by Russia he would defend his country, something Yugoslavs have never failed to do. He did close the Greek frontier to Greek Communists whom he was afraid to welcome lest they turn out to be Moscow's agents against him. But he never agreed to defend either Greece or Turkey, his alleged allies.

THE DRIFT BACK

And since Stalin's heirs Bulganin and Khrushchev started making friendly noises a year ago, Tito has not only increased his opposition to American policies but he has drifted slowly back into intimacy with the U. S. S. R.

What policies, what intimacy?

Well, Tito backs Red China, opposed our winning in Korea, wants us to give up the Chinese offshore islands, sides with Nasser of Egypt in the Mediterranean, wants the French out of Algeria, opposes any rearmament of West Germany, and wants the U. S. S. R. brought right back into one big happy family of nations under the slogan of "peaceful coexistence." This should show his line.

As for his intimacy with the Kremlin crowd, well, this week he is off to Moscow seeking new possibilities of successful Socialist development in the world and strengthening friendship with the U. S. S. R. The first phrase means, in Communist jargon, persuading non-Communist socialists in places like France and Italy to join with Communists in those popular fronts where, as experience shows, they first become neutral against the United States and are then cannibalized by Communist associates.

The amazing thing, of course, is not that Tito should desire any such thing, but that despite his desires he is recognized by a large section of the American State Department and by Cy Sulzberger of the New York Times as a helpful element whose example should be encouraged in other Communist countries.

Tito literally lives by systematically biting the hand that feeds him. Here indeed is a gigantic success.

Jordan Attacks on Israel Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the Israel Digest of May 18, 1956, indicates how little value the Arabs put upon their own promises:

MAC TWICE CONDEMNS JORDAN FOR FIVE MORE BORDER ATTACKS

The Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission this week twice condemned Jordan for breaches of the armistice agreement. At its 255th emergency session held on May 19, the Commission found that on May 15, a group of armed Jordanians who had previously crossed the demarcation line into Israel planted a mine on the side of the Hadera-Afula main road and set up an ambush. They detonated the mine when a motorcycle with two riders stopped close by. One of the riders was wounded. The Jordanians then opened automatic fire and threw a hand grenade at the two Israelis, who managed to escape. The Commission viewed this attack with grave concern. This was the latest in a series of similar acts of aggression which have taken place during the year against Israel lines of communication.

At an earlier meeting, the Commission found Jordanians responsible for the incident during the night of May 9–10, when infiltrators opened fire on a civilian car, traveling along the main road connecting Ramat-Hakovesh with Kfar Saba. In this case also, armed Jordanians who had previously crossed the demarcation line into Israel territory, set up an ambush at the side of the thoroughfare. The Commission called Jordanian authorities to put an immediate end to such and similar violations of the General Armistice Agreement.

During the past 10-day period, the following violations of Israel's borders were reported:

On May 17, an 81-mm. mortar shell was fired into Israel territory from a Syrian post southeast of Ein Gev and almost immediately afterwards, a number of machine-gun bursts came from the same spot. Israel forces did not return the fire.

On May 18, infiltrators opened fire on guards at Amazia in the Lachish area. No one was injured in the ensuing skirmish. The investigation which followed, revealed that tracks led to the Jordanian border. It was also discovered that infiltrators had dismantled six pipes. Irrigation pipes and sprinklers were stolen from Beit Govrin on the same day. Footprints of six men wearing rubber-soled shoes led from the scene of the robbery to the Jordanian border.

On May 21, Lebanese infiltrators opened fire on an Israel border patrol, wounding Constable Moshe Guterman. Safad policemen, United Nations observers, and the Israel delegate to the Mixed Armistice Commission followed the tracks of three men to the border from which they led directly to the village of Kfar Yaroun, 1.5 kilometers inside Lebanon territory.

On May 22, Jordanians opened fire on an Israel police patrol near the British military cemetery on Mount Scopus. There were no casualties.

On May 23, armed Jordanians opened fire on an Israel police patrol near the Hadassah Hospital on Mount Scopus. In the exchange of shots which followed, one Israel policeman was wounded.

National Whirligig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article from the Bradford (Pa.) Era of May 24, 1956:

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Capitol Hill skepticism toward perennial outpouring of American cash and resources to foreign nations has been strengthened by the latest official and complete compilation of the staggering cost of our save-the-world adventure.

It reveals that the United States has advanced $134 billion from the start of World War I through June 30, 1955. If Congress grants President Eisenhower's pending request for $4.9 billion for fiscal 1957, the total will be almost $140 billion, or half of the huge public debt of $280 billion.

If there is agreement to continue the program in accord with the White House proposal at the present rate, the sum will approach the fantastic figure of $200 billion within a decade.

In addition to these public grants, private American investments in 15 countries, mostly Western Europe and South America, amount to $25.2 billion.

NO EXPECTATION OF REPAYMENT

There is, of course, no expectation that this money will be repaid, although $11 billion of postwar assistance is listed on the Treasury books as "credits." However, keeping this figure as an asset appears to be a futile bit of bookkeeping, inasmuch as many of these nations still owe us $17.3 billion of World War I indebtedness.

Here is a full and official itemization of the cost of our overseas generosity:

World War I, $17,297,981,019; World War II Lend Lease, $42,020,779,261; postwar to June 30, 1955, $51,339,142,000; proposed for 1957 fiscal year $4,000,000,000; United States advance to world monetary fund, $2,750,000,000; United States advance to international bank, $635 million; overseas military installations, $20 billion. Total $138,942,902,280, plus United States private investments, $25,264,000,000, equals grand total, $164,206,902,280.

HAS NOT BOUGHT FRIENDS

A geographical breakdown of the distribution of this vast treasure supplies another reason for congressional headshaking. It suggests that this "Niagara of dollars," to use Indonesian Prime Minister Sukarno's critical characterization, has not bought us strong or dependable friends.

Although about $65 billion went to Western Europe, NATO is still only a paper organization and shield. The principal beneficiaries resent our resistance to Russia's new blandishments, insisting on closer diplomatic and commercial relations with Moscow and the satellites. All recognize Red China.

Asia and southeast Asia received $10.1 billion since World War II. But India, Burma, and Afghanistan are more friendly to the Soviet than to us. Indochina is still a battleground between democratic and Communist forces. Sukarno, of Indonesia, openly spurns our money if it is designed to buy his country's friendship. If that is our purpose, he says, we are wasting it.

ASSAILED

The Near East, including Egypt, Jordan, and Israel, took down $4.3 billion. And yet, both parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute assail us. The Arabs purchase arms from the Communists and cozy up to Moscow and Peiping in brazen hostility toward us. Never was American prestige at lower ebb in this area.

Our parsimony toward our good neighbors—Canada and South America—contrasts dramatically with our gifts to unstable allies, actual enemies, and wavering neutrals. Canada is on the books for a mere $6 million in credits. Only a billion dollars in postwar aid has been forwarded to the Latin American Republics.

To make the world picture gloomier, Russia is estimated to have promises in barter form less than $10 billion, and that only within recent months. And yet, many diplomatic experts believe that the Kremlin is winning the cold war.

Licensing of Foreign Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, a regent of the State of New York and the chairman of the Committee on Licenses:

LICENSING OF FOREIGN PHYSICIANS

(Address by Dominick F. Maurillo, A. B., M. D., L. L. D., regent of the State of New York and chairman of the committee on licenses)

It is a privilege and an honor to address this very large group of professional people for three reasons. I believe that I am the first regent of New York State to be invited to talk to your members. I am, and have been a member of the New York State Medical Society for 29 years and third, I am sincerely interested in medical educational problems. My fellow regents have asked me to convey to you their best wishes and to tell you that they have an earnest desire to help and protect the medical doctors of New York State, as well as the doctors of other States, and all the foreign doctors who are qualified and wish to practice in New York.

Licensing of foreign doctors has reached the stage of great importance in our larger States. It has aroused the interest of many different groups of people. Some are for, and some are against the admission of these physicians to the practice of medicine. Today, the problem is very critical because of the shortage of doctors throughout the United States. There are now about 5,500 unlicensed foreign doctors working either as interns or residents in hospitals in the United States. About 30 percent of these doctors are in New York State hospitals. These foreign doctors are either invited to this country, or they are sent here as exchange visitors to study American medicine for one or more years, or they come here to stay under the quota system. It has been shown that most of these doctors remain in the United States and that less than 10 percent return to their native land.

Today there is a need for more than 14,000 interns because of the tremendous hospital building in the last 8 years, and because many residencies have been established in our larger hospitals. Last year our medical colleges graduated less than 7,000 doctors. All of these doctors are serving their internship, but this still leaves a shortage of 7,000 interns. With the supply so small and the need so great, is there any wonder that hospitals are desirious of employing foreign doctors even though their medical education is unapproved by the State authorities? In fact, some hospital administrators or their representatives travel to Europe and Asiatic countries to invite doctors for the purpose of interning in their hospitals. These foreign doctors work on an equal basis with graduates of our medical colleges, and they carry out the same duties and have the same responsibilities. Because of this equal status, some administrators and doctors, who have worked with these foreign physicians and who have formed a favorable opinion as to their abilities, protest vehemently against the procedure of licensing foreign doctors. They cannot understand why some States deny these physicians the right to take medical licensing examinations.

New York State has been and is the leader in the admission of foreign doctors to its medical licensure examination. In the 5 years before World War II (1937 to 1941), 5,065 out of a total of 7,527 foreign-trained physicians were admitted to examination in New York. This is more than 67 percent. From 1950 to 1954, New York State admitted 2,271 foreign doctors to its medical examination out of a total of 6,270 foreign trained physicians or more than 36 percent. The foreign doctors admitted before World War II came mostly from Germany, Poland, and Austria. Today they come from all over the world with the greater number from Europe, South America, and Asia.

New York State has the most experienced and best-trained professional educational department in the United States. It supervises an dadministers all the professions except law, with special emphasis on the professions dealing with healing arts. Screening and evaluation of medical education is done by Dr. Stiles D. Ezell, seceretary of the board of medical examiners, with a very capable and competent staff. They are under the direct supervision of our assistant commissioner for professional education, Robert C. Killough, Jr.

The procedure necessary for a foreign doctor to obtain a license to practice medicine in New York is very simple. An applicant writes to the Assistant Commissioner for Professional Education, to the Secretary of the Medical Board or to the State Education Department, Albany, N. Y., for information and application blanks. These will be delivered immediately. He must comply with the directions by submitting all the required data. His records are then thoroughly evaluated by the department. If his credentials meet our requirements, he is allowed to take the medical licensing examination. If his records fail to meet our requirements, they are then presented to the Regent's Licensing Committee under section 211 of the New York State Education law.

Before I continue with this paper, I will explain this very important section 211. It was passed as section 51 by the New York State Legislature in 1917 and was added to the then existing education laws. Many amendments have been added to this law since then. In 1947 section 51 was recoded as section 211 and it is so called today. The legislators had real vision and understanding when they passed this law and improved it year after year with many amendments. Because of section 211, many thousands of foreign doctors were, and are able to obtain a license to practice medicine and surgery in New York State. These doctors may qualify for endorsement in other States representing 80 percent of the population of the United States on the basis of their New York license, upon meeting the requirements for endorsement in such States. It should interest you to know that many decisions rendered by the courts in interpreting section 211 have favored and sustained the regents' actions thereunder.

I shall read you part of section 211. I quote, "Conformably to law, the regents may supervise the entrance regulations to, the licensing under, and the practicing of the profession of medicine and all other professions except law and members of any other profession which may hereafter come under the supervision of the board of regents.

"The regents may by rule or order accept evidence of preliminary and professional education and where practice as a prerequisite to licensure may receive evidence of such practice in whatever State or country the

same may have been obtained or engaged in, for licensing a candidate to practice any such profession in lieu of that prescribed by the laws provided it shall appear to the satisfaction of the regents that such candidate has substantially met the requirements of such laws.

"The regents shall have further power to endorse a license issued by a legally constituted board of examiners in any other State or country upon satisfactory evidence that the requirements for the issuance of such license were substantially the equivalent of the requirements in force in this State when such license was issued and that the applicant has been in the lawful and reputable practice of his profession for a period of not less than 5 years prior to his making applications for such endorsement. When the evidence presented is not satisfyingly sufficient to warrant the endorsement of such license the board of regents may require that the candidate for endorsement shall pass such subjects of the licensing examination specified by statute or regents' rule as should be required of the candidate to establish his worthiness to receive such endorsement."

This is in part section 211. Under their rules, the regents have broad discretionary powers to judge the fitness of foreign medical school graduates for licensure in New York State. Any physician can request a hearing of his case before the regents' committee on licenses. This committee is a standing committee of three members appointed by the chancellor of the board of regents. If there is a medical doctor on the board he is always appointed to the committee and generally as at present, the doctor is appointed chairman. Its purpose is to help and advise him and recommend what is needed to meet our requirements. The committee is presented with all the records of the applicant. These records include elementary, high school, college and medical college education, plus postgraduate work in hospitals, plus the years in practice if any and also letters of recommendations. The license committee reviews the record of each applicant and then makes a recommendation to the full board of regents which consists of thirteen members. The entire board makes the decision and action is final. Regents' decisions can only be reversed by the courts.

If an applicant has been denied admission to examination by the regents, he may request another hearing before the license committee. It will be granted if he can present new evidence of his qualifications, or if he has passed additional medical educational courses, or if he has served more internship or residencies, since the denial of his previous application.

The regent's policy is to protect the health of the people of New York State by admitting only competent doctors to the licensing examinations. If any doctor meets our requirements, you can be sure, that the regents will see to it, that he or she, will be allowed to practice medicine and surgery in New York State.

The regents have often been asked how they obtain their information about medical education in foreign countries so as to be able to judge the cases that are presented before them. Before World War II, we obtained a great deal of valuable information from the American Medical Association. We also received information from many of our doctors who continued their post-guaduate education in European medical centers. From 1920 to 1939 New York State had a working agreement with some of the European countries as to licensure.

The regents received reports that medical education was deteriorating in quality in Germay, Italy, Austria and Hungary after Hitler and other dictators came into power. Prior to World War II, during the war, and for some years thereafter, medical education was at its lowest ebb in some countries of Europe and certain parts of Asia Minor and Asia. Large numbers of the medical faculties were drafted into the armed services and essential industries. Many medical colleges were destroyed in the war countries. Medical education could not be taught under such impossible conditions. It was very difficult for the regents to obtain accurate information about the quality and extent of medical education taught in those countries. We received some information that diplomas of medicine could be easily obtained.

Because of these many reports, some very conflicting in their analysis, the regents' committee on license had a very difficult job on its hands to review and judge hundreds of cases presented before them from 1945 to 1951. A very large number of foreign graduates were denied admission to examination. It was the opinion of the committee during those years that they recommend denial and be safe in their judgment rather than to admit an incompetent doctor to practice medicine. Can you imagine the great deal of criticism received by the regents as a result of these denied decisions? I should like to state for the record that some of this criticism was absolutely correct.

In 1947, 1948, 1949 about 300 veterans of World War II, who could not gain admission in the United States medical colleges, traveled to Switzerland, Italy, France, and Holland for their medical education. Most of these students lived in New York State. Since the regents were denying applicants from these countries, the veterans and their families were worried about their status after their graduation from foreign medical colleges. Happily for them, the regents have the power under the law section 210, to evaluate, appraise, and register medical education in any State or foreign country.

In January of 1950 the board of regents received an invitation from the Ministers of Education of Italy and Switzerland, to send a regents' committee to evaluate and approve their medical education. Our chancellor appointed a committee of three for that purpose, making me its chairman. In 1951 another invitation was received from the French Minister of Education, to evaluate medical education at the University of Paris. I was chairman of that committee. As a result of the committee's work, the regents approved the medical education of 11 medical colleges in Italy, 5 in Switzerland, and the University of Paris (Sorbonne) Medical College.

In order to obtain more knowledge of medical education in Europe, I visited in 1952, Holland, England, and Sweden to study their system of medical education. In 1953, I attended the World's Conference on Medical Education in London and obtained from the deans of medical colleges in the countries in which the license committee was interested, a great deal of information about their respective system of education. During the same year I visited and studied medical education in the principal German universities. In 1954 I studied medical education in Greece, Turkey, and Lebanon and in the same year was invited by the Minister of Education of Israel, to appraise the medical education in Jerusalem. In my talks with the deans and professors of these European medical colleges, I learned interesting facts about medical education behind the Iron Curtain. Because of the increasing number of applications received by the licensing committee of doctors from Central American countries, I decided in 1955 to evaluate medical education in Mexico, Cuba, and Venezuela. In 6 years, I studied medical education in 38 universities of Europe, Asia Minor, and Central America.

The regents had to solve the big problem of what action to take on physicians who come from unapproved medical colleges and who were working as internes or residents in our approved hospitals. In 1951, with the help of Dr. Boggs, the former dean of New York University Post-Graduate Medical College, our license committee approved a course which we called comprehensive medicine. It consists of 1 year of intensive review of medicine involving the entire curriculum of a medical college. It is practically all didactic work in the basic sciences. The clinical courses involve thorough bedside teaching and examinations. It is a very good review of a 4-year medical curriculum. The following year New York Polyclinic Post Graduate College was also approved for this course because New York University could not handle the large number of candidates required by the Regents to take additional supplementary study.

Since April 1951 the regents have recommended that most foreign doctors, with an unapproved medical education, must complete (a) 1 year comprehensive course of formal study, (b) a 1-year AMA approved rotating internship, and (c) a 1-year approved internship or residency in either surgery, medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, or pediatrics, in order to take the New York State medical license examination. New York is the only State which prescribes these conditions and most of the foreign doctors are very pleased with these requirements. They now have a better chance of passing our license examination and more important they feel confident of practicing good medicine in any community of the State. Reports have come to the regents proving these facts.

It is estimated that only 25,000 doctors out of 32,000 licensed and registered doctors in New York State, are practicising medicine. More than one-fifth of the practicing doctors, or, to be more accurate, 5,061 are foreign trained doctors. I would say that more than a third of the doctors doing general practice, have been educated in foreign countries. Practically all of them are prospering and are a credit to the community in which they live and practice.

On a nationwide basis, this is what has happened durng the last 5 years: 799 foreign doctors were admitted to examination in 1950; 1,066 in 1951; 1,463 in 1953; 1,642 in 1954 and I am sure that not less than 2,000 were admitted in 1955 and probably 2,500 will be admitted in 1956. The figure for 1956 is likely to be more than one-third of what our medical colleges will graduate this year. To put it differently, this number of doctors will exceed the product of 20 of our largest medical schools. We can expect this number of foreign doctors to increase each year unless something is done to increase the number of doctors graduating from American medical colleges.

In 1955 Seymour B. Foreman of our research department reported to the Board of Regents some very interesting facts and future prediction in the medical field for New York State. He stated that next to the District of Columbia, New York State has a larger number of physicians for its population than any other State for the year 1954. Its 32,000 registered physicians provide a ratio of 450 people to 1 doctor, but since only about 25,000 physicians are in active practice, the ratio is 625 to 1. However, the distribution of physicans varies widely from 280 to 1 in New York county to a ratio of 1,500 to 1 in Lewis County. Foreman stated that New York would need 4,475 more physicians to bring down to the State average those counties that are above the State average. It would also require about 296 additional physicians to bring the average to the national average of 900 to 1, those counties having a ratio above the national. This problem of distribution needs further study.

His report continued with the fact that in 1945–46, 5,826 doctors were graduated in the United States and that in 1953–54 after 9 years, only 6,861 doctors were graduated.

This is an increase of 1,035 doctors while the population of the United States increased by more than 18 million people. He stated that in 1953–54 there were 3,555 enrolled medical students in New York medical colleges and 819 graduated as physicians. He predicts that in 1960, (all things being equal) 4,100 students are expected to be enrolled with 940 graduating; in 1965, 5,300 students with 1,220 graduating; in 1970, 6,220 students are expected to enroll with 1,445 graduating. Now this next prediction should be of great interest to the deans of the medical colleges. He estimates and predicts, that, with the great increase in college enrollment expected for the years from 1956 to 1970, 3,200 capable, above the average students will not be admitted to New York medical colleges. If calculated on a nationwide basis, more than 25,000 "B" or better students will be kept out of medical colleges in the United States by 1970. Even today, there are more than 2 students available for every 1 accepted in the United States and more than a 3½ to 1 ratio for New York State.

I quoted the above facts and figures in order to explain why more than 2,000 students are forced to study medicine outside the United States, of whom just less than half are from New York State. The students attending the Italian, Swiss and University of Paris medical colleges must have a college degree (B. S.) with a "B" or better average in order to be admitted. They must take a 5-year course for their medical degree and then, if they desire to take the New York State medical examination, they must first complete a 1-year AMA approved rotating internship. The regents committee which evaluated and approved medical education in these countries, suggested the above qualifications with the authorities of the respective medical colleges and these rules are strictly enforced. Let me emphatically state that these students receive good medical training. The deans of the medical colleges are very well satisfied with the work of the American students. In fact they are in the upper half of their class scholastically. I am certain they will make good doctors. Today some of these graduates are making their appearances in our New York hospitals. My colleagues report that Americans educated abroad are holding their own with graduates of our medical colleges. I am very proud of being the chairman of the regents' committee which has made possible such education for so large numbers of American students.

I have three concluding statements:

1. It is evident that the present policy of limiting the number of students for admission to our medical colleges is responsible for:

(a) The very great increase in foreign doctors in the United States.

(b) The 2,000 or more American students studying in foreign countries.

(c) The growing shortage of general practitioners.

(d) The discouragement of many potential medical students to study medicine.

2. The United States Congress should pass a law creating a commission of experienced persons in this field to study fully this problem and make a substantial grant of the necessary funds available to the commission. Such study should be comprehensive, realistic, unhampered, and unbiased and cover all phases of medical education.

3. The regents of New York State have satisfactorily solved the problem of licensing foreign doctors under the powers granted them in the education law of the State of New York.

Newspaper Editorial Writers Call for Higher Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I have been watching with interest the editorial reaction of the press of the country to our committee's recommendation for higher postal rates.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in what some of the editors are saying and I have selected a few editorials for your consideration. They follow:

The Burlington (Wash.) Journal, in an editorial appearing March 29, 1956, said:

POSTAL RATES THEN AND NOW

Remember the 5-cent loaf of bread—the 5-cent streetcar fare, and the 5-cent cigar?

Those were the days when first-class mail was in tune with the rest of our national economy and the patron paid the Department 3 cents for this mailing privilege.

In those days, some 25 years in the past, it cost 2 cents to deliver first-class mail and the rate was fair. Today the cost is more than 3 cents, resulting in a definite and appalling loss to the Department.

In handling second-class mail in 1954 (before our recent wage increases) the Post Office Department actually lost $232 million. You and ourselves as taxpayers of the great Republic, had to dig down into our jeans and help some of the large magazines and newspapers pay their large distribution costs—because they do not pay a realistic postage rate. One national weekly magazine pays 2.2 cents postage a copy and it actually costs nearly 6 cents to handle and deliver this periodical.

A well known monthly publication (pocket size) pays Uncle Sam six-tenths of a cent a copy for mailing. The actual delivery cost of this magazine is 4.8 cents a copy—with the good old apathetic taxpayer footing the difference of 4.2 cents a copy.

Third-class mail presents practically the same picture. In 1954 we taxpayers subsidized these mail users to the tune of $147 million—and you had to like it.

Frankly—we do not relish paying postage (in the form of constantly increasing taxes) for others.

Occasionally we hear the comment that the Post Office has never been self-supporting. This is a false conclusion—initially the Department was a moneymaker—and continued to be for many years. Even in a 151-year period, from 1789 to 1940, the postal deficit averaged less than $10 million a year. This is a far cry from the postal loss today of more than $1 million every working day.

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, for the second straight year, is asking Congress for a reasonable increase in postal rates to help sop up the tremendous deficit under which the Post Office Department is now operating. He asks, and rightfully so, that the Post Office Department be put on a self-sustaining basis, as are the postal services of every other major nation in the world.

He asks to have first-class mail postage raised from 3 cents to 4 cents (Canada pays 5 cents); airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents; three anual increases of 15 percent each on second-class mail; and other increases are recommended including a 30 percent mark-up on third-class mail.

The Fayetteville Observer, published in Fayetteville, N. C., said on April 24, 1956:

POSTAL DEFICIT: WHO'S GOING TO PAY IT?

Should the United States Post Office Department be operated like a business or like a giveaway program?

The people who operate it, which is to say the postmasters, believe it should be operated like a business, that it should charge at least as much for the services it renders as it costs to render those services.

The National Association of Postmasters of the United States is on record as favoring an increase in the postage rates to enable the Post Office Department to operate on its income instead of running up a deficit which has averaged $460 million (almost half a billion dollars) a year since the close of World War II.

Since that time the prices of almost every other commodity in the United States—including labor—have advanced, but the prices which Congress permits the Post Office Department to charge the public for its service have been unchanged, despite the fact that Congress has voted raises to the men and women who are employed by the postal service.

Of course, there is another side to the proposition, and that side is that whether the people pay for postal service at the stamp window or through their income taxes to balance the budget, it is still the public that pays.

Under the deficit system of supporting the Post Office Department it makes no difference whether you write 1 letter a month or 1 letter a day you pay for the support of the $460 million annual postal deficit in your taxes.

You pay for a substantial portion of the postal cost not in proportion to your use of the mails but in proportion to your income.

Without arguing whether it is right or wrong, the annual huge post-office deficits simply mean that individuals and firms which use the mail less are helping pay part of the expenses of individuals and firms which use the mails more.

The National Association of Postmasters would correct this by increasing postal rates to the point where the income of the Post Office Department would approximate the expense of the Post Office Department.

It would increase the per-ounce cost of first-class letters from 3 cents to 4 cents, domestic air mail from 6 cents to 7 cents, second-class mail by 15 percent, piece rates on circulars, merchandise, books, catalogs, and other miscellaneous matter by about 50 percent, and bulk rates on these classifications by about 2 cents a pound. Book rates in the fourth-class category would be increased 2 cents a pound on the first pound.

These increases would cost a good many firms and individuals more in postage payments than they would save in income-tax payments to make up the annual postal deficit. Others they would cost less.

But the major argument of the postmasters is that if the Post Office Department could attain receipts approximating expenses it could progressively improve the postal services to the people without having to go before Congress every year with its hat in its hand like a beggar pleading for a pittance.

They argue that the Post Office Department would be able to build more and better post-office buildings, extend delivery service, speed up deliveries, and make more frequent deliveries of the United States mail.

In the meantime the operation of the Post Office Department on a deficit basis is costing the taxpayers approximately $100 million a year in interest alone on that portion of the national debt which has been piled up by the postal service since 1946.

The Louisville (Ky.) Times said, February 1, 1956:

WHY SUBSIDIZE JUNK MAIL?

Once upon a time, getting a piece of mail was a matter of some moment. Even if what you received was only a reminder that last month's dentist bill was due, at least it was meant for you, not some ananymous "householder" or "occupant." Now, it seems to us that half the mail we get at home consists of advertising sent out at cheap third-class rates, not to us personally but to our address.

Well, throwing it away isn't much trouble. But delivering it is giving the Post Office Department a lot of trouble—and it is costing the taxpayers some money. Postmaster Scholtz says this so-called "junk mail" is "taxing us beyond our capacity." In Washington, Assistant Postmaster General Abrams told a House subcommittee that the volume of advertising being sent at third-class rates is reaching its 1954 peak, and agreed that the rate should be increased.

That 1954 peak was hit after Postmaster General Summerfield the year before permitted advertising to be sent at third-class rates without any address or name. That created such a problem that Summerfield was forced a little more than a year later to cancel the order. But it still could be mailed if an address was provided.

The postal department almost invariably operates under a deficit. Some of this, perhaps, is unavoidable, but not all of it, and President Eisenhower again has asked for an increase in postal rates to bring in another $350 million. Details have not been given, but it is expected that the request will be similar to last year's, which included a 28 percent increase for third-class mail.

There is no reason why advertisers should not use the mails. But there is no reason, either, why taxpayers should subsidize them. We hope Congress raises the third-class rate to the point at which it would pay for itself. We might still get junk mail, but at least we wouldn't be paying part of the cost of its delivery.

The Columbus (Ohio) Citizen said on March 25, 1956:

THE POSTMARK ON YOUR LETTER IS RED

In 1932, many magazines were a nickel. So was a phone call. For a dime you could get a loaf of bread. And for 50 cents a haircut.

All these costs have zoomed since then. That 5-cent magazine is 15 cents, or more. Other things have gone up similarly.

But you can still mail a letter for 3 cents.

And the increase in rates for carrying magazines and newspapers through the mails is about 3 percent.

Meanwhile, the cost of running the Post Office Department has leaped 107 percent. Most of that is in wage raises for employees.

In the last 10 years, the postal service has run up a deficit of $4.6 billion. The taxpayers have had to make up the difference.

Postmaster General Summerfield has been pleading with Congress to raise postal rates. Most people think this is reasonable. As postal users, they would be paying rates somewhere near what it costs to handle their mail.

But as taxpayers they would be relieved of continually helping to make up deficits—whether they use the mails or not.

That $4.6 billion the post office lost in the last 10 years is part of the national debt. The debt draws interest. Everyday every taxpayer draws any income, a percentage of that income goes to pay interest on this debt.

The taxpayers of this country are paying, over and over, for the postage on letters, newspapers, magazines, and direct mail advertising long since read and thrown in the ashcan.

They will go on paying for this forgotten mail until Congress hikes the postal rates enough to let the Post Office Department come out even.

What's wrong with paying for mail service as we use it?

Why pass on to our children the cost of carrying our mail?

The Daily Standard, of Celina, Ohio, March 25, 1956, said:

UNCLE SAM SHOULDN'T PAY FOR SENDING JUNK

We have never shared the concern of many people with the Post Office deficit. We have felt that communication between people is something that should be as free as the air and that it didn't hurt the Government to pick up part of the bill to make this possible.

And, we realize that picking up the tab is sort of a subsidy to newspapers—which are carried by a very low rate by Uncle Sam, making possible widespread rural subscription lists, which small papers like the Standard dearly love.

But we have just changed our mind. Because we were shorthanded here last week, we let our mail pile up on our desk—fishing out only those letters that we thought might have news of interest to the readers.

At the end of the week, we piled all of these unopened letters into a box to take them home to open. They filled a large box and weighed in at 25 pounds—25 pounds of unsolicited and unwanted mail.

It was, to us, a dramatic demonstration of how mailing privileges are being abused. If a small newspaper like ours receives 25 pounds a week of junk mail, then Uncle Sam must be carrying at less than cost millions of pounds of such mail.

A hike in the postal rates would not have much effect in reducing the amount of this unwanted mail. But at least those who persist in loading the mails with this kind of junk would be required to pay their own way instead of the taxpayers.

The Evansville (Ind.) Press said on March 15, 1956:

POSTAL COSTS ROSE TOO

Few articles, if any, cost as little today as in the depression year of 1932.

But it costs the same to mail a letter, practically the same to mail a newspaper or magazine, and not much more to mail advertising circulars and other such material.

That, in a nutshell, is the reason the Post Office Department is running up such a huge deficit each year—which means the taxpayers as a whole are paying a big share of the postage bills of heavy users of the mails.

It costs the postal system much more to handle mail than it did in 1932, of course, because labor and overhead have gone up.

Postmaster General Summerfield has just given a Congressional committee another detailed description of his department's financial situation, and a forceful argument why Congress should authorize higher postage rates.

He recommends a 1-cent increase in letter rates and appropriate increases for other classes of mail.

These, he says, would eliminate $407 million of the $470 million Post Office Department deficit estimated for the next fiscal year.

This would be a long step toward making ends meet—a logical goal for the agency and the only one fair to the taxpayers.

The Capital Journal, published in Salem, Oreg., said on April 9, 1956:

POST OFFICE SHOULD BE SELF-SUSTAINING

The House of Representatives Post Office Committee has been holding hearings for 3 weeks on a proposal by Postmaster General Summerfield for rate increases sufficient to erase a deficit that has averaged $450 million a year for the past 10 years.

Proposed is an increase of 1 cent an ounce on first-class and air mail and a boost of about 30 percent in rates on second- and third-class mail, principally newspapers, magazines, and direct-by-mail advertising. We've noted no proposal for a reduction in free mail by Government departments and Members of Congress, which contributes much to the deficit. Many millions of dollars worth of free service is rendered annually by the Department.

In our opinion Summerfield's proposals should be approved and the Department put on a balanced budget. It is a vast business enterprise which ought to pay its own way. Most of the newspapers appear prepared now to accept the rate increase proposed for them and several publishers so testified at the hearing. Letter rates are still 3 cents, the depression rate and only 50 percent above the rate of half a century ago when a working man got 10 to 15 cents an hour and most living cost items were in proportion.

The only argument we know against eliminating the postal deficit is that this is an election year and it doesn't sound convincing.

The San Francisco News said on April 26, 1956:

EVERYBODY PAYS

Congressmen are fooling no one but themselves if they think the public doesn't know there is no such thing as "free" or "bargain" mail service, so far as the taxpayers are concerned. When a business firm pays less than it costs the Government to carry its mail, the public pays the difference, in taxes. And this has been going on too long already.

Graduation Address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the United States Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on June 1 to attend the graduation exercises for the 116th class to graduate from the United States Naval Academy in my hometown of Annapolis, Md.

As a further testimony to our good will and our desire to get along with the other free countries of the world, there were graduated with the class 2 citizens of the Republic of the Philippines and 1 of the Republic of Peru. One of the citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, former Midshipmen Vincante J. Brillantes, graduated with honors and made an outstanding record by standing No. 1 in his class in mathematics. He is to be warmly congratulated.

The graduating class was addressed by Adm. A. W. Radford, United States Navy, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Admiral Radford's remarks on this occasion were inspiring and it is my feeling that they should be made available for all to read. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including the graduation address by Admiral Radford at the United States Naval Academy:

GUIDELINES FOR READINESS

Forty years ago, on the 2d day of June 1916, I was one of 178 midshipmen present here waiting for our diplomas.

Forty years from now, in June of 1996, it may be that one of you in this graduating class of 681 midshipmen will have the honor which is mine today. That individual will then appreciate the problem which has faced me since I accepted with great pleasure the invitation to be your graduation speaker.

In a nutshell, the problem is this: How in approximately 15 minutes' time should I cover the worthwhile experiences of a service career so as to interest you young men just starting? What brief guidance would be helpful in these times of tension? What point can I make which will be remembered by you from now on?

In 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916, I listened to graduation addresses here in this same building, just as you in this class have done. At the time of my last two, there was a war in Europe which came to be known as the First World War. It was also called the war to end war. The United States entered this conflict less than a year after my class left Annapolis.

In restrospect, the class of 1916 has been fortunate enough to witness, and to some extent participate in, an interesting and important bit of modern history. Our service careers span the years of World War I, a Second World War, and more recently the Korean war; and they continue today in a period of great international tension—a period marked by great determination on the part of the United States and its free allies that there be a secure peace in the world.

Today we have a peace—an uneasy peace to be sure, and one marked by an armistice in Korea where nearly a million armed men, including many of your own brothers-in-arms, must be alert to counter aggression in a matter of minutes.

Indeed, the past 40 years have proved challenging, interesting, and so completely worthwhile.

So, too, will your future be challenging and interesting. Undoubtedly, you will witness and take part in great events. Now, the part you play and the contribution you make will be somewhat designed by fate, but largely designed by you as an individual. The key, I think, will be your individual and collective readiness to cope with the responsibilities thrust upon you in later years.

The moral is obvious. Be ready and fit for anything that you might be called upon to do. And keep ready and fit.

At my graduation, we had not 1, but 2 speakers—President Woodrow Wilson and Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels.

President Wilson advised us not to forget duty for a moment. He said, "there might come a time when * * * the history of the world might be changed" by what we did or did not do.

Secretary Daniels challenged the members of my class to make progress. He urged us to "keep an open mind, investigate new methods, and not slavishly follow any old theories or practices." At the same time, however, he admonished us to keep bright those long-term traditions "that spell character, courage, and chivalry."

That advice given to the class of 1916 by those two distinguished men has stood well the test of time. It has been proven sound, and today I pass it along to you.

The key words I emphasize are "tradition" and "progress."

At first glance, you may think these words are incompatible. But I can tell you they are not. They go together, and each complements the other. For the readiness of a man is gaged, in part at least, by his flexible and timely adjustments to the new and novel, without sacrifice of principle or abandonment of standards.

Principles and standards are vital to the Armed Forces. Never forget that you are servants of a free country. Wherever you are stationed, you will be representatives and ambassadors of our free principles. Above all else you must maintain our concepts of leadership, of courage, of military competence, and of devotion to duty and to country.

I would suggest, therefore, that you recognize right now that you have a duty which involves not only readiness to die for your country, but also readiness to live day by day for its betterment. I suggest that you resolve always to be worthy of the high traditions which have been impressed upon you here.

Then if your resolution is translated into thought and deed, I feel confident that your careers will add luster to the stars that shine in our country's flag.

In the final reckoning what will count most will not be the lofty stature attained by a few, but will be the sum total of all your earnest service—the sum total of all your efforts to live up in every circumstance to your code of duty.

But while urging you to preserve the noble traditions of the service, I do not imply for a moment that you should make a fetish of tradition. You need never feel that you would be untrue to the classes who sailed before you, if you sail courses different from ours.

Pride in tradition can become a hindrance if weighted or clogged with complacency and oversatisfaction with past achievements. We can never let ourselves rest upon ours oars.

This leads to the second key word: "Progress." No one can deny the need for progress. There is always a place for change. It is an inescapable law of life.

But I think the art of progress and the magnitude of change have never been so great as right now. This is no slow and plodding evolution in weaponry and tactics. This is a rapid evolution—a time when developments in the striking power of weapons, and corresponding changes in tactics, are jumping forward by leaps and bounds.

I feel certain that the 40 years which separate your class and mine sounds like a very long time. The changes, however, which I have seen in weapons, in the world situation, and in the thinking of men, make it seem that it might as easily be 40 decades.

Fortunately, your education has given you knowledge of the past. It has given you an insight into economics, government, and history; and it has helped you to understand the cultural, scientific, and spiritual aspects of this great civilization of ours. I would say you have been give a flying start.

But it is only a start.

One incontrovertible fact impressed on my mind by this Academy was the fact that I knew very little—that the man who thinks he "knows it all" has ceased to learn. Actually, the service is no haven for one who has quit learning. Study, especially the study of peoples and nations, is a continuous part of the job of military leadership.

So it must be with you. Whether in new weapons or social sciences, your search for knowledge and improvement is a lifetime pursuit.

In your early years, you will not be dealing with global strategy or policy. But in your early years, you will be dealing with the men and the weapons at the action end of our policies; and these years probably will be among the happiest in your service.

It is during these early years that you will be preparing yourselves for the time when you will assume greater responsibilities. You will be preparing yourselves for the time when your decisions will help determine whether or not this Nation's military forces stay abreast of the incredible advances in science and the international situation.

None of this is easy. There is a certain orthodoxy and set pattern in all professions. Imaginative thinking and new learning do not always make a man popular. But imaginative thinking and new learning are essential parts of this imaginative age. I think you will soon realize that progress provides a climate for strength, and stagnation is an invitation to weakness.

Now, despite the fact that your profession is war, your first mission is the prevention of war, and to no greater objective could you dedicate your lives.

Your Government has given you a rare opportunity. You are entering a profession that is unusually vigorous, progressive, and interesting; one that is engaged in vitally important missions, and one that places uncommon emphasis on youth and offers unlimited opportunity to all its members.

Remember always that you are part of the Armed Forces team—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. That team—the United States Armed Forces team—must think as a team, work as a team, and when necessary fight as a team.

Accordingly, cherish your pride in your own chosen arm of service, but acquire a complete understanding of the character and contribution of the other arms. Have in mind the thought that some day if you are successful, you may be called upon to lead and coordinate joint operations.

Now I have just a few words for each of the groups represented here today.

First, to the parents, relatives, and sweethearts: This is a happy and proud moment for each of you. Rightfully so. I congratulate you for the role you have played, both in sending and in keeping your young man here. I feel confident I can count on you to share with him his lifetime career, and to support him in it. I want you to know that I, too, will follow his career with great personal interest.

Second, to the staff and faculty: The inspirational and educational importance of this Naval Academy in its service to the Nation has never been greater. With our sister academies, the older one at West Point and the newer one recently established by the Air Force, you are molding men upon whom the future safety of our country depends. Make certain that your counsel is wise and that your cultivation of the youthful mind is sound.

To the Midshipmen who remain behind: Your graduation day is coming. It seems a long way off now but later when you look back on it, it will have come and gone all too fast. Make the most of your time remaining at the Academy. You chose well in making a military career your profession. Never has the challenge of service been so noble, and never has the need for patriotism been so great.

And finally to the graduates, all of you; those who go into the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force: Let readiness be your watchword; and let tradition, progress, and teamwork be your guidelines. If you carry away from these 4 years nothing else, let it be this one word: "readiness."

Congratulations and good luck to each of you.

From Naval Research to Fleet Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the Armed Forces Day ceremonies held at the city of Huntington, W. Va., on May 19, 1956. Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett, Chief of Naval Research, was the principal speaker of the occasion. His excellent luncheon address admirably points up the Navy's modern research program and its contribution to our national defense.

The address follows:

I want to mention some of the Navy's new weapons, their background, and their importance. In rapid succession we have announced the nuclear-powered submarines, shown off our guided missile cruisers and their deadly armament, our supersonic fighters and a high-speed jet seaplane. In addition to their combat importance, these developments have paid the Navy an extra dividend. We have gained added recognition by the public that the Navy is imaginative, powerful, and important. Much of this new recognition has blossomed during the past year, not because naval progress has been a sudden thing, but because many years of planning, research, and hard work resulted in dramatic new weapons that captured the imagination of press and public. The Navy's new arsenal of weapons are their own telling argument before a public that likes to judge the facts for itself.

It is not surprising that the Navy has created a considerable stir during the past year. Look at some of the new weapons in our arsenal:

Man's first harnessing of the atom for propulsion, a nuclear-powered submarine that can cruise underwater at high speed indefinitely, that has shattered dozens of records and opened up a whole array of new naval tactics. Seven sister ships are on the way.

A new concept in submarine hull design, the *Albacore*, which opens a new chapter in submerged speed and maneuverability.

The *Forrestal* class carriers, rugged, highly mobile floating airbases are joining the fleet at 1-year intervals. Designed for jet age operations, they add to America's ability to project her striking power to virtually any corner of the globe.

We have flown the P6M Sea Master, the first large jet-powered seaplane. It has speed, range and needs no concrete runways. It can add a new kind of punch to the Navy's striking power.

We have the A4D Skyhawk, probably the world's smallest attack plane. Fast and maneuverable, it holds the world's record for the 500 kilometer closed course, and can operate from carrier decks with an atomic bomb load.

We have the F8U Crusader, a high supersonic speed fighter. The F8U is the world's fastest naval aircraft. Designed for speed and maneuverability at high altitude, it is one of today's truly outstanding fighters.

The guided missile is the epitome of modern warfare, and the warfare of the future. The Navy has guided missiles—not future dreams, but actual hardware in use by the fleet.

A guided missile cruiser is in the fleet, another one will shortly follow. Two guided missile submarines are in the fleet.

These have been unusually dramatic developments. They have pointed, in a way that everyone can understand, to a fleet transition. It is in transition from steam to nuclear power, from guns to missiles, from gunpower to nuclear weapons, and from subsonic to supersonic flight.

Now let me point out that the naval weapons announcements of the last year or two represent neither a culmination nor a point of departure. They are a part of a continuing process that has taken us over many past barriers and will lead us to even more exhilirating thresholds.

This process is firmly rooted in a desire for advancement on the part of the Navy. The Navy intends to fight with the best weapons of the day—today, 10 years from now, 50 or 100 years from now. We have an organization that can keep the Navy in the forefront of world technology. As Chief of Naval Research, I am proud to point out that the new weapons I have been referring to had their origin in the Navy's research and development organization. The Office of Naval Research, the material bureaus and our many laboratories have sought out the new ideas and shaped the developments that are transforming the Navy. Our work continues, and at an accelerated pace. Therefore, the future should see a steady progression of the kind of dramatic announcements of the last few years, informing the public that the Navy is keeping abreast of these fast-moving times.

Really radical advances stem largely from basic research. Basic research is the foundation for the rest of our work. It is research not fettered by production demands. Its products are new ideas and new knowledge. Unless we keep injecting new knowledge into our work, we can only go on doing essentially the same things over and over again in slightly different ways. Basic research eliminates much guesswork. It eliminates much trial and error. It gives us ability to understand the things we work with.

The Navy program in basic science can be divided into two major categories. The first includes fields that will help solve the problems that face naval operations 10, 20 or 30 years from now.

Here we hunt for the extremes in natural phenomena. We know that very high energy is important. In the past, developments in high energy have changed powerplants and explosives. Much work is now being done in high-energy nuclear physics. I am not referring to the H-bomb or the uranimum-plutonium fission products. I mean the study of the basic behavior of matter using accelerators that generate charges as high as several billion electron volts.

We are looking for very low-energy data. This is the basis for handling information. An example is your radio. A lot of power is put out by the transmitter, but the intelligence is just a small amount of energy superimposed on all that power. We have a program in microwave spectroscopy that gives us information as to how atoms vibrate and rotate in a molecule. It should have important implications for future communications systems, commercial as well as military.

We are looking for very high temperatures. The efficiency of every powerplant depends on the highest possible operating temperature. Naval research includes astronomy and astrophysics partly because the sun and the stars are our high temperature laboratories. Physical reactions taking place on the sun reach temperatures many times higher than any we can produce here on earth. The initial scientific concept for the hydrogen bomb came from studies of what happens on the sun when hydrogen atoms are subjected to enormous pressures and temperatures. From studying the behavior of the periphery of the sun, scientists obtained some information on the mechanism of the starting of the magnetron, a high-power vacuum tube that is our principal source of power for radar.

We are looking for very low temperatures. That is the means by which we can get smaller and smaller bits of information under extreme conditions. The science of cryogenics, which is low-temperature physics, is based on the fact that molecular reactions are slowed down with a decrease in temperature. By studying materials at extremely low temperatures—as close to absolute zero as we can get—we can glimpse slow-motion views of the behavior of matter. Not only that, but matter acts differently at very low temperatures. It doesn't always obey the same natural laws that govern matter at normal temperatures.

These are some examples of basic research that will pay off in the future.

The second broad category of basic research concerns fields that we think will improve existing operations of the Navy. It deals with the Navy as we know it today. One example includes solid state physics and chemistry. They are the foundation for metallurgy and for other areas important for electronics and structural materials. Any gain in understanding of the solid state of matter has almost immediate benefits to the Navy through application to the engineering fields. They are being exploited in sonar transducers, transistors and ferroelectric and dielectric amplifiers.

Nearly every demand for a better surface ship, submarine, aircraft and guided missile, or the equipments that go into them, means a requirement for improved materials. We need steady improvement in structural materials, fuels, lubricants, and corrosion-resistant coatings.

Classical physics is another basic research area that gets heavy Navy support. New ideas in hydrodynamics are being translated into hydrofoil boats and new submarine shapes, like the *Albacore*. Aerodynamic research includes such new and difficult areas as the aerodynamics of rarefied gases. This helps tell the missile designer the best shape for a vehicle to make speeds of Mach 3 or 4 through the upper atmosphere, where air is very thin.

The Navy needs to know all about the medium in which it operates—the sea and the air above the sea. Naval research supports the oceanographer, so we can learn more about the ocean currents, how to predict sea states, how to predict surf conditions for amphibious operations. It supports new scientific approaches to meterology, in search of an accurate method for long-range weather forecasting. It explores the upper atmosphere with balloons and rockets, to bring back data on cosmic rays, air density, and high-altitude weather conditions.

The Navy's basic research program extends to nearly all of the physical sciences, and includes medical and biological research. I have mentioned only some of the areas that get heavy emphasis. This program is the Navy's insurance that it will be ready for whatever the future may bring, technologically. It assures us that the knowledge we use up in development is being replaced, to pave the way for future development.

Since this is an audience of engineers, I would like very much to launch into some lengthy discussions of the Navy's development programs. We cover virtually every engineering field, and we have a lot of tough and interesting problems. They range from the new metallurgy of nuclear reactor engineering to the electronics problems posed by guiding a satellite into an orbit 200 miles above the earth, and tracking it after it gets there.

Since there isn't time to do justice to even one phase of the program, I'll be content with a single story. In connection with guided missile development, we have been exploring several unusual types of engines, such as the valve engine and the valveless pulse jet.

The valveless pulse jet engine shows how an unexpended dividend can come from

development, as well as from research. The pulse jet is a very simple engine. The Germans used it to power the V–1 buzz bomb. Its main trouble was a set of reed valves that tended to burn out in the middle of a flight. Some of you who were in London or in the low countries during 1944 may have watched a V–1 suddenly sputter out and go into a dive, a long way from its target. The reed valves had burned out. After the war, the pulse jet seemed to have a lot of potential, if a valveless type could be developed. Some work has been done on this, with the result that we are no longer so optimistic about the valveless pulse jet as an aircraft engine. But we are not discouraged—we have discovered that it makes a terrific post-hole digger.

I doubt that every farmer will rush out to buy one. Nevertheless, the application is not as outlandish as it sounds. The valveless pulse jet is a very simple device, and it can be rigged into a practical portable unit for digging holes in frozen ground. The principle is that the hot exhaust gases come out at very high velocity, melt the ground and shake the dirt loose at the same time. It should be extremely useful in Arctic and Antarctic operations for setting anchor posts and explosive charges.

Now, let's translate some of this research and development work into terms of naval weapons, and see if we can rough in an outline of future naval progress. Within the limits of military security, it is possible to point to certain general areas and glimpse the direction in which we are headed.

We want to learn more about extreme high temperatures and conversion of chemical energy into thrust, so we can develop better jet engines and rocket motors. This is part of our planned research, toward specific goals. At the same time, we may discover that there is a method better than chemical energy, even better than nuclear energy, for getting the thrust we need to make an aircraft go. Some serious astronautical theorists have suggested the possibility of using radiant energy, radiated from the sun and stars, to power aircraft beyond the earth's atmosphere. This would be an example of the unexpected bonus, the new turn of events, that can come from basic scientific research.

For naval aviation, our general goals are to fly higher and faster, but with increased emphasis on hovering and vertical take-off. At altitudes significantly higher than those in our immediate future we will step beyond the realm of the air-breathing engine, into the domain of the rocket. The Skyrocket II research aircraft has been a laboratory for exploring the use of rocket engines as the main propulsion unit for a manned interceptor.

The emphasis on speed and altitude is taking our pilots into regions completely hostile to human life. Much of our research aims to give us a knowledge of these regions, and of what must be done to ensure safety and efficiency of the human pilots who will fly there. One of our newest concepts stems in part from the requirements of high-altitude escape from a disabled aircraft. This is the capsule cockpit announced last month. It will be a great step forward in aviation safety, but will yield a large return in economy and efficiency. Essentially, it would place the aircraft brains—pilot, instruments, controls and electronic gear—in a jettisonable capsule, separate from the muscle—engine, airframe, hydraulic gear and other heavy items. It would improve training, simplify construction and contribute to safety in storage of nuclear-powered aircraft. The capsule cockpit is now in the development stage.

The Navy is pressing its development of nuclear power for aircraft. We are making progress. Problems that looked hopeless a year ago now appear capable of solution. As the possibilities inherent in nuclear powered flight are explored, we find that once the hardware is available the chief limitation will be human endurance. For nuclear flight, as well as for our other advanced aircraft, studies are constantly being made to design the plane for the man, emphasizing safety and exploring the limitations in speed, G's, altitude, exposure (to heat, cold and radiation) and time, that will ultimately determine just where man must give way to a completely automatic method of transportation in both war implements and peaceful pursuits.

The search for low speeds has produced some new concepts in powered flight. Low speed flight is especially important to the Navy. Low speed means short landing and takeoff space. It means hovering, so important to antisubmarine patrolling and airborne troop landing and resupply. Helicopters have been one solution, but they have an inherent limitation on top speed.

The most promising avenue thus far seems to be the ducted fan principle. This was first demonstrated to us with the Hiller one-man flying platform. We are supporting some promising work with the wingless aircraft called the aerodyne.

On the sea, we can look forward to a completely nuclear powered Navy. By the early 1960's, all major combatant vessels authorized for construction are likely to be propelled by nuclear power. The ultimate objective is a nuclear powered task force that can stay at sea indefinitely without refueling. Progress in reactor design has been rapid, and the success of the *Nautilus* has given us a firm foundation for a more rapid transition to nuclear power.

Beneath the sea, the most promising new development is the "wedding" of the nuclear powerplant with the *Albacore* type hull. This will give the Navy an undersea weapon that combines unlimited range with unprecedented speed and maneuverability.

The addition of hydrofoil-supported landing craft to our amphibious strength is another promise for the future. The added speed going into the beach will be one aspect of the entire effort to add greater speed and surprise to the amphibious operation by air and by sea.

A major addition to naval armament will come from the joint Army-Navy program to develop an intermediate range ballistic missile. The program is well underway. The Navy has been assigned responsibility for development of the IRBM ship-launched weapon system. By joining with the Army we conserve scarce scientific manpower. We conserve money and materials.

These are some of the things we can look forward to as the Navy continues its transition. Each new development will add to naval mobility, to its flexibility and to its staying power.

First Arab Health Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the Israel Digest of May 18, 1956, sharply contrasts the actions of the Israelis with those of the Arabs:

FIRST ARAB HEALTH CENTER OPENS

TIRA.—A health center, the first in an Arab village, was formally inaugurated this week. The Tira center will serve the Little Triangle and provide medical assistance to the 15,000 residents of the 6 villages in the Triangle.

A staff of 20, headed by Dr. Youssef Saig, including 5 nurses, 1 male nurse, a midwife, and a sanitary inspector, all of them Arabs, will service the center.

The Minister of Health, Mr. Israel Barzilai, reported that the ministry will soon establish an Arab section to supervise health work in Arab-populated parts of the country. He said that the percentage of Arab women giving birth in hospitals rose to 22 percent last year from less than 5 percent in 1949–50.

The Retired Schoolteacher and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate is preparing to debate H. R. 7225, the bill which we passed in the House last year to expand and improve the social-security program, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a situation which I feel requires some very serious study.

This is the plight of the retired schoolteacher who retired before the pension system he or she belongs to was covered in under the social-security program. I mention the schoolteacher in that connection, but of course the situation is one which also affects all retired persons whose retirement plans came under social security at some date after the time these people went on pensions.

The social-security systems is far from perfect and certainly does not permit beneficiaries to live in any semblance of luxury. The income limitation, it seems to me, is much too low—assuming it can be justified at all. On the other hand, those who are on social security have been able to look to occasional increases in their pensions through congressional action. In other words when we increase the benefits generally, we usually try to increase the monthly payments to those who are already receiving benefits.

PENSIONS AND SAVINGS SHRANK IN PURCHASING POWER

But the schoolteachers and the other public servants whose retirement plans came under social security after these people had begun collecting pensions apparently have nowhere to turn for an increase in their original pensions. Many of these retirement plans were originally statewide plans or municipal plans. During the years that the now-retired public employees contributed to these plans out of their pay each month, the benefits they looked forward to might have appeared fairly adequate for retirement purposes. But a schoolteacher who retired, say, 10 years ago, when the cost of living was so very much lower than it is today, cannot possibly live on her pension. I just do not see how it can be done. The same holds true for the teacher who retired 5 years ago.

This situation was called to my attention by some retired teachers in St. Louis who pointed out to me that the savings which they may have accumulated over the years to supplement their retirement income just don't go as far or buy as much now as the same money would have done at the time it was saved. What may have looked like an adequate nest-egg and adequate retirement income are not adequate today.

The teacher who is now retiring under social security—that is, among those teachers whose retirement plans have been covered in under the social security system—can look forward in most cases to a much higher beginning pension and to the prospect of periodic increases in that pension as Congress takes note in the social security laws of the increases in the cost of living from year to year. But the teached who retired some years ago before her retirement plan came under social security has, in most cases, no prospect of an increase in retirement income.

I raise this question not to propose some easy solution, because I do not have one. I raise it instead because I think if enough of us are thinking about it, perhaps the appropriate committees of the Congress and the Social Security Administration can suggest a practical solution.

LETTER TO SECRETARY FOLSOM

I took this matter up early this year with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom. I wrote him as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1956.

Hon. MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A constituent of mine raises a very interesting question concerning the possibility of extending social-security coverage to retired schoolteachers. Of course, all retired persons who retired before their type of work was included in social-security coverage feel now that they would like to be covered, and that is understandable.

But the question I would like to have your social-security people consider is what can be done for the retired schoolteacher in case the teachers now covered by the same retirement plan should vote to have their plan come in under social security. Would there be any adjustment in benefits for those already retired under those circumstances? What thinking has been devoted to that kind of problem?

The woman who wrote to me pointed to the fact that those under social security who are retired have received several increases in benefits by legislation following their retirement whereas, as she points out, the retirement funds for teachers do not allow for increasing benefits once a person is retired.

I am directing this inquiry to you rather than to the Social Security Administration in case you would care to add any comments of your own, from a policy standpoint, to the technical information which the social-security people might provide in answer to my inquiry.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, 3d District, Missouri.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked not only for an explanation of the situation as it affects these retired persons but what could be done about it. Particularly I asked what thinking has been devoted to this kind of problem.

I am afraid that not very much thinking has been devoted to it. The Secretary, in his reply, explains the situation and says that it is up to the appropriate State or local governmental unit which originally administered the teachers' retirement fund to figure out a way to supplement the inadequate pensions now being received, compared to the higher benefits which might be paid under social security.

Mr. Folsom states that he has given a great deal of thought to the problem of retired persons who are not covered by social security but that so far no practical solution has suggested itself for extending social security to those who have not contributed to the program during their working years.

SCHOOLTEACHERS CONTRIBUTED TO OWN FUND

I think the schoolteachers are in a slightly different category in that for all of their working years they did contribute—regularly, each month—to a retirement fund which is now combined with social security. It is not as if they never participated in a retirement fund and now ask for something for nothing. Their mistake, if you could call it that, was in being born just a few years too early—had their retirement been delayed a few years, they would now be under the social-security program. As we all know, teachers often have no choice on when they retire.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is not restricted just to schoolteachers. It touches all of those groups of public servants whose pension systems have recently come under social security, but who retired before the changeover took place. I repeat, also, that I raise the question here because I am anxious to have all Members of Congress made aware of the problem in the hopes that among us all we can devise a practical solution.

I include as part of my remarks Secretary Folsom's letter to me on this subject in reply to my inquiry, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 13, 1956.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 12, 1956, in reference to a question raised by one of your constituents regarding the possibility of extending social-security coverage to retired schoolteachers. We regret the delay in replying.

As you know, employees who are protected under a State or local retirement system can be covered under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system if a referendum is held among the active members of the system and a majority of those eligible to vote in the referendum vote in favor of coming under old-age and survivors insurance. When a retirement system group is brought under old-age and survivors insurance, coverage is extended only to those who are still working at the time the group is covered and those hired subsequently. Since benefits under the program can be paid only to persons who have worked for a specified length of time in covered jobs, persons who had already retired before their group was covered could not receive benefits under old-age and survivors insurance on the basis of their employment for the State or local government.

The decision as to whether any adjustment will be made in the benefits of individuals who have already retired if the members of a State or local government retirement system are brought under old-age and survivors insurance rests with the appropriate State or local officials. The provisions of the Social Security Act which make old-age and survivors insurance coverage available to retirement-system members do, however, contain a statement that it is the policy of the Congress that the total retirement protection of the members and beneficiaries of a retirement system shall not be impaired by reason of the members' coverage under old-age and survivors insurance.

Your constituent mentions that retirement funds for teachers do not allow for increasing benefits once a person is retired. Generally speaking, the method of financing such retirement systems does not allow for increasing benefits of retired persons unless the State or local government concerned makes a special appropriation for that purpose. Under old-age and survivors insurance, as wage levels rise there is a reduction in the cost of the program, expressed as a percentage of payroll, because the increase in contribution income is relatively larger than the increase in benefit costs. In this kind of situation it is sometimes possible for the Congress to provide for a general adjustment of old-age and survivors insurance benefit amounts without increasing the contribution rate. I have given a great deal of thought to the problem of retired persons who have not been able to qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. On occasion, proposals have been made to pay a basic old-age insurance benefit to all persons over age 65 regardless of whether they have worked in employment or self-employment covered by the law. In making any improvements in the old-age and survivors insurance system, however, it is essential to preserve its basic principles, the most important of which are that it is a contributory program financed by the worker, his employer, and the self-employed during years of active work, and that the benefits received are related in part to the individual's earnings. The old-age and survivors insurance program owes much of its wide national acceptance to these sound principles. Therefore, neither this Department nor the Congress has favored proposals for paying benefits to individuals who do not meet the work requirements of the program.

Thank you for your interest in social security. I hope that this information will be helpful in replying to your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM, *Secretary.*

Italy Displays Her Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the May 31 issue of New Jersey's Nutley Sun. It points out the very significant changes that have been taking place in the political complexion in Italy. This should be encouraging to the Western World and particularly to the United States. I am confident that the people of Italy will

continue their onward march against the foe of democracy—communism:

ITALY DISPLAYS HER GOOD SENSE

In the first test of strength anywhere in the world since the purge of the Stalin myth, the Communists suffered a staggering defeat in the Italian municipal elections this week. The Italian election results reflected both the democratic determination of the Italian electorate to remain a free and independent people, linked politically and militarily to the West, and the discomfort of many old-line Communists who had been adorators of Stalin and who now, since the Kremlin's flip-flop, were uncertain of its meaning and stayed away from the polls.

Italy's electoral preference went to Premier Segni's center majority, led by the Christian Democrats, and the losses were suffered by both extremes. The Italian Communist Party continues to be the largest outside the Iron Curtain but it has lost both strength and prestige.

It is our interpretation of this vote that on a town level the hand of the moderate Christian Democrats will be strengthened as the guiding influence of the centrist coalition which also includes the Liberals, Republicans and right-wing Socialists. In many places, the left-wing Socialists gained at the expense of their allies, the Communists. As a result, we need look for no drastic change in national and international policies.

That Last Mile on September 22, 1776, When All of Lower Manhattan Was in Flames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include extraneous material by Mr. Gridley Adams, director general of the United States Flag Foundation and an ardent admirer of an outstanding American hero, Nathan Hale. The article follows:

Recently an artist, drawing a map of old Manhattan and upon it depicting the sites of historical events, was somewhat perplexed as to where to note either the place of capture or execution of Nathan Hale.

He said the libraries gave little more than general information concerning these two locations. As my great-great-grandfather both roomed and graduated in the class of 1773 at Yale College with Nathan Hale, it would be quite natural there should be in the possession of my family some facts concerning the life and habits of him whose courageous sacrifices mark him as America's outstanding hero, bar none.

Hale had on his neck a dark mole and this, he once told my grandfather one day they were boating in New Haven Harbor and when a storm broke upon them and threatened to swamp the boat, was a sign that he was not to drown—that some day he would be hung.

And up in my old Connecticut homestead there used to stand the rocking chair both grandfather and Hale shared together as a part of their room furniture. If that chair could but speak, think of the conversations it could recount.

Being early fed on, and still the most absorbing of all my reading, American History (my "Nutmeg" ancestors having started (Iroquois War of 1637) to build up this land over which the eagle screams, but now so often unheard), whenever I visited grandfather's house in Cromwell, I used to climb up into that rocker, sit, and listen to what my grandfather and Hale were talking about during those perilous years of the 17770's. And if you want a thrill that sends a shiver up your spine, hold in your hand, as once it was my great privilege to do, Hale's sword.

Much of the information I have covering Nathan Hale's setting out as a spy and his subsequent capture, is taken from the words of his faithful attendant at camp, Asher Wright, who died at the age of 90 and is buried near the graves of the Hale family in Hale's home, Coventry, Conn.

It is said that Wright never mentioned Hale's name with tearless eyes, so great was his devotion and love for his friend.

From this almost direct testimony it is known that Hale left General Washington's headquarters on Harlem Heights, and, attended by Stephen Hempstead, that they traveled as far as Norwalk before they felt far enough away to attempt to cross the Sound.

As Norwalk they engaged the armed sloop *Huntington* under Captain Pond, set sail and landed on Long Island midway between Eaton and Lloyd's Neck, an elevated tract of land remarkable for its extensive and picturesque, but then, lonely scenery, on the east side of Huntington Harbor. This point was known as the Cedars.

Here Jesse Flint, mentioned above, had a farm, while nearby lived a Loyalist familiarly known as Mother Chich, but whose real name was Rachel Chichester, and whose home was a rendezvous for the Tories of the neighborhood.

Hale got safely by this spot without being seen and finally reached the home of William Johnson, where he put up for the night, and after the next morning's breakfast the stranger departed.

How Hale traveled from this point to lower Long Island noting every activity of the British on the way to and from, and making exact drawings of the works of the enemy, together with descriptions in Latin, has never been traced, but at this time the British line had landed 2 miles above the city at Kip's Nay. General Howe occupied the town; General Clinton was stationed higher up, between the 7th and 8th milestone.

Hale had arranged for a boat to meet him as near as possible to the spot where he landed, and so after securing the fullest information he sought, he made his way back to Huntington.

Feeling still safe in his disguise as a Dutch schoolmaster, and while awaiting the appearance of the ship which was to take him back to Norwalk, he boldly entered Widow Chichester's tavern.

Not long after he had entered into conversation with the men gathered there one of them with a familiar face left the room. Later on Widow Chichester announced that a strange boat was seen approaching.

At this several of the loyalists made haste to get away. Hale, supposing it was the ship he expected to come for him, went down to the beach only to find it to be a British armed vessel, the *Halifax*, under Captain Quarme, lying around the point of Lloyd's Neck, out of view of The Cedars.

Among the party on board Hale noted the very man who had so suddenly left the tavern room, and whom he now recognized as an unworthy relative turned Tory.

Being captured Hale was immediately brought back to General Howe's headquarters in New York City, it being the day (Saturday, September 21, 1776) of the big fire.

General Howe's headquarters were then at Mount Pleasant, the home of James Beekman, Esq. (about three and a quarter miles from the present City Hall Park), near Turtle Bay on the East River at 51st Street and 1st Avenue. (It was in this very house that Andre, the night before he went up the Hudson River, occupied a room near the head of the stairs.

The provost, then in use as a jail (and undoubtedly Hale's place of confinement) was for offenders most notorious, therefore the safest place to keep a prisoner.

This provost stood on the eastern boundary of City Hall Park. On the upper side was what is now Chambers Street, but then called Barrack Street because of the range of barracks there.

Later it was the site of the almshouse. Here between Broadway and Centre Street was an old burying ground which long served both as a place of execution and as a last resting place for the prison dead.

The provost marshal, William Cunningham, was a man than whom none more infamous for cruelty ever graced the portals of any prison upon earth.

Tunic Bogart, mentioned as one of the Long Island farmers impressed into the British service, witnessed Hale's execution, that Sunday morning, September 22, 1776.

Eight years afterward (1784) Bogart being asked to witness another execution replied: "No. I have seen one man hung, a spy, and that's enough for me. I have never been able to efface that scene of horror from my mind—it rises up in my imagination always. That old 'devil catcher' Cunningham was so brutal and hung him up as a butcher would a calf."

Now as to America's recognition (?) of its youthful martyr's sacrifices, this country—these very United States of ours—which, when in her agonies stretched out her shattered, imploring hands for a service from which every other man in Washington's Army shrunk, yet it found "one soul from the russet shades of old Connecticut" heroic enough to take the cross of destiny upon his shoulders, and for his country's sake to do, to dare, to die—this America of ours has never raised to his memory and deeds a single shaft upon which might be carved its gratitude.

Connecticut, Hale's native State, built upon a rock in the harbor at New Haven a brick fort known as Fort Hale, but it has passed out of existence, out of the memory of living man.

Congress, though eight times memorialized for aid reported through select committees in favor of an appropriation but finally refused to grant even one dollar.

And yet that same Congress has seen fit to expend thousands of dollars for this and that commemorative purpose; has erected monuments to Montgomery, Mercer, Nash, De Kalb, Gerry Brown; has employed the sculptor's art on busts of Jay, Ellsworth, Marshall; has voted medals of gold and swords to Jackson, Scott, Ripley, Harrison, Decatur, Hull, Perry, McDonough; granted to Williams, Paulding, and Van Wart, the captors of the British spy, Major Andre, each a farm, an annuity of $200 for life, besides a silver medal; and similarly awarded many other lesser heroes for their exploits of one kind or another. But the Congress of the United States has utterly failed to take the slightest official recognition of America's one outstanding hero of them all—Nathan Hale.

Just when 493 homes in lower Manhattan—from Whitehall Slip to Barclay Street—were going up in flames, perhaps nature's God's revengeful way of matching that tragedy at Collect Pond by hoping to include the whole British high brass in its holocaust embrace—at that very hour a brave spirit was going up—but not consumed—to his Maker to report his mission in trying to save his country so that freemen might live in a land of liberty and peace.

And up there he is enshrined in a splendor which no earthly sculptor has ever yet carved in marble to commemorate a hero's deeds. But, today, by his country "unwept, un-

honored, and unsung," his Government, during the last 177 years, has failed to reward this patriot's deeds with even a citation. "O, tempus! O, mores!"

For in Hale was the greatest of all America's patriots; one whose sublime words in that hour of death—in that "last mile"—transcends all heights of oratory; one who, radiant with resignation and in a spirit so exalted by Christian readiness to meet his fate, spoke as the last immortal testament of his soul to the troubled world he was leaving those 14 words which history will ever enshrine and every temple of liberty emblazen on its entablature:

"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

After so many failures to get any recognition in the way of financial recognition from any Congress the people of Hale's own home village, Coventry, Conn., started to raise money by giving festivals.

Then the Connecticut Legislature was appealed to, and in 1845 it granted the sum of $1,000, and the following year added $250 more, so that it then became possible to erect the stone monument now standing in the graveyard in Coventry and almost in sight of Hale's birthplace.

This homestead is maintained as a Hale Memorial by the gifts of a late private citizen of New Haven, George Seymour.

In it may still be seen the very room where he first began to teach school, his old desk, the benches upon which sat the pupils, and on the wall back of the door the remains of the painted blackboard.

The night before Hale made his supreme sacrifice he wrote farewell letters to his Coventry (Conn.) family and his sweetheart. And during these last hours he asked for a Bible.

This was denied him and all of his letters destroyed, so there remains as his final message, as he stood under the gallows, only those immortalized words.

"Butcher" Cunningham was so stung by the heroism Hale displayed in those last few moments of his life, that he shouted: "String him up!"

It was a British officer, Capt. John Montressor, chief of the Royal Engineers, an eye-and-ear witness of Hale's execution, who was so moved by the calmness, gentle dignity and sublimity displayed by this youthful American patriot, that he could not refrain from reporting it to Capt. William Hull of Washington's Army with the glorious result that they have echoed and resounded down the corridors of time, and are forever engraved upon the hearts of all truly patriotic Americans as long as lives the spirit of American independence and liberty.

England had her Andre, America her Hale, but mark the difference between the ambitions of these two soldiers, each a martyr—Andre for power, Hale for liberty.

Andre dreaded the gibbet and implored Washington that he might die a soldier's death, that by a bullet. Said he to Colonel Scammel: "I pray you to bear me witness that I meet my fate as a brave man," thus measuring himself in the eyes of mankind. No such apprehension tortured Hale; those last words of his measured himself in the eyes of his Maker. Andre was thinking of his own reputation; Hale thought only of his country's glory. Andre of heroism; Hale of benefaction, of the future of his country which straightway seemed to forget him.

England sent an embassy across the ocean to solicit the remains of her Andre, that such might (as later they were) rest in that sepulcher where she garners the relics of her mighty and renowned—"splendid in their ashes and pompous in the grave amid the pomp of kings," Westminster Abbey. Hale, the patriot, who volunteered to defend the liberties of free men, and keenly alive to the sensibilities and affections of home, of family, of his fellowman, lies in ground more hallowed than any manmade sepulcher—the soil of the America he fought to save.

"The powers of language fail;
Love, grief and pity break the mournful tale.
Not Socrates, nor noble Russell died,
Or gentle Sidney, Britain's boast and pride,
Or generous Moore, approached life's final goal
With more composed, more firm and staple soul.
The flesh sunk down, to mix with common clay—
Hale's soul ascended to the realms of day."

Failure of Our Foreign Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to me on May 9, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my complete testimony as presented by me before the Foreign Affairs Committee on May 8, 1956. In view of the fact that other Members who directed inquiries to me at that time had not had an opportunity to correct the testimony, on May 14 I asked and received permission to strike the entire item from the RECORD.

I now direct our colleagues' attention to the complete and corrected testimony, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members, I appreciate the opportunity of coming before you again and voicing my opinions for whatever aid they may be to you in connection with the pending bill.

While I appreciate the worldwide importance of the provisions of the bill, and that it does cover many areas of the world, I would like to address myself primarily to the bill as it affects the Middle East, or the Near East, as it is often referred to.

May I by way of preliminary indicate to the committee that I appreciate that in viewing the testimony of any witness you have the right to ask yourself, what is his background and does he have any prejudice or bias in connection with the subject on which he speaks.

When anyone of the Jewish faith addresses himself to the Middle East, you have a right to take that into account. I want to assure the committee at the outset that my first and primary interest is the same as that of every member of this committee, that is, world peace and the security of our own country.

I hope that in assessing the value of my testimony, you will have in mind not only my religious background but also that I was among the first to look with favor upon restoration or resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. I think that I can justifiably say that my personal report to President Truman late in 1949, after a visit to Spain, together with the information brought back from there by other members, had at least some bearing upon what I think everybody admits today is a desirable result of resuming diplomatic relations with Spain.

I was among the early advocates of help to Turkey, which, as you know, is a 98-percent Moslem country. Despite the fact that it is quite unpopular among many of my constituents, I have taken the position that the interests of our country require if not a full-fledged ambassador or minister at least a special representative at Vatican City.

With those preliminaries, let me address myself to the Middle East situation.

Chairman RICHARDS. May I add that I can testify to the correctness of the gentleman's statement on those matters.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I trust that the members of this committee will not think that I usurped or impinged upon their authority when during the last recess I made a trip into various countries, and more particularly into the Middle East, where I visited in Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, and Israel.

I think that we can all agree that the overall problem is the establishment of peace in that area and that anything short of full-fledged peace is obviously a threat to our own security and to world peace.

I think we also agree that the subsidiary problems are the resettlement of the refugees, the lessening of the existing tensions and an agreement about the boundaries.

I think with a period of 8 years of experience behind us now there must be a complete revision of our policy in that area with much more firmness than has heretofore been shown in our treatment of the peoples throughout that area, or more accurately, our treating with the leaders of the governments there.

The tensions have gotten worse and more bitter. We have had no real negotiations which would lead to peace.

You may recall that as early as 1948, before there was a State of Israel, I said that the only way we will have peace in that area is if we go in there and help all the peoples of that area, the Arabs who are living there as well as the Jews, to help them rehabilitate themselves and to improve their economic conditions there.

That directly relates to the refugee problem. We are told time after time that there are 900,000 refugees outside of Israel who must be rehabilitated and must be resettled.

The Arab position has been they will not talk peace until all of those Arabs are returned to the State of Israel. That means never. I think it should be perfectly obvious to anybody and everybody familiar with the situation that you couldn't possibly resettle those 900,000 Arabs in the little State of Israel even if you were going to take all of the State of Israel and give it to them.

Before they left there 90 percent of them were living in poverty. The average annual income was from $15 to $30 per year. Thirty dollars per year was high income for 90 percent of the Arabs living in that area.

To take them and send them back there would be utter folly—how are they going to live? Obviously these people must be resettled in places where you can give them a piece of land or an opportunity to earn themselves a livelihood that doesn't even begin to approach our standards, but which will at least improve their prior standards, or give them an opportunity to live if not decently as we know it, at least better than they had lived when they were unable to eke out a living for themselves and their families.

Today in these refugee camps they are being supported mainly by the bounty of the United Nations and this country, which supports or gives to that fund most of the money that is being used for that purpose.

Why haven't they been resettled? They haven't been resettled because the Arab leaders have refused to permit them to be resettled.

In that connection, our policy must be changed, and I think it must be a condition

of further aid going to that area, that something must be done about that situation.

We have talked and talked to the Arab leaders, and we have run up against a stone wall. They will not move in that direction. I think it is high time that our Department of State changes its policy in that regard and make it known in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, that we will no longer continue to permit the Arab leaders to use this as a political problem and to keep those refugees stirred up emotionally against resettlement.

I might say that I have been in that area three times—I was there in 1948, 1949, and again in 1955. After each of my visits there I have been visited at home, unsolicited, by Arabs, Moslem Arabs, and Christian Arabs, indicating that much of the story we get out of there about the unwillingness of the Arabs to be resettled is the talk not of the Arab refugees themselves, but of the leaders of the Arabs.

If we can let those leaders know in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, you can begin to move those Arabs out, not en masse but family by family and resettle them. We will then get rid of this emotional problem that has kept that area stirred up all through the years.

You will find back in December 1947 and January and February of 1948 I was urging things such as, as I called it at that time, a Middle East TVA. I had in mind things like the Aswan dam that they are talking about on the Nile. I had in mind things like the Jordan Valley project that Ambassador Eric Johnston has done so much to bring almost to the point of closing.

Secretary Dulles told the Senate committee in February that all of the details had been worked out except the political agreement. In other words, every last item had been agreed upon, between Syria, Jordan, and Israel, as to how it would be financed, what would be done there, where the power would go, where the water would go, the division of water between Syria and Jordan and Israel. The only thing that stops the project from going ahead is political agreement or assent politically by Syria and Jordan. Both are pressured by the Arab League not to agree politically.

Israel has indicated her willingness to go ahead. She is ready to execute the formal documents. The Arabs refuse. Israel has several times indicated that she would go ahead without the Syrian and Jordanian consent. Of course, each time she has been persuaded that that is not the thing to do.

I say the time has come when our Government must say, and this is probably the place for it to be said, in this bill, or in the report on this bill. Lay down the policy that if the Arabs will not go along with those projects, Israel will be permitted to do it herself, that there will be no aid to that extent to Syria or Jordan as such, but as long as Israel will make the commitment, the firm commitment, that the power and the water generated there will go in agreed portions or ratios into Syria and Jordan, when they are ready for it, that Israel may go ahead and do the job and we will help her do it.

I think if we took that firm attitude the Arabs would have no choice in the matter but to say, "Let's go ahead."

I was told, as your study mission was told, as evidenced by their report that was submitted to you under date of March 14, 1956—I met with some of the members of that study mission while we were in that area—that a lot of the tension there was caused by the Baghdad Pact.

The surprising thing is that we were told by Arab officials our American diplomats tell them that the United States did not bring about the Baghdad Pact. Why they should have been told that, I don't know. But it only irritated the situation rather than help assuage their feelings.

There is no doubt but the fact is and Secretary Dulles has taken credit for and has claimed it was his idea. He says he started some 3 years ago to set up this Baghdad Pact as a northern tier or frontier as a defense measure against possible invasion of that area by Soviet Russia.

I sat down in this building, in the old Supreme Court room, with Gen. Bedell Smith, who was then Under Secretary of State, and with Ambassador Byroade, who was then our Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Middle East, when we were talking about this plan 3 years ago.

I said to them, I think there were several of the members of this committee present, I said to those two gentlemen, that you are wasting your time and your energy and money in that kind of venture, because if Russia decides to move in there, all of the money that you are now spending for military aid and economic aid, if it was all used there for military aid, you are not going to stop Russia from moving into that area, when she decides to move.

I didn't anticipate that Russia was going to jump over the northern tier once it was set up. She has done that and moved in. Communist arms have been going into the Arab States for years. Something now must be done to strengthen that whole area. We are not going to strengthen it by sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russian arms. I don't know how much of the facts on that question have been stated to you——

Mr. VORYS. You don't mean into Egypt.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt.

Mr. VORYS. By sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russia—I thought you meant into Israel.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt, in competition, because the record is clear that for some time Egypt has—it goes back, I think, to 1952, when Egypt first sought arms from the United States.

She has gotten small quantities through the years from the United States. But when she sought large quantities of arms, she was asked to sign the usual agreement, that she would not be an aggressor, not use any of these arms as an aggressor against any nation. She refused to do that. Then, as you recall, in the summer of last year the Secretary of State pretended to be very much surprised with the fact that a deal had been consummated between Czechoslovakia and Egypt for the sale of jets and large armaments. Ambassador Byroade told me in Cairo in November 1955 that he had known of the Egyptian negotiations with the Communists for arms for more than a year before the deal was announced.

I think it should have alerted our State Department to the fact that any country that is looking for arms and will not sign an agreement that those arms will not be used as an aggressor or for aggression, doesn't mean well, but intends to be an aggressor.

Let's analyze that a little further. I understand Secretary of State Dulles said to the Senate committee in February of this year, when he was there, that he didn't know what arms had been sent into Egypt by Czechoslovakia.

When I was there, last year, it was known in Turkey, it was known in Israel and it was no secret to Egypt. I am now talking about November 1955 when she had already received at least 40 jets and 6 submarines. She has today, I believe, 18 battle cruisers. When will these battle cruisers and these submarines be used, and against whom will they be used? We are told the only fleet in that area is the United States 6th Fleet. Russia has no fleet there, and Russia is not going to supply Egypt with any of these submarines if they are to be used against Russia. Against whom will the submarines be used? Against Israel? Israel has no navy.

What about this "preventive war" talk we hear? I say to you in all earnestness it has been stirred up in large part by representatives of our State Department, this talk about a "preventive war" by Israel against her neighbors. Let's analyze it.

The little country of Lebanon to the north of Israel is smaller in geographic size and has a population of about a million people, which is just about half of the number of people in the State of Israel.

They say that Israel can muster an army of 250,000 men. Lebanon, when I was there in November 1955, could muster a total police force and army of 5,000 men. If Israel had any intentions to move on her neighbors, I think everyone must concede that Israel could move in on Lebanon and take it over overnight if she had any desires to wage aggressive war against her neighbors. She has not done it and has no intention of doing it. Of all her borders the Lebanese borders have been the most peaceful.

Most of the border incidents coming from the Lebanese side of the border can be traced to infiltrations from Syria and Egypt.

Persons who have had the same advantage as I had of having been in that area as late as 1949, returning again in 1955, are impressed by the fact that Lebanon is making comparatively the same progress as Israel. Her people are prospering, their standards are improving, and they want nothing but to be left alone. Cross the borders into the other Arab countries and you find that they are practically in the same degraded and degrading conditions as existed all through the years up to 1949. There has been little or no improvement in their methods, their means, their standards, or their opportunities to earn a livelihood.

I was interested to find out where this talk about a "preventive war" by Israel comes from. I noticed that Secretary of State Dulles indicated in his testimony before the Senate committee that he believed that there was such talk in Israel of a preventive war against her neighbors.

I found in our Embassies in Lebanon, in Egypt, and in our Embassy in Israel, the talk came from our American officials, that Israel might indulge in a preventive war.

I know that Ambassador Lawson in Israel had no such idea. On the other hand, I know Mr. White in that Embassy made it known to anybody who would listen to him that it was his idea that there will be a preventive war by Israel, and to bolster his position wherever possible he would put you in touch with that minority, that small group in Israel who have been yelling all through the years for such a war and for enlargement of the state of Israel.

That definitely is a very small group in Israel. The large majority of the people, and all the responsible officials in government in Israel, will say that they know that if they were to start any kind of war upon any of her neighbors, they would immediately turn world opinion against them, that they would be cut off from all assistance of any kind from this country and from our allies, and that while they might win the first battle, they would have to lose such a war.

In our Embassy in Lebanon, the same talk was going on. In Egypt I confronted our ambassador, Ambassador Byroade, with the same matter and I asked his pointblank: "Do you think there is a single Arab leader who believes that Israel will wage a preventive war?" and Mr. Byroade said, "They don't believe it, but I, Hank Byroade, believe it."

It is that kind of preachment going on by our American officials there that is keeping this pot stirred up.

Unless our State Department is going to do something about it, to stop it, we are going

to have more and more trouble in that area instead of less and less.

You will probably recall that Mr. Dulles has been taxed many times with the situation in that area, and has been asked to give his reasons as to why something can't be done about it, particularly with the situation in Saudi Arabia, where they refused to permit American Jews to serve as part of our Armed Forces. There is nothing wrong with the provision in any of these agreements that anyone objectionable to a local government should not be permitted to remain in that country.

That has been the way of governments ever since we have had civilized governments. Today, in the United States, if our Government finds a diplomat here from a foreign country who is objectionable, we send him home. We never find anybody objectionable because of his religious beliefs. When the attempt is made to relate Judaism or the Jewish religion to Zionism, then you get this very fine difference that is drawn by the Arabs and by the Moslems, which even our Secretary of State, however, does not try to draw.

They will tell you, the Arabs, the Moslems, that the Jews are our cousins. They say: "We are all Semites. We have all been persecuted together and we want to live peacefully together. But," says the Moslem, "while I do not oppose the Jew, I am opposed to the Zionists, and the Zionist is the fellow who wants a Jewish state."

That cannot be an excuse to our State Department for saying that any American Jew in the armed services of our country may therefore be deemed objectionable to Saudi Arabia or to any of these other countries.

Whether you go to Lebanon or go to Turkey or go to Egypt, you will find that there are Jews living there, and living there peacefully with their neighbors. True, they make no attempt to espouse the Zionist cause in the Arab countries, or the cause of an independent State of Israel. But all this destroys the substance of the charge that the basic difference in that area is a religious difference.

These people can live together and will live together, and will trade together, and prosper together, if given the opportunity.

I think it is up to the Congress to write the directives into a bill such as this, so that our State Department representatives will do the right thing. They talk about trying to establish peace in this area and couple it with talk about the fact that the boundaries must be agreed upon first.

I say to you gentlemen that if our State Department said to the Arab States: "We will not stand for aggression from either side. We will not permit aggression by Israel against her neighbors. We will not permit aggression by the Arab States against Israel," this problem can be settled. It cannot be settled by saying: "We will guarantee your borders if, as, and when you will agree upon the changes," because that may never come. Unless and until we take the firm position that these boundaries will be changed only by agreement or by arbitration (and there is a method of arbitration) we cannot impress upon both sides the imperative need for them to sit down and agree upon a change of boundaries.

But we must first say, "You are not going to fight about these borders and boundaries." Then if they won't sit down and agree upon it, there is a way of making them go to the World Court and submit the matter there.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Haven't we said that?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir, we have not. Mr Dulles has repeated time and time again that we will guarantee these borders and boundaries if, as, and when they agree upon them.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The State Department made a statement about aggression, and offered their services, the United Nations, and so forth, to work this thing out, didn't they?

Mr. MULTER. They have not taken the firm position I advocate. There have been intercessions, but there has been no firm statement of that policy by our State Department to this day.

Israel asked for a mutual security pact, and in asking for it she suggested for each of the Arab States the same security pact that she asked for. This, too, is a method of smoking out the evil intent of a potential aggressor. Such a nation not only will not ask for, but will reject such a pact.

The State Department has not seen fit to give or even negotiate with the state of Israel about such a security pact.

Chairman RICHARDS. Where would you place the line? There is a dispute about the line.

Mr. MULTER. You say to all sides: The lines remain precisely where they are until you sit down around the peace table and agree upon a change, and, if you can't agree, then either you are going to appoint arbitrators, and, if you don't appoint arbitrators, you go to the World Court and let the Court decide. When the Court makes the decision, it will be binding upon all sides.

This is an international dispute. It is a proper subject to come before the World Court. It is high time that we as leaders of the world will say that we will stand for no fighting about things of this kind which can be settled either by agreement or by a Court decision.

In my opinion, we must take that kind of firm position, and, if we did, we could very quickly settle these problems in that area. If we don't take that firm position, then we are bound to have trouble there. These people will continue to snipe at each other, and it doesn't matter who is responsible for the first sniping. A shot from one side brings forth two from the other side. It doesn't matter whether it comes from Israel or the other side. As long as you have these people stirred up, they will be sniping at each other. The only way to handle it is for us to take this firm position. I do hope that this committee will, as a part of this bill, say that we want to give aid, economic aid, to all of this area but peace, true peace, is the price they must pay.

You have heard many times from our Secretary of State that he hopes this issue of the Middle East will not be made a political issue in this year's election campaign, because it will stir up the Arabs into again voicing the opinion that in this country we depend on Jewsh votes and therefore we are more favorably disposed toward Israel than we are to the Arabs.

I was surprised to learn when I met with the Arabs throughout this area, that not one had ever been told that the Jews in this country are a minority, that in the Senate with 96 Members we have only 2 who are Jews, that of the 435 Members of the House the maximum we have ever had is 11.

As I pointed out to them, in the membership of the study mission that was there representing this very committee, not one depended on a Jewish vote in his home district to get himself elected; that this was not a Jewish problem, nor a Christian problem, nor a Moslem problem, that this is a problem of doing the right thing, the humane thing, and making people behave and not fight with one another.

When you talk to some of our Arab friends over there, you find the unfortunate part of it is that our American diplomats have never once taken the trouble to tell these Arab officials that this is not a Jewish problem at home.

They talk here at home about making it a political issue, but they never tell the Arabs it is not a political issue, that neither party needs Jewish votes to elect our President, or our House or our Senate.

The shame of it is that our State Department has not taken the forceful unequivocal, position and said to these people, "You are wrong. This is not a political problem at home."

The same thing goes for the way that they handle some of these other problems there. You travel through the Middle East and you are told by some of the Arabs that we should stop the Jews raising funds here in the United States and sending them to Israel. They don't understand that charity drives are conducted here without the aid or interference of Government.

Not once has an American diplomat said to the Arab leaders that the Jews have said time and time again in the United States that they will go out and raise as much money to rehabilitate the Arab areas as they raise for Israel, if only there can be peace there; that if the Arabs will sign a treaty, Americans of all faiths will do the same for the Arabs as they are doing for the Jews there.

No one knows better than we people here at home, Jew and Christian alike, that you can't have prosperity in one little corner surrounded by poverty, without creating antagonisms in the poorer areas. You have to build up the whole area and give them all an opportunity to live.

Mr. VORYS. Along the line you just mention, on August 26, 1955, in an important statement by Secretary Dulles, he said, with reference to the plight of the 900,000 refugees:

"Compensation is due from Israel to the refugees. However, it may be that Israel cannot unaided now make adequate compensation. If so, there might be an international loan to enable Israel to pay the compensation which is due and which would enable many of the refugees to find for themselves a better way of life.

"President Eisenhower would recommend substantial participation by the United States in such a loan for such a purpose."

What do you think of that statement?

Mr. MULTER. That is directly in line with what I have in mind. The Israelis would like to have that. Every right-thinking person would like to see that done, and the only reason it isn't done is because the Arab leaders sit back and say, "We won't let you resettle these refugees anywhere except in Israel."

Mr. VORYS. That is not my understanding.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to suggest that if you would give me, Mr. Chairman, an executive session meeting I will bring to you Arab-Moslems who will tell you that when you go into these refugee camps you will be permitted to meet only with the leaders. They will tell you how terrible the situation is, how the people in the camps will not be resettled except in their homeland. These witnesses, I can bring to you, will tell you that is not so, that the Arab refugees are willing to be resettled, that they want to be resettled. There have been negotiations time and time again between some of them——

Chairman RICHARDS. I would like to say, Mr. MULTER, that we started a little late. Mr. MULTER told us beforehand that he had a meeting with the Banking and Currency Committee, and he has received a notice that they are ready for him.

Mr. MULTER. I will take just a few minutes more. I would like to answer any questions that the members care to address to me either this morning or at any other time you will invite me back.

Mr. VORYS. As you know, the United Nations resolution said it was the duty of Israel either to compensate or repatriate the Arab refugees. Both of those alternatives are open to Israel.

As far as I know, there has never been any offer by Israel to repatriate——

Mr. MULTER. The 900,000—you are right. As I indicated before it would be an impos-

sible task to try to repatriate them in Israel. They have taken Arabs back into Israel. There have been some 100,000 families that have been reunited within Israel, people who had been outside Israel and permitted to return.

Israel has always indicated her willingness to compensate the Arabs for their property that was left behind. She has unblocked the funds within Israel that were left behind by the Arabs. They have made available that to them.

I was about to say, as I got this message, that I can bring to you Arabs, Christians, and Moslems who left Israel, who negotiated with the State of Israel for compensation, and when the Governments of Syria and Jordan where they were living found out that the negotiations were being consummated, stepped in and threatened their families with annihilation if they dared to go through with the agreements or to accept any of the money offered by Israel.

There isn't any doubt that people who are entitled to the money, if they are left alone, will be fairly compensated and will get the compensation that they are willing to accept, if the leaders of their home governments would let them take it.

I am prepared to bring to you, Mr. Chairman, persons whose names must be protected because their families are still over there and who would be annihilated if it was known they are testifying here. I will bring you Arabs who will testify under oath that what I say to you is the fact.

Mr. VORYS. The home government of the Israeli-Arab is Israel. We all joined in the desire of the Jews to go back to their homeland. The homeland of these Arab refugees is not some other country; it is Israel.

Mr. MULTER. How many of these 900,000 fled from Israel?

Mr. VORYS. I don't know. A lot of them have been born in exile.

Mr. MULTER. Many of them were born in the refugee camps. You will find that in the Arab refugee camps outside of Israel, among the 900,000, you will find thousands and thousands of them who were poor nomads roaming the Arab lands, eking out a living from the countryside, who moved into these camps because there they are supported by the U. N. and the contributions of the United States to the U. N., instead of continuing to roam.

I don't care how they got there. They are human beings who should be rehabilitated. They are human beings who should be given an opportunity to earn a livelihood. Something has to be done for them. But it is impossible to take the 900,000, whether they were ever in Israel or not, and move them into Israel, certainly not until there are firm peace treaties entered into between these Arab countries and the State of Israel.

If the peace treaties were consummated, then you might be in a strong position to say, "Those who came out of Israel have a right to return to their homeland."

But as long as they are at war—as late as January 16, Mr. Nasser said, "From the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf there is but one Arab nation which no one will succeed in dividing again. After World War II part of the Arab heart was snatched from the Arab body"—meaning the State of Israel. "Today Arabs from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf will cooperate in restoring that part," restoring Israel to the Arab lands.

As long as that condition exists, as long as the Arab leaders join with Mr. Nasser, as they are doing in saying that, surely no one believes that bringing those 900,000 Arabs or any substantial part of them into Israel is going to make for peace.

Chairman RICHARDS. Mrs. KELLY.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague from Brooklyn, Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER, for his testimony and appraisal of the Middle East situation.

Is there any question in your mind, Mr. MULTER, that if we could get the representatives of all the countries in the Middle East to a peace conference that Israel wouldn't be willing to settle every controversial issue, including the return of a token number of refugees, repayment for their land and return of their bank accounts, trade, boundaries, and so forth.

Mr. MULTER. Mrs. KELLY, there isn't a doubt in the world that the Israeli Government and their officials will sit down at the peace table and talk about all these problems and try to arrive at a solution of them.

But let's be practical about it. As of today, the Arabs will not sit down with the Isarelis face to face. But that doesn't mean that you can't commence these negotiations.

As a matter of fact, word was sent home at my instance to the Secretary of State. I know it was received here. I know it was received in our Embassy in Israel. I know it was received in our Embassy in Egypt, that the Arab leaders were ready to sit down and talk, not face to face with Israel, but with American representatives, with United States representatives about the settlement of all of these problems, if the United States will take the initiative and say, "We insist that you sit down and talk about these things."

You could keep the Arabs on one side of the barrier, the Israelis on the other. The United States representative could talk first to one group and then to the other group, and finally consummate an agreement and bring them together to sign it.

It was going to be done, and word was sent back that it would be done, not on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution but on the basis of the 1949 resolution. There is a difference, because now the Arabs say they want to roll everything back to the 1947 boundaries.

The 1949 truce agreements recognized the boundaries set up at that time as armistice boundaries, subject to revision. That word came back, was received here in Washington, was received throughout the Middle East, with the exception of our Embassy in Turkey.

Within 5 days thereafter, Prime Minister Eden of Britain issued the statement that he would be the arbitrator between Israel and the Arabs on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution.

It was an attempt by Mr. Eden to reestablish British prestige in that area. Whether or not he knew that by talking about the 1947 resolution he would blow up the possibility of these negotiations, I don't know, and I won't make that charge against him.

The Arabs sent word that they would talk about the 1949 borders. He wanted to talk on the basis of the 1947, and the whole think blew up.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask this: I can't understand how there would be any considerable portion of people of Israel that would advocate a preventive war, because if they fight a preventive war they are going to have to fight the very war that they are going to try to avoid.

It is a good deal like a man committing suicide because he is afraid to die. That would be the case if you fight a preventive war; no one would win.

There is one question that you didn't comment on, and perhaps you didn't do so because you didn't desire to raise that issue; if you do not, do not answer my question.

Do you advocate the United States sending arms to Israel?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I do, sir. I disagree with Mr. Dulles that to send arms at this time into Israel would be creating an arms race. The arms race is on.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Do you think it would be provocative of war?

Mr. MULTER. No; it would not be. I think it would be preventive of war. I think it is much better to do that than send in 1,800 marines from the 6th Fleet. As Prime Minister Ben-Gurion said, "Don't send your boys over here; send us arms so we can fight your battle." As long as Israel is strong——

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I heard Churchill made that statement.

Chairman RICHARDS. And Roosevelt, too.

Mr. MULTER. I am against an arms race. The State of Israel is against an arms race. I think every sensible person is against an arms race. But I think you must keep these parties on an even balance. If they know that to fight one another will be to annihilate one another, they won't fight.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. We have the status of the forces in all of these countries. We can't make it public, but we do have that information

Mr. BURLESON. As our able colleague always does, he makes a splendid case, but he starts with present-day conditions. I think many people do, in justifying a great many things related to this issue.

Humaneness is exactly the reason that Israel was created in the first place. But there were some conditions in the Balfour Declaration which are usually forgotten or conveniently ignored.

There is no legitimate reason for anyone to think or to believe that Israel is going to be driven into the sea or to say that it is not a nation and that it is not going to endure from now on. Certainly I have no such concept that Israel will not endure.

Of course, it will. Nevertheless, going back to the historical facts under the Balfour Declaration, the British finally decided after the great influx of illegal entries into Israel to advocate a trusteeship. We went along with that policy and were discussing it when Israel declared herself a nation and then we immediately recognized her as such. In the declaration were safeguards for the Arab majority. The great majority were Arabs in the country at that time. There were only 50,000 Jews, but hundreds of thousands of Arabs. It was agreed that their right should be protected.

It was also agreed that no people of the Jewish faith would be bound by the Zionist concepts to the State of Israel outside of the State of Israel.

That leads me to say this to the gentleman, when he speaks of Israel as related to Zionism: Would you contend, Mr. MULTER, that there is a distinction between Israel as a nation and Israel as a creature of international Zionism? Do you attempt to set one apart from the other?

Mr. MULTER. I think you will concede that Israel, like our country, guarantees freedom of religion. I think you will agree that Israel, like our country, guarantees every one of its citizens the right to vote and to hold office.

There are Arab-Moslems and Arab-Christians in the Israeli Parliament. The point I tried to make is that while most Jews are Zionists, not every Zionist is a Jew. There are many Christians who are Zionists. Zionism is the political concept of a Jewish state. Every Jew is not a Zionist.

You probably know that we have in this country a so-called American Council of Judaism. They have been bombarding the Congress with literature for some time. Actually, they represent less than 2 percent of the Jews of this country. But they were against the establishment of a State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. If you will allow me to interrupt, they have vehemently denied that they are opposed to the State of Israel. They definitely deny being either pro-Israel or anti-Israel.

Mr. MULTER. They may take the position now that they are in favor of the State of Israel. They were not in favor of it originally. They were bitterly opposed to its coming into being.

After it did, they accepted the fact, but in accepting the fact they do everything they

can to dissuade Christians and Jews from sending money to Israel or aiding it in any way. They are doing what they can to help destroy Israel.

They take the position that we must lean over backward in favor of the Arabs and against the State of Israel, which I say is not good policy. It is not American policy.

I don't say that we should be anti-Arab. My argument all through the years is that we must be just as pro-Arab as pro-Israel. You have to be fair and impartial to both of them.

Mr. BURLESON. Is not impartiality the announced policy of the State Department today?

Mr. MULTER. It may be the announced policy, but they are not doing anything to effectuate that policy. They are doing much that is contrary to that policy.

Mr. BURLESON. In connection with funds collected in the United States, let me ask the gentleman, do you agree that contributions to the United Jewish Appeal for the State of Israel should be a deductible item on the tax account of the American taxpayer as a philanthropic contribution?

Mr. MULTER. To the same extent that they are deductible for the support of the American University at Beirut, to the same extent as they are deductible to help people who are in distress anywhere in the world, to the same extent as they are to the Red Cross, and the like.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you know of any other instances or any precedent where any contribution by United States citizens to any political entity of a foreign government is deductible for income tax——

Mr. MULTER. These funds are not made available to a political entity.

Mr. BURLESON. But I disagree with the gentleman—I do not make a challenge that could not be refuted. Frankly, I don't know, but my information is that the funds collected by the United Jewish Appeal for the State of Israel goes into a common fund and can be used for any purpose the Israeli Government may desire.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, I most respectfully, but just as strongly disagree with you. The evidence is overwhelming that not a penny of that money goes into the coffers of the State of Israel. Not a penny of that money is disbursed by the State of Israel. Every dollar of that money is used—that which goes into the State of Israel; not all United Jewish Appeal money goes to the State of Israel—that which does go in is used for philanthropic purposes, rehabilitating people, making available to them the means for agriculture, to learn to farm, to learn skills for industry, for hospitals, and the like.

There isn't a dollar of that money that is administered by or paid to the State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. Our State Department people were very definite in 1954 in saying that those funds collected went into a common fund in the State of Israel, and the expenditures were not traceable, that they would not give us any assurance that tanks, planes, guns, public housing, health, or anything else were not purchased with them; that it was administered by the Israeli Government.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, were they referring to the United Jewish Appeal funds or to Israel bonds?

Mr. BURLESON. They lumped them all together.

Mr. MULTER. You can't lump them together, because the United Jewish Appeal money is not money that is used by the Government or administered by the Government, while the Israel bonds is a bond issue of the State of Israel and the proceeds go to the State of Israel.

Mr. VORYS. And you pay tax on them?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, you pay the tax on the income.

Mr. VORYS. And you can't deduct it?

Mr. MULTER. There is no deduction for the purchase of bonds or the income therefrom.

Mr. VORYS. I found that out recently at home.

Mr. BURLESON. I know that is true of the bonds.

Mr. MULTER. I assure you, Mr. BURLESON, if any such proof were available, our Treausry Department, the Internal Revenue Service would immediately revoke the tax exemption that is accorded to those gifts.

Mr. BURLESON. They first decided it was not deductible, and then later on they decided it was under an appeals court decision.

Mr. MULTER. I am not familiar with any litigation involving the matter.

I do know very definitely, I have been active in those matters for a long time, on a high level, and I know there isn't a dollar of United Jewish Appeal money that goes to the Israeli Government.

Mr. BURLESON. I hope the gentleman understands I was inquiring. I also hope he is correct and would welcome substantial proof of the correctness of his position.

Mr. MULTER. For more than 50 years the Jewish National Fund, an American organization, has been raising funds here and buying land in Israel, which is then leased on long-term leases, to anyone, to any Jew in Israel who wants to occupy the land. That has been going on for 54 years, to be exact.

Chairman RICHARDS. What is your recommendation about this legislation? You do not want us to include any money for help to any Arab State unless they do what?

Mr. MULTER. Unless they will in good faith enter into peace negotiations, either directly or through the United Nations or an agreed intermediary.

I am not so foolish as to think that you can force these Arabs to sit down face to face with the Israelis. But certainly good faith negotiations should be entered into without delay through an appropriate intermediary.

The United Nations would, of course, be the best intermediary. There are antagonisms there, too. Possibly they could agree upon some other intermediary, who could bring them to the peace table where they could sign the peace agreement.

It is not going to be an easy task. And it will not be accomplished overnight or in a day or week. Certainly we ought to say very firmly, "This is the time to do it."

Chairman RICHARDS. That you have to do certain things or else?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Chairman RICHARDS. If they don't do what we say——

Mr. MULTER. We will know where we stand. We will know whether or not we ought to send in any training tanks to Saudi Arabia at a time when there are reserve tank battalions in this country which haven't been able to get a single tank for training purposes.

Chairman RICHARDS. They agreed in writing to provide those tanks, did they not?

Mr. MULTER. They made the agreement to purchase the tanks in September 1955, and payment was made in November 1955. You and I sitting there would certainly have said, "Well, now, this is not the time to make that kind of delivery."

Mr. JUDD. Was not the basic agreement made in 1951 that they could buy weapons and training tanks, and so on, in this country?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. MULTER, is your suggestion only to this one area or is it your intention that we include such a provision for every area where there is a dispute? For example, do you propose the United States withhold any aid to Greece or Turkey, or Britain, until the Cyprus issue is settled, withhold aid to Pakistan and India until the Kashmir problem is resolved? Further, how about the other areas where there are conflicts?

Mr. MULTER. I say, once you find that the parties' refuse to sit down and negotiate in good faith——

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Who would adjudicate the situation as to whether the parties are sitting down in good faith?

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think that the question answers itself, when 8 years have gone by and the parties have not yet sat down and consummated an agreement? Isn't that long enough to determine that they are not trying in good faith to arrive at an agreement?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, because there is not a settlement over 8 years does not necessarily indicate bad faith on the part of Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. MULTER. That might be the necessary thing. It might be necessary to say to both sides, "You are both intransigent. Neither will talk. We can help neither one of you from here in."

It might be necessary to come to that position. I don't think it will be. But it may be.

I would like to stay on, but if it is agreeable, I will come back at any time you suggest. I must get to my committee, which is in executive session.

Chairman RICHARDS. Thank you, Mr. MULTER.

Texas 4–H Club Boy Delivers Prize Winning Speech on Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the many assets possessed by the great State of Texas our greatest, and the one in which we take the most pride, is our youth. The young men and women of Texas are second to none in their love of country, their forward-looking approach to life, and their ability to analyze, with mature judgment, the pressing problems of our day. Especially capable are the boys and girls on our farms who, through participation in the fine work being done by the 4–H Clubs, are helping to build today the better world we hope for tomorrow.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am very happy to include a speech written by Jim Teegerstrom, of Shamrock, Tex., in the 18th District which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. A student at Shamrock High School, Jim gave the speech in the district 4–H Club public-speaking contest, winning first place honors. Later this month he will compete in the State contest.

This young man, in his speech, goes to the heart of one of the basic problems in our country, the waste of our rich and life-giving soil. All of us can profit from the thoughts expressed by the young farmer from Texas.

The speech follows:

4–H CLUB BOY WRITES PRIZE WINNING SPEECH

(By Jim Teegerstrom)

Beautiful, for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain. For purple mountains ma-

jesties above the fruited plain, America God shed His grace on thee.

What a heritage we Americans have.

America, the greatest Nation in the world today. When the Pilgrim Fathers landed on that bleak, cold day to lay the foundation of a new nation, the sight that greeted them was a wilderness but a wilderness of virgin lands—with its untapped natural resources.

Yes; our heritage is great.

Our forefathers laid the foundation for the growth of a great nation because they had vision—a vision for the tomorrow. As a result, we have this heritage of freedom and plenty, and the greatest heritage of all is the God-given heritage, of our soil. For from our soil has come the food and fibers to feed and clothe our Nation and others. This, our soil, is our greatest resource; our greatest investment. The most bountiful of all gifts. However, this heritage has been and is misused.

When our grandfathers departed from this earth the land was already on its way to depletion. The reason for this terrible condition of the soil was their lack of knowledge of soil control. These men were constantly tilling virgin lands and coming on, so the idea of soil conservation or even the consideration of the soil's condition was unknown. Human existence was the primary thought. Consequently these soil conditions developed further. Thus we see from the beginning, our soil has been rapidly losing its productivity. Very few noticed or cared because there was plenty of new land to the West.

When the frontier land was gone, our farmers learned that it was time to combat soil losses. For they realized that our soil is a strong method of defense for this nation of ours. As they saw, so must we see the needs and conditions of our soil. In this crucial period we certainly need to keep our defenses up. Only can we do this properly if we protect our heritage, the soil. The judgment day has come to the agricultural men of America. It is your job and mine to combat soil depletion.

Erosion is one of the greatest of all hazards to our current standard of living. Approximately three-fourths of the entire acreage in the United States has been damaged by some form of erosion. We, the citizens of America, are now faced with the startling fact that erosion is costing our Nation nearly $400 million annually in soil depreciation and reduced yields.

The Providence Gully is just a slight glimpse of what is now taking place in losses through water erosion. This terrible gully originated from a drip at the eaves of a barn. It has grown so much that it has engulfed that whole farm which gave it its birth, and is eating more and more essential farmland every day and will continue to do so.

A region in Alabama has been so destroyed by erosion that it accounted for almost 500,000 acres.

The mighty Mississippi River alone deposits more than 400 million tons of soil into the Gulf of Mexico annually. To take care of this vast amount of waste it would require a train of freight cars long enough to circle the globe at the Equator 37 times.

There are also regions in our own State that were once prosperous communities, but are now wastelands. In one given area 32,000 acres were in cultivation, now less than 5,000 are profitably tilled. In the same area, once 1,650 people gained their livelihood from this soil. Today the number has decreased to only 435 inhabitants.

The topsoil was once 8 to 12 inches deep; now where topsoil can be found it measures 4 to 8 inches in depth. Gullied slopes, thin soils, poor crops, weak cattle, undernourished children and abandoned homes and farms tell an unpleasant story. This is truly an example of many like areas in the United States today. The people of America led by the Department of Agriculture have taken certain measures to stop these terrible wastes.

Such organizations as 4–H Clubs are designed to educate agricultural youth in actually helping put these improvements into practice, the Soil Conservation Service is actually helping put these improvements into practice.

The Department of Agriculture and the youth organizations of America are helping. But they cannot be expected to do it alone. It is your job, my job, as well as the merchant, the baker, and the engineers' job. They all know that when a soil wears thin, civilization weakens and when it will not produce, a culture is lost.

America must awaken to its soil condition before it is too late. We must keep the lamp of knowledge burning across every tillable acre, and every turf of grass, until the devastation of erosion is halted and brought under control. There we find the answer to the problem: To bring damaging erosion under control.

The industrious, the farsighted, the truly patriotic people will stem the tide of erosion. They are the ones who will not complain about the inconvenience of the contour row, nor the extra cost of building terraces. They will rotate and cultivate the crops with methods that keep the soil in place and cause it to store the proper amount of moisture. They will plant crops in strips in such a way that it will rob moving rain of the soil it carries. These are the people who will keep America great. I trust that you and I, my friends, are among that group.

It has been said that the pen is mightier than the sword, and that 10 firery words can move a thousand people, but I believe that to conquer the soil problems it will take more than words. It will take the wholehearted actions of the citizens of the United States. It is our patriotic responsibility.

Today we are the heirs of America's heritage and it is our responsibility now, with courage born of vision, to "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to defend, preserve, and enrich its blessings, for future generations. Where there is no vision the people perish."

"America. God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood,
From sea to shining sea."

A Ruinous Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 2 issue of the New York Journal-American entitled "A Ruinous Tax":

A RUINOUS TAX

With a balanced budget and a Treasury surplus in sight when fiscal year 1956 ends on June 30, tax relief will again occupy many minds in Congress.

The administration is opposed to tax reduction now. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey believes surplus funds should be applied to reducing the monstrous national debt, which, of course, would pay off in future years by diminishing the gigantic cost of the debt in the form of interest charges.

There are, however, tax fields in which lower rates would actually result in larger tax revenues. Income taxes, both personal and corporate, are in this class.

Even more constructive would be reforms in excise taxation. In fact, excise taxes should in some cases be abandoned entirely—notably so, the Federal tax on motion picture theater admittances.

This tax pays the Government $80 million a year. But it has caused a dwindling patronage that threatens the existence of motion picture theaters worth $1,457,800,000.

The country has 19,200 movie theaters. Of these, 10,900 are in financial straits: 5,200 are operating at a loss, and 5,700 are approaching that depressed status. Figures show that the 10 percent Federal tax is a contributing cause of the current distress.

Movie houses have competition in television and radio. Yet they continue to be the principal amusement source for millions of people, young and old, and almost the only source for millions of families in the lower income groups.

Taxing the recreation of these families out of existence and, in so doing, destroying a large taxpaying industry, along with thousands of jobs, can be called anything but sound economics or good government.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] recently addressed a series of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners in my district. His remarks were enthusiastically received, and I believe he expressed the fundamental Democratic philosophy as well as it has been expressed anywhere in recent times.

In fact, I have received numerous requests from those who were privileged to hear him for copies of his speech. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the address he made on one of these occasions:

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY SPEECH
(By Congressman JIM WRIGHT)

There are several reasons why I am happy to be here to share this occasion with you this evening.

First of all, I am grateful to you for this opportunity to know your beautiful corner of the universe here in southwestern Virginia. I have a particular pleasure in being here, because I've been wanting to meet the folks who sent PAT JENNINGS to Congress. A fine indication of his leadership and of the esteem in which he is regarded by his colleagues was seen in his recent election to head the 84th Club, composed of the first term members. You are to be sincerely congratulated upon your extremely able representation.

Furthermore, I'm enjoying this occasion because you have made me feel at home. Meeting some of you earlier and looking into your faces now I can almost imagine that I am talking with folks from my own native plains country. Basically, I think we are pretty much the same—Virginians and Texans—and I think fundamentally we want the same things. We don't ask for any special privileges or selfish political favors from

our Government. But we want a chance. We want the right to hold our heads high in a free land. We want to feel that our Government is interested in keeping a strong, healthy economy with jobs enough to go around. We know that prosperity and depression both have always begun at the grass roots, and we want to think that the man who tills the soil is not completely forgotten by his Government in Washington.

I expect one of the reasons I feel so much at home among you folks is because you're Democrats. Now, I'm not trying to tell you that the Democratic Party can do no wrong. That wouldn't be honest. We have made mistakes, and you know it.

Nor do I believe that the standard equipment for all Republicans includes a set of horns and a forked tail. I am one of those who has admired the President of the United States as a man of honest intentions, and I think I know how to place the national welfare above purely partisan interests.

But I do view with considerable alarm the apparent design of many Republican Party leaders to turn the clock back to the days of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs, high interest rates, and 12 million unemployed—back to the days of a national policy which ignored the needs of the average people who make up the country.

PARTY OF THE AVERAGE AMERICAN

And I do believe that the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman is the safest custodian of the national welfare because it is the party of the average American. These men are the everlasting symbols of a government responsible to its humblest citizens. Without exception, they have stood for the rights of the many as opposed to the privilege of a few—for the public good as opposed to the private greed.

They knew that the majority sometimes made mistakes. But they counted these mistakes less dangerous by far than the inevitable and vicious mistakes which have always resulted from the rule of a small and tight coalition of privileged men. They believed deeply and passionately that the natural instincts of the common, decent, ordinary human being always and unfailingly prove themselves in the long run to be the highest wisdom and the most reliable judgment available in determining the national interest.

In short, they trusted the people. And the people trusted them.

There have always been some—and they are with us today—who inherently distrust the judgment of the ordinary people. Many of the cultured and learned men of Revolutionary times—Alexander Hamilton among them—regarded this novel idea of a government by the people as something of a "noble experiment" but felt that sooner or later some way must be devised for keeping the actual reins of government in the hands of the privileged and prosperous few.

JEFFERSON BELIEVED IN PEOPLE

But Thomas Jefferson, blessed with almost prophetic vision, saw that such a minority control by the aristocracy would decay and become rotten, exposing this infant Nation to the same corrupt and licentious rule that had driven our forebears from the Old World. So he worked for the extension of suffrage and for a government which heeded the popular will.

He thought that the average man was worthy of freedom and capable of passing on the policies by which the Nation was to be guided. And in Jefferson's day this was a radical thought. The established press of his time, almost without exception, was arrayed in a bitter fight against him. They called him an impractical dreamer, a radical reformer, and worse.

Those who would arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to make all the decisions for the people even had the colossal affrontery to accuse Jefferson and his followers of treason, and to imprison some of his supporters under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. And Thomas Jefferson was driven to resign from the Vice Presidency.

Yet Jefferson won his fight—as all such fights are finally won—against minority control. It was he who, more than any other, authored and fashioned and shaped on this continent the infant form which men called democracy, and then breathed into its sails the breath of motion.

JACKSON'S STRUGGLE SIMILAR

Time passed. Men were not eternally vigilant, and once more the control of national affairs was maneuvered into the hands of a group of citizens small in number. It was the time of the great westward expansion. With the legions of the ordinary people scattered all the way from the eastern farms and mills across the broad valleys to the land which lay upon the fertile banks of the Mississippi, a handful of influence peddlers had succeeded in turning the smile of government favor from the average people to a little network of citizens on the eastern seaboard who engaged in merchant shipping and who owned the Bank of the United States.

It was then that a man as democratic as the wide-open spaces and as down to earth as the boots he wore rode to the front bearing the people's cause. Andrew Jackson took up the fight for these forgotten millions of the ordinary people, the hard-bitten pioneers of the West and South and the inarticulate poor of the great cities. For this he, like Jefferson, was reviled as a radical, and anarchist, and a destroyer of confidence. Like Jefferson, he had to contend with the highly organized opposition of the press and the great financial interests of the country—well-entrenched, wealthy, clever, and powerful.

Also like Jefferson, he won his fight, because he was fighting on the side of the people, and their instincts did not fail him. He kept faith with them. And they kept faith with him.

It has never been an easy struggle to carry the flag of the inarticulate and disorganized many against the vocal and highly organized few.

WILSON BROUGHT REFORMS

We know of the great struggle and the great strides under Woodrow Wilson. We know of the fierce enmity he generated when he turned the clear, clean spotlight of public inspection upon those who assumed the responsibility of investing the people's money. We know of the bitter antagonism he aroused when he enunciated the proposition that those who have benefited most from the blessing of our free Nation should share most in the cost of our Government's operation, when he had the audacity to suggest that the exploitation of children in our mines and pits and smelters should be ended, that women should be permitted the right to vote, and that the code of decency dictated there should be a minimum wage below which nobody should be required to work.

We know of the angry personal vindictiveness of those who, representing the privileged few, committed the most irresponsible act in the history of our Nation when, out of personal spite, they killed his dream of a League of Nations and thus made World War II as inevitable as tomorrow's sunrise and broke his heart and sent that great-hearted Virginia Democrat to a premature grave.

And once more the forces of the few gained control. The people were lulled into lethargy by the mad spiral of the stock market until it came crashing down about our feet in 1929. For those who sat in the seats of government had not bothered to realize that no prosperity can last which does not have its base spread among the average people.

REASON FOR THE DEPRESSION

In retrospect, it is easy to see the reason for that imminent collapse. In the dizzy decade which preceded it, the Nation's production gained 56 percent. But wages and individual income gained only 24 percent, and because of rising prices, real buying power gained hardly at all. Can anyone doubt the reason for that terrible event? People simply were not able to buy those things which were produced for their consumption. Hence, the capitulation of the entire economic structure.

I remember a day—a cold and windy March day in 1933. A man rose from a wheelchair and stood with the aid of a cane and looked into the heart of a nation. What he saw there was a picture of stagnation—stagnation and fear. Twelve million men walked the streets looking for work. Countless homes were foreclosing. Farm gates stood ajar on rusty hinges. Children looked to their parents with expectant eyes and hungry cavities in their empty little stomachs. One-third of the Nation was "ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed."

But then he spoke. And into each place where men and women had gathered breathlessly beside a radio, there came a new confidence and a new hope. Here, again, was a man in the White House who remembered them. And the Nation regained its balance as it tottered there on the brink of the abyss of doom. For a steady hand was at the helm, clear eyes watched the waters. And the only thing to fear was fear itself.

ROOSEVELT AND RECOVERY

The national income in that previous year of 1932 had been only $39 billion. But soon the factories began to hum again. The channels of commerce began to open. The banks were safe. There was optimism in the air, and the Nation was whistling a tune called Happy Days Are Here Again.

For 20 years, under the leadership of Roosevelt and Truman, the welfare of the average American was held paramount by his Government. In no 20 years of our history had there been so much solid progress. The national income rose from $39 billion to approximately $300 billion. People had confidence. There was a productive and remunerative job for everyone capable of working. The "bitter enders" adorned their faces with wry masks of gloom and dourly wailed that the dollar would buy only half as much. But every independent statistical study revealed that the average American had four times as many dollars, and so we were clearly twice as well off.

Yet one of the strangest facts of history is man's propensity for experimentation. The crisis met, we are apt to relax our vigilance and wonder if another course might not do just as well.

In 1952, the Republicans, chafing under 20 years of repudiation, brought out a national hero to head their ticket. He didn't exactly please the traditional kingmakers of the Republican high command, but they had to have a winner. Many of them were convinced, besides, that it made little difference who sat in the White House so long as their particular philosophy permeated the Cabinet and the upper echelons of policymaking. And so they nominated the well-known and well-honored general and rode behind the banners of his national appeal.

The Democrats really had very little chance in 1952, because we were opposed by a nationally advertised product. Even so, the average people demonstrated that they had not entirely forgotten. Even with the tremendous popular personal appeal of General Eisenhower at the head of their ticket, Republicans controlled the House by only a meager handful of votes and the Senate by less than that.

Then 2 years later, the people once again demonstrated that they prefer Democrats

to Republicans. The full significance of that election has not been greatly publicized. In popular votes, the Democratic Party won the 1954 congressional elections by the biggest margin accorded to either party in an off-year election since 1934. And in every succeeding election, the Democratic majority throughout the Nation has been increased.

The Democrats have not been blindly partisan. We have not been guided by either hate or spite. Again and again during the last Congress and during the first session of the present one, on the truly crucial issues, it was the Democrats who bailed out the President's program and saved his broader national objectives from defeat at the hands of his own party. On issue after issue, the Democrats supplied Dwight Eisenhower with more support than did Republicans in the Congress.

DEMOCRATS BACK BIPARTISAN GOALS

Last year, it was clearly evident that the reciprocal trade legislation which is the cornerstone of his foreign policy would have been utterly emasculated if it had been left to the Republicans alone.

Last year, according to the Congressional Quarterly, a majority of the Democrats in the Senate had stood with the President on 31 of the 33 major issues on which votes had been recorded. In the House, the picture was much the same.

As good Americans should, we completely submerged partisanship to adopt the Formosa Resolution by an unprecedented peacetime majority. It was a Democratic majority which enacted the reserve training bill, considered a major pillar of the administration's military program. It was a Democratic majority which, at Presidential request, adopted the Career Incentives Act aimed at making military service more attractive to America's young men.

In the Senate, it was Democratic majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON who forced a vote on a Republican-sponsored resolution which would have tied the President's hands on the eve of the Geneva Conference and, by defeating it soundly, empowered the President and strengthened his hand by a tremendous vote of confidence. Only four Senators stood against the President that day. Not 1 of the 4 was a Democrat.

So we have tried to help him, even when his lieutenants have shown the shameful poor sportsmanship and bad taste to refer to the Democratic Party—the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Wilson and Roosevelt—as the party of treason.

POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT

But we cannot, in good conscience or in good faith with our people, aid his or any other administration when it subordinates the public good to the private greed.

We cannot remain silent and submissive while the gross national product, all the goods and services produced in our Nation, decline $12 billions from the year before, as it did in 1954 in spite of a 3 million growth in population.

We cannot share responsibility for the mere sake of bipartisanship when the specter of unemployment begins to stalk our land again, when the total number of unemployed men and women doubled during 1954, when farm income drops 26 percent as it did in 1955, and when the national administration seems more interested in trying to think up arguments to explain these facts away than in trying to think up ways to correct them.

We found it hard last year to take with good grace the shrill cries of demagoguery and fiscal irresponsibility because we wanted to share with the average American the benefit of a modest tax reduction, when the Republican Congress just the year before had handed out three times as costly a bill of special benefits to the large corporations and higher income taxpayers and dividend earners.

Let me give you one homely illustration of that Republican tax bill of 1954. John and Bill report the same amount of income. John earned his by the sweat of his back or the work of his brow. Bill earned his from the ownership of stocks and investments—clipping coupons. Yet John must pay in taxes one-third again more than Bill pays. Every time Bill (the coupon clipper) pays $75, John (the wageearner) shells out $100. And if you can make any rhyme or reason out of that, there's probably a job waiting for you in the Treasury Department, because Secretary Humphrey has been looking for somebody to try to explain that to the American people.

I've never witnessed a more complete disregard for consistency than that manifest by the Republican leadership in its frenzied fight to kill the Democratic tax proposals.

In 1954, in face of a bigger deficit forecast, they rammed through the $7.5 billion tax reduction for their special friends, and thought it was fine. Last year they called the proposed $2 billion tax reduction to relieve the embattled average American the height of folly and fiscal irresponsibility.

THE DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

Let me give you the Democratic philosophy.

First of all, we believe in our system—a free, healthy, capitalistic economy. In such a system we believe that private employment in sound business is preferable to public-works employment.

Yet we know that our Nation cannot increase private employment except as it increases the production of American business.

Obviously, production can enjoy no continuing increase except as consumption increases—except as people are able to buy the things that business turns out for sale.

And what better way could we find to increase the consumption of goods on the part of the American public than by permitting the average American to retain more of the purchasing power he has earned?

Buying power is the oil that lubricates the machinery of prosperity.

This has been called the percolate up theory, that national prosperity has to begin on a broad base with the average people—that when they have money they buy more things; thus, they increase demand, and more things are produced; when more things are produced, more people are employed; and when more people are gainfully employed there is a better market for the farmers' goods and the retailers' wares, and everybody benefits.

This philosophy has one thing to recommend it, and that is that it works.

THE REPUBLICAN THEORY

Now, let's contrast this with the Republican philosophy. The trickle down theory, it is called. They believe that if we can just shower enough prosperity upon the people at the top of the economic ladder some of it is bound to filter down to all the rest of us.

The only thing wrong with this theory is that it doesn't work. It didn't work in 1929, and it didn't work in 1953 or 1954. It won't work in 1956.

During the past 2 years the corporations of the country increased their income. Yet the Nation's production fell off, and the number of unemployed increased.

Last year corporate profits were up 26 percent, but the take-home pay for the average American was up only 3 percent, and rising prices had wiped this out completely. Rent is up 11 percent, utility rates are up 6 percent, medical costs are up 9 percent. Dividends are up, but family debt skyrocketed to an all-time high in 1955. The prosperity has not trickled down. It is being siphoned away.

And this is the effect of one after another of the proposals of the present Republican administration—the hard-money policy which siphoned off literally hundreds of millions of buying power in excessive interest rates; the Clay commission's highway proposals which would have had us pay out 55 cents in interest over the next 30 years for every dollar's worth of highway we built; the proposal to increase the borrowing of money for school construction; the gesture to help the Nation's health by subsidizing health-insurance companies; the plan the require first-class mail users to bear the burden of an additional subsidy for junk-mail advertisers; and many other similar schemes.

Yet while they talked of a hundred billion dollars for superhighways, they were proposing that we do away with the Federal field activities of the Soil Conservation Service which has returned the American taxpayer a greater dividend on the pennies he has invested in it than has any other activity of our Government.

While natural disasters, such as drought and flood, were taking heavy tolls, the administration was contriving to increase the interest rate for disaster loans.

While the number of small-business failures rose by 21 percent in the year 1955, the Small Business Administration was increasing its interest rates and refusing to process loan applications. Since 1953, some 300,000 individuals have inquired in an effort to secure small-business loans from this agency. Of this entire number, only about 7,000 have ever been favorably acted upon.

This is a rather typical instance of an agency, created under the law to perform a certain task, but now managed by people who are completely out of sympathy with the purpose of the law. It is duplicated in case after case.

Unwilling to suggest publicly that a popular and beneficial program be abolished, the present administration has simply appointed to head the program people who do not believe in it. This process has been called repeal by appointment.

In these and a hundred other ways, the lumbering elephant of the Republican Party has shown not only that it never forgets, but also that it never learns.

Eternal vigilance is, and has ever been, the price of liberty. As a great American, SAM RAYBURN, once said, "Freedom is like an insurance policy; its premiums have to be kept up to date."

As we have seen throughout our Nation's history, it has never been an easy matter to maintain a Government responsible to the needs and responsive to the will of the average people.

We have broken bread together tonight at a Democratic fund-raising dinner. It isn't a $100-a-plate dinner, or even a $25-a-plate dinner. It's a $5-a-plate dinner.

In certain sections of the country, the other party frequently raises the bulk of its funds at $5,000 a clip.

And that is one of its troubles. Let anyone ask himself honestly if donations of that magnitude are made with no expectation of selfish return.

We have the satisfaction of knowing that we belong to a political organization which elicits its main support from people just like ourselves. But I'd rather have a party fund made up from 50,000 people at $5 apiece than from 50 people at $5,000 apiece.

Our way is harder, admittedly. But it is also more satisfying. It is the way set forth by Jefferson 150 and more years ago. It is the people's way. And, with your help, perhaps it will again be our national way in 1956.

Dr. Elliott P. Joslin on His 87th Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in this world of recent times, when so much substance and effort has been expended in the cause of destruction of mankind, it seems very fitting and proper that all of us here in Congress, and that the people throughout the Nation, and in a very large measure, throughout the world, should pause for a few moments to do honor to a very great man whose entire lifetime has been devoted to benefiting and helping mankind.

On Wednesday, June 6, Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, of Boston, Mass., celebrated his 87th birthday. An eminent scientist, a very distinguished doctor of medicine, his tremendous efforts and contributions to the health of mankind all over the world began in Victorian days over 60 years ago. Through the duration of the 20th century, his great achievements for human beings have made it possible for many to live and enjoy life who might otherwise not have been able to do so.

Many of his great achievements have taken place in the research and treatment of diabetes. In this field of medicine his knowledge and judgment and contributions are recognized throughout the world. His eminent authority is recognized not only because of his accomplishments in the field of medicine, but also because of the use of his knowledge in the consideration of the whole man. Kindly, thoughtful, genuine, and always completely interested, Dr. Joslin, in all of his study and research and treatment, never has forgotten that mankind is made up of human beings with nerves, and a mind, and a spirit. Always he is cognizant of the fact he is dealing with life made in the image of God.

During these many years of service to his fellowmen, the eminent leadership of Dr. Joslin has been internationally recognized, not just for his specialty in the research and treatment of diabetes and the interrelationship of the whole man in the treatment of his ills, but also for his eminent qualities as a gentleman and a leader among men during this, his time on earth.

More intimately, Dr. Joslin is revered and loved by the countless patients who have passed through his great clinic in Boston bearing his name—the Joslin Clinic—and the countless people whose lives he has touched in his long, notable service throughout more than three score of years.

Not only is he an eminent man of medicine, but Dr. Joslin is a distinguished teacher and a great scientist. As a professor in the Harvard Medical School, many distinguished doctors today recall with reverence and appreciation their great teacher when they were students in the Harvard Medical School. His teaching and lectures have taken place in many of the great medical centers of the world. In the great profession of medicine, Dr. Joslin's place is secure.

In this age of materialism and conflict of values, the high accomplishments of so distinguished a man and specialist are indeed above praise. Admired, respected, and revered not only by everyone in his profession, but also by men and women everywhere, Dr. Joslin indeed has reached the pinnacle of greatness. In the history of his great and noble profession, and in the history of his country, his name will rank with Osler, Trudeau, Kelly, Welch, Halstead, Ehrlich, Cushing, and others who have done so much to permit men and women throughout the world to live normal, happy lives.

During this long life of service, Dr. Joslin has been blessed with the love, cooperation, encouragement, and understanding of a wonderful lady, his wife, Mrs. Joslin. It is my wish, and my hope, just as it is for countless individuals everywhere, that Dr. Joslin and Mrs. Joslin will be blessed with many more years, to do all that they love so well, which is to give health to the ill, strength to the physically weak, courage to the depressed, and happiness to mankind. Because he lives so do countless others.

On his 87th anniversary, I know he has received congratulations and best wishes from people all over the world. It is an honor for me to extend to him my congratulations and I know the congratulations of the entire Congress and Government of the United States of America.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the Memorial Day address which I delivered in Rochester, N. H., on May 30, 1956:

Ladies and gentlemen, I was glad to receive an invitation from my good friend Dick Cooper to speak here in Rochester at these Memorial Day exercises. I have been here on several occasions and it is always a pleasure to participate in Memorial Day ceremonies in your city.

SIGNIFICANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Today is one of the most significant days of the year. It is Memorial Day and we have gathered here to pay tribute to our honored dead who have made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic may live and to honor those still among us who have borne the strife of battle for the glory of our country. By appropriate ceremonies which are being held in every portion of this great free land, we commemorate the valor and the sacrifice of the veterans of all our wars, from the Revolution to the conflict in Korea.

Although Memorial Day came into existence folowing the Civil War, it is fitting and proper that we remember all those who have died for the United States of America from the earliest days of this great Nation to the present hour. We think, today, of those who have fought and bled and died that the people of this Nation may be free. In retrospect our minds turn to the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the First World War, the Second World War, Korea, and all the other wars in which our country has been engaged. We know that because of these struggles and the great, decisive victories which were achieved, we live in the finest Nation on earth and in the world's greatest citadel of democracy the world has ever known.

IN COMMEMORATION

At this season of the year, we commemorate the valiant deeds of our fallen heroes by placing American flags above their graves, by heaping beautiful floral tributes on their last resting places, by Memorial Day parades, by statements and speeches apropos to this occasion, and by appropriate ceremonies, religious services and affairs such as these in which we are participating. How feeble our attempts to do them honor when what they did and what they have accomplished speaks far more eloquently than anything which may be said on this Memorial Day in 1956.

A DAY OF DEDICATION

Not only is this a day of doing honor and paying tribute—not only is this a day when we recall with ever-deepening pride the many valorous acts performed by so many patriotic Americans on the battlefields throughout the world. Actually this is a day of dedication. We dedicate our minds, our hearts, and our lives to the cause for which so much has been sacrificed.

A day of tribute and a day of dedication. This is the abiding and eternal theme of Memorial Day ceremonies. As Abraham Lincoln said: "It is for us the living rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus so far nobly advanced." These words are eminently applicable at this hour. What is the work our honored dead of all wars have thus so far nobly advanced. It is the work of preserving the American heritage of freedom. It is the work of building a constantly better democratic society. It is, today in the middle of the 20th century, the work of world leadership among the nations of the free world. It is the work of continuing with unabated and unrelenting vigor the struggle against the diabolic forces of Communist tyranny until freedom is known to all men around the globe.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRESENT WORLD

We live in a world of illimitable power and in a world which is sharply divided between the free and the enslaved. On May 21 the United States Air Force dropped a hydrogen bomb over a desolate area in the Pacific. The explosion which followed dwarfed all previous man-made explosions. It was by far the most stupendous release of energy that man has ever made. Forty miles from the explosion the luminosity exceeded 500 suns. The power of this bomb was from 15 to 20 megatons—a megaton being the equivalent of a million tons of TNT.

Tremendous power is within our hands and in my opinion, with this power we are in a position to give leadership in a world gravely dangerous. This power has terrifyingly augmented our responsibility.

This is a divided world. The tyranny of communism seeks to annihilate freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion and the opportunity of the individual to develop according to his innate ability. The issue confronting us was well stated in what is now known as the famous Declaration of Washington issued on February 1 by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Anthony Eden and President Eisenhower. They stated: "We are conscious that in this year

1956 there still rages the age old struggle between those who believe that man has his origin and destiny in God and those who treat man as if he were destined merely to serve a state machine." We propose to win this struggle. We must and we are determined to win this struggle.

RESOLVE TO KEEP THE FAITH

The United States is the indisputable leader of the free world in this universal struggle to ensure the continuation and the spread of freedom. In this world of power and Communist tyranny, we must ever be on the alert and constantly rededicate ourselves to the cause for which our honored heroes of all wars sacrificed so much — many of whom have given the "last full measure of devotion." We must not be misled by the blandishments of communism and by the new tactics of the Soviet Union—by their soft words and by their fabrications. Their fundamental principle is the same. They seek to destroy the free world. I am glad that the House of Representatives on May 10 passed a military apropriation bill amounting to $33,635,066,000 by an overwhelming vote of 377 to 0. This certainly is one resounding answer to the Communist endeavor to subjugate the world. It is telling evidence that we are not going to be deceived by their change of tactics which are designed to accomplish their nefarious goals.

On this Memorial Day in 1956 we recognize that our heritage of freedom and democracy so dearly bought by blood and sacrifice is in danger if we do not remain constantly alert, vigilant and adequately prepared for any emergency. We are fully aware that we face one of the gravest and most sinister challenges to human liberty that free men have ever experienced. We can best do honor and pay tribute to those who have fought in the wars of our country by being firmly resolved that we will rise to the occasion of world leadership, that we will employ our strength and our influence in exercising this leadership in the military field, the economic field, through the United Nations and its associated agencies and that we will give leadership spiritually—steadfastly determined that we will keep the faith with those who have maintained the republic on many a bloody battlefield throughout our history. This is a day of consecrated dedication—a day in which we evaluate the current struggle—a day in which we will endeavor to envision the future—and a day of firm resolution to be successful in the endeavor to maintain and add to our heritage of freedom.

Much has been accomplished but there is much to be achieved. As we contemplate our objectives we know full well that in their realization the accomplishments of the future will be something of which all Americans can be proud. Ours is a civilization based on religious faith. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in a speech to the 4-H Club in Chicago on November 29, 1954, said: "The reality of the matter is that the United States, by every standard of measure, is the world's greatest power not only materially but spiritually. We have national policies which are clear and sound. They fit a civilization based on religious faith."

We say to our honored dead and to those who have fought that this Nation may live: Our faith in the ideas and the ideals for which you sacrificed so much is a living, vital force as we seek to solve the problems that confront us. We believe today as you believe, in the achievement of a better way of life for men, women, and children wherever they may live. We accept the challenge on this Memorial Day in 1956. We will preserve our heritage against the ruthless and unconscionable tyranny of Communism and with zealousness we will seize the opportunity to give leadership in building a better world. We say to all those whom we are honoring today, we derive inspiration from what you have done and we hasten to exercise our leadership in the many phases of world affairs by rededicating ourselves to the ideas and the ideals which have made this Republic what it is—the ideas and the ideals which are the core of democracy and for which you have fought unflinchingly with no thought of self. We pledge our determination to carry on the work which you "have thus far so nobly advanced" and we pledge to you that in the years which are given to us, we will continue to strive as you have striven to bring into existence the realization of the very thing for which you have prayed and we are praying: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

One of the Least of These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1956, in Collinsville, Ill., Sister Katie Day was held to honor the Good Samaritan of the Coal Fields. The Good Samaritan is Mrs. Catherine DeRorre, of DuQuoin, Ill., wife of an immigrant and daughter of immigrant parents.

"Sister Katie" is a legend in the lives of Illinois miners and their wives. For more than 40 years she served the cause of the miners and other working people. Her home was always a haven for the afflicted.

The miners, I believe, are a special breed of men. In every nation of the western world, even in the nations behind the Iron Curtain, miners have been in the forefront of every struggle for social justice. The men have not maintained their spirit without the help and encouragement of women of equal spirit and of grace. The grace and gentleness are as important as the courage.

I join the hundreds of friends who paid tribute to Sister Katie who has given so unselfishly of her time and energies in her encouragement and consolation to the afflicted.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the June 4, 1956, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

ONE OF THE LEAST OF THESE

Those were black nights in the southern Illinois coalfields a quarter century ago and litle sun shone in the daytime. The men who dug the coal and the women who sustained them saw a better chance for themselves and their families in the new union, the Progressive Mine Workers of America. But the struggle to establish that better chance touched off a warfare that flared from coal town to coal town for several years.

Yet the struggle went on and there were those who would take nothing short of victory. One of them was Catherine De Rorre, of Du Quoin, wife of an immigrant, daughter of immigrant parents. Her home was alway a haven and her kitchen somehow reproduced the miracle of feeding hungry men and women and children times without number. No wonder they called her the Good Samaritan of the coalfields.

Sunday was Sister Katie Day and families came from as far away as Colorado and Wisconsin to honor Mrs. De Rorre in Collinsville. They gave her flowers and gifts and spread a picnic lunch for her. They read her messages from Norman Thomas, Paul H. Douglas, Roger Baldwin, Melvin Price, and Tom Tippett; from a University of Chicago professor, a former governor, from labor leaders, from others in the mine towns with Italian, French, German, Scotch, and English names. The small gray-haired woman wondered why and wiped away tears and said she was "only a common housewife."

But Mayor Frank Zeidler, who made the trip from Milwaukee just to pay his tribute, knew why. "Sister Katie," as he said, is a symbol of the pioneer woman of the industrial age. She represents the little people who produce heroes and heroines in the humble ways of life. She is "one of the least of these, my brethren," who along with inventors and builders and statesmen, bring the changes that make a kinder, fairer world.

Address of Irving Stackpole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, annually the Union Square Post, No. 377, of the American Legion, in time-honored custom, holds memorial exercises to pay tribute to our war dead.

On the evening of that day, they have a unique ceremony at which time they honor a resident of Somerville who has done the most for the youth of that city. Selection is made from the ranks of the average citizens of the community, and this year the post selected James L. Colbert, a devoted husband and father.

Mr. Colbert is not a man of great wealth or exalted position, but is typical of many of our citizens throughout this country who contribute their leisure hours to the service of their communities, and particularly to the young.

Among the many prominent citizens who attended the affair to pay tribute to Mr. Colbert were Congressman TORBERT H. MACDONALD; the Massachusetts State commander of the American Legion, Gabriel T. Olga; Senator James J. Corbett; and the mayor of Somerville, William J. Donovan. The principal speaker was the former Massachusetts State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Irving Stackpole. It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to at this time insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Commander Stackpole:

Mr. Chairman, Father O'Sullivan, Mr. Colbert, Congressman O'Neill, Congressman Macdonald, Senator Furbush, Department Commander Olga, Commander Walker, Post commanders, auxiliary presidents, distinguished guests, Gold Star Mothers, we are told that Decoration Day had its inception back in the year 1866. Since a Virginian, named Cassanda O'Moncure had been decorating the graves of the men who had died during the Civil War. She decorated all graves regardless of the side upon which the men had fought.

Later we all know that Gen. John A. Logan, as Congressman O'NEILL said while commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, decreed May 30th as Decoration Day, this day to be set apart and devoted to the memory of the heroic dead. Today, the number of graves to be decorated have multiplied—we are told that 650,000 is a fair approximation of the number who have been felled on the battlefields in actual combat. Added to this host, are those men in the service who have died from the scars of battle. We all know that the freedoms we enjoy as Americans has been purchased by this price. Yet in 1956—and while the whole of veterandom joins in a vast nationwide tribute to our warriors—there are forces outside of America numbering 800 million—who would overthrow this Government, destroy its traditions and make useless the sacrifice of this vast silent army of heroes who died for the very thing that they would destroy. The dignity of man, veterans and citizens alike have a challenge today.

It is a healthy sign in America when, as tonight, the veterans of America recognize the need and urge the continuance of civic consciousness. Tonight an average citizen who is responsive to his obligations as an American is honored. Tireless in his work, unselfish and devoted, never too busy when called, always willing to do more than his share, this typical citizen, James L. Colbert, serves as example of what should be the actions of every American.

A father, devoted to his family, yet he is inspired to the service of his neighbors and their children. He stands out today in Somerville as a shining example of what every man in the community should be in relation to community obligations.

It is fitting and proper that a veterans' organization, devoted as it is to God and country, pay a tribute to him on this occasion.

It is fitting because on Memorial Day we like to think that we have the tradition and heritage granted to us to carry in America, purchased by the death of young men, to whom is paid homage today.

A veterans' organization feel, as a group, that, having seen service in our country, we have a closer obligation to serve it, to preserve the heritage purchased by such expense.

We feel that one of the prime objectives is to have every American with a pride in country and a healthy regard for Christian goodness—love of neighbor.

In James Colbert we find in our city a man who has done everything that every citizen should do. He had dedicated himself to carry out the real purpose of America—dignity of man and inspiration of youth in American ideals. His qualities are outstanding in this community and exemplify everything everyone else is too busy to do.

Look about us—800 millions all concentrating on the destruction of America as the strongest of free nations. But look closer—here we see the need of the James L. Colbert. From within in every walk of life thousands of traitors, more thousands of "dupes" and tools of that form of godlessness. Educators, clergy in every walk of life. This is a startling condition to show why James Colberts are necessary in America.

A petition was filed with the United States Supreme Court that had 359 signers—15 were out and out Communists, dozens were notorious fellow travelers and then the balance on investigation, 100 were clergymen—28 percent; 89 were educators. Do we need men like our guest of honor? December of last year at Christmas a petition was filed with the President to grant amnesty to all of the Communist leaders who had been convicted under the Smith Act. Twenty-seven of the 46 signers were clergymen, more than half of them.

We know there is no excuse for anyone, in particular clergymen and educators, for being dupes, nor is there any excuse for any American citizen for being a dupe of communism.

It is easy to see why tonight a typical American has been sought out in Somerville for encouragement. We need more Jim Colberts. America today is sick by inactivity, yes, and the inactivity is shown in many phases in our community life. We are too busy to vote. We are too busy to go to church. We are too busy for our children, too busy to teach and help the youth to respect law and order, love of home and flamily. How fortunate we veterans are to have community service programs, to help fill in what should be taught and was taught on bended knee by a devoted mother. America, founded by God-fearing men, inspired by almost divine wisdom, has neglected the fundamentals, such occasions as this and so aptly held on Decoration Day only serve to emphasize this need of back to home and teaching of youth of everywhere the respect of home-constituted authority and Christian goodness.

Veterans are proud to salute James L. Colbert for his part as a true American, and one who at personal sacrifice gives his energy to the end that boys and girls of Somerville will be better Americans as a result of his leadership.

I am sure that tonight, the host heroic dead, their fathers and mothers, all pay tribute to James L. Colbert, for he is doing the work that will preserve America. For these United States will survive only if we can inspire a devotion to the goodness of mankind in the youth of America—if we can by guidance and inspiration help mould the characters of youth in a love for God and country which will in turn be reflected by acts of respect for constituted authority and Christian virtues.

The veterans of United States are indebted to the James L. Colberts of America for they have the foresight and the inspiration of service to their communities and are respected for it.

Tonight on this day of decoration, a day of homage to men who have given their all to their Nation in its defense—we salute you, James L. Colbert, as one who is on 364 days of the year paying a substantial tribute of homage to the same ideals, a citizen—outstanding by service to your city, an average man with about average ideals—an inspiration to the youth of the city but more than that—a shining example of what every man in the community should be—one who believes in America and can and will do something about it. Yes, James L. Colbert, you have done something about it and we all join in your praise and hope that your inspiration will lead others to share your work to the end that America will be secure through its youth and justify the challenge handed to us by the thousands who died to preserve its freedoms from assaults both from within and without.

The Late William T. Granahan

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of great sorrow that I learned of the death of my very dear friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN, on Friday morning, May 25.

Not only have I lost a good friend but the people of the district that he represented, the State of Pennsylvania, and the United States Congress have lost a very able, sincere, hard-working, and conscientious Member. It was a pleasure to have him as a friend, and I will always treasure happy memories of him.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to BILL GRANAHAN and extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Granahan.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

How About Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid—Mutual Security Act—has totaled approximately $55 billion since World War II; $38 billion in economic help and technical assistance; $17 billion in military aid. This is $330 per person or about $250 million for Dallas County's share. Just the interest on the foreign aid part of our national debt equals $10 per person every year in this country. Add to this our civilian and military payrolls in foreign countries, plus the huge equipment transfers at war's end. Now we are asked for an additional $4.9 billion foreign aid this year.

Congress always approves foreign aid, but with increasing doubt. The foreign-aid program keeps growing since we are told that "backward countries may be saved from communism" and aid is a military necessity in winning the cold war. Examples of waste, questionable economic practices, and glaring human errors are numerous. We know that some countries which have received aid are not less anti-American, and that Communist influence in others is as strong as ever. We wonder if, since our dollar gifts do not win friends, will Russia's "gifts" win friends for them? We know that $6.5 billion to $9 billion is still unexpended from earlier congressional appropriations and is yet to be spent. We also know that aid given to Britain—$10.5 billion—was partially used to reduce their taxes, that Denmark reduced her national debt. Mainly, the ever-present thought is to combate communism with our gifts.

The Communist appeal is obviously not to impoverished areas or "empty stomachs" alone. For example, France—$10 billion aid to date—grows more communistic, with one quarter the total vote now Communist. Communism seems to appeal to those oppressed individuals who through a sense of futility, frustration or isolation seek asylum in a movement which will give them the answers and tell them what to do. If so, the outlay of United States money will not win people away from communism.

The Communist aid technique is a constant sales effort through propaganda to, one, discredit the United States with claims of Western imperialism—even as Russia is the world's most imperialistic nation; and two, to stress Russia's desire for peace and world brotherhood of socialist nations who through socialism will raise the world's living standards to undreamed of heights. This political propaganda is behind all offers of "aid" so that even military aid is clothed in the guise of peaceful, brotherly economic help.

United States freely gives, while Russia sells. We reason that "economic collapse is the prelude to communist expansion," and wholeheartedly offer help. Example, United States gift of wheat to India in 1951 saved India from Russia. Since 1949 we have given $500 million to India and 750,000 tons of steel free. Russia offers to sell 1 million tons and is praised even as we are criticized. Is this winning friends?

Burma and Indonesia will not accept United States aid but appreciate Russia's offer to sell machinery and technical aid for rice. So Russia gains prestige by selling; we lose by giving. Could it be people dislike handouts? Can we gain by permitting countries to pit the West against the East to get more aid from either or both? Another comparison shows the intangible nature of United States aid, such as funds for technical assistance, salaries and help in agriculture, additional public health, sanitation, and others. Russia, however, deals in tangible with propaganda value—street pavement, storage depots, silos, pipelines; again United States loses. In short, the United States has lacked over the years a consistent philosophy or "sales pitch" representing our true greatness and generosity as against Russia's false claims of brotherhood and peace.

Our errors, now recognized, have included instances where we have subsidized allies who then ship goods to Russia—machine tools, and so forth—defeating our own policy of not shipping to Russia. Our aid builds foreign productive capacity and these businesses then take our markets. The deficit financing of our aid weakens our own economy. Too quickly have projects been undertaken without proper planning, to our later sorrow. Here are some specific examples, according to the audit report to Congress by the Comptroller General: In Iran the water drainage plant for sanitation was built but lost effectiveness because water still flowed through open gutters instead of pipes. The Fars Cement Plant was built, only to find a lack of raw material—limestone—needed to operate the plant. A cotton mill was built but available electric power was insufficient to run it. The Kerman Sugar Refinery site was selected but was subject to flooding, without accessible roads, and a supply of water. The rural community development project No. 64 involving schools, sanitation, water, irrigation, and farm tools was found too advanced for the long-term breaking down of the federal system of land tenure, precluding rapid or large-scale accomplishment—personnel was lacking and training programs far too slow.

The report on Pakistan calls attention to the "lagging program" where the 1952 and 1953 United States funds have not yet been used.

Afghanistan provides possibly the best example of all, namely the Helman Valley irrigation project. The Afghanistan Government secured $40 million from the United States Export-Import Bank which willingly advanced the money. The plant was built by an American firm which did a fine job. When finished—it was found there were no engineers capable of operating the project, no trained personnel. The natives did not know how to use the water to till their soil. They flooded their lands and then became nomads in disappointment. The Afghanistan Government did not get the revenues anticipated, and the yearly cost of $8 million was one-third of the government's entire budget, with not enough money in sight except the credit which Russia offered. So the Afghanistan Government was unhappy and blamed the Bank, the construction company, and the United States Government. None of the four agencies that participated had the final responsibility. The Afghanistan Government overestimated its ability and was encouraged by us. The construction company was responsible only for construction; the Export-Import Bank evaluated only the loan itself; the United States Embassy and a small staff found the project outside its realm. The United States had gotten deeply involved and had to go on. The net outcome—unhappiness all the way around. Lessons to be learned include: the need for prior study and evaluation, not haste, in government planning; that nations, peoples and customs differ, and must be handled differently, not all being ready for the economic development we anticipate or offer to them; United States prestige is always at stake and suffers; that United States has much to learn about helping others.

Other conclusions and questions that come to mind are these: Dollars alone or programs for underdeveloped countries do not make friends but can often alienate. Money alone does not assure our success against communism. The so-called military and economic help become confused and mistaken one for the other because United States policy has not been consistent. Competitive aid with Russia and other nations can only defeat itself without a consistent motivating philosophy displayed. With $6.5 to $9 billion on hand, why allocate more at this time? Since foreign aid, like foreign policy, should be flexible, is the

commitment of expenditure for dams and other lengthy projects a flexible program? Most obviously the United States has not been a "good salesman" of our policy. Finally, the subject of foreign aid is so complex and the cost so great that great care and study is necessary on the part of us all. Certainly a Congressman must think long and hard—and may include a prayer or two—before casting a vote to appropriate more money and to extend aid over longer terms in the face of our previous experiences. Now let us weigh the facts, and soberly, without political distortion, chart the practical course of United States enlightened self-interest.

The Prodigal's Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald by George Sokolsky entitled "The Prodigal's Return":

THE PRODIGAL'S RETURN
(By George Sokolsky)

Tito is really a product of the errors of the West. It was the betrayal of Mikhailovich by the United States and Great Britain that gave Tito his strength and authority.

Perhaps in the year 1956, the name, Mikhailovich, is forgotten but he organized the resistance to nazism and to Hitler in all the Yugoslavian countries; he organized on a democratic basis; he was opposed to the brutality of communism as he was to the brutality of the Nazi.

Opposing Mikhailovich was Josip Broz Tito, Communist, member of the Third International and until 1948, completely dominated by the Kremlin whose agent he was. After Mikhailovich had served the Allied cause, he was abandoned by them and Yugoslavia became part of the Soviet world with Tito as dictator.

Russia had no troops in Yugoslavia and therefore Tito was freer than some of the other satellite dictators. Years before when Earl Browder had proposed "American exceptionalism" to the Third International, it was Tito who most violently opposed the Browder concept of communistic nationalism, but Tito adopted this doctrine as his own and for it, in June 1948, he was expelled from the Third International which at that time went by the name of Cominform.

In a letter dated March 27, 1948, the Communist Party of Soviet Russia wrote to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia:

"We readily admit that every Communist Party, among them the Yugoslav, has the right to criticize the CPSU, even as the CPSU has the right to criticize any other Communist Party. But Marxism demands that criticism be aboveboard and not underhand and slanderous, thus depriving those criticized of the opportunity to reply to the criticism. However, the criticism by the Yugoslav officials is neither open nor honest; it is both underhand and dishonest and of a hypocritical nature.

Tito replied on April 13: "Among many Soviet people there exists the mistaken idea that the sympathy of the broad masses in Yugoslavia toward the U. S. S. R. came of itself, on the basis of some traditions which go back to the time of Tsarist Russia. This is not so. Love for the U. S. S. R. did not come of itself. It was stubbornly inculcated into the masses of the party and the people in general by the present leaders of the new Yugoslavia, including, in the first rank, those so seriously accused in the letter."

It was in this same letter that Tito wrote: "We cannot allow the Soviet intelligence service to spread its net in our country. We have our state security and our intelligence service for the struggle against various foreign capitalist elements and class enemies within the country, and if the Soviet intelligence agents need information or assistance in this direction they can obtain it whenever they want to; on our part, this has been done until now."

Considerable correspondence passed between the two countries and some of it was quite vituperative. But the essential error was to permit the betrayal of Mikhailovich by the United States and Great Britain and to build up Tito into a great international figure. Thus, our policy has again proved to have been without understanding and imagination.

Imports of Japanese Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when the tariff on cheaply made Japanese textile goods was lowered, many people said this would not affect our great textile industry. They argued that the American textile industry had superior management, more machinery and technical know-how. Some of us were aware and predicted at the time that this lowering of the tariff would affect the American textile industry not only because of the 12 cents and 13 cents an hour paid Japanese labor, but also because the Japanese industry was modern, well managed, and had the latest machinery.

Our textile industry has been seriously hurt already by this ridiculous policy and it will feel the effects more in the future unless remedial action is immediately taken by either raising the tariff on Japanese textile imports or establishing quotas. Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong for our policymakers to insist that we import Japanese textile goods when we produce more of these goods than the rest of the world combined. The logical place for Japan to dispose of its textile surplus is in those countries where they are ill clothed and have no textile industry.

The following articles about the disastrous effect of Japanese goods on the American textile industry appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the Greenville (S. C.) News, and the Anderson (S. C.) Independent:

[From the Washington Evening Star]
TWO TEXTILE MILLS CLOSE, JAPANESE IMPORTS BLAMED

NEW YORK, June 7.—Consolidated Textile Co. announced today it is shutting down 2 plants—1 in New England and 1 in the South—because of Japanese competition.

Lester Martin, president of Consolidated, said the Windsor Print Works, of North Adams, Mass., a subsidiary, would halt operations by the end of the week. It has been processing flannel shirting.

Mr. Martin said Consolidated is also closing a 500-loom print cloth mill in Martinsville, Va. "We are starting to run it out now," he added.

The textile executive was bitter in his denunciation of low-cost Japanese fabrics. "Japanese goods are cancer and they will kill the entire textile industry," he declared. "They should be kept out of the United States market entirely."

Several weeks ago, he said, Consolidated shut down another subsidiary, the Luther Manufacturing Co. of Fall River, Mass.—also blaming Japanese competition.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News]
MAINE SENATOR WARNS IKE ON TEXTILE IMPORT POLICY
(By Essell Thomas)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, today warned President Eisenhower that the administration's refusal to protect the American textile industry from foreign textile imports may defeat its national trade policy.

PAYNE issued the warning in a letter to the President urging prompt action by flexible import quotas.

The Republican Senator hinted that he himself may refuse to back the administration's trade policies unless a solution is found in the immediate future.

PAYNE recommended a flexible quota on textile imports on a temporary basis, scaling it high enough to allow exporters to share in the American market but low enough to halt the present trend toward a complete absorption of some segments of the domestic market.

PAYNE also suggested that American mills be permitted to buy surplus cotton at the same price it is available to the foreign competitor under the new export program. He also said the United States should aid Japan find markets for its textiles in undeveloped countries.

The New England Senator charged that insufficient consideration has been given to the importance of the domestic textile industry and to the effect which lowering tariffs on textile imports has had and is continuing to have.

He said present policies are creating conditions which could lead to the collapse of any domestic industry.

"It would appear that the domestic textile industry is carrying double burden: it is at one and the same time expected to decrease its share in expanding domestic markets; and is expected to carry high costs of raw materials to support a segment of the domestic agricultural industry," he said.

"For my part, it will be extremely difficult to continue to support our present policy if it continues to spell distress to the domestic textile industry," he concluded.

[From the Anderson (S. C.) Independent]
REPORT IS SHOCKING
(By Lou Schneider)

The entire American textile industry is shocked by the report of the United States Tariff Commission. It said imports "are not offering serious competition to most segments of the domestic textile industry" and that Japanese textile makers don't have an "across-the-board competitive advantage over the United States."

This Government agency, usually sympathetic toward tariff barriers to protect American industry, say textile men, appears to have gone out of its way to find statistics

to uphold the Japanese attitude that President Eisenhower's foreign trade policy will protect them.

The argument that Japan hasn't an across-the-board competitive advantage, or that the so-called high volume of imports is only a small percentage of the total consumption, don't hold true. The textile dispute is based on the big damage done in fixed sectors of the industry. Import of Japanese ginghams totaled only 3 percent of the United States gingham market in 1954 but zoomed sharply to a 40 percent last year, and is still running at a high percentage.

Despite the Tariff Commission findings and the Japanese voluntary quotas, the American industry will continue to demand higher tariffs or import quotas. All textile labor unions are behind this protective move. It will be a stiff fight. The White House, Department of State, and Department of Commerce stand firmly against any cut of imports from Japan.

Under the protection of the administration, Japan's trade will go on shipping into American markets. Thus Japan wins a diplomatic victory. But it will not win the favor of United States labor. This attitude will eventually reach consumer levels. In other words, this is the time for Japan to correct its long-term sales program if it hopes to maintain a position in United States markets.

Wesley A. D'Ewart Deserves Senate Confirmation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on Friday, June 8, 1956. The editorial argues that my good friend and fellow Montanan, Wesley A. D'Ewart, is entitled to a fair hearing on his confirmation as an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The editorial follows:

A HEARING ON MR. D'EWART

We hold no particular brief for the confirmation as Assistant Secretary of the Interior of former Representative Wesley D'Ewart, some of whose views have aroused conservationists. But we do think that Mr. D'Ewart is entitled to a Senate vote for or against his confirmation. His appointment has been pending since the first of the year, and he has occupied the post on an interim basis since last October—without any congressional action. Chairman Murray of the Senate Interior Committee announced last week that a hearing would be held on June 19. There were subsequent reports that Senator MURRAY had agreed to the hearing in exchange for an administration move to permit a go-ahead on the $100 million Yellowtail Dam in Montana. Now Senator MURRAY has vigorously denied these reports but curiously has vacated the proposed hearing.

It may be that the views of Mr. D'Ewart, who was appointed under Secretary McKay, will not square with those of the new Secretary Seaton. It may well be also that there is substantial ground for objection to Mr. D'Ewart's handling of public land matters, including the plan to set up a new separate Bureau of Fisheries. But it ought to be the due of any American to hear the charges against him in public. Elementary courtesy, it seems to us, calls for a fair hearing on Mr. D'Ewart's confirmation without any qualification, real or implied, by way of a horse trade.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I also wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York for offering this amendment.

I wonder if the members of the committee have been reading the news reports out of Moscow in the last few days. Apparently someone has brought to the attention of Marshal Tito the fact that attempts may be made here to eliminate all of our aid as far as he is concerned. He has been quoted in the press as saying that it is not important, that "our friendship with the United States will remain regardless of these attempts." I suppose you might say regardless of whether he is going to get any aid or not.

I notice also he expresses the desire to visit Washington in the next few months. I am wondering if that is also going to be in the cards.

Seriously, I saw on the ticker just outside a while ago that in Moscow he has signed a trade protocol with the Soviet Union, another example of how closely he is alining himself with the Kremlin at this particular time.

In discussing this matter of aid to Yugoslavia, Mr. Chairman, I think it sort of almost completes the circle that our foreign-aid program has taken in the last few years. When the Marshall plan was originally conceived the Soviet satellites, including Yugoslavia, were all invited to participate. They turned it down. Then we decided we were going to give aid only to our actual allies and our potential allies. Now we are aiding the underdeveloped areas, including the neutralist states, including pro-Soviet states. Continued aid to Yugoslavia under present conditions would be aiding frankly open enemies. I wonder if the next step after aiding Yugoslavia is going to be an offer of aid to the Soviet Union itself, thereby, as I say, completing the circle.

With regard to Tito, I would like to make a few personal comments. I remember Marshal Tito from firsthand experience. I first saw him back in December of 1947, about 6 months before he broke with the Cominform. At that time, and that was only a year, I believe the committee will recall, after he had shot down two American planes, he was hand in glove with members of the Kremlin. The break came 6 months later in June of 1948. I believe the break was genuine. I happened to be living in eastern Europe at that time. On that basis I supported aid to Tito for a number of years. I even spoke before groups which were avowedly anti-Tito. But all that policy has changed with the death of Stalin.

Today I am firmly convinced that Marshal Tito is back as strongly in the Soviet camp as he was prior to June 1948, and will remain there regardless of what we do or do not do.

I would also call your attention to one more thing, and that is also, I believe, on the ticker today. Certain prominent Yugoslav emigree leaders testifying before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body this morning stated, as I recall the news ticker, that American aid to Tito had been a disaster to their country, that it had created consternation behind the Iron Curtain on the part of people who could not understand our policy of building up the Communist dictatorship, that it had created consternation among the people we are trying to help, the people of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, to say nothing of the people of Yugoslavia, itself. They said it was a disaster as far as the entire list of Communist-enslaved peoples were concerned. They sincerely and earnestly hoped that this aid would be terminated and terminated immediately.

They also said one more thing, which I want very strongly to call to the attention of the committee, particularly the Members on my right, and that is they stated categorically that all of the assistance that had gone to Egypt in the past several months in the way of military aid, aid which has so deeply concerned many Members of this House, had been shipped from Czechoslovakia to Egypt via Yugoslavia.

So you can see what kind of friend Marshal Tito is, not only to us but to our allies, such as Israel and those other countries who are trying to remain free.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENTLEY was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this money is left in for Yugoslavia and Yugoslavia refuses to take it, do you suppose it would be forced upon them?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am sure the attempts of the administration to force Tito to accept it will be very great.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. You should have heard what Tito said. He recited a little couplet:

Those to us who aid do send
See no further than the end of their nose.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is a good idea of Tito's opinion of us. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Home of Medical Library Called a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. R. 11445, providing for the establishing of a National Library of Medicine in the city of Chicago. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article which appeared recently in the Chicago Daily News, under the authorship of William McGaffin, which discusses in a most informative manner this particular subject. In this article, Mr. McGaffin portrays in a most effective way the great need that has existed for many years for a good medical library.

The great city of Chicago is really the center of medical knowledge in the Middle West. It has many advantages that should be considered in connection with the selection of a location for a new National Library of Medicine. The reading of this article is recommended to all who may have even the least interest in this particular subject. The article from the Chicago Daily News follows:

HOME OF MEDICAL LIBRARY CALLED A NATIONAL DISGRACE—CHICAGOANS HOPE TO GET UNITED STATES TO LOCATE NEW BUILDING HERE

WASHINGTON.—The world's largest medical library is housed in a 69-year-old building here that is a national disgrace.

A bill now pending before Congress would authorize a new building for the Armed Forces Medical Library, or National Medical Library as it will be renamed.

Chicagoans hope the new library will be located in Chicago.

A new building was needed 38 years ago when talk about one first started. Congress twice has passed appropriations. Various factors, however, always have got in the way so that the project never has been carried through.

Now the situation is approaching desperation. I can testify to this from first-hand observation. I have just taken an inside tour of the grimy red-brick building at Seventh and Independence.

I went into restricted areas never seen by the general public.

Under the personal escort of Lt. Col. Frank B. Rogers, the Library Director, I walked from the basement to the fourth floor attic.

Here are some of the disquieting things I saw:

Space is at such a premium that stacks have been set up in the old coal bins in the basement.

A steam pipe running overhead exposes the books to extreme changes of temperature. A water pump broke down the other day and sprayed them.

Old-fashioned skylight windows, put in in the days before electricity, leak when it rains and canvas tarps are kept handy to throw over the books.

A constant fire hazard that is inevitable in a building with only one staircase and with exposed electrical wiring.

Already a priceless collection of the world's medical literature dating back to 1094, the library is growing at a rapid rate.

It receives about 10,000 medical periodicals and adds 25,000 volumes a year.

The total collection to date comes to 961,631 items—counting books, theses, pamphlets, microfilms, portraits, and pictures.

It is so large that part of it has had to be kept in a separate library in Cleveland 400 miles away.

Even with improvisations of this nature, space is fast running out. In 2 years' time the stacks here will have reached their maximum capacity.

After that, the books will have to be piled on the floors and windowsills, and moved into grossly inadequate temporary buildings across the street.

Your respect for the dedicated personnel of the library grows when you see the efficient job they are managing to do despite extremely difficult conditions.

The books in this remarkable storehouse of knowledge do not grow dusty from disuse. For, as Senator HILL, of Alabama, Democrat, puts it, "This medical library is a living, vibrantly functioning institution, serving members of the health professions daily and in a myriad of ways."

It is, as its director, Colonel Rogers observes, by and large, a mail order library.

The biggest volume of its loans are microfilm and photostat reproductions of material in the library. More than 100,000 such requests are mailed out each year.

In addition, more than 30,000 actual volumes are loaned yearly, largely in the Washington area.

Here are some of the special services the library performs:

It publishes a monthly Current List of Medical Literature. More than 100,000 articles collected from all over the world are indexed in this each year.

It publishes lengthy bibliographies, is at present working on one about the chemotherapy of cancer which will be the biggest on the subject ever production.

Senator HILL, who with Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Republican, of Masachusetts, is sponsoring the bill for a new building sums up the library in these words:

"It is difficult to exaggerate the important influence this library has had on the advances in the medical sciences throughout the world.

"It is impossible to gage its value in dollars."

Cultural and Citizenship Activities of the Bay Ridge High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick, principal of the Bay Ridge High School, recently told me of certain cultural and citizenship activities carried on at that school which impressed me very much. I asked her to write a short report about them and I am glad to be able to place her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Both the school faculty and the parent-teachers association, who are responsible for planning and carrying out the programs, are to be congratulated upon their important service to the community and the country.

The Bay Ridge High School is in the 15th Congressional District which it is my good fortune to represent and I am very proud of its accomplishments:

BAY RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAY: A very informative and interesting Polish heritage program was presented by the Polish Heritage Council at the Bay Ridge High School on Thursday, May 3, 1956. The affair was in commemoration of the anniversary of Poland's May 3, 1791 constitution. One thousand persons attended this affair which was held in the Bay Ridge High School auditorium. The principal speakers were the distinguished historian, Prof. Oscar Halecki, of Fordham University, and Mr. Ignatius Morawski, editor of the Polish Morning World. Mr. William A. Kostecki was chairman of the meeting and the honorary chairmen were City Magistrate Ludwig Golwa and Principal Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick, who also spoke. The invocation was given by the Reverend Arthur Demski of Our Lady of Czenstockowa Church.

The Polish heritage program that we presented that evening is part of the general policy of the Bay Ridge High School in reaching out into the community in order to bring to the school the cultural contributions that make for a solid American community. The basic philosophy that underlies our program can be epitomized in the statement that America is not a mere "melting pot" but a mosaic materpiece composed of the rich cultural and the fine moral contributions brought to us by all races, colors, and creeds.

We have similar groups of interested citizens of Irish, Norwegian, Italian, and Greek ancestry who cooperate with the faculty and students of the Bay Ridge High School in inculcating this great lesson.

A corollary of our basic doctrine is the firm belief that a constructive approach to the youth problems of a great cosmopolitan city is to emphasize to each and every young person that the land of his parents has brought many worthwhile gifts in the construction of this coutnry. This, we believe, tends to make the young people better citizens and stronger Americans. We feel that too many young people because of the humble origin of their parents and neighbors, tend to look upon, not only their ancestral lands, but their own families with disrespect. We feel this is an unfortunate situation since it is manifest that the family is the cornerstone of every solid civilization. By acquainting our young people with the deep rooted cultures that constitute our American background, we arouse in them the realization that each individual and each group that came to our country brought worthy contributions in appreciation of the benefits they received from our bountiful nation. In honoring the land of their forebears, we are adhering to the commandment, "honor thy father and mother" by creating in them a desire to be worthy children and better citizens of the United States of America.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,
ELIZABETH T. FITZPATRICK,
Principal.

Tito Top Red in Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the June 7 edition of the Evening Star by Constantine Brown entitled "Tito Top Red in Mediterranean":

TITO TOP RED IN MEDITERRANEAN—YUGOSLAV DICTATOR SEEN DUE TO HEAD NEW DANUBIAN-BALKAN SETUP

(By Constantine Brown)

One of the main none-too-secret diplomatic weapons of the U. S. S. R. is Marshal Tito, who this week made his triumphant entry into Moscow.

According to diplomatic observers in the Soviet capital, the renewal of "permanent ties" between the Soviet duumvirate and the Yugoslav dictator will have important chain reactions which will be noticeable only as time goes on. Among these, it is believed, will be the creation of a new Danubian-Balkan confederation with Marshal Tito as its leader. This has been the Yugoslav dictator's dream for many years and was one of the reasons he stubbed his toe with Joseph Stalin. When he began to press this idea "Uncle Joe" decided to cut him down to a boy's size. Fortunately for Tito, Uncle Sam was around the corner and rushed to his rescue.

Now Marshal Tito's ambition to be top man in a confederation comprising nearly 100 million peoples is close to realization, if the prognostication of Western diplomatic observers in Moscow proves accurate. There is no question that Yugoslav is the foremost military power in the Balkans. Its personnel always has been excellent. Thanks to the military assistance that country has received from the United States over a period of 8 years, its equipment is as up to date as that of any other Western military force.

Marshal Tito's prestige, which was somewhat doubtful while he was chained to Stalin's chariot, has been enhanced by America's and Britain's courtship and wooing. The warm receptions he enjoyed in Egypt, India, and Burma were far less impressive than his state visit to London and this year to Paris, when the French Government spent nearly $2 million, mostly for security measures. The former MVD man, whom the other Balkan leaders looked on as their equal in the days when Yugoslavia was just another Soviet satellite, now has gained a position of unmatched preeminence in that section of Europe.

The idea of a Danubian-Balkan confederation within the Soviet orbit is not particularly new in the minds of the men in the Kremlin. It was one of the motives which prompted them to give Austria her full sovereignty in the hope that the little Danubian Republic eventually might be forced by economic necessities to join Moscow's satellites. And if Greece showed interest in joining this Red coalition, so much the better.

Marshal Tito is, of course, now recognized by Moscow as the only man who can put such a deal through. His close contact with the Greeks, his strong stand in favor of Cyprus, his prestige among the Balkan gauleiters, and his thunderous voice in world affairs make him the ideal choice to lead such a confederation for the greater glory of the Communist goals. Moreover, Marshal Tito's closeness to the Arab leaders and particularly to Prime Minister Nasser gives him a strong position in the eastern Mediterranean.

Diplomatic observers also have noted that the Italian Communist chieftain, Palmiro Togliatti, visited him in Belgrade just before Marshal Tito's departure for Moscow. According to what has transpired from Communist quarters in Rome, Togliatti's mission was to bring about a closer coordination between the Italian Communist Party and its Yugoslav brothers.

Thus the ultimate result of the present conferences between the Belgrade and the Kremlin leaders is expected to be that Marshal Tito will become the dominant figure not only in the Balkans but also in the strategically vital eastern Mediterranean.

When this country, with Britain's cooperation, rushed to the assistance of the man Stalin had so rudely discarded, the main argument was that if we did not take immediate steps to bolster him up, the West's position not only in the Adriatic but also in the Mediterranean, east of Malta, might become endangered. The maintenance of that strategic position was worth any amount of billions, it was then said.

Now it looks as though the sand castle built by us and Britain on a foundation of upward of $1 billion might collapse, merely because the Bulganin and Khrushchev team has decided to accept the Yugoslav dictator as its equal in the great Communist fraternity. Those in Washington who still insist that military and economic assistance to Yugoslavia should be continued no longer argue military necessities. They talk about political and diplomatic strategy and say that after having gained Marshal Tito's friendship through our unselfish support, it would be fatal to annoy him.

We are now moving toward some kind of coexistence, they say, and the wind of friendship from the Kremlin is blowing away the cold war clouds. The possibility that this warm wind might turn into a tornado is recognized mainly by the responsible military men and the relatively few diehards who want deeds and not words.

Tito's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the June 5 edition of the Detroit Times entitled "Tito's Choice":

The important news is what is happening in Russia. The several aspects of the situation are really parts of the whole, and we shall treat them that way.

A Communist "traitor" beyond the pale in 1948, Yugoslavia's Tito is now lapping up ice cream and exchanging toasts of everlasting friendship with Communist Party Boss Khrushchev in Moscow.

There is an ironic applicability of the lines of Poet Robert Browning in the middle of the last century: "How sad and bad and mad it was (in 1948)—but then, how sweet it was (in 1956)."

Among the points to remember in thinking about Tito's return to the Kremlin's embrace is that he has always been a Communist. Since the 1948 break until now, he has clearly been playing in both ways from the middle; turning to the West (meaning chiefly the United States) for military and economic aid, and still remaining a Communist.

It appears to us he can no longer play it this way, although undoubtedly he will try. Since 1948 this Nation has poured $1 billion into Yugoslavia and there are $15 million more earmarked for this year.

Now Tito has made his choice. He has elected to return to the Kremlin. So it seems to us this country's course is imperative and logical. It is cut off the projected $15 million and put it to far better uses—in such things as roads, health, slum clearance in this country, or if a giveaway seems necessary, to the two democratic members of the Balkan Pact, Greece and Turkey.

We are not saying this in a mood of angry retaliation. We are saying it in calm appraisal. If Tito decides to join up again with Russia, that is his choice. But he can no longer expect the West to treat him and his country, as let us say, quasi friends.

And that brings us to the Molotov motif, meaning the downgrading of old Iron Pants from foreign minister to a member of the Presidium (the ruling cabal). Molotov has been slugged but he is still on his feet.

It is quite likely Molotov's demotion was timed with Tito's arrival, since it was Molotov on the orders of Stalin who called Tito a traitor to communism.

But it goes deeper than that. Molotov, as William Randolph Hearst, Jr., pointed out in his Editor's Report Sunday, has been on his way out for a long time.

He had to be. Molotov is a remnant of the Stalin regime, so he was dispensable, and he was dispensed. On the efforts of the present dictatorship to renounce Stalin the latest of interest in the secret text of what Khrushchev had to say about Stalin during the Communist Party Congress in February. Khrushchev was much tougher than expurgated reports indicated.

He called Stalin a coward, a brutal, capricious egomaniac, and a mass murderer.

These very words about Stalin have been printed a number of times in the Hearst newspapers. The interesting thing is that the truth now has been acknowledged by the present Russian leaders, and the purpose, of course, is to persuade the world that the Soviet objective has changed.

It has not. It is still to conquer the world, and let us keep remembering that. We'll give odds around here that Stalin's remains will be removed from the Kremlin tomb ere long.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. It is my very sincere hope that the arguments that have been advanced with respect to the necessity for this additional and relatively small amount to the Republic of Guatemala will receive the approval of the House, and thus the pending amendment will be passed. We should bear in mind that Guatemala represents the one nation in the world today which, having come under the domination of international communism, successfully threw off the yoke and returned to the ways of freedom and of democratic processes.

Guatemala needs the small amount that is here suggested. In many quarters it has been charged that having assisted Guatemala to resist the aggression, we turned our national back on them and with the successful termination of hostilities our interest in the welfare of the people of that country lapsed. Certainly I do know—and I might say paren-

thetically that I know that small and beautiful republic and its people well—that the people of Guatemala are an industrious and friendly people. They are determined and courageous, and I believe them to be a people who will use this additional amount of money wisely and well if provided by the Congress.

The economy of Guatemala during the period of the Communist regime there was good, largely because of the price of coffee. Unfortunately, since that time the basic single-crop economy has suffered to a substantial degree by reason of a depression in the world market price of coffee. I am confident that Guatemala will make progress under the administration of President Armas. I am certain that it will in due course become a leader in the Latin American world. The eyes of all the republics of Latin America are today on the Republic of Guatemala as they are also upon the United States. What happens in Guatemala will in large part condition the thinking of millions of Latin Americans in all of the republics to the south of us.

It seems to me that in our own national self-interest as well as in the interest of the inhabitants of Guatemala, who are in large part anti-Communist, that we will act favorably on the pending amendment. It is to be hoped that the House will undertake to consider favorably the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made and also to thank him for the support he gave me when I offered an amendment in committee which, with his help, carried, to aid Guatemala to the extent of $5 million additional.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to assist the gentleman in committee, and as those of you who heard me previously speak this morning know, I have not attempted to increase any other item since.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from California and also with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in favor of the amendment. I have had the privilege of visiting Guatemala. I know something of the conditions there left by the Communists when they were kicked out.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the arguments that the gentleman from California has made and that the author of the amendment has made are so convincing that the amendment ought to pass unanimously. I have made several visits to Guatemala and I hope that little country will survive and become a good, strong, free country again.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Let me say this, that we have in Guatemala a substantial ally in the Western Hemisphere. We have an ally which has proven itself, which has given a demonstration of the dedication of its substantial leadership to the principles of human freedom. Certainly the amount that is here requested is not great as we consider sums today, in relation to other provisions of this bill. I sincerely urge a vote in support of the amendment.

Laying at Rest Some More False Arab Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Don Peretz from the January 1956 issue of Jewish Social Studies is important reading to those who wish to better understand Arab-Israeli relations:

ARAB BLOCKED BANK ACCOUNTS IN ISRAEL[1]

(By Don Peretz)

The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine (CCP) was set up in 1949 for the purpose of establishing peace between Israel and the Arab nations. One of its major efforts and accomplishments was the release of about 6,000 Arab refugee accounts in Israeli banks, with a total value of approximately £P4,000,000. These accounts were blocked in 1948 by an order issued by Israeli's Government which provided for the freezing of absentee property. Although the issue of the blocked accounts of Arab refugees is an integral part of the question of the absentee property of the Arab refugees and is closely linked to the problem of compensation for such property, it has been treated by the CCP as a separate problem, particularly after this agency began to shift its activities from political to functional areas. Since the failure of the Paris Conference in 1951,[2] the CCP has concentrated nearly all of its efforts on compensation and blocked accounts. However, the only tangible result of its work is the Israel Government's agreement to release the frozen Arab accounts. For this reason, this act assumes significance far beyond Israel's contribution to a settlement of one of the Palestine problems.

Both Israel and the United Nations underscored the importance of the release of the accounts. Israelis repeatedly emphasized that the first and only direct contact through the CCP between their Government and the Arab States had taken place on the occasion of the negotiations on this question. The CCP felt that agreement on blocked accounts was a step toward peace and used it as a touchstone of the two antagonists' attitudes toward a conclusive settlement.

Parleys leading to the first release of blocked accounts late in 1953 extended over a 4-year period because of a complex of technical and political factors. There were problems of transfer, procedure, and responsibility. Israel's tenuous foreign-exchange position and the Iraqi Government's decision to freeze Jewish property further complicated the matter. Misunderstandings caused a constant recurrence of difficulties. Political implications of the issue of blocked accounts generated internal commotion within Israel and the Arab States. In the latter the question threw open the whole issue of recognition of Israel and once again emphasized the violent psychological reactions to any step which might involve official acknowledgment of the new State's de facto existence.

It was claimed that release of the accounts would help to improve the living conditions of the Arab refugee. However, its significance in relation to the overall social and economic situation of the approximately 850,000 refugees is illustrated by the following figures: (1) The total number of the frozen accounts was approximately 6,500, of which 450 belonged to Jews who were in Arab countries at the time of the issuance of the freezing order. (2) The total value of the accounts was around £P4 million, of which approximately £P500,000 were unfrozen outside the U. N. scheme. (3) More than half of the accounts were less than £P100. Only 1,200 accounts were over £P500. The distribution of the Arab accounts was as follows:[3]

	Up to £P49	£P50 to £P99	£P100 to £P149	£P150 to £P199
Number	2,800	523	435	275
	£P200–£P249	£P250–£P499	£P500–£P999	£P1,000 and over
Number	300	300	520	680

EARLY NEGOTIATIONS: THE GENEVA AGREEMENT AND THE PARIS PROPOSALS

Israel's custodian of absentee property froze the accounts of the Arab refugees in December 1948 by virtue of the authority granted in the emergency regulations concerning abandoned property.[4] The accounts remained under his jurisdiction until the first releases in 1953. The Arab States brought the subject of blocked accounts to the attention of the U. N. at Beirut in March 1949.[5] Among the duties assigned to the CCP's technical committee on refugees was an examination of such problems.[6]

Shortly after the CCP began its field operations, it requested Israel to allow the Arab refugees access to all or part of their blocked accounts. The commission's general committee was charged with studying immediate possibilities of action in answer to an Arab request for measures to protect the rights of Arab Palestinians. In June 1949, Israel agreed to discuss a reciprocal agreement with the Arab States in which there would be a mutual release, in equal proportions, of Arab accounts frozen in Israel banks and of Jewish accounts frozen in the Arab countries. After the Arab States accepted the arrangement, a mixed committee of experts under a neutral chairman was established to study and recommend means of releasing the funds. The committee consisted of 1 Israeli, an Egyptian representing 4 Arab States (Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon) and the CCP's principal secretary who acted as chairman. This constituted the first and only direct official contact between Israel and the Arab States in the long history of otherwise unsuccessful attempts to bring together the two sides in negotiations for a final peace settlement.

The committee initially restricted its activities to examining a procedure for unfreezing the accounts. It reached an agreement on the principle of mutual release. However, unfreezing on this basis could not be effected because only Syria had taken

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

steps to block accounts of Israel's residents and the total sum involved—only a few hundred pounds—was too small to make possible any significant reciprocal action.

Consequently, the mixed committee adopted a new procedure at a meeting in Geneva on February 15, 1950. They agreed that, pending a final settlement, every refugee who had a bank balance in Israel could receive an advance on his account up to £P100. The funds would be advanced in local currency by institutions or by the Arab governments to refugees living in their territory, and would be guaranteed by an amount in Palestine pounds which the Government of Israel would deposit to the account of the institution or government concerned. The deposit would be administered by a trustee, in accordance with Israel's conditions. It would be released to the institution or government which had made the advance as soon as a final settlement was reached. The CCP also recommended that the Bank for International Settlement be appointed as trustee for the operation. However, the bank would not accept this arrangement because of its political implications. Instead, it was planned to conclude seperate agreements with a trustee chosen for each country concerned.[7]

At the Fifth General Assembly in 1950, Foreign Minister Sharett emphasized the political importance of the negotiations and of the February agreement. He stated that it was significant that the "sole occasion when Arab Governments had agreed to meet with Israel in joint session under the chairmanship of the Commission, the meeting had resulted in agreement."[8]

Although the CCP also commended the agreement as an indication of Israel's sincerity, banking difficulties prevented an early release of funds. The difficulties limited negotiations to the matter of accounts of refugees in Jordan. There it had been found possible to release advances from sterling sources, with the understanding that they would subsequently be repaid from the accounts when they were unfrozen.[9]

During 1950, the CCP continued in vain its unsuccessful attempts to overcome the technical obstacles blocking the release,[10] while Israel's custodian of absentee property claimed that steps were being taken to unfreeze the bank deposits of a few Arab refugees who had legally returned to the country.[11] Efforts to obtain release were seriously retarded in March 1951 when Iraq adopted a law freezing property—including bank accounts—of Jews emigrating to Israel. The Israeli press and Kneset opposed any compromise on the release of Arab accounts at that time.[12] A protest sent by Foreign Minister Sharett to the United Nations, the United States, and the United Kingdom, made the point that Iraq's move would affect Israel's position on compensation and release of blocked accounts.[13]

One of the five comprehensive proposals submitted by the CCP at the Paris Conference in 1951 called for the mutual release of blocked accounts by Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, with consequent payment in pounds sterling.[14] However, the Commission acknowledged that nearly 3 years of negotiations on the issue "were not productive" and that efforts to agree on a formula for even a partial release had been unsuccessful.[15] Because by this time the ownership, identity of owners, and amount of each account had been established, the members of the CCP thought that the matter could be easily settled. To cite: "In this regard there are no questions for negotiation and under these conditions payment to the individual owners of the accounts can be readily effected." The Commission reemphasized that agreement on this issue "would contribute to the well-being of the refugees and would be a step in the development of peaceful relations."[16]

Israel's representatives took up the Commission's point that negotiations on the issue had produced the only direct contact with the Arab delegations. They complained, however, that the technical obstacles were not the only difficulties that blocked the settlement of the issue and charged that the agreement reached in February "could not be put into practice owing to lack of cooperation by the Arab governments in implementing it." The Israelis also emphasized that any settlement would be conditional upon the freeing of Jewish deposits blocked by Iraq.[17]

The Egyptian delegate answered that the Arabs did not oppose the proposal, particularly as they had accepted it in principle at Lausanne. "The only desire of my delegation is that the formalities of unfreezing should be undertaken as soon as possible, for the freeing of the assets * * * would be of considerable assistance."[18]

THE FIRST INSTALLMENT

The question lay dormant until the end of 1951 shortly after the Sixth General Assembly. Early in 1952 the Commission reconvened in New York to discuss problems of compensation and blocked accounts. It was decided to reopen the issue by resuming negotiations with Israel to ascertain its position and to consider what further steps should be taken to secure the release. On the basis of Israel's reaffirmation of its offer at the Paris Conference further steps were to be initiated to proceed with the release plan.

In May 1952 the CCP authorized Ambassador Ely Palmer, the United States representative on the Commission, to undertake on its behalf a demarche with Ambassador Eban urging that his Government unconditionally release the blocked accounts. It was believed that some 20,000 to 30,000 Arab refugees might eventually be affected by the action, and that "opinion toward Israel in the Arab States would be perceptibly affected by an act of goodwill in this matter."[19]

Israel appreciated the CCP's desire to improve its relations with the Arabs, but pointed out again that bank accounts of many Jews from Arab countries, especially Iraq, were still held by the Arab governments and banks. "It would be reasonable to expect that the interests of these refugees from Arab countries should be treated with no less concern than those of Arab refugees from Israel." Nevertheless Israel did agree to discuss measures for gradually releasing accounts held by Arab refugees in Israel "subject to the overall foreign exchange position of the country."[20]

In the Commission's view, Israel's answer expressed a desire to make a practical contribution toward the alleviation of the lot of Arab refugees and the advance of peaceful relations between Israel and the Arab countries. The CCP's Chairman expressed his satisfaction with the response which he considered "an important step toward the settlement of * * * differences * * *." Israel's action was in accord with the General Assembly position that the governments concerned had primary responsibility for settling outstanding differences in line with resolutions of the United Nations.

As negotiations proceeded, it became clear that there had been a misunderstanding between Israel and the Commission. The latter believed that Israel had agreed to release to their legitimate owners all blocked accounts, regardless of the amounts involved. It understood that the agreement was to be unconditional regarding both release of Israeli accounts blocked in the Arab countries and the final settlement of other issues. The act was to be unilateral. The only restrictive factor was to be availability of foreign exchange.[21] On the other hand, on July 17, 1952, Israel merely renewed its offer made 2 years earlier at Lausanne to release only amounts up to £P100 from each bank account. The total was expected to be about £P500,000. While the offer was not linked with a request to the CCP to arrange for release of Jewish accounts frozen in Iraq, the Israeli authorities stated that "it is hoped that action to that end will be taken."[22] That was a condition in Ambassador Eban's original offer to free the Arab accounts. After several months of negotiations with the United States, Israel's delegation to the United Nations was persuaded to remove it. Only then did the CCP and Israel's friends in the United Nations recognize the offer as a genuine concession.

The concession was unpopular in Israel. Davar, the Histadrut (General Federation of Labor) daily,[23] felt that the offer should logically lead the Government to seek a more sympathetic attitude from the United Nations. "Israel's gesture is directed at the Arab States, which have done nothing toward a solution of the refugee problem," it commented. Its editors hoped that the Arabs would consider Israel's readiness to release the deposits and to help resettle the refugees in their present abodes as proof of the possibility of peacefully resolving other problems. The General-Zionist Ha-Boker,[24] commented that the Government made its concession to release Arab accounts on the very day when five Israeli watchmen were murdered by Arabs in the Negeb. It pointed out that nothing has been heard yet from the part of the Arab governments about the release of Jewish deposits which they had frozen arbitrarily.

Following the agreement on the principle of unfreezing the accounts, the CCP and the Israel delegations met to discuss technical arrangements. Matters of method, amount and time of release were yet to be determined and agreed upon.[25] The CCP believed that arrangements should be made between Israel and the banks concerned. It favored a normal banking operation in which Israeli banks would receive a government order to unfreeze all accounts. It proposed the transfer of funds to correspondent banks accessible to the legitimate owners, in stages according to the value of the accounts. The CCP offered to lend its good offices and to provide expert assistance, whenever necessary. "Such a procedure is consistent with the initiative and responsibility assumed by Israel," it declared.

Israel was prepared to implement the transfer by entrusting the banking operations to an institution which would act as the agent for all banks in Israel holding deposits, and for the banks which would be authorized to accept applications from depositors in the Arab countries. It indicated its willingness to enter discussions with Barclay's Bank, Ltd. (Dominion, Colonial and Overseas) and to use the good offices of the United Nations delegate from the United Kingdom to facilitate negotiations.

The CCP believed that as the transfer was to be by stages, an equitable system of payments to the account holders should be worked out. It, therefore, urged Israel to indicate at an early date the amount it was prepared to release at the first stage. The Commission suggested a system of priorities to give the greatest possible number of refugees their assets in the first installment and to provide sufficiently large amounts to individual holders at each stage to effectively alleviate their economic distress, with priority to small accounts.

However, Israel's delegation informed the CCP that in view of their country's international currency position the first installment would consist of only £P1 million,

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

which would be transferred at the rate of exchange of one pound Sterling for one Israel pound.[30] It agreed to give preference to small account holders. The release would be made in monthly amounts of £P50 from all blocked accounts up to £P500. Since more than half the accounts were less than £P100, the majority would be released in the first 2 months of the scheme. At the end of the first stage of the unfreezing operation all but 1,200 Arab refugees who held accounts of £P500 or more would have received all their blocked funds.

The Commission expressed the hope that securities and valuables in safe deposit boxes belonging to Arab refugees would also be transferred without delay. The operation would not require an allocation of foreign currency and could be considered a normal banking activity between Israel and the banks involved, with the assistance of the CCP. The Israel delegation promised that following agreement by Israel, the banks, and the depositors on the procedure for opening the boxes, its government would be ready to transfer the contents of the boxes, in accordance with the laws of Israel, and with the greatest measure of fairness.[31]

Conversations between Israel and Barclay's bank officials began on October 20, 1952, after the CCP had been informed by the United Kingdom that the bank was prepared to undertake the operation. It was proposed that the Ottoman Bank should also participate at a later stage. During all these parleys, an economic expert provided by the Secretary General of the United Nations was present.[32]

The talks were concluded early in November, and a general agreement on an outline of the release scheme was reached. A central control office was to be established at the Jerusalem (Israel) branch of Barclay's Bank. Barclay's was to prepare standardized application forms, setting out particulars to be given by every applicant to enable the banks to verify and identify the validity of each claim. All claims were to be sent to the depository banks for verification, after which they were to be approved by the Israel Custodian of Absentee Property, who would return them to the banks. The latter would make the transfer in pounds sterling or the equivalent of other acceptable currency to the appropriate bank on behalf of the claimant.[33]

Late in February the application forms were ready for distribution to Arab refugees through the local offices of UNRWA and the branches of Barclay's and the Ottoman banks in Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Cyprus, and Israel, and through the Banque de Syrie et du Liban in Syria and Lebanon. Actual distribution was to begin on March 1, 1953. The Israel Government announced that it would continue to receive applications until May 31, 1953. Applications received after that date or on other than prescribed forms would not be considered. The forms, which were in Hebrew, Arabic, and English, required the applicant to state his current address, his address on November 29, 1947, and to give documentary proof of this information, as well as data concerning his account.[34]

POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS OF THE RELEASE SCHEME

Israel's agreement to release refugee accounts came when the efforts of the CCP to carry out the other aspects of its mandate were at a particularly low ebb. The Commission had been employing all the procedures and devices at its disposal since 1949 with no tangible results. Finally, it began to doubt whether "any attempt on its part to undertake again one or another of these procedures would be fruitful." However, in evaluating the significance of its success in obtaining a release of blocked accounts, the Commission was encouraged to believe that further progress could be made in eliminating differences which separated the parties by "concentrating in a constructive way on individual issues and thus gradually reducing the area of disagreement." By successfully solving specific problems, the CCP hoped to eliminate many causes of friction and "generate sufficient good will to lead eventually to the undertaking of negotiations between the parties themselves." [35] Although the CCP was optimistic, the United States Department of State cautioned that Israel's concession was only the beginning of an arduous path to an Arab-Israel settlement.[36]

Israel's Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett emphasized that his government's concession was an experiment in arriving at arrangements with the Arabs. "It is clear," warned its spokesman, "that the absence of any positive reaction would not be received favorably." [37] Abba Eban, the chief of the Israel delegation at the U. N. Seventh General Assembly, emphasized that his country had responded to the United Nations' request despite heavy strain on its economy, especially at a time when the Arab Governments were doing everything possible to restrict Israel's economic capacity by economic boycott and blockade. Release of blocked accounts was causing a flow of currency to states that were jeopardizing Israel's own currency position. Surely, this move, he claimed, should demonstrate Israel's good will.[38]

The scheme was attacked by Israel's right wing press shortly after the distribution of application forms began. Herut, organ of the nationalist Herut (Freedom) Party, argued that this gesture would not change the Arabs' uncompromising position, but on the other hand, "it has caused Israel to forfeit a trump card in the effort to save frozen Jewish property in Arab countries. Commonsense would suggest that Arab assets should not have been released without reciprocal action regarding the assets of Jewish immigrants from Iraq." The paper believed it extraordinary that, at a time when Israel was in severe economic straits, when unemployment was growing, when new taxes were about to be levied, and when it could not even afford to buy jet planes, the government should permit itself to present a cool million pounds from funds and grants as a gift to the Arabs.[39] The General Zionist HaBoker compared the Arab refugees with the 4 million Sudeten Germans who were forcibly expelled from Czechoslovakia after World War II. It argued that the Sudetens did not claim compensation for their property nor did any foreign power justify such a claim. The Israel Government should have delayed compensation until the Arab Governments showed willingness to release frozen Jewish assets.[40]

On the Arab side, an attack was opened on the release scheme in Jordan early in March. Dr. 'Izzat Tanus, secretary general of the Palestine Refugee Committee, declared to the press that he questioned the legality of the application forms for release of blocked accounts.[41] He particularly objected to the application form,[42] which according to him, implied the recognition by the signatories of the legal existence of Israel, in contradiction to the Refugee Committee's policy of nonrecognition. Furthermore, he pointed out that the Israel Government deducted 10 percent of all refugee accounts for its compulsory national loan imposed on all bank accounts in Israel in June 1952.[43] Tanus felt that Israel had no moral or legal right to impose such a loan on the Arab refugees who were neither citizens of the Jewish State nor subject to its laws. He also objected to withdrawal of amounts of £P500 and over from all Arab blocked accounts by the Custodian of Absentee Property at the end of 1952. The Custodian took this action by virtue of the absentee property law of 1950 vesting in him all the absentees' properties and every right to them.[44] The Custodian's office denied that these withdrawn funds had been confiscated, and he promised that they would be returned to the absentee accounts. For the time they were being used as a loan to develop absentee property.[45]

Tanus' campaign induced Jordan's Council of Ministers to order branches of Barclay's and the Ottoman Bank and UNRWA offices to cease handling the Israeli application forms. The Jordan Government also requested holders of blocked accounts to stop submitting the forms "pending an investigation into the legal correctness, obvious confusion and mistakes included in the text." [46] It accused Israel of illegal confiscatory measure in levying the 10-percent loan and in removing accounts of £P500 and over.

Israel condemned the bad faith of the Arab governments. Its diplomats were instructed to call attention of diplomatic quarters to "the poor prospects for substantive steps likely to contribute to the relief of the Arab refugees' plight." According to the Israelis, "The Arabs proved once again that they intend to exploit the refugees' distress for propaganda purposes." Israeli official communications presented this point of view to the Western Powers that had influenced Israel to make the good-will gesture.[47]

In discussions with United States diplomats in Tel Aviv, Israel's authorities maintained that Jordan's sentiments were not in keeping with its declarations, for it had criticized Israel in the past for not releasing blocked accounts. Now when many refugees had the opportunity to receive their frozen funds, residents in Jordan were forbidden to take advantage of it. This could only mean that Jordan was opposed to solving the refugee problem and to clearing the way for peace.[48] Furthermore, Israel announced in the United Nations that it did not intend to compel anybody to accept the offer. "If a step intended to create good will was liable to cause friction, Israel could not consider it reasonable to allocate foreign currency, which she badly needed herself, for transfer to countries which consider this undesirable." [49]

The political storm stirred up by the new controversy was disconcerting to the CCP, whose members had so laboriously threaded their way through 4 years of delicate negotiations to attain this first tangible step in lessening Arab-Israel friction. To prevent a miscarriage of the whole operation, the CCP delegated John Reedman of the United Nations Secretariat to visit the various capitals concerned. The Commission also officially noted the Arab allegations concerning the compulsory loan and the removal of all deposits of more than £P500. It pointed out that Israel had informed the Commission that accounts under £P50 had not been subject to the 10 percent loan, and that the transfer of accounts over £P500 to the custodian "was for the technical purpose of facilitating the release of funds to account holders." The Commission also urged account holders to submit their applications, so that those in need could receive the first installment of the payments as rapidly as the technical work of verifying claims by the banks could be completed. The Commission assured the refugees that they would not "prejudice whatever other claims they may have, nor will this payment * * * in any way prejudice the claims of owners of accounts to the balance of their accounts." The CCP also requested the Governments of Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yeman to facilitate prompt sub-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

mission of applications, wherever possible.[46]

Reedman spent nearly 2 months in an attempt to reconcile Israel and Jordan. In the course of his travels back and forth between Tel-Aviv and Amman, the Arabs suggested that the words "State of Israel" be deleted from the forms and replaced by "competent authorities." Israel rejected this proposal, considering it an affront to its authority and sovereignty.[47] The substance of the dispute did not involve mainly procedure or technical matters but rather stemmed from Jordan's resentment of Israel's existence.

Meanwhile, the flow of applications almost stopped and it seemed that the number of accounts eligible for release would be quite small on the deadline day of May 31. However, when agreement was finally reached on format of the applications and the approval of the Jordan Government was obtained, Israel extended the deadline until July 31, and later again to August 31, 1953.

The final compromise of June 3, that led to the end of Jordan's ban called for the attachment to the original application forms of a special slip of paper issued by the CCP in English and Arabic, with the explanation that the 10 percent transferred to the national loan and the sums of over £P500 to the custodian would be returned to the accounts. The slip included the explanation that no political strings were attached to the release and that the rights of the refugees to their entire accounts were in no way jeopardized by signing and submitting the applications.[48]

When the deadline for the first installment expired, a total of 3,216 applications had been received, of which 2,689 were approved by the Israeli authorities. They accounted for £P720,743 of the £P1 million which Israeli had agreed to unfreeze. According to U. N. sources, applications were not submitted for the total because of inadequate information and publicity, especially in Syria, where the officials of the Banque de Syrie et du Liban that handled the operation had not been properly briefed. The confusion during the operation's suspension also contributed to the shortage of claimants.

Israel's original agreement with the CCP in 1952 called for releasing all accounts, with the reservation that the release be effected in stages, subject to the availability of foreign currency to the Israel Government. Interested in the completion of this task, the Commission informed Israel on February 17, 1954, that it was convinced that the balance of approximately £P3 million should be released and that the problems of the availability of currency could be worked out with the banks through the good offices of the United Kingdom.[49]

TEST CASES BEFORE JORDAN AND BRITISH COURTS

Barclay's Bank was particularly eager to settle the issue because of claims made upon it through courts in Jordan. On May 23, 1954, Jordan's court of cassation ruled that Israel's blocking of accounts did not release the banks from their responsibility to the Arab depositors. In a test case, the Jordan court ordered Barclay's Bank to pay £P6,000 to Mme. Bahiya Barackatt, a refugee from Jaffa, who had sued the bank 2 years earlier when it had refused to pay her the sum blocked in its Israeli branch.[50] Barclay's lawyers had argued that the banks holding blocked accounts had been forced to close in 1947–48 because of prevailing conditions of insecurity; that in such a situation of force majeure, they could not be held accountable for the consequences; that payment was barred by Israeli currency controls over transfer of funds outside the state; and that the depositors must apply to the branch banks that held their accounts. However, the court rejected these arguments and held that the main office of the bank was required to pay deposits held in the branches. Of course, the true reason behind the court's ruling was Jordan's principle of nonrecognition of Israel.

In a similar case carried through the English courts to the House of Lords, the blocking of accounts by Israel was held to be binding on the banks. The Arab Bank sued Barclay's Bank in England, for the sum of £582,931—the balance in sterling—of the Arab Bank's account in Barclay's Jerusalem branch, at the end of the British mandate in Palestine. The action was brought to determine the legal result of the outbreak of Israel-Arab hostilities on the relations between the two banks. The Arab Bank argued that its contract on current accounts with Barclay's Bank was wholly frustrated and that in its place the respondents were obligated to pay the appellants the equivalent, as money had and received, on the ground that they would otherwise be unjustly enriched. This would constitute an obligation enforceable wherever Barclay's Bank could be found. The bank contended that the effect of hostilities was different, that the contract between the parties was merely suspended; that the indebtedness of Barclay's Bank was not destroyed, but was an accrued right and, therefore, outside the general rule regarding abrogation. The balance, therefore, remained in existence only subject to the Arab Bank's right to sue for it after the cessation of hostilities. The Arab Bank lost its final appeal in the British courts when the House of Lords handed down a decision in favor of Barclay's Bank on April 1, 1954.[51]

Despite the decision of the British court, the banks felt that their position in the Arab countries became endangered by the Jordanian court order. Consequently, Barclay's informed the CCP in May 1954 that it had offered a sterling loan to the Israel Government sufficient to repay all the remaining blocked Arab balances. This loan was to be accompanied by a much larger loan to the Israel Government, at that time hard pressed for foreign currency. The Commission informed Israel of its gratification that the means had been found to facilitate speedy liquidation of all outstanding accounts and expressed the hope that the matter would soon be concluded successfully. In reply, Israel informed the CCP that it was prepared to proceed with the scheme, despite its disappointment with the results of the release. To avoid further obstructive interference "and insure genuine relief to all those entitled to benefit from the scheme Israel felt that it was necessary to enter direct discussions with the Arab depositors concerning new release procedures."

However, the CCP took the position that the Israeli proposal "would represent a departure from the agreement between Israel and the Commission for a settlement, which had been unconditional except for the question of the availability of the necessary foreign currency." In the Commission's view, the introduction of new procedures and Israel's demand for direct negotiations with the depositors, "would introduce a step which was unnecessary and which would, in all probability, prove unfruitful * * * to make the proposed negotiations a condition to the ultimate payment of the remaining accounts might jeopardize the entire scheme."[52]

DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS WITH REFUGEE REPRESENTATIVES

Despite this warning, Israel decided to open negotiations with representatives of the refugees. In the summer of 1954 Israeli officials began direct parleys in Paris with representatives of the General Refugee Congress of Palestine, one of several unofficial Palestine Arab refugee organizations. However, when the negotiations became known, the Government of Jordan objected, arguing that they were being carried on by unauthorized individuals. The Jordanian Minister responsible for Arab affairs stated that the unauthorized negotiators "would be guilty of 'treason' for making contact with 'the enemy')."[53]

Israel called Jordan's reaction "most extraordinary." It pointed out that the absence of any direct contact with the depositors had made the first stage of the unfreezing operation "a most lengthy, laborious and imperfect process, with the result that less than $2 million of the $2.8 million allocated was actually paid out and that with great delay." To avoid such difficulties, Israel had entered direct negotiations with the General Refugee Congress and had invited it to submit proposals for the release scheme. The list of proposals was "purely of a technical banking nature," and Israel had accepted it. The role of the Congress was limited to assistance in processing the applications. Funds would be paid directly to the individual depositor. The conclusion of the issue, in the opinion of Israel's delegation, lent support to the Israeli argument that the questions at issue between Israel and the Arab states could be solved only by direct negotiations. Furthermore, Jordan's reaction proved that the Arab Governments "are evidently quite prepared to do injury to the interests of the refugees in order to feed the passion of hostility and hatred against Israel."[54]

In the meantime, the CCP learned that on November 16, 1954, Israel's Government announced over the radio procedures to be followed by holders of blocked accounts for securing payment. The Commission noted that there were important differences between the procedures announced on November 16 and those agreed upon with the Refugee Congress, particularly, Israel's grant to the Congress of exclusive handling of application forms and authorizations for payment on behalf of the refugees. The November 16 broadcast made no such provision.

Accordingly, on November 25 the CCP asked Israel for clarification. It was informed that the steps announced in the broadcast described the entire procedural agreement between Israel and the banks. The Commission therefore assumed that the latter agreement was acceptable to the banks and that it (and not the agreement with the Refugee Congress) described the procedure to be followed. The CCP felt that it could assist in any arrangements for carrying out the release without further difficulties. Despite the differences of opinion that arose between Israel and the CCP, the latter derived "satisfaction from the knowledge that those differences were ultimately resolved through the very process of conciliation which constitutes the Commission's principal task."[55] By the beginning of 1956 the release was proceeding with only minor technical difficulties. More than half the accounts had been released, and it was expected that the balance would be unfrozen without major difficulty.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, to conclude successfully this small operation of releasing frozen Arab accounts, the CCP had to labor through 6 years of intricate negotiations. The difficulties encountered in achieving even this small advance are indicative of even greater obstacles to the solution of larger and more complicated issues.

On the one hand, Israel did not view the release of the Arab blocked accounts as an obligation. It tended to connect it with the whole Palestine problem. In view of the Arab refusal to negotiate directly a general peace settlement, Israel considered the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

release as a concession. It did not view the accounts as a debt to the refugees, because the problem was taken out of the total context of all refugee and Palestine issues. After it had released the first installment, the Israel Government expected some quid pro quo from the Arab States before completing the release process.

The Arabs, on the contrary, did not regard the release as a concession, but rather as a final implementation of the refugees' natural rights. They regarded Israel's move as a tactic to withhold the remaining three-quarters of the funds. In Arab eyes, Israel's concession was not at all related to a general settlement of the Palestine problem. Because the United Nations did succeed in obtaining some small part of what was due the refugees, the Arabs saw no reason to regard this as a step toward peace, nor would they permit such a concession to be used to strengthen Israel's political position. The Arab attitude toward the application forms for release of blocked accounts was characteristic of their suspicion of Israel's motives. The forms reinforced the Arab fear that one of their purposes had been to secure de facto recognition of Israel's sovereignty and authority over Arab property, which they were not prepared to grant. In general, the Arabs tended to isolate such problems from the total context of the Palestine situation and to insist that they were in no way related to a peace settlement.

In view of these sharp differences, it would seem that the CCP greatly exaggerated the psychological importance of the release plan. Its belief that this measure would advance peaceful relations between Israel and the Arab countries seems unjustified. Nor does its estimate of the value of the accounts to be released as a practical contribution toward the alleviation of the lot of the Arab refugees appear to be grounded upon fact. The figures presented at the beginning of this article clearly underscore the relative insignificance of these funds as a contribution to bettering the refugees' living conditions.

---

[1] This article is part of a large study of Israel and the Arab Refugees undertaken on a Ford Foundation grant in 1952–54.

The following abbreviations are used in the article: CCP—United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine; U. N.—United Nations; G. A.—General Assembly; OR—Official Records; PR—Provisional Records; Pol. Comm.—Political Committee; Supp.—Supplement; UNRWA—United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

[2] The Paris Conference (September 10—November 19) was a final effort by the CCP to find a political settlement of the Palestine problem.

[3] Interviews with officials of the Office of the Custodian of Absentee Property.

[4] To cite from paragraph 5 (a) of the Emergency Regulations Concerning Absentee Property, issued by the Minister of Finance, December 2, 1948: "Every property of an absentee is hereby vested in the Custodian from the date of publication of his appointment under these Regulations and every right which an absentee had in his property shall pass automatically to the Custodian from the time of such vesting." in Provisional Israel Government, 'Iton Rishmi (Official Gazette), supp. II, No 37, December 12, 1948, p. 59, The Law and Administration Ordinance, 5708—1948.

[5] U. N., G. A., OR, Ad Hoc Pol. Comm. (4th session), Annex, II, pp. 3–5 (doc. A/838).

[6] Ibid., pp. 5–9 (doc. A/927).

[7] Ibid., pp. 9–14 (doc. A/922); (5th session), Annexes, I, Agenda Item 20, pp. 9–15 (docs. A/1252/1255); (5th session), Supp. no. 18, (A/1367/Rev. 1), pp. 16–17; Ha-Aretz, February 15, 1950.

[8] U. N., G. A., OR, Ad Hoc Pol. Comm. (5th session), Summary Records, p. 454.

[9] Ibid. (Palmer).

[10] U. N., G. A., PR (5th session) (doc A/1793) CCP 9th Progress Report.

[11] Jerusalem Post, May 14, 16, 1951.

[12] Divrei ha-Kneset, VIII (1951), pp. 1358–62.

[13] Ibid., VIII (1951), p. 1358.

[14] The other four proposals were: (1) mutual cancellation of war claims; (2) Israel acceptance of the obligation to pay compensation to the refugees; (3) Israel agreement to a limited repatriation of the Arab refugees; (4) consideration of a revision of the armistice agreements between Israel and the Arab states.

[15] U. N., G. A., OR (6th session), Supp. no 18, op. cit., p. 4.

[16] Ibid., p. 6.

[17] Israel's representative, Abba Eban again emphasized the success of direct talks on January 12, 1952. Cf. ibid., p. 19; Ad Hoc Pol. Comm. (6th sess.), Summary Records, p. 213.

[18] U. N., G. A., OR (6th sess.), Supp. No. 18, op cit., p. 22.

[19] U. N., Department of Public Information, Press Release PAL/669, April 30, 1952; U. N., G. A., OR (7th sess.), Annexes, II, Agenda Item 67, pp. 3–4 (doc. A/2121).

[20] U. N., G. A., OR (7th sess.), Annexes, II, Agenda Item 67, pp. 5–7 (doc. A/2216).

[21] Ibid., p. 5.

[22] Jerusalem Post, July 17, 1952.

[23] July 16, 1952.

[24] July 17, 1952.

[25] Cf. Medzini, Moshe, in Ha-Aretz, July 18, 20, 1952.

[26] Cf. Government of Israel, Government Year-book 5714 (1953–54), pp. 138–139, 271, where the point was made that in 1951 only 18 percent of Israel's imports were balanced by exports. The country's total estimated income in foreign currency from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, totaled $305,100,000, of which only 18.8 percent was balanced by exports. Estimated foreign currency expenditure totaled $305 million of which Arab deposits accounted for $2,800,000.

[27] U. N., Department of Public Information, Press Release PAL/672, July 11; PAL/673, July 16, 1952.

[28] U. N., G. A., OR (7th sess.), Annexes, II, Agenda Item 67, pp. 5–7; U. N., Department of Public Information, Press Release PAL/878, October 9, 1952.

[29] U. N., G. A., OR (7th sess.), Annexes, II, Agenda Item 67, pp. 8–9 (doc. A/2216/Add. 1).

[30] Ha-Aretz, February 24; Jerusalem Post, February 24, March 1, 1953.

[31] U. N., G. A. OR (7th sess.), Annexes, II, Agenda Item 67, p. 7 (doc A/2216).

[32] Ha-Aretz, Oct. 14, 1952.

[33] *Ibid.*, Oct. 13, 1952; Jewish Agency, Digest of Press and Events, VI, No. 431, Oct. 24, 1952, p. 27.

[34] U. N., G. A., OR, Ad Hoc Pol. Comm. (7th sess.), Summary Records, p. 31.

[35] Mar. 2, 1953.

[36] Mar. 2, 1953.

[37] Filastin, Mar. 3; Beirut Daily Star, Apr. 9, 1953.

[38] The application forms originally issued included the following statement to be signed by all claimants:

"DEAR SIR: I hereby request you to apply to the Government of Israel on my behalf for permission to remit, for payment to me at the address stated below, such part or parts of any balances held by you on current, savings or deposit account in my name as may be authorized for payment to me now, or from time to time hereafter, by the Government of Israel, and in accordance with such stipulations as they may make, and I hereby request you to make such payments, as and when so authorized, in whatever manner you may deem fit, but without any responsibility on your part, and to debit my account with the countervalue thereof. I authorize you to furnish any information required."

[39] The Law on the Exchange of Bank Notes and National Compulsory Loan was passed by the Kneset on August 12, 1952. *Cf.* Israel Government, Sefer ha-Hukim (1950–52), No. 105, pp. 272–275.

[40] The Absentee Property Law, 5710—1950, par. 4 (a), in *ibid.* (1949–50), No. 20, pp. 86–101.

[41] A spokesman for the Office of the Custodian of Absentee Property stated that about £P2,500,000 were borrowed from absentee accounts for development purposes. The money was used largely in the rationalization be abandoned citrus groves. During the 5 years prior to 1953 £5 million were spent for this purpose.

[42] Jerusalem Post, Apr. 7, 13; Ha-Aretz, Apr. 7, 1953.

[43] Correspondence in Davar, Apr. 9, 1953.

[44] Ha-Aretz, Apr. 9, 1953.

[45] Ibid., Apr. 14, 1953.

[46] U. N., G. A., PR (8th sess.) (doc. A/2629), CCP 13th Progress Report, pp. 2–5; Department of Public Information, press release PAL/686, Apr. 11, 1953.

[47] Jerusalem Post, Apr. 28, 1953.

[48] Ibid., June 5, 8, 1953; Gideon Weigert in ibid., June 17, 1953; CCP press release, Jerusalem, June 18, 1953; U. N., G. A., PR (8th sess.) (doc. A/2629), pp. 2–5.

[49] U. N. G. A., PR (9th sess.) (doc. A/2897), CCP 14th Progress Report, pp. 3–6.

[50] New York Times, May 24, 1954.

[51] Cf. Journal of the Institute of Bankers (London), LXXIV, pt. V, pp. 221–222, 252–263; pt. VI, pp. 305–313; New York Times, Apr. 4, 1954.

[52] U. N., G. A., PR (9th sess.) (doc. A/2897), op. cit.

[53] New York Times, Nov. 5, 1954.

[54] Israel Government Information Office, Israel Digest (New York), vol. No. 46, Nov. 15, 1954, pp. 4–5.

[55] U. N., G. A., PR (9th sess.) (doc. A/2897), op cit.

Should We Give Away Our Textile Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues some information supplied by the Northern Textile Association concerning the flood of Japanese textiles into the United States which reflect the difficulties as encountered by our own industry today.

The American textile industry will be financially unable to absorb any more competition from Japanese importations of goods manufactured at an astoundingly low cost as compared to those borne by American mills. Many of the textile factories which have been indiginous to New England consequently have been forced to either close down or relocate to areas in the South where wages are appreciably lower. In any case we shall be faced with a growing number of ghost towns in New England, most of whose citizens are dependent upon the sole textile industry.

I believe strongly that our tariff authorities take a closer look at this

situation which is endangering the welfare and security of so many of America's textile workers.

United States imports of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan have continued to increase at an alarming rate during the first quarter of 1956. Imports of cotton cloths, excluding velveteens, are now at the annual rate of 244 million square yards—which is an increese of almost 700 percent over total imports from Japan during 1953.

The imports of certain specific fabrics, predominantly those with high labor content, have increased in an even more drastic fashion during the past 3 years. Imports of cotton velveteens from Japan reached the staggering total of almost 6 million square yards during 1955—an increase of close to 2,000 percent over 1953. During the month of March alone, imports of Japanese ginghams totaled 16 million square yards—almost three times as much gingham as was imported during the entire year of 1954. The current annual rate of gingham importations based on first quarter shipments to the United States is 121 million square yards—an increase of 1,876 percent over 1954.

During the month of March, shipments of 500,000 yards of voiles and lawns marked the beginning of what may become an avalanche of importations of these fabrics—made by fine combed mills in the United States, many of which are located in New England.

In addition to cotton cloths, United States imports of finished sheets and pillowcases from Japan increased 791,000 units in 1953 to almost 12 million units during 1955—an increase of 1,382 percent.

Just as fantastic have been imports of cotton wearing apparel, the bulk of which are cotton blouses and shirts, which jumped from a combined total of $1,315,200 during both 1953 and 1954 to an annual rate of $44,055,600 during 1956—an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

Examples of why imports from Japan are increasing at these astonishing rates is found by comparing the prices of some domestic and Japanese cotton fabrics. Japanese ginghams are selling in New York, duty paid, at 33¼ cents per yard, while it costs American mills 37½ cents per yard to make the same fabric. Japanese broadcloth sells in New York, duty paid, at 26 cents per yard, which is 4 cents below the cost of production in many American mills.

The invasion of the cotton textile market is only the start of what can be expected from Japan in the near future. Equipped with modern machinery and average hourly earnings of approximately 15 cents, the Japanese textile industry will soon be ready to export synthetic textile fabrics, as well as woolens and worsteds, at prices so far below the cost of manufacturing these fabrics in domestic mills that American producers will be completely unable to compete.

Highlights of United States imports of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan, 1953–56

COTTON CLOTHS

	Square yards	Percent change from 1953
1953	30,666,000	
1954	47,804,000	+56
1955	99,534,000	+224
1956 [1]	243,756,000	+695

[1] Annual rate based on actual imports during January and February and reports from Japan of March exports to the United States.

Highlights of United States imports of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan, 1953–56— Continued

COTTON VELVETEENS (PLAIN AND TWILL BACK)

	Square yards	Percent change from 1953
1953	277,000	
1954	64,000	−77
1955	5,754,000	+1,977

COTTON SHEETS AND PILLOWCASES

	Number	Percent change from 1953
1953	791,000	
1954	1,322,000	+67
1955	11,726,000	+1,382
1956 [2]	11,792,400	+1,391

COTTON OUTERWEAR

	Amount	Percent change from 1953
1953 and 1954	$540,000	
1955	873,000	+62
1956 [2]	2,448,000	+353

COTTON WEARING APPAREL

	Amount	Percent change from 1953
1953 and 1954	$1,315,200	
1955	15,762,000	+1,098
1956 [2]	44,055,600	+3,250

HANKERCHIEFS

	Dozens	Percent change from 1953
1953 and 1954	139,200	
1955	826,800	+494
1956 [2]	1,208,400	+768

[2] Annual rate based on actual imports during January 1956.

Sources: U. S. Department of Commerce and Japan Ministry of Finance.

Carelessness, Conservation, and Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and informative address that should be as widely read as possible, Carelessness, Conservation, and Construction, made on May 18, 1956, by Dr. John Fowler, immediate past president, American Academy of General Practice, at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, which took place in Washington, D. C., on the above date:

CARELESSNESS, CONSERVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION

It is my hope that this address will be viewed with the eye of a doubter and the mind of a skeptic. I hope it will be thoroughly analyzed and constructively criticized. At the outset, let me say that the general physician has a latent interest and a vital stake in the overall problem of rehabilitation. Also, he has a definite and inescapable responsibility. Since employment is a good therapeutic measure and rehabilitation precedes it, the two are insolubly linked together in our consideration. Following several months of study and research, reading literature of various organizations and departments, noting inconsistencies and weaknesses, observing indifference and woeful lack of information among those who should be informed, asking myself and others questions, many of which have not yet been answered, I can only conclude that much needs to be done on the ground level to develop well-organized and effective machinery to carry out the great purposes of this committee. However skillful the artisan, he cannot do his best work without the proper tools of this trade. However inept the workman, he can do better work with proper tools.

I shall briefly dispose of the first part of my subject, Carelessness. Carelessness is defined briefly as "wanting in care or interest; neglectful." I think this term can be applied to both the medical profession, individually and collectively, and other agencies on the top level, including rehabilitation organizations.

Insofar as the medical profession is concerned, most of the lack of care and interest has been due, I think, to the fact that this phase of the general physician's work has been, percentagewise, so minor a part, and the fact that the public at large, the patient himself, and the attending physician so long resignedly accepted the philosophy that, when means immediately at hand were exhausted for improvement of the patient's condition, the status at that point was accepted as the will of God. In many or most instances, the economic barrier was also present. This is still a factor on the treatment level.

With this state of mind, the majority of general physicians were not properly alerted to the fact that all about them facilities were being developed and improved (and available to them) for the continued and better care of these patients. Whether a more comprehensive and intensive effort to bring this to their attention would have been more effective without the rude awakening of individual responsibility, I do not know.

I do know that we, as general physicians, lost the initiative and, by default, lost our place of importance in this great field of medical endeavor. Yet, without the general physician, it will be difficult to reach more than 50 percent effectiveness. Narrow specialty level treatment has been emphasized to our exclusion as a body. It is my hope that this wanting in care or interest will soon be brought to an end, and we, in medicine, can retrieve for the medical profession, and particularly for the general physician, this phase of medicine which rightfully belongs to us.

If any doubt these assertions, that our part has been minor, I would refer them to page 10, paragraph 3, of the Bulletin, "A

Message to the Medical Professional on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled," in which appears the statement, "Even now, only 3 percent of the State's clients are referred by physicians." If this be presently true than someone other than physicians has been remiss. Could it be possible that the proponents of these programs neglected to study the basic philosophies of the general physicians? Could it be possible that there was overlooked the natural reluctance, a product of fear, of the general physician to participate in a program sponsored by the Government?

There are those now who look suspiciously on any Government activity, however worthy, which has the appearance of working with or for a Government agency. I think I know the philosophy of the present administration and the earnest devotion of the personnel working in rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped. So well, indeed, that I need exact no statement from them that they are interested only in a free and unfettered medical professional who, aware of its obligations, will meet them, and a vital concern for the best welfare of the patient, and the individual who can be profitably employed. That we all have weaknesses, only the foolish would deny. That there are many improvements which can and should be made, the thoughtful and wise admit. On method, there is frequently divergence of opinion—but on one thing we must all agree. The manpower of the medical profession is not sufficient to engage in all the details of rehabilitation. Hence, the organizations all over the country developed for this purpose must be used by us to achieve our goals. There must be better understanding and more effective coordination. That the Government's concern is justified, we must admit. That its aid to private facilities by grants to States on a matching basis to support these facilities, we must accept as a good and necessary thing. So much for our "Wanting in care or interest."

On the level of both the President's Committee and most of the national organizations set up for rehabilitation, I think the indictment can be made that such an analysis of true fact was not made by them and effective steps taken at the ground level to incorporate and use them rather than concentrating all effort on the superstructure.

In organized medicine, I think the importance of the personnel of rehabilitation committees appointed by District and State medical societies was overloked and were made, in many instances, without due regard to the personal interest of the individuals so appointed in the subject of rehabilitation, or indeed whether or not they had any knowledge of the subject.

I have observed in many meetings of medical societies that, when rehabilitation committees were called upon to report, almost invariably there was the statement: "No report." I think that the membership of most of these committees, if asked the question, "What is actually being done by the members of the society for active and effective participation in rehabilitation programs?" the answer would be far from satisfactory. Or if they were asked "What is the list of all organized facilities for rehabilitation of all kinds that exist in your country?" the reply would be equally unsatisfactory. Nor is there proper knowledge of jobs in the community fitting the needs and capacities of the rehabilitated.

It has been brought to my attention through many sources, that the personnel of many of the local lay-rehabilitation groups have more interest and enthusiasm than good judgment, and that failure to enlist the cooperation of physicians is sometimes due to the fact that they arbitrarily make moves which alienate medical cooperation. These personnel misfits are, I believe, the exception rather than the rule, and I also hasten to add that there are thousands of physicians throughout the country who have realized their responsibility and have excelled in rehabilitation efforts.

There are many notable exceptions who have been constantly aware, as general practitioners, of their obligation to go farther than most in the field of rehabilitation, notably doctors Gradie Rowntree, of Kentucky, and James Perkins, of Denver, Colo., and others in every State. This is the bright spot in this picture. I believe that we can get almost all general physicians to do the same. But they must be better informed and educated specifically in this field.

In the organization of private facilities, some local units are often directed by overzealous individuals who, in their enthusiasm, sometimes go beyond reason, and attempt to do things which encroach on medical prerogative. This, in such areas, does antagonize practicing physicians. These are facts which must be admitted. It will be noted that these are all observations, not criticisms. I do not think anyone is to be criticized for slow progress in a field the full import of which has not been appreciated or fully understood. The general practitioner of medicine wishes, at this time, to reclaim its share in the field of medicine which he has so nearly lost by the carelessness of default.

We desire to engage to the limit in our share of rehabilitation. We desire to see every employable handicapped person back at work. This is good sense, good economy, and good therapeutics.

The laws of every State should be carefully scrutinized to see if compensation insurance to cover these handicapped would be prohibitive for the employer, and, if so, methods of supplementing this for the benefit of the handicapped employee. This beyond the funds now available. The employer is justified in refusing to agree to a program which might jeopardize his financial stability.

Since, after months of study and compilation of data from many diversified publications, pamphlets, and material put out by individual facilities, it is my firm conviction that, from these scattered sources, most general physicians will not acquire the concentration of information which is so necessary for their understanding of the overall problems of crippling, rehabilitation, and employment.

I recommend that immediate steps be taken to compile a textbook containing a summary of the conditions most likely to lead to crippling, possible methods of prevention of amelioration and definite information as to when active rehabilitation should be instituted and where such facilities may be found, and that such a textbook be made a part of the curriculum of all medical schools and be the basis for lectures and information given to medical groups all over the country as well as an effort made to place such a comprehensive textbook in the hands of every general physician and specialist who should have interest in rehabilitation, as a member of medical society committees.

Suggested subjects:

1. Amputees: While a large part of this is now being done by the Veterans' Administration, the future will see the most of it in civilian personnel.
2. Heart disease: As a crippling disease (rheumatic, etc.).
3. Blindness: Its prevention, its early treatment, corneal transplants, trauma, cataracts, corneal ulcers, etc.
4. Cerebral palsy: Its five divisions.
5. Multiple sclerosis.
6. Arthritis.
7. Cerebro-vascular accidents, all ages.
8. Muscular dystrophies.
9. Poliomyelitis.
10. Diabetes.
11. Epilepsy.
12. Paraplegia.
13. Hemiplegia.
14. Tuberculosis.

Every condition which may lead to crippling should be evaluated at the time of its earliest recognition and efforts begun at that time to conserve all possible function rather than wait until the final static condition of the patient requires active rehabilitation. This, I believe, will reduce materially, the active field of constructive rehabilitation.

Also, every member of a rehabilitation committee of any medical organization should be required to familiarize himself with its contents and be able to disseminate accurate information at all times.

It is the basic philosophy of the general physician that it is his responsibility to provide the best possible medical care to the American people at a moderate cost. Therefore, he is particularly concerned that his patient receive care at a cost which he can meet. It would seem that the more encouragement which can be made to develop rehabilitation facilities in connection with hospitals with which he has staff connections, the more effective would be the care given the patient. It would be an advantage, also, to have a wing for the inboarding of such patients who do not require full hospital care and thus reduce the cost markedly.

While we note with interest the prospective construction in New England of the area's first rehabilitation center under the provisions of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (Hill-Burton program), it is noted that the construction cost is $800,000 for an institute building and will provide self-help accommodations for only 46 inpatients with separate facilities for both hospitalized and ambulatory adults and children.

While a facility of this sort is magnificent as a research center, it seems a staggering sum, per capita, in overhead investment, and falls far short of the needs for such a large area and, incidentally, the operation of such a center would be exclusively in the hands of narrow specialty groups.

The general physician is, I think, justly puzzled by the expenditure of such great sums of money for such small returns. Certainly he would find himself frustrated in attempting to get proper rehabilitation for his patient from widely scattered areas in this manner. In order to maintain interest he must have contact and at least a medium of control.

In our present-day social consciousness, there seems to me to be conflicting philosophies—on the one hand, we encourage rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped. This is good philosophy, good economic judgment, and excellent therapy both for the body and the mind. On the other hand, we encourage, and in some areas insist, retirement and cessation of employment at age 65 even when such idleness is conducive only to deterioration, economic loss, and need for therapy where none existed before. This is another problem in our humanitarian concept which causes us in general practice some concern. That is the fact that we are facing the increasing problem of the aged—those above 65 years of age who are in good health and have the capacity for years of gainful labor, yet in many instances, they are compelled to stop work and all too frequently deteriorate both mentally and physically. It seems to me that we should reconcile these conflicting philosophies and perhaps review the whole social structure in the light of all conditions and all facts.

The family doctor is vitally concerned with all these inconsistencies and is confused in viewing the parts and not the whole. He is trained to view the whole man, or a whole situation, and is concerned when one element contradicts the other. Particularly we should not on the one hand bend every effort to rehabilitate and employ, which is good,

and on the other hand allow perfectly capable and able men to be deprived of their employment because they have reached a certain age. Age is not necessarily chronological. A man at 65 may be more able and competent than a man of 45. Yet he is shunted aside to deteriorate and become one of the army of unemployed. We cannot condone this on the one hand and work feverishly for an opposite philosophy on the other.

It is time to harmonize these philosophies and speak out strongly against retirement at any given age. Let capability and competence be the sole guide. Otherwise, we compound our social, economic, and medical problems. I think we should make a far-reaching plan to analyze the probable disabilities with which we are so much concerned with the objective of anticipating and conserving as much as possible in the potential cripple rather than wait until attempts at rehabilitation is the only treatment at hand.

I think we should realize, too, that many of the physical problems and catastrophes which beset our population in middle life in ever-increasing numbers may have their genesis in past medical successes. Infant and childhood death rates have fallen. It is conceivable that many of these infants now living and growing to adulthood have in them a larger percentage of congenital defects which mitigate against longer life. Early degeneration could, therefore, be a possibility and the increased incidence of heart disease in younger people may be due to congenital constitutional deficiencies.

In summary, I would recommend as a first step in proper overall accomplishment in the field of rehabilitation that—

1. There be a thorough reevaluation of every rehabilitation committee in every unit of medical organization and that no man be reappointed or appointed to such committee unless he has a real interest in the subject and will engage to ascertain and disseminate to every member of his organization:

First, the importance of every member assuming his individual responsibility to his patient in the field of rehabilitation.

Second, be able to furnish him with a complete list of all facilities in his county and State which can be of assistance to him in rehabilitation to the highest degree in whatever field of disability or crippling comes to the attention of individual physicians.

Third, make stimulating reports at medical meetings. On the other hand, the various lay organizations should undertake to see that there is a reevaluation of its personnel in every facility and train all personnel who are not distinct assets to the organization, and also insist on proportionate representation of general physicians on medical advisory committees.

Fourth, a new textbook covering those disabling conditions requiring rehabilitation. This is essential.

Fifth, encouragement of rehabilitation facilities in smaller hospitals is desirable.

Sixth, actively interested committees on rehabilitation should replace indifferent committees in all units of medical organization.

Seventh, careful selection of working personnel in private rehabilitation facilities will be helpful in coordinating medical responsibility and lay effort.

Eighth, more planned editorials and articles in medical journals with particular attention to local society bulletins. Every physician should be stimulated to familiarize himself with all available types of employment for which the variously handicapped can be employed.

The general physician at long last recognized the importance of his role in the vast area of rehabilitation and accepts its responsibilities. It is my belief that most organized medical units will cooperate. We have assurance that all Government committees and agencies will cooperate. The large rehabilitation agencies such as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the National Rehabilitation Association have indicated a willingness to work closely with us.

This is a hurculean task but can be accomplished. What the mind of man can conceive, the hand of man can eventually do. Fragmentary effort is not enough.

J. R. FOWLER, M. D.

BARRE, MASS.

Two Texile Mills Close—Japanese Imports Blamed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my own remarks I am including an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Evening Star in its issue of Thursday, June 7 entitled "Two Textile Mills Close—Japanese Imports Blamed," as follows:

NEW YORK, June 7.—Consolidated Textile Co. announced today it is shutting down 2 plants—1 in New England and 1 in the South—because of Japanese competition.

Lester Martin, president of Consolidated, said the Windsor Print Works of North Adams, Mass., a subsidiary, would halt operations by the end of the week. It has been processing flannel shirting.

Mr. Martin said Consolidated is also closing a 500-loom print-cloth mill in Martinsville, Va. "We are starting to run it out now," he added.

The textile executive was bitter in his denunciation of low-cost Japanese fabrics. "Japanese goods are cancer and they will kill the entire textile industry," he declared. "They should be kept out of the United States market entirely."

Several weeks ago, he said, Consolidated shut down another subsidiary, the Luther Manufacturing Co. of Fall River, Mass.—also blaming Japanese competition.

Mr. Speaker, here is further compelling evidence that the administration's disregard for the welfare of the textile industry is gradually destroying it. Of course, I realize that the GATT agreements are not the only cause for the troubles of the textile industry, but added to other factors the tariff cuts put into effect by GATT last September have proven, "the straw that will break the camel's back."

It is noteworthy that the State Department has recently announced other reciprocal trade agreements drastically cutting American tariffs. Fortunately for the textile industry the 15 percent cuts made under this latest agreement do not affect the textile industry because last year Senator GEORGE of Georgia got written into the reciprocal trade agreements bill a provision that prevented any further cuts than those then in process of consummation, but which had not been announced at the time of the adoption of Senator GEORGE's amendment.

The experience of the textile industry this year makes it crystal clear that the escape clause and peril point provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are not effective. They must be strengthened if the act is continued or not only the textile but other American industries will suffer as a result of the pressure of the huge industries such as steel and automobile for further tariff cuts. The voices of these huge industries are heeded by our Chief Executive and our Department of State while the voice of the textile industry is as of one crying in the wilderness.

For Our Own Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 7, 1956:

FOR OUR OWN SAFETY

It must be hoped that the House as a whole, with the Senate following suit, will ignore its Foreign Affairs Committee's decision to slash $1.1 billion (nearly all of it for military uses) from the $4.9 billion requested by the administration for overseas aid in the coming fiscal year. The cut is much too drastic to be defensible. If Congress does not restore it, or at least a very large part of it, then Congress will be taking a gamble that our country can ill afford to take.

This has been made clear by President Eisenhower both at his news conference yesterday and at his earlier meeting with Democratic and Republican leaders of the House. Along with all his uniquely well-informed advisers, including the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he has warned that such a reduction in our mutual-security program would endanger our own national safety. No matter what its advocates say—and some of their statements may seem to be superficially persuasive—the simple fact is that a slash of these dimensions would have a lamentable effect, psychologically and otherwise, on our friends and allies abroad, including particularly the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Let us not be naive about this matter. Let none of us be beguiled or bamboozled by those who say that the United States is just playing the role of "Santa Claus" or "Uncle Sap" when it extends economic and military assistance to nations overseas. Actually, as the President has indicated, this aid—even when it goes to neutralist countries like India and Yugoslavia—is not mere altruism for altruism's sake. It is a thing that helps us just as it helps the recipients. And that is why it rightly comes under the official heading of "mutual security." It is not a starry-eyed or one-sided program of soft-hearted or soft-headed handouts. It is a down-to-earth business proposition—a sort of cooperative insurance policy that makes it easier, more effective, and less costly for us, as well as for our allies, to cope with the still-formidable menace of Communist subversion and aggression.

As a matter of fact, as the President has emphasized, "we are going to spend many more billions" on our own separate defense unless we "support mutual security earnestly, sincerely, and with a clear realization that we are serving America's best interests in so doing." And he has gone on from there to add—with that moving eloquence that often characterizes his informal remarks to the press—that our foreign aid, which is as good for us as for others, is of incalculable peace-promoting value in an age when we must understand this: "As long as we are not shooting, we are not spending one-tenth as much as we would if we were shooting, and, remember, there is no destruction that we saw in World War II • • • that would even give a hint of what another war would bring."

So it is understandable that Mr. Eisenhower has hit hard against those who would be parsimonious in the field of war-deterring mutual defense and mutual security. In effect, appealing to the reason of all of us, he has left no room for doubt that niggardliness or false economizing in such a ivtal matter could gravely imperil the United States. Congress, in the circumstances, will be skating on thin ice and risking much too much if it fails to heed his warning.

The Coordination of Future Airspace Use Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] recently made a significant address in the city of Boston, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address, as follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE OREN HARRIS, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956, AT A MEETING OF RADIO TECHNICAL COMMISSION FOR AERONAUTICS, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. Chairman, His Excellency the Governor, distinguished guests, and other friends, I feel highly complimented in having an invitation to meet with you on this auspicious and important occasion. It is good to meet with you on such an interesting subject. I must confess, however, that even though our committee has been deeply involved with this subject matter, and we have sat through many sessions of hearings, public and executive, the technical phase of it is still somewhat baffling to me.

I am delighted to have this privilege of renewing pleasant association with my old friend and former colleague of the House, your Governor, Chris Herter. From reports we get, I am sure he is carrying on with the same force, enthusiasm, and ability as Governor of this great Commonwealth as he did in rendering such a fine service in the Congress of the United States.

Now I fully realize that my time at bat here this morning is in the nature of a pinch-hitter. My able colleague from California, CARL HINSHAW, who is one of your official technical advisors, and I might say who undoubtely is better informed on technical matters affecting aviation than any other Member of Congress, could not be with you for an obvious reason. Today so happens to be primary day in California. I think we have heard or seen something about that in the newspapers. Of course, CARL has no opposition for nomination in his own party, but they have the unusual procedure in California where he as a Republican is trying to get the Democratic nomination too. In view of his problem, I am glad to pinch-hit for him and hope that I can do justice with this discussion.

I have the distinct honor and privilege of serving as chairman of one of the most important committees of the Congress, in my judgment, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

We have had an exceedingly busy schedule. It has covered many highly technical subjects. Some of our most important problems during this Congress have been in connection wtih matters affecting aviation. We have amended the Airport Construction Act, providing a definite program for the next 4 years.

We have permanently certificated local service airline carriers. We are considering other bills in the committee at this time which could have far-reaching implications in the field of aviation.

One of our most difficult problems during this Congress has been our investigation of the development of a common system of air navigation and traffic control. Developments over the past few years apparently caused the concept of a common system of short-range air-navigation aids for joint use by civil and military aviation to be jeopardized. The controversy, which threatened the common-system concept, came out in the open in February 1955. A new rho-theta short-range radio air-navigation system, known as TACAN, is definitely being considered and developed presumably to replace the present system commonly known as VOR/DME.

On this issue we had some most interesting hearings. We found that there were a lot of important people who held very definite convictions.

This situation developed, among other reasons, as a result of the jet age into which we are moving swiftly.

As an important aspect to this problem, we found, is the question of airspace. Thus the subject Coordination of Future Airspace Use Planning is most appropriate today.

I appreciate your suggesting that in view of this background that I discuss with you briefly the importance of coordination in airspace use planning.

I should like to say that congressional interest and responsibility in the field of aviation covers all aspects of airspace utilization. These recent events make it imperative that we give more attention and most careful consideration to this vast important subject. It is therefore, appropriate for some of the thinking on coordination of future planning and development be presented here today.

With a group as well informed as you, I am sure I don't need to dwell on the importance of coordination in working out the problem we face. But I thought I would point out some of the mistakes made in the past in the hope they can be avoided in the future. The fact that we are behind in getting required equipment installed would indicate that mistakes have been made.

And I want to stress the point that Congress cannot be overlooked, if the maximum speed is to be achieved in solving the serious problems already facing civil aviation.

Not only must the taxpayers be protected in avoiding duplication of effort, but all concerned—Government and industry—must face up to the fact that we just don't have enough scientists qualified to work on these problems. So we must make the maximum use of both money and brains.

We have come a long way since World War II in meeting the growing problems of air navigation and traffic control. But let me say right now that I think we would have had more progress and fewer problems if there had been more coordination and less competition.

There could have been better coordination among those working on these problems in the executive branch. But equally important, there could and should have been greater efforts to coordinate activities of the executive branch with Congress.

Often it is overlooked that Congress is the policymaking branch of the Government. True, sometimes part of the job of making detailed blueprints is delegated, and rightfully so, to boards and commissions, and in cooperation with Government agencies, but still the basic policymaking responsibility rests with Congress and policy decisions made by Congress can only be modified by Congress.

You might say that too often the coordinators have coordinated with everyone except Congress only to find that after all the taxpayers are going to pay the bill, and Congress must approve the payment. Any effort at coordination which overlooks the fact that the responsibility for making national policies in the public interest rests with Congress may run into trouble, especially when appropriations are needed.

It is important to keep that in mind. We are dealing here with vast sums of money. I am told that the air defense radar system now being installed will cost in the neighborhood of $3 billions. Then the Department of Commerce through the CAA has a program for new equipment that will cost $246 million.

Now, I don't want to imply that the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics needs a lecture on coordination—you have not been lax in this respect. You are not trying to make policy. You are the fellows who do the work. And a good job you have done, too. Without your help, the marvelous progress of the past decade would have been impossible.

As a result of the TACAN hearings held last session by my subcommittee, I have a speaking acquaintance with the SC-31 report which came out of RTCA. That was a magnificent job and has been followed by many splendid contributions in solving problems in the very difficult field covered by the report.

In passing, I might say that I like the idea of setting up a government-industry advisory group like RTCA to work on these problems. It is better than establishing a special Government bureau to do the job. Through RTCA, we have available the best brains in the country upon request, something that would not be possible even if we went to a lot of expense to set up or expand a Government agency. The Government can't always compete with industry in hiring brains and experience.

No doubt some of you have read the report of our committee on the TACAN investigation. That report makes a very positive declaration on the importance of coordination.

In the TACAN report, the committee said:

"The position taken in 1947 by this committee that there must be but one system of aids to air navigation and traffic control common to all users of airspace in the United States and not a multiplicity of systerms is reaffirmed. A multiplicity of systems would constitute both a hazard of large proportions and a burden upon the taxpayers. We insist that coordination among the Government agencies concerned be maintained to prevent overlapping and duplication of effort in the development of the common system concept."

To me, the TACAN controversy is a very interesting example of the difficulties you get into when coordination breaks down in a field as complex as the one we are considering here. I think a brief review of the history of the TACAN controversy will point

up the problem facing us in future planning.

Problems follow in the wake of progress. If someone hadn't come up with something he believed was an improvement over VOR-DME, there wouldn't have been a TACAN controversy. Discussion is necessary to solve problems but when discussions reach the stage of controversy we are likely to get more heat than light.

Be that as it may, the TACAN controversy did get out of hand, resulting in two congressional investigations and the threat of several more.

When I was elected to Congress back in 1940, the possibility of being called upon to preside at hearings on a subject as involved and technical as TACAN would have seemed to me fantastic. But I walked into it when I was assigned to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and eventually became chairman of this important subcommittee.

As you know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has broad, general jurisdiction in the field of transportation and communications. Both subjects are very interesting, as well as important. You could not have the present air transportation system without communications of a highly complex variety.

To me, transportation in itself is a highly interesting subject. When you get into the field of jet-age transportation, the normal interest is multiplied many fold.

I don't need to dwell upon the importance of transportation in maintaining our high standard of living and the country's great industrial activity. Transportation activity is a good indicator of business activity. We have long judged a country town's prosperity by the number of automobiles and trucks on the streets, by the number of railroads and good highways it has. Now we add airport facilities. Businessmen out looking for a new plant site are now passing up cities that do not have adequate airport facilities.

The rapid development of air commerce since World War II is ample evidence that air transportation fills a public need.

Then there is the all-important question of national defense. Without air power, it is admitted that our country would be in a desperate situation today.

Thus, no one questions the importance of a sound aviation program to the national defense and the national economy. Civil aviation and military air power go hand in hand. We have to have both. And they must work together. They must use the same airspace. In World War II, the military would have been severely handicapped without the invaluable aid of civil aviation. Civil aviation again proved its importance in moving men and materials long distances in a hurry when the Korean conflict broke out unexpectedly almost halfway around the world.

We, on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have spent a lot of time over the years on civil air policy. The committee put in many weeks of hard work drafting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act sought to establish a sound air-transportation system to meet the Nation's present and future air commerce and air-mail needs, and to promote aviation in the interest of national defense.

We think that the vast air transportation system now serving every section of the country and maintaining our competitive position in international aviation is pretty good evidence that we have done a good job.

But the job has not been completed. It would be bad for all of us if we had finished the job. That would mean we had reached the limit of man's ingenuity and that the final ultimate air-traffic control system had been achieved. We know that is not true. We know we need better air-traffic control to handle jets and that we will get it. As air transportation expands, and big jet transports take to the air, we will have new problems, and people such as you will solve them.

In the old days before the Wright brothers, the air and airspace may have been free. When, day and night, we must protect the airspace above us against enemy attack, the air may still be free, but our airspace is not.

With jet fighters guarding the skies above us and a fleet of big transport planes flying nearly 20 billion passenger-miles a year, the airspace in many areas is getting crowded. We have to do what we can to keep these planes moving in safety and to provide for more and faster planes as the commercial jets come off the line.

It is well to remember that there are other users of our airspace besides planes. The Army must practice artillery firing. Radio and TV towers use valuable airspace. The TV tower problem is being considered by our subcommittee this session. The Air Coordinating Committee has been working on the problem and has put forward a compromise. I hope that it is the solution. If it is not, Congress may have to make some positive policy decisions in this area to protect the public interest.

And there are other users of airspace, too. This points up the big question which we may well ask: "Are we running out of airspace?" which, though rarely regarded as such, is actually one of our most valued natural resources.

Speaking plainly, we must face the sad fact that we are running out of airspace, and it is most interesting as to what is happening to it and how it is being used up. What was once thought to be unlimited in this resource, has now become a critical commodity for specialized training, testing areas and numerous other purposes. It is a diminishing commodity, being rapidly shrunk by modern-day aircraft.

It might seem somewhat farfetched to say that Congress should lay down the ground rules in a field as highly technical as air navigation and traffic control system planning. But a little history will indicate the necessity for this. The same brief history will indicate how the long and bitter TACAN controversy might have been avoided, or at least kept from getting out of hand.

Let me say at the outset that I am not one of those who believes Congress should plot and chart the course of the Nation's economy down to minute details. I am inclined to believe that we often have too much dictation from Washington. That is a field, however, in which we must of necessity act.

We all realize that in certain areas the States and local communities must look to Washington for guidance. The field of transportation is a good example. Without some Federal regulation of interstate transportation, you would have chaos. That is especially true of jet age air transportation. Today a plane can pass through the air space of several States in a few minutes.

In a situation like this, somewhere there must be ground rules. Somewhere the inevitable conflicts must be resolved. From the beginning of the Republic, Congress has had the responsibility of fostering and encouraging the development of communications and transportation facilities. At the end of World War II we encountered a situation in aviation demanding the attention of Congress.

Among the many problems of readjustment which faced the Nation following World War II was that of taking advantage of the strides made in aviation. The art of flying developed tremendously during the war. Larger and faster planes were built.

A great many young men learned to fly. Many thousands more learned the advantages of air transportation as passengers.

Following the war, air traffic on the airlines increased tremendously. For the first time military aircraft became important users of the Federal airways, sharing the air space with commercial aircraft.

Traffic control facilities were under heavy pressure. During bad weather, traffic was delayed or flights canceled, because of inadequate aid navigation and traffic control facilities. Canceled flights not only inconvenienced the public but cost the airlines a lot of money at a time when revenue was badly needed.

It was a dark picture. Traffic delays and cancellations made it hard to sell the public on air transportation.

The pessimists had their day. In 1947 the air transportation bubble burst. A series of fatal accidents occurred. There was an almost complete breakdown of traffic control under bad weather conditions. The over-expanded aviation industry faced economic collapse.

Then as now, we realized the importance of aviation to the country's defense and economic growth. Without airpower we were virtually helpless from a military standpoint. Without adequate air transportation the country could not keep pace, economically, in a world where international competition was being stepped up rapidly.

But what to do about it? That problem was tackled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, which made a far-reaching investigation. Congressman HINSHAW, of California, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, submitted a report which made detailed recommendations. It called for a common system of air navigation and traffic control for joint civil-military use.

As a result of these recommendations, the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics set to work on the problem. As you well know, a group of highly qualified experts, representing all segments of aviation, both civil and military, met in Washington. After long and concentrated effort, RTCA Special Committee 31 came up with the blueprint of a plan for a modern, comprehensive system of air navigation and traffic control for common use by civil and military aviation.

The Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the President's Air Policy Commission, representing the legislative and executive branches of the Government, endorsed the RTCA common-system concept.

We were on the right track. We were getting somewhere.

The Air Navigation Development Board, representing the Commerce and Defense Departments, was set up to develop the common system, using the RTCA blueprint. The CAA set to work installing VHF omnidirectional radio range (VOR), along with greatly improved communications equipment and then distance-measuring equipment (DME). Other items such as the instrument-landing system and ground-controlled approach were installed.

Schedule reliability of the airlines improved tremendously.

While this was going on, the Navy was attempting to solve a very real problem, that of providing a short-range navigation system for carrier-based aircraft. VOR/DME was not satisfactory. That, as you know, was the beginning of TACAN.

We were still working within the common-system concept. Then came the Korean conflict and the Russians also finally succeeded in exploding an atomic bomb. Lessons learned in Korea indicated that VOR, due to citing problems, not only was unsatisfactory for carrier-based aircraft, but was not suitable for tactical operations of the Air Force.

The military, faced with the threat that the continental United States could very easily become a battleground, proposed TACAN as the common-system short-range air-navigation system to replace VOR/DME.

The reaction was immediate. The military was criticized for developing a new system in secret. The Defense Department was challenged to reveal what they had in their little black box. Some went so far as to suggest that the common-system concept be abandoned and the military permitted to go its own way.

At that point, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications was forced to look into the matter. We had a heavy schedule of hearings previously arranged. But the subcommittee found time to hear both sides of the TACAN controversy. It was long and tedious and very technical but also very interesting. As we proceeded, it began to appear that somewhere along the way there could be at least a meeting of the minds. The Air-Coordinating Committee came up with a compromise, which the subcommittee and then the full committee endorsed with certain reservations. The principal reservation was that the common system concept remain valid and must not be compromised.

Now, I am convinced that had there been proper coordination in time on the part of the various groups involved, that a great deal of time could have been saved. But that is hindsight.

In view of the magnitude—and the cost—of the job ahead of us, we must work together. There must be continued and full coordination on the part of the various groups involved. And Congress must be kept informed. After all, appropriations must be made and Congress is not going to write any more blank checks in this field.

I am told that there are now over 75 committees, subcommittees, and special committees, working in this field. That is all right. In a field as technical and as complex as this, special problems have to be attacked by groups specially picked for the task. But that situation increases the importance of coordination and makes more difficult the problem of eliminating duplication.

For that reason, I feel that the appointment of Mr. Edward Curtis by the President to coordinate activities in planning in this field is a great step in the right direction.

Admitting that we have problems, I am sure that the industry, as represented by this group here, has the know-how to meet them. By continuing to work together, bearing in mind that we are all working to the same end, I know we will get the job done. We will get the jets into the air and keep them flying in defense of our country and in the interest of the national economy.

Thank you.

Admiral Stark Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News calling attention to the groundbreaking exercises for a new science building at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, to be named in honor of Adm. Harold Stark, a native of Wilkes-Barre, and former Chief of Naval Operations:

Wilkes-Barre was aware of the high esteem in which Adm. Harold Stark, a native son, has been held nationally and internationally through the years, but it was stimulating yesterday to have confirmation from the President of the United States, naval associates, and others at the groundbreaking exercises for the new science building at Wilkes College, to be named in his honor.

Admiral Stark, a former Chief of Naval Operations, was in command of the United States naval forces in the European theater during the Second World War when General Eisenhower was Supreme Allied Commander. So when the President, in a message to Dr. Eugene Farley, president of Wilkes, referred to Admiral Stark as "my good friend," it was not an idle compliment but a statement based on close wartime association.

It must be a source of no little satisfaction to Admiral Stark, now in retirement after 50 years of service to his country, to know that he is so highly regarded not only by those in high places, but by his fellow Wilkes-Barreans. There just isn't much more that life has to offer than to occupy such an enviable position as the twilight approaches.

Sound Business Principles for Federal Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SOUND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERAL POWER

(Address by Hon. FRANK T. BOW at the annual meeting of the Edison Electric Institute, June 5, 1956, Atlantic City)

I am glad to have the opportunity to consider with you gentlemen of the Edison Electric Institute a matter to which I have recently devoted considerable study. I refer to the application of sound business principles to rates to be charged for public power, at least where sold pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.[1]

Specifically, I propose to show that it lies within the authority, and likewise is the duty, of the executive agencies, to establish Federal power rates in accordance with sound business principles; to point out that in this respect those agencies have been greatly remiss; and to examine what would be the effect of really applying sound business principles as prescribed.

In general, this matter of rates for public power has been viewed primarily from the standpoint of the consumer of the power and only to a minor extent from the standpoint of the sellers, being essentially those citizens who pay Federal taxes. In other words, the matter has been viewed from the standpoint of short-term advantage for relatively few instead of the long-term advantage of all of such citizenry.

This is largely because those who are beneficiaries of the existing discriminatory preference are so very vociferous. Rarely is a voice raised in behalf of the taxpayer. Because my State, Ohio, contributes so heavily in proportion, I am all the more inclined to analyze what is involved.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

Without taking the time to go into the genesis of the policy provisions, being those in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, I quote the vital first sentence thereof:

"Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rate to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission."

This is the most specific and influential of the several fragmentary and too often inconsistent, statutory statements of Federal power policy. I dip into past history only to the extent of pointing out the interesting fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority policy announced August 25, 1933, included the premise that, in its marketing of power, the controlling consideration should be that of "making power available at the lowest rate consistent with sound financial policy."[2]

The importance of the language I have quoted, from the act of 1944, may be judged from the fact that so prominent and ardent a proponent of so-called public power as former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes used that language in his memorandum of January 3, 1946, promulgating what he stated to be "the primary objectives of the acts of Congress." Although, strictly speaking, no other act contains just such language, Secretary Ickes cited, not merely the Flood Control Act of 1944 but also, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Bonneville Act of 1937 and the Fort Peck Act of 1938 as authorities for the principle that—

"Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles."

The criterion established by Congress in the act of 1944 for setting "the lowest possible rates" is neither the practice of charity, in the form of subsidies, nor discrimination between groups of citizens in respect to rates of charge for power, but rather sound business principles. The statute mentions nothing else.

Inasmuch as sound business principles are assumed to apply to the element of rates as set forth in section 5, it is reasonable that the same principles should be assumed to govern in the cases of all of the other elements excepting only where and to the extent that there is an express prescription that they shall not apply. Please understand, however, that what I have to say is regardless of whether the buyer, that is the consumer, of the Federal power is, or is not, in the preferred class prescribed in the same section 5 of the Flood Act of 1944.

Even if we were to consider that "sound business principles" shall control rates in the cases only of Army engineer reservoir projects, there would be involved all Federal power development in the East except those of TVA; practically all of those in the Southwest; and largely those in the Missouri Valley and the Columbia River Basin. In all, taking into account those in operation, under construction and authorized, they comprise almost two-thirds of all Federal hydroelectric power development.

Let us now examine the application of sound business principles to the elements entering into the fixing of rates for Federal power. I take them up in the following order:

Charges for the use of money.
Amortization of investment.
Allocation of cost.
Tax charges.
Allowances for overhead costs.
Actual project income as compared with preconstruction representations.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

CHARGES FOR THE USE OF MONEY

Actually it is not a benevolent Uncle Sam or the Government that lends the money for the construction of Federal power projects. It is we taxpayers. The money advanced or invested in these projects comes in the main from the use of Federal income taxes, paid of course by corporations as well as individuals.

But we taxpayers are concerned also in the fact that, up to the present time, some of the funds in point have been procured by borrowings against our combined credit. Fortuantely the use of this credit is growing less and less. Indeed, inasmuch as the national budget is now being balanced, present advances for the construction of these power projects are practically all from the pockets of the taxpayers.

A fundamental—a sound—business principle observed by those individuals and those banks and other institutions lending money is that the charge for the use of money shall be at least as great as the cost to the lender. Anything less would lead to bankruptcy. Moreover, the charge must cover costs of all kinds of making the money available, including overheads. For instance, in the case of a savings bank, there are the costs of gathering the savings and accounting for them; also there must be an allowance on account of loans which have "gone sour."

What is the cost of money to the Federal Government, that is, to us taxpayers? Surely it is not merely the direct charge for interest on the respective bonds, certificates, or Treasury bills. The total cost must include that of the floating of the loans, including refunding where that is involved, and of all accounting.

Further, in the case of money raised by income taxation, there is the proportionate part of the cost of the tax collection system.

As to the cost of the use of money expressed in percent of the advances from the Treasury for construction: At no time has even the mere interest on the long-term Treasury borrowings averaged as low as 2 percent; yet the Department of the Interior has used that figure, though more recently 2½ percent. Apparently at present the Army engineers, the marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission, at the instance of the Bureau of the Budget, are using a 2½ percent rate.[3] Of course, short-term money is cheaper than the long-term money which is involved; yet at present even 90-day Treasury bills yield almost 3 percent. On long-term Federal borrowings, the interest rate exceeds 3 percent.

Estimates of the complete cost of Federal money runs from a minimum of 3½ percent to more than 4 percent.

AMORTIZATION OF INVESTMENT

First we may look at the period or number of years allowed for paying off the loan, that is, amortization of the investment. In section 5 of the act of 1944, the prescription is "a reasonable number of years." The period now used by the Army engineers a 50 years. For the Bureau of Reclamation, a minimum of 40 years is prescribed with a permissible 10-year allowance for getting underway; the minimum in actual practice becomes 50 years.

Increasingly there is pressure for the use of longer periods—60 years, 70 years, and in the cases of recent proposals, affecting power from Army engineer projects in the Southwest, marketed by Southwestern Power Administration, a 100-year period.

Here, too, the matter has been viewed from the standpoint of the borrowers or beneficiaries. However, in applying sound business principles, the matter would be looked at from the standpoint of the lender. If the borrower cannot afford to meet that minimum basis of amortization and particularly that period of amortization which is sound from the standpoint of the lender, the loan is not made. Safety of the loan is the prime consideration.

After all, 50 years is a long time. The past 50 years have witnessed the almost complete disappearance of the streetcar and the interurban trolley; the bankruptcy of many, if not most, railroads; and a tremendous shift of population from farm to city. Most pertinent perhaps is the fact that railroad securities issued 50 years ago have in many cases suffered severely from decrease in amount and value of railroad transportation and hence necessitous reorganization proceedings.

At present we are entering the age of nuclear power. It is my understanding that such power has potentialities of ultimately attaining a cost and hence market price so low as to undercut the overall costs of even hydroelectric power. In view of this prospect, the Power Authority of New York, in floating bonds for its St. Lawrence River power development, was forced to limit the maturity of its bonds to 40 years from the time of issuance.

Various bodies of experts, including the Engineers Joint Council and the pertinent second Hoover Commission task force, have recommended an amortization period of not more than 50 years. Surely, in the light of what is facing us by way of nuclear power, a 50-year period should not be exceeded.

Turning now to the method of amortization, there is no prescription in the act of 1944 or any other pertinent statute.

The present practice—initiated by the Federal agencies, not by Congress—is to use the sinking-fund method which results in equal annual payments for the sum of amortization and interest (on unamortized balances). The reasons are twofold: Convenience of the agencies and leniency to the beneficiaries, that is, the power consumers.

A basic assumption of the sinking-fund method is that the income from the power project will continue at the assumed annual rate throughout the entire period of amortization.

Under the sinking-fund method, the return of the investment into the Treasury, that is, to the taxpayers, begins at a minimum and, if all goes well, reaches its maximum in the last year of the period of payoff. In consequence, the lenders—the taxpayers—during their productive lifetime get the benefit of only a minor repayment of the loan. For instance, during the first half of a 50-year pay-out period, only about one-third is repaid.

But sound business principles require the reverse. Because of the uncertainty in respect of the future, particularly as regards nuclear power, Federal projects should "pay out" at a more rapid rate during the earlier years. In other words, the method of amortization should be one which results in a diminishing financial burden on the project as the years go on.

It seems to me that a sound business means of accomplishing this is that method of amortization which requires equal annual repayments of the Federal investment (not equal annual payments of the sum of amortization and interest on balances). Thus the annual interest requirement, and therefore the sum of amortization and interest, becomes less year by year.

This method results in a greater amount of amortization during the life of that generation of taxpayers which in effect has advanced the funds for constructing the project. It is to be remembered that, unlike the private investor or money lender, the Federal taxpayer is an involuntary investor. The former can, in general, get back the principal of his loan, or the unrepaid portion of it, by sale at any time in the open market. On the other hand, except as a Federal project during the taxpayer's lifetime makes repayment into the Treasury and thereby lowers taxes or has a corresponding effect on the national debt, the Federal taxpayer cannot recover the equivalent of any part of his contribution to the investment in the power project.

To the consumers of the power from the Federal project in turn, there would be the advantage of gradually decreasing rates for the power. Furthermore, this method of making equal annual payments in amortization of the investment, with consequent decrease in payments of interest year by year, results in a substantially smaller total payment of amortization and interest during the period of amortization than is the case under the method involving equal annual payments of amortization plus interest. In short, here is a method of amortization by which the investment in Federal power projects can accord with sound business principles.

ALLOCATION OF COST

In the cases of Federal multiple-purpose projects, it is necessary to make an allocation of cost against the power purpose or function. Here I step more gingerly than with regard to some of the other elements of power cost and rates. Clearly, however, there should be allocated to power no less than is reasonable. Costs which actually belong to power should not be allocated to functions presently treated as nonreimbursable, such as flood control and navigation.

Recently there has been much clamor as regards the effect of allocation of costs upon the power rates of the Southwestern Power Administration. It has been contended that power should be charged with only its incremental cost, namely, the difference in cost as between a project including the power function and a project not including the power function. A Senator, presumably without thinking the matter through, has suggested that power should not be charged with any part of the costs of the dams.

Needless to say, I am not and do not claim to be an expert in this field, but I do know that

1. A dam and reservoir solely for flood control cannot reasonably serve also for power development.

2. If power development is to be added, the dam and reservoir must be correspondingly enlarged beyond the needs for flood control; that is, there will be much greater cost.

3. Practically the only case where power development is not chargeable with a substantial part of the cost of the dam is where there is developed the waterpower resulting at a dam constructed solely for navigation and constructed to a height no greater than is absolutely essential for the navigation purpose.

Surely departure from these simple propositions cannot be in accord with sound business principles.

TAX CHARGES

The most serious problem involved in the establishment of rates for Federal power is that of the charge to be made on account of taxes.

Under present practice, Federal commercial enterprises, such as power development, and therefore the customers of those enterprises are permitted to be free of Federal taxes and generally to be free of State and local taxes. Practically the only exception in the latter respect is that TVA makes a contribution to the State and local governments in lieu of and as a partial offset to State and local taxes. In the case of Hoover Dam, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940 contemplates the possibility that State taxes may be imposed upon some aspect of the project; but it seems fair to say that the annual payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada, specified by statute, are not in

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

lieu of taxes, but were provided because of other considerations.

The equity of participation in the cost of local government and governmental services is recognized in the case of the District of Columbia, to which the Federal Government makes contributions which are the equivalent of payment of local taxes.

This practice has long been recognized with regard to national forests. Twenty-five percent of national forest receipts are distributed to the counties wherein forest lands are situated, for schools and roads. This year the counties will participate in forest receipts to the extent of about $25 million.

The exempting of Federal property and enterprises from taxes dates back as far as 1819 when the Supreme Court [4] held in effect that the sovereign, the Federal Government, could not be taxed without its consent. To be sure, in those days there was no Federal income tax and the Federal Government's acquisition of property outside the public domain had not reached modern proportions. Thus the practical or "sound business" aspect did not come to the fore.

At any rate, as regards Federal lands and structures, it must be recognized that taxation thereof by States or other forms of local government is subject to the consent of Congress. Nevertheless, the exemption of such Federal property from taxation has become burdensome beyond toleration. As an example, pertinent to our present subject, I need only point out that, contrary to the case of private development, Federal reservoir development means removing from local tax rolls the land to be overflowed and the improvements thereon.

It is no wonder that there is a growing movement to require the Federal Government, through local taxes on its property, to participate in supporting local governments and their services. Various bills to that effect are pending before Congress. Some would apply even to the public domain and establishments for national defense.

As to Federal commercial enterprises, for many years the postal service was practically the only one—and is still the outstanding one. Unlike Federal power enterprises, the postal service is expressly authorized by the Constitution; it serves all citizens; and it serves them without discrimination as between classes of citizens. Hence the fact that the postal service is tax exempt has been accepted as natural.

Incidentally, as a matter of sound business, there is earnest endeavor, not merely to make postal service completely self-supporting, but also to make the charges for the service equitable as between the several classes of users.

Next in order of quantitative importance are those with which we are here concerned—Federal power enterprises. I refer of course to the Federal commercial business of producing and supplying power to the public. Unlike the postal service, the Federal power business has no constitutional authority; it is far from serving all citizens; indeed, it actually serves only one segment of the population. About 30 percent of the electric power consumers of the country are served to some extent by Federal powerplants. In most cases the extent to which they are so served is indeterminable; in others it is solely federally produced power which they receive.

Let us turn now to the application of sound business principles in respect to taxation of Federal power enterprises. Outstanding is the principle that all beneficiaries of the services rendered by a given kind of business shall pay their proportionate parts of the cost—plus ordinarily some return or profit, but at least their proportionate part of the cost.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Government of the United States is business, big business, not commercial, but the biggest of all American businesses. It renders governmental service to its citizenry—all of its citizens.

That governmental service is paid for out of taxes, nowadays mainly income taxes. All of the beneficiaries of governmental service should pay their full proportionate share of those taxes. Any departure from that principle is not merely discriminatory—it is unsound business.

As you know, at least as well as I, each power consumer served by private companies, in paying for his power, must on the average include some 14 percent on account of the Federal income tax which must be transmitted by all such companies to the Federal Treasury. In contrast, Federal enterprises, as we have already noted, are free from Federal income taxes. Thus some 10 percent or so of all of the power consumers of the country are served with solely Federal power and therefore, as power consumers, they contribute nothing at all toward the cost of the Federal Government. Something of the order of 20 percent more of the Nation's power consumers, as we have seen, are served partially with Federal power and therefore, as power consumers, do not pay their full proportionate part of the cost of Federal governmental service.

The amount of Federal tax which in this way is avoided must be made up by other Federal taxpayers, mainly by the customers of private power companies. In short, quite aside from the fact that there obviously is discrimination, here is a violation of a sound business principle.

Such violation would not be tolerated in the cases of services rendered by business concerns. For instance, insurance companies, when the rates for one class of risks do not meet the costs, either raise the rates or drop that class of risks. In fact, if sound business principle did not suffice, State insurance supervision would insist upon such action.

Similarly, in the cases of railroads: Up to the limits of what the traffic will bear, passenger rates must include their proportionate share of all costs, just like freight rates. Indeed at present railroads, interests having large amounts of freight to be hauled and the Interstate Commerce Commission—all are seeking to make sure that in this respect the pertinent sound business principle is observed.

In summary, the present practice in Federal power business, so far as concerns Federal taxes, is inconsistent with the prescribed criterion of sound business principles.

The same thing is true as to State and local taxes. In that respect, of course, any such lack of accord with sound business principles is more readily recognized. Thus in the cases of some counties, and all the more some townships, tax-free Federal reservoir projects, by reason of eliminating agriculturally productive or other lands from the local tax rolls, may impose an intolerable burden upon the local governments and those who continue to pay local taxes in order to maintian road and other services at their prior quality. I have already referred to the growing movement, including bills in Congress, requiring Federal projects, including those involving power, to pay directly or to pay the equivalent of State and other local taxes on property.

In contrast to our own practice, Great Britain, with its completely socialized British Electricity Authority and Area Boards, subjects all phases of its power property and operations to any and all taxation to which any other property or business is subject.

As concerns both Federal and local taxes, most of our Federal agencies have within the past year or two advanced in their thinking and practice to the point of requiring that, for purposes of economic evaluation and comparisons with at least non-Federal alternatives, the tax components of true cost be fully taken into account. We find this expressed in the April 1954 agreement of the Department of the Interior, the Army Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission on cost allocation; that Commission's December 1955 prescription for evaluating Federal power projects,[5] and the January 1956 report by the Presidential Advisory Committee (the Cabinet Committee) on Water Resources Policy.[6]

But that procedure does not go far enough. Consistency with sound business principles requires that the corresponding taxes, cost, and charges actually be included in the rates for Federal power and therefore be borne in fair proportion by the consumers of that power. This may require action by Congress.

ALLOWANCES FOR OVERHEAD COSTS

Although overheads are not a major element involved in ratemaking, it is as clear as it is simple that sound business principles require that the pertinent overhead costs of all kinds should be charged against Federal power projects and that the rates should be sufficient to cover those overheads. The principle needs to be applied to initial investment as well as to the annual costs of operation and maintenance.

The accounting for the initial investment should include all costs of bringing the given project into being, including the initial investigations, any explorations and all legal services within the constructing agency.

In the initial investment and likewise in the annual costs, there should be included all associated costs of district, division, and Washington offices. Then, there are the expenditures by other agencies, such as the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, the postal service, the Department of Justice for legal services, and the Civil Service Commission for administration of the Retirement Act. In too many cases some, or even all, of the foregoing are not charged against the project for rate-making purposes.

In any event, adequate allowances for the unforeseen, that is, allowances for mishaps and other contingencies, should be included. If provision for such overhead items in detail is deemed to be too cumbersome or expensive, then at least there should be some percentage allowance high enough to cover these overheads.

ACTUAL PROJECT INCOME AS COMPARED WITH PRECONSTRUCTION REPRESENTATIONS

No sound business would tolerate a condition whereunder preauthorization or preconstruction estimates, predictions, or representations are forgotten as soon as they have served their purpose of helping to bring the project into the stage of authorization or actually into being. Yet in the case of Federal projects, it is fair to say that, if not forgotten, at least such earlier estimates or representations are in general disregarded.

An outstanding example of what can and does result is the case of three projects (Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow, and Center Hill) on the Cumberland River, constructed by the Army Engineers and with the power marketed by the Department of the Interior through its Southeastern Power Administration. The Army engineer estimate of the average annual benefits from the power of these three multiple-purpose projects totaled $11,223,000,[7] whereas the power output was sold to Tennessee Valley Authority for $3,500,000, with subsequent increase to $3,950,000.[8] That is, we Federal taxpayers are annually receiving only about one-third of what the Army engineers estimated to be the average annual value of the output.

To be sure, a different agency, the Department of the Interior, does the marketing, whereas the Army engineers do the con-

Footnotes at end of speech.

structing—and often the promoting—of the project. But the Army engineers have no excuse for failing to recognize and point out that, up to the present, and whether it be their fault or that of Interior, the financial performance of Federal power projects which they have constructed is all too often woefully below the prediction and representation.

Can it be said to be in accord with sound business principles if the promise is not performed and departments which fail to cooperate are not forced to do so? In some cases, notably in the southwest, the actual cost of Federal power is greater than the market can afford. In those cases the projects have been badly conceived and probably should not have been constructed at all.

CONCLUSION AS TO RATES

Let us not be so concerned with the impropriety and inequity of it all that we forget the principles involved. The fact is, at least so far as concerns Federal power projects constructed by the Army Engineers with the possible exception of including full tax charges in rates, the remedy lies within the authority—indeed the duty—of those administering section 5 of the act of 1944.

It is as simple as this: The plain mandate of Congress, that rates for power shall be fixed according to "sound business principles," is being disregarded. In my view this statement applies to the Army Engineers, to the Department of the Interior and its power marketing agencies, and to the Federal Power Commission.

---

[1] 16 U. S. C. 825s.
[2] First Annual Report, p. 22.
[3] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 34.
[4] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316).
[5] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 33.
[6] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 26.
[7] House hearings, Army civil functions appropriation, 1950, pp. 346–351.
[8] Annual Report, Secretary of the Interior, 1955, p. 122.

Army Veterinary Corps Complimented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a veterinary trade journal as well as remarks by Mr. A. A. Case, of Columbia, Mo., on the work done by the Army Veterinary Corps:

ARMY VETERINARY CORPS COMPLIMENTED

The widespread influence of Army veterinary officers' work in Europe is lauded in a release from the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

Brig. Gen. Webster Anderson, Quartermaster General of the United States Army in Europe, commented briefly as follows about the Army Veterinary Corps food inspection service:

"Due to the efforts of the Army veterinary personnel on the continent, milk is delivered in paper cartons and shipped in nonreturnable cases—thus eliminating the danger in reuse."

Three years ago the general said it required 4 or 5 days to deliver milk from approved sources to our commissaries and 11-day-old milk was found in troop messes. We now have sources of wholesome milk near troop centers and delivery is made in 36 hours.

The Army milk program has been influential in France, Austria, Denmark, Belgium, and Germany, and in many areas improved dairy practices and better milk production is spreading among dairymen. Thus, the health of the free nations of Western Europe will improve permanently from quality milk standards of the United States Army Veterinary Corps.

General Anderson also thanked the Veterinary Corps for the help they gave in finding European sources of other food west of the iron curtain—in Yugoslavia, Finland, Norway, and Iceland, as well as the cheese factories in France and the sausage factories of Germany. He also credited veterinary inspection personnel with phenomenally low loss rates of foodstuffs in depots.

COMMENTS OF A. A. CASE

In addition to the milk sanitation and cleanup program, the Army Veterinary Corps (and Air Force Veterinary Corps) also:

Inspect and make sure meat and meat products meet the bid specifications, as well as wholesomeness. All the ARS does is inspect for wholesomeness.

Inspect and make sure poultry products are safe to eat, meet bid specifications, and are not diseased, or spoiled, in transit, or otherwise.

Inspect and make sure fish is fit to eat as well as up to grade for what is being paid for.

Inspect and make sure (part of Medical Corps) that camp and mess halls measure up to what they should.

As part of medical research, teams are responsible for many essential roles in both the Biological and Chemical Warfare Branches, as well as being very, very essential as part of the radiation medicine team, and this might prove to be by far the most important future need for veterinarians in the Army and Air Force.

Then veterinarians, logically, are the ones that do have the animal health problems with dogs and other animals in connection with the military services.

Also to be pointed out: Over 80 diseases are likely to be transported by or communicated to man from animals of various types.

There are other important things that any veterinary officer of the Army and Air Forces could point out.

New Ideas Needed for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for June 5, 1956:

NEW IDEAS NEEDED FOR FOREIGN AID

Overshadowing the controversy over foreign aid is an unanswered question: How can the United States exercise world leadership in a time when the emphasis is rapidly shifting from military to economic competition?

So long as there is no satisfactory answer to that question the issue of foreign aid will seem irrelevant and outdated.

The Senate may restore part of the billion dollars cut out by the House. But it will not seem to matter too much to anyone, and certainly not to the administration, which has been going through the motions, but scarcely more than that.

The answer can be found only through some hard thinking that takes into account that vast change in the world situation that has come about with the new Soviet look.

It is vital to move ahead into the new era. This can be done either in a giant stride calling for the utmost courage and candor. Or, if that is too much to ask, then it can be done by the piecemeal acceptance of new ideas and concepts.

The same palsy of indecision applies to the North Atlantic Alliance, which today straddles the Old World of military defense prepared against Soviet aggression and the New World of economic and ideological competition.

It was to try to bridge the gap that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles came up with the proposal to develop the political side of NATO.

The NATO council, meeting in Paris, responded by naming a committee of three foreign ministers, Lester Pearson of Canada, Gaetano Martino of Italy, and Halvard Lange of Norway, to discover ways and means for political and perhaps economic cooperation to give the alliance new and broader meaning. They are to report their findings to the council in December.

This week Pearson will come to Washington to talk with Dulles. He already is discovering, according to reports from Canada, that it is going to be hard to get agreement in the fields—politics, economics, and propaganda—in which he is convinced NATO must expand if it is to survive.

Yet he is a fortunate choice for this assignment, since again and again he has come up with ideas that look to a broad new concept of cooperation in the West.

He has served as a kind of broker between Western Europe and the United States, mitigating the impatience of the Europeans to move on to much wider cooperation and prodding Washington to move off of dead center.

In several recent speeches, Pearson has pointed the way to new channels of economic cooperation between the have and the have-not nations.

While he has urged much greater use of the United Nations as a means of distributing economic assistance on a fair and impartial basis, he has at the same time been aware that domestic political considerations stand in the way of channeling all such assistance through the U. N.

Not long ago he came up with a compromise proposal that deserves far more consideration than it has received. This was for the establishment in the U. N. of a clearing house to which each nation would submit its plans and policies in the field of international assistance.

There these plans and policies could be, in Pearson's words, "examined, made public, and coordinated" and "any suspicion that they were being used for political purposes could be challenged and exposed as true or false."

"This procedure," he went on to say, "would have the advantage of letting the world know what was being done and by whom. It would separate the propaganda chaff from the wheat. It would also expose the motives of any nation which refused to cooperate with the United Nations in this way."

Even those Members of Congress most adamant against turning American aid dollars over to the U. N. could scarcely object to such a plan. Administered by competent and objective international civil servants, it would put in proper perspective all the aid programs.

One complaint in this country has been that American aid programs of great scope and generosity are obscured by the cheap and easy gestures of Soviet Russia, a Johnny-come-lately in the field of foreign aid. An official U. N. appraisal would show the world on which side the balance lay.

These are constructive ideas of which the West stands urgently in need if we are to do more than merely react to Communist action.

Mr. SPEAKER, always I have been a supporter of our foreign-aid program and expect to continue to support the efforts of the administration to bolster the economics and raise the standard of living in the free countries of the world, especially those in Asia. However, until the administration comes up with a more imaginative and practical program of foreign aid than trying to match the promises of Soviet Russia to the nonsatellite nations, I am going to go slow on approving blank checks to Mr. Dulles for continuation of the same old unimaginative, unrealistic programs of foreign aid.

In this connection I am including also an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor in its issue of June 4, 1956, entitled "A World Development Policy."

This article refers to a study of a new foreign economic policy for the United States made by Profs. Max F. Millikan and W. W. Rostow at the request of Government officials. Certainly it is a thought-provoking article and it is my hope that those in charge of our foreign policy will come up with a dynamic, realistic, economic foreign policy and a new and more realistic program of foreign aid:

Foreign aid has come to the point where it needs a new name. More than a mere change of label, it needs fresh clarification of purpose and the development of a well-rounded, solidly based character. Like a youth that has met the challenge of high-school football games and the senior prom, it must now look forward to a career of planned usefulness.

Some such program for America's practical contribution to a sane and livable world is offered in the very provocative study of a new foreign economic policy for the United States made by Profs. Max F. Millikan and W. W. Rostow at the request of Government officials.

That paper, substantial excerpts of which were printed in the Christian Science Monitor of May 31, takes as one of its premises that "some increase in the per capita availability of material goods, while not enough by itself, is certainly a necessary condition * * * for the development of stable and peaceful societies and for the viability of democratic institutions."

It does not argue that all that has been done in the name of foreign aid has been good; it recognizes that some efforts have been wasteful, some actually harmful. It rejects the premises that economic gifts will automatically "bring us friends," strengthen military allies, sell private enterprise, or defeat communism. But it avers that "properly designed and administered, economic programs are one of the few levers available to us which have a serious chance of influencing in important ways political developments in the underdeveloped areas."

Those programs, the report recommends, should not be directed to particular countries but should be open to participation by countries which initiate sound projects and can give evidence that the assistance would result in actual increase of productivity, repaying at least part of the cost and starting the country on the road to supplying its own capital needs.

The aid would not carry with it any military or political strings, but it would be limited to undertakings which will benefit the population at large and which are approved by the electorate in some genuinely democratic manner.

On this basis the two experts from Massachusetts Institute of Technology estimate that the program would cost the United States only a little more than is currently being distributed.

Some of the realism of the study may be judged by this passage:

"Our influence can, of course, be no more than marginal. The political, social, and economic development of foreign areas is a task for the peoples of these areas themselves, and we cannot insure that they will do it well or badly.

"But two considerations suggest that it would be inexcusable for the United States not to exert to the utmost whatever marginal influence we have. In the first place we have a compelling national interest in promoting a world environment in which we ourselves can live freely, secure both from the menace of hostile States and the distraction of chaotic ones. In the second place, American society is at its best when we are wrestling with the positive problems of building a better world."

It may involve something of a reorientation in American politics to accept the proposition that the people of the United States have a long-continuing, even more or less permanent role in fostering abroad the kind of economic progress which has served them so well. The Millikan-Rostow study, however, should help materially to develop that concept.

Proposed Changes in Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means today resumed consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. As I have done in the past, I will insert in the RECORD a release which I issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the tentative action taken by the committee today:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER, OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, 16, 17, and June 6, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 15, 16, 17, and June 6, 1956, and appear on pages A3818, A3918, A3965, A4020, and A4525, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee had completed the consideration of the subcommittee's recommendations as set forth in the subcommittee report. The next action by the full committee on the subcommittee recommendations will occur with the consideration of specific proposed legislative language embodying the subcommittee recommendations as agreed to by the committee. This consideration will occur at such time as the proposed statutory language is drafted. A table of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

1. The full committee approved the subcommittee recommendation for the adoption of the proposed revision in the alcohol, tobacco, etc., taxes as presented by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service with the changes and modifications noted in numbered paragraph 2 below and as noted in the press release of June 6, 1956.

2. The committee approved a subcommittee recommendation that provisions be adopted which will permit distilled spirits of different ages to be commingled in an internal revenue bonded warehouse. Such distilled spirits, however, cannot be less than 4 years old. The date of original entry of the youngest spirits mingled in this manner is to be deemed the date of original entry of all the spirits in any package for purposes of determining the expiration of the 8-year bonded period. In approving this subcommittee recommendation, the committee adopted an amendment which would embody the provisions of H. R. 5367 with an amendment that would substitute a 20-year bonding period for the unlimited bonding period provided in the bill.

3. The committee deleted the subcommittee recommendation which stated that provision should be made in the case of the tobacco and alcoholic beverage taxes to shift from the stamp system for collecting these taxes to a semimonthly return system. This semimonthly return system should be provided for the period from August 1, 1957, to July 30, 1958, and should make provision for the reporting of collections for the first 15 days of each month on the 18th of the same month and for the reporting of collections for the period from the 15th to the end of the month on the 3d day of the following month. Beginning with August 1, 1958, and for subsequent years, a monthly return system should be adopted. Each month's collections would be reported on the 15th day of the following month under this recommendation.

The committee returned to the consideration of subcommittee recommendations that had previously been passed over and took the following action:

I. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES

Recommendations 1 through 3 were previously approved by the committee.

4. Credits or refunds should be available with respect to the tax on gasoline destroyed as the result of a disaster (as so declared by the President) to the extent that the tax losses are not compensated by insurance or otherwise. The commitee in acting on this recommendation deleted the words "by fire or" from the original subcommittee recommendation so that the credits or refunds would be available only in the case of gasoline destroyed as the result of a disaster.

Recommendations 5, 6, and 7 were previously approved by the committee.

8. In the case of sales by manufacturers directly to retailers, the manufacturers' price on which the tax is computed should be based upon the price at which the manufacturer sells to wholesale distributors. This alternative to the actual price charged by the manufacturer would not be available where sales to the retailer are the normal method of distribution within the industry and would not be available where the manufacturer does not make a sufficient number of sales to independent wholesalers.

9. Present law provides that the base on which the manufacturers' tax is computed is to be constructed where a manufacturer makes a sale (otherwise than at arm's length) at less than the fair market price. In practice a sale to a selling subsidiary in such a case would be presumed to be not at arm's length. This administrative presumption should be codified.

10. The status of cooperative advertising in relation to a manufacturers' tax base should be clarified by a specific ruling of the Internal Revenue Service. The subcommittee has been informed that the Service will issue a ruling providing substantially as follows:

(a) The distinction between national and local advertising is abolished.

(b) Where a manufacturer's selling price to his customer contains an unsegregated advertising charge, it is a part of his tax base.

(c) In the case where a manufacturer makes a separate charge to his distributor for advertising and the proceeds are kept in a separate account earmarked for advertising, the separate advertising charge is not a part of the tax base. This separation can be evidenced by showing that the charge is either listed on the sales invoice or billed separately; the contributions from distributors are set aside as a fund to be used for advertising for the benefit of these contributors and the funds are so used, or the unexpended portion is held in trust or refunded to the contributor upon his withdrawal from the program.

(d) Where the manufacturer makes a contribution to the advertising account in the case of a separate fund, the amount of the manufacturer's contribution may not be deducted in computing the taxable sales price. However, the subsequent allowances against such contributions to distributors for expenditures by them or their dealers for advertising should be treated as readjustments of sales price.

IV. TRANSPORTATION TAXES

Recommendations 1 and 3, previously approved by the committee.

2. Present law imposes a tax equal to 4½ percent of the fare charged for the transportation of oil by pipeline, with an exemption for any movement through pipelines between the premises of a refinery, bulk plant, terminal, or a gasoline plant if the movement is not a continuation of taxable transportation. "Any movement through lines of pipe within the premises," in addition to including any movements interpreted by the Secretary or his delegate as being within the premises under existing law, should also include any movement which constitutes an integral part of the operation of a refinery, a bulk plant, a terminal, or a gasoline plant. In drafting proposed statutory language to carry out this recommendation, the staff was directed to include a mileage limitation prescribing the maximum distance that such transportation may cover without payment of tax.

In addition to the committee action described above, the committee also ordered favorably reported H. R. 11619, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana.

The chairman announced that the committee was tentatively scheduled to meet in executive session at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 12, 1956, to begin consideration of proposals for the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 as amended.

Just a Little Comment by a Little Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a great many people back home are inclined to believe the attempt of the arrogant labor bosses to control all business activity is just a myth. Perhaps some realize the dangers that can come to localities where the labor czars attempt to control everything that moves in commerce. Many a small-business man does not know of the impending danger, namely, someday a labor boss will drive up to his place of business and simply ask a question, "Does your help belong to the union?" Mr. Average Small-Business Man will say "No." The Cadillac-riding boss will say, "You will get no more deliveries until all your help belongs to the union."

You say this cannot happen in rural America. This is happening every day and the Teamsters A. F. of L. and CIO openly boast they will control all small-business establishments by this method.

Labor-management relations is not something that belongs exclusively to large cities and big industrial areas. They affect the small-rural newspaper owner. Here is what a small-newspaper editor recently wrote about how arrogant, domineering union methods affect his business. Here is his editorial:

JUST A LITTLE COMMENT

This year's political campaign in Kansas is likely to be governed pretty largely by the campaign for and against the right-to-work bill, which will again be a major issue before the State legislature.

There will be a lot of propaganda over the trite phrase calling this a "union busting" bill, which is not the truth in any sense of the word.

But it is a bill to try to stop some of the major unions in their aspirations to get a stranglehold on the entire economy.

No man is forced against his will to work for any industrial concern if he doesn't want to—except in Communist-dominated countries.

Why should any concern be forced to hire only certain men who may have had to sell their souls to some labor union bosses to be privileged to take a job?

There are thousands and thousands of men forced to join unions in order to get or hold jobs, after a union gets control, who do not condone the actions of the very unions to which they belong. Just because a man belongs to a union doesn't make a crook or gangster out of him—but too often a union gets control of a small group of men who have no consideration for the common good.

In many cases they make rules that handicap the employers from giving good service to their customers.

Just as a sample, there are business institutions, even in our small towns who cannot get quick shipments from wholesale houses because the unionized shipping department simply wants to show its power by taking 2 to 4 days to get an order out.

We have to take facts like this under consideration, every time we place an order. This office sent an order 2 weeks ago Monday for a small shipment of expensive paper that could be wrapped and sent out by mail by the front office of a Kansas City paper house and 2 days later we received the shipment. Then from the same house we ordered a heavier shipment that had to be sent out by freight, with one package of large sheets cut once for better handling, and it was 4 or 5 days before the shipment was even sent out of the warehouse to the freight depot.

We have complained many times to the various paper companies about this lousy type of service, but the only answer we can get is that they can't control the shipping departments.

The union rules seem to require that if a ream of paper has to be cut, it must stay on the hook at least until "tomorrow." Then another "tomorrow" seems to be required to pass by before it can be properly packaged and shipped out.

One of the prominent men of this paper company told us some time ago that they could handle their shipping department with half as many men and more efficiently, if the union would let them.

This useless hiring of twice as many men as necessary on some jobs—commonly called featherbedding, costs the public more and more in the goods they buy.

Progress Toward the Integration of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech given by me before the First Regional Model Assembly of the Council of Europe in Rochester, N. H., Saturday, May 19, 1956. The speech is entitled: "Progress Toward the Integration of Europe":

Mr. President and members of the Model Assembly of the Council of Europe: It is a great pleasure, a high privilege and a distinct honor to be here in the Spaulding High School Auditorium this afternoon to address the High School Model Assembly of the Council of Europe under the sponsorship of the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs and the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire. I am delighted to have the opportunity of delivering the closing address to the members of this assembly.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire, and the students of the participating high schools in New Hampshire for your efforts in making this Model Assembly an outstanding success.

I am greatly pleased that New Hampshire has a Council on World Affairs. We need to devote our attention to international problems since they affect our everyday life. Whatever happens in one part of the world sends repercussions around the globe because of the closeness of the continents in

this age of rapid scientific advancement. I notice that in the brochure put out by the New Hampshire council entitled "World Affairs Are Your Affairs," it is stated that the purpose of the organization is to "create an informed public opinion as the democratic basis for a sound foreign policy, to operate as a ccordination point and service center for interested organizations, advocating no specific policy or action, and to promote the widest possible understanding of world affairs as an essential step toward lasting peace." I hope this organization continues to grow and that it will have a wide membership in every section of the State, for we certainly need to have the broadest possible understanding of foreign affairs in this nuclear era.

I know of no more worthwhile endeavor than the organization and the holding of a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe. This interest in foreign affairs is most encouraging and it is most important, since the United States of America, this Republic, is the leader of the free world. We are in foreign affairs to stay and as the days come and go, we will find that it is necessary for us to have an ever-increasing understanding and to take an ever-increasingly active part in the solution of international problems. We need to know more and more about foreign affairs and the shaping of foreign policies because the future of the world will depend directly upon how wisely the United States exercises its destiny-given position of leadership in the new role in which the Republic finds itself.

REPORT OF STUDY MISSION

My specific object this afternoon is to discuss with you the progress toward the unification and integration of Europe. This is a subject in which I have long been interested. In the fall of 1953 I had the opportunity of being the chairman of a study mission to Europe. The mission made a thorough study of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, also a complete survey and appraisal on European unification and integration. In the section of our report dealing with European integration, we gave detailed information on the Benelux Economic Union, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Coal and Steel Community, the Western Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the proposed European Defense Community, and the Council of Europe, all having the purpose of bringing about a closer unity among the nations in Europe.

NEED FOR UNITY

In our report dated February 25, 1954, the study mission stated: "At the end of World War II, the concept of unity took on new meaning and significance. * * * Cooperation among the nations of Europe had become more than an ideal or a dream. It had become a matter of life and death for free peoples. The formidable obstacles to unity, so long recognized, were at last challenged by the overwhelming need for unity.

"Since the closing days of the war, efforts toward increased cooperation among the European nations have followed many different lines and assumed many different patterns. These have ranged from consultation among national governmental representatives on international committees to the surrender of portions of national sovereignty to supranational organization, with one objective in mind: To achieve peace, security, and economic prosperity through the joint action of two or more nations."

In an article entitled "United States Leadership in a Divided World," which I wrote for the 1953 September issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, I stated: "As I think of the disunity in Europe and as I think how important the achievement of unification—political, economic, and military—has become, my mind turns to the history of the 1860's in which Abraham Lincoln gave leadership to his country. His farsighted statesmanship prevented the division of our country and made certain the continuation of the United States."

Had it not been for Lincoln's leadership the United States today might not be in existence and our continent would undoubtedly be an atomized continent, with many divisions, and instead of one nation we might find ourselves hopelessly factionalized. Happily, this is not the case. Although it would be impossible to make one nation out of the European countries, nevertheless, a much greater degree of unity is possible and a much greater degree of unity is essential if Europe is not to perish in a maelstrom of differences, rivalries, dissensions, and conflict.

INTEGRATION IMPERATIVE

By the end of World War II it had become perfectly apparent to thinking people that a greater integration of Western Europe was imperative if the nations on that continent were to survive the threat of communism and if they were to preserve the culture developed over so many years. The Soviet Union insisted upon maintaining large standing forces. The policy of Moscow was intransigent and aggressive. The Soviet Union presented a threat that was far beyond the ability or capacity of any of the European states to meet as individuals. Collective action was the only way that the countries could be preserved. It was also apparent that Europe by itself could not survive.

With United States help and by moving together, the countries had the possibility of achieving a power sufficient to form a balance. The economic problems created by a series of small States separated by tariff barriers and trade restrictions seemed to mean continued economic difficulties for all, while integration offered the efficiency and economy of a mass market and specialization. Integration, in short, seemed the one logical way of meeting a number of different problems. It is my purpose to trace the development and the contribution made by various European organizations toward a greater integration of the continent, economically, militarily, and politically.

BENELUX

In 1944 the first attempt at integration economically was the so-called Benelux group, consisting of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. These countries established a customs union which merged, to some extent, the economies of the member States. The agreement provided for the elimination of tariffs existing between the member countries and the establishment of common tariffs on imports coming into the union. Complete union has not been achieved, since all trade barriers have not been eliminated.

ORGANIZATION FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Three years later, in 1947, steps toward a broader economic integration occurred when 16 countries in Europe cooperated to create the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. This organization, established to implement United States economic aid under the Marshall plan, had four aims: First, to reduce trade barriers; second, to facilitate the distribution of essential materials; third, to promote economic stability; and fourth, to utilize more effectively European manpower.

In our report on the unification and integration of Europe, our study mission stated that "the long-term aim of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is the achievement of a sound European economy through the economic cooperation of its members. In pursuing this goal, its immediate purpose was to insure the success of the European recovery program through cooperation with the United States." The program was most successful and in the present mutual-security bill there is no economic aid programed for Europe.

EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY

Another of the organizatitons making an outstanding contribution to economic integration is the European Coal and Steel Community. It is particularly important because it created the first effective supranational agency. For the first time nations surrendered a sufficient amount of their national sovereignty to the new organization, the authority of which was considered superior to the individual authority of each member state.

The members of the European Coal and Steel Community include Belgium, Italy, France, Western Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Its purposes are: First, to enlarge the European market; second, to encourage the increase per capita steel consumption; third, to pool their resources; and fourth, to assist member states to adjust their economies to an intensified competition in Europe and elsewhere. In establishing a dominion over the distribution of coal, iron ore, steel, and ferrous scrap within the political frontiers of the member countries, the European Coal and Steel Community is a real supranational authority and is making a valuable contribution to the economic integration of Europe.

THE EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

Another organization contributing to economic integration was founded in July 1950. This was the European Payments Union. The Union provides a common currency pool for balancing international payments on a multilateral basis. In this way a freer flow of currencies and goods has been made possible.

WESTERN UNION

The establishment of the Western Union on March 17, 1948, by France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, was the first step toward the postwar military integration of Europe. Under this pact the countries pledged themselves to give immediate military assistance to any party against which aggression might occur.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

On April 4, 1949, a treaty was signed in Washington, D. C., which brought NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, into being. By negotiating this treaty, the North Atlantic Community reaffirmed its faith in the purposes of the United Nations Charter, seeking to stabilize the North Atlantic area by organizing for collective defense to keep the peace and maintain the security of the community. The treaty aimed to strengthen the free institutions of European nations and to encourage economic collaboration within the framework of cooperative consultation.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been an outstandnig success. At the moment the following nations—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Western Germany—are members of the Organization.

In the military sphere the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is accomplishing the principle task for which it was intended, that is deterring Communist military aggression in Europe, insuring the territorial integrity and political independence of the European nations and enabling those nations to stabilize their respective economies. However, events of recent months have clearly demonstrated that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to become more than a military alliance. The threat of the new look Russian foreign policy demands that new life and broader vision be given to NATO.

RECENT NATO ACTION

In view of the new tactics of the Soviet Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has taken some recent and significant action. At a meeting of NATO in Paris on May 5, it was decided to set up a committee of 3, including Foreign Ministers Gaetano Martino of Italy, Lester B. Pearson of Canada and Halvard M. Lange of Norway, to make a study of NATO problems and to develop ways and means of defeating communism. As suggested by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the NATO meeting in Paris, this high level council would sit permanently, dealing with political and economic problems confronting the Atlantic community. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has reacted to the new situation created by the change in the tactics of the Soviet Union—a change which is, of course, calculated to help them in their fundamental objective of world domination, which does not change.

Today perhaps more than ever before, Europe is aware that its very survival rests on the strengthening of economic, military and political ties within the Atlantic community. European nations must realize that there are issues involved that require the sacrifice of certain nationalist goals and desires. For Europe to assume her rightful place in any international negotiations and decisions, she must work effectively and soon toward greater integration and unity.

Guy Mollet has said: "Russia's cold war has shown the need for a Europe united militarily; Russia's new look calls even more loudly for a Europe united politically." Progress has definitely been made toward European integration. Europe has moved toward the idea of a common market. A common coordinating authority will act as a spokesman for the common European interest, although a "United States of Europe" with executive, legislative and judicial powers is far from a forseeable realization. An agency coordinating on a supranational level to give Europe the strength she needs for survival and effective international cooperation is a reasonable expectation.

REJECTION OF EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY

The foregoing is a brief summary of the principle successful European ventures since the termination of World War II. Concomitant with these successful ventures have been certain projects and proposals which have not fared so well. The aura of success which tends to surround these union efforts of postwar Europe must not blind us to setbacks which have occurred.

For one thing, I refer to the rejection by France of the European Defense Community. Although France had led the way in proposing the European Defense Community, the proposal for pooling the Armed Forces of the 6 member nations into a common army was turned down by the French assembly in 1954. Among the principle reasons for this rejection of the European Defense Community was the French fear that Germany would dominate it, being potentially more capable of developing military predominance in Europe. Of course, the concept of supranationalism associated with all these schemes for integration has always run headlong into the competing nationalisms of the respective countries. For this reason all the interested European nations have approached this concept with caution.

With the rejection of the supranational European Defense Community, the countries fell back upon a more orthodox military alliance. Some years earlier, Britain, France and the Benelux countries had signed a defensive alliance called the Brussels Treaty Organization. With this Organization as a basis, the Western European Union was established at the Nine Power Conference held in London in the fall of 1954, consisting of Britain, France, the Benelux countries, Germany and Italy. Since this alliance was a substitute for the European Defense Community, it naturally had the same purpose to add Western German strength to that of the allies and at the same time to control that strength. As stipulated in this Western European Union, Western Germany is pledged to abide by a continental arms control, not to manufacture atomic, biological or chemical weapons, to conduct its foreign policy in accordance with the United Nations Charter and never to resort to force to achieve German unification. Thus, although the Union does have certain aspects of supranationalism, it does not have such extensive ones as those the defunct European Defense Community would have had.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

In the report of the study mission several paragraphs were devoted to the Council of Europe. As you all know, it was in March 1948 that the French Parliament adopted a resolution calling for a European Constituent Assembly to establish a European federation. Established on May 5, 1949 with the aim of promoting "greater unity among the European countries in order to facilitate their economic and social progress," the Council of Europe now, includes the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Ireland, Saar, the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Turkey, Iceland, and the German Federal Republic.

The major organs of the Council are: the Committee of Ministers, composed of the Foreign Ministers of the member States or their deputies, which meets at least twice a year in closed sessions; the Consultative Assembly, consisting of 132 delegates with delegations varying in size according to the relative sizes of the member countries, which meets in open sessions annually for 1 month in Strasbourg, France; and the Secretariat. Before the Consultative Assembly can make recommendations to the Committee of Ministers, a two-thirds majority vote is required, and such recommendations, if unanimously approved by the Ministers, are then transmitted to the member governments. A system of "partial agreements," agreements among certain members which do not bind those who abstain, which slightly modifies the unanimity rule, has only recently been adopted by the Ministers.

Because of the existence of other international organizations with functions similar to those of the Council of Europe, which in essence is a clearinghouse of ideas for the means of advancing European unification, the Statute of the Council provides that the work of these other organizations be kept in mind when the Assembly is planning its agenda, thus avoiding a duplication of effort.

PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION

We may now ask ourselves what are the prospects for further progress toward integration in Europe. In the first place, the new habits and institutions established within the European Community have taken root and have been accepted by Europeans and the world. The European idea has captured the imagination of even the once skeptical European. A new consciousness of "Europeaness," so to speak, about the common background of the European civilization has been realized by Europeans themselves.

More and more one hears Europeans speaking in terms of common interests and a common market. From the beginning of the Marshall plan the matter of a common market has persistently appeared. When Robert Schuman's plan for pooling coal and steel resources was accepted by the 6 European nations in April 1951, it was establishing a common steel and coal market for regulating production and eliminating trade and other restrictions. It is felt that this 6-nation common market of 150 million in a united Europe should increase production and prosperity by creating a larger and greater demand for new goods. Coal and steel were selected as the first sector to be pooled because these two resources are the major ones upon which the heavy industries of both France and Germany exist. By September 1955 progress had been made toward stabilizing the common market, as well as toward integrating other fuel and power resources into the plan. For the future there is talk of integrating transport, other conventional fuel and power, and even nuclear energy.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

In the report of the special study mission on International Organizations and Movements and on the unification and integration of Europe issued in 1954, we stated in our last paragraph: "The United States has steadfastly encouraged and supported unification and integration movements in free Europe. In the final analysis, however, these movements must spring inwardly from the will of the Europeans themselves. United Sstates policy is premised on that will. But if the passage of a reasonable length of time indicates that such a will does not exist, the United States would be compelled—not by its own choosing—to readjust its policy."

I like to believe that there is springing from the hearts of the Europeans a desire for a closer integration and unification. The events of the past several months have posed new problems and in view of this, the United States is in the process of readjusting its policy, not because we have lost faith in the unification of Europe, but because we recognize that into the existing organization, particularly the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, there must be breathed a new life and a new vitality.

That Europe is endeavoring to come to grips with this problem is evidenced by the recent appointment of a committee of NATO members to study and report to the Council, which I mentioned previously. That we are coming to grips with this problem is evidenced by a suggestion which Secretary of State Dulles offered in his speech closing the mutual security hearings on May 10 of this year. The Secretary stated that consideration is being given to the establishment of a committee to conduct an independent study of various aspects of the mutual security program. In listing the topics under consideration, he included: "The relative role of the State and Defense Departments in administering the program; whether we should seek to put more of our program on a loan rather than a grant basis; whether the program needs to be enlarged and given greater continuity to meet the new Soviet tactics." Thus, the free nations of the world, because of the recent change in Soviet tactics, are endeavoring to shape policies to meet the new situation.

STATEMENT MADE BY THE UNITED NATIONS DELEGATION TO SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

In connection with this shift in Soviet policies, the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations, of which I was a member, submitted to the Secretary of State on December 9, 1955, a statement on foreign policy. In this communication we stated:

"The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.

"Members of the United States delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics

under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.

"We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.

"We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.

"We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.

"We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

CONCLUSION

Europe must continue its drive with constantly increasing intensity to become more united economically, militarily, and politically, if the threat of communism is to be effectively met and destroyed. The Council of Europe, which is the political organization for the purpose of developing ways and means to bring about political unity, can well become the most important instrument for the realization of more cooperation among the countries of Europe. The unification of Europe has widespread support not only in Europe but throughout our own country. I know of no better way to become familiar with the problems inherent in the various moves calculated to bring about European unification than to make a study of this many faceted problem through a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe, such as you have held here today.

Europe is an integral part of the free civilization which it is our privilege to possess. Stretching back over the centuries, the nations of Europe have made a growing and an enduring contribution to the culture and the civilization of the West. From these countries we have received enrichment in art, music, literature, and many of the fields of human activity.

The revolution in scientific fields, particularly aviation and nuclear energy, is demanding that equal progress be made in the field of economics and politics. As the organizations we have been talking about become successful, we will find in the future a strong and invigorated continent continuing to make a contribution to the civilization of the West. This is our hope for Europe. We thoroughly believe in European unification and integration. We are endeavoring to shape our policies to bring about this desired end. I have confidence that we will be successful and I am certain that the nations of Europe, which are already hearing the clarion call of destiny "unite or perish," will rise to the occasion in this mid-20th century, and will, with our help and our encouragement, move ever closer to unification and integration until the peoples of those countries are completely secure from the sinister threat of communism, are able to live free from the fear of war and are able in a peaceful environment to help in the bringing about of a prosperous and peaceful world community.

Russian Persecution and Genocide of the Church in Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of this academic year, Marquette University has been celebrating its 75th anniversary. In its 75 years of existence this great Jesuit institution has developed an imposing record of scholarly achievement, educational service, and constructive effort in behalf of public enlightenment on every conceivable issue confronting American society.

As part of its 75th anniversary celebration, an impressive program was held on Sunday, May 20, on The Church Behind the Iron Curtain. Sponsored by the Slavic Institute at Marquette and under the honorary patronage of the Most Reverend Albert G. Meyer, archbishop of Milwaukee, Wis., this colorful and vitally important program was directly undertaken by three outstanding citizens of Milwaukee: the Honorable Francis X. Swietlik, Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, and Prof. Alfred J. Sokolnicki.

Preceding the program was a celebration of holy high mass in the Byzantine Slavic rite at Gesu Church in which the Very Reverend Nestor Fecica, O. S. B. M., was the celebrant, assisted by Rev. Sebastian Kurylo, O. S. B. M., and Rev John Oleksiuk. A deeply moving sermon was delivered by the Most Reverend Roman Atkielski, auxiliary bishop of Milwaukee, and an explanation of the mass was given by Rev. George E. Ganss, S. J. Mr. James Ivankoe, directed the choir of the St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church in Chicago. The Voice of America recorded both the mass and the program in full.

The program devoted to The Church Behind the Iron Curtain covered most of the countries of Eastern Europe. One of the most instructive addresses delivered on this program was the Russian Persecution and Genocide of the Church in Ukraine, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics in the graduate school of Georgetown University and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. At this time of the visitation of two religious delegations from the Soviet Union, the contents of this address may well be used as an authoritative source for several pointed questions that might be raised on the alleged freedom of worship and conscience in the U. S. S. R. I commend this address to the studied attention of my colleagues:

RUSSIAN PERSECUTION AND GENOCIDE OF THE CHURCH IN UKRAINE

(Address by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet Economics, Graduate School, Georgetown University, chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America)

It is with an eminent sense of honor that on this distinguished program devoted to the Church behind the Iron Curtain, I have this oportunity to portray the church in Ukraine. In taking this opportunity, I desire first to convey the further greetings and warmest wishes of Georgetown University on the complete success of the 75th anniversary celebration of its sister institution, and may the many God-given blessings of this Ignation Year, in which we pay great tribute to the rich Jesuit tradition, bring to Marquette still more illustrious achievements of progress and popular enlightenment. Never before in the history of western society have creative achievements in faith and knowledge been more desperately needed than now, with the fatal aim of atheistic Russian Communist imperialism pointing at the very heart of our civilization.

The timely character of this short address is further enhanced by the recent celebrations in this country of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine. In every sense a national tradition, this colorful background of loyal faith was founded by the holy baptism of Saint Olga, princess of Ukraine, in the capital of Kiev in A. D. 955. While the enslaved Ukrainian people themselves could only observe this glorious event in the silence of their present catacombs, we Americans, in the free environment of our country and under the wise leadership of the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky and the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshen, O. S. B. M., are privileged to perpetuate this tradition in the abiding hope that one day its full expression will capture again a free and independent Ukrainian nation. In this, we are most thankful for and greatly inspired by the prayers and hopeful messages sent on this commemorative occasion by numerous eminent dignitaries in the Catholic hierarchy of America. Their bountiful source of inspiration to the relentless freedom-aspiring efforts of the 40 million Ukrainians, who have rightly come to be known as the Irish of Eastern Europe, cannot be too strongly emphasized.

THE NECESSARY MATRIX OF HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING

For one to understand, rather than just know, the state of the church in Ukraine today, it is imperative for him to view the salient contemporary facts in a necessary matrix of historical understanding embracing the relations between Russia and Ukraine. By analogy, no more than we can affirm a person's understanding of the philosophia perennis without a foundation in its metaphysics, could we expect an appreciative understanding of the present plight of the church in Ukraine without a historical knowledge of Russia's traditional imperialist appetite for resourceful Ukraine. It would, indeed, be an error of extreme abstractionism to view the church in Ukraine devoid of its context in the form of the persistent struggle of the often free Ukrainian nation against the colonial and imperialist domination by Moscow. The atheistic doctrines of Marxism help little in this understanding, for the policy of the Russian Communist today, in relation to the church in Ukraine, is substantially that of the Russian czars of yesterday.

The history of Eastern Europe abundantly shows the consistent attempt on the part of Muscovy and empire-building Russia to reduce and liquidate Ukraine as a nation. This is the meaning of Russification. With its third Rome obsession and ideologizing orthodoxy for the expansionist ambitions of the czars, the Russian Orthodox Church long served as the medium of Russification. In the imperious big-brother spirit of "be my brother or I'll slay you," it has always condemned the great union of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church with Rome in 1595.

"If an angel appeared from heaven before you," wrote the Muscovite Metropolitan Jonas, "and told you to recognize the authority of the Pope, then curse him." Religious persecution and genocide were integral parts of the Russification programs launched by Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and Czar Nicholas I. The institutional continuity of this tradition was established by Stalin himself. On the forcible absorption of western Ukraine during World War II, his appointed head of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Patriarch Alexi, directed these words at the Ukrainian Catholics: "Where is the Vatican leading you at the present time. * * * To complicity with the abetter of fascism." Even on our shores bold expression is given to this combination of colonial empire and Russification, as witness the letter of the Russian Bishop Nikon to the New York Times on August 16, 1953.

A detailed study of this history, from Muscovy to the present federated Soviet Russia, amply demonstrates that for the greater part of this period the characteristic totalitarian Russian phenomena of imperialism, colonialism, empire, Russification, and religious persecution and genocide have developed hand-in-hand. In the current period it discloses, too, the singular fact that the church in Ukraine is the object not only of Russian Communist persecution but also of genocite perpetrated through the medium of Russian orthodoxy. This religious genocide constitutes a mortal attack on the soul of the Ukrainian nation as other forms of Soviet Russian genocide have on the head and body of this capitive non-Russian nation. Moreover, the indisputable record of this religious genocide furnishes additional evidence of the spuriousness of the Soviet constitution which in article 124 allegedly provides freedom of conscience, separation of church and state, and freedom of religious worship. This history convincingly shows also how the conquest and captivity of one large non-Russian nation leads to the enslavement of other formerly independent non-Russian nations, attended by similar forms of tyranny and persecution.

THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST RECORD OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND GENOCIDE IN UKRAINE

The Russian Communist record of religious persecution and genocide in Ukraine commences only a few years after the destruction of the independent Ukrainian National Republic in 1920. In the twenties it was the forerunner of things to come on other Ukrainian territories incorporated in other states, not to say, in regard to persecution, on other non-Russian ethnic territories as well, with the imperialist expansion of Moscow. The genocidal attack on the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the period of 1926–32 led to the complete liquidation of this body in Ukraine. Metropoliton Vasyl Lypkivsky was banished, Metropolitan Mikola Boretsky was imprisoned, and about 10,000 lay and monastic clergy met similar fates of deportation to concentration camps, imprisonment, and execution. Up to the outbreak of World War II, 34 bishops and over 3,000 priests were executed or died in the forced labor camps to which hundreds of thousands of the laity were deported. In his testimony in the work on Forced Labor in Soviet Russia (Dallin and Nicolaevsky), Prof. Ernst Tallgren, a former prisoner, points out that the most numerous of the political prisoners in these camps are Ukrainian farmers, Catholics, and members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. In the sweep of this genocidal onslaught about 80 percent of the Ukrainian Orthodox churches were demolished.

With the forcible annexation of other Ukrainian territories toward the end of World War II, Moscow now applied this pattern of religious genocide chiefly to the Ukrainian Catholic Church. As the patriotic Ukrainian Catholic leader, the Most Reverend John Buchko, well pointed out in his letter to the New York Times on August 5, 1949, before the cases of Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Stepinac and Archbishop Beran emerged, the extreme case of Metropolitan Joseph Slipyi and the entire loyal Catholic hierarchy and clergy, who were deported or murdered in 1945, was a closed chapter. The death of the greatly beloved Metropolitan Sheptytsky on November 1, 1944 appeared to set the stage for Moscow's plans in the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church which was fully launched on April 11, 1945.

The hierarchy, including 10 bishops, was arrested or killed, 3,600 priests serving 6 million believers were jailed, executed, or deported for forced labor, and 4,400 churches were desecrated. The roll of Christian martyrdom reads in part as follows: Archbishop Slipyi sentenced to the coal mines of Vorkuta and still believed to be in custody; Bishop Josephat Kotsylovsky of Peremyshl refused to join the Russian Orthodox Church and died in prison in Kiev on September 21, 1947; Bishop Hryhory Khomyshyn of Stanyslaviv died in a Siberian camp, January 17, 1947; Bishop Nicetas Budka of Lviv, tortured into insanity and died in prison; Auxiliary Bishops Hryhory Lakota of Peremyshl and Ivan Latyshevsky of Stanyslaviv in Siberian concentration camps; Most Rev. Mykola Charnetsky a slave laborer in the Urals; Bishop Theodore Romhza of Uzhorod in Carpatho-Ukraine killed by a Red Army tank in an alleged accident, October 27, 1947; Very Rev. Petro Verhun, Apostolic Visitator in Germany, kidnapped by the Russians in 1945, whereabouts unknown; Msgr. Augustyn Voloshyn arrested by the MVD on May 17, 1945 in Prague, whereabouts unknown; Most Rev. John Shimrak, Bishop of Krizevci, heading some 10,000 Greek Catholic Croatians and 40,000 Ukrainians in Yugoslavia, murdered in prison in 1947 on orders of the Tito regime; Rev. Dr. A. Boychuk, former rector of the Catholic seminary in Stanyslaviv, at forced labor in Siberia.

Each of these particular facts intimates the following more general facts. One, the movement of the Iron Curtain westward brought with it further genocide of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. In 1947 the attack centered upon the church in Carpatho-Ukraine and in 1950 in Czechoslovakia, resulting in the arrests of Bishops Paul Hoydych and Vasyl Hopko and numerous Basilian fathers, the Jesuits of the Eastern Rite. Two, Moscow's tactics of assault were the familiar ones of false accusation, divide and conquer, police sentences, and sacerdotal Russification. "Agents of the Vatican and American imperialists" led a long list of stock accusations; a "Committee of Initiative for the Transference of the Greek Catholic Church to Orthodoxy" was formed by the Patriarch of Moscow to entice the few apostate priests, and on his order and the assistance of the MVD it called a Synod in Lviv on March 8–10, 1946, to complete the break with Rome and enforce allegiance to the Russian Orthodox Church; and Ukrainian seminaries and churches were subjected to wholesale Russification.

However, these measure of religio-political imperialism have failed to break the religious resistance of the Ukrainian nation to Moscow. On the surface, both the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Orthodox do not exist, but underground their memberships grow. The quisling paper, Radyanska Ukraina (Kiev, No. 191) complains: "Religious prejudices are still hampering the consciousness of some of our people and preventing them from taking an active part in the building of communism." Under the caption of "Christians from Catacombs in the Donetz Basin in Rome," the Swiss organ, Vaterland (Feb. 4, 1952) states: "This underground religious movement embraces large areas of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic." The attempted implication of the Catholic Church at the trial of the Polish Bishop Czeslaw Kaczmarek in 1953 in the activities of Ukrainian political underground resistance points to a not unnatural alliance between the Polish and Ukrainian peoples who, leaving aside relatively minor differences, today face arm-in-arm a common enemy.

PRAYERS FOR ACTION ON THE CHURCH IN UKRAINE

It is well known that His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the encyclical, Orientales Omnes, calls attention to the martyrdom of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and appeals to all Catholics to pray for his "Church of the Catacombs."

In the encyclical Orientales Ecclesias, significantly directed at the Ukrainian nation, His Holiness points to the religious genocide of "flourishing Christian communities." Truly, this solid vanguard of Catholicism in the Soviet Union merits our first and prayerful consideration. If anywhere they strongly converge, the three great ideas of religion, national independence and liberty, which Father Don Luigi Sturzo rightly holds to have shaped the history of mankind (Nationalism and Internationalism, p. 13), it is in captive Ukraine.

Prayers lead to action and today, in our own Congress, the resolutions submitted by Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota and Congressman DODD of Connecticut on the genocidal persecution of Christianity in Ukraine are aimed to test the supposed reasonableness of the collective leadership which attributes the horrors of the past to Stalin. The rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Orthodox would not be posthumous, for they are not functionally dead. These measures offer a concrete test to the capacity of the oligarchical dictatorship to translate the words of article 124 in the Soviet Constitution into deeds. Furthermore, the forthcoming visit of the eight Russian Protestant and Orthodox churchmen, led by Metropolitan Nicolai, who heads the department of foreign affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, presents a most appropriate occasion for their responses to questions on the genocide of the church in Ukraine and a list of names of those presently persecuted. It is surely not conducive to our national security to permit an uncontested dissemination of policed misrepresentations on freedom of religious worship and conscience in the Soviet Union.

Facing the emperors of his day, Tertullian wrote, "Every day we stand seige; every day we are betrayed; above all in our gatherings and our assemblies we are surprised." His words ring truer than ever today as the assemblies of God increase in Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, Byelo-Ruthenia, Croatia, and even in Russia. Their unshaken faith is the foundation for the realization of the three great ideas that shape the history of mankind.

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Genocide Convention: Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1950, pages 319–413.

2. First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecutions in Ukraine, Rome, 1953.

3. The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism: Roman Smal-Stocki, Bruce, 1952.

4. Martyrdom in Ukraine: Walter Dushnyck, The American Press, 1946.

5. Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine: Special Report No. 4, Select Committee on Communist Aggression. The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, chairman, Washington, 1955.

6. Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U. S. S. R.: Hearings, Washington, 1954.

7. Political Background of the Religious Persecution in Ukraine by Moscow: Nicholas D. Chubaty. The Ukrainian Quarterly, volume XI, No. 1, pages 56–65.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Misleading Tactics of Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the attached article explains the many tactics that the Communist Government of Russia is using to foster herself and to destroy the American form of government.

I have known for sometime about the action of the countries behind the Iron Curtain writing to minority groups and urging them to come back to their native country. Those who do return usually find themselves imprisoned or worse. This has been going on for some time and the article explains vividly and pointedly the actions of the Communists.

What bothers me, though, is that the present administration, including the President of the United States, in their desire for so-called peaceful coexistence consistently disregard these actions of the Communists and seem to see only the olive branch the Russians are holding out to us. For instance, during the Geneva Conference, Czechoslovakia was making her arrangements for sale of arms to Egypt. Also, while putting out the olive branch in the Middle East, the Communists are taking action to destroy the present forms of government there.

The recent action of the Soviets to cut down their armies by over a million, which, of course, is only a very small portion of their total armed forces, was undertaken with the object of having us do the same. If we did, we all know we would be left with only approximately one-half of our present men in the service.

All of these signs point definitely, as many of us have known for years, that regardless of what the proposal from Russia is, it can never be honored on its merits.

Present action in Korea by the United Nations inspection team, the disregard of the Korean armistice, and actions in Southern Vietnam, all point further that the administration is being fooled by the Soviet promise that you can do business with these people. The sooner we do away with such thinking and bring about constructive thought for the future, we will all be better off.

Following is the article Return to Us, They Beg, by Fred Woltman and Jack Steele, which appeared in the Thursday, June 7, 1956, issue of the Washington Daily News:

Josef Novak, a Czech escapee from the Red putsch, was mystified to receive a sentimental, anonymous chain letter from Munich, Germany, just before Christmas 1954.

It was simply worded and crudely handwritten. But the envelope had his name and home address in Pittsburgh clearly and right on the nose.

The letter began "Sisters and brothers of Bohemian and Slovak countries." It sang of the joys of Christmas in our native country, the bells resounding over the snowdrifts, and our dearest ones close at hand.

It also told of a great new movement gushing out with elementary force to bring Czech exiles back.

"In its name, copy this proclamation three times," the writer beseeched, "and send it to your friends."

Josef Novak soon learned that fellow Czechs all over the United States were getting identical letters—also precisely addressed, but mailed from different points in Austria and West Germany.

The gimmick in the Czech chain letter, of course, was to fool each recipient into thinking he got a spontaneous note from some fellow exile in Europe.

PART OF GRAND SCHEME BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Instead, it was part of a grand scheme hatched behind the Iron Curtain.

In later months, waves of these personal letters hit the various emigre groups—Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, Rumanians, and so forth.

From within the Soviet Union, Russians and Ukrainians heard from beleaguered relatives for the first time in a decade. Before that, those left behind hadn't dared to correspond. Now, evidently, they were being forced to.

"My dear Uncle Dmytro," began a typical letter from Orysia Yurivna in Stanislaw, the Ukraine.

"In our community we do not have any longer any rich capitalists," wrote the enthusiastic Orysia. "When we sing together in the Kolhosp (collective farm) everyone is happy. In the home of every kolhospnyk is a radio. * * * Two times a week movies are sent free. * * * No one is unemployed. * * * Practically everyone has bought a bicycle."

"Return to us," Orysia pleaded with Uncle Dmytro, "and you will live in prosperity and happiness among your own people."

VIRGINIAN'S LETTER TOUTED NEW RUSSIA

A Ukrainian-American farmer in Virginia heard from a brother he hadn't seen since 1943. The letter touted the new Russia. He refused to reply. A few weeks later a follow-up letter arrived, dropped in the mail in New York City. By whom, it was impossible to tell.

Emigre groups say there have been thousand of such personal letters. Many times that number are sent to America by "Return to the Homeland" committees in eastern Europe, chiefly the central committee in East Berlin headed by Maj. Gen. Nikolai Mikhailov.

Last winter, over a span of a few days, 1,500 Estonian-Americans found packets from General Mikhailov in their mail boxes. They contained invitations to return and promises of amnesty.

The Tolstoy Foundation cites, as typical, this letter recently received by a Russian emigre and signed by General Mikhailov:

"DEAR COMPATRIOT: Your mother, ———— ————, informs us that in 1948–49 you were brought to America and she requests us to trace you.

"Please confirm immediately receipt of this letter and let us know what hinders you from coming back to your motherland. We shall try to help you to come back to the Soviet Union and join your people."

POLES RECEIVE MANY FLOSSY BULLETINS

Polonia International sends 30,000 letters as well as copies of its come-home paper to Polish organizations in this country and to old-time immigrants as well as recent escapees. And it sends out flossy bulletins urging Poles to revisit the homeland even if they don't want to return.

Free emigre committees are astounded at the size of the mailing lists in the hands of the Mikhailov committee and its satellite counterparts.

As a sample of its thoroughness, the Mikhailov group got hold of partial membership lists of two groups of emigree Russian doctors, the Russian Medical Society of New York and the Pirogov Society. Copies of the Mikhailov Homeland paper thereafter popped up on some of the doctors' waiting room tables.

Two facts are obvious:

Red mailing lists were built up by criminal means.

Red agents in the United States are collecting data on refugees.

After Mikhailov set up shop last year, anti-Communist offices which look after Russian refugees in West Germany were burglarized. Only membership and mailing lists were taken. The offices included the Central Union of Postwar Refugees, the American Friends of Russian Freedom and the Munich YMCA.

The free Estonian headquarters in Baden had its address lists taken on September 17, 1955. The Latvian offices in Augusdorf were rifled on August 19. Burglars broke into the files of the Lithuanian office at Reutlingen on October 22, but were frightened away.

RED AGENTS SCAN ROOM-TO-LET ADS

In New York, Red agents scan personal room-to-let and lost-and-found ads in Russian newspapers to collect names, according to Mark Weinbaum, editor of the free Russian newspaper Novoye Russkoye Slovo.

Other mailing list sources are Russian cultural and professional groups, he says. Refugee groups even fear they may be infiltrated by Red agents who steal their lists.

Behind the Iron Curtain, security agents take down names and addresses from mail and gift packages from the United States. Americans who send parcels behind the curtain have to fill out forms, one copy of which goes to the Red governments.

In the Ukraine, MVD agents systematically went from village to village collecting—sometimes by coercion—the names of exiles from their families and friends. And in the last few weeks Estonians received form letters from General Mikhailov suggesting that they send him addresses of other refugees.

The mailing lists serve a more sinister purpose than merely providing names for pen pal letters. The Reds also use them as sources for future fifth-column activities in the United States.

THEY DEMAND LEADERS DO "PATRIOTIC WORK"

In fact, the Mikhailov committee demands that emigree leaders do what is officially calls patriotic work as a condition of amnesty. To prove themselves, these leaders are directed to spread dissension and redefection propaganda among their fellow refugees.

Mikhailov has even tried to recruit one of the stanchest anti-Communists among the Russian escapees.

He is Gregory Klimov, a former Red army major who fled to the West and founded the Central Association of Post-War Emigrees of U. S. S. R. Mr. Klimov, who lives now in New York, also is the author of The Terror Machine—Inside Story of Soviet Rule in Germany.

Despite his record, Mr. Klimov recently received a letter signed by one Michael Kolo-

soc, a redefector now on Mikhailov's payroll.

"I write on request of a member of the Committee for Return to the Homeland," said Kolosoc. "They say you are a man for whom it is possible to return, too. They say there is no front door for you because amnesty does not apply. * * * But there is a back door. * * *

"If you wish to return, you should do several tasks for them. You should do some patriotic work."

Mr. Klimov declined the offer.

The United States Is Being Forced Into Isolation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Miss Dorothy Thompson writing in the Washington Evening Star a few nights ago said that the international situation is becoming increasingly dangerous to the United States for lack of foresight and analysis with the result that it is being increasingly isolated by other nations who are and have been friendly to us.

The article follows:

NO CAUSE FOR REJOINING HERE—RECENT WORLD EVENTS INTERPRETED AS INCREASING ISOLATION OF UNITED STATES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

There was much international news over the weekend, but none of it should cause rejoicing in Washington.

While the House Un-American Activities Committee heard 39 American "authorities on communism" testify that the new developments in Russia are a greater menace to the free world than Stalinism, and the American Ambassador to Russia, Charles Bohlen, assured Khrushchev (at a party) that NATO was not being liquidated, but strengthened, French Premier Guy Mollet signed a far-reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, on trade, cultural exchanges, and even principles to be realized, which will bring strong Soviet influences into a not at all unreceptive France.

In the upper house of the West German Parliament (the Bundesrat) Chancellor Adenauer, America's most reliable ally in Europe, suffered another defeat on two sections of the military service bill, charged with infringing free speech and making it impossible to protect conscientious objectors in their constitutional rights. The Bundesrat previously had voted down 18 months of military service in favor of 12, and the 18-month bill was passed over the veto of the upper house. The East German Government has said that conscription in West Germany will permanently preclude reunification, and meanwhile the British Government has announced that it will end conscription.

In the Middle East, Premier Nasser of Egypt announced his country would accept no external restrictions on her right to buy arms anywhere and in any quantity or category, and Egypt's official national news agency reported that an Egyptian military mission would go to Red China to shop for arms, the day Egypt's recognition of the Communist regime was proclaimed.

Although China is not normally considered a supplier of arms it could be a transshipment point for other Communist bloc states—with the advantage of not being subject to any restrictions that might be imposed by the United Nations, of which she is not a member.

Most sensational of all, perhaps, has been Israel's approach, via a young Egyptian journalist, Ibrahim Izzat, to Premier Nasser, of Egypt, and the message he conveyed from the Israel Government to the Egyptian. Nothing else in his report (which was released in Cairo in summary and will appear more fully under Egyptian censorship in the widely read magazine for which he works) is so important, Mr. Izzat said Foreign Minister Sharett and the Minister of Labor, Mrs. Golda Myerson (previously an American citizen), had told him "Egypt and Israel had the identical aim of opposing British influence in the Middle East. They were as opposed as the Egyptian leaders to the western-backed Baghdad pact."

The Baghdad pact, creating a northern defense against Soviet aggression was initiated by the United States, and although our Government has not joined it, we are closely cooperating with its members—Britain, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Iraq.

Izzat's visit was in response to an Israel invitation, apparently issued as a means of securing direct contact with Egypt. His report on social conditions (excluding the treatment of Israel's Arab citizens) is remarkably favorable.

Ben Gurion announced via Izzat his willingness to meet Premier Nasser in any place, including Cairo, and in return for conclusion of peace between Israel and the Arab bloc. Israel, it appears, has offered the plum of cooperating against western influence in general and British in particular, on the theory if you can's lick 'em, join 'em. This is no negligible offer. Israel has immensely able diplomats and one of the world's best intelligence services.

For those who have thought Israel to be an outpost of western policy, this will come as a shock. But Israel always has been officially neutral between East and West and could be counted on to pursue her own self-interest. Should peace be established on such terms, the international repercussion among Israel's supporters and upon British-American relations would be enormous.

The ice is breaking up along all fronts. New streams are flowing, and the United States, for lack of foresight and analysis, is being increasingly isolated.

Eisenhower Is Criticized for Theory of Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1956. It is most interesting in pointing up the lack of knowledge of our national history in high places.

EISENHOWER IS CRITICIZED FOR THEORY OF NEUTRALISM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—President Eisenhower doesn't often make mistakes with his impromptu remarks at press conferences, but when he does, it usually has international repercussions. Mr. Eisenhower almost pulled the rug from under his whole foreign-aid program by letting it be implied that nations which stay neutral in the cold war against Communist imperialism can still get financial benefits from the United States.

The President fell victim to the oft-repeated alibis of the "uncommitted" nations which argue that, since the United States stayed neutral during the first century or more of her existence, such a policy now is justified for them. This inaccurate statement of American history has been repeated often by various spokesmen for and champions of the neutralist cause in Asia, but it is surprising to see the President accept it and give it to his press conference as a valid argument.

SAYS POLICY WAS NEUTRAL

Mr. Eisenhower's exact words were these: "If you are waging peace, you can't be too particular sometimes about the special attitudes that different countries take. We were a young country once, and our whole policy for the first hundred years—or more, 150—was we were neutral. We constantly asserted we were neutral in the wars of the world and wars in Europe and antagonisms."

But what are the facts? In 1801 the United States declared war on Tripoli, which had interfered with American shipping in the Mediterranean. "Millions for defense, not one cent for tribute," was the battle cry.

The American Republic was less than 25 years old when it entered a world war, known on this side of the Atlantic as the War of 1812. The United States entered that war on the side of the French, who were fighting Britain. The main causes were the impressment of American seamen on the high seas by the British, blockade of American ports by the British, and violation of United States neutral rights on the high seas.

In 1821, when the Russian Czar issued his famous order extending Russian claims in the Pacific and closing the Bering Strait to commercial shipping of other nations, the young American Republic, by diplomatic note, publicly challenged the action.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

In 1823 the United States served notice in what became known as the Monroe Doctrine that the American continents were no longer to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers and that this country would consider dangerous to its peace and safety any attempt on the part of the European powers to extend their system to this hemisphere. This was a participation in world affairs which, coming from the young Republic, was bold and defiant.

During the American War Between the States, President Lincoln did not hesitate to send a stern warning to Great Britain, which had recognized the belligerency of the Confederacy as British ships sought to run the blockade of the Union Navy.

In 1895, President Cleveland served notice on Great Britain that, if it interfered in a boundary dispute in Venezuela, it "will be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of any governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela."

In 1898, the United States intervened in a war to save Cuba from Spanish oppression.

FOUGHT BOXERS

In 1900, the United States joined with five European powers and landed American Marines on the mainland of China to do battle against the Boxer rebels who had besieged the foreign legations in Peking.

In 1917, the United States intervened in World War I to protect neutral rights on the high seas, and, in 1941, the United States again intervened in a world war to protect her territories against attack.

The United States did not stand aloof at any time in its early or late history when there was aggression against its rights. The help of allies was sought not only in the Revolution but in the War of 1812.

What the United States has tried to do in southeast Asia by its pact there and in the treaties with Korea and Nationalist China and the Philippines is to arrange for common measures to resist aggression. The SEATO pact and the NATO treaty are really extensions of the Monroe Doctrine principle.

Mr. Eisenhower's words also will plague him with respect to West Germany. The Soviet regime wants Germany to be neutralized. Mr. Eisenhower speaks of the dangers that countries face which have military associations because they may have difficulties along their borders. Certainly the President didn't mean to give the impression that he favored neutrality for West Germany and a withdrawal from NATO, yet that's what his remarks can readily be construed to mean. His closing words—uttered with reference to Yugoslavia—were somewhat inconsistent with his other statements but they better express the American point of view. He said:

"The reason we help and assist others is in the belief that this will help us, also."

That's the only basis on which a foreign-aid program will be voted—and neutrals will have a hard time getting any American taxpayers' money out of Congress.

Liberal Education and the Crisis in Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this country is facing a crisis in leadership. The shortage of scientists imperils our national defense and, though there are more literate people in the United States today than ever before there is, in proportion, less literature being read and much less being written. Even on the political scene there are few giant statesmen to inspire us through the long winter of the cold war. While America has produced her skyscrapers, her huge industries, her fertile farms, her communication system, her network of airlines, her conquest of disease, her vitamized foods, and her housing projects, she has failed to rear the cultural leaders adequate not merely to plant the seeds of new progress but even to preserve the fruits of the past.

These matters were ably discussed by Prof. Vincent Edward Smith, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame, at the commencement exercises of Trinity College on June 4, 1956, in Washington, D. C.

Dr. Smith went on to say that—

For leadership in the works of the mind, we depend on our schools whose primary function is the communication of knowledge and truth, and yet the typical American school in our century, turning away from the ideal that knowledge and truth have an intrinsic value of their own, is no longer directed toward the genuine culture of the mind. If America has been short-changed in theoretical scientists, for example, surely a large share of the blame is the pragmatic method which has discouraged abstract theorizing by assigning concrete consequences as the sole test of truth. In this respect, the present-day American university has surrendered its lofty ideal, unfolded in Athens and held aloft wherever learning has flourished—the love of knowledge for its own sake.

CHARTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE SIGNED BY THE OFFICIALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON AUGUST 20, 1897

The administrators of the Catholic University of America encouraged the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur to erect a building that would serve as a college for women and the charter of Trinity College was signed by the officials of the District of Columbia on August 20, 1897. The 19 pioneer students, representing 11 States and the District of Columbia, assembled for their first class on November 7, 1900. From its origin Trinity has offered only a liberal arts course leading to a bachelor of arts degree, with the sole purpose of providing its students with a broad cultural education.

Dr. Smith was, therefore, speaking to a sympathetic audience when he said—

The liberal arts of language and mathematics—presented not merely as tool subjects or as skill courses but with the truly liberal aim of understanding—are highly relevant to the culture of the great thinkers that our Nation is challenged to produce in almost every field. Taught in the mode of understanding and not merely for practical utility, language and mathematics at all stages of education can be effective means of awakening the notion that the works of the mind are a great adventure and that there is a repose for human intelligence in the mere possession of truth, apart from its utilitarian consequences. It is false to suppose that democracy, by equalizing all men, discourages leadership. Everyone has a natural right to the education proportioned to his own ability. Our real problem in democratic education is not our commitment to offer educational opportunities to everybody. It is not a problem in the quantity of education but its quality. Our pragmatism has weakened, at all levels of schooling, the bridges to intellectual eminence that have always been the liberal arts.

Because of the contribution to the continuing discourse on the problem of education in our country which Dr. Smith has made, I include here the text of his address to the students of Trinity College.

LIBERAL EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS IN CULTURE

(Address of Vincent Edward Smith, Ph. D., professor of philosophy, University of Notre Dame, delivered at Trinity College, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1956)

The leaders in America have alerted us to a serious crisis in our culture. It is indeed a crisis in leadership itself. In the sciences, for instance, there are persistent reports from Government, industry, and the halls of education that our shortage of good theorists may even imperil our national defense. From the literary point of view, though there are more literate people in the United States than ever before, there is, in proportion, less literature being read and much less being written. Even on the political scene, there are few giant statesmen to inspire us through the long winter of the cold war. While America has produced her skyscrapers, her huge industries, her fertile farms, her communication system, her network of airlines, her conquest of disease, her vitaminized foods, and her housing projects, she has failed to rear the cultural leaders adequate not merely to plant the seeds of new progress but even to preserve the fruits of the past. After a careful study of human inventivity throughout recorded history, William Sorokin, a Harvard sociologist, has concluded that, despite the great mechanical advances of our own time, the number of great discoveries reached its peak about the beginning of the present century and started curving downhill. Some voices even proclaim that our brand of democracy here in America discourages leadership by flattening us all into mediocre and anonymous masses. Whatever be the truth in this proposition, it does appear that while we have been glorifying the common man the uncommon man has become more and more rare.

The crisis in our cultural leadership is an issue appropriate to bring before our present graduates. Some of them, in the Providence of God, may be called to such leadership, but all of them, as future mothers or, please God, as future religious will exert an influence on a new generation that must produce its share of leadership for Christian culture. But unfortunately, there is no formula for the making of leaders, and even in charting out the causes of our present shortage the analysis becomes darkly entangled in the whole complex of American culture. Our critics need hardly remind us that we are a practical-minded folk, impressed more by experimental results than by the intrinsic worth of abstract principle. A spirit of this kind was quite natural in a young nation spreading a civilization across the wilderness; and it is no surprise to find that up to the turn of the century our intellectual culture was chiefly imported, at first from England and France and later from Germany. When America reached a maturity able to express her genius in a conscious, philosophical way, the spokesman who came forward was William James.

Like most philosophers in the modern period, James was after a criterion of truth, and his search finally led him to the so-called pragmatic method. According to James, truth is defined by its practical consequences. "'The true,'" he wrote, "to put it briefly, is only the expedient in our way of thinking, just as 'the right' is only the expedient in our way of behaving." By his pragmatic method, James merely sanctioned the practical-minded direction of the American genius and blessed it with an academic respectability. If there is one way to discourage leadership, it is to take as a yardstick for the true or the good the immediate practical consequences to which an idea leads. A leader is a person with a vision of a great object that is worthy of being pursued regardless of the consequences; his mind is not isolated upon the immediate results of his projects, but expanded to the dimensions of life's ultimate meaning. A leader is a person whose will is anchored in a cause that is worthy of sacrifice and even the surrender of life itself; his primary concerns are not the things which are open to practical human control, but the great, unchanging principles that control human conduct itself. A leader is a person who can communicate with others, because he has lived his own cause so intimately that he expresses it in his very life itself. Of such fabric are leaders made; a leader loves the true because it is true and the good because it is good. What further reason is there to love either of them?

For leadership in the works of the mind we depend on our schools, whose primary function is the communication of knowledge and truth, and yet the typical American school in our century, turning away from the ideal that knowledge and truth have an intrinsic value of their own, is no longer directed toward the genuine culture of the mind. If America has been short-changed in theoretical scientists, for example, surely a large share of the blame is the pragmatic method which has discour-

aged abstract theorizing by assigning concrete consequences as the sole test of truth. In this respect the present-day American university has surrendered its lofty ideal, unfolded in Athens and held aloft wherever learning has flourished—the love of knowledge for its own sake.

If there is one thing more important than knowledge, it is the love of knowledge. St. Thomas Aquinas, recognizing as a Christian theologian that the supernatural destiny of man is a vision did not hesitate to exalt knowledge as a foretaste of beatitude itself. Let us not sell the intellect short. To love knowledge is to love our last end, namely, God. To convert knowledge into a merely pragmatic device is not only to defeat the purpose of a university or college, but it is also to turn against the very nature of scholarship, which received an infinite exaltation when the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us. When ex-President Conant, of Harvard, defines the objectives of the liberal college as the cultivation of man, the citizen, he parts company with the whole tradition of western learning where the intellectual virtues of science and wisdom, rather than the social virtues of the citizen, have always been the great liberal ideal. Important as social virtue or any other moral virtue may be, it cannot be communicated by teaching, and it belongs to other agencies of education besides the strictly teaching work that is proper to the classroom.

The shortage of leaders in our arts and sciences is the immediate concern of a college and university where, instead of the liberal atmosphere, the spirit of pragmatism prevails; but leaders, to the extent that they are made at all, are made much earlier in life. Toward the basic formation of the intellect, high school contributes more than college, and the elementary grades contribute even more. Prior to college, the mind is taking possession of the two great arts which are presupposed for any further intellectual achievement, the logical or language arts on the one hand and the mathematical arts on the other. Historically, they are known as the liberal arts—arts because they involve a construction by human reason, and liberal because they enable the mind, like a free person, to operate for its own proper good. By means of these arts of language and of mathematics, the mind achieves command of its own instruments to analyze and abstract, to reason and reckon, to communicate and criticize; and thus awakened to its own dynamism, the mind can engage, from its own inner vitality and not merely for pragmatic reasons, in the pursuit of knowledge and truth. Without a prior possession of the liberal arts, the generalization, order, and communicability necessary to a first-rate achievement in intellectual culture cannot truly prosper.

The crisis in intellectual leadership has been favored by our pragmatic commitment which has led higher learning away from its great liberal vocation: to pursue knowledge for its own sake. But if the acquisition of the arts, necessary to all basic areas of the mind from letters to the sciences, is in large measure the work of precollege education, it may be of value to take at least one fix upon the current teaching of language and of mathematics in the lower stages of education.

For such purposes, it should be noted that pragmatism, as defined by James, was taken up with a slightly different emphasis by John Dewey, a philosopher who has had an immeasurable impact on American education. There are two aspects to Dewey's philosophy of education. In the first place, he regarded the school as primarily social in function, having for its aim the adjustment of the learner to his or her biological-cultural environment; the school has for its specific purpose not the intellectual development of the human being as a thinker but the social evolution of the human being as a citizen. In the second place, Dewey regarded all knowledge as an instrument, validated only by its consequences. As a result of this view, language and mathematics are described in the educational vocabulary as tool subjects. Taught strictly for use, the liberal arts from grade school through college tend to be regarded today as skill courses, and since use is primarily a social affair, language and mathematics are emphasized primarily for their relevance to citizenship.

Now in a very strong sense, the liberal arts are tools, simply because they are instruments which equip the mind for the pursuit primarily of abstract truth. But where language and mathematics are taught merely as tool subjects they will not even make good tools. Unlike mechanical arts which construct a product outside the mind, language and mathematics have an intellectual status and are governed by their own intellectual principles. There is a logic embodied in a good prose paragraph, a paragraph that is not merely a staccato of simple declarative sentences but a hierachy with the proper coordination and subordination of ideas, the right transitional devices, and the correct punctuation scheme to express the organization of thought. Logic has suffered as much as language because our students are no longer plunged into the classics and challenged with the hierarchies in, for example, Cicero's periodic sentences. A good course in writing introduces a learner even in grade school to the proper ordering of ideas that may some day expand into scientific achievement. In any event, the ultimate aim of a language program requires attention to the liberal character of language, rather than its merely pragmatic utility. Language is not a mechanical system to be learned simply by rote, and where it is taught merely as a skill subject without the deliberate attempt to understand it, much of its value for the liberal ideal will remain unrealized.

The understanding of language, begun early in education, requires attention in college where, at least, under our present arrangement, a full-dress course in logic aids the mind toward a critical and reflective possession of all its instruments. Unfortunately in many of our liberal colleges, there is hardly any emphasis on creative writing and even less respect for the composition of poetry. The argument is proposed that even the bachelor of arts today does little writing or reading except in expository discourse and that creative writing is an expendable part of an already crowded syllabus. Here again, apart from all the other issues involved, there is a serious dislocation between our educational practices and the need for cultural leadership. Surely our great thinkers in history have always been imaginative and truly creative minds, and what can give a finer challenge in this regard than creative writing? It can surely be conceded that there is a discipline for the mind in the exact description of the Washington Monument, or an accurate exposition of a fluoridation program; and yet there is an equally necessary discipline for the mind in the control of one's own original creations for expressing the darker and deeper things explored by fiction.

The liberal art of mathematics, presupposing that of language, is likewise an important training for leadership. Science in its most perfect form, mathematics brings the mind to grips with the most rigorous scientific order. It is sheer pragmatism to exalt mathematics only because it is exact; surely every genuine science can make a similar claim. Mathematics is valuable in the culture of the intellect because its principles are abstract and general and because it exercises the mind in perfect scientific discourse.

At this juncture, it may be helpful to recall the contrast of Gabriel Marcel between a problem and a mystery. A problem is something that can be finished, so that the mind may move on to other considerations; there is no more to be learned about 1 and 1 after knowing that it is equal to 2. But a mystery, to keep Marcel's figure, is inexhaustible. The propositions, God exists, or man is free, are capable of constant reconsideration without ever sounding their depths. Now the subject that deals par excellence in problems is mathematics, and it is urgent to study pure problems to be aware of what it is to have a complete and exhaustive understanding; where mathematics is approached in a properly mathematical way, the mind is also aware of the metaproblematic world of mystery which invites reason to a lifetime of reflection. Yet mathematics can never be studied in terms of pure problems unless it is pursued as pure mathematics, apart from the applications which engage it in the mystery of things.

If the foregoing premises are valid, then the liberal arts of language and mathematics—presented not merely as tool subjects or as skill courses but with the truly liberal aim of understanding—are highly relevant to the culture of the great thinkers that our Nation is challenged to produce in almost every field. Taught in the mode of understanding and not merely for practical utility, language and mathematics at all stages of education can be effective means of awakening the notion that the works of the mind are a great adventure and that there is a repose for human intelligence in the mere possession of truth, apart from its utilitarian consequences. It is false to suppose that democracy, by equalizing all men, discourages leadership. Everyone has a natural right to the education proportioned to his own ability. Our real problem in democratic education is not our commitment to offer educational opportunities to everybody. It is not a problem in the quantity of education but its quality. Our pragmatism has weakened, at all levels of schooling, the bridges to intellectual eminence that have always been the liberal arts.

This occasion has provided a passing review of some of the great blessings of these graduates who are formed by an institution that has held firm to the liberal arts as taught in a liberal atmosphere. It has reminded us that these young graduates can serve our Christian culture by working in whatever ways they can toward a revitalization of the liberal arts against the present horizons of pragmatism. Language and mathematics are learned early. They are learned at home and, with the constant encouragement and understanding of parents, in school. Unless they are learned early and learned well, all further education must take constant corrective measures to make up the deficit, and the leadership in American culture will continue to lag behind our needs. Properly taught in the home and in the school, such arts equip reason with more than the knowledge which they embody because they invite the mind to the exciting life of pursuing truth for understanding. And in the long run, there is something more important than the knowledge which can be crowded into schools and curriculums; it is the love of knowledge which can inspire and enrich a whole lifetime of liberal learning and lead at last to the face to face knowledge of God Himself.

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in one of my leading daily newspapers an article entitled "Let's Take a Look Just for the Record." It deals with Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and we in this House should likewise keep the record straight on members of the high court. The article follows:

LET'S TAKE A LOOK JUST FOR THE RECORD
(By Andrew Avery)

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is one of those angelic anti-anti-Communists who often accuse other people of being character assassins. Yet now we find Justice Douglas going into Great Britain's high court of justice and confessing that he committed a libel in his book "North From Malaya."

A libel suit had been filed by Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, former British Governor of Burma. Characteristically, Douglas had accepted hearsay about Dorman-Smith's conduct of that office; he had not made the slightest attempt to check the facts. Now he and his British publisher have apologized to Dorman-Smith, paid the plaintiff's costs, and agreed to stop distributing the book until the defamatory passages are removed.

When a Justice of the United States Supreme Court makes a confession of libel, in a British court, isn't that a reflection on the United States? What kind of country are we to have a Justice of our highest Court who recklessly proclaims calumnies?

The truth is that Douglas has repeatedly committed much worse libels of Americans. In his spare time he has been averaging a book a year, racing into print with his annual mishmash of misinformation.

An example is his 1954 book, An Almanac of Liberty. This title is deceptive; for Douglas' program would help the Kremlin's quislings here to crush all liberty. No wonder the Communist Party repeatedly praised the book and promoted its wide distribution.

In that book Douglas defamed many unnamed New York State judges and the New York police. This was during his attack on the State's system of authorizing certain judges to sign an order allowing a district attorney or the police to tap a telephone wire that may yield evidence of crime.

"During 1952," he wrote, "there were in New York City alone at least 58,000 [court] orders issued which allowed wiretapping—over 150 every day in the year."

That is wholly untrue. It is a smear of the judges. Douglas' hair-raising figure, 58,000, is 113 times the true figure.

When a congressional committee invited Douglas to testify in support of his stupendous charge, he responded with a letter smoothly asserting that his "figures will prove to be conservative ones." But had he asked the New York judges how many wiretap orders they had signed? No. His 58,000 figure was simply hearsay.

Then Wellington Powell, vice president of the New York Telephone Co., testified that in 1952 the total number of court orders for wiretaps in all five counties of New York City was only 510.

Edward S. Silver, district attorney of Kings County (Brooklyn), testified that the 58,000 was impossible. "Every time you get an order you have to have at least six detectives manning that wire." (Two men at a time, in 3 shifts of 8 hours each.) "If you have over 1,000 a week," said Silver, "in 3 weeks you wouldn't have a policeman on the street. They would all be down in cellars."

Douglas was treated with cold scorn by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, of New York County (Manhattan). Fifty-eight thousand court orders? "It is scandalous, ridiculous, impossible," Hogan testified. "You couldn't do it with a police force of 50,000. * * * We must be wary of * * * the hysterical alarmist with a flair for the dramatic. * * * A United States Supreme Court Justice makes such an unsupported and utterly ridiculous statement as that, and his figures are off by a mere 10,000 percent." (In fact, more than 11,300 percent.)

Yet Douglas' libels of the New York judges and police are still in the book, which hasn't withdrawn—unlike Douglas' other book in England. An Almanac of Liberality is in public libraries and school and college libraries all over the country. Students and others are reading it this minute, swallowing Douglas' calumnies as gospel. Shouldn't somebody warn them?

Now that Douglas has been forced in a British court to confess his libel of a Briton, shouldn't the American people ask this member of their Supreme Court to confess his libels of Americans?

Resolution by Michigan House of Representatives Urging That Arms Be Made Available to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan has joined with other right-thinking people by unanimously adopting a resolution urging that arms be made available to Israel. I hope that the administration will act with the same intelligence and vigor as did the State legislature in recognizing the great danger to world peace caused by the weakness of Israel and the growing strength of the Arab nations. I cannot urge too strongly that immediate steps be taken to make available to Israel the necessary aid.

Representatives Edgar Currie, Detroit second district; Frederick Yates, Detroit fourth district; and Ed Carey, Detroit third district; were the sponsors of the resolution. The original resolution was introduced by Senator John B. Swainson, Wayne County 18th district.

The text of the resolution follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to implement the Tripartite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France to guarantee the borders of Israel

Whereas the State of Israel was created by resolution of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, and was recognized by the United States on May 14, 1948; and

Whereas the State of Israel has secured her borders by force of arms of invading aggressor nations; and

Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteed the borders by tripartite agreement; and

Whereas certain Communist nations have sold munitions to Egypt, thus threatening the peace of the Middle East and the entire world; and

Whereas the State of Israel has requested this Nation to sell certain arms for its own protection: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby petitioned and urged to take such action as may be necessary to make available to the State of Israel such arms as may be necessary and also to negotiate a mutual-security pact with the State of Israel; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Michigan Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

The Late Honorable William T. Granahan

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the people of the Second District of Pennsylvania have sustained a great loss in the passing of our beloved colleague, my good friend, BILL GRANAHAN.

Back in the 79th Congress, after taking his oath for the first time as a Member of this House, he was assigned to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. It was in that way that a warm friendship commenced and developed between us—a friendship that I valued because of the many attributes of fine character that BILL possessed. He was distinguished by his gentle friendliness and sincerity—marks of a true gentleman. These traits alone, however, did not make BILL GRANAHAN the outstanding legislator that he was. His industry, wisdom, and conscientious devotion to duty that became immediately apparent in his work on the committee were what also contributed so much to his success both in committee work and in the representation of his constituents.

BILL GRANAHAN is going to be missed by his family, his colleagues, and his constituents. To his widow who, I know, in BILL'S eyes was the person most responsible for his own success, I particularly want to extend sincere condolences.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*..
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Candle of the Lord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on May 29 it was my privilege to address the overseas breakfast of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, Pa. I had been urged to discuss the world situation and what atomic energy might do to improve it.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of that address, entitled "The Candle of the Lord," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My pastor gently chides the members of his congregation who come to church only on Easter Sunday. Perhaps he makes a mental exception in my case, because Washington is a far journey from Albuquerque. Yet last Easter morning our family was at his service, well rewarded by his sermon.

The glory of the Gospels is that they grow as our lives grow, that their lessons take on new meaning as our tasks expand and our experiences broaded. A Bible story that we heard as youngsters in Sunday school may have a wholly different meaning when we hear it at the baptism of the children of our children.

How many times I have heard the story of the resurrection. Yet this past Easter, against the background of a contemplated trip to the far Pacific to watch the air burst of a hydrogen bomb, it changed color like a chameleon and was seen anew. The trip itself was later abandoned, but the setting for the sermon remained.

My pastor was sounding again the declaration of Christian faith: that Christ was risen, that "He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty * * *"

Then came these words: "Without the resurrection, Christ would be a good man but only a good man. Without the resurrection the Christian plan of salvation would be a beautiful theory, but only a theory."

Through my mind ran the conviction that he was right. Without the resurrection, without the power to roll away the stone and arise from the dead, there could be no Christian faith. But my thought went to the atolls around Eniwetok, to the atomic blasts I had seen, and to this question: If the world die, can it live again? Would it, too, need to experience disaster and rise phoenix-like from ashes in order that in the end it might find salvation?

Eleven years have passed since the first atomic explosion at Alamogordo, 11 years since a group of noted scientists went into an unpopulated section of New Mexico to wait in that cold dawn behind hastily constructed bunkers to find out if the monstrous thing which they had concocted would finally go off.

How had we come to that momentous point of modern day history? Scientists had speculated for generations that the atom could be split. Yet it remained for Albert Einstein on August 2, 1939 to send a letter to President Roosevelt suggesting that recent work by Fermi and Szilard which he had seen in manuscript had led him to expect that the element uranium might be turned, as he put it, "into a new and important source of energy in the immediate future." It might become possible, he thought, to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium by which vast amounts of power and large quantities of new radium-like elements would be generated. Then came his hint which altered the course of history. This new phenomenon, he said, would also lead to the construction of bombs, and that it was conceivable though much less certain that extremely powerful bombs of a new type might thus be constructed.

We can pass over the preliminary experiments leading to the first atomic pile and the first chain reaction. The actual work toward a bomb got under way in April of 1943.

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, who then headed the effort, has since described to me a week-long series of meetings during that month. They were held at what then was known as site Y—the mountain camp famous ever since as Los Alamos, birthplace of the atomic bomb.

Beginning each day at 9 o'clock, 30 men were cloistered in a brand new but windowless building, a strange structure to fit into that mountain setting of singular beauty. For 3 hours they would discuss their undertaking, break up for lunch, put in a whole afternoon again and then following their evening meal, continue informally until late at night. They literally breathed, ate and slept the nuclear possibilities of their task. They were driven by the white heat of war, constantly prodded by the idea that our enemies might achieve this new weapon ahead of us and that we would thereby emerge from worldwide conflagration as the vanquished instead of the victors. All through the bitterness of Dunkirk, the bombing of London, the slow, difficult fighting in the far Pacific, this fear that they would not be in time was to drive them to long hours of unprecedented endeavor.

Military men were later to label this new type of bomb as a "decision in a packet," and our scientists were determined to claim the decision.

Finally they had a chance to test their potential weapon. Slowly the seconds to zero could be counted off—5, 4, 3, 2, 1—then the brilliant flash, the light which could be seen for hundreds of miles, the roar that rumbled and thundered against the mountain peaks of my home State. Then there was silence, and a chance for men to reflect that the instrument which they devised in their effort to free men from the yoke of oppression in all parts of the earth might equally well constitute the instrument of man's eventual destruction.

Dr. Oppenheimer, in whose hands had been placed the responsibility for the creation of this newest of all weapons, was among the watchers. He, like the others, had been reasonably sure that the device would explode. And yet, on that cold grey morning when he saw and heard the evidence of the correctness of all their calculations, he could experience no sense of exultation, no rapturous ecstasy that success had crowned their efforts. He could think only of two lines from Bhagavad-Gita: "I am become death, the shatterer of worlds."

My hope this morning is that we may sketch briefly the world scene and attempt to discover how atomic energy may affect it, that we may consider what spiritual significance atomic energy may have over the world today, that we may ask, in other words, what atomic energy and atomic power mean as we try to build a Christian civilization.

First of all, then, what does a layman see on the horizon? Are there spots that give us concern? Is there a tenseness in the air? Do we live in a troubled and restless world?

Obviously time does not permit a careful review of world conditions even if I were competent to make it. But we might take a few quick glances to see if forces of integration, of community, of peace are drawing us more surely together than diverse forces are pushing us apart.

We have placed great faith in NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Today it is in a state of disintegration, and the most recent meeting of NATO Ministers was, in effect, an added failure. I could hardly speak disparagingly of Three Wise Men before a church gathering, and yet, despite the creation of a commission of three wise men who are supposed to explore the totality of NATO to see in what field it can be broadened, the fact remains that NATO was never in a more dangerous state than at present, nor is it prepared to become stronger in the future.

In the book of Proverbs there are these words: "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." If the spirit of man can bring into being a candle which will shine its light into this problem of NATO, then we may hope that this international effort may not head toward eventual disintegration but instead may find increasing strength.

But let me mention the little things—the clouds no larger than a man's hand—which threaten to set aside our high hopes for the future of mankind. For example, the United States has been asked by the Icelandic Parliament to withdraw from our air bases there, even though we came in initially at the request of Iceland itself and have spent there over $200 million in projects.

In the middle of NATO, the French have withdrawn practically all their divisions assigned to NATO to handle the trouble in Algeria.

On the eastern anchor of NATO, we have the trouble in Cyprus which involves Great Britain, Greece and Turkey. Britain's only remaining major base in the Near East is Cyprus which she must maintain to protect the oil of the Middle East, on which England and Western Europe depend for 90 percent of their needs. In the Middle East there is 70 percent of the known world reserve in oil. Cyprus has a world importance all out of proportion to its size.

The Arab-Israeli question has been accentuated by the penetration, economically and politically, of the Soviet Union and its satellites into that area. The Soviet Union is, for the first time, in both the Middle East and Africa, and in to stay.

In south Asia, Nehru is facing tremendous difficulties internally. In Thailand there is

a shift away from its alliance with us and toward neutralism.

In southeast Asia, Cambodia has indicated, as Indonesia has so pointedly announced, that it will receive help from any quarter. Vietnam still has a long and difficult road to travel.

Singapore may well be on the verge of being lost to Great Britain, and it would not be surprising, unless there is a drastic turn of event, that this Crown Colony might go Communist.

The importance of the Bandung Conference of April 1955 cannot be overestimated because out of this conference came the Afro-Asian bloc, which is becoming more unified and stronger as time goes on—especially in its voting capacity in the United Nations.

Hong Kong is being held only on sufferance. Taiwan and Korea are being maintained largely through United States help, and Ceylon, as the result of recent elections, is shifting away from the West and toward closer relations with the Communist states.

I am one of those who is persuaded that the two most important areas of the world at the present time are Germany at one end of the Soviet Empire and Japan at the other. I share this morning's program with the moderator of the United Church of Christ in Japan and hope that his impressions of this assembly will be that America in official and unofficial life senses the great importance to the peace of the world of the 90 million people who live in his land.

I hope that the people of the United States will continue to appreciate that Japan's population is increasing at the rate of 2 million a year and that this poses an extremely difficult problem for her with not more than 16 percent of her land arable and with many resources missing that her economy sorely needs. Japan, I would think, faces three choices: (1) Increased trade with the world; (2) trade where she can find it and continued assistance from the United States; or (3) going Communist. If the first two fail or falter, the third result may well happen, not because of any sympathy for the Communist ideology, but because of economic necessity.

Germany, on the other hand, is interested primarily in unification. The Western World has placed great reliance on rehabilitation, reconstruction, and the possible rearming of the Western German army. The Soviet Union, to look at the other side of the coin, has the power to compel Eastern Germany to unify with Western Germany; she can offer the return of lands which she and the Poles have taken from the Germans; she can persuade Czechoslovakia to effect a Sudentenland settlement; she can offer trade and economic opportunities to the East; and she might well ask in return a treaty of neutrality and a German withdrawal from NATO. While Adenauer may refuse, we have a right to wonder what the German people would do.

Africa is in a state of turmoil, and nationalism is on the rise. In Latin America there are strong indications that the Soviet Union is seeking to extend its way economically.

Thus we can call a partial roll of trouble spots. The list, though not complete, may suffice for this discussion.

If you are willing to accept my belief that the world we live in is troubled and restless, then we may ask why that condition is particularly perilous now. The world has been at war before, has been divided between alliances of great powers, has seen the areas of conflict grow until nearly all the civilized world became involved, but has come at last to the day of armistice and peace when the wounds of war could be slowly bound up and the scars of a hundred battles could disappear. Is this experience unique?

Yes, it is unique, without parallel in history. If man could destroy his fellowmen in the past, such destruction was limited. But we have come a long way from the days when the walls of Jericho came tumbling down. We passed through the age of gunpowder, through the conflict between the trench and the tank, through the terrific pounding of aerial bombardment and the menace of the submarine that lurked in the sea. Now we are not content with airplanes that sweep through skies at several times the speed of sound, not made safe by automatic antiaircraft missiles that can track an attacking bomber and explode it and its cargo, not satisfied with submarines propelled by nuclear fuel that may lurk in deep waters month on end. Why, the crew of the *Nautilus* jokingly guarantees that their ship need surface only to let its crew members reenlist. But with it all, we do have enough.

Now we study and design and test for the ultimate weapon, if such there be. We want the tools for a push-button war. We will have guided missiles with atomic warheads that will be able to fly at thousands of miles an hour, far above the range of defense guns, and hit a target 5,000 miles away with deadly accuracy. We will have bombs that will plunge into the far depths of the ocean and wipe out a nest of submarines. We will have power to fill the stratosphere with atomic particles so dangerously charged that airplane crews cannot pilot their craft. So we will find what we may then call "safety" in these arsenals of annihilation—on land, in the sky, and deep in the bosom of the sea. Only—these will not bring safety, and we will not know peace.

We have had before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of this Congress a long parade of witnesses outlining the latest plans for the military application of atomic energy. These top military leaders were competent and convincing. They have not only paraded their weapons and explained their plans, they have estimated the capability of the enemy and then played the game of war with different sets of assumtptions as to which combatant has taken the initiative.

From all their testimony, there seems to me but one conclusion: That we and the enemy become, as one scientist said, like two scorpions in a bottle. Each scorpion has the power to inflict the sting of death. Naturally, he seeks to maneuver himself into a position where, if he sees the need, he may destroy the other without harm to himself. But, being scorpions, each recognizes that to close with his opponent means the risk of a deadly counterstroke. And so we sit in uneasy stalemate, realizing that war with atomic and thermonuclear weapons means not only the destruction of the active participants but could easily mean the end of civilization itself.

Of course, we could remove ourselves from the bottle, and so could our opponents, merely by dismantling totally and forever all manner of atomic arms. But that brings only partial relief. The intelligence that taught us to make the bomb may tell us how to fashion new devices not banned by rules of war but equally destructive.

For man has reached to the very source of the energies resident in the cosmos—atomic energy. In doing so he binds to his will a force that seems without limit by the finite standards of men—yet puny in contrast to the infinite power of God.

Latent in this almost unbounded source of energy are immense possibilities for both life and death—death because no man can hope for immunity from the worldwide contamination of earth and atmosphere that would result from all-out nuclear war. Yet every day brings stories of how the split atom may be used to bring new standards of health, wealth, and happiness to the peoples of the earth.

Near Chicago is an isotope farm where plants and animals can be raised in an atmosphere of radioactive carbon dioxide. From this work can come the tools for the investigation of biochemical mechanisms. We will soon begin to learn more about how our bodies work, what throws them out of gear, and what therapy may set them right again.

Near New York City is a laboratory where radioactive isotopes are being applied to the problems of agriculture. These tracers can be followed through a growing plant like a man carrying a lighted lantern down a dark street at night. We see how a plant uses its food, and what foods best suit the digestive systems of different plants. We have not yet learned why a red cow eats green grass and gives white milk, but we learn how to trace tiny particles from the roots of a plant to its branches and leaves, how to produce disease-resistant varieties of grains and fiber, and how to grow more and better food.

I am ready to concede that here in America where agricultural surpluses are a perpetual headache to Congress and the farmer, this science may be of no immediate value; but there are hungry mouths in many parts of the world where we might go, not to be ministered unto but to minister. After all, with world population increasing 50 million persons each year, the day of food surpluses may not last forever—even in America.

The atom, then, has possibilities for life or death. Of itself, atomic energy knows nothing of these ends to which it may be put. It is in the truest sense a neutral. The decision to use it for one purpose or another rests with man himself.

Indeed, if atomic energy presented only the issue of life or death it might be in no way different from all the material means at man's disposal. But there is a difference which is made evident by the orders of magnitude of what the new power does. A week ago a hydrogen-type bomb was exploded in the Pacific. It was not nearly as powerful as we know how to make bombs, but it had the TNT equivalent of all the firepower this Nation used in World War II—in rifles, in field artillery, in naval shells, and in the rain of bombs that poured from our airplanes. It was a one-shot atomic war . What if a hundred such bombs should fall?

Perhaps as we think of that grim possibility, our reflections will permit us to penetrate beyond the issues of life and death to those that are really decisive. For beyond them are to be found the larger issues of justice and injustice, of right and wrong. In the last analysis, this breakfast assembly might regard these as the true alternatives between which a choice must be made. Life or death remain but the consequences of that choice.

The making of a right choice in these matters will involve courses of action that are many and varied. The possibility of physical destruction must be a matter of personal concern for each and every one of us. It cannot be otherwise when all-out nuclear warfare could mean the annihilation of human life on this planet. Consciousness of this fact should serve to demonstrate anew the moral solidarity of mankind. It should likewise serve to demonstrate that every man is responsible to all men and for all men. The problem we face is to make all men feel this responsibility that is theirs.

How do I intend to exercise my responsibility? That question is asked to illustrate that each of us must find the work best suited to our hands.

First of all, I shall not rely on the powers of destruction . That does not mean that my voice or vote will be used to cripple the defense of my country or to stop the development of its weapons. On the contrary, I shall favor its programs of defense as a deterrent to the horror of an atomic war. But I shall know that there will be no victor in a nuclear conflict, and I shall want mankind to survive.

Second, I shall seek to encourage at home and abroad an understanding of the basic issues confronting mankind today.

Only a few days ago President Sukarno, of Indonesia, addressed a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. He told us that he had come to the United States to see our country with his own eyes, to confirm or to modify the impressions of this land which he had collected from afar over a period of many years. But most of all, he had come to learn something from America—not merely as a nation, but as a state of mind.

That, in my judgment, is the part of his address that appealed most to the Congress—this concept that the visitor from abroad must study not only the physical characteristics of our country, must count not only the dollars we may spend in our programs of military and economic aid to the free peoples of the earth, but must know the state of mind which exists in America itself. This understanding of us and our problems—and our appreciations of theirs—may in the long run persuade the uncommitted people of the earth to cast their lot with us and our allies in the worldwide cause of freedom and right. Without it, they may turn to some other land which may offer less in material goods but more in sympathetic understanding.

Third, I shall recognize in atomic energy an instrument that may be useful in the endeavor to find peace. To do that, it may be necessary to cast off the bonds of materialism and practice the ancient and noble Christian virtue of sacrifice, but the goal is worthy of it.

This morning, when I fly back to Washington, my first obligation is to return to hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of the Nation's reactor program. We have been taking testimony for more than a week, considering every facet of the subject.

Through the testimony—like a red thread woven into a dull blanket—has been the showing that here in America the development of cheap atomic power is not urgent. As a nation, we have large supplies of power generated by falling water—and we are about to add the power of Niagara to our supply. We have inexhaustible supplies of coal from which electricity might be generated, and we have a reasonable supply of gas and oil. We may not need a new source of energy, but 20 years of population growth with a heavy drain on other resources may alter that story.

Then, too, the presently planned atomic power plants will not be competitive with conventional plants using fossil fuels. Therefore, their construction in America now would impose a double burden: (a) The current would be higher in cost and a subsidy for its use thereby required, and (b) the plants would be outmoded and hence need to be substantially modified when a later round of atomic powerplants with lower power costs could be constructed.

But there are areas of the earth where power costs are high and where atomic power is soon to be cheaper than conventional power. Hence England has already turned the electricity from its first plant into its national grid, and Russia will be building its first atomic plants in its European areas where power is high and not in Siberia where coal is abundant. Likewise, atomic power is already attractive to many sections of South America, to Turkey, and to parts of Africa.

Do we like the threat that godless Russia now poses in atomic science? Shall we permit a communistic country to occupy the areas that we leave open? Russia will build an atomic plan in East Germany, is pushing atomic development in Red China, has her eyes on Egypt, and will undoubtedly expand her atomic penetration whenever and wherever the chance may come.

So what can we do to help atomic energy build a Christian civilization? Presbyterians are at work in 34 countries, and in many of these lands, the very thing that they can use now is the power of the atom.

To these friendly lands and to the uncommitted peoples of the earth, I would send the evidences of our purpose to use the atom for peace, not just the nuclear fuel which the President has already promised, but the vessels in which it is to burn. Thereby we would test the most promising types of reactors, revise and rework them under actual operating conditions and thus have them ready for our use at home when the cost of their electricity became competitive with the energy we now have in abundance. Such a program could cost us as a nation a billion dollars in 5 years, a large sum to be sure, but only a small part of what is now contemplated in military aid. I think it would pay far greater dividends both in security and satisfaction. Actually the House of Representatives seems to feel that the cost of foreign aid might be cut a billion dollars this year—enough for a whole program of international atomic aid.

Then what we did would speak clearly to the world of what we are—a nation devoted to peace, working through Christian faith toward the goal of worldwide justice and welfare.

If "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord" then the candle would shine in these far fields where humble people need this blessing of modern science poured out to them.

First, in many cases they need such a program in research and in building up adequate numbers of trained scientists, engineers, and technicians. We are training foreign scientists and engineers at State universities and at our great atomic installations at Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratory. We must encourage these activities; and the moral influence of the church can help to enlist new trainees and potential scientists from the lands across the seas.

Second, they need it in medicine—and we have medical research reactors schedules for use in friendly countries. There the people understand medical purposes. Most of what they have heard of us in atomic matters is the bomb—the messenger of death. Now they see the beneficent side of the atom, the medical research reactor—the giver of life.

Third, they need it in food. Here again we are not dealing with the agriculture of the United States. The world has never had enough to eat, and in many of these 34 lands, the skills developed by atomic research would be very welcome.

Fourth, they need it for power. At the Geneva Conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy last August, I heard Dr. Homi Bhabha describe the energy problem of India where 75 percent of their power comes from cow dung. With population on the march, India needs new sources of power. Where will she turn? I hope: To this Christian land. Surely the sacrifices we will require in our own program will be nothing compared to the benefits we will bring to them.

"The candle of the Lord"—how will it shine around the earth? The decisions now being made in America on these problems of atomic power may determine how far it will throw its light. For these decisions with regard to the use of atomic energy are shaped by a very few men. The spiritual problems of the multitudes are pressing ones, indeed. But still more pressing are the problems of these leaders of the people in this day of atomic crisis. It is a spiritual and moral problem of the greatest moment.

From my post of observation in the Senate of the United States and as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, I have no doubt whatever about the material strength of this Nation. Yours is the responsibility to see that the spiritual strength is not lacking to the end that our people and our leaders may continue to discharge their responsibilities to all mankind and prove this truly to be a "nation under God."

Life Expectancy of Minnesotans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a Senator from Minnesota I have always been confident that Minnesotans were among the healthiest people alive. I am delighted to have my confidence bolstered by some official statistics which have just been released by the Minnesota Department of Health. These statistics indicate that people from Minnesota can expect to live longer on the average than residents of all but two States in the Union. Only the States of South Dakota and Nebraska exceed Minnesota in life expectancy at birth, and I am happy to add that I myself was born in South Dakota—so I have the best of all possible worlds.

This study shows, Mr. President, that the life expectancy of white males during the period of survey, 1949–51, was 68.2 years, while for white females it was 73.4 years.

An article appearing in the St. Paul Dispatch on May 21, 1956, lists life expectancy for various Minnesota individuals according to age level. I am happy to share this information with my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article I have just referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTANS HEALTHY: NORTH STAR STATE RANKS THIRD IN UNITED STATES

Minnesota residents can expect to live longer, on the average, than residents of all but two States in the Nation, the Minnesota Department of Health said today.

Basing its report on a national Office of Vital Statistics survey, the department said that when the survey was taken in 1949–51 the life expectancy of white males at birth in Minnesota was 68.2 years and for white females it was 73.4 years.

Similar figures for the United States were 66.3 years for white males and 72 for white females. Only South Dakota and Nebraska exceeded Minnesota in life expectancy at birth.

The information was compiled in the statistical bureau of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. The expectancy tables were based on the average number of deaths within each specific year of life occurring among residents of the State during the survey years.

In the last half century, the report shows 18.08 years has been added to the life expectancy of white males and 20.95 years for white females in the Nation. In 1900 the life expectancy for men was only 48.23 years and for women 51.08 years.

For Minnesota here is the life expectancy for individuals at varying age levels in 1949–51:

Age	White males	White females
Birth	68.22	73.35
10	60.67	65.42
20	51.26	55.69
30	41.97	46.04
40	32.73	36.54
50	24.16	27.52
60	16.61	19.17
70	10.44	12.01
80	5.96	6.71

POPULATION UP 10.8 PERCENT SINCE 1950

WASHINGTON.—The Census Bureau today estimated the United States population on April 1 at 167,440,000, including Armed Forces overseas.

The Bureau said this was a gain of 16,308,000, or 10.8 percent, over the 151,132,000 on April 1, 1950, when the latest census was taken.

It estimated that about 10 percent of the net population gain in the last 5 years was accounted for by a net civilian immigration of 1,700,000 during the period.

Disposal of Land Along the Inland Waterway in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KERR SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Federal Government is planning to dispose of some 4,858 acres of land it now owns along the Inland Waterway in North Carolina.

According to the General Services Administration, the land lies along the Waterway between the North Carolina-Virginia line and Beaufort Harbor.

In response to inquiries by me, the GSA says it has just let a contract to appraise the property, and the appraisal report is due to be completed September 1, 1956. The GSA says further that immediately after the appraisal report is approved, the property will be advertised for sale to the general public.

The Federal Government bought the land, mostly from individuals, to cut portions of the Inland Waterway through North Carolina. It was purchased in much the same way as right-of-way is bought for highways. The first purchase was made in 1908, and the Government continued buying land adjoining the waterway through 1947.

It now says that it no longer needs the land and wants to sell it.

To me, there seems to be a serious question of what will happen to the land in respect to soil erosion. Recent hurricanes and floods have taught us that conservation practices are precious factors in all coastal areas.

I think the Government ought to consider seriously offering to the State any surplus it has for use as State parks and the like before taking competitive bids. I should dislike to see selfish interests come in, buy the land for a song, and then sell valuable timber from it at a handsome profit. There is a large amount of first-class timber on some of the property, and every precaution should be taken to avoid windfall profit schemes devised by persons who have no interest in the waterway or the land adjoining it.

If there is no public use for the land, the Federal Government ought to give the original owners the first opportunity to buy it back.

I understand that plans to sell the land have been underway since last October, but until now the GSA has failed to offer any information about what is going on in the matter.

To me, this seems to be a poor way to do business. At least, the GSA could have let the public know what it has in mind. Both Congress and North Carolina State officials should have been advised, if not consulted. It is, in short, another case of not letting the right hand know what the left hand is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD letters concerning this matter which I have received from Edward J. Fanflik, Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Real Estate, and Frank J. O'Gara, regional director of the General Services Administration, Atlanta, Ga.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. W. KERR SCOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: Reference is made to your informal request to this office on May 29, 1956, for information as to the status of excess lands along the Intracoastal Waterway from the Virginia State line to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., and of the disposal proceedings in connection therewith.

On October 28, 1955, the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Wilmington, N. C., reported certain lands acquired by the Government for the Intracoastal Waterway to the regional director, General Services Administration, at Atlanta, Ga., for further utilization by other Government agencies or disposal, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) and implementing regulations of the General Services Administration. The lands so reported comprise the following sections and acreages of the waterway:

Section	Acreage	Holding agency No.	GSA control No.
North Carolina Cut, N. C.	592.51	WILM-2(56)	D-NC-432
Alligator River to Pungo River, N. C.	2,591.08	WILM-3(56)	D-NC-433
Goose Creek to Bay River, N. C.	443.50	WILM-4(56)	D-NC-434
Neuse River to Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	1,231.70	WILM-5(56)	D-NC-435

Brig. Gen. Henry J. Hoeffer, the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Atlanta, Ga., informs me that he has recently obtained informal information from the Regional Director, General Services Administration, that the contract for the required appraisal of the aforementioned property was awarded on or about May 15, 1956, and that the appraisal work is scheduled for completion around the middle of August. The property is scheduled to be advertised in September 1956, and it is anticipated that disposal action will be completed by December 1, 1956.

In connection with the operation and maintenance of the Intracoastal Waterway, it is considered necessary that certain easement rights in the aforementioned property be retained by the United States. A copy of the reservation recommended by the Department of the Army for inclusion in any conveyance of these lands by the General Services Administration is inclosed for your information.

Inasmuch as the General Services Administration is the disposal agency of the Government in this instance, it is suggested that further information regarding disposal of the property be obtained from the Regional Director, General Services Administration, 50 Seventh Street NE., Atlanta, Ga. In any communication to the Regional Director of General Services Administration concerning these lands, a citation to the holding agency numbers and/or the GSA control numbers indicated above will be of assistance to the Regional Director in expediting a reply.

I trust that the foregoing information is satisfactory for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. FANFLIK,
Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Real Estate.

AMENDED RESERVATION CLAUSE

Each instrument or deed of conveyance shall include the following:

"Whereas in the River and Harbor Act of Congress approved July 25, 1912, and subsequent amendments thereto, provision was made for the constructing, improving, and maintaining an intracoastal waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in accordance with a project set forth in House Document (or River and Harbors Committee Document) No. 391, 62d Congress, and pursuant thereto, an intracoastal waterway has been constructed over, across, or adjacent to the land herein conveyed, there is excepted from this conveyance the said Intracoastal Waterway as a part of the navigable waters of the United States, and there is reserved to the Government and its assigns the perpetual right and easement to maintain the said Intracoastal Waterway and to enter upon, dig or cut away, and remove any or all the hereinbefore described tract of land as may be required at any time in the prosecution of the aforesaid work of improvement, or any enlargement thereof, and maintain the portion so cut away and removed as a part of the navigable waters of the United States; and the further right to maintain the aids to navigation presently established by the United States on the land herein described with the rights of ingress and egress thereto; and the further perpetual right and easement to enter upon, occupy and use any portion of said tract of land, not so cut away and converted into public navigable waters as aforesaid, for the deposit of dredged material, and for the placement thereon of such aids to navigation deemed necessary by the Government, and for such other purposes as may be needful in the preservation and maintenance of said work of improvements: *Provided, however,* That the grantee,

his heirs and assigns shall enjoy all such rights and privileges in said tract of land as may be used and enjoyed without interfering with or abridging the exceptions and reservations herein contained."

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 5, 1956.

The Honorable W. KERR SCOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: At the request of Mr. Cochrane, of your office, furnished below is information regarding the property known as the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, N. C. The property was turned over to us for disposal by the Corps of Engineers and is divided into four reports, as follows:

Location	Case No.	Acreage
Currituck County	D-NC-432	592.51
Hyde and Tyrell Counties	D-NC-433	2,590.63
Pamlico County	D-NC-434	443.50
Carteret and Craven Counties.	D-NC-435	1,231.78

We have just let a contract to appraise this property and the appraisal report should be received in this office on or about September 1, 1956. Immediately after the appraisal report is approved, the property will be advertised on a tract basis to the general public, with sealed bids to be returned to this office on a specified date.

In reporting the property to us, the Corps of Engineers reserved the right to maintain and, if necessary, enlarge the waterway and in so doing, dig away or remove any portion of the land considered necessary for this operation. This restriction might indicate that sale of the property might have to be made at rather low prices; however, there is considerable interest in the property and we believe that its sale will reflect an adequate return to the Government.

We propose to offer the property in tracts, as acquired.

If additional information is desired, it will be a pleasure to furnish it upon request.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. O'GARA,
Regional Director.

Memorial Day in Normandy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Memorial Day in Normandy", written by Mr. J. Mitchell Pilcher, of Montgomery, Ala. The beautiful tribute to the courageous Americans who made the supreme sacrifice on the Normandy beaches and battlefields for the cause of freedom was published in the Alabama Journal on May 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY IN NORMANDY

The long march is over, the winter gone,
Our soldiers' graves are wreathed with late May flowers,
When emerald leaf and petaled flower acclaim
Memorial Day in French Normandy • • •
Here one may visit those soft silent towns
Wherein are sleeping—till the trump of time
The men who fell, pledging their light-foot years.
That fearless Freedom might be born anew!
Nine cemeteries filled with silent men!
Row after row of crosses, small and white,
Grave after grave as lonely as the heart.
Pause, visitor, for Young America's sake—
Honor to Youth's valor on distant shores,
Yankee lads that sleep beneath reconquered soil
Of Normandy—where wave-swept beaches lie,
Hallowed and enshrined by stripling martyrs.

—*J. Mitchell Pilcher.*

Senator Lehman's Sixth Radio Report to the People of New York State on the Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a monthly radio report which I made to the people of New York State on Sunday, June 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORKER'S REPORT ON THE NATION

(Text of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S sixth radio report to the people of New York State during the 2d session, 84th Cong.)

Fellow New Yorkers, the past 4 weeks in the United States Senate have been busy and productive. I am pleased to report to you that since my last broadcast, the Senate has passed four major pieces of legislation on which I have been working for some time—the Niagara power bill, the flood disaster insurance program, a broad Federal housing program, and an extension of the GI home-loan program.

This has certainly been my most productive legislative month in the Senate. Each of these four major legislative achievements are matters of vital interest to the people of New York and I am sure you would like to hear something about them.

The bill providing for the public development of the Niagara Falls power resources by the New York State Power Authority passed the Senate on May 16 by a vote of 48 to 39. As the primary sponsor of this bill, I was most gratified by the size of the favorable vote in the Senate. The chief issue in the debate on the Senate floor was whether Niagara Power should be developed by the State of New York, for the benefit of all the people of the State, or whether the Niagara resource should be given away by the Congress, despite the laws of New York State to a private power monopoly headed by the Niagara Mohawk Power Co.

The people of New York State are the direct beneficiaries of this victory over the advocates of the giveaway of Niagara power. The Senate action in passing my bill was a great step forward in achieving early development of this single greatest undeveloped hydroelectric site in the United States.

My colleague, Senator IVES, attempted to have this bill sent back to the Public Works Committee for what he called further study even though we have been studying it for years. This move would have killed the bill. Fortunately, his proposal was defeated and now the day is closer at hand when all the people of New York State will reap the benefits of two great hydroelectric developments—the St. Lawrence, presently under construction, and the Niagara.

Practically speaking, what does this mean for the people of New York State? It means that low-cost hydroelectric power will attract more industry to New York and that employment opportunities will thus be increased in our State and it means cheaper rates of electricity for home and business consumers.

Under the terms of the Niagara bill, as it passed the Senate, this will all be accomplished without cost to the taxpayers of New York State or of the Nation.

Now we must all push ahead to achieve the same type of victory in the House of Representatives. This is your fight. Passage of the Niagara bill in the House is going to be difficult. I am confident, however, that with the same widespread citizen support for the public development of Niagara power which I received during the Senate debate, we can achieve affirmative action in the House, and the great Niagara power development can proceed to become a reality in the next several months.

The Senate also enacted a Federal flood-disaster insurance program on which I have been working since the disastrous floods in our Northeastern States last fall. As acting chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee considering the flood-disaster insurance program, I held extensive hearings in New York State and in other on the east coast. Over the decades our Nation has been intermittently plagued with floods. Almost no State has escaped their devastation.

The Northeastern States, and the Atlantic Seaboard States have suffered terrible losses in recent years from floods following hurricanes. We all remember the destruction wrought by hurricanes Diane and Connie. The losses to homeowners and businessmen amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Since private insurance companies will not write flood insurance, I conducted hearings on this subject for the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Senate, on May 10, passed my bill providing for the establishment of a Federal program of flood-disaster insurance. I am sure that those of you who have been hit by floods will understand the importance of this legislation. It, too, is now befor the House and I am extremely hopeful that favorable action will be taken on the disaster insurance program before the closing of Congress.

The last two major legislative achievements of the past month which I want to tell you about are in the field of housing. The great volume of mail which I have received from citizens of New York State has made me more keenly aware that the question of adequate housing for our citizens is at the top of the list of unresolved problems confronting our Nation today.

With this in mind, I introduced a bill proposing a major overhaul of our Federal housing program. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee I heard the testimony of experts on housing needs and of representatives of the housing industry. From these hearings, and subsequent studies by the committee, we drew up and sent to the Senate a good housing bill. This housing bill was passed by the Senate. It goes further than the scanty program proposed by the administration but I would have liked to see it go even further in several respects, especially in the area of providing middle-income housing for persons unable to qualify for low-cost public housing but who are unable to meet the high cost of sale and rental housing being built by the housing industry today.

The housing legislation passed by the Senate authorizes 135,000 public housing units for each of the next 3 years, as against the meager 35,000 units for each of 2 years requested by the administration. This legislation provides a greatly expanded program of urban renewal and slum clearance assistance to our cities struggling with the growing problem of our slums.

But that isn't all that this housing bill accomplishes. We have also made provision for 15,000 units annually of public housing for elderly people, and instituted a program of special financial assistance to housing enterprises designed to meet the needs of our elderly families which are unable to find adequate apartments or homes.

This elderly housing program was a great victory for those of us who have witnessed the real needs of our senior citizens. It is a good start and it is a firm basis on which to build and expand a program for housing for the elderly in the years to come.

While my proposal for a full-scale middle-income housing program was defeated in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by a tie vote, the Senate agreed to direct the staff of the Housing Subcommittee to make a complete study of middle-income housing needs and to report back to the Banking and Currency Committee the full facts of the crisis in middle-income housing. I am proud of the progress we made this year in laying the groundwork for positive legislation in this field and I am also proud of the overall housing bill which the Senate passed and sent to the House for action.

Still on the housing bill, I was the sponsor of an amendment which the Senate adopted extending the GI housing loan program for another year. When the Veterans' Administration announced its plan to stop receiving applications for home loans as of next January, I felt it would be a tragedy to let this program expire before some 11 million veterans throughout the Nation—and many hundreds of thousands in New York—could avail themselves of their rights for these Veterans' Administration guaranteed home loans. I therefore proposed to the Senate, and the Senate unanimously passed a 1-year extension of the GI home-loan program. I am confident that the House of Representatives will take similar action before the end of the session.

So much for our recent victories in the Senate.

In my remaining time I want to tell you about another important subject now being debated on the floor of the Senate—a proposed liberalization and revision of the social-security program.

Among the changes being proposed to the social-security program, there are two particular amendments I want to discuss with you. These deal with the payments of benefits to totally and permanently disabled workers at the age of 50 if they were, before their disability, employed in jobs covered by social security—and the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 62.

The bill which is now under discussion passed the House of Representatives last summer by an overwhelming vote. It contained the two provisions to which I have just now referred. However, the Senate Finance Committee accepted the arguments of the administration and various pressure groups and eliminated the disability provision completely and made the lower retirement age for women applicable only to widows.

A group of my colleagues and I are now carrying on a fight to have the two original provisions restored. There is nothing complicated about these proposals. The do not deal with involved legal questions or abstract theories. They deal with people—their human needs and wants.

The Senate Finance Committee also decided that the reduction in retirement age for women should be made effective only for widows. To me this is an outrageous example of discrimination. The problems of the older woman do not depend on her marital status.

Of course I am concerned about the woman who finds herself a widow at the age of 60 or 62—a woman without skills, training, or job experience. But, I am also concerned about the woman in her early sixties who loses her job and is unable to find another because of the reluctance of employers to hire women over 60. And I am concerned about the woman who has no children to support her, no insurance or other source of income to fall back on.

By lowering the retirement age for all women to 62, we can give them something to look forward to—we can make their advanced years, years of brightness and hope—we can make them secure in the knowledge that they will not be dependent on others—that they will be self-sufficient, instead of charity cases.

I have touched only on the high points of the social security debate. I am confident that you share my views—that you hope and pray, as I do, that the United States Senate will promptly approve these pending amendments that mean so much to the people of this Nation.

All of my time has expired. I will be back on this station in 4 weeks with another report to you on my work in the United States Senate.

A Future in the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, has proved himself to be an authority of high standing in matters of governmental functioning, especially relating to the maritime industry. His capable service in the executive and legislative branches has shown that when he addresses himself to a public question his statements are logical and worthy of public attention. For these reasons I believe that his address at the 100th commencement of the Maritime College of the State of New York, Fort Schuyler, N. Y., is deserving of national attention and I ask that salient excerpts from President Casey's speech be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FUTURE IN THE MERCHANT MARINE

The first order of business at any commencement is congratulation. Ordinarily, I would turn first to the graduating class, for this is certainly their day. But I shall reverse the order today and address myself first to the Maritime College herself.

Almost any graduate of my college or university has taken pride, at one time or another, in the age of his alma mater. "Old" may be an insult to a woman, and surely no compliment to a man, but to a college it is a term of positive endearment. This is true even if the school was founded only in recent years. But when it has reached the point of graduating its one hundredth class, as Fort Schuyler has today, it has certainly earned all the honor and veneration with which its alumni regard it. Those of us in shipping who are not Schuyler graduates share your pride today that our earliest maritime collegiate training institution has passed such a milestone.

To you, Admiral Durgin, and to your staff, congratulations on producing this and other fine classes, and on bringing the college safely to this major port of call. Congratulations to all of your remaining undergraduate body who, though not yet ready to go to sea for good, will have the chance to go temporarily aboard your fine new training ship, the third of the *Empire States*. Finally, I know I speak for the entire merchant marine when I say that we congratulate ourselves today that we have a Fort Schuyler and that we can count on a continuation of the training methods which have given us so much of our best navigational, engineering, and building talent.

It is not news to any of you here that Fort Schuyler has played a very large part in shaping the modern American merchant marine. Nevertheless, I should be shirking an obligation, if, on my first appearance before you as president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, I failed to acknowledge the great debt which our industry owes to this college. Over the years, whether on liner bridges, at freighter hatches, or in tanker enginerooms, not forgetting steamship company offices, maritime agencies of the Government, and countless manufacturing, engineering, and shipbuilding plants where a thorough grounding in maritime technology is indispensable, many hundreds of our ablest men have come out of just such classes as yours.

How much Fort Schuyler has meant to the merchant marine was symbolized on National Maritime Day when a member of your class presented the golden rivet to Commodore John Anderson of the United States Lines, one of your fellow-alumni who, by virtue of his command of the *United States*, could well be considered the Nation's top-ranking merchant seaman.

In my own organization, we have had ample occasion to know the willing and cooperative spirit with which Fort Schuyler men enter into all programs and activities of general benefit to the merchant marine. Both alumni and staff members of the college sit side by side on many of the committees of the American Merchant Marine Institute.

What are some of these things that will be expected of you as soon as you have taken your degrees and licenses, saluted the *Empire State's* quarterdeck for the last time, and gone ashore to look for other ships? I shall mention two—not because there will be no others, but because these will be lifelong responsibilities growing directly out of the fact that you are Fort Schuyler men.

First, there is the responsibility to practice your newly acquired profession. This may seem too obvious to mention. It is taken for granted that most of you will go as deck or engineroom officers at the first opportunity and keep going as long as you have sealegs to go on. But you don't need a deck under you to put your general knowledge and special technical training to work both for your own advantage and for the good of the merchant marine. As the electronic and nuclear age advances, there are going to be many dryland industries working directly for the merchant marine, and unable to do their work properly unless they have trained marine engineers to tell them whether the miracle gadgets they produce will be suited to seafaring.

Second, you will be called on to be lifelong public servants, largely of the unsalaried variety. Those few of you who may actually go into Government will find in due course that all your practical and theoretical knowledge will be valuable in the solution of America's deep-rooted and difficult maritime problems and in the formulation of future policies.

But the great majority of you will remain private citizens, whether at sea or on shore. As such you will be on shore much more than mere voters when issues arise out of these same problems. You will be men who have studied the subject, who know it firsthand and who not only must cast your own ballots in the light of that knowledge but must seek every opportunity to educate your fellow Americans. Sadly enough the great majority of the American public are traditionally—I might almost say zealously—ignorant of shipping matters, even where the conduct of the country's maritime affairs touches their own prosperity and safety more closely.

At sea and in foreign ports, you will have another public responsibility. It has been said that a ships' officer is an ambassador of our country. Not many of us think of ourselves quite so pretentiously, and certainly there is little of diplomatic pomp and protocol about conning a tramp into a minor foreign port, running the gauntlet of local officialdom and local traders, and getting out with a whole skin. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that every American officer can play his part in what is perhaps the most urgent campaign of our industry today—the camapign to fill our cargo holds and increase our carryings.

You may have been wondering what the industry has to offer you in exchange for discharging these obligations. It goes without saying that, if you get a berth on an American ship, you will be among the best paid, the best fed, and the most secure, both personally and socially, of all the world's merchant officers. But, you may still ask, will the berth be there?

I think I can give you an optimistic, if cautious, answer to that one. We have admittedly gone through a period of depressed shipping employment in recent years. The evidence of the past 12 months, however, is that we are coming out of it. If present plans and prognostications mature, there should be steadily increasing shipboard job opportunities for some years to come. I can cite, for one thing, the present comparative prosperity of the tramp shipping industry, which seemed threatened with extinction only 2 years ago. More promising still are the very extensive fleet-replacement and enlargement programs upon which many of the major companies have embarked in recent months—programs usually looking as far ahead as 15 to 20 years. Eleven large new passenger liners are now building or embodied in firm replacement plans.

I recently had an opportunity to talk with some people in Washington concerning the development and placing in coastwise service of roll-on, roll-off vessels. There are those who feel with absolute conviction that this type of vessel will at last bring about the gravely needed revival of our coastal shipping trades. I myself believe that if these ships overcome the greatest obstacle which has stood in the way, namely, slow cargo-handling coupled with devastating in-port costs, the trailership and the trainship will once again vindicate water transport as the most efficient and economical way of moving some types of goods between our domestic ports.

All-Out Fight on Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of June 8, 1956, entitled "All-Out Fight on Disease."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL-OUT FIGHT ON DISEASE

How strong a fight the United States will make on disease in the coming year is now being decided in the Senate-House conferences on the bill for medical research. The Senate on Tuesday voted approximately $183 million for the National Institutes of Health. The House had voted $135 million. The larger appropriation was made as a result of strong recommendations from many distinguished medical scientists, including the cardiologists, Dr. Paul Dudley White and Dr. Irving Wright, and the cancer specialists, Dr. Wendell Stanley, a Nobel prize winner, and Dr. Sidney Ferber, an outstanding authority on leukemia. These and other witnesses representing the major fields of medical research testified that manpower and research facilities were available to make effective use of the funds asked.

If the larger appropriation is not maintained, some promising and exciting forays in what the Senate Appropriations Committee called the "grand national strategy of medical research" will be weakened. One of these is the use of chemical compounds in the treatment of cancer. Another is a crash program agains arteriosclerosis, proposed by Dr. White. In view of the great loss of manpower and economic productivity and the widespread grief and unhappiness that the big disease enemies cause, we hope that the conferees will authorize a full scale research offensive against them.

Three Colleges—All Founded for Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this is the college commencement season. It is a time to commend our institutions of higher learning which are teaching the basic things in our way of life. Decency, courage, loyalty, faith, tolerance, and love of God are the virtues which have made our Nation so great. They must be constantly taught and brought to our attention.

The Washington Observer has an editorial entitled "Three Colleges—All Founded for Service," relating to Washington and Jefferson College, holding its 157th commencement; Waynesburg College, its 105th commencement; and California (Pa.) State Teachers College.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE COLLEGES—ALL FOUNDED FOR SERVICE

It is graduation time for three colleges in Washington and Greene Counties.

Two of them are liberal arts colleges which have served young folk for many decades, and the other is a State teachers college, supported by State funds.

Of the two liberal arts schoools one—Washington and Jefferson—will hold its 157th commencement. It had its beginnings, however, in private schools more than 175 years ago, when this was the new west.

The other—Waynesburg—will graduate its 105th class.

Both were founded by men whose impact on their communities was great.

Both have had great leaders, great presidents, great faculties. And both have served greatly. Graduates of both stand high in many fields—ministry, law, medicine, business, and science.

The two schools have served well, and they have lived because they have served.

They are great examples of the kind of schools which have made America and created its moral and spiritual character. For colleges such as these have turned out the men who have led the Nation in its religion, who have set the ethical and moral standards which have put America high in world leadership.

These two colleges have been engaged in building foundations for life. They have not been specializing institutions, in that they have not tried to prepare men and women for specific trades or professions. But they have laid foundations on which life and its professions are built. And experience over the years has taught that men who secure strong foundations build better life structures.

Such schools, we believe, have a great future—as long as they serve well. And such service requires, above everything else, a desire on the part of school administrators and faculties to help young men and young women to ready themselves for big places of service in the world.

The other college—California State Teachers College—has established itself as a strong influence in southwestern Pennsylvania. Its graduates have stamped their influence and moral character on generations of school pupils. And because of the influence they have on young people, the alumni of this school have done much to build human character.

It also will prosper as it continues to serve.

And back of the service of all three—and of all other colleges in the land—there must be a passion to train young men and women in such a way that they will find God in their work and put God in their achievements.

If they do that our colleges will continue to make America greater, and to keep it strong among the nations of the world.

Soviet Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assembly of Captive European Nations which met in Strasbourg, France, April 12–15, brought together many able and thoughtful leaders of the peoples now suffering under the Communist yoke to plan and work for the return of freedom to their countries.

One of the notable addresses on that occasion was delivered by Dr. Peter Zenkl, courageous former mayor of Prague and vice premier of Czechoslovakia, on the subject of Soviet Imperialism. I ask unanimous consent that this timely and penetrating address, reminding us that the menacing colonialism of today is Soviet imperialism, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

together with a brief descriptive sketch about Dr. Zenkl recently written by Edward R. Murrow as a preface to a booklet entitled "Peter Zenkl, Champion Anti-Communist."

There being no objection, the address and descriptive sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET IMPERIALISM

(By Peter Zenkl)

All of us present, as members of the Assembly of Captive Nations, know at first hand what Soviet imperialism is. I shall not talk about the substance of that condition. I wish to explain why it is necessary to call the system by that name, not avoid the name but do everything in our power to make that technical term current, commonly used and obvious. It has its own specific meaning and individuality, different from other imperialism.

First, I would like to emphasize that even calling the oppression of central and eastern European peoples by Communist Moscow "colonialism" is no derogation of our good friends Great Britain, France or much less the United States. Colonialism by the Western powers has ended, or is rapidly ending, and I must say, honorably since most of the former colonies have attained freedom. Furthermore, western colonialism never and nowhere ever attained the horror and inhumanity of the Soviet variety. It was largely a trusteeship of the more advanced over the less advanced. The mistakes of the past century, and there were mistakes, have long since been counterbalanced by the tremendous progress made by their wards. The western powers, whose leading statesmen have willingly admitted mistakes, can be justly proud of the final balance. We can speak of colonialism without hurting their feelings because they have terminated or are terminating their period of domination with honor, while the Soviet Union is forcing its colonialism among the most cultured parts of Europe, transplanting the worst forms of oppression from medieval centuries into the middle of the 20th century.

Second, I wish to emphasize that no one who has not personally suffered the horrors of Soviet oppression can even imagine them. Many persons recall that oppression is unpleasant, not from its present forms, but from what they know of its past forms.

For instance, take the fact that two-thirds of all the 76 present members of the United Nations were colonies at one time. Think of the 22 American states, including the United States of North America. Think of all the British dominions like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, of all the Arab States, of all those in southern and eastern Asia, with India at their head, of Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, the Philippines, Indonesia. Think of the African states, recent colonies like Tripoli, Tunis and others now coming to the age of independence, with many others to follow. Think of Sudan and of British Togo, which will have its plebiscite on May 7, and Somaliland, which will be free in 3 years. Nigeria and the British West Indies in the Carribean Sea, which will be independent dominions in the near future. None of these members or future members of the United Nations know anything of communism, but they know a lot about colonialism. Not even the people who are neutral in the cold war, or those who boast incorrectly of neutrality, can be indifferent to the dangers of colonialism. It is our duty by using the proper name to warn them that they are threatened by colonialism—not the old colonialism, but the much worse new colonialism of communism.

The best reason for using the correct name, however, is its deep truth. Soviet imperialism has all the characteristics of suppression from the worst and most primitive times in history, times long past and forgotten in the West. It has all the signs of colonialism in the political, economic, social and cultural fields. Let us look at the matter from those four angles:

Politically, ancient colonialism meant that the subject people had no control over its own public affairs. They were governed from some foreign capital, through a governor to whom the local puppets could only bow and obey. If they objected, the local princelings were bought or threatened. Exactly the same thing is happening today in the capitive nations. "Matushka Moskva" has a new significance today, as she alone governs in Praha, Warszawa or Budapest through chieftains bought with money or power, who can appoint and remove any official at will.

The people of these new colonies have no right of free elections any more than had the peoples of Africa or Asia. Moscow's subjects in the captive nations have no human rights, no independent courts, no rights of assembly. These colonies are governed by the police, with no political parties, no free press, or right of free expression. I tell you the oppression in Soviet colonies is worse, much worse than in Asian colonies within the past 50 years.

Economically ancient colonies were managed by mammoth companies, who ruled without responsibility to anyone but their shareholders. We see the same today in the captive countries, with their national enterprises, their joint Soviet-Rumanian, or Soviet-Hungarian corporations, and their 5-year plans, which subject their economies to that of the Soviet Union, and place economic goals and quotas above the life and death of mere people, above all human rights and liberties. These corporations exploit the labor of their colonial subjects more or less like slaves, pay miserably in comparison with the cost of necessities, seize private property without compensation, push particularly old people out of their homes, deny medical attention to those no longer able to work. They do not treat their subjects like people; forced labor and concentration camps have become the symbol of Soviet colonialism. The horror of this form of colonialism is worse than we could find back in the 16th century in the west.

Naturally the planned economy in captive countries is not planned for the benefit of the domestic population, but only of Russia. That in central European colonies is a purely complementary economy, to complement or supplement the economy of the U. S. S. R. Even the much advertised Soviet form of collective farming is a copy of the old plantation system with all its unpleasant symptoms. In ancient times colonial subjects paid head taxes; today the Soviets have replaced the fair income tax with consumers' taxes, similar in effect to a head tax. Such economic similaries with ancient colonialism could be listed without end.

In social matters the similarity is still more remarkable. We could say a lot about breaking up families in Soviet colonies, about exhausting work by women, about excessive working hours, about physicians who don't treat patients but drive people to labor they cannot stand, about the collapse of labor unions which now serve the state and not their members, about the lack of any protection for labor against unfair treatment by the one great employer—the state, about workers chained to one plant where the government orders them to work, about the lack of freedom to travel at home or abroad, the death penalty for trying to escape this workers' paradise.

Soviet colonizers have no interest in maintaining the culture of their occupied peoples; they want only skillful hands and willing servants behind the Iron Curtain. They falsify history in each of the European colonies, try to erase the greatness of past national leaders and artists, to substitute Soviet art, literature, science, invention, and political leadership. Their colonized peoples must forget they were ever free, ever played a part on the world stage; they must worship only Soviet heroes. It has become a crime to remember freedom in the past or to dream of future freedom.

Why do I say all this? Because colonialism no longer exists in the west and the last colonies are rapidly moving into complete independence. Because the paradox of our century is that it has ended colonial rule over backward peoples, while at the same time permitting something worse to be foisted on advanced peoples. Because this new colonialism is actually the worst threat to world peace. It is our duty to show the world that all attempts to negotiate permanent peace will be stillborn unless it puts an end to this ulcer on the face of world politics. All the work of the United Nations for peace will remain phrases on paper, shadows on the wall, until it faces up to this problem.

We must point out to the world what an absurd anomaly it is for the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly to debate about elections in the wild sections of New Guinea and say nothing about free elections in Bucharest, Budapest and Riga. It is a shadow game to debate about corporal punishment for a few criminals in central Africa while a 100,000 people in Poland are tortured in concentration camps for no crime at all. It is really absurd for the United Nations to worry about a few students from some colony somewhere refused visas to attend an American university, while whole classes of young people are excluded from the 600-year-old university in Praha and denied all rights to higher education because they or their parents do not belong to the right political party. We ought to stand up and proclaim aloud that we are for free elections in the most remote corners of the earth, that we protest against physical humiliation of people anywhere, that every person has a right to education. But while demanding these rights for peoples just entering civilized society, let us demand the same for the 100 million people in central Europe, who had these rights but have lost them, and also for the other millions in the East who have never had a free election, still live under the threat of physical torture. Is it too much to demand that the Twentieth Century movement which has given self-government to hundreds of millions in Asia, also return self-government to the peoples in central Europe and insist on civilized government in Eastern Europe?

I therefore propose that this assembly establish a committee to study these questions and select a group of those who know the problem to draft memoranda and a program in this field.

I propose that we define Soviet colonialism as based on works by modern Communist authors, and prove that their charges against the West are long out of date whereas they still apply behind the Iron Curtain.

I propose that the facts and data we discover be presented to all non-Communist members of the United Nations—not only to their delegations in New York, but also directly to their governments around the world.

I propose that we form a special commission of legal and political experts to study means of including these problems in the agenda of the United Nations as a contribution to its efforts toward permanent peace. Yes, I know the wording of Article 3 paragraphd 7 of the United Nations Charter, which forbids interfering in internal affairs of member states. But I also know that both colonialism as such and threats to world peace are not internal affairs of member states. I also know that the question what is or is not an internal matter of member states is decided in the final analysis by a voting majority of those present. We also

know that the United Nations has often interfered in internal affairs of member states, rightly or wrongly—at the instigation or the consent of the Soviet Union. We see that Greece, for instance, has placed the question of Cyprus on the United Nations agenda. Well, it is time that the United Nations considered the question of the captive nations—and it will be our fault if this is not put on the agenda. Truth is on our side; our cause is right and sacred. Free men—free nations are rising throughout the world—be assured that they will rise to their feet also behind the Iron Curtain.

The Soviet Union calls for an end to colonialism—shouting like a thief, "Catch him. There he goes." It is up to us to unmask the real thief.

PREFACE TO PETER ZENKL, CHAMPION ANTI-COMMUNIST

(By Edward R. Murrow)

Brackett Lewis has written an unadorned account of the life of Peter Zenkl. A full account can come only from the pen, the mind, and the memories of Dr. Zenkl himself.

It was no accident that nearly all competent Western observers who visited Czechoslovakia in the years between the wars labeled it a model democracy. Czechoslovakia was at the same time an inspiration and a challenge to its neighbors. And one of the principal reasons that this was so was that small, smiling, and vigilant statesman known as Peter Zenkl. He was three times lord mayor of Prague; was Minister of Social Welfare and Public Health under President Benes—leader of the largest anti-Communist Party in Czechoslovakia. He witnessed the saddest sight a patriot can behold—the death of his nation without battle, when Czechoslovakia was betrayed by her Western Allies.

Dr. Zenkl is a fighting man, with as much faith in free men's ability to govern themselves as any man I have ever known. He spent 6 years in Nazi concentration camps, was condemned to death, but managed to survive those last few indescribable days of horror at Buchenwald. When this reporter had the honor of finding him there, he was not a broken man; he had not even bent. His faith in his country, in democratic processes, in the dignity of the individual and his right to be free, were undiminished.

Czechoslovakian Communists in Buchenwald, seeing me in the company of Zenkl, warned me against him. They said: "Beware of old Zenkl. He still believes in that old-fashioned nonsense, like Masaryk, Benes, and Woodrow Wilson." They hated and were fearful of him because, fortified with an idea, he would not break. They promised to destroy him if he returned to his native land. It never occurred to him to do anything else. He became Deputy Prime Minister under Dr. Benes. And then, for the second time, saw his country go down under the flood of a foreign tyranny. Finally he managed to escape, and now resides in this country.

Peter Zenkl knows as much about fighting communism as any man I know. He spent much of his mature life doing exactly that. He is an inspiration for all men who seek freedom. The hatred of his fellow-countrymen in Buchenwald, the fact that the Communists in Czechoslovakia still fear and malign him, are both tributes to the power of the man and of the idea he cherishes.

Technically, I presume Dr. Zenkl is now classified as a refugee. But he will be at home wherever freedom flourishes and men are prepared to fight for it.

There are refugees who believe that they know precisely the pattern and form of the government and society which should and must replace the present tyranny when they return to their native land. It is not so with Zenkl. This is a decision he reserves for his fellow-countrymen when, in freedom, they may determine such matters for themselves. The years in prison and in exile have served to intensify and strengthen his intolerance of injustice. He knows that in a world where there is no security for little nations, there is no security for big ones. He is a quiet man, with a truly ferocious faith in freedom. And there will come a time when schoolchildren in his own country—and I hope in mine—will read the story of Peter Zenkl, his life, and his works, and will draw from it the pride, inspiration, and respect for human rights which is the diet on which individuals and nations must survive.

Congressman Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, Takes a Look at the Record on the Farm Issue

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year or more hundreds of my constituents have written me expressing their great concern about the welfare of our farmers. Businessmen, as well as farmers, wrote and called on me, because all business is tied to agriculture. Many said give us about the right amount of rain and sunshine and all will be well without a farm program, while others talk about feed distribution, feed costs, feed supplies, credit, transportation, machine costs, and high taxes. Many complained about hog and cattle prices, and said they felt politics was entering into all proposed farm legislation. Let us take a look at the record.

The Democrat Party was in full power in both the White House and in Congress in 1951 when the President's hand-picked Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, Mr. Michael DiSalle, announced on February 19, 1951, that he would soon roll back the price of cattle 10 percent with President Truman's approval. At the same time he announced that was only the beginning—because said he, "I'm going to roll back cattle prices another 4½ percent on August 1, and another 4½ percent on December 1, because said he, cattle prices are too high." We Congressmen from cattle producing areas took up the fight and were able to stop all except the 10 percent roll-back, but the damage was done—cattle prices, as you well know, started on the toboggan the day after DiSalle made his dictatorial announcement, which also pulled other farm prices down and down. Now we hope the present increased prices of livestock will hold, and they will hold unless the packers decide otherwise. We are still waiting for the packers to explain the low hog prices in 1955 in face of the fact that the American people ate more pork in 1955 than the farmers marketed as shown by the Department of Agriculture records.

The House of Representatives passed a bill amending the Agricultural Act on May 5, 1955, to strengthen the farm economy, but the Democrat controlled Senate committee pigeonholed the bill, and then the Democrat bigwigs began trying to blame the farmers' troubles on the Republican administration. That was the worst kind of politics, and at the expense of our farmers. Their time would have been better spent cooperating with the congressmen from the farm States who asked nothing more than fair and equal treatment for the farmer with others segments of our people. Then in order to give quick help to many financially distressed farmers President Eisenhower and all the Republicans, and a few Democrats, in Congress, worked hard to get this present Democrat controlled Congress to put a provision in the soil-bank bill to pay 50 percent of the soil-bank benefits this year to farmers who would agree to comply next year with the soil-bank provision in the bill; but the Democrats screamed politics to the end that section was knocked out of the bill.

Now let us take a look back at the record. Total farm income was less during the Democrat 8-year period, 1933 to 1940, than it was during the preceding Republican 8-year period. Take a look at hog prices for instance—long after the New Dealers plowed under corn, wheat, and cotton, and destroyed little pigs, and spent over $19 billion trying to prime the pump—the highest price paid for hogs at the Omaha market in 1940 was $7.30 in August, the low was $5.25 in February. Please note below price chart compiled from the Omaha market, also please note hog prices for years 1947, 1948, 1953, and 1954, when the Republicans were in control of Congress:

Top prices for hogs by months

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Year
1956	15.25	15.00											
1955	18.75	18.00	18.75	18.50	19.00	22.25	20.50	17.85	17.25	16.35	13.75	12.00	22.25
1954	27.35	27.25	27.90	28.65	28.25	27.00	26.00	24.50	21.50	19.75	19.75	18.85	28.65
1953	19.25	21.75	22.25	24.65	25.25	26.00	27.50	27.25	26.00	24.75	24.00	27.00	27.50
1952	18.35	18.10	18.25	17.85	22.25	21.25	23.50	23.75	21.60	20.75	17.60	19.25	23.75
1951	22.00	23.75	22.75	22.25	22.25	23.00	23.25	23.50	21.65	22.50	19.60	18.75	23.75
1950	17.75	17.85	18.00	17.75	20.50	21.75	25.75	26.50	24.50	20.75	19.25	20.75	26.50
1949	21.50	21.75	22.50	21.75	22.25	22.25	23.00	23.60	22.75	19.50	17.00	16.00	23.60
1948	28.75	26.50	25.25	23.50	26.00	29.50	30.50	32.25	30.00	27.50	25.35	22.75	32.25
1947	25.25	29.50	29.25	28.00	25.25	25.25	28.75	28.75	32.00	30.00	25.85	28.75	32.00
1946	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	22.85	24.00	15.90	27.50	25.25	25.00	27.50
1945	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50
1944	13.45	13.55	14.10	13.75	13.45	13.50	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45
1943	15.00	15.35	15.40	15.50	14.50	14.15	13.90	14.60	15.10	14.65	14.15	13.50	15.50
1942	11.85	13.00	13.65	14.50	14.20	14.40	14.50	14.70	15.00	15.30	14.10	14.75	15.30
1941	8.85	7.75	8.10	9.10	9.35	10.90	11.60	12.15	12.30	11.35	10.50	11.15	12.30
1940	5.65	5.25	5.50	6.35	6.00	5.40	6.75	7.30	7.25	6.40	6.10	6.85	7.30
1939	7.70	8.20	8.00	7.00	6.90	7.00	7.15	6.65	9.25	7.15	6.50	5.75	9.25
1938	8.50	8.85	9.35	8.60	8.65	9.00	10.05	9.80	9.15	8.60	7.90	7.45	10.05
1937	10.50	10.00	10.45	10.15	11.60	11.50	12.60	13.10	12.25	11.40	9.25	8.35	13.10
1936	10.75	10.75	10.55	10.60	10.10	10.50	10.75	11.40	11.00	10.15	9.55	10.35	11.40

In the year 1940 after 8 years of new dealism when the Democrats were in full control, both in the White House and in Congress, over 10 million Americans were out of work, but World War II solved that problem for them by giving jobs to 14 million Americans in uniform—then, of course, all prices, including farm prices, went up and up. But thinking Americans want no more of that kind of business.

By honorable, peaceful means—without the stimulant of war and its heartaches—the Republican peace party will earnestly strive, and will succeed in leading the way to genuine prosperity. That is our sacred pledge to the American people. So, I am proud to continue to cast my lot with the Grand Old Party.

The Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on Wednesday, June 6, 1956, entitled "Bohlen Wrong, BRIDGES Right." This editorial refers to an exchange of correspondence between Kenneth D. Robertson, Jr., of Boston, Mass., and the Honorable Charles E. Bohlen, United States Ambassador to Russia, which should be of interest to the general public and which I request be printed immediately following the editorial referred to.

There being no objection, the editorial and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOHLEN WRONG, BRIDGES RIGHT

Our readers will remember the shock so many patriotic Americans experienced when President Eisenhower appointed Charles E. Bohlen as our Ambassador to Russia. They also will remember Senator BRIDGES' patriotic opposition to the appointment.

Just how right Senator BRIDGES was can be seen from reading the correspondence between Kenneth D. Robertson, Jr., of Boston, and Charles E. Bohlen, of Moscow, and a member of the board of overseers of Harvard University. That correspondence is printed on today's editorial page under "Important," with "Harvard and Oppenheimer" the main caption.

It will be noted from the correspondence that Bohlen favors Dr. Oppenheimer's appointment as William James lecturer at Harvard. "I do not mind telling you," he writes alumnus Robertson, "that had I been present at the meeting (of the board of overseers) I would have approved Dr. Oppenheimer's appointment."

Ambassador Bohlen, then, apparently sees nothing wrong in Harvard's honoring of Oppenheimer in spite of the fact that Oppenheimer contributed money to the Communist Party, associated with Communists, lied to a security agent of the United States Government during wartime, and was denied security clearance because of "basic defects in character."

With such a lack of moral sensitivity, as indicated by his judgment of Oppenheimer's connection with Harvard, Bohlen must feel very much at home in Moscow, associating as he does with the atheistic killers in the Kremlin.

BRIDGES was right.

WILLIAM LAUB, *Publisher.*

BOSTON, MASS., *February 24, 1956.*

Hon. CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Department of State,
New State Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR BOHLEN: As an interested alumnus, I ask you as a member of the Board of Overseers ("which directly represents alumni interests in the policies of the university"—Pusey) whether or not you now approve of the Oppenheimer appointment as William James, lecturer.

I would like a yes or no answer to that question regardless how you voted at the board meeting which "approved" the appointment—or whether you even voted or not.

And I would like your answer to include your views as to Dr. Oppenheimer's moral qualifications to lecture on the subject of ethics and philosophy to the young students at Harvard. It seems to me that the moral issues involved go far beyond any purely scientific accomplishment, no matter how illustrious.

If this letter makes you angry by speaking too plainly, please don't take it out on me. After all, I didn't have a Communist as an intimate "girl friend," didn't contribute money to the Communist party, didn't associate with Communists and employ them in secret government work or fail to pass security tests. Nor have I lied about the foregoing when questioned thereon.

Finally, don't blame me for appointing him.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH D. ROBERTSON, Jr.

(cc: Dr. Pusey member of the corporation, Same letter to all members of board of overseers).

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Moscow, U. S. S. R., April 28, 1956.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: I have received your letter of February 24 in which you inquire whether I as a member of the board of overseers voted for Dr. Oppenheimer's appointment as William James, lecturer. In view of my absence from the country I did not attend the meeting of the board at which this question came up.

Although I do not know that you have any right to inquire how individual members of the board of overseers did or not vote on any given question before it, since in this case it is a hypothetical question I do not mind telling you that had I been present at the meeting I would have approved Dr. Oppenheimer's appointment.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN.

BOSTON, MASS, *May 12, 1956.*

Hon. CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
American Embassy, Moscow, U. S. S. R.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR BOHLEN: The tenor of your letter of April 28 is not altogether surprising in view of the very real doubts at the time of your appointment regarding your qualifications to represent America's best interests in Moscow. Defending Dr. Oppenheimer without any reservations—a man who so well served the enemies of his country—is, perhaps, to be expected of you.

It does seem strange, however, that an interested alumnus cannot get a forthright answer to a direct question from a member of the board of overseers, particularly in view of Dr. Pusey's statement that your board "directly represents alumni interests in the policies of the university"; and in a man of your intelligence I can hardly believe that you purposely misread that question.

If you will reread my letter, you will see that I did not ask you how you voted on the Oppenheimer appointment; I asked whether you "now approve" of it. You call that a "hypothetical question," challenge my right to ask it, and then answer it by indirection only. Moreover, you are very careful to avoid answering the question of Oppenheimer's moral qualifications to discourse on the difference between what is right and what is wrong. Are you, perhaps, ashamed to express your views on them?

I am so disgusted at your undeviating loyalty toward a tool of the conspiracy—a self-confessed liar and one who was officially denied security clearance because of basic defects in character—that I am sending copies of our correspondence to Senator EASTLAND and to others who, with him, will be in a position to evaluate its significance and take appropriate action.

Very truly yours.

KENNETH D. ROBERTSON, Jr.

Enclosure: Raymond Moley's The Pink Flag Flies, Newsweek, April 23, 1956.

(cc: Dr. Pusey—other overseers—members of the Harvard Corporation—Senator EASTLAND—and others.)

A Watch on Bigness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Watch on Bigness," which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on Sunday, May 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WATCH ON BIGNESS

Last year General Motors Corporation earned $1,189,000,000. It was the first time any business ever earned a billion dollars in 1 year, and commentators had much to say about this vast sum and the power of the corporation that made it.

Congressional committees buzzed around General Motors as if it were a shady giant that needed its ears pinned back.

GM's dealer relations were sifted and a Senate committee made solemn recommendations as to changes. The Justice Department's antitrust chief talked darkly about GM divesting itself of some of its manufacturing enterprises. An attack on GM's defense contracts sputtered out when it was learned they were down 35 percent in 1955, but the slur had been made, and it stuck.

No phase of General Motors operations escaped close scrutiny. Its business methods were probed and prodded in the disapproving tones of prosecutor trying to send somebody up for embezzlement.

All this about a corporation whose sales, earnings, taxes, profit, plant investment were clear matters of public record and about which no hint of scandal could be found. The only excuse given was that bigness must be watched.

But it seems that only certain kinds of big business must be watched. Corporate big

business but not union labor's big business, which is the operation of welfare funds.

In total, the labor welfare funds make General Motors' billion-dollar income look like a piddling amount. In 1954 the union funds took in $6,500,000,000 and the cash total in the funds at that time was estimated by a congressional committee at upward of $25 billion. No American corporation, no American industry, has such enormous assets, either liquid or in property.

This is bigness almost beyond comprehension—and it is operating in virtual secrecy.

Victor Riesel, the blinded labor columnist, says he is convinced that the hoodlum who pitched acid in his face last month was working for the racketeers who have horned their way into labor. The loot they're after, he opines, is the pension and welfare funds. Not only are they after it but they are already regarding it as their own. Any interference with this huge grab of power and money, says Mr. Riesel, is the spur to violence.

The shakedowns by which these labor criminals amass fortunes are varied. They include outright theft, padding of expense accounts, operation of insurance companies. There is practically no accounting of any of the money. In the words of Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, "administrators * * * treat the money more as their own than that of the beneficiaries."

What an ironic state of affairs is this. A respectable American corporation is badgered and defamed for the crime of making a billion dollars honestly. And the hoodlums who have wormed their way into a much bigger enterprise, labor's pension and welfare funds, operate without any threats of Federal interference of any kind.

Surely some of the energy and indignation expended in watching General Motors could profitably be diverted to keeping an eye on the hoodlum-infested welfare funds. Congress should waste no time in getting around to it.

Nonmagnetic Taconite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my colleagues will be aware of the tremendous importance of the new taconite industry in northern Minnesota. It is a subject I have discussed many times on the Senate floor.

The St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 30, 1956, contained an editorial entitled "Nonmagnetic Taconite Is Next Ore Frontier." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONMAGNETIC TACONITE IS NEXT ORE FRONTIER

Minnesota's tremendous resources in the way of low-grade iron ore may be stretched still further, through plans now underway. Taconite has been the big source of expansion in which so much enthusiasm centers as to long-range future prospects. But it is the magnetic kind that is being used, in which iron can be removed from the rock rather simply by the use of magnetism. There are nonmagnetic ores in tremendous abundance, particularly toward the western end of the iron ranges. The Great Northern Railway Co. now plans to encourage the development of such ores on the western Mesabi Range.

The Grand Rapids Herald-Review, hailing this new, bright prospect, says "these ores can be made magnetic by the application of heat up to about a thousand degrees. After that, the process of extracting the iron may be generally the same."

The western end of the iron range area watches, perhaps with a bit of envious interest, the taconite developments further eastward. "Every year," says the Grand Rapids paper, "points to the use of the western ores, and the day of their usefulness may not be too distant. While the nonmagnetic taconites must be heated to utilize present processes, they have some other advantages. Great tonnages have been mined and stockpiled. The vast red piles may be seen across the whole western range. * * * Much of the western range ore may have higher iron content than the magnetic taconites now being used. The western taconites are softer and will be crushed at less cost. They will not require as fine grinding. In future operations on the western Mesabi there will be no need for high investment in housing or transportation facilities. There are investment advantages which may be very important."

The developments being discussed may take some years, but they do hold great promise.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the United States has produced many distinguished military and naval leaders—men tested in both peace and war. The qualifications for high positions in the Armed Forces are far greater today than ever in our history. Yet few people realize the years of arduous application necessary to attain such posts.

The present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is Adm. Arthur W. Radford. His distinguished career was summarized in the June 1956 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the United States Naval Academy Alumni Association.

In order that the indicated biographical sketch about Admiral Radford may have a wider distribution I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the subject summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTHUR WILLIAM RADFORD, CLASS OF 1916

Although Adm. Arthur William Radford is a Navy man by virtue of graduating from the Naval Academy in 1916 and subsequently giving 40 years of service to the United States Navy, he is far more than just a Navy man. In his present top post as chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff—a post he has held nearly 3 years—he is a man dedicated not only to all armed services of the United States, but to the entire world. His friends and classmates know him as quiet and reserved but highly compatible, easy going with his fellow man—but firm on important issues or when the well-being of his country is at stake.

Arthur W. Radford was born in Chicago, Ill., on February 27, 1896, the son of John A. and Agnes E. Knight Radford. At the age of 14, an uncle took him to Chicago to see the first international air show in Grant Park. He made up his mind then and there that he wanted to be an airplane pilot. When he attended the Werntz Preparatory School in Annapolis, where the beginnings of naval aviation were underway at North Severn, he spent all his free time there.

As a midshipman, he was a one-striper member of the Masqueraders, farewell ball committee, and went out for track. He graduated in the upper half of his class. At that time the Navy Department was taking few officers into its flying program so Ensign Radford went to sea, in the U. S. S. *South Carolina*, where he served during World War I. He was in Central America when the opportunity arrived to be in the first Pensacola class, but he entered the second class and was awarded his wings as naval aviator 2896 in 1920.

Then followed 10 years of apprenticeship in which Radford served as a flying instructor at Pensacola, an aviator aboard a battleship, a fighter pilot abroad the first carrier which was a converted collier, and a tour of staff duty in Washington. He flew seaplanes and land planes; he was catapulted from the decks of many ships, including an improvised turret platform. He studied, investigated and tried out aerial gunnery, air-to-air refueling, balloons, parachutes, and aerobatics. He was officer in charge of the Alaskan Survey Detachment which investigated the forest and mineral resources of Alaska in 1929, along with representatives of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

In June 1932 Radford returned to the Bureau of Aeronautics, serving in the Flight Division until August 1935. He joined the aircraft tender *Wright* as navigator, after which he served successively as tactical officer and operations officer on the staff of Commander Aircraft, Battle Force, U. S. S. *Saratoga*, the flagship.

He commanded the Naval Air Station at Seattle, Wash., from June 1937 until 1940, then served as executive officer of the aircraft carrier *Yorktown*. His next major post was commander, Naval Air Station, Trinidad, British West Indies, with additional duty as commandant of the Naval Operating Base at Trinidad, serving until the fall of 1941.

Upon the outbreak of World War II, the Navy had to expand immediately its aviation program, with thousands of aviators needed. Radford—now a rear admiral—started a program of rigorous preflight training in a few universities with ground studies and physical conditioning. He set up a number of inland centers for primary training, and in 2 years the program was turning out thousands of superbly trained pilots annually.

He was awarded the Legion of Merit and cited "for exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as Director of Aviation Training, Bureau of Aeronautics, December 7, 1941, to April 19, 1943."

With the problem well in hand, Admiral Radford asked for sea duty, and fought his first major action as commander, Carrier Division II. Here he organized and trained at sea the first so-called airborne nightfighter teams for which he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

In December 1943, Admiral Radford became chief of staff and aide to the Commander Aircraft Pacific, serving until the following spring when he returned to the States. He was appointed Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air and in that assignment was awarded a gold star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit.

Admiral Radford moved forward into other battles with the fleet, and in November 1944 assumed command of Carrier Division 6. He was awarded a gold star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal "for exception-

ally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service. * * * He expertly directed his task group in carrying out effective attacks against the enemy in the Tokyo area on February 16, 17, and 25; Iwo Jima, from February 19 to 22; Kyushu and the Inland Sea area on March 17, 18, and 19; and supporting operations at Okinawa from March 23 to May 29, in addition to a strategically important photographic mission over this heavily fortified Japanese-controlled island."

He reported to the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air, on temporary duty in connection with planning the postwar Navy, then became Deputy Chief with the rank of vice admiral. In early 1947 he was commander, Second Task Fleet, then returned to the Navy Department as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

On April 2, 1949, the White House announced his temporary appointment to the rank of admiral while serving under Presidential designation as Commander in Chief, Pacific; Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet; and High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

When he was assigned to this command, Admiral Radford was given the opportunity to put some of his ideas concerning unification into effect. Unification was not a new subject to him, for its principles had been discussed among the services for many years. Although he did testify in opposition to the original draft for a merger, he fully supported the real unification that came about in the National Security Act of 1947. He felt then, as he does now, that unified effort could come only after a generation of interservice education. It develops as a natural process of evolution from mutual trust, understanding, and respect, and depends on good leadership by competent and sincere individuals.

In the fall of 1949, Admiral Radford received official orders to report to, and testify before, the Congressional Committee of the Armed Services investigating the slow B–36 and related matters. This was a role he did not seek, but he spoke out forcibly with his true objective views based on many years of varied experience. The congressional probers focused their attentions on questions of airpower, and on this subject Admiral Radford spoke with authority.

To him, national airpower meant the combination of land airpower, naval airpower, commercial airpower, and aircraft industrial airpower. The tremendous national power of the combined airpowers would provide ultimately the most imaginative instrument of national policy.

As Commander in Chief, Pacific, he made it a point to cover his entire area with frequent visits in order to learn firsthand what was going on. He often was at the control of the plane.

During this period, Radford's responsibilities increased tremendously not only due to the conflict in Korea, but because of the unsettled conditions throughout Southeast Asia. In April 1951 the Joint Chiefs of Staff turned over responsibility of the Marianas-Bonin area to the Pacific Command, and followed this a year later by adding the Philippines-Formosa area. He was later given increased responsibilities concerning military-assistance programs in Southeast Asia.

He was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal, with citation as follows: "For exceptionally meritorious services * * * during operations against enemy aggressor forces in Korea from June 26, 1950, to January 1, 1951 * * * as a result of his brilliant leadership, professional skill and able administration of naval operations in the Western Pacific, surface forces were strategically placed to control waters surrounding the target area and to provide coordinated support of land operations designed to aid the Republic of Korea in her fight against domination and oppression."

In June 1953, Admiral Radford was appointed Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, succeeding Gen. Omar Bradley. To this job he brings the greatest variety of experience and the greatest degree of patriotic devotion to duty. He believes that now, more than ever, there should be no partisan advocacy of any one service, or role, or mission, or weapon. The best possible use of the total moral, economic, and military strength of the country is his goal.

In addition to the medals mentioned, Admiral Radford has the World War I Victory Medal, Atlantic Fleet Clasp, American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, American Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal.

The Government of Great Britain awarded him the decoration of Companion of the Order of the Bath, and he also holds the Cross of Military Merit, awarded by Guatemala.

Admiral and Mrs. Radford—the former Marion McMichael, of Portland, Oreg., make their home at Nebraska Avenue in Washington D. C. He has little time to spare from his heavy duties, but gives generously to civic affairs. Recently, he made an address at the presentation of the annual awards by Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., when in conclusion he said: "We will find our freedom tasks demanding—demanding courage, humility, selflessness, service, and lots of hard work; and demanding an unshakeable belief in the manner of life which we defend.

"These tasks may even demand our lives. And in the final analysis, there is no greater sacrifice than for a man to lay down his life for God and country. In the end, truth, justice, and faith will win."

Proposed Unification of Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "All Too Plausible" by William H. Grimes. This article deals with the suggestion from some sources that the Armed Forces should be unified to the extent that they would be under 1 Chief of Staff and all 3 services would wear a common uniform. I feel this is of interest not only to Members of the United States Senate, but to the general public as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING THINGS OVER

(By William H. Grimes)

ALL TOO PLAUSIBLE

It is certainly a plausible proposition that the Armed Forces should be further unified to the extent that they would be under a single chief of staff and all three branches, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, would wear a common uniform.

In case of war the three branches must coordinate their operations toward a common objective or objectives. That alone constitutes a powerful argument in behalf of further steps toward unification.

The very plausibility of the idea is the thing that should make one wary. The layman cannot pretend to an expert opinion on military matters. But it is permissible for the layman to draw on his own experience and suggest that what seems so plain and indisputable on the surface is a warning to look underneath.

From a military standpoint is it advisable to have a single authority which can say, "March here and do that. Sail there and do this. Fly to such and such a place and do so and so?"

Hitler had that power in Germany and the result was disaster. If he had not insisted on the operation at Stalingrad, if he had not ordered the Germans to make a stand, World War II might have been prolonged. Stalin had absolute military power and we now learn that he ordered an operation at Kharkov against the advice of his generals. The result was a defeat in which thousands of Russian soldiers perished needlessly.

In Great Britain and the United States there was no single individual with that authority. Strategy grew out of discussions to which many minds contributed. There were no mistakes comparable to Stalingrad.

It can be argued that both Hitler and Stalin were disordered minds. So they were. But can there be any assurance that in any country the man in charge of military operations will not make misjudgments, unless checked?

It is well to emphasize again that these are the observations of a layman. But it is within a layman's province to point out that where any individual had supreme military power—and some of the most brilliant military minds have possessed it—he sooner or later came to grief. Napoleon, Alexander the Great, and Gustavus Adolphus finally went down to defeat.

The immediate occasion for the suggestion looking to closer unification is the bickering among the various branches of the armed services which has just been revealed.

In the first place, would a unified command and a common uniform do away with those differences? Or would it merely conceal the differences; sweep them under the rug as it were?

The Army man, the Navy man and the Air Force man has each been raised in his service. Preponderantly these are men dedicated to their callings. Why should they not be expected to fight for those measures which they believe will strengthen their services? Would anyone seriously want them to do anything else? Does anyone seriously propose that there should be a form of organization which would silence these men and make them afraid to offer their ideas?

When these military differences break into the newspapers there is an impression of disorder. Well, the whole process of representative government is at times disorderly. The process depends on conflicting opinions being offered, argued and resolved. How do you bypass that process in military matters and at the same time maintain civilian control over the military?

That leads to another question. Is civilian control of the military possible or even feasible under modern conditions where military organization must be complex and spread over the globe, where the weapons and the methods of today are obsolete tomorrow?

If one conceives that the public and the Congress are capable of passing on the details of military problems, then the answer is negative. Neither the majority of Members of Congress nor the public can possibly have the information on which to base judgments. Much of the information cannot be revealed. If it could be revealed, most of it would be incomprehensible to all except a very few specialists.

The case is that the information that the public does get is often distorted. Much of it is brought out by Congressmen who have a political motive in slanting and coloring their revelations. Much of it comes from military men who do not want to see an appropriation for their activities decreased.

The man who runs as he reads sees the headlines that a general said that in a few years Russia would have the capabilities of destroying the retaliatory power of the United States. Careful reading of the general's testimony shows he came very far from saying anything of the sort. But few have time to go beyond the headlines.

Then is civilian control of the military anything more than a pretense? Would it not be better to eliminate the pretense and proceed on the basis of reality?

In a letter to this newspaper the other day, Mr. Eugene Wilson recalled the case of General William Mitchell and his serious charges that the Armed Forces were neglecting airpower. The public was unable to judge the merits of that famous controversy. But it had the good sense to know that there should be action. As Mr. Wilson recalls, the action was the appointment of a Presidential Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Dwight Morrow and that committee paved the way for development of American airpower.

It would have been a tragedy if there had been a type of command which could have silenced General Mitchell. And while public opinion could not form its judgment on his charges, it could bring about the fullest investigation.

"Unification" is one of the good words. One who seems to question "unity" is at once suspect. And perhaps unification of the defense forces would be as beneficial as the promise held forth. There is the chance it might be something quite different.

Address by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, Commencement Exercises, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., June 5, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I place in the RECORD the fine address delivered at the graduation exercises at the United States Military Academy at West Point by the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker.

West Point is in the 28th Congressional District that I have the honor to represent, and it was my great pleasure to hear the Secretary deliver this address that will long be remembered by the graduating class of 1956 and by their friends and relatives from every one of the States and the Territories of our great Republic:

General Bryan, General Taylor, Congresswoman St. George, alumni of the Academy, members of the class of 1956, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I come on this unforgettable day to express the esteem and good wishes of the entire Nation to you of the graduating class. Three-quarters of this graduating class are receiving commissions in the United States Army, and one-quarter are receiving commissions in the United States Air Force. For each of you this day is one of the most memorable occasions of your life. It is also important for your country because in the tremendous future each of you will bear a large responsibility for her security and well-being. One hundred and sixty-seven million Americans will be depending upon you.

Forty-one years ago this week 2d Lt. Dwight D. Eisenhower departed from West Point after receiving his diploma and commission. It was 1915, and already the turmoil of a warring world was beating upon America's shores and washing away the foundations of her traditional defenses. I remember it well myself. America had sore need for the strength and courage and devotion of every one of her sons. He was ready. The great traditions of the Academy, built upon the creed of honor and dedication to the highest good of the country, had fortified the strength of his youth, and had added new meaning to the standards by which he lived and the faith he held. He was prepared to go forth and serve America, and to keep his momentous appointment with destiny.

You, too, have an appointment with destiny, America has never had a greater need for rising young leaders of high competence who exemplify the spirit of unselfish service to the Nation which West Point has nurtured throughout its glorious history. As professional soldiers, you will have a principal part to play in providing the tough military shield our country must have for a long, long time to come, fortifying it against the grim threat of armed aggression.

You have not sought the smooth road, the easy life, or you would not have chosen the military profession, which is one of the most demanding and strenuous of them all. It appeals to robust men of courage and physical stamina who place the greatest value upon the soul-warming rewards of service which only the soldier knows. It appeals to the men who seek the strenuous life. It was Theodore Roosevelt who praised, "that highest form of success which comes * * * to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph."

The task of military leadership which you have undertaken becomes more exacting every day. When I was a platoon leader with the Rainbow Division in World War I, it seemed to me that the Army was exceedingly complex. Now, after 40 years, looking back, I am impressed by how simple we had it in comparison with the modern Army in this age of swiftly advancing technology.

You have learned at West Point how atomic weapons, guided missiles and air transport have revolutionized strategic and tactical concepts. Their impact upon the art of war has not even yet been fully assessed. But this we do know—they have multiplied both in number and in magnitude all of the problems of command, from the highest to the lowest. Because of the tremendous compression of time and space—the telescoping of cause and effect—which science has brought about, the burden resting upon the individual officer at all levels has become increasingly greater. Decisions that a few years ago might have waited upon a staff conference must now be made in the twinkling of an eye. Today's modern Army, Navy, Air Force are the fastest moving, and the hardest hitting in all history. The highest professional competence and the soundest possible judgment on the part of leaders charged with responsibility for the lives of men in battle and the success of our mission are of even more vital important than they have been at any time in the whole past.

Gentlemen, today we are threatened by a vile international conspiracy, backed by the largest mobilized armed forces on earth. During the last 10 years the Communists have extended their control to embrace 600 million people. They have more than 8 million men under arms at this moment, including 2½ million Red Chinese. Most of their troops are ground troops. They have 405 armed and well-trained divisions ready for immediate action.

Menacing as this may be, it is only a part of the overall challenge that we face. Of equal importance is the menace of a diabolical ideology of hate, atheism, and intellectual perversion which saps men's moral stamina, impoverishes their minds, and gnaws at their souls. The Communists know that if they could destroy America by either method—I mean, of course, with military force or this insidious ideology—they could end all effective resistance to their plans to capture the whole world for communism.

The ability of our Nation to stand firm in the face of this challenge rests upon our spiritual strength, our unswerving purpose, and our sustained vigilance. The steel of America's spirit will always be her most formidable armament. It is important that the influence of your knowledge, your training, your vision, and above all, your character, be brought to bear to the fullest extent to help keep that American spirit strong and vigorous.

The concept that the soldier should be called in only after statesmanship has failed and war is actually upon us is outmoded because it is motheaten, shoddy, and threadbare, and a part of the past. Today the United States Army is one of the strongest pillars of statesmanship by which we are seeking to compel any warlike nation to keep the peace. With half of its strength deployed in 73 countries overseas, what a powerful deterrent to war it is—along with the Navy, of course, the Marines and the Air Force, which altogether make up the defense team.

Our troops abroad constitute visible evidence to the leaders of the Communist conspiracy that we mean exactly what we say—that we steadfastly intend to resist aggression in any form. In the future, there should never be an occasion for an aggressor to explain that he "misunderstood" America's position. The presence of our troops standing guard along the frontiers of freedom in Europe and Asia stimulates the morale over there, and stiffens the resistance of our friends. It is a constant reminder that we're in this together. It proves our determination to see it through together, and it constitutes a powerful deterrent to any aggression.

Then, my friends, if we are challenged by enemy acts of violence, the United States Army, with its supporting tactical air power, has uniquely the capability to counterattack with force commensurate to the threat. The Army is not bound to any single weapon strategy, but is, instead, equipped and trained to meet any military emergency from a small local war to an all-out aggression. The United States Army stands ready to apply the right kind of force at any time, any place, in any weather, and to any degree. The Army thus provides a flexible deterrent as well as a strong counterattack capability.

Gentlemen, in addition to leadership for war, leadership for peace is a major concept of the military profession, and you must be equally well prepared to assume the obligations which it entails. The only thing America covets is peace—the kind of peace that is durable because it is founded upon justice and backed up by moral and physical strength that will deter war from ever again invading the world. Within the last 20 years, the soldier has evolved into a soldier-statesman. Eisenhower, Marshall, MacArthur, Collins, Taylor—these are only a few of the many officers at the top levels of the Army who have contributed immeasurably to our security, and to the realization of our national objectives, by brilliant accomplishments not only in the military sphere, but also in the field of international diplomacy.

Yes, the role of the soldier-statesman in all ranks is steadily becoming of gretaer conse-

quence. The United States is now linked with 45 other nations in the greatest system of mutual defense that the world has ever seen. The United States Army is at this moment helping to train over 200 allied divisions and has become the backbone of the mutual defense system. The Army is not only a military instrument, but it also stands as the embodiment of American national policy.

During the course of your careers, many of you undoubtedly will be called upon to participate in high councils by means of which the nations of the world will continue to seek a practical resolution of the differences which stand in the way of enduring peace. You must be fully ready to play your part there with the same devotion, skill, and wisdom which have been characteristic of your predecessors at so many conference tables.

Although few in number, West Point men for a century and a half have had a profound effect upon the development of sturdy Americanism, and the growth of our Nation to greatness. As an officer, you will walk in the footsteps of great men. You must never think in small terms limited solely to military duties. Although you are a specialist in the military art, you've been taught here to be a generalist in the world field of human relations. As an officer you are in the forefront of man's struggle to control his technological achievements and to reap from his scientific labors not just destruction but a better way of life. As an American officer you must have a broad comprehension of the objectives toward which we as a Nation are moving, and of all the interrelated factors which are involved in their attainment.

Yes, the value of the service that you render through the years in these important areas of activity cannot be overestimated. Nevertheless, no matter how many worthy and essential noncombat tasks you may be called upon to perform, you must guard with jealous care your most priceless possession—your soldier's soul. You are a fighting man. If war should finally be thrust upon us, your job is to fight, to lead our troops to victory in battle. This is the immutable obligation of your profession. When the chips are down all else is secondary.

Despite all the momentous changes in the techniques and the weapons of war, the standards by which an officer is judged have never altered. What you know is important; what you can do is important; but in a larger sense what counts most is what you are. Knowledge and ability can never be substituted for character.

"Noblesse oblige" must be your motto. From those who have, much is expected. You are a member of the "Long Gray Line." You have had superior advantages, and superior achievement is expected of you. You cannot afford to leave West Point and rest upon your laurels.

The character of a great officer is made up of many essential elements. One of them is uncompromising rectitude. High morals and ethical principles still count mightily. What would be considered a minor lapse from integrity in the ordinary man, amounts in an officer to trifling with the lives of his comrades and the honor of his country. Of course, merely refraining from doing wrong is not what I mean. An officer must live a private life above reproach, but an officer must be diligent in doing right. His character must be on the positive side.

High courage, which is one of the greatest traditions of American arms, is also a basic ingredient of soldierly character. While you must have great physical courage, there are other types of courage which are equally important, which often test the mettle of a man far more severely than facing great personal danger. You must have moral courage to stand up and be counted for what you believe in your heart to be right, no matter what it costs. You must have the courage to be patient until the time comes for action. You must have the courage to shoulder responsibility and bear it without flinching, no matter how onerous a load it may be. And, above all, you must have the courage to make decisions upon which hang the lives of your men and the fortunes of your country. That is the kind of courage that is the hardest to come by and the most difficult to sustain. No man has ever been a great military leader who lacked that type of courage.

Can we doubt that dash and daring, combined with audacious imagination, are prime requisites of outstanding leadership? History has proved it to be true all down the line of mighty warriors from Hannibal, who crossed the Alps, to MacArthur, who threw away the book and landed at Inchon, where he was least to be expected, and broke the back of the first savage offensive in the Korean war. Later in Korea it was the dash and daring of leaders like General Taylor and those down the line and through the ranks which enabled 22 Allied divisions to whip 72 divisions of the combined Communist Chinese and North Korean armies.

Only if leaders take the imaginative approach to every problem, translate their creative thinking into dynamic action, can the Army be fully ready to meet the challenge of the future. New pathways must be cut through every jungle of precedent and custom that blocks the march of true progress. Nothing has ever been done which could not be done better. Creative thinking will put you ahead, and keep you ahead, through your whole career.

It was Elihu Root, a great Secretary of War, who said this: "I observe that there are two entirely different theories by which individual men seek to get on in the world. One theory leads a man to pull down everybody around him in order to climb up on them to a higher place. The other leads a man to help everybody around him in order that he may go up with them."

That regard for others which impels a man to help those around him is another of the virtues dominant in the character of the great officer, as it is in the character of every great leader in life.

You could adopt no better guideline also for the future than the creed of Gen. George S. Patton, who said: "In yourself demand the impossible." A well-rounded personality is the best guarantee of success in any field of endeavor, and if you keep your goal you will be able to scale any heights. Your diploma evidences no more than the foundation of learning. The pursuit of knowledge and understanding is an eternal quest. No plateau of accomplishment could ever be so lofty that there did not loom above it another mountain of challenge.

Gentlemen, the record of West Point's sons in every war since the Revolution has been a glorious one. It has been many years since they were numerically preponderant among the officers of the Army, either in war or peace, but they leaven the whole Army with the inspiration of West Point. They are trained and worthy leaders bearing the hallmark of a thoroughbred who, going out into the Army, multiply themselves a hundred-fold by their dedication to "duty, honor, country."

As Secretary of the Army I charge you to hold high the principles for which West Point has ever stood. Never compromise with lesser ideals. You will set an example of individual dignity as well as military competence. The Nation will never cease to depend for its strength and vigor upon men like you—men who think in terms of what they owe their country, not what their country owes them—men who proudly acknowledge that patriotism is still a strong driving force in their lives and in the lives of all of us. Gentlemen, the prayers of all the millions of Americans go with you today as the Class of 1956 now mounts the parapets of our national defense.

Caleb Mills Saville: Engineer for the Gatun Dam and Locks of the Panama Canal

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut can look with pride on the careers of many of its distinguished citizens. Outstanding among such persons in Caleb M. Saville, who from 1912 to 1948 was manager and chief engineer of the Metropolitan District Water Bureau of Hartford, and is now its consulting engineer.

Of greater historic significance than his numerous important achievements in Connecticut are his contributions for the construction of Gatun Dam and Locks of the Panama Canal.

It is indeed gratifying to read in the June 2, 1956, issue of the Hartford Times an interesting news story of this distinguished engineer's accomplishments and present life by Raiph Minard.

Under leave granted, I include the indicated news story as a part of my remarks:

CALEB SAVILLE, ENGINEER, BUSY AT 91

(By Ralph Minard)

Every weekday morning at 9:30 a short, portly brisk man with a moustache leaves the lobby at Heublein Hotel, steps into a car, and is driven out to Broad Street, where at No. 115 he steps out and enters the spacious quarters of the Metropolitan Water District.

The brisk little man is Caleb Mills Saville, and he is probably Hartford's oldest engineer. Mr. Saville was 91 Sunday.

Mr. Saville works in a small office reached through a plain wood door. There is no name or other designation. Once chief engineer and manager of the Metropolitan District, he serves now as consultant engineer and has 36 years of technical papers to work over. He is also concerned with such matters as the gradual obsolescence of the Panama Canal on which he once worked.

Mr. Saville's day, is a precise one. He enters the Heublein dining room a few minutes after 7 each morning and seats himself at his customary table. The waitress knows what he wants without asking. After nearly 2 hours at his office, he motors to the University Club on Lewis St., where he also has his customary table. He arrives at 11:30 and sits down for a light lunch at 11:55, usually with his old friend Frederick R. Merrels of West Hartford. His lunch is likely to be a sandwich.

Back to his office for more work, then at 3 he leaves for the Heublein and a hearty evening meal.

He was born in Melrose, Mass., grew up in Medford and was graduated from Harvard in 1889 cum laude in engineering. As a young engineer he helped with the construction of the Simpson dry dock in Boston, then designed and constructed water works systems in various parts of the country.

In 1895, after 4 years designing and building a sewerage system for Malden, Mass., he became division engineer of Boston's metropolitan water and sewerage board and directed such projects as building a tunnel under the Mystic River, a storage reservoir at Spot Pond and a reservoir at Forbes Hill.

In 1907 he went to work on the Panama Canal, first as assistant division engineer in charge of construction at the Gatum locks, and later as engineer in charge of the third division of the canal.

In 1912, local officials became concerned over the city's health and sanitation conditions. Water was supplied to the city by an old reservoir at the top of Asylum Hill.

Mr. Saville took up his work with the Hartford Water Department as chief engineer. He laid out long-range plans not only for improving the city's water and sewer systems, but also for obtaining pure water from better sources. Eventually this search for water led as far north as Barkhamsted, and out of the search also came the Metropolitan District Commission.

He designed the linked system of water supplies running north from Hartford, the Nepaug Reservoir, the Barkhamsted Reservoir, its industrial adjunct, the Compensating Reservoir and the huge dam in Barkhamsted which bears his name. For 36 years, until his retirement in 1948 as chief engineer, he was the guiding spirit behind the Metropolitan District Commission and its successful drive to insure Hartford a water supply for generations.

Saville Dam stands as a Connecticut example of his engineering skill. But in the engineering world there is one other work perhaps better known. These are the papers containing Mr. Saville's research for the foundations of the Gatun Dam in the Panama Canal. They have been called by engineers "a masterpiece of engineering investigation."

Emigre Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. Peter Zenkl delivered at the recent meeting of the Assembly of Captive European Nations on the subject of On Emigre Problems. This thoughtful discussion of a few of the refugee problems should be helpful to those who are working to keep alive the hopes and possibilities of freedom and the distinctive cultures of the captive peoples of eastern Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON ÉMIGRÉ PROBLEMS

(By Peter Zenkl)

The struggle between West and East is called a cold war. It is not a bloodless war, however, even if no lists of dead and wounded are published. It is cold with the coldness of bare steel—and the coldness of Communist hearts. The cold war has wounded soldiers on every battlefield, just as any other war. Among these wounded are the refugees, hundreds of thousands of them throughout the world. A commander who left his wounded to lie on the field without trying to save and heal them, would surely lose his war, and also be severely criticized by all the civilized world.

It is not my purpose to discuss the whole problem of care for refugees, nor do I wish to tell the free nations what they should do to save and assist exiles from the countries overrun by the Communists in order not to be compared to that heartless commander. I shall not repeat things which have been said so often and the urgency of which is generally recognized, but it is true that many things have been left undone which are urgently necessary in order to lighten the suspense and discomfort of the first days after refugees escape from the Communist yoke; make their stay in border countries as profitable as possible in preparing for life in the country where they will settle; make their stay in a border country as short as possible, and help them through the complicated process of immigration to some country in the free West. This applies not only to able-bodied trained workers, but also to those not so well qualified by health and training.

Here I wish to speak in detail only of certain problems which seem to merit extra attention. The first is our duty to increase the attention given to the needs of older and less healthy émigrés. People are not draft animals, to be discarded as soon as they cannot do heavy work.

A sick person, even with tuberculosis, still has an immortal soul, even though the Communists do not think so. You often find a sick person, or one with a physical handicap, who has a greater spirit than the healthy one next to him—and, if you allow me, I would like to add that he often has more intelligence. It is remarkable how many geniuses are people with some handicap or other. How many great people had tuberculosis, how many geniuses ended up in mental illness No; people are not rabbits, to be judged merely by their physical condition. Several States have immigration laws which would have excluded Chopin, Beethoven, or Smetana. How are we to know how many of the young folks, declared ineligible in the present refugee camps, could eventually become the pride of a state which drove them into exile or of a state which accepts them? Please remember in our discussion this category of the humble and declassified.

Another category to which we should devote more attention are the children. There is a trend in some States to urge that the children be assimilated as fast as possible into their new life and forget the past, forget their mother tongue. They are supposed to become good Americans, Australians, British, Brazilians or Mexicans. I take the liberty of disagreeing with this policy, first from the viewpoint of our enslaved nations. We Czechoslovaks, for instance, struggled for centuries to prevent our children being Germanized. Are we to be indifferent to their complete Americanization or Gallicization? If so, we shall lose them as fast as if we left them in Communist hands, where they would be systematically denationalized. We combat communism if we save them for our future homelands. I am not being chauvinistic; I, too, know that the motto "Nothing but our nation" is fascist, totalitarian and bad. I only wish our children to return home some time as world citizens, free of chauvinism. If they are to return home, however, they must have a home—and not roam the world as uprooted souls. One of the fundamental Communist policies is to uproot everybody, to make everyone a proletarian. Many famous people have defined a proletarian as a day laborer with no firm roots anywhere.

I would even say that denationalized children are a loss also for the states in which they have settled. The countries which receive us should wish us to be prophets in the struggle against communism, living examples of the harshness of communism. A person who wishes to be assimilated as rapidly as possible into his new surroundings, whose greatest objective is to buy a car, is not much of a warrior against communism. A child who forgets Czech, Polish or Rumanian, who ceases to dream of returning home and loses interest in his nation's problem—soon disappears in the mass who have no interest in politics. I say that each state which admitted us ought to wish us to return home eventually as the best representatives of America, Britain, France, Argentina in the countries from which we originally came. Returning emigres can mean a great deal in Hungary, Estonia, Poland when they reconstruct their commercial, political, and cultural life. If our children are denationalized, our present hosts will lose more than they gain.

For these reasons I suggest that we seek ways to influence public opinion in the lands where we now live to permit us to save our children for freedom, for the anti-communist cause. When freedom returns to central Europe, the free world will need them in Prague and Bucharest much more than in America or Australia. We should invent ways of teaching them their mother tongue, our history, of arousing their active concern for the future of their home peoples—not ways of becoming the lax and indifferent people the Communists want. Indifferent people are of little use in this struggle; they are no threat to communism.

I suggest that each nationality publish a Golden Book, reviewing its history and achievements briefly but truthfully and strikingly for children, their parents and teachers. Such a book should include the best literature and art, our national customs and songs, our immortal poetry. If it is to be golden, it should teach our children to love those of other nations, overwhelming past quarrels and uniting them in our common cause as centers of culture placed by fate between two great powers, Russia and Germany.

We should also publish textbooks of our languages, children's books in our mother tongues, and foster children's theaters, choruses, and puppet shows. There is no end of work to be done in that field, and its results can be vital. If we do not save our children for the day of reliberation, we only serve the enemy.

My third comment on this problem is the duty of emigres to preserve and advance the culture of our peoples. Fortunately we have in exile many artists, writers, composers, actors, scientists, professors of the highest rank. We should help them concentrate their efforts, improve conditions for their work, publish and publicize their work. No, please do not think I wish to influence the content to their work or to make them produce propaganda, even anti-Communist propaganda. We must not subject the arts and science to politics, as the Communists do. Art and science must be free, as they are not free behind the Iron Curtain. But let us realize that each well written book, each exhibition or concert, each successful scientific experiment is a victory against communism. It is up to us to see that the work of our writers, poets, and scientists sees the light of day and becomes the general property of all in the free world, and then of our peoples behind the Iron Curtain. There are many cultural organizations and some serious cultural journals among emigres, which were founded without our help and in harder times. We can find ways to help those doing that work without offending them or interfering, perhaps by making it possible financially for them to publish a larger volume or more frequently. We can certainly increase the number of subscribers and readers by publicity, and thus expand and improve our language newspapers.

I do not believe in tight organization in cultural fields. Culture is not a matter of power or instantaneous decision, like politics, and it is not necessary for everybody to go in the same direction or to submit to discipline. That is valuable in political life,

gentleman, but not in cultural work. As a matter of fact, culture has often risen highest where political conditions were confused and scattered, as in ancient Greece or renaissance Italy. In Germany culture was highest in Goethe's time, not in Hitler's. I am not concerned that there may be more centers of culture, about opposing cultural trends, experiments and research. Those are exactly what are lacking in the constrained conditions behind the Iron Curtain. What does concern me is that our life takes place in a tea cup, without public impact, without readers and critics. That is where we owe our cultural workers help, without dominating their work. This, too, is in the interest of our struggle against communism. The remarkable Czech historian, Palacky, wrote that whenever he won a victory it was not by force of arms, but through higher culture. I believe we also will defeat communism by higher culture.

It is for that reason, gentlemen, that I suggest we discuss these problems carefully and systematically. Cultural work requires constant attention to small details, often in efforts not seen by the public, which do not bear immediate fruit. The fruit is permanent, however, it lasts for generations, often outlasts many, many political decisions.

Sedition, Treason, and Subversion Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner, Los Angeles, Calif., Thursday, May 24, 1956, entitled "Back to the Law," and which I feel will be of interest to Members of this body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO THE LAW

"The Department of Justice favors enactment of the bill."

In the foregoing forthright language—contained in a letter from the Justice Department to Congress—the Eisenhower administration has placed itself squarely on record as upholding States rights and opposing the usurpation by the Supreme Court, or lesser tribunals, of legislative powers belonging exclusively to Congress.

On April 2 the Supreme Court handed down a split decision which had the effect of abrogating the laws of 42 States and two territories against sedition, treason, and subversion. The court held that Congress, in passing the Smith Act, had preempted the field and had intended to do so. But no such provision was found in the Federal statute.

The duty of the court was to interpret and apply the law as written by Congress. Instead, the court amended the law, which only Congress has a constitutional sanction to do.

Senator BRIDGES (Republican), New Hampshire, introduced at once a bill to nullify the Supreme Court decision.

The Justice Department has fully approved the Bridges bill in a letter to Senator EASTLAND (Democrat), Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The letter said that, "in the fields of sedition and subversion, the Federal and State governments can work together easily and well, supplementing each other."

That is exactly what the Supreme Court should have said.

Tribute to Hon. Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat concerning tribute paid to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON on June 8 in Mexico, Mo.:

ALONG THE POLITICAL TRAILS—LITTLE DIXIE PAYS TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE CANNON TODAY

(By John R. Hahn)

CLARENCE CANNON, 77, of R. F. D. 1, Elsberry Mo., is assured of reelection to this 18th term in Congress from Missouri's Ninth District, simply because no Democrat and no Republican felt it would be worth while to challenge him.

It would seem to be a logical conclusion, since CANNON has never lost an election. (A minor historical note on his career is that he has also never lost a fist fight in Congress, of which there have been at least three.)

But if CANNON's election seems assured and he is moving up the ladder of age, he still has lost none of his fire and energy.

When you ask anyone who knows him about CLARENCE CANNON, the dean of Missouri's congressional delegation, the answer from friend or foe usually starts out like this:

"CLARENCE is quite a guy * * *."

That's about right. CLARENCE is quite a guy. In the first place, one of the tools of his successful political races which he wins in his heavily Democratic district is that he's a fire and brimestone campaigner. He stirs up his constitutents—and interests them in CANNON.

Today CANNON is being honored at Mexico, Mo., with an all-day celebration during which he'll be given a plaque and toasted by speakers headed by United States Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

CANNON was once described as "a political evangelist for the Democratic party." Still, theres' more to him than the way he campaigns. Cannon works hard and is something of a watchdog on the powerful House Appropriations Committee, of which he is chairman when the Democrats control the House.

He is regarded everywhere as one of the country's outstanding parliamentarians and has been parliamentarian for the House of Representatives under both Democratic and Republican administrations, which is a rare distinction in itself.

He wrote the rule book for the Democratic National Convention, and even now the National Committee is having more copies of Cannon's rules printed to guide this year's convention.

CANNON's will be one of the most televised faces at the convention this year. He'll be in plain view of the camera near almost every speaker, wearing his customary frozen frown.

CANNON explains his dour facial expression during these proceedings by saying that he wants to show no favorites among the candidates.

When SYMINGTON was told by the writer that CANNON was without opposition this year, the Senator said he was delighted to hear that.

This was SYMINGTON's tribute to CANNON:

"As chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON is one of the 5 to 10 most powerful and influential men in Washington. One would never know this, because at all times he is a kind and humble person, despite his great authority in the field of money and the fact he is the acknowledged parliamentarian of the Congress. If there is anyone more respected and beloved in Missouri's Ninth District, it is his wife, Miss Ida.' Together, they represent their district, the State and the Nation in a manner that can only bring pride to all Missourians."

SYMINGTON, who is CANNON's candidate for the Democratic nomination for President, will doubtless expand on this tribute today.

This is not the first time that a victory for CANNON has been automatic. As a matter of fact, he was nominated unanimously by the Democrats for his initial term in Congress.

In those years, his campaign literature discribed him as a protege of the late, great Speaker CHAMP CLARK of the House, also of Missouri.

As SYMINGTON noted, CANNON is one of most powerful men in Washington. All the Government spending bills originate with the House Appropriations Committee, and under his chairmanship, bills have originated in that committee appropriating literally hundreds of billions of dollars.

Most of the Nation, since the televising of the Democratic National Convention, may think CLARENCE CANNON is the man without a smile.

But they ought to see him out through Little Dixie, back in his Ninth District with the folks who are sending him back to represent them in Congress for the eighteenth time. They ought to see him today in Mexico, for example.

He's all smiles up there in the country.

For Better Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, some of the material circulated and statements made about fluoridation in recent months seem to me to be quite extreme and unsupported by scientific evidence. In order that the Members of Congress and readers of the RECORD may have available a temperate expression of opinion from an unbiased source on this issue, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily News for May 7, 1956, on the topic "For Better Teeth."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR BETTER TEETH

The scheduled start of fluoridating the water supply for 1,500,000 Southside Chicagoans brought a final parade of protest by a small band of die-hard opponents of this method of combating dental decay.

We have expressed our conviction many times that the extensive research upon and experience with fluoridation proves it to be effective and desirable. It has had far-

longer tests, for instance, than the Salk vaccine against polio.

But, just as there are always some who think that grape seeds cause appendicits, doubtless there will remain a small minority who believe that the addition of a tiny percentage of fluorides to the water can be harmful.

Proving that a little knowledge can be misleading, they cite the fact that fluorine is a poison. We can only point out that so is chlorine, but we all continue to shake its sodium salt on our food daily, and are the better for it.

We hope the objectors can bring themselves to believe that not they but the consensus of medical opinion on the subject might just conceivably be right about it.

Constitutionality of OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of a statement prepared for the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550. The part included relates to the constitutionality of the OTC proposal and deserves in my judgment the most serious consideration.

The statement was prepared by Mr. Lennox P. McLendon, Greensboro, N. C., in behalf of the Southern States Industrial Council and others. I believe that it throws a revealing light on the constitutional question involved in H. R. 5550. I commend it to the attention of all Members for its clarity and its authoritative analysis of the subject:

THE OTC PROPOSAL—CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

A. H. R. 5550 INVOLVES AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATION OR RESIGNATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS

Should Congress enact H. R. 5550, it would assist in a direct violation of the Constitution by delegating or resigning its legislative powers, to lay taxes and import duties, and to regulate commerce with foreign nations—powers exclusively vested in Congress (U. S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clauses 1 and 3). The unconstitutional nature of this delegation is underscored by the fact that it will run not to an administrative agency of this Government but, by redelegation, to a supernational organization.

(1) *There is no precedent in American jurisprudence for H. R. 5550*

We may search our congressional history in vain for any act that even approaches in scope or in effect H. R. 5550. A realistic constitutional evaluation of the power delegated by H. R. 5550 must embrace more than the bill itself in view of the fact that it necessarily implies congressional approval of our participation in GATT—the branch of the quasi-government composed of GATT plus OTC which initiates the laws. In other words, one cannot consider the constitutionality of United States membership in OTC without considering the constitutionality of United States participation in GATT, which is immutably grafted on and intertwined with OTC. It has been previously established precisely in what respects the two are interlocking and independent, so that in legislating OTC Congress will have approved GATT.

As we have previously observed, GATT has the power to make rules, binding as law on its members, in matters concerned with world trade as well as domestic matters affecting world trade. Since all domestic economic events have an effect upon world trade, and the power rests with GATT or OTC, or both, to determine which of these economic events have a significant effect upon world trade, it necessarily follows that no clearly defined limitation exists on GATT's power over our domestic affairs. In the future, GATT, by promulgating rules and regulations or by self-amendment (art. XXX) will have the power to enact legislation conflicting with our laws. It may also be able to beat Congress to the punch by legislating on new matters before Congress can act or wishes to act. Clearly, rules and amendments to GATT should not be binding as domestic law in this country.

Our analysis of OTC and GATT indicates that the contemplated delegation of congressional powers is, for practical purposes, limitless inasmuch as it ranges far beyond the power of Congress to fix customs duties and regulate commerce with foreign nations, and includes authority for the State Department to accept, on behalf of this Nation, economic measures which affect our domestic affairs and jurisdiction, even to the point of overriding domestic policy established by Congress.

Our courts have never ruled upon a delegation of power of the magnitude involved here, nor have they ruled on a delegation of congressional power to a supernational organization comparable to GATT alone or GATT plus OTC. Nor has Congress ever authorized a delegation similar to that implicit in the pending bill. United States participation in GATT cannot be justified by using the United Nations as a precedent. Proposals that the United Nations infringe upon the internal problems of its members were condemned from its inception and article II, section 7, of its charter provides that the United Nations shall not intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or requiremembers to submit such matters to settlement before it. Even the charter of the International Trade Organization, the discredited precursor of GATT-OTC, contained a similar provision (ITO art. 73 (c)). Moreover, in the United Nations the United States has a veto while in GATT and OTC it has none.

(2) *It is a basic principle of constitutional law that Congress cannot lawfully delegate its lawmaking powers*

In 1689, John Locke pointed out the reason for the rule that the Legislature cannot transfer its lawmaking powers in this language:

"The legislative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands, for it being but a delegated power from the people, they who have it cannot pass it on to others." [1]

The Supreme Court has stated on numerous occasions that Congress is without constitutional authority to delegate its legislative power, the power to make laws, even to the executive branch of our Government.[2] No less an authority than Chief Justice Marshall stated the rule to be self-evident, as follows:

"It is not contended that Congress can delegate to the courts or to any other tribunals powers which are strictly and exclusively legislative." (*Wayman* v. *Southard*, (10 Wheat 1, 311, 325).)

In the leading case of *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649, 36 L. Ed. 294) the Supreme Court, speaking through Justice Harlan, said (36 L. Ed. at p. 310):

"That Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution." [3]

It is one of the settled maxims in constitutional law that the power conferred upon the Legislature to make laws cannot be delegated by that department to any other authority. When the sovereign power of the State has located the legislative authority, there it must remain; and by that designated constitutional agency alone laws must be made until the Constitution itself is changed. (See Cooley, Constitutional Limitations, 7th Ed., p. 163.)

Since Congress cannot delegate its legislative powers it becomes necessary to inquire to what extent Congress may lawfully delegate authority, not legislative in character, and secondly, to examine the tests which have been applied to acts of Congress by the courts when such acts are challenged as constituting unconstitutional delegations or resignations.

(3) *The constitutional right of Congress to delegate authority is limited to the delegation of administrative functions, to be exercized within limits clearly and definitely set forth in a congressional enactment, and designed to make the will of Congress (the law) effective*

The distinction between valid and invalid delegations by Congress were set forth clearly in *Hampton* v. *U. S.* (276 U. S. 394, 407):

"The true distinction, therefore, is, between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be and conferring an authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first cannot be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made."

The Congress is under compulsion to enjoin upon its delegate "a certain course of procedure and certain rules of decision" in carrying out the delegate's function. (See opinion of Chief Justice Taft in *Wichita R. R. and Light Co.* v. *Public Utilities Commission* (260 U. S. 48).)

In *U. S.* v. *Shreveport Grain & Elevator Co.* (287 U. S. 77), the rule was again stated:

"That the legislative power of Congress cannot be delegated, is, of course, clear. But Congress may declare its will, and after fixing a primary standard devolve upon administrative officers the 'power to fill up the details' by prescribing administrative rules and regulations."

It is therefore clear that Congress can delegate certain authority to the executive branch of the Government or to an administrative agency in order to carry out the will of Congress. Accordingly, Congress can authorize administrative officers or the President to carry out or fill in the details of legislation.[4] The constitutional right of Congress to delegate an interpretative, administrative, or functionary role, as distinguished from a delegation of its legislative power, is accompanied, however, by constitutional restrictions and limitations. If such delegation is not to be unconstitutional, Congress must, by its own enactment, set forth: (a) A clear statement of the congressional objective to be striven for by the delegate, and (b) definite methods or standards to guide the Executive in attempting to achieve the congressional objective. (*U. S.* v. *Shreveport Grain & Elevator Co.* (287 U. S. 77).)

(4) *The application of these principles to H. R. 5550 conclusively establishes the unconstitutionality of the proposal*

I maintain that passage of H. R. 5550 would be an unconstitutional delegation by the Congress for each of the following reasons:

First, H. R. 5550 involves a delegation of or resignation from essential legislative power, i. e., the power to make laws levying taxes and customs duties, regulating commerce with foreign nations and covering

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

other nondelegable matters, which powers are vested exclusively in Congress by the Constitution.

Second, even if we assume, for the purposes of argument, that H. R. 5550 does not constitute a delegation of legislative power, the act is still unconstitutional, because it allows the recipient of the delegated power to exercise an unfettered discretion without setting forth either a clear constitutional objective or definite standards for the guidance and control of the delegate.[5]

Addressing ourselves to the pending bill and the respective charters of GATT and OTC, we must ask whether congressionally authorized participation involves a delegation of what the courts have determined legislative power. The Constitution of the United States specifically defines the relevant congressional power in article I, section 8:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises."

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, delegating to the President, for a limited period of time, the right to enter into reciprocal trade agreements, is not an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power, it is manifest that United States participation in GATT–OTC does involve an unconstitutional exercise of legislative power by the executive department. GATT has the power to regulate our commrece with foreign nations, and the President has the power to determine what our customs duties and basic regulations of foreign commerce shall be within the broadest sort of limits, undefined except by such broad phrases as "raising standards of living," "insuring full employment," "developing the full uses of the resources of the world," "expanding the production and exchange of goods," and "promoting the development of the economies of all the contracting parties." These broadly stated objectives of GATT may be desirable, and even laudable, but to use them as the vehicle for giving to the President or the State Department the authority to regulate foreign commerce is nothing less than a grant of authority to legislate. Our Constitution does not provide for a sharing of legislative power with the President or even for a delegation of a portion of the legislative power to the President. Rather, it specifically provides in article I, section 1:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

The analysis of GATT–OTC which I have heretofore presented inevitably leads to the conclusion that H. R. 5550 is a delegation and resignation of legislative powers by Congress. Indeed, in this respect the proposed legislation closely approaches the act of Congress involved in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Company* (298 U. S. 238), in which the Supreme Court held the act in question to be "legislative delegation in its most obnoxious form," since it was "not even delegation to an official or official body, presumptively disinterested." There the delegation was to the producers of more than two-thirds of the annual tonnage production for the preceding year and more than one-half of the mine workers employed. Here the delegation is to the President to commit the United States to membership in OTC, and this involves the subdelegation to a group of nations, now 35 in number, of control over tariffs and imposts upon both United States imports and exports and of power to regulate numerous other vital economic factors such as standards of living, balance of payments, and a maze of factors affecting the economies of numerous nations. So far-reaching and comprehensive is this delegation and subdelegation that it becomes impossible to catalog the consequences. To ask the American people to accept this sort of legislation is tantamount to asking them to approve a delegation from Congress to the President and then to a supernational agency of the power to regulate a vast field of economic factors which are absolutely vital to the maintenance of our standard of living and our industrial system of regulated but essentially free enterprise.

The second reason why the proposed act is unconstitutional is that the Congress has not included in the act any standards for the guidance of the delegate. (See *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 495).)

Every Member of Congress who seriously considers this proposal will surely ask the question: What standards for the guidance of the delegate are set up by Congress in H. R. 5550? Since the language of H. R. 5550 does nothing more than authorize the President to accept membership in OTC, it is apparent that we must look elsewhere for the limitations, if any, upon the authority of the delegate. We then look to GATT and we find its objective (art. I) stated as follows:

"1. The contracting parties recognize that their relations in the field of trade and economic endeavor should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, insuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods, and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties.

"2. The contracting parties desire to contribute to these objectives through this agreement by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

A consideration of the foregoing language leads to the conclusion that the attempt is now being made to tie up the economic destiny of the United States with that of a group of nations—in short, to commit the regulation of foreign commerce to a supernational agency.

With respect to the unlimited discretion and authority vested in OTC we again call attention to the language of article 14 of the OTC Charter. That language permits only one interpretation, i. e., that OTC, when considering a charge that a benefit to some nation-member is being nullified or impaired or a charge that any objective of GATT is being impeded, may "make appropriate recommendations * * * or give a ruling on the matter." The appropriateness of the action of OTC is left entirely in its broad discretion.

Notwithstanding that Congress has repeatedly disclaimed any intention of authorizing United States participation in GATT in several acts extending the Tariff Act of 1930, the proponents of H. R. 5550 have argued that section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended by the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is congressional authority for GATT. The purpose of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as most recently amended by Public Law 86 adopted at the first session of the present Congress is set forth as follows:

"For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States."

The act provides that when the President finds as a fact "the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified" he is authorized, among other things, "to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments." The only kinship between section 350 and GATT is highly tenuous. It is clear that the objective of section 350 is to expand foreign markets for United States products as a means of establishing and maintaining better relationship among the various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce, and that the laying of tariffs on foreign products admitted to the United States is always subordinate to the promotion of foreign markets for American goods.

On the other hand GATT's objectives are raising the world standard of living by insuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of income and demand and expanding the world's production and exchange of goods and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties. The mere narration of these contrasting objectives points up the inconsistency between the two pieces of legislation and demonstrates how unprecedented is the scope of GATT-OTC, rendering it impossible to be fitted into this Nation's constitutional structure.

The authors of H. R. 5550 have provided for a broad and, in many respects, an unlimited delegation and, at the same time, have carefully omitted any clear constitutional objective or definite standard for the guidance and control of the delegate. That these two characteristics of H. R. 5550 are fatal to any claim for its constitutionality may be illustrated by comparison with the Emergency Price Act of 1942. The constitutionality of the act was challenged before the Supreme Court in *Yakus* v. *United States* (321 U. S. 414), on the ground that it (a) was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power, or (b) failed to set up proper standards to guide the Administrator. The Court held that the purpose of the act was clear—"to stabilize prices and prevent speculative, unwarranted and abnormal increases in prices and rents, to eliminate and prevent profiteering * * * speculation * * * abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency." Thus, the objective was a limited one and the act was to be effective for a limited period of time—the war emergency. The Court said: "By the act * * * the President is directed to stabilize prices, wages and salaries, 'so far as practicable' on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942." Thus, known prices existing on a specific date were fixed by Congress as the standard for price stabilization. The Court concluded:

"The act is thus an exercise by Congress of its legislative power. In it Congress has stated the legislative objective, has prescribed the method of achieving that objective—maximum price fixing—and has laid down standards to guide the administrative determination of both the occasions for the exercise of the price-fixing power, and the particular prices to be established. * * *

"The act is unlike the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195, ch. 90), considered in ALA. *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 79 L. Ed. 1570, 55 S. Ct. 837, 99 ALR 947) which proclaimed in the broadest terms its purpose 'to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources.' It prescribed no method of attaining that end save by the establishment of codes of fair competition, the nature of whose permissible provisions was left undefined. It provided no standards to which those codes were to conform. * * *

"The essentials of the legislative function are the determination of the legislative policy and its formulation and promulgation as a defined and binding rule of conduct."

It is believed that one of the prime underlying factors which led the Court to sus-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tain the act was the fact that this Nation was then in the throes of all-our war.[6]

The broad objective of Congress "to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources" condemned by the Supreme Court in the above quotation and in the Schecter Poultry case strikingly similar to the above-quoted language setting forth the purpose of OTC-GATT, the latter being even more objectionable because it must operate on a worldwide level, whereas the National Recovery Act operated on a national level. Unlike the Emergency Price Control Act, H. R. 5550 contains absolutely no standards for the guidance of the delegate except the purpose to promote the economic prosperity of all the nations participating in GATT.

(5) *Decisions of the Supreme Court fix the line of demarcation between valid and invalid delegations by Congress*

The decisions of the United States Supreme Court, having either a precedential or persuasive value in considering the constitutionality of H. R. 5550 divide themselves into two groups, first, those in which acts of Congress have been held valid against the challenge that such acts constitute an unconstitutional delegation of legislative powers; and secondly, those in which acts of Congress have been held invalid because they did constitute an unconstitutional delegation of legislative powers.

Illustrative of the first group of decisions (without attempting to include all of them) in which the challenged acts of Congress have been held valid are the following:

The *Aurora* (7 Cranch 382, 3 L. Ed. 378), an act authorizing the President to revive and put into effect an embargo act of Congress upon the refusal of either France or England for a period of 3 months to revoke her edicts violative of the neutral commerce of the United States; *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan* (192 U. S. 470), an act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, upon recommendation of a board of experts, "to establish uniform standards of purity, and fitness for consumption of teas imported into the United States"; *Union Bridge Co.* v. *U. S.* (204 U. S. 364), an act authorizing the Secretary of War to determine whether bridges and other structures constitute unreasonable hazards to navigation, etc., and to remove such obstructions; *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304), a joint resolution of Congress authorizing the President to prohibit, by proclamation, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, the sale of arms and munitions of war to countries engaged in the armed conflict in the Chaco, if he finds that such prohibition "may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries"; the power given the President concerned a single clearly defined function relating to a very limited existing crisis, which power once exercised was exhausted and did not have continuing future operation as H. R. 5550 will; the court relied on the fact that this matter fell completely in the area of foreign relations, which matters are inherent in sovereignty and do not find their basis in any enumerated powers of the Constitution (whereas the powers enumerated in H. R. 5550 are circumscribed by art. I, sec. 8, clauses 1 and 3, delegating to Congress the power to lay duties and regulate foreign commerce). The case of *Yakus* v. *United States* discussed above belongs in this group.

In the acts of Congress involved in these and in many other cases (many of them cited in the Schechter case and Curtiss-Wright case) no difficulty is experienced in ascertaining the specific objective of Congress or the clear-cut standards by which the delegate was to be guided.

The Supreme Court has decided two cases involving earlier Tariff Acts and it is very important to examine briefly the conclusion of the Court and the principles enunciated in these cases—*Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649) and *Hampton* v. *U. S.* (276 U. S. 394). *Field* v. *Clark* passed upon the constitutionality of the Tariff Act of 1890, which authorized the President to put into effect a specific list of tariffs fixed in the Act for a period of time determined by the President, upon his ascertaining that the duties imposed by other countries on the products of the United States "were unequal and unreasonable." The renowned Mr. Justice Harlan laid down these principles:

"That Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution. The act of October 1, 1890, in the particular under consideration, is not inconsistent with that principle. * * * Congress itself prescribed, in advance, the duties to be levied, collected, and paid, on sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, or hides, produced by or exported from such designated country, while the suspension lasted. Nothing involving the expediency or the just operation of such legislation was left to the determination of the President. The words, 'he may deem,' in the third section, of course, implied that the President would examine the commercial regulations of other countries producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea and hides, and form a judgment as to whether they were reciprocally equal and reasonable, or the contrary, in their effect upon American products. But when he ascertained the fact that duties and exactions, reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, were imposed upon the agricultural or other products of the United States by a country producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, or hides, it became his duty to issue a proclamation declaring the suspension, as to that country, which Congress had determined should occur. He had no discretion in the premises except in respect to the duration of the suspension so ordered. But that related only to the enforcement of the policy established by Congress. * * * Legislative power was exercised when Congress declared that the suspension should take effect upon a named contingency. What the President was required to do was simply in execution of the Act of Congress. It was not the making of law. He was the mere agent of the law-making department to ascertain and declare the event upon which its expressed will was to take effect." * * *"

Hampton v. *U. S.* dealt with the constitutionality of the Tariff Act of 1922, which broadened the scope of power delegated to the President. This act conferred on the executive department the administrative task of revising tariffs upward and downward (not to exceed 50 percent change) in strict accordance with a definite formula fixed by Congress, precisely geared to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, as such differences were ascertained and computed by the President.[7] It is immediately apparent that there is a basic distinction between this type of an act, which was sustained by the Court, and the proposed regulation of tariffs by OTC and GATT, which distinction highlights the invalidity of the latter. The congressional formula was inflexible and could not be altered in any way by the President; the application to each particular product was functionary, primarily involving compilation of data and administrative calculation.

Nothing the President could have done would have altered cost of production of a traded item in the United States or the cost of production of that item in Germany, the two factors which absolutely control the adjustment of the tariff. Conceding the complexity of administratively ascertaining the comparative costs of production, what happened was simply that if it cost 20 cents to produce a pound of barium dioxide (involved in the Hampton case) in this country and 14 cents in Germany, the tariff on barium dioxide imported from Germany would be raised from 2 cents, the rate fixed in title I of the act, to 6 cents in order to equalize the cost. The delegation to the executive department squarely fits the time-honored test (the brig *Aurora; Field* v. *Clark*): the power granted was to ascertain the applicable tariff and not to select it. Just as Congress had in Tariff Act of 1897 fixed the specific tariffs to go into effect upon the President's ascertain tariff and not to select it. Just as Congress had in the Tariff Act of 1897 substance fixed the specific tariffs to go into effect upon the President's ascertaining that certain facts existed, leaving the actual computation, on the basis of the detailed congressional formula, to the executive branch.

Chief Justice Taft said:

"To avoid such difficulties, Congress adopted in section 315 the method of describing with clearness what its policy and plan was and then authorizing a member of the executive branch to carry out its policy and plan and to find the changing difference from time to time and to make the adjustments necessary to conform the duties to the standard underlying that policy and plan. As it was a matter of great importance, it concluded to give by statute to the President, the Chief of the executive branch, the function of determining the difference as it might vary. * * *

"The true distinction, therefore, is, between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring an authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first cannot be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made. * * *

"If it is thought wise to vary the customs duties according to changing conditions of production at home and abroad, it may authorize the Chief Executive to carry out this purpose, with the advisory assistance of a Tariff Commisison appointed under congressional authority."

Illustrative of the second class of cases in which the Supreme Court has held acts of Congress invalid as an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power are the following:

Panama Refining Co. v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), striking down a part of the National Recovery Act authorizing the President to prohibit the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of oil produced or withdrawn from storage in violation of State law, for the reason that "Congress did not declare in what circumstances that transportation should be forbidden, or require the President to make any determination as to any facts or circumstances. Among the numerous and diverse objectives broadly stated, the President was not required to choose. The President was not required to ascertain and proclaim the conditions prevailing in the industry which made the prohibition necessary. The Congress left the matter to the President without standard or rule, to be dealt with as he pleased." (These statements of Chief Justice Hughes are strikingly applicable to GATT-OTC.) One of the aspects emphasized by this case was the absence of a requirement of findings of fact by the administering agency or of any procedural safeguards or adequate means of review—all of which are absent in GATT-OTC. *Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495), a part of the National Recovery Act authorizing the President to promulgate codes of fair competition, the only statutory guide being the requirement that the code "will tend to effectuate the policy of the act"; *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238), the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act delegating power to fix maximum hours of work to a group of producers and mineworkers composed of the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

producers of more than two-thirds of the annual tonnage produced for the preceding year and more than one-half of the mineworkers employed.

In each of this last group of cases, the objective of Congress was declared to be in the public interest but in each instance the Congress failed to set up clearly defined and permissible standards for the guidance of the delegate.

We search in vain for any language in OTC or in GATT setting up any specific standards for the guidance of the delegate in the exercise of the duties imposed upon him.

It therefore appears as an inescapable conclusion that H. R. 5550 not only delegates authority to make tariff laws and is unconstitutional for that reason but, even if it is not an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power, it fails to set up any standards for the guidance of the delegate and fails to pass the tests of constitutionality on one or both grounds.

(6) H. R. 550 is also unconstitutional because it is a subdelegation, not to an officer or agent of the United States but to a supernational organization

One of the distinguishing attributes of H. R. 5550 rendering it unlike any previous legislation of Congress involving the delegation of power is the fact that it provides for a subdelegation from the President to a supernational body over which the President will have no effective control since the United States would have but 1 vote in 35. The Supreme Court has been positively clear in announcing the rule that the Congress cannot delegate either legislative or administrative functions to a private body or to a trade group. As previously noted, the Supreme Court in the Carter Coal Co. case condemned the delegation by Congress of power to fix maximum hours in the coal industry to a nonofficial group as legislative delegation in its most obnoxious form. In the Schechter case, the Court had this to say on this subject:

"But would it be seriously contended that Congress could delegate its legislative authority to trade or industrial associations or groups so as to empower them to enact the laws they deem to be wise and beneficent for the rehabilitation and expension of their industries? Could trade or industrial associations or groups be constituted legislative bodies for that purpose, because such associations or groups are familiar with the problems of their enterprises? And, could an effort of that sort be made valid by such a preface of generalities as to permissible aims as we find in section 1 of title I? The answer is obvious. Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress."

In the absence of constitutional amendment, Congress cannot delegate power to a supernational organization.[8] Congress can, within the limitations previously discussed, delegate to the President because the President is responsible to the people; it can delegate to an administrative agency subject to congressional or presidential control because both Congress and the President are responsible to the people; and it can delegate to 1 of the 48 States matters affecting the citizens of that State since State officials are likewise responsible to the citizens to be affected. On the other hand, Congress cannot delegate to a private group or to a supernational organiaztion which is not responsible, either directly or indirectly, to the people of the United States.

In considering H. R. 5550, one cannot overstress the fact that Congress will have no right to amend or modify the provisions of GATT, and that future amendments to GATT will not be brought before Congress for its approval even if they cut across our domestic legislation.

In dismissing a contention that the Webb-Kenyon Act of 1913, which subjected interstate commerce in intoxicants to Federal control, constituted an unconstitutional delegation by Congress of its legislative powers, Chief Justice White stated that Congress could at any time recover the power it had delegated. (*Clark Distilling Co.* v. *Western Maryland Railroad* (232 U. S. 311, 326).) H. R. 5550 effectively eliminates congressional control over tariffs, customs rules and regulations and our foreign trade.

Proponents of GATT–OTC maintain that the United States could terminate its membership at any time. This is not an effective argument because, disregarding for the moment the international implications, it begs the question of who is doing the legislating and to whom legislative power has been delegated. Congress has always had the power to overrule decisions of an administrative agency, statutes enacted by prior Congresses and even treaties. (See *George E. Warren Corp.* v. *U. S.* (94 F. 2d 597, cert. denied, 304 U. S. 5723; *United Shoe Machine Co.* v. *Duplessis Shoe Manufacturing Co.* (155 Fed. 842).) But prior to the time Congress so acts, an unconstitutional act is in effect and action taken under that unconstiutional act would have to be considered ineffective.

And even assuming that Congress wishes to act, it is likely that it would be dissuaded from taking such action because of the international implications thereof. World opinion would in all probability prevent the United States from resigning. Our system of government is supposed to be responsive to the demands of our own people and it has never been suggested before that it should be responsive to the demands of other nations.

(7) Our present participation in GATT is unconstitutionl

From what has already been said, it is clear that our present participation in GATT represents an unconstitutional usurpation by the Executive of legislative power to fix duties, to regulate our commerce with foreign nations, and to legislate in other areas.

The State Department argues that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, authorizes participation by the United States in GATT,[9] but this is belied by the difference we have already seen between the objectives of GATT and the objectives of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended,[10] and further by the specific congressional disclaimers with respect to GATT in 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955 extensions of the Trade Agreements Act. The legislative history of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 refutes the State Department's argument since it shows, in my opinion, that Congress meant to authorize the President to enter into bilateral trade agreements on a country by country basis and not a 35-nation multilateral agreement, equivalent to quasi-government, empowered to make laws binding upon its participants.

Our membership in GATT even without OTC involves an unconstitutional usurpation of legislative power, since GATT is exercising lawmaking functions affecting our foreign and domestic trade. If Congress should pass H. R. 5550, the question of whether GATT is authorized under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, will become moot, since by such action Congress will have authorized sub silentio participation by the United States in GATT. This usurpation of its legislative power has not gone unnoticed in the Congress. Senator O'MAHONEY, in a recent debate of H. R. 1 (approved June 21, 1955, as Public Law 86[11]), has said:

"Mr. President, this country is being transformed into an executive government, and Congress blandly and calmly cuts its own throat, although every Member thereof has taken his oath to support a Constitution which provides in the simplest of simple words that 'all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.' But, Mr. President, the legislative power of fixing duties and imports is * * * delegated away from the constitutional authority and is vested in the Executive. * * *" (101 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4760, May 4, 1955).

In connection with the same legislation Senator MILLIKIN, in colloquy with Secretary of State Dulles, has said:

"I want to add a word of friendly advice. In committee, while differing in some matters, we all seemed to be unanimous on the point that there were a number of things in GATT * * * which I am quite sure the majority, if not all the members of the committee, felt that too much authority was delegated to GATT, more than could be constitutionally delegated" (hearings, Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 1, pt. 2, p. 1243, March 8, 1955).

The Randall Commission recognized the constitutional question involved in GATT, saying (report, p. 49):

"Indeed, questions concerning the constitutionality of some aspects of the United States participation in the General Agreement have been raised by the Congress."

I have not discussed, at any great length, the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, because the unconstitutionality of H. R. 5550 is clear and does not depend upon the constitutional status of the 1934 act. The constitutionality of the 1934 act, however, has not yet been determined by the courts. At the time of its enactment, the 1934 act was considered by many Members of Congress to be unconstitutional, but justified by the emergency then existing. (H. Rept. 1000, 73d Cong., 2d sess.) Since its enactment the Supreme Court has ruled that equally far-reaching delegations of legislative power in other emergency legislation of the same period are unconstitutional. (See *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388); *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 495).)

Two cases are now pending which involve the constitutional issues discussed above. One case is pending in the District of Columbia and it challenges the constitutionality of both the 1934 act and United States participation in GATT. (*Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc.* v. *George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury* (Civil Action No. 876–55).) The other case is pending in the United States Customs Court and it challenges the constitutionality of the 1934 act. (*Star-Kist Foods, Inc.* v. *United States.*) In view of the pendency of these actions, it would seem impolitic for Congress to pass H. R. 5550 before the Supreme Court has had an opportunity to pass upon the constitutional issues raised in those cases.

The American Bar Association agrees with my position on the unconstitutionality of H. R. 5550. In August 1955 they adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the bill, H. R. 5550, authorizing the President to accept membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation is hereby disapproved on the grounds (a) that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 (Tariff Act of 1930, sec. 35) confers no such power on the President and (b) that neither the President, nor Congress has the legal authority under the Constitution, to delegate the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign-controlled group."

If, then, the forces backing H. R. 5550 were to triumph, we would all have to join Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes in saying:

"It would be idle to pretend that anything would be left of limitations upon the power

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

of the Congress to delegate its law-making function. The reasoning of the many decisions we have reviewed would be made vacuous and their distinctions nugatory. Instead of performing its law-making function the Congress could at will and as to such subjects as it chooses transfer that function to the President or other officer or to an administrative body. The question is not of the intrinsic importance of the particular statute before us, but of the constitutional processes of legislation which are an essential part of our system of government." [12]

B. CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT CANNOT LAWFULLY COMMIT THE UNITED STATES TO GATT-OTC BY MEANS OF AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

Despite what has already been said, let us assume solely for the purposes of discussion that the passage of H. R. 5550 would somehow not be an unlawful delegation of legislative power by Congress. The scheme proposed in this bill would still be banned by the Constitution.

The Department of State recently described GATT in the following terms:

"GATT is the most comprehensive international agreement ever negotiated for the reduction of barriers to and hence for the expansion of world trade, having regard to the number of participating countries, to the scope of its provisions, and to the volume of trade affected." [13]

The one lawful manner in which to effect an agreement with foreign states of this character and importance ascribed to GATT by the State Department is expressly prescribed in the Constitution which states unambiguously:

"The President * * * shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur" (art. II, sec. 2).

The Constitution makes no mention of any power or procedure whereby the President or the Federal Government may commit the United States to any foreign agreement in any other manner. Nor does it suggest that Congress by majority vote of both Houses is to authorize or ratify international agreements. The only constitutional method by which the Federal Government may conclude a treaty with a foreign state is for the President to negotiate it and then submit it to the Senate for the approval of two-thirds of that body present.

The Constitution in article VI, clause 2, proclaims treaties as the "supreme law of the land" on an equal basis with other law-making procedures:

"This Constitution * * * the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States * * *; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to contrary notwithstanding."

While the President can only enter into important agreements with other nations by following the treaty route, he can carry out certain functions delegated to him by the Constitution which relate to foreign affairs without the advice and consent of the Senate. In connection with such functions the President enters into executive agreements with foreign states when they are administratively necessary and incidental to specific powers vested in him by the Constitution. These powers can be found in article II, section 2:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. * * *

"He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and consuls."

Footnotes at end of speech.

If the Congress purports to authorize the Executive to join GATT-OTC by means of an executive agreement, such action would be without legal sanction because in derogation of the treatymaking clause. GATT-OTC is not an agreement which is incidental to the performance of the Executive's functions vested in him by the Constitution. Nor is it one that the Congress can properly delegate to the President to make. Rather, it is a far-reaching, 35-nation treaty between states which will have a broad and continuing effect upon most of our foreign and domestic trade. Committing this nation to such a grave step by the mere use of the executive agreement would be an inexcusable evasion of the clear command of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

The framers, in drafting article II, section 2, of the Constitution, use the term "treaties" advisedly for they were aware of the distinction between treaties which deal with important and executory matters, and agreements such as records, conventions and compacts which deal with routine matters. This is shown by another provision:

"No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation. * * * No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power" (Constitution, art. I, sec. 10).

The late Senator Robert A. Taft has analyzed the intention of the framers as follows:

"The founding fathers felt that the matter of assuming obligations or making promises to do something in the future for foreign nations was of sufficient importance to require that the proposal have the support of two-thirds of the Senators." [14]

Support for Senator Taft's analysis may be found in the following comment of Alexander Hamilton as to what transpired at the Constitutional Convention:

"As to the sense of the convention the secrecy with which their deliberations were conducted, does not permit any formal proof of the opinions and views which prevailed in digesting the power of treaty. But from the best opportunity of knowing the fact, I aver, that it was understood by all, to be the intent of the provision to give to that power the most ample latitude—to render it competent to all the stipulations, which the exigencies of national affairs might require; competent to the making of treaties and alliances, treaties of commerce, treaties of peace, and every other species of convention usual among nations; and competent in the course of its exercise for these purposes, to control and bind the legislative power of Congress. And it was emphatically for this reason, that it was so carefully guarded; the cooperation of two-thirds of the Senate, with the President, being required to make any treaty whatever." [15]

The distinction in the substance which a treaty or executive agreement may lawfully deal with has been acknowledged by the executive branch of the Government itself. In an opinion on the bases-for-destroyers transaction the then Attorney General, Robert Jackson, wrote:

"Some negotiations involve commitments as to the future which would carry an obligation to exercise powers vested in Congress. Such Presidential arrangements are customarily submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate before the future legislative power of the country is committed. However, the acquisitions which your are proposing to accept are without express or implied promises on the part of the United States to be performed in the future. The consideration which we later discuss is completed upon transfer of the specified items. * * * It is not necessary for the Senate to ratify an opportunity that entails no obligation."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Executive agreements deal with the day-to-day activities of the Government and should be confined to limited transactions. Borchard, Shall the Executive Agreements Replace the Treaty? (53 Yale Law Journal 670, 674.) The Federal Government can do by treaty what it cannot do by statute. This is dramatically illustrated in the leading case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). The Migratory Bird Act of 1913 had previously been held unconstitutional under the 10th amendment as a Federal encroachment on power belonging to the States. The United States thereupon concluded a treaty with Canada dealing with the same subject matter as the unconstitutional act. The Supreme Court concluded, erroneously in the view of many, that the treaty was valid and effective. Accordingly the purposes of the act were achieved. Our courts have not given a clear answer as to whether this result could have been accomplished by an executive agreement. (Cf. *U. S.* v. *Pink, supra.*)

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, speaking for the executive branch of our Government, has spoken of GATT as a treaty:

"He signed it ad referendum, subject to the approval by Congress. * * * The same way treaties are signed. As you know, they really do not become operative until the Senate has consented to their ratification, and that is the way he has acted in relation to this document." [16]

Senators O'MAHONEY and MALONE have also stated that GATT-OTC is in reality a treaty in substance, procedure, and consequences.[17]

Since the Constitution unambiguously requires that the President and the Senate mutually share the treatymaking power, there are some who advocate a conscious policy of evading and nullifying that provision. (See McDougal and Lans, Treaties and congressional-executive or Presidential Agreements: Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy, 54 Yale Law Journal, 181, 534.) It is inconceivable that the Congress would knowingly participate in such an unlawful course of conduct. McDougal and Lans invidiously characterize the traditional position on constitutional construction as "the mechanical, filiopietistic theory [purporting] to regard the words of the Constitution as timeless absolutes." It need not be elaborated that the Constitution through the course of time has proved to be a flexible instrument able to adjust to a dynamic, expanding Nation.

It is not contended here that the three branches of the Government should not expand their activities in conformity with their growing responsibilities. This, however, should be done within the area allotted to each of them by the Constitution and is to be sharply distinguished from the policy of evading the treaty provision of the Constitution. Evading the treaty procedure, it is submitted, makes a fundamental, qualitative change in the balance of power between Congress and the Executive, one of such importance that it should be decided by consitutional amendment.[18] (See *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579 (Steel Seizure case).)

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the State Department has deliberately planned the proposed legislation to give it the appearance of necessity in promoting our national welfare in world affairs. They support the proposed legislation with the argument that our policy of dealing with foreign commerce cannot be separated from our foreign political relations. It follows, therefore, according to these State Department spokesmen that we should now abandon our time-honored observance of the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

constitutional requirement for separation of legislative and executive functions and vest the proposed authority in a quasi-Government composed of representatives of 35 nations.[19]

One wonders why the advocates of "amendment by evasion" do not apply their energies and determination toward an appropriate constitutional amendment in the lawful manner. Perhaps the answer can be found in the wise statement of John Bassett Moore:

"I deem it to be inconceivable that there should exist in the United States any general sentiment in favor of committing to the Executive Department of the Government the entire and absolute control of treaty-making. [Such a sentiment] would justify a feeling of profound apprehension and alarm." [20]

The treaty provision of the Constitution was weighed very carefully by the Framers in convention.[21] The making of treaties was deemed of such importance to the Nation, that the advice and consent of the Senate were made an integral part of that process. Although, since that time, the Senate has grown to such proportions that the function of advising the President has, of necessity, been diminished, still, the Senate's consent remains a vital check on the President in committing the Nation to foreign agreements. In fact, the crucial role envisioned for the Senate in the treatymaking process is evidenced by the fact that it was only 10 days before the final adjournment of the constitutional convention that the President was given a share in the making of treaties with the Senate.[22]

In summary: Both Houses of Congress plus the President cannot lawfully commit the United States to GATT-OTC. Assuming that they can do so, H. R. 5550 still should not be enacted, since the heart of this bill is GATT, which has never been presented to the Congress or the people for approval. Congress should not acquiesce in the amendment of the Constitution by evasion.

---

[1] Essay Concerning the True, Original, Extent and End of Civil Government (London, 1690). sec. 141, as quoted by Sidney V. Jacobi in Delegation of Powers and Judicial Review: A Study in Comparative Law, 36 Columbia Law Review 871 (1936).

[2] *Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 421).

[3] See also Justice Story's statement with respect to the separation of powers required by the Constitution:

"That the whole power of one of these departments [legislative, executive, judicial] should not be exercised by the same hands which possess the whole power of one of the other departments." (Story, Commentaries, sec. 525).

[4] *Hampton* v. *U. S.* (276 U. S. 394).

[5] "Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion." (*Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 495); *U. S.* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1).)

[6] "In considering these asserted hardships, it is appropriate to take into account the purposes of the act and the circumstances attending its enactment and application as a wartime emergency measure. The act was adopted January 30, 1942, shortly after our declaration of war against Germany and Japan, when it was common knowledge, as is emphasized by the legislative history of the Act, that there was grave danger of wartime inflation and the disorganization of our economy from excessive price rises. Congress was under pressing necessity of meeting this danger by a practicable and expeditious means which would operate with such promptness, regularity and consistency as would minimize the sudden development of commodity price disparities, accentuated by commodity shortages occasioned by the war." (Majority opinion of Chief Justice Stone (321 U. S. at pp. 431–432); see also pp. 422, 441, 443.)

[7] The act provides:

"Whenever the President, upon investigation of the differences in costs of production of articles wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States and of like or similar articles wholly or in part the growth or product of competing foreign countries, shall find it thereby shown that the duties fixed in this act do not equalize the said differences in costs of production in the United States and the principal competing country he shall, by such investigation, ascertain said differences and determine and proclaim the changes in classifications or increases or decreases in any rate of duty provided in this act shown by said ascertained differences in such costs of production necessary to equalize the same * * * *Provided*, That the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty shall not exceed 50 percent of the rates specified in title I of this act.

"(c) That in ascertaining the differences in costs of production, under the provisions of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section, the President, insofar as he finds it practicable, shall take into consideration (1) the differences in conditions in production, including wages, costs of material, and other items in costs of production of such or similar articles in the United States and in competing foreign countries; (2) the differences in the wholesale selling prices of domestic and foreign articles in the principal markets of the United States; (3) advantages granted to a foreign producer by a foreign government, or by a person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country; and (4) any other advantages or disadvantages in competition."

[8] It has already been noted that in the United Nations this country has the veto power and the action of that body is therefore subject to our control at least negatively.

[9] President Truman in his proclamation of December 16, 1947, announcing our participation in GATT, stated that our Government acted under the authority of the 1934 act.

[10] Tariff Act of 1930, sec. 350.

[11] 69 Stat. 162.

[12] *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 430).

[13] Department of State, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

[14] 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9276 (1942).

[15] 7 Works of Alexander Hamilton (John C. Hamilton, ed. 1850–51, p. 518).

[16] Hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 1, p. 209, March 21, 1955.

[17] 101 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4759, 1865, 3607; S. Rept. 232, 84th Cong. 1st sess., p. 15.

[18] The New York Times has stated that calling "treaties" "agreements," "is merely to argue that we could get around the Constitution by conspiring with each other in calling a spade by another name," and that if this can be done "we can do away with the need for any approval of treaties"; in fact, we can "interpret" the Constitution away. "There is one honest, straightforward method of change" and that is by constitutional amendment. (April 17, 1944, p. 22, col. 1.) In another editorial the Times declared: "This ignoring of a plain constitutional requirement would be a dangerous precedent. It would put in doubt the validity of treaties and international agreements not ratified in the constitutionally prescribed manner." (May 22, 1944, p. 18, col. 2.)

[19] "In other words, foreign economic policy is two things at the same time:

"It is foreign policy, governing our relations with other countries and having exactly the same objectives as any other aspect of foreign policy—namely the security and well-being of the United States as a whole.

"It is also the policy governing that part of our domestic economy which projects beyond our borders.

"Now, sound foreign relations and prosperous domestic economy are not in conflict. They go along together. Nevertheless, at the point of merging traffic, a high degree of dexterity is called for, and even then there are sometimes collisions and uncertainties over the right of way * * *

"Entirely aside from our internal difficulties in arriving at decisions, there is a further fact which is always with us; other countries are involved in these matters and we cannot accomplish all our objectives through decisions of our own." (Statement by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, November 9, 1955.)

[20] Collected Papers of John Bassett Moore, p. 95 (1944).

[21] See statement of Alexander Hamilton, supra, pp. 44–45.

[22] Corwin, The Constitution and World Organization, 31 et seq. (1944). It is also of interest, that the convention rejected by a vote of 10 States to 1 a proposal that treaties should be made by the President with the advice and consent of both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Surrogate William T. Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of June a distinguished citizen and jurist, the Honorable William T. Collins, surrogate of New York County, will reach his 70th birthday. At the end of this year, by statutory requirement, he will retire from the bench and thus bring to a close a brilliant and dedicated public life of service to the community. The long and distinguished career which lies behind those 7 decades is of such an inspirational quality that I should like to bring some of its highlights to the attention of my colleagues.

Judge Collins was educated in the Catholic parochial grammar and high schools of New York City, then went on to St. Francis Xavier College, and in 1909 he received his law degree from Fordham University.

His career of public service dates from 1907, when he served in the office of the corporation counsel. In 1915 he was elected to the old board of aldermen, and he served as a member of that board for 5 consecutive terms. From 1920 until he became its president in 1924, he was the leader of that body. Then in 1925 Judge Collins became county clerk of New York County.

The late Alfred E. Smith, while Governor of the State of New York, took cognizance of the capabilities of this distinguished citizen and attorney and appointed him a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. In 1929 the confidence shown in Judge Collins was upheld when the people of the State elected him to a full 14-year term. In

1943 Judge Collins was reelected to that court, after receiving the endorsement of all political parties.

Judge Collins was designated by the appellate division of the supreme court to serve as surrogate when Judge James A. Foley became ill, and in March 1946 he was appointed a surrogate by the Governor. Later in that year, with the endorsement again of all political parties, he was nominated and elected surrogate of New York County, the position which he holds today.

This then is the life of government service that Judge Collins has given to the people of New York. What are his other interests which rounded and gave meaning to his life as a member of a community?

Judge Collins served with distinction in World War I, and he was honorably discharged a second lieutenant, after enlisting as a private. His interest in the activities of the Air Force, the branch in which he served, and his later interest in matters affecting veterans was recognized by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which presented him, in 1954, with its Achievement Award.

His concern for community betterment has caused him to be active in organizations such as the Grand Street Boys, the Knights of Columbus, and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Judge Collins, in addition, is a past President of the National Democratic Club of New York and of the Manhattan Club of New York City.

In the fields of religious and philanthropic work, Judge Collins has been for many years a trustee of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City and a supporter and trustee of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin at Mount Loretto, Staten Island, one of the largest orphanages in our State. The list is indeed endless.

Mention must however be made of the fact that in 1949, Judge Collins was honored by his church by being made a Knight of Malta; that, in 1951, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies honored him for his efforts on its behalf; that in 1953, he was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by his alma mater, Fordham University; and finally, that in 1943, he was the recipient of the award of honorary chairman of the Interfaith Movement. The judge's remarks on the occasion of that award are so moving, so eloquent, and so timely even today, that I take the liberty of incorporating them at this point. His remarks A Challenge to Bigotry, follow:

A CHALLENGE TO BIGOTRY

(Remarks of William T. Collins, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York)

Judge Goldstein, and friends of the radio audience:

I have heard with deep humility the kind things that have been said of me. I do not feel that I deserve them, but if I must be flattered at all, and if I have any say in the matter, my preference would be a compliment for one thing above all others—and that one thing would be whatever I have tried to contribute to the sublime cause of the interfaith movement.

I am happy and honored to accept this award. This cause is based on human dignity. Its guiding principle, from its president, Judge Vincent S. Lippe, to the last of its members is no more or less than the concept of the true fellowship of all men.

The most devastating war in all history was caused by a ruthless disregard of that principle. Brave and loyal adherence to the principle of interfaith would have averted this war. Wider and wider recognition of that principle today will not only hasten the end of the war, but—as the principle spreads throughout the United Nations—prevent war in the future. That is a victory truly worth living for.

"For all our dreams of nobler things
Will meet the same old fate
Unless we turn to fellowship, and do
Away with hate."

Our first duty is to win the war. There is no valid reason why the war and the peace cannot be won at the same time. The peace cannot be won and stay won unless and until we erase the causes of war. The most sinister of those causes are intolerance, the disregard of the rights of others, the proscription of religion, the discrimination against races, the tyranny of the majority over the minority—all these wicked flowers shooting off the crooked stem of the dishonest declaration that might makes right.

Nations consist wholly and solely of individuals. Justice among nations can proceed no faster than the acceptance of justice among individuals, and between groups of individuals. There is our clue to the peaceful world of a long tomorrow—there is our interfaith principle again; achieve individual justice and you abolish international injustice. This organization is a small body of individuals, but its influence upon international justice can reach to the ends of the tortured earth, and can help the wounds of the world to heal.

Now we must not be so naive as to believe that this massive victory will be won by broadcasting speeches, or holding meetings, or passing resolutions—or even by enacting laws. All those steps help, but they are not the goal; they are simply the pathways leading to it. That goal is "live and let live." That goal is "do unto others as you would have others do unto you." The path seems so straight, so natural, so easy to traverse. And yet it is not easy. Across that path lie menaces and traps, mines and barricades, the more dangerous for their invisibility and their subtlety.

What are those traps the enemy has sown across the path of brotherhood. Here are a few: Arrogance, personal greed or vanity, prejudice, bias, bigotry and intolerance, stupidity and sheer ignorance, contempt for the rights and beliefs of others, inflated superiority concerning one's own ideas.

Those are only a few of the obstacles concealed along the road to the true fellowship of man that is our goal. They must be sought out, rooted out, and neutralized. Recognizing them takes a keen eye. Rooting them out takes a sure hand. And destroying them takes a strong heart and a cool head.

Those threats are everywhere, every day, as you know. There are so many of them that the real size of the interfaith task begins to take shape before you and me. You can't eliminate these menaces with a sledge hammer. You've got to go slowly, steadily forward on the long road of unceasing education.

The right education will expose bigotry—will make the bigot his own victim, drive him into the open to stand ashamed and wretched before the public eye. It must be brought home to the bigot and the persecutor and the intolerant that his own intolerance stamps him unmistakably as a small and mean person. To scoff at the race or the color of another individual is to turn the merciless spotlight upon one's own shortcomings. To attack the character of another is to attack one's own character. At the base of the statue of Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee there is an inscription. Here is what it says:

"I will let no man drag me down so low as to make me hate him."

There is a French writer who recently spoke cleverly of those who love their prejudices more than justice. Well, in the interfaith movement we aim to transpose those key words. We want a world peopled by those who love justice more than they love their prejudices. A woman once clodded Dr. Samuel Johnson, who wrote the famous dictionary: "Your book" she said "contains many offensive words." Dr. Johnson replied, "Madam, I see that you have gone through my dictionary looking for them." She stamped her own character as she attacked his. It always works that way.

Yes—the cause of interfaith is a long task. Too many of the menaces to true human fellowship we take too much for granted. We call them "self-evident"—but they are not self-evident at all. They must be brought out into the open and measured for their danger afresh. Anybody would agree that bigotry is as un-American as a Messerschmitt. It is. But interfaith declares that bigotry is downright and absolutely lawlessness. Freedom of worship is a cornerstone upon which our Nation was built. Bigotry is an attack upon that cornerstone. It is outright sabotage to the form of government we cherish, and it is treason to the Constitution, and a cancellation of the Bill of Rights. You can't be a patriot and a bigot at the same time. It was Dryden who said:

"Of all the tyrants of human kind
The worst is that which persecutes the mind."

The creed we espouse is a simple American creed. The United States has a record unbeaten on earth for championing the persecuted, for defending and protecting the rights of the minority, and for protecting you and me on our way to and from the church of our own selection. On that magnificent record there are, alas, some stains. One of our aims is to erase those stains. The greater task is to keep the record rolling forward, clean, unsullied.

It is self-evident—but it can't be repeated too often—that this country was founded and built mostly by people who fled from religious persecution, and that it has grown great by the united support of peoples of all faiths. We have no right to insist that other nations give their people equal protection, rights, and opportunities—if we don't accord them to all of our own people.

Let me emphasize what Judge Goldstein has said so well; that the interfaith cause does not propose an amalgamation of faiths. It recognizes the strength and autonomy of each, and the power in respect for one for another, and cooperation between them. Real tolerance is not merely knowing one's own beliefs, but knowing the other fellow's as well, and respecting them, and respecting him for being true to those beliefs. Interfaith doesn't proselyte for members. It crusades for respect between the faiths.

Out there on the fighting fronts you see among all faiths respect and cooperation in action. The chaplains on the firing line are ministers and priests and rabbis. The first man after the commanding officer to cross that Guadacanal bridge under fire was a Catholic priest. But under the Stars and Stripes it could have been a rabbi or a minister. Those men have set up new ideals for us all. They hold each other's beliefs in meticulous respect—and they go forward into battle arm in arm. We should aim to deserve the freedom they are winning for us together.

Have we any right to wait for the end of war to live as hard as they live in the cause

of true freedom? I do not think so. Our task is here—and interfaith recognizes it. The enemy of tolerance is here in midst, and the time for attack is today and everyday. The battle is long, and we shall not win our victories lightly or easily. But today's setback does not mean that we shall not win tomorrow. With the principle of active human fellowship in our hearts victory is within our grasp.

"And though you stand defeated
When evening sunset dies
Defeat is never final
As long as suns shall rise."

This then is the partial story of a distinguished and devoted public servant and citizen. As is true in the case of all great men, there is always a source of inspiration and support which is such an important factor in their lives that it must be acknowledged. In this case, tribute must be paid to the former Mae Godfrey, who since 1909 has been the dear wife of William T. Collins. She is responsible for the happy home and happy life which is inevitably the birthplace of the activities and accomplishments of men who leave their imprint on the community. Her loyal and devoted companionship, in great measure, is the key to the life which Judge Collins has lived and which has caused the unanimous affection in which he is held by all who know him.

At the end of this year the judicial career of Judge Collins will come to a close. He has occupied his position of trust with great dignity. His record will chart the path for those who follow him. We cannot help but learn how best to serve our fellowmen when we review the activities and interests on a man like William T. Collins.

Economy in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dean Richard L. Kozelka, of the School of Business Administration at the University of Minnesota, recently addressed an assembly of the directors and officers of the Federal Reserve bank in Minneapolis on the significant topic, One Man's Opinion—Economy in 1961. Dean Kozelka's talk aroused such keen interest that excerpts from it were reprinted in the issue of Commerce West for May 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION—ECONOMY IN 1961
(By Richard L. Kozelka)

A forecasting speech is regarded with suspicion, and the forecasters misses are thrown back at him with high glee. But forecasting is an inescapable part of most human decisions and nowhere more far-reaching than in the business decisions which affect our livelihood and our standard of living.

The art of forecasting rests on varying combinations of intuition, analysis of trends and patterns, interpretations of fundamental factors, and just plain luck.

A forecast for 1961 may consist of nine parts temerity and one part analysis, but an examination of trends and fundamentals may be of value.

Two basic figures are offered for 1961, followed by some comments on the contributing factors.

The first of these is a forecast of a population for the United States of 175 million people, about 10 million more than at present.

The second is a forecast of $470 billion for gross national product, compared with about $400 billion expected this year. Gross national product is the increasingly recognized concept of the grand total of value of goods and services produced by our working population in a year. There's a general relationship between gross national product and population which is represented in our standard of living, but obviously gross national product is not all consumers' goods. It must include our rather substantial provision for national defense and local protection, as well as replacement and increase in our intricate but efficient machinery for production.

The increase in the gross national product will be accomplished by a relatively smaller proportion of our population working less than our present labor force.

There will be a larger population in 1961, but a smaller proportion in normal working ages, 20 to 70 years. At present the percentage is estimated at 55.2 percent, which is expected to fall to 54 percent by 1961. This will reflect the continuing trend in longevity for our "senior citizens," and the trend toward early marriages and larger families.

The labor force, which consists of the people working or able and willing to work, also will show a shrinkage in relation to the total population. This will occur primarily at the high and low ages. The retiring age has been drifting downward and there is no reason to expect a reversal, particularly as social security approaches complete coverage.

At the other end of the age scale, the labor force is reduced by the extension of the school years. At present about 23.5 percent of the college age young people are attending some institution of higher learning. By 1961, this ratio is expected to rise to 28 percent, with all the problems of expansion which are worrying the school administrators today.

This postponement of entrance into the labor force is not only consistent with the American tradition of maximum educational opportunity, but with the rising standards of preparation required for business and the professions.

The increase in gross national product at a faster rate than the population growth naturally results in more goods and services per capita. The income per worker is estimated presently at $3,100 per year and will increase to $3,400 by 1961. The income per worker family averages at present about $4,500, and should reach $4,900 annually by 1961.

The reason for the higher income is familiar to all in the phrase "higher productivity." The increase in productivity due to technical progress is well publicized and generally welcomed, except by those temporarily displaced by the advances of technology.

New products, new materials, new processes seem to be announced with increasing rapidity, and there is no reason to expect a decline in the next five years.

Research is not new in university thought and practice. Reasearch is not new in private industry, but the scale on which it has been adopted and supported since World War II is relevant to a forecast for 1961.

The results of research are frequently like an iceberg, the visible evidence of a much larger body beneath the surface, the failures, the patient tests and experiment which may not bear fruit for months or years to come.

Postwar research has brought us many improvements and new products, but this may be only a foretaste of the benefits which are about to emerge from the experimental to the production stage.

Improved methods must be adopted more quickly if companies are to remain in business. "Automation" simply dramatizes a process which has been going on for centuries, and which is simply accelerated in this decade.

The special attention to technical progress may overlook the higher productivity resulting from the improvements in the art of management. The people who are responsible for the coordination of men and materials in an effective productive organization are under increasing pressure to improve their operations.

Close attention is being paid to executive development instead of leaving managerial succession to chance or personal favor.

Market research is becoming a necessary aid to executive decision.

Long range planning is accepted as a systematic necessity.

The demands of organized labor have forced management to intensive review and ingenuity to prevent labor costs from rising as fast as wage rates.

More recently the stockholders have taken a new interest in the quality of management.

There is no reason to expect these pressures to abate over the next five years. It is more likely that the effects of improved management will continue to appear in higher productivity.

Higher productivity is not limited to manufacturing, although results have more dramatic visibility in these areas. Equally significant changes have taken place and are in the offing in finance and wholesale and retail distribution.

Few consumers are aware of the spread between factory cost and retail price and the intensive efforts being made to reduce the cost of the service which the consumer has been accustomed to expect.

There should be a noticeable improvement in the stability of our economic climate by 1961. We can hardly complain about the violence of our economic fluctuations over the last decade, but the probability of such upheavals seems to be decreasing as we look into the future. There is both public and private concern in minimizing the business cycle.

We have national legislation on the books, in the full employment law, which commits the Federal Government to fiscal and other policies if unemployment becomes serious. We are acquiring experience and wisdom in the use of "built-in stabilizers," such as unemployment compensation and credit controls.

Our banking system is stronger, and the Federal Reserve System has the tools for control and the courage to use them.

Private business has an increasing stake in stability, and the chances are very good that increasing initiative will come from this direction.

A powerful incentive for reducing fluctuations is found in the increasing investment per worker. A fair estimate of average investment by 1961 would be $12,500. Rising cost of overhead on idle investment added to the costs of unemployment compensation for idle workmen combine into a persuasive argument which any alert manager is bound to heed.

The increasing prevalence of long-range planning prepares the manager for action which extends beyond short-run fluctuations.

The increasing diversity of industry creates countervailing forces against a general collapse.

There is little likelihood that the total tax burden will be reduced by 1961. Even if Federal expenditures are reduced, State and

local taxes will hardly decline. In the dismal 1930's, public works were promoted as a stopgap to relieve unemployment until private business regained its momentum.

Today public works are demanded by our growing population as part of their higher standard of living.

Schools, roads, water systems, and other "amenities of civilization" cannot wait for a depression, and the drawing boards are full of plans which will extend at least to 1961. This a strong backlog for sustained activity.

The dollar figures used in this forecast thus far have assumed no change in purchasing power. Such an assumption, unfortunately, is not likely to be realistic. The history of the American economy and the American philosophy show greater concern over falling prices than rising prices.

It is difficult to envisage any basic change in this attitude in the next 5 years. We are learning the value and the mechanism of price level controls, but on balance the chances favor at least mild inflation.

Another basic assumption in this forecast is at least no deterioration in the international situation. If a hot war breaks out in the next 5 years, "all bets are off" because substantial portions of our economic machine may be destroyed by enemy action, and our productive capacity temporarily, but seriously impaired.

If the present cold war is continued, we shall see 40, 50, or 60 billions of dollars of labor, time, and natural resources used to protect our peace of mind. That may be a bargain in peace, but one cannot help but wonder what that sum would mean in the American standard of living, if we want to be selfish, or in helping underdeveloped countries if we choose to share with others.

We alone cannot eliminate the threat of war, but as a major, responsible world power we are not without influence in encouraging the substitution of deeds for words.

An enduring peace rests on several foundations, one of which is economic. An economist is not an expert on disarmament, and would hardly dare forecast peace by 1961. He can only hope for a little progress in a troubled world.

America and the World's Debt to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include the address I delivered on April 29, 1956, at the annual convention of the Worcester County Association of Polish American Citizens' Clubs.

The committee in charge of convention arrangements was headed by Mrs. Stella A. Ciborowski, association president, assisted by Mrs. Stella A. Recko, Mrs. Anna Kowiako, Mrs. Adeline Petriewicz, Mrs. Stephania M. Paterak, and Miss Amelia Gutowski.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT CONVENTION OF WORCESTER COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN CITIZENS' CLUBS, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 29, 1956

I am very grateful for the cordial invitation to visit with you this afternoon and very happy I was able to accept your hospitality because I know I am among good friends.

Another good reason is that I feel right at home here. As perhaps most of you know, I was born and lived for many years within a few blocks of this building. As a schoolbay, I went to school in this area and played in the streets of this neighborhood. It was in those early years I first learned by observation about the high and noble qualities of the Polish-American people because I lived among you. All of those early Polish associates are still among the closest friends I have.

No one can live among the Poles without seeing that they are honest, hard-working, God-fearing people. They are devoted to their families, quietly courageous, and possessed of intense loyal patriotism. They have never hesitated and will never cease to be ready to fight and even die for the Christian principles and democratic freedoms. Without having to refer to the pages of the noble history of your native land, we have the impressive truth and proof of your willing heroism in the war records of America. Such names as Pulaski and Kosciusko are immortally associated with the origin of our own liberty. During the Civil War, the documents demonstrate that several thousands of Poles fought to preserve the Union. In the First World War, tens of thousands of Polish Americans served with our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. In the Second World War, several hundred thousand fought and died to maintain American freedom, and the battle awards and distinctions they achieve are legion.

The contribution to the beginning and development of this Nation by your people is universally recognized with the deepest gratitude by your fellow Americans all over the country. Is it any wonder, then, here in our own vicinity, that every citizen of our area knows about the surbstantial part your Worcester County Association of Polish American Citizens' Clubs has played and is playing in advancing all the civic and patriotic objectives of this community and this country. They respect and admire you for it. They realize that your combined activities in explaining the standards of good American citizenship to your members and your persistent urging of the acceptance and fulfillment of the individual responsibilities of good citizenship is vitally needed for the preservation of this blessed Nation in these hectic times. It is, then, not only a pleasure, but, indeed, a public duty for me as Congressman to compliment you for your wholesome and inspiring example of the highest patriotism.

There is another reason why I personally have the highest regard and admiration for the Polish American. It is because no people have a greater concern or any greater loyalty to the old folks than you do. In the best Christian spirit, you are devoted to your own families, you are courteous and respectful to the aged and truly charitable in providing for their needs. A good Christian heart is your heritage and you, and your fathers and mothers before you, brought that good heart to America to add to the culture and progress of every city and State in which Polish Americans live.

It is, indeed, because of your Christian heritage that you recognize better than most Americans the grave danger threatening us and the free world in this fierce struggle against the barbaric atheism of Communist tyranny. Because of the experience of your beloved native country and because in some cases of unfortunate family experience, you have a clear understanding of the terrible fierceness, the relentless cruelty, and the devilish determination of the Soviet leaders in their plans to conquer and subjugate the free world into slavery. Because you are intensely aware of the godless nature of communism, you are intensely concerned with the universal promotion and practice of good citizenship without which America cannot expect to escape Communist subjection and consequent suppression of all the fundamental liberties we enjoy.

Because of your Christian heritage, you appreciate better than most what these liberties are and what they mean to you and your families and to all Americans. You realize very well that here in America we have the privilege of casting votes as our conscience dictates without any dictatorial interference. Here our Government leaders do not seek to impose their will upon us, our homes cannot be searched without a warrant, our property is not subject to unlawful confiscation, our families are not put in danger of bodily harm or imprisonment because of our convictions, our choice of schools to which we send our children is unlimited, and our privilege of worshipping God is unrestricted. These are blessed freedoms of a blessed land. You Polish Americans know very well just how blessed they are, and you also realize very well how easily they might be lost.

Other unfortunate peoples all over the world almost overnight have lost the rights and the privileges and the freedoms that had taken hundreds of years to gain. Under Communist inspiration, events are constantly occurring around this current world which are a grim reminder to all Ameircans that we must not and cannot take our freedoms for granted. All Americans today must earnestly realize, as you people do, that the struggle for freedom never ends and that the greatest danger to our present freedom is to take our democratic liberty for granted.

It is not enough ever, but more especially in these dangerous days, to merely enjoy the privileges and the liberties of a democracy; we must accept the responsibilities of citizenship to maintain our freedoms. The Communist leaders stand ever ready to take quick advantage of any wide neglect in or retreat from acceptance of the responsibilities of American citizenship. We, then, must remain ever ready to make the sacrifices necessary to prevent such a terrible castastrophe.

Your native land gave us the best modern example of such sacrifice in that serious engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned Communist objective of reducing the free world to tyrannical slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example, and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreats, of developing world confusion, and of increasing turmoil might well have been avoided.

The debt that the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 36 years ago still remains unpaid and it still remains as a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations.

It is not, however, thank God, too late to save America and to vindicate our honor by continuing to demand liberation and freedom from Communist tyranny of Poland and the other enslaved nations. America is today the outstanding single force preventing the final success of Communist propaganda, intrigue, and even forceful aggression. It would appear that they fear our military strength and so are content to wait and watch, hoping that we will become weak from within. They hesitate to openly attack us because they know we have great military resources; they are not so sure and they doubt that we possess the greater and more enduring strength of moral character as a nation and a people.

We must, then, give a resounding and convincing answer to that particular challenge. We must demonstrate to them that the great majority of Americans do possess the moral capacity to make personal sacrifices

for the common welfare. We must show them that the great majority of Americans are willing to govern their private ambitions for the general good. We must thoroughly convince them that they could wait until doomsday before the great majority of Americans will ever betray their neighbors, become disloyal to their country or accept the false and unholy appeal of Communist propaganda.

The only way we can do that is by individually and wholly accepting and carrying out our responsibilities as good American citizens. The foundation of good citizenship is to live our daily lives among our fellows with Christian self-restraint and in accord with the laws of God and duly constituted authority. In my opinion, the continuing demonstration of the great moral strength of the Christian unity among the American people will provide the greatest discouragement to the Kremlin leaders and will eventually force them to abandon their pagan plans to enslave the world.

You members of the Worcester County Association of Polish American Citizens Clubs have provided us with an inspiring example of how that Christian unity and moral strength is achieved. If the rest of the American people will imitate and persevere in your patriotic example, I hope and believe that, with the help of God, all of us will live to soon see the dawn of a new era of peace for America and freedom for Poland and the rest of the Christian world.

Another Presidential Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 8, 1956, is most interesting:

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS—EISENHOWER TACTICAL ERROR BLAMED IN FOREIGN-AID UPSET

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 7.—President Eisenhower's foreign-aid program—mostly military and much needed—is in trouble in Congress, and this is due largely to his own mistakes in tactics.

Thus, the damage done by the President's offhand remarks at Wednesday's press conference is incalculable. Even the clarifying statement issued Thursday afternoon does not erase the injury done when the President, in effect, encouraged neutralism and caused the many allies and trusted friends of the United States in southeast Asia who have joined America in military alliances to wonder if they were being let down by Mr. Eisenhower.

TELEPHONES BUZZED

The telephones buzzed with expressions of shock and surprise and at times righteous indignation as the news of what Mr. Eisenhower said on Wednesday reached diplomats who represent America's allies in Asia. On Capitol Hill there was consternation. At the State Department there was an obvious discomfort but a discreet silence.

To understand what happened, it is necessary to present here the text of the President's remarks at the press conference as authorized for publication:

"Now, today there are certain nations that say they are neutral. This doesn't necessarily mean what it is so often interpreted to mean, neutral as between right and wrong or decency or indecency.

"They, are using the term 'neutral' with respect to attachment to military alliances. And may I point out that I cannot see that that is always to the disadvantage of such a country as ours.

WORLD OPINION

"If a nation is truly a neutral, if it is attacked by anybody—and we are not going to attack them—public opinion of the world is outraged. If it has announced its military association with another great power, things could happen to it, difficulties, along its borders; and people would say: 'Good enough for it. They asked for it.' So let us not translate this meaning of the word 'neutral' as between contending military forces, even though the conflict is latent, and neutral as between right and wrong."

But, asked some of the diplomats who represent countries that have already joined America in military alliances: "Shall we tell our people now that they were wrong and that, if attacked, they 'asked for it'?"

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

The President heard from his colleagues inside the government who advised a public statement. Here it is in its essential part:

"It is obvious that in some countries of the world there are certain ideological, geographical or other reasons making military alliances impractical. Such nations may declare themselves to be neutral, hoping thus to secure the support of world opinion against attack from any quarter. Neutrality does not mean either disarmament or immunity from attack. We have had historical examples of this kind of neutrality for many decades. * * *

"The President does believe that there are special conditions which justify political neutrality but that no nation has the right to be indifferent to the fate of another, or, as he put it, to be 'neutral as between right and wrong or decency or indecency.'

ASSOCIATION WITH UNITED STATES

"The President does not believe that association for mutual security with the United States will involve any country in added danger but, on the contrary, will provide added security on the basis of mutuality and scrupulous respect for the independence of each. As the President pointed out, the United States is not going to attack anybody; but some great powers have shown an aggressive disposition, and military association with such a power could lead to difficulties."

Why did the President plunge into such a delicate field of discussion, anyway, without going over carefully in advance with the Secretary of State the text of what he had to say? The answer is that, with the press conferences conducted as they are today, when a President's impromptu remarks are quoted directly without regard for the sensibilities of governments abroad, tragic mistakes like this will happen. They have occurred before under previous administrations, too.

ASIAN SITUATION

Unfortunately, Mr. Eisenhower isn't "briefed" in advance as he should be. Many of his friends in New York and elsewhere who have access to him have been dinning into his ear statements about the Asian situation which seek to justify neutralism and the expenditure of billions by the United States to nations that tomorrow may become Communist.

Mr. Eisenhower allows such friends to influence him, and the State Department is often in the dark as to what is going on.

This intervention of a separate kind of "State Department" at the White House is a difficult thing to deal with, and it is amazing that a man with the President's fidelity to well-defined lines or responsibility in military life should tolerate an influence on foreign policy separate from the officials charged with responsibility in making it. For the same phraseology and argument used in his press-conference statements of Wednesday can be found in the writings and speeches of the clique which has access to Mr. Eisenhower and is known in many parts of the world as "the real State Department."

The National Conference on Problems of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Council on Aging and the Council of State Governments are to be commended for arranging the National Conference on Problems of the Aging which was held in Washington, D. C., last week to discuss the obligations which we owe to our older citizens.

Some interesting facts were presented in the report of the Council of State Governments: First, the ranks of the aged are growing, both relatively and absolutely; second, the rate of increase of older people is twice that of the total population.

The report pointed out that the problems of older people include: Unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation, even more psychological than physical, from family and friends; widowhood for more than one-half of the older women; loneliness; lack of social participation; and the great shortage of trained personnel to help our older citizens with their problems.

Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, addressed the conference and urged a reevaluation by modern society of the entire concept of old age. I include his important speech together with an editorial which appeared in the Trenton Evening Times regarding it:

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGING, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 5, 1956

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the National Conference on Problems of the Aging, we meet here today to discuss one of the most poignant problems of the latter half of the 20th century.

The Federal Council on Aging and the Council of State Governments are to be commended for arranging this meeting to discuss and explore the difficulties our States and our Nation face in trying to solve the problems of our older citizens.

I am reminded of a story found in a poem about a Mr. Arrents, who was the father of seven children. Mr. Arrents worked hard all of his life to feed, clothe, and educate his children. Once in a while throughout these hard working years, Mr. Arrents would sit back and muse about that one fine day when he would be able to relax and enjoy life—to retire and, so to speak, live off his children. Time passed. The children grew up and left home. "Ah," Mr. Arrents now said to himself. "The time has come to retire. "The children," he said "are all making a good living. Now let them support me in my autumn days as I cared for them for so many years."

And so, he called on each of his seven children. But from each one came the same answer: "Honestly, pop, I just can't do it."

Then, Mr. Arrents turned and went back to the task of finding support for himself. As he did, Mr. Arrents was struck by the ironic thought that it seemed to be much easier for 1 parent to support 7 children, than it was for 7 children to support 1 parent.

In a symbolic way, each of us today is 1 of those 7 children. For like them, we have been unable, for one reason or another, to care properly for a vast army of older parents and grandparents, many of whom played a great role in caring for us. We have neglected, instead, this vast population of older people, many of whom, because of our neglect, are living lives that are isolated, lonely, and useless.

Of course, there are the more fortunate parents, those with children who care. One young guitar-strumming singer is now enjoying fantastic popularity and an income equal to twice that of the President of the United States. The singer was asked on a television interview one day, how he intended to care for his "aged" father now that he had this great wealth.

"My daddy?" the singer replied. "Well, I'm gonna retire my daddy." It turned out later that "daddy" was 39 years old.

But what of the obligations we owe to our older citizens today?

The splendid report of the Council of State Governments has highlighted the significant facts concerning its magnitude. These facts are, first of all, that the ranks of the aged are growing, both relatively and absolutely; the rate of increase of older people is twice that of the total population. The report further points out that the problems of older people cannot be reduced to one simple factor. The many facets of the problem include: unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation, even more psychological than physical, from family and friends; widowhood for more than one-half of the older women; loneliness; lack of social participation; and the great shortage of trained personnel to help our older citizens with their problems.

"These problems, in their totality" emphasizes the report, "represents the failure of our economy, our Government, and our society to design a program which permits our older citizens to contribute to our economy and to live healthful, useful, and happy lives in accordance with accepted American standards."

Is it enough to say, "Through medical science, we have given you 10 possibly 20 more years of life," and then tell them to go off somewhere and sort of "do something" until their time is up? If this is what we want to continue to say to them; if we continue to disregard, or to force into early retirement or to place in mental hospitals, the army of aged in the United Statess today, these people shall be heard from. Politically, we cannot afford to deal lightly with the problems of more than 13 million people over the age of 65. No government, no political organization, can afford not to treat, with great pains, the problems of that number of people—a number comprising 8½ percent of the total population of the United States today.

In addition to this political consideration there is another practical consideration which might serve as a spur to action. We must prepare now for the potentially disruptive effect that this group (of which, let us face it, we shall all sooner or later be members) could have on the economy of our Nation. Today in the United States our payments to persons over 65 total $6 billion a year. Estimates are that by the year 2000 the cost of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance to the United States Government will be $20 billion annually, a figure which could play havoc with our future national economy if we are not prepared to deal with it.

As a further practical aspect of this problem, we must consider the possibility that the older group may be agitated into political action by our neglect, might vote into office men who made rash promises of financial help which could prove disastrous to our national economy.

All of these factors point to the need for sound, constructive action in dealing now with the very human problems of people over 65.

For the most part these human problems are new and greater than they have ever been. In years gone by old age brought with it peace and contentment and security. Or at least that's our recollection of it.

But today the picture has changed.

In the United States the change began in the last century, when America began to grow from an agricultural to a mainly industrial society. In the last 65 years, while the population of our big cities increased by something over 350 percent, the number of people in the smaller, farm communities rose by only 51 percent. This change brought with it many magnificent benefits, but quite naturally, too, there were difficulties and hardships. There were people who were hurt by the change in our way of life.

Foremost among these were people who had found contentment in their later years in a rural existence.

For an older person to live in a small farm community years ago often meant that he had a farm of his own, and sons to help him care for it. The farm gave him economic independence and brought respect and recognition in the community. His pleasures were many. There were the grown-up children with families who lived nearby. For recreation, there was fishing and hunting.

What is life today for many of our older people who spend their later years in an urban community?

Many of them are workers who, reaching the age of 65, are forced into retirement. Many of them live in the heart of our large cities and have the television screen or an occasional trip to a baseball game as their major forms of enjoyment. The grown children are seldom seen, for urban life has given them greater mobility.

The social status of the older man in an urban society may be low, for often he does not seem to have a role in life. He may sit in a rocking chair and watch the rest of the world go by. He is alone. The degenerative process is speeded by inactivity. Idleness breeds illness, both physical and mental.

Now, most of these people do not want to quit. The survey by the Council of State Governments found that they wanted to continue as long as they were well enough. This survey also destroyed the old idea that people retired in order to enjoy leisure. Only 1 out of 25 workers thought that he would actually enjoy sitting and doing nothing. Retirement, it was found, was something that was forced on them because of failing health, or compulsory retirement, or because they lost their jobs and simply could not find new ones.

Retirement is often a crushing blow. For, in his own eyes, and in the eyes of the people around him, a person may become suddenly "an old man."

For many of our older citizens, mental problems which might have been dormant through the active years of life, begin to appear with inactivity and the decline in self-estimation. And so, we find that one-third of the patients in our mental hospitals throughout the country, today, are people over the age of 60. In New Jersey, the proportion of older people in mental hospitals increased from about 17½ percent of the total State mental hospital population in 1933, to almost 36 percent in more recent years.

As a matter of fact, we have allowed the admission of many older people into these hospitals who have no business being there and who could be treated much better somewhere else. Many of them need no more assistance than that offered by a local geriatric center which they might visit periodically for advice or treatment by well-trained personnel. Other alternatives to the mental hospital include day care centers, boarding homes, and nursing homes, all of which might be associated with a hospital and be able to draw on its personnel for guidance and treatment.

Our problem in dealing with the older people in their communities is not always financial. Indeed, we face a task of re-evaluation by our society of the entire concept of old age.

There is no doubt about it—such a re-evaluation is tremendously difficult, for it means that we must develop a completely new way of looking at the man or woman who is 65 and older.

The idea is prevalent that when a person becomes old, he is a different person, to be pitied and coddled, to be rejected when it comes to doing a man-sized job.

The idea persists that after 65 a man should practice the art of doing almost nothing. Such a program can be disastrous.

These firmly entrenched ideas have done much to magnify the problems of our older people today. We need new and fresh outlooks.

Certainly we can depend on our religious leaders to help fill this need. In addition, the Council of State Governments has set down a "Bill of Objectives for Older People" which is in reality a modern application of some of our most revered moral and religious principles. These objectives, which constitute a bill of rights for our senior citizens, are worth repeating.

1. Equal opportunity to work: Our society recognizes the value of work to the person and to the community. The older person should have equal opportunity, if physically and mentally able, to be gainfully employed.

2. Adequate minimum income: Older persons should have a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens.

3. Home living: Older persons are entitled to the satisfactions of living in their own homes and, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes.

4. Homelike institutional care: For older persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, they have a right to expect the institutions that serve them to be as homelike as possible and have high standards of care.

5. Physical and mental health: Older adults should have adequate nutrition, preventive medicine and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years.

6. Physical and mental rehabilitation: Older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or unemployable for other reasons, have a right, to the fullest extent possible, to be restored to independent, useful lives in their homes and communities.

7. Participation in community activities: Older citizens can expect encouragement and assistance to form social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, religious and civic activities in their communities.

8. Social services: In planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, older persons should have the benefits of such social services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework.

9. Research, professional training: Older citizens should be able to expect an increase of research on the human aspect of aging, and development of special courses in school and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

10. Freedom, independence, initiative: In securing the foregoing objectives there should be increased emphasis on the right and obligation of older citizens to free choice, self-help, and planning of their own futures.

This conference is faced with the monumental project of helping to achieve these objectives. The job can be done by utilizing the Jeffersonian philosophy: "Give the people the facts * * * and they'll know how to act." Our work here will be fruitful if we can return to our individual States with a plan for letting the people know what must be done on every level, day by day, to help our older citizens achieve the rights to which they are entitled.

We must begin to teach that life must be lived dynamically at every age, and that to reach the age of 60, or 70, or 80, does not mean to become suddenly different from what a person was at 40. It does not mean that he suddenly must become a burden to himself or to society. It means simply that he has become older, that he has more free time. This time can be used productively. It can bring new satisfactions for himself and new contributions for society.

Recently, I met a New Jersey woman who had spent her early years as a missionary in China, where she adopted a young son. When she returned to the United States, much of her time was devoted to the upbringing of this boy. When the woman was 64 years old, the boy was 26, and left home to pursue his career. To occupy her time, and with a genuine interest, the woman began translating books into braille for use by the blind. Today, this woman is 84 years young. She is not plagued by the problems which confront so many of our aging today.

Preparation for such activity should begin with the education of children and must be nurtured throughout life. This will mean the coordination of efforts, public and private, at all levels.

All too often in discussing a social problem, people are looking for a startling new idea, something that holds out hope for a quick or an easy solution. This conference will harbor no such illusion.

The answer lies in utilizing to best advantage the multitude of organizations and agencies—both public and private, both lay and professional, on local, State and national levels—that are now attempting to deal with various aspects of the problem.

The time has come to evaluate and coordinate their activities; to let the right hand know what the left hand is doing; to have these agencies working together.

Only in this way can the facts be brought home most effectively to the people. Only in this way can the coming legions of older citizens use their autumn years in increasingly fruitful service to our country, to their communities, and to themselves.

[From the Trenton Evening Times of June 8, 1956]

HUMANE AND ENLIGHTENED

Governor Meyner discussed with enlightenment and sympathy in his talk to the National Conference on the Problems of the Aging the need of a revaluation by modern society of the entire concept of old age.

The older citizen, as the Governor reasonably and humanely insists, has rights which cannot justly be denied him. Transcendent among these rights are an equal opportunity to work, which recognizes the value of work to the person and to the community; an adequate income sufficient for health and participation in community life; home living or a suitable subsitute; physical and mental rehabilitation when necessary, to restore older persons to independent, useful lives.

Such a program, as Governor Meyner insists, is a humane obligation. It is also one whose fulfillment holds the possibilities of economic value to the individual and to society.

Until Lithuania Is Free, the United States and the United Nations Have Not Discharged Their Moral Obligation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include the address I delivered at a meeting on June 10, 1956, sponsored by the Lithuanian Community Committee of Worcester, Mass., protesting the illegal and unjust Russian occupation of Lithuania. One of the resolutions unanimously adopted at the meeting called upon the United States Government to use its influence "to the end that the armed forces of the Soviet Union be withdrawn from Lithuania and the other occupied countries."

The chairman of the community group was Mr. Pranas Pauliukonis with the following members of the general committee: Mikolas Zemaitaitis, Jonas Dvareckas, Jonas Palubeckas, Albina Grazulis, Stasys Raudonis, Mrs. Maria Vaisnoriene and Julius Svikla; Anthony J. Miller was master of ceremonies.

The address follows:

It is a high tribute to the Christian tradition of your forefathers that you are holding these exercises in commemoration of the countless number of heroic Lithuanians who have died in defiance of Russian tyranny. I am privileged to take part in this ceremony.

It is particularly fitting that we specially pray for and publicly honor the more than 40,000 innocent Lithuanian men, women and children who were deported by Soviet order to the Siberian labor camps 16 years ago. Only God knows how many of these tragic souls have died under conditions of barbaric brutality in these slave camps or continue to live under constant torture and terror. The terrible mass murders and inhuman deportations of these thousands of unfortunate Lithuanians by the Soviets in June of 1940 stands out among the blackest pages of world history.

It is a fearful reminder and warning to us of the evil depths to which the Communist leaders will descend in their devilish determination to wipe out the Christian liberties of free peoples everywhere and eventually enslave the whole world. Although the Communist leaders have most recently been making faint gestures of apparent desire to cooperate for peace, we must wisely beware of their treachery. In the light of their inhuman persecution of Lithuania, and so many other unholy aggressions against small defenseless nations, we would be foolish indeed to place any confidence in their mere words.

We must remind ourselves and remind them also that actions speak louder than words, and there are actions within their power to take that would prove their sincerity. One of the most convincing and happiest actions they could take tomorrow would be to liberate Lithuania and the other small nations that they unjustly hold in subjugation under the iron heel. Until the Communist leaders give back the God-given freedom they stole from Lithuania and the other subjugated nations, we can have no faith in the new Russian propaganda policy of apparent repentance and reform into a peaceful world neighbor. In remembrance of the heroic Lithuanians who were annihilated and deported in 1940, we shall never relax our efforts until Russia has restored liberty to their homeland.

The slavish tyranny still being forced upon Lithuania and the other oppressed nations by Russian domination is a constant challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great basic principles of Christian freedom and liberty for all peoples. In assuming leadership for justice in the world, our Government must perseveringly request and insist that the Lithuanian people be granted back the inalienable right to govern themselves as they see fit without Communist interference.

The major allies and the United States engaged in two great world wars and the Korean War for the Christian objective of liberty throughout a free world. Although the wars were won, the objective has not yet been accomplished.

The other world powers and this country still remain unhappy partners in the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations like Lithuania, while they continue to allow them to be cruelly suppressed by the Soviet imperialism which defies every concept of Christian democracy. The deaths of our World War and Korean war heroes will not be vindicated until Lithuania is free.

Although we have good cause to be sorrowful today about present Lithuanian subjugation, we have no cause to despair; quite the contrary. We can be certain that the Lithuanian people themselves will never cease their efforts to throw off the Communist yoke of slavery. Repeatedly through her history, Lithuania has proven that her people can eventually overcome any temporary defeat of oppressors. The Christian faith which in 1399 emerged triumphantly over the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It still gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any ungodly dictatorship.

From my own friendship with and knowledge of my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the hear of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who remain ever determined to be free.

Let us, then, pray for the souls of the Lithuanian patriots who have heroically died in defiance of Russian persecution and oppression. In memory of their sacrifices, let us dedicate ourselves to perseveringly work together until Lithuanian independence is restored.

May God grant that we can meet again soon in joyous celebration of the return of freedom to Lithuania and the other persecuted nations throughout the world.

Honorable John A. Blatnik Fights For Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was with interest that I read an article in the June 1956 issue of Sports Afield on the work of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of the Eighth District of Minnesota. As a conservationist, I was interested in the article because it cites some of Congressman BLATNIK's record

on behalf of conservation. The full text of the article, "He Fights for Conservation" follows:

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, Minnesota), former paratrooper captain with combat decorations, Intelligence and OSS services in hotspots overseas, started his career in Congress in 1946 with a major conservation victory.

Sports Afield readers well remember the hard crusade to consolidate the roadless area of the Superior National Forest to preserve this incomparable canoe country wilderness. Representative BLATNIK, representing this district, achieved a unique result for a freshman Member of Congress in getting his roadless area bill through the House and, cooperating with Senator EDWARD THYE, enacted into law.

Representative BLATNIK has a special appreciation of the wilderness values so dear to sportsmen, and your reporter can testify to the prodigious job he did in fighting for this legislation.

Representative BLATNIK's solid conservation interest and excellent grasp and growth as a Member of Congress make him one of the leaders in the conservation bloc of the House of Representatives.

Through seniority, Representative BLATNIK has moved up to a key position on the House Public Works Committee which deals with the various water and works programs. He is chairman of the subcommittee which heard the pollution abatement bill and is working hard to get an improved bill onto the floor of the House so the pollution abatement efforts on a national basis will not expire this June.

Representative BLATNIK is not a headline maker but his know-how, persistence and capabilities as a Congressman who serves his constituency, make him one of the most invaluable Members to add strength to the conservation of the Nation's natural resources.

Rochester Bar Association Pays Tribute to the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1956, the Rochester Bar Association gave a testimonial dinner in honor of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Over 700 persons attended the dinner which was held in the Rochester Chamber of Commerce Building. The principal address was delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the toastmaster was Mr. Paul Miller, executive vice president of the Gannett Newspapers.

Mr. Frank Traynor, president of the Rochester Bar Association, presented Mr. KEATING a silver plaque on behalf of the association. It is inscribed:

The Rochester Bar Association, on the occasion of its testimonial dinner to him on March 20, 1956, salutes its distinguished member, lawyer, soldier, and legislator, KENNETH B. KEATING, of whom it is proud to say that everything he does, he does well.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute paid the gentleman from New York by his friends and colleagues and in doing so I wish to bring to the attention of the House the address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the response of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. The speeches follow:

ADDRESS OF MR. MARTIN

It is a great privilege for me to come here this evening and join with the bar association and friends of Rochester in honoring a great public servant.

This trip has brought to me many pleasures. It is a privilege to come here in company with these grand Congressmen from New York who are at the head table, every one doing a wonderful service in this great task to keep America free, to keep America on the American track. It is a great privilege to come to this city where back in what I might almost term the horse and buggy days, Frank Gannett and I were trying at the national committee to keep the party alive after the Wendell Willkie collapse of 1940. I am glad to come to this city that I may pay tribute to this great Republican, who in the hours of party need, gave freely of his time and money that this party should live to serve the cause of America.

I am happy, too, to come here that I might see two of my former ex-Congressmen, Congressman Duffy and Congressman Whitley, who labored through the years in Congress, helping to carry America through those perilous days.

But primarily, we come here to honor a great American. A nugget of wisdom from the past says that "a man is not without honor save in his own country." Fortunately, that is not true here, because this great meeting, the men and women who have gathered here to honor KEN KEATING, give tribute to the fact that you do honor him, here in this city of Rochester, where he lives and where he works to make you a better community, and to make New York State and our country a better land.

We need men of the type of KEN KEATING in Washington. Never before was there so great a need for experienced men, men of character, men of ability, men of courage and of conviction, men trustworthy and honest. And that's the type of man you here in Rochester send to the Halls of Congress.

A little while ago I was one of the very few who said that President Eisenhower would be a candidate for reelection and that he would not only be renominated but that he would be reelected. That was because I knew in this tense period, this period when the world and the country needed the man so much, he could not fail to respond to that call of country.

The last testimonial dinner I went to I dropped a torch that caught flame and resulted in the man becoming chairman of the Republican National Committee. And with that thought in mind I'm going to be very careful tonight, that I don't set fires that may like the prairie fires sweep across the country.

I don't know whether KEN KEATING wants to go to the United States Senate or not. He hasn't told me and I'm not going to express an opinion upon that. If you decide to send him, I'll say this, you'll send a very efficient and competent man, a man who'd be a credit to this great Empire State of New York.

But I am a bit selfish. Perhaps it's because I come from New England—we are supposed to be a closed corporation up there in New England—and I am selfish and hope that he'll decline all these blandishments that have come from all over the State, that he'll go back with me, so that he might become chairman of the great Judiciary Committee.

Ah, my friends, that is a high honor, an honor that's not to be underestimated in any degree. To be chairman of the committee that handles more than one-third of all the legislation that flows through the Halls of Congress is a great honor. It requires a great legislator. It requires a man with the knowledge of law and procedure. And so, KEN, I'm not going to bring any pressure on you, but I would not feel badly if you decided—as I decided many years ago—that there was a greater opportunity to serve the people of this country in the House instead of the Senate.

I remember back—and, like an old man now, you know, we reminisce—back in 1936 a substantial group of Republicans and a good segment of the Democratic Party—including the leading newspaper of New England of the Democratic affiliation came to me and wanted me to run for the United States Senate. That was a great temptation, of course, but I resisted because I believed that there in the House a man could find his greatest mission and contribution to his country. I say that not to discourage you in the least bit, KENNETH, but we do need strong men in Washington, and whether he goes to the House or Senate you can be proud of him and you'll be proud of the record that he will achieve.

I cannot help but bring to you just one little message. These are tense days in the history of America. Yes; they are tense days in the history of the world. What we do in the next 2 or 3 years may well determine what kind of a world we are going to have—whether we are going to have freedom or whether we're going to have an ideology that crushes men and women beneath their iron heel. And we here in America will be given the opportunity, in the large sense, to determine that decision, because we are the one Nation in the world today strong enough, either in an economic or military way, to lead this world to freedom.

My dear friends, that's a challenge we dare not shirk. That's a challenge we must accept. I'm not one of those who's a pessimist on the future of the United States. I'm an optimist. I believe in America. I believe in its institutions, its ideals, and its hopes for the future. They are going to be brought into fruition because of the men and women who go into the public service. It cannot be written in the stars that this great Republic shall fail in the crucial period of our history.

O my friends, it may call for sacrifices. It may call for all of us to do a little more than we would desire to do. Those sacrifices must be made, because the world needs men and women, brave men and women, men and women who realize that the moral and other issues involved far transcend materialism.

Only recently, in the last few days, we hear the leaders of a great nation admit that their guiding genius for over 25 years is a murderer and a public cutthroat and everything else besides. We're not going to let that kind of people dominate this free world. That is not the spirit of America. It's not the spirit of America that made this Nation what it is today.

America has become great, not because of the resources and the great advantages that have come here in America, although they do contribute in large measure to that end—America has become great because of men and women who are willing to meet the test and meet it strongly and firmly. And so I am happy to come here, full of confidence in the future, believing that America is going to lead this whole wide world along the pathway of peace to better days in which all people, whether they live in Asia or Africa, may find life a little better. That is the goal for which America is pointing. It's an opportunity for all of us to aid.

Your good friend and my friend, because he is one of my loyal friends, and one who can take my place when the time comes that occassionally, you know, even the leader has to go out of the hall for a little while or lay down temporarily his duties. It's a great privilege for me always to know that I have KEN KEATING substituting for me. I've

called him to do that job on many occasions and he always fills the duties with credit and distinction.

Oh, my friends, I'm happy to come here tonight, happy to come that I may offer my personal felicitations to your Congressman, happy also that I might be able to give you this ray of confidence: America need fear no foe. America needs only to make sure which way it goes and to go that way on the side of freedom, peace, and justice.

Ah, my friends, let us realize the great obligation we owe to America. If we do, we will not fail. We will go forward to heights never dreamed of by our countrymen. And it will be a better day for all of us, whether he live in these great United States or in darkest Africa or Asia.

You do well tonight to come and pay this tribute to your Congressman. Too often, men in public life fail to secure the praise and approval of the better citizens of the community until it is too late to do them good. I'm glad to know that that's not the custom here in Rochester. And so, KEN, I salute you. Salute you as a great American, a great legislator, a great public servant. And I know wherever you go in Washington or to some other place in New York, you'll be serving the people and making a contribution to this citizenship which is so desirable in these days ahead. Thank you so much.

ADDRESS OF MR. KEATING

I am deeply grateful and touched by this tribute from the bar association. It is extremely hard, of course, for me to put into words all of my thoughts on this memorable occasion. I hardly know where to begin to thank all those who have contributed so much to this wonderful evening.

I am most grateful to the colleagues who have taken the long trip from Washington to be with me on this occasion. It so happens that all the colleagues here this evening are of my political faith, but you know, one of the finest things about service in the House of Representatives is the wonderful opportunity it affords to form warm and fast friendships, regardless of party affiliation.

Those Members who have come here tonight—HUGH SCOTT, HAROLD OSTERTAG, BILL WILLIAMS, and WALTER RIEHLMAN—have all been very close friends of mine. I don't know how to thank them enough for being here with me.

I am likewise overwhelmed that as busy a man as our minority leader should take time out of his busy life to come up here. This is indeed a fine tribute. I am most grateful to JOE MARTIN and to Judge Wheeler and HUGH SCOTT for the very nice things they have had to say about me and my work.

Since this dinner is primarily given by the bar association, I want to say just a word or two about lawyers. We in the bar association have no politics and it is, of course, among the lawyers of both political parties that I have had my most intimate association over a period of years. It is always a special pleasure when I am able to assist any members of the bar when they contact me in Washington.

You are all aware, I am sure, that it is very fashionable these days to tell stories about lawyers. It seems we hear them all the time. I am reminded of the one about the minister and the lawyer and the doctor who were marooned on an island. They had to get to shore for help, but the waters all around were infested with sharks. So they decided to draw lots as to who would swim ashore, and the lawyer got the short paper. He jumped in and they were about to kiss him goodbye, but when he started to swim all the sharks went in the other direction. The minister said, "That's the most amazing thing I ever saw." And the doctor said, "Oh, that's nothing, it's just professional courtesy."

Yes; we hear a lot of that sort of thing about lawyers. But I'm proud to be a lawyer and I am proud to say a word or two in rebuttal to that kind of talk. It's high time we did a little talking about the generosity of the legal profession.

I knew in my practice and I know now from my correspondence since assuming the role of a legislator, about hundreds and hundreds of cases in Rochester and this vicinity, in which lawyers—who are so often charged with acting only for a fee—have taken cases solely out of the depths of their feelings for someone who could not pay anything. And I know how industriously and diligently they pursue these matters even when they know they cannot possibly collect a fee.

Lawyers should have—and I feel in our community do have—an honored place.

Often we hear that lawyers are interested only in contention and about fights in court. As so many of us who have practiced law know, however, the truth is that much of the most constructive and finest work done by lawyers is performed outside of the courtroom. It is the wisdom and foresight which lawyers so often show in drawing up a will or a trust or forming a corporation that eliminates the risk of litigation. This is a real and positive aspect of the lawyer's role that should not be neglected.

I think lawyers sometimes overlook the vitally important role which they should fill as counsel for themselves. Many lawyers feel that because of the unique standards of their profession, they should not take the credit to which they are not entitled. But perhaps because I am somewhat removed from the active practice of the law, I can say that members of the legal profession in community service, in public life, in their contributions to the welfare of their clients and in living up to the standards of ethics to which they subscribe, are serving in the finest traditions of our county.

Let us as lawyers, therefore, be more articulate in expressing what we as lawyers do. We must remain faithful to the oaths we have taken as lawyers, but when stories are told such as I've told tonight, let us come back at them.

There has been a lot of talk here tonight about what the future may hold. Of course, I cannot predict what that may be, but I can say that no one could ever have been as fortunate as I have been to have had the honor of representing the 38th Congressional District. No one could ever have held a position of greater importance, or more enjoyment, or greater opportunity for constructive service than my post in Congress. I am proud to carry out that role, just as I am proud to be a lawyer.

I am grateful to so many of you who have helped me to serve in the House of Representatives and to all of you who have honored me so signally tonight. I thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

"Second State Department" Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of June 8, 1956:

"SECOND STATE DEPARTMENT" HIT—CLIQUE ADVISING PRESIDENT BLAMED AS CAUSE OF NEUTRALITY MISSTEP

(By David Lawrence)

President Eisenhower's foreign-aid program, mostly military and much needed, is in trouble in Congress, and this is due largely to his own mistakes in tactics.

Thus, the damage done by the President's offhand remarks at Wednesday's press conference is incalculable. Even the clarifying statement issued Thursday afternoon does not erase the injury done when the President, in effect, encouraged neutralism and caused the many allies and trusted friends of the United States in Southeast Asia who have joined America in military alliances to wonder if they were being let down by Eisenhower.

The telephones buzzed with expressions of shock and surprise and at times righteous indignation as the news of what Eisenhower said on Wednesday reached diplomats who represent America's allies in Asia. On Capitol Hill there was consternation. At the State Department there was an obvious discomfort but a discreet silence.

To understand what happened, it is necessary to present here the text of the President's remarks at the press conference as authorized for publication:

"Now, today there are certain nations that say they are neutral. This doesn't necessarily mean what it is so often interpreted to mean, neutral as between right and wrong or decency or indecency.

"They are using the term 'neutral' with respect to attachment to military alliances. And may I point out that I cannot see that that is always to the disadvantage of such a country as ours.

"If a nation is truly a neutral, if it is attacked by anybody—and we are not going to attack them—public opinion of the world is outraged. If it has announced its military association with another great power, things could happen to it, difficulties along its borders and people would say: 'Good enough for it. They asked for it.' So let us not translate this meaning of the word 'neutral' as between contending military forces, even though the conflict is latent and neutral as between right and wrong."

But, asked some of the diplomats who represent countries that have already joined America in military alliances: "Shall we tell our people now that they were wrong and that, if attacked, they 'asked for it'?"

The President heard from his colleagues inside the Government who advised a public statement. Here it is in its essential part:

"It is obvious that in some countries of the world there are certain ideological, geographical, or other reasons making military alliances impractical. Such nations may declare themselves to be neutral, hoping thus to secure the support of world opinion against attack from any quarter. Neutrality does not mean either disarmament or immunity from attack. We have had historical examples of this kind of neutrality for many decades. * * *

"The President does believe that there are special conditions which justify political neutrality, but that no nation has the right to be indifferent to the fate of another, or, as he put it, to be "neutral as between right and wrong or decency or indecency.'

"The President does not believe that association for mutual security with the United States will involve any country in added danger, but, on the contrary, will provide added security on the basis of mutuality and scrupulous respect for the independence of each. As the President pointed out, the United States is not going to attack anybody; but some great powers have shown an aggressive dispostion, and military association with such a power could lead to difficulties."

Why did the President plunge into such a delicate field of discussion, anyway, without going over carefully in advance with the Secretary of State the text of what he had to say? The answer is that, with the press conferences conducted as they are today, when a President's impromptu remarks are quoted directly without regard for the sensibilities of governments abroad, tragic mistakes like this will happen. They have occurred before under previous administrations, too.

Unfortunately, Eisenhower isn't "briefed" in advance as he should be. Many of his friends in New York and elsewhere who have access to him have been dinning into his ear statements about the Asian situation which seek to justify neutralism and the expenditure of billions by the United States to nations that tomorrow may become Communist.

Eisenhower allows such friends to influence him, and the State Department is often in the dark as to what is going on.

This intervention of a separate kind of "State Department" at the White House is a difficult thing to deal with, and it is amazing that a man with the President's fidelity to well-defined lines of responsibility in military life should tolerate an influence on foreign policy separate from the officials charged with responsibility in making it.

For the same phraseology and argument used in his press-conference statements of Wednesday can be found in the writings and speeches of the clique which has access to Eisenhower and is known in many parts of the world as the "real State Department."

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein excerpts of speeches I made at Memorial Day exercises at Clinton and Gardner in my district:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN'S REMARKS IN PART AT THE DEDICATORY EXERCISES AT CLINTON, MASS.

The beautiful placque which we dedicate today on Memorial Day to those who died in World War II and the Korean conflict will fittingly commemorate the valiant service and supreme sacrifice of these great heroes. We thank the veterans of Clinton for establishing this lasting memorial to their names.

We could never adequately express our gratitude, but their noble deeds will live in the hearts of our fellow citizens forever.

To their families and loved ones, we again tender deepest sympathy. From the immortal sacrifices of these boys, and boys like them, our people will ever take inspiration and courage. Their memory will ever be sacred to us.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT CLINTON AND GARDNER, MASS., MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1956

Speaking at Memorial Day services at Clinton and Gardner yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, declared that "the honored dead of all American wars set a stirring example of courage and devotion to the principles of freedom which the people of this generation must emulate, if we are to guard our way of life against the evil designs of potential enemies."

"These gallant heroes never hesitated when the call came to defend the Nation," he said. "Many of them paid the supreme sacrifice. Others were completely disabled and lie in hospital beds keeping the lonely vigil of liberty. All those who served us so nobly—those who died, and those who were willing to die, symbolize the spirit of America. They best exemplify the spirit of American freedom. They have won the undying gratitude of the Nation. Their memory is imperishable. They will ever inspire our youth and our people in loyal devotion and willing sacrifice for our cause."

"Today as we recall their illustrious deeds and reverently send up our prayers of gratitude for their unselfish devotion, it is fitting that we should repledge our own loyalty to the great cause of human liberty for which they gave their all."

"In this troubled world, never so upset before, we are threatened with military aggression, poisonous propaganda and stealthy infiltration openly designed to accomplish the undermining and collapse of our great democracy. These evil movements are not confined to this Nation alone. They extend to virtually every part of the world. Their declared aim is to destroy democracy and conquer the world for communism. They are moving toward that aim with unbending purpose and great cunning."

"Through treason and espionage they have stolen our most previous military and scientific secrets. They now pose a threat of deadly hydrogen warfare over the heads of all nations.

"Behind the Iron Curtain, they hold millions in cruel bondage. Outside of the Iron Curtain, they skillfully move to impose slavery on the peoples of the earth.

"But this Nation must not flinch. This Nation is strong in its arms, strong in its terrible weapons of war, strong in its trained men and women and in its invincible spirit to protect our shores and our Government, come what may, against possible aggressors and those who scheme, conspire, and work to destroy us.

"The world situation is profoundly serious. But we have faced serious situations before. Our Nation was born in a struggle against oppression. It has been guarded against oppression by generations of Americans who were determined to protect their liberties. Inspired by the sacrifices of the past and by the great faith of religion, democracy, and freedom which guides our destinies, the American people of this generation are also determined to defend their liberties. They will not let the threats of Marxist communism and its evil works, or the hydrogen bomb, or any other devilish weapons swerve or dissuade them one iota from guarding and protecting this great democracy and this great Nation. The American people will not be intimated or terrorized by the machinations of any earthly power.

"Peace we must have, and peace we must work for. Let it be clear that this great Nation, devoted to the welfare of free men and women, would never in any sense take responsibility for starting a great war that might spell the doom of civilization. Only complete fanatics could take such a step. Soviet leaders know as well as we do what the dire consequence would be, not only to other nations but to themselves, because, whatever destruction were wrought elsewhere, they well realize that the greatest devastation of all would be visited upon the territory behind the Iron Curtain. God forbid this should ever happen.

"In the memory of these heroes, liberation of oppressed peoples should be a foremost aim of the free world. We should insist in the United Nations and in all our foreign relations, upon freedom for all peoples, the present pitiful captives of stupid diplomatic concessions, as well as the age-long victims of colonial tyranny. And we should try our best to end the myth once and for all, that any race of people living in this world is superior before the law merely because of its color, its origin or its status. Equality of justice, equality of opportunity and the precious civil rights of the individual should be zealously safeguarded and protected. The dignity of every human soul must be acknowledged and recognized."

"If we could lift the shadows of doubt, fear and suspicion, end aggressive threats and poisonous infiltration, this Nation and the world could move forward to a veritable golden age. In the name of our hollowed dead whose blood consecrates our sacred cause, let us resolve today to strive to our utmost for peace. Let us keep our Nation possessed of that strength, vigor and spirit which are vitally needed to guard and develop our way of life. But so long as danger lurks, let us be claim, steadfast, and courageous—prepared to meet every test, every sacrifice, that may be called for to keep inviolate our country, our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our free institutions and the safety and security of our homes and our people.

"If we achieve these things in our day, we will be contributing best to the future of our great Nation as well as to a peaceful world. We will thus justify the glorious patriotism, the unselfish service and indomitable loyalty of those whom we honor today from our grateful hearts."

PHILBIN said that Memorial Day has become a great national holiday "dedicated to our honored dead, and to the remembrance of loved ones who have gone to join their Maker in that great land from whose 'bourne no traveler ever returns'. With the beautiful flowers of spring and fervent prayers, we recall their love, their useful lives and their contributions to our country. If we measure up to their God-fearing devotion, this Nation need have no fears for the future."

Address by the Honorable Arthur Levitt, Comptroller of the State of New York, Keynote Dinner, Michigan Democratic State Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich., June 1, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Levitt, comptroller of the State of New York, was the keynote speaker at the Michigan Democratic State convention held in Grand Rapids on June 1, 1956. Mr. Levitt spoke for the Honorable Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. Levitt is one of my constituents, and is a former president of the Board of Education of the City of New York. We are proud of his record as a public servant and I am happy to have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD his speech at the Michigan convention:

I am honored to be with you this evening and proud to take part in the convention

proceedings of this great body of Democrats. I bring with me Governor Harriman's sincere regrets. He wanted very much to share this occasion with you, and to express for all of us in New York our deep and sincere admiration for your Democratic achievements here in Michigan.

Under our great Democratic Governors—Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert Lehman—New York led the States in progressive government. Then New York entered a dark age. For 12 long years progressive ideas wandered in the wilderness, and we watched with envy as the State of Michigan assumed the leadership of which New York had boasted for so long.

In the past 7 years, we have watched you revitalize the entire economic, social, and political structure of your State, and at the same time achieve financial stability and undertake the largest construction program in the State's history. All achieved, I am proud to say, by Democratic leadership.

And so we have a special admiration for your illustrious Governor, who made all this possible. We are as proud as you that it is our party that claims the talents of this great leader, your popular Democratic Governor, Mennen Williams.

And let me add that we in New York consider Governor Williams eminently qualified for any position to which the people of this Nation may call him.

I also bring our compliments to your other leaders who have done such a splendid job in creating a winning party in this State—to Neil Staebler, to Ernest Lacey, to Margaret Price, to Adelaide Hart, to Senator McNamara, to your distinguished congressional delegation, and to many others. We would particularly like to compliment your party for the recognition which women have attained in Michigan politics. We in New York are now striving to follow your example in this regard.

In the last 18 months we in New York have begun to match your record of legislative progress. Under Gov. Averell Harriman, our State is regaining its old position of leadership in responsive and responsible government. We have added over $120 million a year to State aid to education, the greatest advance since the time of Al Smith. We are bringing our State's social insurance programs up to date over bitter opposition of the Republicans. We have pioneered the most advanced housing legislation in the country. We have extended and strengthened our fight against discrimination in all its forms. We have rallied our State in a concerted attack on the problems of older people and of youth. And while doing all this we have balanced the budget and cut individual income taxes by $40 million.

So New York and Michigan have something in common—a renaissance of social progress under dynamic Democratic governors.

I am sure our two States have something else in common, too—and that is our conception of what the Democratic Party is and has to be.

What is it that sets us apart from Republicans? Why are we the oldest political party in America?

The genius of the Democratic Party is, I believe, simply that we are the people. As a consequence the hopes and needs of all of us are automatically the goals of our party.

When there is suffering among us—when there is an opportunity to be realized—we are not afraid to use the instrumentalities of government because we know that the government is not "they" but "us." We know, because over 20 years we proved through experience that the people acting together can accomplish great good for all of us. These are above all the lessons we have learned from the inspired and dedicated leadership of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

The Republican Party, whether under McKinley, Taft, Hoover, or Eisenhower, has represented predominantly only one segment of our people—the powerful and the privileged among us. Theirs has been, and is, a Government designed to serve not all of us but a few. We have defended and advanced the interest of the many—especially the less powerful and the less privileged who most need assistance to redress the balance between the weak and the strong in our society.

Thus it is that our party—and only our party—has fought to give the farmer elementary protection. Thus it is that our party has consistently championed the rights of labor.

Thus it is that we have fought monopoly of every kind—fought to preserve and develop public resources for the benefit of the people—and striven to protect and give greater opportunity to small business.

And thus it is that we have been the constant advocate of the rights and progress of minorities among us—minorities which, when taken together, add up to our great America.

I know I speak for the Democrats of New York when I say that we cannot conceive of any other kind of Democratic Party. We have no desire in our State to make our party over—in the image of our opposition—in any way. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman expressed our fighting spirit and our liberal principles. What we must do this year is to apply to the problems of our own day and the days ahead the spirit which guided these two Democratic Presidents.

It has been said that this year is not the time for bold ideas. It has been said that this is the year when we should go slow, when we should soft-pedal words like "liberal," when we should modify our principles. Only then, some say, can we win the next election.

We of New York reply that this is a counsel of opportunism and a counsel of despair. We are not out just to win elections. We are a political party because we are a body of like-thinking men and women, organized to advance a philosophy of government that we believe is right for this Nation.

If we were to change our principles as readily as we change our clothes—to fit whatever is the climate of the times—then we would stand for nothing. We would be as devoid of principles as the Republicans are of ideas. And we would neither deserve nor receive the confidence of the people.

This is not alone a matter of principle—although that alone would be enough. It is a matter of practical politics as well. We did not become the majority party in this Nation by trimming our sails to every political breeze that passed our way. We became the majority party because we advanced a philosophy of vigorous and liberal action to meet the needs of the times. That is how we won five successive elections from 1932 to 1952. This is the only way we can win again—and it is the way we shall win again—in 1956.

Those who speak of trimming our sails talk first, of course, of civil rights. We are told that the best way to attain party unity is to try to compromise this issue. To this solution, we Democrats reply that unity attained by compromise would be a unity without substance, a unity without vitality, and a unity without effect. It would deny our very reason for being as a political party. Unity obtained at the expense of our beliefs and principles is meaningless.

What would they have us do about these decisions? Would they have us declare that the Supreme Court is not the final arbiter of what is the law of the land? Would they have us say that desegregation with all "deliberate speed" as the Supreme Court has directed is too fast? Would they have us contend that there are only States rights and no State duties to guard individual rights? And would they have us advocate to the world the principles of equality embodied in the Declaration of Independence while denying those principles at home?

To ask these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that our party cannot equivocate on this issue.

No one has expressed our party's stand better than did your Gov. Mennen Williams, at Northwestern University some weeks ago. As he said so clearly at that time: "Ours is the party—not only for the rich, not even for the poor alone, but for the rich and the poor and all in between, for men of all groups, of all classes, of all colors, of all creeds, without regard to any of the accidents of their birth."

I know that your convention will adopt a straight-forward and courageous statement on this important issue. And I am confident that when we meet in Chicago in August, our national convention will do no less.

The fight to protect the rights of labor is never finished either. We are right now witnessing a systematic and concerted attack on the political rights of working men and women. You have seen it here in Michigan. Under the protection of one of the most vicious sections of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Republican leaders and their antiunion allies are passing union-busting "right to work" laws wherever they can.

The Democratic Party can never compromise with those who would stifle the growth of labor organization. This is a time for vigor and vigilance by the Democratic Party to defend the advances which labor has made and is making.

With the advent of automation and atomic energy, we are entering a period of economic change that will surely be as rapid and as decisive as any in our history. It is an era filled with promise—but filled with danger, too. Right now over 200,000 automobile and other Michigan workers are unemployed. There is danger ahead of even more extensive unemployment, of increasing casualty lists of small businesses, and of more and more economic power concentrated in the hands of a few mammoth corporations. To realize the promise, yet avoid the dangers, it is up to industry, with the help of Government, to see to it that rapid changes in our industrial system are guided and controlled so that they result in human well-being and not in human tragedy.

Democrats will never accept the Republican thesis that one of the inalienable rights of an American is the right to suffer. Indeed, one of the factors that distinguishes us from Republicans is our faith that suffering can be eliminated by human ingenuity and our deep belief that our free economy must be the servant, not the master, of the people.

This philosophy applies right now to agriculture, too. The hardships that have been experienced by our farmers since 1952 have not been and are not necessary. If there had been a Democrat in the White House, they never would have happened. The farmers' plight today is the consequence of callous and calculated neglect. Next year, under a Democratic President, the farmers' right to suffer will be revoked.

As comptroller of the State of New York I am very conscious of our current financial condition. Today we are witnessing a situation in which the State, the municipalities, the school districts, the small-business man, the farmers, and the consumers of our Nation are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain the credit and capital essential to their effective operations. This lack of availability is unfairly and dangerously restrictive of our economic enterprise. Conservatism in money affairs is, of course, a basic factor for our economic health. I submit, however, that the Washington policy of tight money springs

more from fear than from a reasoned estimate of our economic prospects. Fear itself it more to be feared than inflation. In their concern over inflation the financial authorities should recognize the expansion of our population of the past 20 years and the estimated 65 million increase by 1975. They must realize that our people in keeping with the American tradition have constantly rising hopes and needs. If we are to progress the plan for tomorrow cannot be cut with yesterday's pattern. The present money and credit policies are not necessarily suitable for today's conditions. It has been suggested that we should have a broad inquiry into the money and banking systems of the Nation. In the light of what is happening, such a study appears overdue. This should enable us to plan more intelligently for a broader and more imaginative approach to the monetary needs of our American families and businesses.

What are some of the other things which American families need?

They need homes. In this field, our Nation is not gaining. We are not even holding our own. We are slipping backward in our housing standards. Yet, President Eisenhower has seen fit to scuttle the public housing program, and tight money is cutting back private home construction.

The families of America need security. Despite our economic growth, we are putting a smaller share of our resources into social security than we did in 1935 when the system was created. The whole purpose of social security is defeated when retired people do not receive benefits enough to live a decent life. Yet, only this year, President Eisenhower's spokesman was fighting against improvements in social security for women and for disabled workmen.

They need schools. Yet for 3 years, all we got from President Eisenhower was a White House conference, and he has still proposed nothing at all to help young men and women from poorer families to gain the benefits of a college education.

We need to launch a concerted attack upon all the causes of poverty. Under the leadership of Averell Harriman we have done this in New York State. But it should be done not only State by State but on a national scale.

America needs a solution to the problem of the growing cost of medical care.

We need national leadership to deal with the growing problems of the greater number of older people among us.

Yet, in all these fields—housing, schools, social security, health, the aging—President Eisenhower has given us limited and timid programs. In many cases, he has proposed nothing at all.

Now Republicans tell us that they want to take this lack of leadership and put it on a part-time basis. Was a bill of goods like this one ever offered for sale to the American people before?

This is not a year for the Democratic Party to equivocate and compromise. This is a time to state the issues clearly and sharply. It is a time for higher sights, for new vision, for bold action. Today, the American people seek the counsel of men of imaginatin, of courage, and of strength. Michigan has such a man in Mennen Williams. New York has such a man in Averell Harriman.

Those of us within the party who believe most strongly that our future lies in a clear-cut, dynamic, liberal philosophy, must be vigorous and united. The sleeping sickness which has paralyzed the national administration for 3 weary years must be dissipated.

The timid years must come to an end. Progressive leadership must be restored to the White House with a Democratic President of the United States.

Your convention here in Grand Rapids is one beginning. It is an auspicious beginning. You are laying the groundwork in this State of a great Democratic victory.

Once again, thank you for the privilege of attending this keynote dinner. I have witnessed here tonight a wonderful demonstration of party loyalty and political solidarity.

Good luck to you and my best wishes for a successful and triumphant convention.

Influence of the College of William and Mary on 18th Century America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 10, 1956, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, JR., Virginia's distinguished junior United States Senator, delivered a most interesting and inspiring address at the annual graduation exercises of the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va.

Since obtaining its charter in 1693, thus becoming the second college to be established in America, the College of William and Mary has maintained a continuous period of proud and honorable operation. It has exerted great influence for good in the life of our Nation. I am pleased to count myself among its alumni.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following text of Senator ROBERTSON'S address:

INFLUENCE OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY ON 18TH CENTURY AMERICA

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the annual graduation exercises of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., June 10, 1956)

In selecting for discussion today the influence of William and Mary on 18th century America, I planned to emphasize the importance in human affairs of intangible values but my preparation has reminded me of the fact that intangibles are not as readily perceived or as easily defined as tangibles. Take my own experience with William and Mary for example. I had tangible contacts with William and Mary athletes on the football field in the falls of 1905, 1906, and 1917 but long prior to that I had unrecognized intangible contacts through attending public schools of Lynchburg, headed by E. C. Glass, an LL.D. of William and Mary and a member of its board of visitors, a high school in Rocky Mount of which the principal was J. Taylor Thompson, a William and Mary graduate, and classes in English at Richmond College, under another William and Mary man, Dr. J. A. C. Chandler, father of your present president.

In attempting to recall something of the tangible influence of William and Mary on the early life of our Nation, I shall mention as illustrations only a few of the many personalities involved.

Two years ago, when I delivered the commencement address at another Virginia institution, often referred to as "Mr. Jefferson's university," I started out by saying: "The longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of the fact that Thomas Jefferson was our greatest political philosopher." Naturally, therefore, I want to say something about Jefferson today, since he was one of the men trained at William and Mary who influenced the thinking and course of events not only in our country but in the entire world. But I also want to emphasize the cumulative importance of other graduates, less widely known, whose accomplishments some of you may duplicate.

In recent years, more people from other States and more people from foreign nations have become acquainted with the physical plant of William and Mary and the wonderful restoration of Colonial Williamsburg than any other historic spot in our State. And in the celebration next year of the first settlement in nearby Jamestown, hundreds of thousands will come to Williamsburg to visit that spot which, as Daniel Webster said "cradled and defended the infancy of our Republic." Some of these visitors may learn that William and Mary was the first institution of higher learning projected for American and the second actually to be established; that William and Mary is unique in receiving a charter directly from the crown of England and a Coat of Arms from the College of Heralds in London; that this college was the first in the United States to have a full faculty of professors, first to adopt the lecture system and the elective and honor systems, first to widen its scope to that of a university, first to establish courses in municipal and constitutional law, modern languages, political economy and history and first to organize a Greek letter Intercollegiate Fraternity, the Phi Beta Kappa Society, a membership in which I highly cherish.

Some of them may also learn that men trained at William and Mary in the latter part of the 17th century and the early part of the 18th century accounted for 7 out of 11 members of the Committee on Intercolonial Correspondence, 6 out of 11 members of the Virginia Committee of Safety which was the real governing body of Virginia after the iniquitous Lord Dunmore took refuge on a British gunboat, 4 of the 7 Virginia signers of the Declaration of Independence including its author, Thomas Jefferson, 15 of the 33 Virginia members of the Continental Congress, including Peyton Randolph, the first President of that Congress, 2 of the 3 Virginia members of the Annapolis Convention of 1786 to frame a new Constitution and 4 of the 7 Virginia members of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787, including Edmund Randolph who opened the proceedings by presenting the Virginia plan on which so much of our charter of American liberty was framed. We could also tell them about one-half of the Governors of Virginia from 1776 to 1800, 6 of 8 United States Senators from Virginia and 3 of the 7 Virginia-born Presidents being trained at William and Mary.

All those things would fall in the realm of the tangible but it is more important for the members of this graduating class and for the thousands of visitors who annually come here, to have a clear conception of the intangible influence of William and Mary not only upon 18th century America, which is my primary topic, but upon more than 300 years of our history.

William Wirt Henry wrote in 1891 that William and Mary "trained and gave to the world during the Revolutionary period a host of statesmen whose names are indelibly impressed on the pages of American history." It was that type of training that caused Thomas Jefferson to say that his beloved science teacher, Dr. William Small, had probably fixed the destinies of his life.

Woodrow Wilson said in a commencement address shortly after he left the University of Virginia that those who are leaders must lead their own generation. William and Mary had an important influence on 18th century America because the college was adapted to the needs of its day.

Historians have pointed out that two great movements were born and flowered in the

18th century. One was the movement among the intellectual classes referred to as "The enlightenment," which meant self-emancipation from prejudice, conversion and tradition and assertion of the right of individuals to give their intellects free rein rather than be curbed by established dogmas. The other 18th century movement was the democratic revolution among the middle and lower classes, involving all human activities, and leading to development of two of our most cherished political principles. One of these was that all men are born equal, meaning, as John Adams explained to his wife, Abigail, when she wrote that he knew this could not be true, that the phrase in the Declaration of Independence meant all men were born men and not some men and some whales. The second principle was that there were certain cherished rights which were not derived from kings or potentates but were inherited by man from his Creator and could, therefore, be designated as inalienable rights of which he could not justly be deprived by any form of government. How well these principles were absorbed by Thomas Jefferson and others of his generation who attended William and Mary is suggested by the epitaph Jefferson selected for his tomb indicating the three forms of freedom he had championed: Freedom of the body, as spelled out in his Declaration of Independence, freedom of religion, as spelled out in Virginia's Statute of Religious Freedom and embraced in the first amendment to the Federal Constitution, and freedom of the mind, as exemplified by a system of public education capped by the university at Charlottesville which he sponsored.

Jefferson once wrote that all the manna in heaven could not make a mammoth out of a mouse. He obviously was of superior clay to start with, but there is much evidence to show that the training he received at William and Mary increased his stature enormously.

Looking back 60 years after leaving the college, Jefferson vividly remembered his teacher of natural philosophy, William Small. He spoke of Dr. Small's enlarged and liberal mind and said, "Most happily for me," he became "attached to me and made me his daily companion, * * *and from his conversation I got my first views of the expansion of science and of the system of things in which we are placed."

It was through Small that Jefferson met George Wythe, with whom he studied law and whom Jefferson later had appointed as the first teacher of law in the college, and this friendship continued throughout his life.

Recently I asked Dr. Julian P. Boyd, the distinguished editor of Jefferson's papers, for his comment on what William and Mary did for Jefferson, and he told me this: "Jefferson was a man of clearly defined aims and a practical sense of what was possible as well as what was proper. One thing we can be sure of is that his teachers did not try to instill in him the idea that this was the best of all possible worlds, or that colonial Virginia was a stable, orderly society incapable of improvement. William and Mary prepared him for a world of change. Small and Wythe gave Jefferson a sense of man's endless possibilities. They showed what man might become if he went on improving himself and his institutions under the general reign of reason and justice. They helped to prepare him to be both a revolutionary and a founder."

We can trace these influences through Jefferson's career. He assumed changes were natural and inevitable but accepted this as a challenge and an obligation to control the change rather than be controlled by it. He believed in an aristocracy not of wealth or power but of character, intelligence and accomplishment. He believed it was the duty of this aristocracy to make issues clear but that the ultimate power of choice and decision must lie with the whole people.

But the system of things that Jefferson and his contemporaries learned at William and Mary did not include the belief that the people were automatically right. What he learned, and what his whole life teaches, is that the citizen in a free society faces an exacting and heavy responsibility. Free enterprise to Jefferson meant freedom of opportunity and equality before the law, but it did not mean freedom from responsibility.

Applying his principles to his own life, Jefferson confessed that music was his great passion, science was his delight, agriculture his cherished occupation and the beloved Monticello the end of all his private dreams. But these things he subordinated whenever the higher duty demanded. These things he laid aside when his obligations as a citizen required him to do so.

On the 200th anniversary of the establishment of William and Mary a brilliant alumnus, J. Allen Watts, of Roanoke, after discussing the contribution of William and Mary's alumni to the birth of a new nation, said of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of the Founding Fathers: "The chief danger that menaces this country of ours is the danger that these principles may be forgotten, or may be cast aside as antiquated and of no value in these latter days. Hoping and believing as I do in the great destiny of this country, I feel that our safety depends upon our keeping before us for emulation the names and deeds of our colonial and revolutionary sires, whose lofty intellects, dauntless wills, and unquestionable love of true liberty—liberty regulated by law—enabled them to gain a foothold in this country, wrest it first from the savage and then from England, and found the first true republic the world has ever seen, and under whose care the common property, the common liberty, and the common future of all were to be protected."

Many of you will recall that William and Mary was established as a church school and while the first instructors in theology did not teach separation of church and state they did teach many fundamental principles of the Bible as found in the King James version and the Bible is filled with references to property ownership. "Thou shalt not steal"; "the Lord loveth a cheerful giver"; King Ahab coveted Naboth's vineyard; the good and faithful servant was he who prudently invested the funds left in his care by the master. And how little meaning would there be in the words "pursuit of happiness" if they did not include the right to own and enjoy property, the fruit of one's own labor. William and Mary had a part in teaching the framers of a unique experiment in self-government that it must rest upon the teachings of the Bible.

It is the fundamental principles of our democracy for which William and Mary trained the leaders of the 18th century which are being challenged today by the anti-God ideology of communism. In recent years it has been my privilege to visit most of the countries in Europe that are not behind the Iron Curtain and some of the countries in the Orient, and the more I see of the spread of socialism in other parts of the world, to say nothing of communism, the more convinced I am that it is folly to assume that there can be a separation of property rights from personal rights. They are the root and branch of the same tree, and when you kill one, both will die. Yet that vital principle is being challenged by sponsors of the welfare state as well as Communists who would overthrow our Government by force. On neither front can we afford to let down our guard.

On the home front a willingness to take some hard knocks is implicit in any system of private enterprise. Who carried an ax in one hand and a rifle in the other? Those who carved an empire out of a wilderness. And one hundred and sixty-eight years after the first humble start at Jamestown those settlers were willing to fight a world power to protect their property and political rights. They believed those rights stemmed from the teachings of the Bible and that God would be on their side. "And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice," said Franklin at the Constitutional Convention, "is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Russian leaders have repudiated Stalin but not Lenin who dedicated his revolution to the destruction of all capitalist countries. We cannot afford to accept words in lieu of deeds as proof of the fact that the present leaders of the Politburo have abandoned Lenin's plan for world conquest. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I have had access to confidential information concerning the relative military power of Russia as compared with our own and it is disturbing.

Since the end of World War II we have invested $60 billion of gifts and loans in a program intended to strengthen our allies and stop the march of communism. While the purpose of that program was sound, it was organized on too lavish a scale and the results have been disappointing. The European Defense Community failed, and international military organization called NATO is only a skeleton of what it was supposed to be and European politicians have invested our funds in socialistic schemes helpful to themselves.

In August of last year when I met with representatives of some 35 nations attending a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki I was impressed by the obvious lack of appreciation of our efforts and the fact that other free nations receiving our aid were taking at face value Russia's assurances of peaceful coexistence and using it as an excuse to ease their own tax burden for military spending.

I was shocked, therefore, to read in the press when I returned to Washington that some unidentified spokesman for the administration had predicted we would cut appropriations for our Air Force by a billion dollars and I wrote a strong letter of protest to the President, urging him not to reduce our capacity for defense while Russia was continuing to increase her offensive power with hydrogen bombs and other weapons of mass destruction.

Fortunately the President decided to put adequate defense above a balanced budget and a tax cut and the suggested cut in the Air Force was not proposed. My position as to our defense needs was further supported this year when the President, after sending us the defense budget, sent a supplemental estimate of $500 million to speed our production of strategic bombers and guided missiles. But there still are doubts among those of us who daily hear testimony from top military experts as to whether our projected defense program will give us a superiority in the air which the Russian leaders can both understand and respect.

I believe defense spending must be geared to a sound economy in the United States but we must have an Air Force commensurate with our needs. Therefore, if a choice must be made as to allocation of funds, and there is not enough money for both, I shall vote to cut foreign aid to allies of uncertain dependability and to step up our production of strategic bombers and guided missiles. The time may come when the rank and file of the Russian people will recognize our viewpoint and our superior manner of life. The time may come when they will listen again to the sound of bells coming across the fields and comprehend and reverence the symbolism of the cross.

But until such time as God in his omnipotence and loving kindness sees fit to change the hearts of men and teach us how to

build a temple of peace dedicated to the victory of moral force, the duty of every young American should be crystal clear. He must be willing to support at home American constitutional liberty which includes, of course, the American system of free competitive enterprise and he must be ready, able, and willing to defend it with his life if need be against any foreign aggressor.

In this behalf there is a job for all to do. "If we go out into a cloudless night and glance skyward, we observe the eternal stars and constellations; we call some of them by their name—Venus, Mars, Saturn, Jupiter, Neptune, the Pleiades, and the Milky Way. If there be no moon, we believe that the visible stars shed the light upon our pathway, and indeed they do, but astronomers who peer through remote spaces of the universe tell us that more than one-half of all of the blended radiance of the skies that falls upon our pathway comes from stars we never see. They are invisible; they have no name on earth; they seem to have no place in heaven; yet they light us on our way. Thus it is with human life and human destiny; a few persons may become bright particular stars in the political, financial, social, or economic sky, but we all may be, if we will, a part of that invisible host of stars that serenely shed their kindly lights on the paths of all mankind.

Future Business Leaders of America Meet in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciated and enjoyed very much a visit made to my office by a number of young folks from Louisiana and their sponsors who are in Washington for a convention of the Future Business Leaders of America. This organization is sponsored by the United Business Education Association, a department of the National Education Association, and is made up of students who are specializing in business subjects, particularly secretarial science and bookkeeping. Its purpose is to sponsor activities that provide opportunity for development of the proper attitudes and leadership among boys and girls interested in the field of business.

Louisiana leads the Nation in the number of chapters of the Future Business Leaders of America and in participation in the national conventions. The program in Louisiana is incorporated in the State department of education, under the supervision of Superintendent Shelby M. Jackson.

The group which I had the pleasure of greeting included: L. C. Cambre, Paula Mackey, Janelle Savoy, Dolores Hebert, Betty LeBlanc, Tracy Trahan and Susan Phillips, from Lafayette Senior High School and their sponsor, Mrs. F. J. Nugent; Jerry Meaux, Ruth Pellerin, Geraldine Duhon, Jane LeBlanc and Amos Trahan, sponsor, Judice High School; Jeannette Smith, Annette Smith, Lucille Breaux, Madeline Brewer, Paul Steve Benoit, Sue Ann Broussard, Dolores Breaux, Carline Prejean, Sylvia Brasseaux, Nina Breaux, Velver Roger, Thomas Hutchinson, Judy Hutchinson, Tyrona Devalcourt, Carencro High School, accompanied by Mrs. Russel Hutchinson, chaperon, and Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Devalcourt, the latter being sponsor for the group from Carencro; James Wilkins, Washington; Paul Blanchard, University High School, Baton Rouge, with his sponsor, Mrs. Louise H. Beard; Eloise Allen, Janelle Brussard, Istrouma High School, Baton Rouge, and their sponsor, Mrs. E. W. Graves.

Statement By Hon. John E. Henderson, of Ohio, in Opposition to H. R. 5550, Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, when the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was considering H. R. 5550, Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON, of Ohio's 15th District, appeared before the committee to express his vigorous opposition to this measure. H. R. 5550 would authorize the United States to join an international organization known as the Organization of Trade Cooperation. The OTC would, in turn, have as its principal function the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The seven counties of Representative HENDERSON's district in southeastern Ohio have suffered seriously for many years as a result of policies which have lowered tariffs on those products which they and adjacent areas of our State produce. Although H. R. 5550 would not, in itself, authorize further tariff reductions, it would, in my opinion, authorize participation in an organization whose actions and policies would soon accomplish this end.

I believe Mr. HENDERSON's testimony before the committee is an excellent treatment of this complex subject. It is as follows:

My purpose in appearing before your committee during the hearings on H. R. 5550 is to urge that the committee and the Congress act with extreme caution in consideration of this legislation.

The bill before you would, if enacted, authorize the United States to be a party to the Organization for Trade Cooperation among whose duties are the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I should like to point out at the very beginning of my remarks that the average citizen looks to Congress as the responsible agency for those things which control his commercial activities. He feels that if remedial action is needed in any phase of Government he can look to Congress for that action. Especially does he feel that the question of the regulation of trade rests within the purview of the Congress for he knows that the Constitution of the United States, brief as it is, has specifically enumerated the question of tariffs for especial treatment when it says in article 1, section 8:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

This is a definite assertion of congressional responsibility for the regulation of duties and commerce with foreign nations.

The average citizen is somewhat bewildered to learn that the economic pinch that he feels because of a reduction of protective tariffs on the goods he manufactures has not been brought about by action of the Congress but by an international agreement which the Congress has not ratified.

The average citizen remembers that the courts at one time had declared that there were some powers which Congress could not delegate. He is confused to learn that today he is faced, not with a simple delegation of authority, but a complex delegation from the Congress to the Executive and, thence, from the Executive to an international entity known as GATT—to the end that even the executive branch, in becoming a party to the agreement, has lost some of the authority that had been delegated to it.

That is the state of affairs prior to the enactment of the legislation which is now before us.

At the time that H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade Act extension, was under consideration in the first session of the 84th Congress, many of us expressed ourselves on the subject of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and what it had done to weaken the economic position of the United States.

In the first place, it was pointed out that the entire GATT program had been directed toward the reduction of United States tariffs and toward the establishment of economic advantages of one sort or another for many of the nations who were parties to GATT. Seldom, if ever, has this organization worked to the economic advantage of the United States.

Parenthetically, I would like to endorse the statements which have been made by the two speakers who immediately preceded me that these agreements have worked more specifically for the advantage of other nations.

We have progressed to the point now where our tariff rates are among the lowest throughout the world.

Those who advocate low tariffs will say that the benefits lie in three categories. First, that it encourages world trade. To this some of us must answer that our exports as related to our national productivity have reached such a low ratio that the benefits cannot outweigh the detrimental effects of wrecking home industries and rendering jobless the pottery worker, the glass worker, the worker in our clay tile industry, and the coal miner. In other words, the price we pay for world trade places a great and unequal burden on many of the important industries of our Nation.

Secondly, it is argued that by giving economic advantages to other countries, we are helping them without expense to our own taxpayers. To this must be given the answer that such economic concessions will cost us far more in terms of lost income to American industry and ultimately in the tax revenues our Nation receives.

Let us not forget that every dollar of corporate profit in the United States means at least 50 cents in tax revenues. Where our tariff practices have reduced the profits of the American pottery, tile, and glass industries by a certain figure, those same practices have reduced the taxes paid by those industries by at least one-half.

Thirdly, the advocates of low tariffs will say that American industry is more prosperous than ever and shows no signs (except in certain specific industries such as pottery,

glass, coal, bicycles, textiles, wool, etc.) of being hurt by the program. To this we must answer that we are enjoying prosperity not because of but in spite of our trade practices. The ill effects are slow to show themselves. In spite of our dollar export figures our quantity export figures have not kept pace.

All of which leads me to the point of saying simply that the GATT and the concomitant low tariff policy has done nothing to help the American economy and that GATT and its international attitudes has done several things which may only be interpreted as harmful to notable segments of our industry and the men and women who depend upon these industries for their livelihood.

First, it has reduced America's bargaining position to something less than its wealth and prestige would reserve for it at diplomatic level. Though our world position as a nation among nations is one of great influence, as a signatory to the GATT it approaches the same degree of influence as the weakest member. Secondly, it has weakened the constitutionally granted authority of the Congress to regulate foreign commerce. You and I know, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years the Congress has been repeatedly cautioned that it must follow certain selected paths and that failure to do so would lead to embarrassment because of concessions which our Nation had granted through GATT. To say that GATT has no power to work its will upon congressional policy is ignoring reality. Each time that a cautious Congress attempts to look under the covers of a trade policy all sorts of taboos, both large and small, are raised.

Yes; it is literally true that Congress has not ratified or officially recognized the GATT; that Congress can yet act in matters of foreign trade. But will it be true if H. R. 5550 is enacted?

In enacting this bill Congress will be authorizing membership in an agency that will have as its chief duty the administration of the GATT. The bill clearly states that purpose. Since it has this as its chief function, do we not at the same time ratify the contract which it administers? True, the organization has other duties, but they are lesser duties and they are ones which can be ably performed in some other manner.

Let us ask ourselves several questions before we act upon this measure. First, do we want to continue down this pathway to ever-lower trade restriction? As we answered the rollcall on H. R. 1, many of us said we did not. Our industries, particularly those which produce our handmade products, our pottery and clay tile, our glass, and the industries which prepare our natural resources, coal and oil, and the thousands of American workmen engaged, or until recently engaged, in such production say that we do not. Secondly, do we want our trade practices so completely divorced from congressional authority through this process of double delegation to the point that we relinquish our prominence in the world today by being out-voted in a contractural arrangement such as the GATT? As I see it, if we want an agreement, do we want this one? The Congress has never had an opportunity to express itself directly on this point. Thirdly, do we want to join this specific club, this organization, the OTC?

Perhaps we have reached the point in civilization's march when we should direct more of our attitudes to internationalism—a march which has been fraught with disappointment in the past. But if we concede that we must now express ourselves as one unit of an international confederation, and must not only join, but, in return for some advantages must surrender sovereignty in some degree or other—if that is so, aren't we still privileged to carefully investigate the club we will join? Perhaps this organization which seems so bent upon bringing advantages to other nations is not the one for us. Possibly one can be fashioned which will meet our needs far better—one which will not reduce this Nation of ours to the voting position of a second or third rate power. For as surely as we concur in OTC, and indirectly in the activities of GATT, we will be reduced to that positon in other things.

Mr. Chairman, the day has not yet come when American industry cannot find markets within our borders and among our growing population. The day has not yet come when other nations will not procure our goods just as we will buy that which we must have from other nations. The day has not yet come in America when we would, as a measure of national policy, say to coal miners and pottery workers that you will be deprived of your jobs and you must sell your homes and leave your established communities to find new fields of work, forgetting your skills and accomplishments, because of the decisions of an international organization to which your elected Representatives in the Congress gave such authority.

The people of the 15th Congressional District in southeastern Ohio, which I have the honor to represent, have suffered grievous economic hardship because of the tariff policies of the past several decades.

My constituents have written and called on me to urge that your committee proceed on this legislation with extreme caution. Mr. Chairman, in appearing here today, I am speaking for them.

Possible Congressional Investigation of Labor Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, June 3, Victor Riesel, labor columnist for the New York Mirror, was guest on the NBC television program, Meet the Press. Panel members were Lawrence E. Spivak; Murray Davis, New York Telegram and Sun; Abe Raskin, New York Times; and Ernest Lindley, Newsweek. Members of the House will recall that Victor Riesel was permanently blinded last April when an unknown assailant threw acid in his face.

Much of the program centered about the possibility of need for a congressional investigation of labor racketeering.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include excerpts from the transcript of last Sunday's Meet the Press program:

Mr. LINDLEY. Vic, I'd like to ask you about some of the larger implications of this terrible assault on you. You've already said I believe that you favor a congressional inquiry into labor racketeering; is that right?

Mr. RIESEL. I favor it; I think Congress has ducked it. There have been statements by counsellors to congressional committees that congressional committees have been stopped dead in their tracks, and if you go back you will find that in a situation of rising crime there has been practically no real investigation; there has been no investigation of consequence by either House. One more thing, the Paul Douglas committee which investigated these multibillion dollar welfare funds, died for lack of funds some 2 months or 3 months ago. That's the Senate committee. Why did it die?

Mr. LINDLEY. Now Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey has introduced two resolutions calling for congressional investigations, one by the House Education and Labor Committee, one by the House Judiciary Committee. Since he's done that and since you've spoken out on this has any party leader in Congress on either side indicated to you that he would support a congressional inquiry into labor racketeering in this country?

Mr. RIESEL. No, they are ducking it. As a matter of fact one Member of the House said, "Oh, well, this is not in our jurisdiction." He said, "Let somebody else do it." Well, nobody is doing it. And nobody is investigating it.

* * * * *

Mr. DAVIS. Vic, I noticed in some of your answers there was a strong tone of resentment against some political group; you've mentioned Congress. Is there any police or prosecuting group in this resentment area of yours that you think aren't carrying on the proper investigation of your case?

Mr. RIESEL. No, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. It's all in the congressional area?

Mr. RIESEL. I think they've ducked it, Murray. There's widespread crime not only in New York; I mean there have been indictments all over the place, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, I mean all the way through.

Mr. DAVIS. But not in New York; is that what you mean?

Mr. RIESEL. No; what I mean is that if, for example, District Attorney Hogan says that there's a rise of crime in New York but he doesn't have the power to fight it; that was in that famous five-page statement; that was a statement on the record by an honest man. O. K., then if he doesn't have the power, what about the glare of publicity? Here's the district attorney of Manhattan saying that there is a rise in crime but he doesn't have the power, the legal right to go after these people, and he shows it in a five-page statement and nobody in Congress moves.

* * * * *

Mr. SPIVAK. Vic, I want to get to that. W do you think that Congress has ducked th investigation? Why do you think they haven't had an all-out investigation with a watchdog committee that kept it going once they exposed this thing?

Mr. RIESEL. First, I'd like to say, Larry, there ought to be a watchdog committee. We have a Committee on Internal Security which goes after the commies, why not a committee on this kind of corruption? Is there less a danger in this underworld second government to the rank and people, to the public, to the man on the street? If this can happen to me, does anybody think it couldn't happen to anybody else? Why not another committee, standing committee?

Mr. SPIVAK. Vic, why do you think Congress has ducked this thing?

Mr. RIESEL. I think they've ducked it for several reasons. First they feel that all labor would feel that they are attacking labor if they go after some lot, and I know from personal experience—well let me go back. Four or five years ago there was a five-man committee here in New York that investigated the waterfront and came up with the report—and it is on the record—there is no crime. I think the candidates for office who now need labor support, the precinct workers, the support, feel that they will alienate labor if they investigate that sleazy section of the labor movement which is crooked, and I want to say on the record that labor consists and is led by men of many kinds. There are crusaders, men who come and do their business and go home, and there are crooks. There are some Communists.

* * * * *

Mr. LINDLEY. Has any of these reputable leaders of organized labor indicated to you he would really favor such an investigation if conducted by the type of person you mentioned, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, or some other friend of the labor union?

Mr. RIESEL. Yes. I got specific word from the highest leaders of the AFL–CIO that they would go along—how this, of course, was in words to me and I can't speak for them, but that they would go along with an investigation by such men as PAUL DOUGLAS or Senator IVES, who they know as friends not because they feel they would be whitewashed but because they also know these men as honest men, or even they would go along with critics of the labor movement if these were men of unimpeachable and objective principles.

Mr. LINDLEY. Don't you think that an investigation of that sort would be a tremendous benefit to organized labor?

Mr. RIESEL. Well, I do. You don't think this kind of assault on me has done the labor movement any good?

At It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the confusion that surrounds our national security as a result of charges and countercharges in this political year, the Wall Street Journal, on May 22, 1956, carried the following editorial which is very sobering.

This aditorial, titled "At It Again," warrants reading by every thoughtful American because it reveals that bickering, while harmful at times, has the end result of assisting in the development of a stronger national defense.

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services and the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and being briefed from time to time on world conditions, I agree with the substance of the editorial that honest criticism is always constructive if we accept it in that spirit and keep our feet on the ground in the building of an adequate national defense.

The editorial follows:

AT IT AGAIN

A few years ago there was a great row between the Air Force advocates of the B–36 bomber and the Navy advocates of the supercarrier. Today the United States has both the carriers and far more advanced intercontinental bombers than the B–36.

We recall this bit of history not to suggest that that protracted and public argument accomplished nothing. To the extent that interservice rivalry sharpens our defenses and gives people a better grasp of military problems, it is probably a good thing. The point, however, is that the B–36-carrier debate did not result in the scuttling of either type of weapon or of any of the three services.

It is in that context that the new outbreak of Pentagon bickering ought to be viewed. The Air Force, in studies leaked to the press, contends that the strategic-bombing capacities of aircraft carriers are being exaggerated by the Navy. The Air Force also suggests that the Army's Nike missile is a far less useful antiaircraft weapon than the Army claims. The Army, for its part, has long felt that it is being squeezed by the new emphasis on airborne nuclear weapons and the aircraft to deliver them.

Now, if it were true that a particular type of weapon and a particular service were being built up to the exclusion of other weapons and other services, it would indeed be a matter of serious concern. The reason is that the United States faces all kinds of military threats, from full-scale war in which aircraft might play a dominant role, to "little" wars which might depend mainly on ground troops.

But there is no evidence that one-weapon-one-service thinking is in fact winning out. The Army has been reduced in size for a number of military reasons, but it is still the biggest Army this country has maintained in peacetime. The Navy, with its atomic submarines and mammoth supercarriers, is hardly being slighted; it is the strongest navy in the world. The common-sense emphasis on air-atomic power has not put anybody else out of commission.

That being so, the quarreling among the services turns largely on details. Perhaps, for example, the Nike is being outmoded. In a sense all weapons are in a constant state of flux. If the arguments produce any good ideas for improvement, that will be fine. Meantime the charges so far made are hardly anything to get unduly worried about.

The time to worry is not when the services are simply making their normal claims to superiority. It will be when one or another of them should succeed in selling the notion that it alone is the answer to military preparedness.

Bill for $600 Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide an increase of $600 for all postal employees. Last year when we passed Public Law 68 the increase provided was too little and too late. The simple truth of the matter is that the pay increases we have given to our postal employees have not kept pace with the increases prevalent in America today. Our American standard of living is constantly improving.

Business Week, under date of June 2, announces that all United States incomes are up 6.5 percent from last year. Public Law 68, which was intended to bring up the standard of living of postal employees in keeping with that of other people in the American economy, provided increases for some postal employees amounting to as little as 6.1 percent. In some areas, according to Business Week, United States incomes have increased in the last year as much as 11.7 percent.

I also read in the same issue of Business Week that Harlow H. Curtice, General Motors Corp. president, had a salary of $776,400 in 1955; Eugene G. Grace of Bethlehem Steel Corp. had a salary of $705,923; and Albert Bradley, chairman of the General Motors board, received a salarly of $701,525. The salaries plus bonuses of all business executives were higher in 1955 than ever before in history. The increases that these executives have received since 1939 run on the average about 300 percent and in some instances probably run 500 or 600 percent.

The average salary increase since 1939 granted to those who work is around 200 percent; the increases received by postal employees are a mere 120 percent. The increases granted to these good people have not kept pace with the improved standard of living in America and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to the legislation I have introduced today.

The Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there were only about 15 members present in the Senate the other day for the vote on H. R. 6376. Before that vote a great deal was said to indicate that this is really an innocent piece of legislation. Just to make sure the facts are all in, I would like to insert the following report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was prepared by George C. Finn and Charles C. Finn, the famous "Finn Twins," and I commend it to the attention of the House. The report follows:

REPORT ON ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL, H. R. 6376

The Alaska mental health bill, H. R. 6376, was fashioned after the Teapot Dome oil deal of the early twenties. At that time, the Secretary of the Interior made a private arrangement in cooperation with the Secretary of the Navy to lease the Teapot Dome Naval oil reserve to a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. In that case the land belonged to the Navy, was explored by the Navy and was for the purpose of keeping the oil in underground storage in reserve for future wartime needs. However, under the pretext that the oil was being drained away by wells operating outside the reserve it was decided to lease the reserve and store the oil above ground. The crude oil was withdrawn by private interests and the Navy was given refined oil in exchange with a tremendous profit going to the private oil company. The private oil company was selected by the Secretary of the Interior who excluded public bidding and received a large sum of money for the deal. Top Government officials of unquestioned reputation made the arrangements and sent a detachment of Marines to protect the oil company's contract when private citizens intervened. Subsequent congressional investigations exposed high level corruption, bribery and fraud. Later a court rescinded the contract and the lands were ordered returned to the United States Government. Some of the responsible officials went to jail.

Now, in 1956, private oil interests wish to procure the Navy oil reserves in Alaska withdrawn from private entry under Public Land Order 82, this time under the pretext that Alaska needs a comprehensive mental health program.

Federal law prohibits the sale and passage of title to known Federal oil and gas lands.

In order to circumvent this law, one million acres of Federal oil and gas lands will be given to Alaska by the Alaska mental health bill, H. R. 5376, to be sold on conditional sales by Alaska to private oil interests even before Alaska gets title. Alaska has at least 90 days to negotiate a deal with a preferred oil company before the land is open to others.

Arrangements have already been made to sell the land and the Navy's oil drilling and exploring equipment to private interests. Passage of the Alaska Mental Health bill is all that is required.

The land grant sections of the bill provide in part:

"SEC. 202. (a) The Territory of Alaska is hereby granted and shall be entitled to select, within 10 years from the effective date of this act, not to exceed 1 million acres from the public lands of the United States in Alaska which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved at the time of their selection. * * * All lands duly selected by the Territory of Alaska pursuant to this section shall be patented to the Territory by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) * * * Upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective during which period the Territory of Alaska shall have a preferred right of selection, * * *.

"(c) All grants made or confirmed under this section shall include mineral deposits.

"(d) Following the selection of lands by the Territory pursuant to subsection (b), but prior to the issuance of final patent, the Territory shall be authorized to lease and to make conditional sales of such selected lands."

Governor Heintzleman, presently Governor of Alaska, is on record proposing the circumventing of the Federal law prohibiting the sale of Federally owned oil and gas lands to private capital. He urges the transfer of Federally owned oil and gas lands to the Territory so that it may be sold to private buyers (hearings before the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, September 15, 1955, Fairbanks, pt. I, pp. 108–110):

"STATEMENT OF HON. B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN, GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

"Governor HEINTZLEMAN. My name is B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska.

"I have a written statement here and I think it will save time if I read it, because it is just about the way I would like to see it go into the record.

"*4. Land grants to the Territory*

"Those who have worked on any phase of Alaska development have all recognized that more rapid economic growth requires greater local control over our public lands and resources. Consequently, all of the various statehood bills have proposed grants of varying but substantial areas of Federal public lands to the proposed State of Alaska. If the granting of such lands is recognized to be good for the possible future State, it should be equally good for the strengthening of the Territory in its course toward statehood status.

"I strongly urge the establishment of a program of substantial land grants to the Territory of Alaska. These should be outright grants with full title going to the Territory, including the rights to all minerals and other resources on or under the surface. The Territory should be permitted to select these lands, not only from the unreserved public domain, but also from those areas presently reserved if and when they are released.

"I suggest that the grants be fairly modest as to size, say 500,000 to 500,000 acres, and be repeated as the earlier grants are used up in sales and leases of lands to settlers and other users. When statehood is acquired, the entire remainder of the land the Congress intends to grant to the new State would then become immediately available.

"The territorial department of lands, recently established by the legislature, has the authority to undertake the initial job of making selections and accepting land grants. I am confident that Alaska can make such transferred lands more readily available for development by private enterprise than is now possible or is likely to be made possible under Federal administration."

Referring to the need to reduce Federal reserves in Alaska, Governor Heintzleman stated (hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, September 15, 1955, pt. I, pp. 109–110):

"In this connection, you will learn of public requests to open to private development certain oil lands in northern Alaska presently reserved by the Department of the Interior under Public Land Order 82. This order, which withdrew three separate areas from entry under the public land laws, was a wartime measure of 1943. These tracts were located on the Alaska Peninsula, the northeast shore of the Gulf of Alaska and on the Arctic slope. The lands on the first two areas mentioned have been released from reserved status and extensive oil and gas prospecting by private firms is now being conducted in both areas. The Arctic slope area, still withdrawn, contains some 48.8 million acres, including about 28 million acres in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The exploration which was carried on there by the Navy showed good prospects for development—particularly an oil field in the Umiat area and a gas field at Gubik. These, along with some other withdrawn oil and gas lands in the Territory, should be restored to the public domain to permit of private entry and development under the Federal oil and gas leasing laws."

The above statement that "particularly an oil field in the Umiat area and a gas field at Gubik * * * along with some other withdrawn oil and gas lands in the Territory, should be restored to public domain to permit of private entry and development under the Federal oil and gas leasing laws," is deceiving under the provisions in the Alaska mental health bill that permits Alaska to acquire 1 million acres of this land and sell it to any private oil interest and thus circumvent the Federal oil and gas leasing laws.

Governor Heintzleman's statement points out the development of Federal oil and gas reserves in Alaska by Navy exploration both in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 and outside the Navy reserve. This exploration was carried on for the benefit of the Navy by a private concern known as the Arctic Contractors. (It is still undetermined how the Navy was to benefit by drilling outside its reserve.) This company was formed by Herbert Hoover, Jr., president in 1945. It received a negotiated contract, No. y 13360 on a cost plus fixed fee basis for oil exploration of Navy Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska and by 1953 had spent over $50 million of Navy funds.

The project discovered oil in the naval reserve, petroleum 4, called the Umiat structure, estimated at between 20 million and 150 million barrels. Outside the naval reserve, a giant gas field, the Gubik field, was discovered, estimated at a trillion cubic feet of gas under high pressure. A land survey was made for laying a pipeline from these fields to Fairbanks 500 miles distant and thence to Anchorage another 300 miles distant. This pipeline could join a 650-mile pipeline now connecting Fairbanks with the seaport town of Haines, Alaska.

[Map omitted in RECORD.]

The Arctic Contractors, formed by Herbert Hoover, Jr., president, explored both inside and outside Navy Petroleum Reserve No. 4 for 7 years and spent over $50 million of Navy funds to determine the potential oil and gas resources of the area. A 10-year program was established, beginning in 1945. In 1951, after a personal visit to the area by the then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, John T. Koehler, Koehler recommended that the project continue.

Early in 1953, oilman Earnest O. Thompson, chairman, Texas Railroad Commission and a group of Texas oil men visited the Alaska project. Oilman Robert Anderson, the newly appointed Secretary of the Navy, halted the project 1 month after he assumed office on February 4, 1953. It appears that a personal letter in 1953 from Earnest O. Thompson to his friend Navy Secretary Anderson influenced Anderson to reverse Assistant Secretary Koehler's recommendation to continue the project. The project was halted just when the drilling rig was being moved into place to drill the most promising site discovered in the past 7 years (hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, Sept. 20, 1955, pt. I, p. 306):

"Mr. BARTLETT. The program was not ended because it had been completed?

"Mr. REED. No; I tried to make that plain a little while ago.

"Now the final drilling for the 1954 and 1955 program was centering around some of the lower sequences of the rocks, the base that I have described, and in most places over the basin those particular rocks are too deep to be reached readily by a drill. You would have to go to very deep drilling, and that was out of the question in the program because of the expense, and we therefore had moved back closer to the range and farther east.

"You recall I said the porosity and the permeability got better as you went farther east, and the closer you get to the range the nearer to the surface those lower rocks are, and there is a very fine structure in there underlain by what we believe to be the best potential reservoir rock that was known.

"The geology of the structure has been mapped in detail. The geophysics (seismic exploration) of that structure has been completed, and they were in the process of bringing in the drill when the program terminated. We don't know that that would be an oil field. A professional man would be foolhardy to say it is likely to be, but it was believed, and I believe it to be a very good bet.

"Now let me recall, as George has made plain, that the record of this whole program is available publicly. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that the major oil companies know of that particular structure that would have been drilled if the program had gone on. This has not gotten much to your committee's attention because there has been so much talk about Gubik, the gas structure, but I believe it is that structure we were about to drill that will be of real interest to the oil companies, plus many others we haven't had a chance to take a look at."

At this point private oil interests took over; as in the Teapot Dome deal, arrangements were made to coordinate the actions of the Secretary of the Navy with the Secretary of the Interior. Transporting drilling equipment, pipe and camp sites to Alaska was costly, so further arrangements were made to dispose of the Navy's drilling and exploring equipment carefully stored at Point Barrow, Alaska; along with the Navy oil and gas reserves. Authority for the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the oil and gas reserves was written into the land grant section of the Alaska mental health bill (hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, September 14, 1955, part I, pp. 9, 10):

"Frankly, I do not know. I do not think there is any interest in anything except oil and gas, as far as I know.

"Mr. ABBOTT. Would it be possible, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that letter might be placed in the record at this point since reference has been made to it?

"Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1955.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: The Department of the Interior has received several requests from officials of the Territorial Government of Alaska, the Delegate to the Congress from Alaska, and numerous private citizens to open to private development certain lands on the Arctic slope of the Territory presently reserved under Public Land Order 82.

Public Land Order 82, a wartime measure, was signed on January 22, 1943, and withdrew three separate areas from entry under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws. These tracts were located on the Alaska Peninsula, the Gulf of Alaska, and the Arctic slope. The minerals on these lands were reserved under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for use in connection with the prosecution of the war.

In 1946, Public Land Order 82 was revoked insofar as the lands on the Alaska Peninsula and the Gulf of Alaska were concerned. Oil and gas prospecting is now being carried out in both areas by private firms.

The northern Alaska withdrawal created by order 82 includes within its boundaries Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 established by Executive order on February 27, 1923. At the time the reserve was created, oil had been reported at a few places near the coast, but practically nothing was known of the inland area. Beginning in 1944 the Navy instituted a petroleum exploration program in the naval reserve and on adjacent lands withdrawn by order 82. This program was suspended in March 1953.

With the suspension of the Navy exploration program, Alaskans began to express an interest in having the lands outside the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 restored to entry under the public land laws and the mining and mineral leasing laws. It is believed in the Territory that private exploration will lead to the development of oil and gas deposits in commercial quantities and the establishment of new industries in interior Alaska.

The Alaska Development Board, an agency of the Territory, in mid-1954 published a study of the possibility of commercial development of the area and the use of natural gas as a source of energy. This study concluded in part that

"The availability of cheap fuel (natural gas from the Arctic slope) will promote the industrial development of Alaska by significant reduction in the cost of utilization of natural resources. Ensuing economic growth will enable the Territory to become less dependent upon imported products and promote general stability at a time when a tapering off of military construction expenditures threatens to upset the economy of the railbelt area."

The Congress has taken a deep interest in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 and the now discontinued exploration program of the Navy. On March 6, 1954, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, wrote to the President concerning the future of Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Senator SALTONSTALL'S letter was brought to the attention of the Defense Mobilization Board which unanimously agreed that disposition of the naval petroleum reserve at this time would not be in the national interest. Senator Saltonstall was so advised on July 19, 1954, by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Likewise the Department of the Navy desires to maintain the present status of the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. However, the Department of the Navy has advised us through an exchange of correspondence that it would raise no objection to revoking Public Land Order No. 82 provided that the proposed revocation would in no way affect the present status of the lands in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The oil and gas deposits of primary interest to Alaskanas for private development lie for the most part outside the boundaries of the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Additionally, it is understood that the Department of Defense plans to recommend that certain other lands within the area covered by Public Land Order No. 82 be reserved for defense purposes.

There is vested in the Secretary of the Interior authority to revoke or modify Public Land Order 82. In the event that such action is taken by the Department, it would relate only to those lands lying outside the boundaries of the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The oil and gas deposits in the restored area would be subject to the mineral leasing law of the United States which requires that lands and leasable minerals within a known geologic structure of a producing oil and gas field be leased by competitive bidding. Other areas may be leased to the first qualified applicant. In view, however, of the interest of the Congress in the oil reserves of northern Alaska, we wish to have the views of your committee before issuing an order which would change in any appreciable degree the status of the lands on the Alaska Arctic slope withdrawn by Public Land Order 82.

There is a related matter which should also be brought to your attention, the disposal of the naval oil-well drilling equipment. This equipment has been declared surplus by the Navy and is subject to disposition by public sale. It is understood that the Department of Defense believes that it would be in the best financial interest of the Government to withhold sale of this equipment until after the revocation of Public Land Order 82.

The limited transportation facilities and harsh climatic conditions of northern Alaska would make the shipment of new equipment to the drilling site extremely costly to a private developer. This high cost might well spell the difference between success and failure in bringing in a producing field.. The holders of the surplus oil-well drilling equipment, conversely, would have a competitive advantage in bidding for any oil and gas leases which may be offered. This Department will, therefore, work closely with the Department of the Navy in order that disposal of the surplus property may be properly coordinated with any mineral leasing in the area.

I should appreciate having your views and comments on possible revocation of Public Land Order 82. I shall be pleased at any time to supply any additional information which you may require. A letter has also been sent to each of the Chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees asking their views and comments on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

(Identical letters to: Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, United States Senate; Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives; Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, United States Senate.)

In the Teapot Dome fraud, Congress was told that the Navy was losing oil from its underground storage by wells operating outside the reservoir draining it away, consequently the Secretary of the Interior was compelled to lease the Navy oil lands to a private interest and bring the oil to the surface for storage above ground in order to conserve it. This proved to be a hoax.

Likewise, the hoax that Alaska has a mental health problem and needs a million acres of land to solve it was conceived to provide a mental health bill that will allow the Secretary of the Interior, through Alaska to sell the Navy oil and gas reserves to private interests.

That there is no problem for the 360 mental cases of Alaska is adequately expressed by Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON and by Mr. Parsons of the Alaska Department of Public Health (hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, Sept. 22, 1955, pt. II, p. 251 and p. 254):

"Congressman DAWSON. We are all supporting the mental health bill and want to see it get through, but I think you are going to have to be very practical about this thing and, after the bill is passed, not try to go all the way and expect to have set up here a big hospital for the care of mentally ill, with 5 psychiatrists and a lot of expense for 360 mental patients, which is the total for the whole Territory. In my State we have 1,400 patients in a mental hospital which is designed for about 800, and I think we have 2 psychiatrists on the staff. And back in Washington they would like to work out what they call an ideal situation where they would have one psychiatrist for every dozen people, I suppose, or something like that, and they would be around looking at all of us wondering if anything was wrong with us.

"I have overexaggerated that, of course, but what I am trying to say is that you have got a hospital here, a Government hospital that is half filled; there is no reason in the world why that hospital should not be used to its capacity and one of those wings is set up and could be used to take care of these mental patients and do a very good job, without going down and building a new hospital somewhere. I think you have got the facilities, and with a little good, practical judgment up here on the local level you could work this thing out.

"Mr. MORAN. If we had access to that hospital, I think one of the immediate problems of our court would be solved.

"Now the marshal's office here is very diligent, and we cooperate completely by holding, as a matter of fact, our hearings at such times as to expedite the transportation of these people to Morningside, if they are committed, so as not to require their detaining in jail. I think we go to every possible extreme and get a lot of cooperation from all of these people immediately involved in this procedure. But for some reason or other we cannot disabuse those in charge of the Anchorage hospital, and perhaps this goes all the way back to Washington, from the idea that our immediate problem is not to staff that facility there with psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses and clinical psychologists. But let us get our people in there with custodial help who are qualified to look after the mentally ill, as our jailers are not, and at least we would have the improvement of using the facility which is suitable for the purpose."

Mr. PARSONS. For 2 years and when Dr. Anderson came up as chief of section, he was promised 18 beds and 10 rooms over at the Anchorage Medical Center, specifically constructed for the care of the mentally ill. These have lain vacant gathering dust be-

cause of redtape, lack of coordination, and firm policy on the Federal Government level. We urge that congressional impetus and financing be given to enable the opening of this unit. Even Morningside administrators with whom we sometimes disagree state that this facility should be activated.

In view of the fact that in 1920 high placed Government officials disposed of known Navy oil reserves to a private interest and—

1. That Federal law prohibits the disposal of known oil and gas lands to private interests.

2. That the Alaska Mental Health bill provides conditions that circumvent this law.

3. That these conditions allow Alaska at least 90 days to select known Navy oil and gas reserves and to pass title by conditional sales to private interests.

4. That Alaska is ready, willing, and able to sell Navy oil and gas reserves to private interests.

5. That valuable oil and gas structures were discovered both inside and outside the Navy reserve and a pipeline was surveyed for the Navy by Arctic Contractors.

6. That the project was halted at its most promising stage.

7. That the Navy oil exploration and drilling equipment is being sold.

8. That the sale of the Navy equipment is coordinated with the disposal of the Navy oil and gas reserve to private interests through Alaska.

9. That some oilmen are in top executive positions and the Alaska Mental Health bill originated with the executive branch of the Government.

10. That the Alaska Mental Health problem is a hoax comparable to the oil drainage hoax of the Teapot Dome fraud.

Of Senators, Supreme Court Justices, and Prior Judicial Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished member of the judiciary of my State, Judge Stanley Mosk, of Los Angeles, has sent me an article by an equally distinguished member of the California State bar, the Honorable Loren Miller, which I think deserves to be called to the attention of the country.

Mr. Miller takes as his thesis the proposition that the strength of the American judiciary lies in its independence and that any attempt to "foreordain their decisions" is foredoomed to failure. I think he proves his point in a novel and convincing manner.

The article originally appeared in the Daily Journal, a legal publication of Los Angeles, and reads as follows:

OF SENATORS, SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL EXPERIENCE

(By Loren Miller)

Every Supreme Court controversy breeds its own myths. Time was when the insurgent agrarians blamed their lack of judicial success on the railroad lawyers who were said to have infested the Court at the turn of the century. A few years later, social reformers raised the spector of "The Nine Old Men" and laid invalidation of progressive legislation to the senility of the judges. Current mythology, welling up out of the South, has it that something is dreadfully wrong with the Court due to the lack of prior judicial experience by the judges.

Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, authored a bill requiring 5 years judicial experience as a prerequisite to Supreme Court appointment while Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, would stretch the requirement to 10 years. Both Senators were outraged by the Court's school desegregation decision. Opposition runs a little deeper in Mississippi than in Florida which may account for the more stringent provisions of the Stennis bill. In any event, it will be interesting to see just how much correlation, if any, there is between liberalism or conservatism on the one hand and prior judicial experience on the other.

During its 167 years of existence, 87 men have sat on the Supreme Court, as Chief Justices and associates. Four have served in both capacities: Oliver Ellsworth, Edward D. White, Charles Evans Hughes, and Harlan F. Stone.

Let's take the Chief Justices first. There have been 13 Chiefs, excluding John Rutledge who presided for a short period but who was never confirmed. John Marshall, Roger Taney, Salmon P. Chase, Morrison Waite, Melville Fuller, and Earl Warren assumed the position without a day's judicial experience behind them. None could have qualified under either senatorial plan. John Jay, Oliver Ellsworth, Edward D. White, William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, Harlan F. Stone, and Fred M. Vinson had varying degrees of judicial experience when appointed. The count is 7 to 6 in favor of experience but the record also shows that the Court has been headed by men without prior experience for 112 of its 167 years. A comparision, on any count, of the quality of service rendered as between the experienced and the inexperienced lends little luster to the hue and cry for service on the bench as a prerequisite to appointment as Chief Justice, to say the least.

We have already excluded the six inexperienced Chiefs as disqualified to serve under either the Smathers or the Stennis scheme. What of the other seven? Chief Justices Hughes and Stone got their only judicial experience on the Court itself before promotions. Since neither could have got on the Court had either SMATHERS or STENNIS had his way when they were appointed, we'll have to rule both out. Jay had 2 years experience on the bench before he became Chief Justice; Ellsworth, 4, and Vinson, 3 months less than 5 years. They're out. White had 2 years experience before he went to the Court as an Associate Justice. He is out. That leaves Taft who became Chief with 11 years prior service on State and Federal courts. It is comforting to know, as the advertisements say, that we have salvaged 1 Chief Justice out of 13 for Senators SMATHERS and STENNIS—even if he did fill the post for only 9 of the Court's 167 years. But let's get on. Deducting the 12 Chief Justices we have disqualified we still have 75 Justices who may, or may not, qualify under the proposed plans.

We run into trouble right off the bat. Associate Justices who went to the Court without prior service on the bench (excluding Hughes and Stone with whom we have already dealt) include: William Paterson, Bushrod Washington, Joseph Story, Henry Baldwin, John McKinley, Benjamin Curtis, John Campbell, Noah Swayne, Samuel Miller, Joseph Bradley, L. Q. C. La Mar, George Shiras, William Moody, James McReynolds, Louis Brandeis, Pierce Butler, George Sutherland, Owen Roberts, Robert Jackson, James Byrnes, Stanley Reed, Felix Frankfurter, William O. Douglas, Tom Clark, and Harold Burton. Now we've disqualified 25 more for both Senators. Almost any lawyer would be willing to take a chance on the $64,000 question by answering that some of these lawyers made important contributions to constitutional law and the Nation and that men of all shades of opinion are included in their ranks. Come to think of it, the list includes some mighty hard bitten exponents of the separate but equal doctrine so dear to the embattled Senators—like, say Byrnes, McReynolds, or La Mar—But SMATHERS and STENNIS will just have to take the bitter with the sweet. Subtract these 25 from the 75 Justices we have left after elimination of the 12 Chief Justices and we have only 50 Justices left out of the 87 with which we started.

This thing seems to be getting out of hand but we can't turn back now. Associate Justices who went to the Court with less than 5 years' judicial experience (excluding White and Ellsworth, who have already been accounted for) include: James Iredell, Thomas Johnson, Brockholst Livingston, Alfred Moore, John Rutledge, Peter Daniel, Stanley Matthews, John Clarke, Hugo Black, John Harlan I, J. R. La Mar, Wiley Rutledge, and John Harlan II. That's a total of 13 whose less than 5 years' service on the bench before their appointments disqualifies them under both proposed senatorial dispensations. This list, like our prior lists, includes men of varying degrees of competence, brilliance, and social, economic, and political beliefs. Some were, and some were not, supporters of the Smathers-Stennis view of the 14th amendment.

Well, anyhow, Senator SMATHERS last left us with 37 qualified justices according to his lights. They fall into two groups. Group 1, consisting of Justices with 5 or more but less than 10 years experience, includes: Samuel Chase, Gabriel Duval, William Johnson, William Todd, John McLean, Thomas Barbour, Levi Woodbury, Stephen Field, James Wayne, Ward Hunt, Howell Jackson, William Day, Joseph McKenna, Willis Van Devanter, Frank Murphy, and Sherman Minton, a total of 16. Group 2 consists of Justices with 10 or more years of prior judicial experience and includes: John Blair, William Cushing, Smith Thompson, Robert Trimble, John Catron, Robert Grier, Samuel Nelson, Samuel Blatchford, David Brewer, Henry Brown, David Davis, Horace Gray, William B. Woods, Rufus Peckham, William Strong, Benjamin Cardozo, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Horace Lurton, Edward Stanford, and Mahlon Pitney, associate Justices, and Chief Justice Taft, a total of 21. Senator SMATHERS' 37 Justices include liberals, not-so-liberals, and conservatives. Obviously, he hasn't solved his problem.

Senator STENNIS hasn't done much better. He has wound up with a hodgepodge of 21 Justices (those in group 2) representing all of the various shades of opinion that have bobbed up on the Court since it was established. By playing games with combinations or mutations of the 21 whose experience accords with the Mississippi Senator's notions of Supreme Court qualification you could get almost any kind of an opinion you wanted on the racial reach of the 14th amendment or on child-labor legislation.

At this point the Senators may tax me with lumping the post-1937 Court personnel in with its pre-1937 composition and they may protest that they want none of the judicial shenanigans that came with the New Deal-Fair Deal middle of the road appointments of our last three Presidents. Let's take that position for a moment. The Senators would still have only one Chief Justice, Taft, left. Of the 73 Justices who served prior to 1937 Smathers would have only 35 (we would have to drop Murphy and Minton off his list) while Stennis would be left with his same 21. Either plan would play havoc with the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* Court which enunciated the separate-but-equal doctrine. Smathers

would lose Chief Justice Fuller and Associates White and Shiras which would leave him in a bad way since Brewer didn't participate and Harlan (who would have been eliminated anyhow) took a dissenting position. Stennis would have eliminated those four plus Justice Field and would have been left with only Justices Gray, Brown, and Peckham as having had the requisite more than 10 years prior experience. And, finally, the 1937 Court, intact for a considerable period and conservative enough to meet the most fastidious taste, was composed of Stone, Cardozo, Hughes, Van Devanter, McReynolds Brandeis, Sutherland, Roberts, and Butler. As we have seen, only Cardozo and Van Devanter could have met the qualifications Smathers would impose while only Cardozo could have served if the Founding Fathers had had the same vision that has come to Senator Stennis.

Confidently, I know the answer to the Senators' problem. Ponder, for a moment, the given names of the Judges who banned segregated schools: Earl Warren, Hugo Black, Stanley Reed, Felix Frankfurter, Sherman Minton, Harold Burton, Tom (not Thomas) Clark, Robert Jackson, and William O. Douglas—get it? Only one good, earthy William in the lot and he a renegade and only one good solid Robert, and he unpredictable. What about the rest of those given names heretofore unknown to Supreme Court history? Gone are the Johns, the Samuels, the James', the Davids, the Henrys who made our Nation great. But, whoops, wait a minute, I had forgotten Bushrod Washington, Brockholst Livingston, Lucius Q. C. La Mar, Morrison Waite. Oh, well, forget the whole thing. Maybe my plan has its defects, too.

Quite seriously, there is no mechanical method of selecting Supreme Court Justices that will guarantee a desired construction or interpretation of the 14th amendment or any other section of the Constitution. On reflection it will be apparent to any lawyer that a liberal Court or a conservative Court could be appointed from present members of the courts of appeal, the district courts, State supreme courts or from our own Superior Court, for that matter, under either the Smathers or the Stennis plan. The same thing goes for appointments from the ranks of practicing lawyers or law school professors. Prior judicial experience, or the lack of it, did not foreordain or even forecast the decisions in *Marbury* v. *Madison*, the Dartmouth College case, income tax cases, *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* or *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Those decisions, and other landmark cases, are the end-products of far deeper experience, shared with the American people by the judges. It is undoubtedly true that the selectivity by our Presidents who appoint Supreme Court Justices plays an important role in the timing of various constitutional interpretations and that such timing may delay or retard, on the one hand, or accelerate, on the other, the processes of growth and change that are hallmarks of a free society. Even the presidential factor can be overemphasized; judges have disappointed, even enraged, those who appointed them.

The strength and the greatness of the American judiciary, no matter what its shortcomings and lapses, lies in its independence. Our Supreme Court Justices have been charged with the responsibility of interpreting a Constitution designed to protect the rights and regulate the relationships of individuals in an ever-changing and evermore complex world. They must perform that task in the hurly-burly of the pulling and hauling and the backing and filling and the sometimes inching forward and the sometimes leaping-forward moods that are at once the strength and the weakness of the democratic system. Any scheme designed to destroy their independence and foreordain their decisions is freighted with the promise of stultifying the very Constitution that is their guide.

Address of Congressman Philip J. Philbin at Graduation Exercises, Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, Sunday, June 10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech which I delivered yesterday at the graduation exercises of the class of 1956 in the 81st year of Cushing Academy at Ashburnham, Mass.

These exercises, which were held at Cowell chapel of Cushing, were largely attended and most impressive.

This commencement marked the final official appearance of the outstanding headmaster of the school, Mr. Clarence P. Quimby, who is retiring this year after 23 years of most conspicuous service.

During his administration, Cushing had made great progress. Its physical plant, its enrollment, and its curriculum had all been extended and greatly improved. Under his direction, the school achieved highest ranking among the secondary schools of the Nation.

Mr. Quimby leaves a tremendously vital, incomparable legacy, which would be impossible to excel. He has profoundly influenced the educational processes of his time and our generation, and his contributions, not only to Cushing, but to the cause of improved, progressive education will certainly be difficult to equal, if not impossible to excel.

The popular and famous headmaster retires at a time when he is virtually in the prime of his intellectual powers and professional fitness, and it is ardently to be hoped that he may be persuaded to pursue his activities in some broad educational field commensurate with his great ability, long experience, and inspired zeal. Cushing Academy and its many friends may not only be proud, but exceedingly grateful to this illustrious headmaster, who, out of the goodness of his heart, tenacity of his purpose, integrity of his dedication, and exceptional talents has forged such a remarkable record in the educational world.

The address follows:

Doctor Quimby, distinguished guests, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, parents, and friends:

This is indeed a day of fulfillment, a day of vital tasks successfully finished, a day mingled with feelings of joy of achievement and the sorrow of parting. I am greatly honored to be with you. I come, not only as Congressman of this great district, but a genuine admirer of Cushing and its outstanding headmaster, Dr. Quimby. And I come as a friend who has, for the past 3 years, had an excellent opportunity to observe the class which we honor today and as a proud parent with a lovely daughter just completing her junior year at this fine institution.

First of all, let me heartily congratulate each and every one of you, your parents, and teachers, on your graduation. I am exceedingly pleased with the splendid record which the members of this class have made at Cushing. The completion of your course here marks an important step in your personal advancement. It is an accomplishment of which you can be justly proud. If you had not worked sincerely and intelligently, you would not have been able to reach the cherished goal which we all take joy in celebrating in these impressive exercises, and which bring to this happy ending your secondary school careers. But actually, it is just the beginning. The wide world opens before you. Boundless opportunities of a promising and successful future await each and every one of you—await the impact of your aspirations, energy, and ability.

In every sense of the word, you are the beneficiaries of a noble tradition. You were blessed by providence with the favored destiny of being raised and educated in this great free country of ours—the most powerful, the richest, the most prosperous, and the happiest democracy the sun has ever shone upon. It has been your happy privilege and good fortune to be educated here in the atmosphere of a beautiful historic New England town, in a select institution of learning typified by an abundance of patriotism, idealism, constructively balanced living and genuine American culture. You have been fortunate enough to live in an atmosphere of tolerance where men and women are judged for what they are, what they achieve, and what they strive for, and not alone for their success, for the circumstance of their birth, their race, their religion, or their national origin. It would be difficult for me, indeed, in this brief talk, to recite the merits, the virtues, the reputation, and the immeasurable contributions of Cushing Academy, its great leaders and its able teachers. The vital thing to recall here and to remember henceforth is the wonderful atmosphere of opportunity, tolerance, pride in accomplishment, incentive, scholarship, and inspiration which has been engendered in this place and which you have been so fortunate to share.

We must remember that it has taken well nigh a century to fuse the basic elements of our American culture, outlook, and institutions into the comprehensive traditions of learning and useful citizenship that rightfully belong to Cushing and its graduates.

We must take note of the fact that the deep spirituality of the early American founders combining with their practical vision and love of freedom, merging with the enthusiasm, unbounded energy, and willingness to sacrifice for advancement under personal liberty which characterizes the many people who comprise this Nation, is mainly responsible for the dynamic, stimulating atmosphere of the school of which you may be so proud to be graduates today.

As years go by, you will place higher and higher value upon the advantage given you of living here during your formative years and you will come increasingly to appreciate the broad, spiritual, God-fearing patterns which have formed the secure foundation for so many of its other favorable characteristics.

You have been fortunate also in the extreme of being educated under such high minded, able leadership by such devoted capable and conscientious teachers. There is background and patient development and rich traditions associated with your school. Its contemporary leaders and teachers are admirably carrying out and implanting the ideals of the great leaders and teachers of the past and when history is written, the names of men like Clarence Quimby as well as individual members of the faculty will be ranked with those of past generations whose devoted and unselfish work has helped so immeasurably in laying the groundwork and advancing the high aims of Cushing Academy.

In this connection there is a special sadness associated with this occasion in that it marks the last official commencement appearance of Headmaster Quimby, whose rugged character, high ideals and unflagging devotion have been indelibly impressed upon

this institution and the educational history of our times. Please bear with me a moment while I recount for you a brief excerpt appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent date concerning the service of your beloved and unxcelled headmaster. I quote:

"It would be a happy circumstance indeed, if every institution in the land could be infused with the spirit of patriotism, love of humanity, enthusiasm for work, unselfish devotion to students, school, and Nation, which Clarence Quimby has exemplified at Cushing.

"A true patriot in thought, word, and action, he is never given to narrow provincialism, hysterical fanfare or eccentric theory. His powerful influence for good will long be felt in the field in which he worked.

"The Nation that has men like Clarence Quimby among its leaders, working for the enlightenment and advancement of its youth, need have no fears for the future.

"I extend to him and to his devoted helpmate, Mrs. Quimby, who has been loyally and magnificently by his side in all his endeavors, my heartiest congratulations for their very many contributions to the educational, cultural and business and civic life of my district and State and wish them both many years of continued constructive effort and happiness."

And I tender to the new and able head master every wish for a most successful administration. He is well equipped for his tasks and will have the wholehearted cooperation of all.

I know that this afternoon as you meet officially with your teachers for the last time that your hearts are filled with deepest gratitude for all they have done for you. Future years, let me assure you, will serve only to heighten your feelings of appreciation for their labors in your behalf, and they will serve to bring into focus as an inspiring force in your lives the many unparalleled advantages and benefits that you have enjoyed under their leadership as students of this school.

There is another group this afternoon to whom you owe an indefinable debt for your present success. I know you will recognize that as a parent myself I speak in a very personal sense and, like all the other parents here, I am exceedingly proud at this time for the events which transpire here in which you play the principal role as graduates.

For I am sure that you are even more anxious than I am to emphasize in your own hearts and minds and in every fiber of your being the truly infinite value of the love, devotion, loyalty, and in all so many instances, the real sacrifice, which your loving parents have displayed in furthering your interests and welfare without which this happy result we all rejoice in would never have materialized.

Your parents seek no encomiums. They are patient and long suffering, let me assure you as one who knows. But I think I can speak for all the parents when I say that what they have done, they have done gladly and willingly, yes, with the eagerness born of true affection—and they seek no reward or commendation of any sort, save that which is worth more than anything else—continued goodness of character, renewed devotion to duty and future contributions in the form of good living, good works, and constructive activity by all our graduates for and in behalf of their families, their commmunity, their Nation, and their Creator.

In brief, parents ask nothing more of you than that you adhere to the ideals which you have been taught in your homes, your churches, and your school; that you continue honestly and wholeheartedy to do the best you can in whatever work you undertake; that you recognize your responsibilities to yourselves, to your families, to the people as a whole and to the country; that you work, live and strive as good industrious, God-fearing, self-respecting Americans contributing in every way you can to the building of good citizenship, wholesome family life, loyal friendships and the building of a better America and a peaceful world.

For parents this afternoon, there is a real pride and happiness for your success up to this time. But this occasion also brings rememberance and reminescence. Parents, too, have come this very path years ago. They know the joys and sorrows of life, the trials, adversities, and problems.

From personal experience we parents know the obstacles, the pitfalls, the difficulties which you will have to face. Yes, my friends, we came this way ourselves. And if we were to close our eyes today we would find ourselves again in the bright sunlight and flower-decked fields of other years.

We would see before us the smiling faces of dear loved ones who made our way easier, who made our progress possible. We would feel again the affectionate touch of their hand upon our shoulder, we would hear their words of counsel, advice, and courage.

We would recall the love and help they so unselfishly gave us; their look of disappointment when we lost; their unrestrained joy when we won; their never ending concern for us; their loyalty and steadfastness. These are precious memories which will always live in our minds. Because those were days when family ties bound us together like hoops of steel, more tightly perhaps than in this modern day.

And now the vision dims, the bright sunlight of those happy years fades, the faces of those dear ones disappear and we are back again in the prosaic world of the present.

And so it will be with you, my young friends. Opportunity is beckoning. It knocks on your door. It may knock but once. It is up to you to embrace it. It is up to you to remember your noble heritage, to treasure and sustain your high ideals and let nothing swerve you from them. We will all be pulling for you in your every undertaking.

Many of you will go out into the realistic, practical, everyday world of work. Some of you will go to higher institutions of learning to seek further training for higher fields of endeavor. But all of you will have to face the same essential problems—how can you fulfill your highest destiny—how can you meet the responsibilities you have as educated men and women living in this fast-moving rapidly changing atomic and hydrogen age with its quantum mechanics, nuclear physics, and theory of relativity.

You are finishing the happiest but at once a most vital and important period of your lives. You have made a fine start. As a class and as individuals you have made a great record here. Your class has distinguished itself in the classroom, on the athletic field and in every other school activity. You have all recorded a significant accomplishment in your school work. By your training and your character, you are well equipped for the future. If you have the will, ambition and determination, you can go on to finer achievements.

You can go on to service to your own aims, and service also to the Nation and humanity, to the task which faces every one of us today more than ever before of protecting, preserving, maintaining, enriching and perfecting the great institutions of our country which have given you, and so many others, priceless, incomparable advantages of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

If you but will it, if you courageously persevere in your aims, you can reach your goal and you can make your contribution worthwhile. Whatever that contribution is, make sure that it is your very best. Make sure that it represents the very best effort of which you are capable. Make sure that it is sincere, earnest and conscientious. Make sure that you work diligently at the tasks at hand. But no matter what your gains in material wealth and position, never take yourself too seriously.

Remember that you are human and finite. Never let failure deter you from another and still another try. Remember the words of a great philosopher, "There is no such word as failure in the lexicon of a bright youth." Keep your courage high, because you may score a touchdown on the next play. Be humble of your talents and accomplishments, and never gloat over the reverses of misfortunes of others. Tomorrow they may rise to success.

Distinguish between confidence in yourself and vainglory. Keep it in mind that "pride goeth before a fall," and that vanity casts doubt upon your real worth. Be generous, kindly and just—always ready to lend a helping hand, particularly to your less favored brethren. Respect the judgment of your elders because their experience can guide you safely away from the shoals. One is wise who learns from his own mistakes. One is a genius who learns from the mistakes of others.

Be interested in the civic and political affairs of your town, your State and your Government. Democracy can be destroyed by nonparticipation of the average citizen and the activity of minority pressure groups. The Nation and the world are faced by many grave problems. Your generation will necessarily have to play a large part in solving them. They cannot be solved without your active help.

You and those who will work with you will be the leaders of the future. What kind of a future—slave or free? Upon you the Nation will depend for its freedom and security. To you and other young Americans the whole world will one day look for guidance and inspiration in the struggle for peace and democracy. It will be your major task and duty to defend our liberty and save it from destruction by tyrants who are, if the facts were known, case problems for the psychologists, but who are preaching poisonous class hatred and intolerance and seeking by force or stealth the destruction of individual liberty and the enslavement of mankind.

My friends, there is no magic formula to prepare you for these great tasks, no open sesame to success. But there are some guides and signposts you can follow. First, remember that there is no substitute for hard work in the life of an individual or a nation. The able-bodied individual who strives to avoid or evade his responsibility, who turns to the government at some level to solve his personal problems, or to provide him with a means of livelihood, is foredoomed to failure. Similarly, that nation which turns its back on the dignity and worth of the individual and pursues the wraith of collectivism and socialism will soon suffer the same fate as all the other nations throughout history which have departed from the basic values of life ordained to us by the Almighty and exemplified so brilliantly by the unmatched glories and achievements of our Nation.

Remember that this Nation is not a static organism. To stand still is to retrogress. We must work for a dynamic, forward-looking, forward-moving democracy. But at the same time we cannot ignore or discard the solid, constructive values of the past. Industry, thrift, preparation for rainy days, above all, the deep spiritual values, and wholesome home and family life are the enduring basis of any worthwhile, well ordered government.

Do not be led astray or swerved from your chosen course by current despotic doctrines as old as Methuselah or the Corn laws of Rome that there is any easy road to personal success, governmental stability or national prosperity. A nation, like an individual, must zealously protect its freedom, or it will crumble through soft living, inertia, moral decay and spiritual degeneration, like so many other nations of the past, into the dust of oblivion. All the experience of mankind

and all the lessons of recorded history indisputably prove that fact.

Let me reemphasize: Be true to yourselves and the ideals you have learned in your own homes, your churches and this school. Be confident of your abilities and aim high. Remember the words of the poet "Not failure, but low aim, is crime." Be proud of your heritage and never betray it. Stand by your principles and your convictions. Respect yourselves and others will respect you.

Live like your fathers and mothers have tried to live—loyal to God and country, loyal to every worthy institution, loyal to your friends. Strive to advance yourself, and live, not by selfishness or vanity or materialism. "To thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day thou canst not then be false to any man," is something to remember, if you place beside it "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and the injunction of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." And when you are right, fear no one but God, because the truth will make you free and freedom will make you strong.

It always tugs at the heart to leave dear friends—the young and the old. But time waits for no one. Like all those who have gone before you, now you must move forward—always forward—to the broader opportunities and achievements of the future. You part today but you will be together again, I know, together in these fine warm friendships you have formed here, together in the spirit of these noble teachings and ideals, together in the company of all those who strive to keep our high faith in America and all she stands for, the eternal faith which by the blood and sacrifice of her sons we have sworn to uphold to the end.

Years ago in a similar setting as this I had the high privilege of rendering my own class ode and the closing lines of it went something like this:

"But now as we start on life's battle, let us be brave and heed, the words of our own class motto, 'Every day some noble deed.'"

And I think today, my friends, that the last line of that song may well be kept in mind by all of us, young and old: "Every day some nobler deed."

Let me again congrateulate you, your parents and teachers, upon this great memorable, unforgettable day in your lives, so full of deep meaning for them and for you.

And let me wish you all, and let me wish for my dear friend, Clarence Quimby, your great headmaster, all the very best of health, success, prosperity and happiness in the future, whatever may be your chosen way of life.

May the good Lord of hosts continue to shower his richest, choicest blessings upon all of you.

God love you.

The Overton Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a resolution adopted by the Louisiana State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, which confirms the support of this organization for construction of the Overton-Red River Waterway in Louisiana. I feel this waterway will render great benefits to all the people of northwest Louisiana.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Overton-Red River Waterway, a $300 million project planned for the entire southwest area, will offer great conveniences for our citizens and will result in widespread employment for labor's people throughout the entire area covered by the project; and

Whereas such projects bring unlimited advantages to Louisiana, adding to the already significant development of our State, and contributing to a better and a more abundant way of life for all of our people; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, go on record as approving this project as one of the immeasurable benefits to Louisiana, and that we urge upon our people the importance of letting their United States Senators and Representatives know that they are in favor of the Overton-Red River Waterway for Louisiana.

The President's Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues, to the following item, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1956:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE PRESIDENT'S ILLNESS

WASHINGTON.—It is good to know that the President's operation was a brilliant success, that his recovery should be complete within 6 weeks, and that his doctors agree that his illness need not bar him from a second term. Even so, there is no ducking the fact that the President and the country are again squarely faced with a familiar question: Whether a man in his condition should attempt to carry the crushing burden of the Presidency for 4 more years. The question can only be intelligently decided by a frank and careful weighing of the medical factors, and of other more intangible but equally important factors as well.

The world's greatest medical authority on the President's disease, ileitis, is Dr. Burrill Crohn, who first diagnosed the disease as benign and operable in 1932—before that, the patient usually died. Since 1932 Dr. Crohn has treated some 700 cases of the disease.

Dr. Crohn agrees, on the basis of this experience, that the President should have recovered fully in 6 weeks. Moreover, Dr. Crohn points out that there is virtually no chance of malignancy developing, since the small intestine is almost immune to malignancy. It is thus quite reasonable to hope that the President has many years of active and happy life ahead of him.

But there is a minus side to the medical picture as well. As Dr. Crohn points out, the President's operation, involving the elimination of several inches of intestine, is most distinctly a major operation. Although the heart is not directly involved, the President's heart attack and his age are unquestionably complicating factors. Finally, based on Dr. Cohn's experience, there is a 35-percent chance of recurrence of ileitis.

There is, of course, a somewhat similar chance of recurrence of coronary thrombosis. In sum, like his heart attack, the President's operation has been no minor indisposition. Even after his recovery, Dr. Crohn and other doctors consulted agreed, a physically vigorous campaign by the President must be ruled out.

So much for the medical factors. The President's personal prestige is perhaps the most important of the intangible factors to be weighed. In a speech some days ago, the President said: "Certainly the prestige of the United States since the last World War has never been as high as it is this day." The statement is open to dispute. But hardly anyone will dispute that the prestige of Dwight D. Eisenhower has never been higher, all over the world.

Almost single handed, the President has removed the false face of the United States as an unstable and warlike power. This has been, perhaps, his single greatest service to his country. His second greatest service has been to restore a large measure of the national unity which was so sadly lacking only a few years ago.

If the President decides to withdraw, the irreplaceable national asset of his world prestige will be lost. A period of extreme political confusion will also be ushered in, in which the violent partisanship which the President has done so much to still will again be loudly heard.

Yet, as in the case of the medical picture, there is another side of the picture which must also be considered. Ever since his heart attack, there has been a tendency among his subordinates to shield Mr. Eisenhower from the unpleasant responsibilities of his office. A case in point was the urgent message on the Middle Eastern crisis from British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, which was apparently concealed from the President.

Military leaders, appalled by the accelerating shift in the world power balance to the Communist bloc, complain that the President is so protected that they have not been able to make known to him the real case for a sharply stepped up defense effort. Again, there is heavy pressure on the National Security Council to avoid troubling the President with split papers. The result has been largely to transform the NSC into a mechanism for reaching the lowest common denominator of indecision.

Since the President's latest trouble, the tendency to overprotect him is sure to grow. Perhaps this is not too great a price to pay for his prestige abroad and his leadership at home. But it is silly to pretend that there is no price to pay; or to disregard the risks involved in a second term for a man of 65 who has had a coronary thrombosis and a major abdominal operation within less than 8 months.

As before, the final decision will rest with the President himself. But it is not only legitimate, but right and needful, that the matter be fully and frankly debated by the country.

Panama Canal Problems: Issues Stated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming meeting of Presidents of the American States at Panama in late June has attracted world attention to the problems of the Americas. Among the foremost of these under current consideration by the Congress is am-

plification of interoceanic transit facilities.

The most recent contribution to the literature on this subject is a paper by Earl Harding, vice president of the National Economic Council of New York, published in Economic Council Papers, volume XI, No. 2, of June 1, 1956. In this he brings the principal canal issues into focus.

The paper carries the following biographical note of its author written by Vice Adm. Charles S. Freeman, United States Navy, retired:

Mr. Harding's continuing interest in the Panama Canal stems from his earlier background in journalism, to which he was diverted from engineering. As news editor of Joseph Pulitzer's New York World he was thrust in 1908 into an intensive investigation of the Panama revolution of 1903. This took him to Europe, and many times to Panama and Colombia. Later, in industry and finance, his interest was extended to other Latin American countries. He has been a member of the Pan American Society of the United States since 1919.

Articles on the Panama Canal problems over the past 10 years have been numerous. The attention of the Congress is invited to the excellent documentation on Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, prepared by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955. Mr. Harding's paper is a highly meritorious addition to this documentation, and is commended for reading by every Member of Congress and its staff experts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the text of the indicated paper is quoted:

WHAT MORE WILL AMERICA GIVE AWAY AT PANAMA?

(By Earl Harding)

President Eisenhower's announced venture this month into the diplomatic jungles of Panama to confer with the heads of the South and Central American Republics is certain to be of historic importance.

The big game of this safari will be you, the American taxpayer—your dollars, and eventually the sovereignty of your country. The pitfalls will be well camouflaged, but they will be there.

Besides the maneuvering of the other Latin American neighbors for benefits from rich Uncle Sam, there will be these problems affecting the lifeline of America's economic and military defense, the Panama Canal.

1. Agitation for eventual internationalization of the Panama Canal—after American taxpayers have footed the bills. Our original canal investment was close to $400 million. It could not be replaced for less than $1 billion today. And the canal rebuilt at sea level would cost 5 to 10 billions more.

2. Concentration of pressure on the United States Congress to pass legislation to make effective certain features of our vitally important giveaway treaty with Panama. This treaty was negotiated in secret for 16 months, ratified by our Senate, July 29, 1955, without adequate investigation or debate, and was almost completely overlooked by the American press.

3. Propaganda for constructing practically a new canal, at sea level—regardless of the billions it would cost, the engineering risks involved, and the certainty that Panama would again hold us up for the right to vary present Canal Zone boundaries for the sea-level relocation.

4. Complaint of American ship owners that Panama Canal tolls are prohibitively high, and the lawsuit now pending, brought by 12 American steamship companies for refund of $27 million in tolls collected since 1951 allegedly in excess of the amounts authorized in the law passed by Congress reorganizing the Panama Canal administration.

5. Decision of the Panama Canal authorities to abandon the American-owned Panama Railroad and replace it with an automobile and truck highway. Congressional investigation has stopped this one, at least temporarily.

THE THREAT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

Internationalization of the Panama Canal is not a new idea with the Panamanian politicians. In Economic Council publications as far back as September 1, 1953, I forecast that "If Panama's desire for still further concessions is not satisfied, pressure in behalf of Panama such as Alger Hiss in 1946 brought to bear through the United Nations may take the form of demanding internationalization of the Panama Canal."

This warning was reemphasized in 1954 and 1955 in my urging that the future of the canal be not compromised in the then unratified giveaway treaty.

Representative FRANCIS E. DORN, Republican of Brooklyn, as one of the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, while attending hearings in the Canal Zone last December, heard Panamanians talking about the time when the canal would be internationalized. Further, the Congressman told me recently, he found Panamanian politicians grumbling about our giveaway treaty—Uncle Sam hadn't given them enough.

How serious are the implications of this "internationalization" threat was evaluated in Washington on May 12 by the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, Governor of the Canal Zone 1910–13, later a Member of Congress from Kentucky. As toastmaster of the Panama Canal Society's meeting honoring the memory of John F. Stevens as the engineering architect of the canal, Governor Thatcher said:

"There are those who wish to see the Panama Canal internationalized; taken from the hands of the United States and turned over to an international or world organization, which would very likely team up with the world-at-large and use it in a way to greatly harm this Nation. * * *

"The work was effected under American treaty rights and arrangements which the world recognizes as valid. Speaking for myself, and voicing, I believe, the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, I would oppose the indicated suggestion, or movement, as one of monumental stupidity and evil. * * *

"There is no other country in all the earth which, if it had built the canal as we have built it, would surrender its right to own, control, and operate it.

"Yet there are those in our midst at this hour—at this time of grave danger to the freedom of the entire human race—who, through impractical idealism or sinister design, would yield up all these precious and dearly earned rights, which are ours. * * *

"The canal has enabled us to make the critical contribution to defeat in war the tyrannies of despotism, and in peace to serve the free shipping and commerce of the world. We have thus benefited not only ourselves but all mankind. Our abandonment of the control of this great waterway, beneficent and strategic, would be, indeed, an act of stupendous folly."

THE GIVEAWAY TREATY—WHAT IT MEANS

The extent of the surrender of America's vital interests through our latest giveaway treaty with Panama and the pressures to implement it are too little known. Who is responsible?

The Americas Daily, published in Miami Springs, Fla., in separate Spanish and English editions which are widely distributed in Latin America, stated in a front-page editorial on May 19, 1956:

"It is a historic fact that President Eisenhower was a decisive factor in the negotiation of the treaty recently signed by the United States and Panama. * * * The participation of President Eisenhower, at determining moments of the negotiation, was of great significance. * * *

"It is to be desired that before the President arrives in Panama, approval be given to the laws implementing the treaty, and which will put it in full force, since Eisenhower had so much to do with it * * *

"There is some fear that, for some reason, the Legislature of the United States may end its present session without approving the laws implementing the treaty."

Legislation to implement the treaty and it supplementary memorandum of understandings must be voted by our Congress before the administration can deliver title to the properties which the treaty donates to the Republic of Panama.

The estimated fair market value of the donated properties, as stated by our Government is $24,300,000. They include the Panaman Railroad yards and terminals at both ends of the canal; the Washington Hotel in Colon, worth $1,450,000; the Colon Hospital, market value now $1,400,000; and many other parcels.

But the $24,300,000 is not all. Cost to the United States of replacing or relocating properties affected by the treaty is stated officially to be $12,300,000.

Add to these items a bridge across the canal, as promised in 1942, to cost $20 million. (Other estimates, up to $27 million.)

And don't forget the $1,500,000 increase in our annuity to Panama for the privilege of operating our canal. Once it was $250,000; then $430,000. Now our giveaway treaty makes it $1,930,000 a year, in perpetuity, since the treaty cannot be reopened without mutual consent.

SQUANDERMANIA AT SEA LEVEL

On the day of the announcement that Panama was inviting President Eisenhower and heads of the 20 other American Republics to celebrate together the Bolivar anniversary, June 25 and 26, agitation for a sea-level reconstruction of the Panama Canal was revived in 8-column headlines in the Panama press.

Brig. Gen. John S. Seybold, ending his term as Governor of the Canal Zone and President of the Government-owned Panama Canal Company, announced that he has reached the unqualified conclusion that the proposed sea-level canal "is both feasible and desirable and, in fact, inevitable."

Thus the old controversy between sea-level and high-level-lake-and-locks type of canal again becomes a threat to every American taxpayer's pocketbook.

Sooner or later, perhaps not before this summer's adjournment, Congress will discover that voters have a vital interest in a money-conserving, defense-sound solution at Panama.

Reduced to laymen's language, the question is: Should the existing canal be modernized, at a cost estimated at around $700 million; or should, in effect, a new canal be constructed at sea level, at a cost estimated by the sea-level advocates at $4,500,000,000; but likely, say civilian engineers, to be at least double that amount.

An alert, informed Republican Senator wrote last year to an economy-minded Democratic Senator: "It is notorious that Government engineers habitually underestimate the cost of projects in which they are particularly interested." (The strategy of spenders is to get a project started, and then trust Congress to meet the deficits.)

Still pending are the Martin and Thompson bills for creation of an independent commission of qualified experts to determine what is the logical solution of the engineer-

ing problems. Also pending is the bill of Senator MAGNUSON to transfer the canal from the Secretary of the Army to civilian management under the Department of Commerce.

New light on the sea-level controversy will be found if Congress digs deeper. For instance, there was recently declassified a preliminary report dated January 17, 1944 by the then governor of the canal, Gen. Glen E. Edgerton. He recommended a thorough investigation of the possibilities for modification of the existing canal, extension of Gatun Lake and abandonment of the Pedro report approved in principle the suggested modification of the existing canal.

The Edgerton report also warned that sea-level advocates would "oppose unjustifiably" any move that would delay their sea-level dream.

Now the outgoing governor, General Seybold, says the investigation projected in the Martin and Thompson bills to evaluate both plans would be a waste of money. But that is for the Congress, not the administration,, to decide.

One sentence in the long-unavailable Edgerton report is of special interest now, in view of current evaluation of the work of John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the canal during its creative period, 1905–07. It reads: "* * * the wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established."

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a carefully documented address to the Panama Canal Society of Washington on May 12, 1956, placed Mr. Stevens in "historical perspective" as "the basic architect" of the canal. Mr. FLOOD's studies show that Mr. Stevens saw the advantages of consolidating the locks at the Pacific end of the canal, but was compelled to compromise on one lock step at Pedro Miguel and two at Miraflores. This created, against the chief engineer's better judgment, a transportation bottleneck at Pedro Miguel.

The alternative to the sea-level proposal, known as the Terminal Lake plan, would extend Gatun Lake to new, giant triple locks near the present Miraflores site. Then, with new triple locks at the Atlantic end of Gatun Lake large enough to accommodate any giant craft of the future, there would be uninterrupted navigation through the enlarged lake.

Navy men and merchant seamen recognize the navigational advantages of such a high-level lake channel over the deep, and necessarily narrow, channel dug to sea level and menaced by slides.

The sea-level side of the argument is that a sea-level channel, with tidal locks, would be safer under atomic or thermonuclear attack.

The answer of the advocates of a modernized high-level canal—the Terminal Lake Plan—is to quote such authorities as Maj. Gen. Thomas F. Farrell, who has been inside the atomic and thermonuclear developments since their beginning. General Farrell wrote on April 5, 1956, to Senator MARTIN:

"Atomic and thermonuclear weapons—if delivered on the target—will put a sea-level canal out of service as effectively as they would a lock canal."

Governor Thatcher has stated that not one of the engineers, still living, who had experience in building or operating the canal, approves the sea-level idea.

Mr. E. S. Randolph, of Baton Rouge, La., spent 35 years on the canal and is recognized as the greatest repository of Panama Canal engineering knowledge and experience living today. Mr. Randolph's evaluation of present canal problems was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1956, by Congressman DORN, of Brooklyn. The following is quoted from the Randolph statement:

"The sea-level plan contains engineering and constructional features which are grossly without precedent in the Isthmian area. * * * The oversize dredging equipment required for deepening the cut before lowering the water level would necessitate a program of development involving unforeseeable risks, delays, and costs. Without experience, there is no solid basis for the evaluation of the action of the materials under the new order of pressures which would be developed [by cutting the channel 108 feet below its present level]. The problem of landslides would be greatly accentuated. * * *

"The interoceanic canal problem includes, besides engineering and geology, grave questions of diplomatic relationships, economics, and marine operations. The issues must be decided on their merit at the highest plane of wise and experienced judgment and statesmanship. This I firmly believe can be best accomplished by an independent and broadly constituted commission as provided in the Martin-Thompson bill now pending."

Every American taxpayer's pocketbook will be affected by the decisions President Eisenhower may be asked to make in Panama, and by the action that the Congress must take in Washington, now or later.

The outcome can be influenced by what is heard from the people back home within the next fortnight.

Possible Congressional Investigation of Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received the following letter with enclosures which I received from Thomas Jefferson Miley, Executive Vice President of the Commerce & Security Association of New York. I feel sure it will be of interest to our colleagues:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 8, 1955.

Hon. PETER FRELINHUYSEN, Jr.
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: I would like to take this opportunity to commend you for introducing House Resolution 512, which would authorize a congressional investigation of labor union activities designed to extort money or other advantage by means of violence, intimidation or other improper interference with normal business operations.

As the representative of approximately 3,500 employers in the New York metropolitan area, this association feels the time has come for the Federal Government to act in a comprehensive way on this pressing national problem.

While local enforcement officials are attacking this growing problem conscientiously, frequently they are stymied by a number of factors beyond their control.

Today, we sent the enclosed letter and telegram, urging a Federal investigation of labor union racketeering, to each member of the United States Congress, and to the President of the United States, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor. We have specifically mentioned, and endorsed, your resolution as one possible approach to the problem.

I hope that you will actively encourage approval of your proposal. Rest assured we are entirely in sympathy with it; and you have our enthusiastic support.

T. J. MILEY,
Executive Vice President.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 8, 1956.

To Members of Committee on Rules and Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

As the representative of approximately 3,500 employers in the New York metropolitan area, this association feels the time has come to act on the pressing national problem of labor racketeering and extortion.

Here in New York City we are especially conscious of this increasingly serious problem posed by unscrupulous individuals who attach themselves to the labor movement. At the moment, there are separate investigations being conducted here by the New York County district attorney, the New York State attorney general, and the United States attorney for the southern district of New York. We are convinced that they are working as assiduously as possible on this grave issue.

Unfortunately, there are many obstacles in the paths of these agencies:

1. Employers and others who suffer from the predatory practices of those who pervert the labor unions for personal gain by whatever means, are frequently too frightened to bring their complaints to existing local authorities.

2. While we are particularly aware of the situation here in New York City, clearly the total problem of labor racketeering goes beyond State boundaries and is national in scope; yet, existing investigatory facilities are essentially local in character.

3. There is a substantial possibility that a Federal probe could provide the basis for Federal legislation to prevent many of these vicious practices in the future.

4. Perhaps the most effective way to eradicate labor racketeering is to marshal an informed, outraged, nationwide public opinion.

Each of these factors calls for a thorough and fairly conducted investigation at the Federal level. Such a study could provide a vital service by focusing the publicity spotlight on those who would blemish the legitimate trade union movement, and who would prey upon employers, employees and the public. House Resolution 512, introduced by Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., which would authorize a congressional investigation of labor union racketeering activities, is one possible approach to the problem.

We are heartened by newspaper reports this week that President Eisenhower also favors some kind of comprehensive Federal action against union racketeering.

In an economy such as ours, trade unions must occupy a position of high public trust. It is their clear and unequivocal duty to represent employees, in their relations with emyloyers, in accordance with the enlightened best interests of those employees. Many unions fill this role effectively and with honor. However, where individuals succeed in taking over unions for improper malicious motives, the fundamental public policy of free collective bargaining in a free economy is jeopardized. Such individuals must be exposed.

Sincerely yours,

T. J. MILEY,
Executive Vice President.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
June 8, 1956.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., representing approximately 3,500 employers in the New York City area, highly gratified by newspaper reports this week that you favor new comprehensive approach on Federal level against union racketeering and infiltration criminal elements in union movement.

New York City especially conscious increasingly serious problem posed by unscrupulous individuals perverting trade unions for personal gain, through violence, intimidation, extortion.

Local Government agencies working assiduously on problem but many obstacles in their paths: Victims of predatory practices frequently too frightened to complain to local authorities. Labor gangsterism goes beyond State boundaries. Substantial possibility new Federal legislation needed to prevent vicious practices in future. Informed, outraged, nationwide public opinion most effective in eradicating labor racketeering.

These factors call for thorough fairly conducted investigation at Federal level. House Resolution 512, by FRELINGHUYSEN one possible approach.

In free, democratic society unions must be true to their high public trust. Most unions represent employees effectively and with honor. Where individuals take over unions for malicious purposes, fundamental public policy jeopardized. Such individuals must be exposed.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Executive Vice President.

American-Italian Educational Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver a lecture under the auspices of the Institute of Italian Culture in the United States on the theme American-Italian Educational Relations. In the course of my address, I offered a 10-point program calling for the improvement and expansion of the cultural and educational relations between America and Italy.

In recent days I have been informed by the institute that my address has been received with considerable interest in American and Italian educational and cultural circles. The institute is now arranging for a translation of the address into the Italian language and copies will subsequently be submitted to authorities in the Italian Ministry of Education, to the foreign minister, and other leading officials of the government, to Members of Parliament, to the heads of universities, technical schools and normal schools, and others interested in the field of education or in American-Italian relations.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this wide interest and for the benefit of further improving American-Italian relations, I am inserting the text of my address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members of both houses of Congress and the American public generally may have the opportunity to learn of my proposals.

The text of the address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO ON AMERICAN-ITALIAN EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS, INSTITUTE OF ITALIAN CULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES, FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1956, AT INSTITUTE OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, Professor Gerig, my good friend Ugo Cecchini, ladies and gentlemen, it is with considerable trepidation that I have accepted your kind invitation to speak to you this evening, under the auspices of the Institute of Italian Culture in the United States. May I say at the outset that the objectives of the institute are most praiseworthy. The dissemination of Italian culture in America and the intercultural relationship between the people of Italy and the people of America can in time, if properly developed, form the basis of a great cultural partnership of tremendous importance. The mingling of our two cultures holds vast promise for the future, and for this reason I want to extend my congratulations to all who are laboring in this vineyard of civilization.

I am very happy to be here with you and to have this opportunity to share some thoughts with you. My topic for discussion is "American-Italian Educational Relations." I am not an educator or pedagogue as are some of my distinguished listeners here this evening, but education is a field in which I have always found a great deal of interest as a parent, as a jurist on the bench, and as a legislator in the Halls of Congress. The educational relationship between the land of my forefathers and the land of my adoption is of particular interest to me because of very obvious reasons.

At this stage, however, I must ask you to bear in mind that what I am going to say to you tonight are the thoughts and views of one who is trained primarily in the fields of law and politics. Above all, do not regard this as political oratory.

The story is told in Washington about a Congressman whom a constituent of his was trying to reach. An important debate was going on then on the House floor, but the constituent nevertheless sent in a page boy to call the Congressman off the floor. When the Congressman came into the cloakroom, the constituent started to apologize for taking him away from the debate.

"Oh, that's all right," said the Congressman. "I am glad to have an excuse to come out here. This cloakroom is the best shelter we have from oratorical fallout."

Well, I don't know about the oratorical part of my effort here, but I am hoping that there will be a fallout of ideas which might prove stimulating as far as the educational and cultural relations of Italy and America are concerned. This is a field of endeavor which requires more than mere stimulation—it requires inspiration.

You have heard the story of Michelangelo and the piece of marble. He was strolling one day with a friend of his in Florence and came upon this block of marble half buried with dirt and rubbish. He cleared away the debris and lifted it from the mire. His friend, in surprise, asked what he wanted with such a worthless piece of rock anyway, whereupon Michelangelo replied.

"Oh, there is an angel in that stone and I must bring it out."

He brought the piece of marble to his studio. There, he worked on it patiently, lovingly, and finally brought out the hidden glory that was to inspire others for generations to come.

Not many of us can have the talents and the inspiration of a Michelangelo. But all of us, I dare say, can do our share in bringing out that which is true, and good and inspiring in human nature. And I know of no field where this can be done at its best than the educational and cultural relations of Italy and the United States.

Back in March of this year, you will recall, the President of Italy, the Honorable Giovanni Gronchi, came to these friendly shores on an official visit to the United States. It was an appropriate occasion for the highest representatives of both countries to acknowledge again the strong links between our 2 cultures, the bond between our 2 nations. Today, perhaps as never before in our relationships, the United States and Italy recognize that the bonds joining our two countries are much stronger and deeper than the ones resulting from a military pact, of an economic-aid program, or a program of student exchange. The bonds are those of continuous reciprocal contributions, of mutual respect between 2 great peoples, of genuine friendship for one another, and the desire to bring out the hidden glory of our 2 cultures—as Michelangelo did with that block of marble several centuries ago.

My friends, the bridge of understanding between Italy and the United States was not constructed overnight. It is a process which is at least as old as the United States, and in fact goes back to colonial days. I do not wish to go into a discourse on Italian American history or the contributions of Italian Americans toward the growth and progress of this country. That is not my purpose tonight. But I do want to make a few references in order to point up my general subject.

During the colonial period of United States history, small but significant numbers of Italians joined the waves of early explorers and settlers that came to these shores. These Italians fitted themselves comfortably into the American social structure of that era, but interestingly enough they always retained a part of that color and sparkle which personifies the Italian. You know their names as well as I, beginning with Columbus, Giovanni Caboto (John Cabot) and his son Sebastian from Genoa, the Florentine Giovanni Verrazano, who discovered the harbor of New York, and Amerigo Vespucci after whom America was named.

But let me mention a few names, perhaps not so well known, but no less significant from a cultural standpoint. There was Philip Mazzei, who settled in Virginia and became an intimate friend of Thomas Jefferson. According to historians, Mazzei's letters had a tremendous impact on Jefferson's political philosophy.

There was Philip Tragetta, a musician and composer from Venice, who later became a friend of Presidents James Madison and James Monroe. Tragetta established the American Conservatorio in Philadelphia, probably the first institution of its kind in the New Yorld.

There was Father Gregorio Mengarini, a missionary and educator from Rome, who established the first collegiate institution on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara.

There was Father Benedict Sistini, who pioneered the teaching of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry in this country with his outstanding treatises on these subjects.

There was Prof. Vincenzo Botto, who taught Italian and literature at the University of the City of New York and was a friend of such literary luminaries as Horace Greeley, William Cullen Bryant, and Edgar Allan Poe. Professor Botto established the first important literary salon in the history of American letters.

These and many others too numerous to mention have made lasting contributions to our American heritage over the many and long years. The imprint of their contribu-

tion to American life and culture is visible all over our land.

Coming down closer to our own times, in the period after 1880 when large numbers of Italians immigrated to the United States, we find that they became a vibrant and meaningful asset to American democracy. We must not forget that the Italian immigrant came to this country through choice and with a burning determination to improve his lot. He believed in the "American dream" long before he left his native land. Political unrest and religious persecution played no effective role in the mass immigration of Italians, as it did in the case of immigrants from other parts of Europe. The Italians came to America in order to improve his human desire for advancement, for a better life for himself and his family, for opportunities which he did not have in his native land because it lacked the material resources.

The optimism with which the Italian immigrant greeted his newly adopted land was reflected in all his endeavors and throughout all his pursuits in this country. In the field of culture the contributions are practically inexhaustible. In art, for example, the works of Cappellano, Persico, Valperti and, of course, Brumidi, all exude the warmth and depth of meaning with which the Italian artist is known to imbue his art.

Over the years the bonds of blood, understanding and admiration between the two countries continued to grow. Academies and cultural institutes—and I want to single out this fine institute under whose auspices I am speaking here this evening—have become familiar phenomena in American life. In Italy, of course, these institutes contributed to the spread of culture and they helped to disseminate knowledge abroad of Italian intellectual life.

During World War II, America "rediscovered" Italy. In the inter-war period between the two World Wars, the attraction of Italy to the American tourist and the connoisseur never lessened, but somehow those visitors did not always have the proper appreciation for the more subtle and sophisticated phases of Italian life and ways. With World War II, however, there was almost a rediscovery of the finer facets of Italian culture. Since then this movement has been gaining momentum.

What has brought about this increased interest? Cultural exchange and development programs have accentuated the community of interests between Italy and the United States. Under the Fulbright Act, for example, good will and understanding between the two countries have been furthered through the exchange of students, teachers, university lecturers, and research scholars. The resounding ovation given recently in Italy to American performers with the opera troupe of Porgy and Bess, demonstrated the basic pool of good will and appreciation for the finer things produced in America. Italians and Americans accord each other's motion pictures a high degree of prestige and recognition. Italy, the universally recognized birthplace of the melodrama, spontaneously acclaimed the popular music and the artists of America.

This common link between the cultures of the two nations was recently emphasized by David E. Finley, the director of the National Gallery of Art, in Washington, D. C., when he said: "We owe much that is best in our culture and our ideas of freedom * * * to such nations as Italy." The cultural interchange in art, music, education, and other facets of life, has forged links in a chain of understanding that must stay strong and untarnished.

Turning now more specifically to American-Italian educational relations, you will remember that during World War II many educational institutions in Italy were severely damaged. The universities of Bologna, Cagliari, Florence, Genoa, Milan, Naples, Pisa, Turin, and the Catholic University of Milan were so badly damaged that for a time it seemed the damage was irreparable. Whole buildings were destroyed, others were sacked of valuable equipment by the Nazis; some were requisitioned as hospitals or troop quarters, and some were even used as defense points in battle. There was also widespread destruction or deterioration of scientific equipment and libraries.

After the war, the Government was faced not only with the problem of rebuilding and reequipping the universities, but also how to cope with the large number of war veterans who sought to gain admittance to the universities. It was at this time that the United States stepped in with aid from Marshall plan funds and also from private contributions, which were used for the restoration of buildings and equipment. Of course, the Italian Government also allocated funds for these purposes and, in addition, provided assistance to many students (former partisans, prisoners of war, etc.). It is now a matter of record that this Marshall plan aid was most efficiently used, and today we find that Italy's universities—at least in their physical aspects—have made a complete recovery, thanks to this generous aid from America.

At this point, I want to make brief reference to the School Reform which was decreed in 1949. It do not want to go into a detailed discussion of this reform, other than to say that it is based fundamentally on Article 33 of the Italian Constitution which states emphatically: "The arts and the sciences are free and free must be the teaching of them." The reforms, though gradual and experimental, also underscored the principle of education for all. This is a relatively new concept in Italy, where for generations both secondary and higher education were a privilege enjoyed only by the few, rather than by the masses as in this country. Make no mistake about it: the distinction between popular education and education for the elite has not yet been eliminated, but progress in that direction is being made. Today, the literacy rate in Italy stands at 92 percent, compared with 97 percent in the United States, 99 percent in Britain, 93 percent in France, and only 54 percent in Spain.

One of the achievements in this country which has a great impact on the people of Italy is the belief that "everyone in the United States goes to college." Such sweeping generalizations are always a bit exaggerated, just as is that other mythical assumption that "in America everyone has a car." But if this American impact helps to raise the goals of the Italian people in their educational endeavors and it encourages them to broaden their educational scope, then I feel it constitutes an influence for the good.

More and more one finds that educational circles in Italy, particularly the more progressive and more democratic elements, look to the United States for guidance and contact and specialization in every field of endeavor. Scholars and students in Italy manifest an ever-increasing desire to avail themselves of the vast educational resources of American universities, especially in science and technology. However, to date this thirst for knowledge and experience has not been fully utilized. It should be vastly expanded on a scale to benefit our two countries.

The questions remain: What is to be done? How is it to be done? And by whom? This is where I want to inject a few ideas and proposals. In full modesty, I urge you not to look upon this as a blueprint or even a specific plan. I prefer to regard it more in the nature of a set of ideas and suggestions toward the improvement and expansion of the cultural and educational relationship between America and Italy. These ideas should be weighed by experts, and those which are practicable and capable of realization should be developed fully. I can only indicate an outline for a plan.

First, I should like to suggest the establishment of an American House in Rome. This is not a novel idea. Our good friend, Prof. Vincenza Rivera, is the head of an organization of scholars at the University of Rome which aims to establish such a house. It is visualized as an educational link or as a clearinghouse between the universities in Italy and the universities in this country. In its beginnings, however, it would of necessity have to be on a very modest scale and on an experimental basis.

In this respect, we can perhaps learn from the experience of our fellow Americans of Scandinavian extraction, who maintain a foundation which over the years has proved itself to be of exceptional character and achievement. Suffice it to say that more than 500 American students attend institutions of higher learning in Sweden each year. This is an achievement of which Scandinavian-Americans can be justly proud, for it is one of the best and wisest methods in cementing the ties between two cultures.

Surely, we can do as well. We have the human resources in this country for a project of this kind. An American House in Rome would channel the placement of American students in every university in Italy, in every faculty of instruction, in every field of endeavor. One thousand American students in Italian universities each year would be a thousand American ambassadors of good will there, and a thousand ambassadors of friendship for Italy after their return to this country. Repeated year after year, you can visualize for yourself the enormous possibilities for close cultural and educational cooperation between the two countries. Its scope is unlimited. I am sure of that, with millions of Americans of Italian descent and many fine Italian-American organizations in this country, it would be possible to underwrite the establishment of an American House. It would be an act of patriotism in the interests of both countries. As you can see, I am interested in an American House that will help American-Italian relations, not one that will exploit either country.

Second, I suggest the establishment of several cultural agencies in this country whose purpose it shall be to maintain and develop intellectual relations with Italy. These agencies are to be set up in various geographical localities throughout the country, perhaps a half dozen at the start. Where possible, they should be established in conjunction with a leading university, preferably on or near the campus. They are to serve as a clearinghouse for Italian students studying in this country, for Italian educators and intellectuals visiting here; they are to be centers for the dissemination of Italian culture, for the study of the Italian language, for lectures on every phase on Italian creativity of the past and the present. They are to be a center of attraction for young Americans, who are to be encouraged to familiarize themselves with Italy, its people, and its great cultural heritage.

Third, I should like to see a much larger educational exchange program than the one we have now. Educational exchange projects offer an effective way to enlarge the areas of common interests between two nations. By bringing together people of different countries and enabling them to share their knowledge and skills, to learn from each other, and to study common problems, we are helping to develop mutual understanding and respect.

How big has been this educational exchange in recent years? Let me cite to you some figures for the year 1954. In that year the State Department's exchange program, which applies to students, teachers, research scholars, and certain specialists, records a total of 419 persons, 232 coming from Italy

to the United States and 187 Americans going there. It may interest you to know that in the same year the exchange program with Germany involved 1,338 persons (more than three times the size of the Italian exchange program), for England it was 762, and for France 643.

I should like to see this program considerably expanded, both in an official and private capacity. I think, for example, that trips to Italy should be arranged for Members of Congress and also for legislators and administrators in our State and municipal governments. It is important that as many American newspapermen as possible visit Italy, and that Italian newspapermen have an opportunity to work for a while on American newspapers. There should be an organized program of exchanges to include such groups as industrial leaders, professionals, people who are active in communal affairs, labor leaders, the heads of women's organizations, and other groups. But, above all, the exchange of students, teachers, and scholars should be increased to much larger proportions.

This exchange program should be established on a basis of mutuality of interests. It should be planned and developed to broaden and deepen the community of interests between the United States and Italy, if we are earnest in achieving greater understanding and solidarity between the two nations. When people of different countries have the opportunity to live and work together and to be in daily contact, they must develop feelings of friendliness and respect for each other, just as they are sure to lose the feelings of fear and suspicion of each other.

Fourth, I propose the establishment of more Chairs in American Studies in Italian universities, and Chairs of Italian Studies in American universities. Such studies should become a part of the regular curricula of the universities in both countries. Here, too, something has been done, but not quite enough. I visualize not only chairs which offer courses in the Italian language in our universities, but full educational programs which are to stress Italian civilization and culture, of the past and contemporary period, in American universities; simultaneously, such chairs in Italian universities should present courses in American history and contemporary life in this country in all its aspects, including the political, the economic, the social, and the cultural.

Fifth, I want to impress upon you the urgent need for adequate library facilities in Italy on all levels, from the university on down to the elementary schools in the villages. Let me read to you a few lines from an article by an American scholar who was in Italy on a Fulbright scholarship in 1954. This is what he says:

"Library facilities in Italian universities are shocking to the American observer. Not only are resources poor, especially in current acquisitions, but they are also inaccessible because of archaic cataloging and inefficient systems of circulation. Some libraries are rich in manuscripts, incunabula, and periodicals, but these are very difficult for the student to get at and study efficiently. There is little concept of library services in Italy; comfortable and well-lighted reading rooms, the so-called 'tools' of library research, open shelves, and well-trained and available librarians familiar to even the smallest college libraries in the United States are virtually unknown in Italy."

Now, if this is the situation in the university libraries, how much different or how better could it be in the relatively few existing public libraries? The fact is that existing library facilities are not generally used effectively or to capacity. The universities spend very little for the acquisition of new books, and if this attitude is pursued for another decade or two the libraries of Italy will eventually lose their value as centers of research. It will hurt the universities and the entire educational system of Italy, and indirectly affect every aspect of Italian life and activity.

Here, then, is a field where a real job can be done—and it should be done fast. A project can be undertaken in this country to build up the libraries of Italian universities through acquisitions of books and manuscripts from this country, or making funds available to them for their own purchases. Let each large community of Italian-Americans in this country sponsor the rehabilitation of a library at some Italian university. But that is not all. I should like to see the establishment of an American library in every major city in Italy. These are to contain books for adults and children on every manifestation of life in America and Italy, from adventure to zoology.

At the same time, I believe that in many parts of this country it would be logical to approach public libraries to set up special sections, rooms or even shelves on Italian culture and civilization. Both in Italy and here, these library projects could serve as a profitable educational accomplishment.

Sixth, I should like to see an exchange program to include all phases of the arts, music, the theater, opera, radio and television, and of course, the painters and the sculptors, etc. Sponsorship could be for individuals, groups or whole companies. It could be under public or private auspices. But it must be the best and the finest in the arts and artistry of both countries. It must be an exchange on the highest artistic level which will be to the credit of both countries and to the benefit of both nations.

An American artist from Virginia, who studied painting at the Academy of Fine Arts in Rome on a Fulbright scholarship, had this to say of what he called his "Italian experience":

"The American artist who comes to Italy for a period of study and work has much to gain from many sources. The variety and richness of the Italian landscape, the ruins of ancient cities and temples, the warmth of the Italian people themselves, and constant contact with the Italian artists, all fuse into an experience, vivid and inspiring. Italian artists have been eager to communicate their ideas and have taken a great interest in the work and ideas of the visiting American artist. This healthy interchange has provided a stimulus which, together with the richness of other impressions, forms an integral part of the Italian experience."

What has been done in this single instance, I am sure, can be done in thousands of other instances to stimulate the cultural interchange of ideas and experiences between America and Italy.

Seventh, I should like to recommend an exchange, not of people, but of documents. I have in mind particularly the translation of important American documents into the Italian language and made available to the Italian people through their universities, schools, libraries, etc. This is a field which has been almost completely neglected. Do you know, for example, that the first Italian translation of the famous Federalist Papers of Hamilton, Jay, and Madison, which have played such a significant part in American history, was published only a few months ago, in October 1955? Here is what an Italian scholar who read these early American essays had to say:

"Many reviewers are astonished that American thought of the 18th century could be so alive, original, and profound."

I believe that scholars in this country and in Italy could be interested in the participation of similar projects for the translation of other worthwhile documents, manuscripts, literary works of the past and the present of the two countries. This, in itself, could be a wonderful way for the promotion of educational and cultural relations between the two countries.

Eighth, I must express utter surprise that to this day there is no American University in Rome. American universities are functioning in Istanbul, in Beirut, in Cairo, and in other places. Why is it that no such institution has ever been established in Rome, which has so much to offer to American students and scholars?

I should like to see such an educational institution established, but on the basis of American standards and the American system of instruction, rather than the European system of university instruction. This is to be an American institution aiming to diffuse American culture and an appreciation of the American way of life and democratic ideals. I am sure that many Italian-American groups in this country would gladly underwrite scholarships for deserving students in Italy to attend this university.

Ninth, another field which should come under consideration, though it is indirectly related to education, is social welfare. I am thinking particularly of social-welfare institutions designed to aid children, such as nurseries, clinics, homes and schools for handicapped and delinquent children, and the like. This is another field where considerable work could be done, and should be done as soon as possible.

About 3 or 4 years ago, an Italian woman came to this country on a Smith-Mundt grant to study public health, juvenile delinquency, and other rehabilitation problems in this country. What were the things that impressed her most? Not the skyscrapers, the slick cars, or the numerous gadgets which have become indispensable to our daily living. She was impressed by the fact (and I quote) "that the streets of the United States were not swarming with ragged and begging children, that school buildings were adequately lighted, heated, and stocked with books."

I believe that with the aid of certain specialized agencies of the United Nations, church groups, women's organizations, and other voluntary groups in this country various institutions could be set up to aid such children through programs for health and education, to keep them off the streets and prevent them from becoming chronic beggars, to help them avoid the degradation of illiteracy and moral delinquency. There is much that we can offer in the form of advice and material assistance in helping the people of Italy to alleviate the conditions of these underprivileged children and give them new hope and a new lease on life.

My tenth and final proposal concerns the expansion of tourism between the United States and Italy. I would like to see tourism established on a large and organized scale, to encourage Americans of all walks of life to visit Italy. Perhaps courses could be set up in various parts of the country to acquaint Americans with Italy, its people and climate, its cultural heritage and its historical significance. Groups in larger and smaller number could be organized for a visit to Italy. Italian-Americans should be among the first to participate on a large scale. Perhaps we should undertake a campaign where every American of Italian descent should at least once in his lifetime visit the land of his ancestors. This would be a great educational experience for them and for the people in Italy, too. Incidentally, it would also be of tremendous economic importance to Italy.

Some 200 years ago, the sagacious Dr. Samuel Johnson once remarked that "A man who has not been in Italy is always conscious of an inferiority." For many centuries people from many lands found that Italy was a source of inspiration because of its treasure house of past glories and the vitality of the genius of the Italian people. It can truly be said that the creative spirits of almost the entire world have turned to Italy, and in every instance the contact has been rewarding. I have no doubt that it would be

equally rewarding to many Americans who would go to Italy, and that is why tourism should be an important part of American-Italian educational relations.

Such is the program I am proposing to you today. It is in a sense an educational point 4 program, aimed as a two-way avenue of educational and cultural relationship between two great nations of the Western World. A combination of this sort would be unparalleled in the sphere of cultural relations, perhaps unequaled in the annals of human affairs of all time because of the vast and unlimited possibilities it entails for intellectual creativity and educational accomplishments.

It has been said that "economic cooperation, political cooperation and military cooperation may break down under the strain of crisis, unless there is much more than superficial understanding of one another's cultures, problems and aspirations." That is very true, and that is the very purpose of my 10-point program. It is designed to bring about closer unity and fuller understanding of the cultures of our two peoples.

At the beginning of my address I stated that the bridge of understanding between Italy and the United States was not constructed overnight. I am not so naive as to believe that the program I have just outlined to you can be realized overnight. It is not a project for a year or two, but a painstaking endeavor which may require a decade or a whole generation. But it is practicable. It is realizable. Some of those points could be started immediately, others would require study and preparation.

This much I want to tell you: It is imperative that our cultural and educational relations with Italy be strengthened and extended. It is true, there are problems of an economic and military nature to be solved, but the cultural relations are no less important for both nations. A great American scholar has observed that "you can subtract Italian culture from civilization only by destroying that civilization." The future progress of democratic America depends, in a large measure, on reinforcing the cultural and other bonds with nations like Italy.

I can visualize the coming years as the period in which this cultural partnership may reach full fruition, a partnership which has so much to offer to the progress of mankind. Perhaps it may some day become known as the "Golden Era of American-Italian Relations." We can initiate that era. We can help to create it and to build it through bold action, and thus gain the everlasting appreciation of future generations in this country and in Italy.

Nearly a century ago, the English essayist John Ruskin said:

"When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them: 'See this our fathers did for us.'"

Matthew Woll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Matthew Woll labor has lost one of its greatest champions and our country and the world one of the really great men of our times.

In the building days of the Chicago Federation of Labor and in the struggle to maintain on the air the voice of labor in the early years of WCFL, the radio station of the Chicago Federation of Labor, Matthew Woll worked day and night tirelessly and devotedly with John Fitzpatrick and Ed Nockels, finding in each obstacle a new challenge and moving ever forward in the advancement of labor's cause. The names of Matthew Woll, John Fitzpatrick, and Ed Nockels are written imperishably in the history of the labor movement in Chicago and in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Matthew Woll has been remarked throughout the Nation in many editorials paying tribute to his memory. It is fitting that one of the very finest tributes should be that in the Federation News, the weekly newspaper of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

I am extending my remarks to include Editor Irwin E. Klass' moving tribute to Matthew Woll in the Federation News of June 9, 1956, as follows:

MATTHEW WOLL

The death of Matthew Woll at 76 takes from the American scene he last surviving link with Samuel Gompers in labor's top leadership. For Mr. Woll was perhaps the most ardent advocate of the Gompers tradition which recognized that the atmosphere of American freedom provided the best possible opportunities for working people. Hence, Mr. Woll—like Gompers—set the American labor movement on the path of resistance to government interference in the collective bargaining relationship.

Matthew Woll was truly the spiritual heir of Gompers. We can think of no man in organized labor whose life more exemplified Gompers' last message to the American Federation of Labor just before his death in 1924:

"Say to the organized workers of America that as I have kept the faith, I expect that they will keep the faith. They must carry on. Say to them that a union man carrying a union card is not a good citizen unless he upholds the institutions of our country and a poor citizen of our country if he upholds the institutions of our country and forgets the obligations of his trade association."

If all the words written by Mr. Woll or uttered at AFL conventions since 1909 were collected, we would have a veritable encyclopedia of information on American labor's unique history and its impact on the social, economic and political life of the Nation. A scholar familiar with the works of philosophers, Mr. Woll himself was a thinker in the tradition of the great minds of his lifetime. His vast knowledge of law, history, and economics was always at the service of the trade union movement.

Although his organization—the International Photo Engravers Union—is at its peak, it has only 15,300 members. It wasn't the numbers he represented that gave Matt Woll the laurels of leadership in many fields; his ability and eloquence, his calmness under stress of depressions and divisions of the labor movement, his supreme faith in the rightness of the American Federation of Labor helped give continuity and direction to the trade union movement of our country. Matt Woll's restless mind was always probing. Where freedom was threatened at home, he spoke out vigorously. He recognized tyrants in the infancy of their ideas of enslavement and shouted warnings where others were lulled to sleepy acceptance of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. AFL President George Meany has declared that the American Federation of Labor was proven right in every position it has taken on foreign policy. Matthew Woll was the architect of the AFL position on international affairs.

In 1940, he wrote of the Nazi dictatorship:

"With a totalitarian revolution sweeping across the world, with the very foundations of our western civilization threatened by irresponsible military dictatorship seeking to dominate the world by the strategy of terror and ruthless force, mankind faces the most critical hour since the fall of Rome."

Forecasting the agonies of the atomic age, Mr. Woll said 15 years ago:

"Today war is no longer the war of old; it is no longer the test of arms and armies; it is the indiscriminate death and destruction that comes with the earthquake, flood and fire. If man cannot put an end to the mad destruction of nihilistic war, war will veritably annihilate the human race."

Later, he predicted the gestures of amiability by the Soviet regime and warned:

"The free world must first of all avoid being entrapped by the present Soviet strategy which aims to get extensive material aid from the democracies in order to overcome the Communist orbit's political difficulties and economic weaknesses. To avoid such entrapment, the non-Communist countries must never forget that though Moscow's tactics may now and then change, these tactics are at all times bound together by a single purpose and directed toward the one goal the—promotion of Soviet power for domination of the world under totalitarian communism."

His activities in labor and related fields were of extensive variety, yet to each project he gave tirelessly of his energy and imagination. He was president of Labor's League for Human Rights, which helped rescue victims of totalitarian error during World War II. He long headed the AFL committees on education, social security, and international relations. He was president of the AFL Union Label and Service Trades Department, headed the International Labor Press of America for 42 years and was founder and chief executive officer of the Union Labor Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Woll was long identified with the Chicago labor movement, as an officer of Chicago Photo-Engravers Union Local 5. He called the meetings of the Chicago Federation of Labor the best possible training school for young trade unionists. Since WCFL was founded just 30 years ago, Mr. Woll served as a member of the station's board of governors.

That was Matt Woll's way—to help where he was needed most. The free labor movement everywhere is in his debt. When the story of American labor is written in the generations to come, the name of Matthew Woll will be inscribed among those whose wisdom, love of country, and power of expression helped shape the economic and social history of our times.

Postmen Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial which appeared in the Boston Evening American on June 1, 1956, entitled "Postmen Muz-

zled." This editorial analyzes clearly the objections to section 744.442 of the Postal Manual of March 1956:

POSTMEN MUZZLED

No better example can be found of the widespread trend in Government bureaus to keep people in ignorance of their stewardship, than section 744.442 of the Postal Manual of March 1956.

The section claimps this muzzle on post-office employees:

"A. Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"B. If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

What's wrong with this?

That the postal service is a vitally essential public service and hence the people have the right to know what's right and what's wrong with it.

That bureaucrats in command will naturally tell only what is favorable to their regime.

That the best source of dependable public information about the service comes from the ranks of carriers and clerks, not from political appointees in command.

And finally, that a public service is the people's business, and no bureaucrat has the right to censor or suppress news about it.

Postal employees are noted for their devotion to their work and their desire to improve it.

They are notoriously underpaid and often overworked but nevertheless stick to their jobs in the hope that well-informed public opinion will help improve their lot.

Now they are told to shut up and keep their place; to let only their masters speak for them at their autocratic discretion.

The gag order has not been meekly accepted.

A resolution vigorously protesting it was unanimously adopted by the Government Employees' Council, comprising all Federal civil service workers, at Washington, D. C.

The same action was taken, also unanimously, by the recent convention of the California Association of Letter Carriers, a branch of the national association, at Long Beach, Calif.

Section 744.442 of the Postal Manual has no title nor justification to remain on the books. It should be rescinded—by congressional action if necessary.

Flag Day, June 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, of all the emblems of the United States, the most respected is our national flag. No one has expressed its significance more adequately, yet succinctly, than William Elliot Griffis, who, in 1890, wrote:

In the American flag are happily blended the symbols of the old and new, of history and prophecy, of conservatism and progress, of the stability of the unchanging past with the promise and potency of the future.

Despite its constitutional meaning to the people of the United States and its symbolism of liberty for many millions in other lands, the American flag, in recent years, has not been revered in our homeland as it should be. Thus, it is with gratification that I read, in the June 9, 1956 edition of the Tablet, an editorial urging a more general display of the United States flag on national holidays.

The Tablet is the well-known weekly newspaper of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, N. Y. Its vigorous presentations of important news and thoughtful editorials have made it an effective leader in the current renaissance of patriotic American thinking.

Under leave granted, I include the indicated editorial:

FLY THE FLAG

There was a time when national holidays were observed everywhere in this country with flying flags. It was the usual thing on such occasions to see our grand American flag draped from the windows of private homes as well as raised to the top of poles on public buildings. In fact, there was a time when there was a fairly general display of the Stars and Stripes on all days of good weather.

Flag Day, June 14, reminds us that we could use a little of that oldtime patriotism, symbolized by the flying of the flag.

Of late, there has been some noticeable thoughtlessness or downright neglect, especially on the national holidays, in this matter of putting out the flag. Surely, proper international-mindedness does not require that we must be ashamed to show off our own flag. Our pride in Old Glory cannot be called narrow isolationism.

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress passed the resolution, "That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." The new constellation has never faded. It has grown more brilliant, now with its 48 stars.

Next Thursday, as we commemorate that historical resolution, let us prominently display our glorious flag. Let it be seen all over town, on private homes, apartment houses, public buildings, skyscrapers, places of big business, small stores, schools, and churches. Even if it means a special effort, see to it that your flag is unfurled.

An Example of Community Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States Housing Act of 1954, Public Law 560, calls for citizen participation as a condition for approving any city's request for urban renewal subsidy. Such citizen participation was notably demonstrated in the conference on the Forward Look: The Rehabilitation of the West Side, on May 12, 1956, sponsored by the Riverside Neighborhood Assembly, a school-community council on the West Side of Manhattan, in cooperation with the League of West Side Organizations, the West Side News, and the chamber of commerce. More than 500 citizens and top officials joined hands and minds on the common problems of neighborhood blight to reach areas of agreement and action that will encourage all groups in the community to stay their flight and start to fight for total community improvement.

The principal conference speakers, Commissioner James Felt, Stanley Lowell, assistant to Mayor Wagner, Assemblyman Ludwig Teller, and myself, paid honor to the previous activity of this dynamic community and to its continuing interest and strong bonds of unity. More than 60 religious, civic, and business organizations, including every public school PTA—12—and 10 private schools, cosponsored the conference on the rehabilitation of the West Side. They represented thousands of other west siders who will have submitted to them a complete report of this conference.

The conference technique had been used three times previously by the Riverside Neighborhood Assembly to meet community challenges in other areas: The first, in January 1954, a conference on public education, had widespread influence in informing the public of the facts and philosophy underlying public education. The formation of a public school affairs committee, still alive and kicking, was only one of many healthy, tangible results. The second, in April 1954, Our New Neighbors—A Community in Transition, courageously faced the bewilderment and hostility engendered by rising tensions due to prejudice, before they could become dangerous. An intercultural committee embracing every school in the area and a youth ambassador to Puerto Rico project became positive factors of integration on the West Side. The third, called the U. N. at Our Door, in cosponsorship with the Foreign Policy Association, presented the community as a grassroots participant in the work of the United Nations.

The fourth and present conference has utilized all the former and added to its numbers and prestige because rehabilitation was everybody's business. The R. N. A. has clearly demonstrated the value of community action by this last, but by no means least, conference on the rehabilitation of the West Side.

Address by Mr. George Meany at 67th Annual Commencement of the Catholic University of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 10, 1956, the 67th annual commencement of the Catholic Univer-

sity of America took place in Washington, D. C. Among those who received honorary degrees from the Catholic University of America were Mr. Neil MacNeil, former editor of the New York Times; Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; the Very Reverend Edgar Schmiedeler, O. S. B., former director, National Conference on Family Life; and myself, all of us being the recipients of honorary degree doctor of laws; and Mr. Thomas W. Pangborn, president, Pangborn Corp.; and Professor Hugh Stott Taylor dean of the Graduate School, Princeton University, the recipients of honorary degree doctor of science.

Presiding over the commencement exercises was His Excellency, The Most Reverend Patrick Aloysius O'Boyle, D. D., LL. D., Archbishop of Washington, and chancellor of the Catholic University of America, and the introduction was made by His Excellency, The Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, D. D., LL. D., rector of the Catholic University of America, and the recognition of the deans of the schools of the University, as well as the presentation of candidates for honorary degrees, was done by The Right Reverend (Msgr.) William J. McDonald, Ph.D., vice rector of the Catholic University of America.

On the occasion of the commencement exercises President Meany gave the commencement address. Mr. Meany gave one of the most powerful addresses that I have ever heard. With his profound knowledge and years of practical experience, and with the position of great responsibility that he occupies in the field of organized labor, there is no man better qualified to understand and appreciate the evil minds of the Communists and their destructive intents and purposes than he. His address should be read by as many persons as possible. His address was one of dynamic Americanism and was received with profound appreciation and enthusiasm by those who were present and had the honor to listen to him.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am pleased to include therein the timely and stirring address made by President George Meany:

I most sincerely appreciate the high honor which you have conferred upon me by this award of an honorary degree of doctor of laws. I appreciate it all the more because I feel, in reality, it symbolizes recognition by one of America's outstanding institutions of higher learning of the vital role American labor plays today in the life of our country.

To be given the privilege of addressing a group of young men and women at a moment in their lives that is so meaningful as this one must be to all of you, would, under any circumstances, be a real privilege. To have this privilege at Catholic University is—to me, as a life-long trade unionist—truly inspirational.

When we of the trade-union movement think of Catholic University and its early history, there immediately comes to mind the tremendous contribution made by the late Cardinal Gibbons to the moral and material welfare of labor in America by his stirring defense of the Knights of Labor in the early and trying days of the trade-union movement as well as his life-long championship of the rights of workers to maintain trade unions for their mutual aid and protection.

Then, too, in connection with this institution we invariably think of the contributions to the cause of labor and industrial peace made by men like Msgr. John A. Ryan, Bishop Francis Haas, Msgr. John T. Ellis, Father Henry J. Browne, and many others.

To you who are today leaving the classroom of learning to enter the school of life, may I say you have been doubly fortunate in your preparations for your entry into that school. You have had the opportunity of receiving not only a higher education but a higher education fortified by the highest moral precepts.

Remember, first of all, that your training is by no means completed—in reality it is just beginning. What you have learned is not to be put behind and forgotten. It is to be cherished and enriched and built upon in the larger school of practical experience which you are about to enter.

Do not look upon this graduation as a break between your academic past and your future of practical and unsheltered living. Look upon it rather as a bridge—a bridge over which you move on forward toward the fulfillment of your goals and aspirations.

Much has been given to you during the years of your attendance at this institution. Your most precious gain has been the understanding given to you of values, of spiritual values, of ethical values, of moral values in the relationship among men. It is this understanding and this knowledge which will give you confidence in making judgments and will help you in making right decisions at every step and every turn that lies ahead.

You are indeed fortunate that the society in which you will live and work here in America is a free society founded on the precious principles embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In order to insure continued enjoyment of the privileges of a free society, you must of necessity be willing to bear the responsibilities that go hand in hand with those privileges.

Never before in the history of our Nation have we had the responsibilities that are ours today. It has been truly said that responsibilities naturally gravitate to the shoulders of those best able to bear them. If this be true of individuals, it is likewise true of nations—especially of nations dedicated to freedom and peace based on justice such as our Nation is dedicated. Whether or not it was the will or desire of the American people, the leadership of the free world rests today on the United States of America.

This means that great responsibilities rest on each and every citizen of our Nation. This means, in particular, great responsibilities for you who have been educated—prepared for life—trained for leadership in an outstanding institution of learning.

We are living at a moment when ideals and moral values, ideas and institutions, men and movements, whole nations and groups of nations are being tested very severely. Profound changes are stirring at the roots of humanity. Millions of men and women are gripped by insecurity, by fear about their place in our tense and tormented world, by uncertainty as to their relationship to the very soul of mankind.

Yet, the last thing in the world, I would say, is that the situation calls for pessimism. Mankind is not rudderless in the present world struggle which is, without doubt, the most significant ideological conflict in many centuries.

We have clear and definite moral values, human ideals, and ethical principles to guide us. Let our compass be the wisdom of the great British historian and moralist who never published a book but whose ideas can serve well as our guiding lines today. In his brilliant inaugural lecture at Cambridge, more than 75 years ago, Lord Acton declared that the first human concern is religion; the second is liberty; and the two are inseparably bound up with each other.

You who are now entering a new path of life are going to face many new tasks and complex responsibilities. Your first and most important task is to be aware of the world you live in, the world you worship in, and the world in which you work.

This is indeed a critical juncture in the life of mankind. First of all, the spirit of man—the dignity of man—all human freedoms are threatened by an inhuman totalitarian despotism.

Then, the very existence of the human race is menaced by the danger of nuclear war. It is harrowing to contemplate that a godless, ruthless dictatorship—not subject to the controls of public opinion as we know it in a democratic society—can plunge mankind into an atomic war when its irresponsible and paranoic top rulers decide to do so.

Remember, when we of the free world talk of peace, we talk of defending mankind against the danger of aggression and war. But when the Moscow-Peiping axis warlords talk of peace, their talk has but one purpose—to undermine our morale and our will to resist Communist despotism and Soviet domination.

Let us understand and not underrate the power of the enemy. Then we will not fear him. If the free world is really alert to the danger, it will not lose in the test of ideas or in a test of strength on any field of contest or conflict.

I do not presume that I can give you a full blueprint for success in meeting the Communist challenge and beating it back. I would, however, like to point to one danger that could prove our undoing. This is the danger of apathy—indifference.

It is rather paradoxial that our very way of life here in America tends to make us highly susceptible to this danger of indifference. We have a free economy and enjoy all the blessings of a free society. We have, as a Nation, without question an overwhelming desire for peace. We do not covet the testimony and possessions of any other nation. We have no aggressive ideas or intentions against any other people. We, therefore, naturally tend to believe that others likewise want peace—that they also have no designs for aggression or domination. In such a soil, with such an atmosphere—complacency and indifference can very easily develop.

Bear with me as I read to you from the prologue of an unfinished novel by Bruno Yasienski, a major Soviet novelist in the thirities.

He began his novel, the Plot of the Indifferent, in 1937, but he never finished it. In this prologue, the Soviet peoples were prophetically and ominously given the following warning:

"Do not be afraid of enemies; the worst they can do is to kill you. Do not be afraid of friends; the worst they can do is to betray you. Be afraid of the indifferent; they do not kill or betray. But only because of their silent agreement, betrayal and murder exist on earth."

For giving such advice to the Soviet peoples, Yasienski was purged. By heeding this advice, you graduates will live and help our Nation and the entire free world.

We cannot and dare not be indifferent to the pangs of hunger, to the perils of poverty, war and dictatorship anywhere, to the indefensible old colonialism under the red flag of communism in eastern, central, and southern Europe.

We cannot live in self respect and be indifferent to the shocking fact that the Communist regime of the big lie and brutal brainwashing terrorizes 600 million Chinese on the Asian mainland. Nor can we be indifferent when some of our allies or our own great captains of industry think it is perfectly sound policy to do business as usual with such a regime and to help it build a

modern economy and powerful military machine geared to the enslavement of the human soul and mind.

I pray that you graduates will do your share in overcoming such indifference, in preventing such numbness of our moral conscience.

A society in which there is no dignity or value of the individual, is a society in which there is no social dignity or social morality. In such a society, social behavior becomes inhuman.

The Communists have conceived the State as their tool with which to do all and get all. But the State has become their master. The dictatorship governs everything and rules everybody. In the Soviet slave system, the State runs every person as well as the means of production. The individual can no longer be the free owner of his conscience, his capacities, his talents or his working power. This holds true without regard to the degree of education that the individual has received.

We, of the trade union movement, have a great interest in education. The pioneers of our unions were among the early champions of America's free public school system. But we have learned that education is not an end in itself.

Modern industry requires the elimination of illiteracy. It demands engineers, chemists, physicists and scientists of sundry sorts. But even the highest education, under a totalitarian system, does not inspire faith in human values, dedication to human freedom or respect for the dignity of the individual.

Before the Nazis came to power, Germany had a very high level of literacy. Pre-Hitler Germany had very fine technical and scientific schools and trained personnel. But after Hitler seized power, the educators and the educated knew only one duty and one freedom. They were duty-bound and they were free to serve only the Nazi dictatorship. They were rewarded with many social and economic privileges for such service. Too many of them became indifferent to the fate of others. The cruel fate that befell them and their fatherland was inevitable.

This holds just as true for the educated men and women under the yoke of Communist totalitarianism. Let no one, therefore, feast on the illusion that because the Soviet Union is being rapidly industrialized and, therefore, needs more educated people, this process of modernization will of itself lead to the liberalization of communism and its regime. The latest Khrushchev revelations about the Stalin terror and his endorsement of terror as an indispensible weapon for the preservation of the Communist system should dispel all such illusions. This confession should once and for all end the fatal illusion of pro-Communist "Liberals" at home and abroad that there is a proliberal communism now developing in the Soviet Union.

Nor will technical progress in the economically underdeveloped countries, or even in highly industrialized lands like our own, in itself eliminate such ghastly evils as religious and racial discrimination, or the exploitation of man by man.

Humanity on both sides of the Iron Curtain needs human and moral engineering as well as chemical, electrical and industrial engineering. Higher education will be truly high only to the extent that it enhances higher human and moral values, higher spiritual and material well-being of the people—freedom, social justice and enduring world peace.

I would be telling you less than the truth if I were to give you the impression that as you enter your next stage of life, you will be facing only dangers and threats.

To us Americans, and to all other freedom-loving peoples, every danger, every threat, every challenge presents an opportunity. Our country, we of the labor movement and you who are now coming into the Nation's front ranks of responsibility and leadership, all have magnificent opportunities to render distinguished services in building a better America, in making our people ever better equipped to help mankind come out stronger from the deep-going moral crisis in which modern civilization finds itself.

The much-vaunted dynamism and infallibility of communism as an ideological system have recently been shown to be made of rather perishable and shoddy fiber. Communism has lost much of its power of attraction as an enchantment and even as an escape. There are many elements of disintegration in communism as an ideological system, and in its whole philosophical structure—though not yet in its political structure. The free world has a splendid opportunity to unmask and expose the fraud of communism as an "ideal" and the folly of communism as a system for human betterment.

Our Nation has the ideals and the ideas for removing from our body-politic—antimoral, antidemocratic, unjust and unpardonable practices like racialism and greed, poverty and insecurity. We can and we will make American democracy more healthy, more effective, more genuine. Despite all our imperfections and mistakes, we are a people who have shown the ability to transform many of our dreams of yesterday into the deeds of today.

Our Nation has the idealism and the great traditions, the moral and the material resources, to help the peoples of Africa and other economically underdeveloped regions to fulfill their aspirations to national freedom and human betterment.

Let the American oil corporations in the Middle East show an example worthy of the finest traditions of American free enterprise by setting aside annually a fixed proportion of their profits for establishing and maintaining universities and training centers for the awakening Arab peoples.

Let America take the lead in helping the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco rebuild their homelands and serve as generators of human freedom and social progress throughout the Arab world.

Let our country show the independence and initiative in policy worthy of a nation that is not only strong but great by bringing to bear the fullest moral pressure on our allies to break with every vestige of colonialism in Cyprus, Algeria, and everywhere else.

Let us welcome every move—no matter how small— away from inhumanity and savagery behind the Iron Curtain. But let us have no illusion that the democratic world can encourage human freedom, social justice, national independence, and peaceful policies in the Soviet orbit by keeping silent about the evils inherent in Communism—its monolithic one-party dictatorship, its denial of human liberties, its captive peoples and satellites. Appeasing aggression will never aid the cause of world peace.

Let us rather try with broadened vision and fresh vigor to develop a sound collective policy for the free world. This is the first requirement for collective security. We of the free world have the common ideal of human freedom and individual dignity. It is this ideal which binds us together. Let us translate our devotion to this ideal into deeds for unifying and strengthening the ranks of freedom and peace.

Here are great tasks. Here are great opportunities. Here is a great challenge. American labor will do its share to help our country meet this challenge. We are counting on you, the newly graduated men and women of our great institutions of higher learning, to help our Nation provide the inspiration, the determination, and the capacity for leadership at this crucial moment in the history of mankind.

Our conception of freedom and dignity is basic. It is moral. We hold that each individual is equally sovereign in his relationship with God. Our conception of political freedom is an extension and application of this idea.

We want every individual, without regard to race, region, or religion equally sovereign in his relationship to the state and the community. This is the hope of humanity. This is at once the great responsibility and opportunity for all of us. With God's help, we shall not fail to measure up to the challenge of our times.

Minority Views on the Foreign Aid Bill, H. R. 11356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the minority views of my colleagues MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, E. ROSS ADAIR, and myself, that were filed to accompany H. R. 11356. The report follows:

In 3 previous years we have felt compelled to express our strong conviction that passage of a multibillion-dollar mutual security bill of this nature was not and could not be the answer to our basic national need for pecae and security.

In our minority report on the Mutual Security Act of 1953, 3 years ago, we asked the following questions:

"What magic formula is there in this program that is going to transform millions of insecure people throughout the world into valiant, invigorated, and dependable allies? Is it United States money? No. We have tried that one many times—with no success. Is it United States armed might? No. Our forces have been bearing the brunt of the fight in Korea on behalf of the principles of sovereignty, independence, and freedom—and still the peoples of Asia waver. * * *

"It would therefore seem to us particularly essential that we evaluate the present program in the light of what similar programs in the past have failed to accomplish; and from the point of view of whether or not it offers fulfillment of pledges made to the American people." (H. Rept. 569, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 8.)

In 1954, when the Mutual Security Act attempted to exchange the existing patchwork of foreign aid programs for a permanent form, we stated with equal emphasis:

"There exists in our minds a grave and fundamental question concerning the wisdom of enacting now what is considered permanent legislation. This is particularly so in view of the unsettled world conditions which become even more unsettled with each passing day and the widespread uncertainties in high plaecs as to our own foreign policy. The House Foreign Affairs Committee is a legislative committee, a policy committee. The sole purpose of the committee in reviewing past programs and proposed programs is to determine policy. To carry out that responsibility has been the function of the committee in bringing out this bill. But how can we determine legislative policy as a directive and framework of action for the executive branch without being fully apprised of executive branch policy to give root and substance to what, after all, amount only to the cold words of a statute?" (H. Rept. 1925, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, p. 2.)

In 1955 we felt again constrained to speak these words:

"In the past we have urged what to us has semed natural and logical—a thorough

study, a reappraisal, a redefining of foreign policies, techniques, and statutes concerned with the goal of international peace and security, which we all seek. The executive branch has not seen fit to do this before submitting this bill to the Congress; nor has the Congress of the United States itself, which is directly responsible to the people who foot the bills, make the sacrifices, and fight the wars, undertaken such an analysis." (H. Rept. 912, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 2.)

And now in 1956, with still no reappraisal of the problems, of the policies, or of the programs, we are again asked to accept a multibillion dollar authorization based on a concept whose validity is outmoded, if, in fact—as we would deny—such validity ever existed. We could only wish that we had been wrong; that our fears of the inefficiency of the approach had been proven groundless. We would be the first to hope that this mutual security legislation might have proved to be the effective weapon for American security and world peace that it was advertised to be.

Events, statements by foreign officials and expressions by our own leaders in the executive branch and in the Congress confirm the fears which we expressed in our three previous minority reports.

Nothing that has happened has changed our conviction that mutual security legislation of this nature is not and cannot be an adequate or right answer to our need for national security and world peace. The program continues to reveal an inherent failure in basic philosophic intent, a failure in direction and approach, and a failure to interpret the shifting nature of world events and to combat successfully relentless Soviet policy. It is increasingly apparent that the policy and the programs to be authorized by this legislation have proved to be not only wanting but actually self-defeating.

It is not that we have failed to pour out money and pour it out generously. One glance at the following table, listing the money yet to be obligated and spent, indicates our unrestrained generosity and spending:

Estimated unobligated and unreserved balance June 30, 1956

	Estimate in March 1956	Estimate in May 1956
Military	$297,000,000	$195,500,000
Nonmilitary	106,600,000	190,000,000
Total	403,600,000	385,500,000

Estimated unexpended balance June 30, 1956

	Estimate in March 1956	Estimate in May 1956
Military	$4,765,100,000	$5,000,000,000
Nonmilitary	1,678,200,000	1,800,000,000
Total	6,443,300,000	6,800,000,000

Source: H. Rept. 2213, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6.

A complete and detailed breakdown of United States generosity will be found in the appendix to this report.

This year, with mounting dissatisfaction and disillusionment with this policy among the people of the United States and their chosen Representatives in Congress, the program in this bill nevertheless plunges along, in its frustrated way, not knowing what its future course, size, or policies will be.

We feel that this bill is particularly objectionable in that the only certainty contained in it is its duration—"permanent." Those who approve this legislation have inserted into the program the mysterious, magical formula which they call "permanent legislation" as if "permanent" were synonymous with "sound." The philosophy contained in the statement of policy in section 7 of the bill is particularly objectionable in this regard. It puts the Congress of the United States on record and commits the United States to pursue programs of assistance as long as Communist danger to the peace of the world and the security of the United States persists. In other words, the United States is to take upon its shoulders, and the American people are to assume, the tax burden of supporting the free world indefinitely. No mention is made of what other nations are to do in order to keep the free world free. No clue is indicated as to our future course with respect to the nations who do not see fit to commit themselves with the free world.

The time is long overdue when the American people—and particularly the Congress, which carries a basic responsibility for the future of this country—must face hard facts with courage. Despite the outpouring of billions of dollars, an honest appraisal of the world situation and of our relationship to it should give ample warning, even at this late date. To continue the philosophy and policies so far provided in mutual security legislation at a greater sum and for a longer period of time, can only mean an ultimately disastrous continuation of the all too apparent failures of the program.

It is impossible to list in this brief report, either all inclusively or at sufficient length, the total reasons that call for serious questioning and opposition to House Resolution 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, currently under consideration. Suffice it to say that even former strong proponents of the program—and certainly the American people—are now demanding a reappraisal and rescrutiny of the purpose and policy, based on the following disturbing record:

1. It has failed in its futile attempt to make an appropriation of money a solution for a problem.

2. It has failed to expand the area of the world which may be called free world. On the contrary, that area is being steadily constricted while the area of uncommitted or neutral nations is steadily expanding. "Neutralism" makes it easier for the Communists to increase their influence while the efforts of the free world are made more difficult.

3. Despite the mutual security program we have failed to convince peoples seeking their freedom and newly independent nations that we are sincere in opposing colonialism.

4. It has proved deficient in wise programing, sound fiscal practices, satisfactory presenation to the Congress, adequate implementation of congressional intent, and understanding execution in the field. This is amply indicated by the testimony of the Hon. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the mutual security program on May 21, 1956.

Further, this bill reflects the increasing tendency to lump money, areas, and programs together, thus giving blank check authority to the Executive. Because of the diffusion of delegated power which this bill makes possible, both the President and the Congress are steadily losing control of the spending and operations of the program.

5. It has failed to achieve for the free world the expected defense against Soviet military power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was organized as a defense against Soviet military power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is losing power when it should be increasing it.

The Secretary of State, in a news conference on April 24, 1956, stated "Broadly speaking, it is our view, and I think has been our view, that an organization of this kind [NATO] either grows or tends to dry up." With each Soviet smile, another crack appears in the NATO armor.

6. It has failed to solve the problem of how to reach the peoples themselves in the underdeveloped nations.

7. It has intermingled the valuable technical cooperation program, which is a sharing of knowledge, skills, and know-how with the peoples of the underdeveloped countries, with a huge military program that deals with arms and the implements of war. These are two totally different programs in magnitude, in philosophy, in intent, and in approach.

Study should be made of how best to emphasize the importance and long-range character of the technical cooperation program. Some thought should be given to separating this vital program from the other phases of the mutual-security program. In fact, the advisability might be considered of setting it up as an independent agency.

8. It has failed to consider sufficiently the present importance and the potentialities of our Latin American neighbors. The peace and security of the Western Hemisphere is vital to the preservation of the entire free world.

9. Finally, it has failed to convey to the world, and even to our friends, the real meaning of American traditions, principles, and ideals—those attributes which have made us a great Nation and a great people.

In the face of this honest questioning even by former proponents of the program and by the public, and in the face, as well, of what seems to us also an undeniable failure in priciple, policy, and performance, we cannot go along with the proposal to appropriate more billions for a longer time for more extensive programs of the same nature. What is needed is a stern, realistic reappraisal. In fact, returning from a recent study mission around the world, the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs stated with sober emphasis in its report:

"If it is to succeed, the United States must do more than reappraise its programs; it must subject to minute rescrutiny its policy and its determination" (H. Rept. 2147, 84th Cong., 2d sess, p. 212).

There has been introduced in the Congress a concurrent resolution calling for a congressional committee, 6 members from the Senate and 6 from the House, to study, reevaluate, and give relentless judgment on the policies and programs that have been carried on under this mutual security legislation; and to produce, following such study, sound suggestions for better implementing our national desire for peace and security.

We urge the Congress to join with us in insisting upon a rescrutiny of our foreign policies and programs as the basic need of this hour. What is actually now at stake is not the mere continuation of programs or appropriations, but the very peace and safety of this country and the whole free world.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.
MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH.
E. ROSS ADAIR.

The Dangers of Oil Importation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years those of us ever mindful of the threat constituted by continued high importation of foreign oil have worked in various ways to curtail this dangerous practice. Although we

have worked long and hard, we have little to show for our labors. The Neely amendment, which would have curtailed such importation to an extent, was not adopted by the Congress. Although the President has authority under the provisions of H. R. 1 to curtail imports of any commodity which might threaten the security of the United States or endanger our domestic market in any given field, the law has not been properly applied to the importation of foreign oil.

It is my sincere opinion that every American should be warned of the dangers of continued high foreign oil import quotas. The President, his Advisory Cabinet Committee, the Congress of the United States and all persons in a position to do something about these excessive imports should combine their efforts to right the wrongs and eliminate the dangers brought about as a result of this folly.

Import quotas are provided on a large number of commodities including cattlefish, wheat, nuts, barley, sugar, tobacco and furs. Yet, there is no legal restriction on most foreign oil production and none whatever on foreign oil imports. Wells in the Middle East run as high as 6,000 barrels of oil daily, while the average well production in my own State of Texas is only 19 barrels. The foreign wells, owned mostly by a few major oil companies, produce oil every day while in Texas, largest producing State in our Nation, production is often shut down to 15 days per month.

I would like to ask the Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, if they know of any other industry that would not be severely crippled should it be forced to work on a part-time basis? Is there a man among us who could properly feed and clothe his family, and meet his other financial obligations, if he should be forced to restrict his earning capacity by working only 2 of every 4 weeks? Yet, this is the situation that has been thrust upon our domestic oil producers by foreign oil imports.

Since 1946, oil imports have increased almost 200 percent, or 5 times as rapidly, percentagewise, as domestic production. Before World War II, imports averaged about 5 percent of domestic demand. In 1946 to 1951 they averaged about 10 percent of consumption in this country. Today, foreign oil supplies more than 15 percent of our requirements.

The independents in this industry own little or no foreign oil. They have been damaged by excessive imports. Yet, the real threat lies not in what has happened, but what can happen in the future. Our own country, among the major free world powers, is alone blessed with ample oil resources and productive ability to assure fulfillment of our needs for both war and peace. We must guard that position at any and all costs. I believe that can be done without disrupting our trade relationships, and certainly without disturbing our friends in oil-producing countries in the Western Hemisphere. We want their trade and can use some of their oil, but it should bear a realistic relation to our domestic production and requirements.

The United States has today the heavy responsibility of leadership to maintain throughout the world. Never has there been a more urgent need to expand the Nation's productive facilities that insure our economic well-being and our military preparedness. No material is more essential to national welfare and security than petroleum. This Nation must have access at all times to sources of enough oil to meet the requirements of any emergency. This requires substantial and continuing expansion of the capacity to produce, process, transport, and distribute crude oil and its products.

Prior to World War II, the petroleum industry in the United States had developed a reserve-producing capacity that exceeded the then current level of oil consumption by about a million barrels per day. The importance of that reserve cannot be exaggerated. It meant the difference between victory and defeat.

Today, we are in a far less fortunate position in terms of petroleum productive capacity. Our ability to produce liquid fuels provides no margin of safety over present requirements.

The reason for this lack of reserve is all too obvious: it comes from idle wells in the United States, and from lack of speculation by many of our domestic producers. We cannot expect these producers to invest and risk their capital in extensive exploration and drilling, if they know any strike made will be restricted to half-time production while foreign oil continues to come into the country in increasing abundance. We cannot expect them to invest in ventures which only pay dividends on a part-time basis.

The petroleum industry in the United States is one of the greatest bulwarks to our general economy. All but 18 of our 48 States now produce oil or gas, or both. Others are being explored, and are hopeful of being added to the producing ledger. In 11 of our States including my own State of Texas, crude petroleum ranks first in value of all minerals produced. It is obvious that the health of the domestic oil-producing industry is of primary importance to these States. In Texas, for example, taxes on oil production amounts to 67 percent of all business and property taxes. Oil pays 45 percent of the cost of public education in Texas, and 44.9 percent of the cost of higher education. When production is slashed, our State budget is denied funds for schools, highways, colleges, and other essential public projects.

The Cabinet committee on oil imports has reached certain conclusions, with which I find fault. I think they should be reconsidered. The conclusions would permit total crude oil imports for the year 1956 to exceed their 1954 relationship to domestic oil production by an average of 234,000 barrels per day. The conclusions would permit increase in crude oil imports during 1956 over 1954 of 1,300 percent from Canada, 36 percent from the Middle and Far East and 26 percent from Venezuela, as compared with an increase of 10 percent in United States crude-oil production. The conclusions would permit the United States west coast to become increasingly dependent on Eastern Hemisphere crude oil. The conclusions would permit total imports of crude oil and refined products to take over 20 percent of the United States market in 1956 as compared with 18.3 percent in 1955 and 16.6 percent in 1954—the largest increase in this ratio since 1950, which would inevitably lead to inadequate domestic supplies and increasing dependency on foreign oil.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, and other persons realizing the dangers to the oil industry and our Nation as a result of excessive imports, have asked for the Advisory Cabinet Committee and the Office of Defense Mobilization to take another look at the recommendations, and reach a more realistic conclusion; a conclusion which will be more in keeping with our national interests and with a strong sense of justice and fair play.

I pledge my efforts to aid in this fight, Mr. Speaker, and I urge each Member of this body to study the facts and join in the battle to curtail these dangerous, excessive, foreign oil imports.

Amendments to Mutual Security Act of 1956—Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, seemingly endless debate, pro and con, drones on and on. At this writing, 3 days of debate have elapsed, with more to come. This lengthy debate is in itself unusual, perhaps demonstrating the nationwide controversy over United States money sent abroad. Many strong views are expressed, only a few Members are objective and dispassionate. Now, here's a ringside digest, brief necessarily—you weigh the arguments.

First the facts: The original $4.9 billion foreign-aid request was cut $1,109 million by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Even so the present bill provides $860 million more than last year. The Mutual Security Act includes 19 programs involving 54 countries of direct aid and 4 programs, through the U. N., affecting 79 nations. Actually, all this money is economic aid strengthening military defense. This huge sum is in addition to the amounts already appropriated this year; namely, $36 billion for defense and $2.9 billion in worldwide military public-works programs.

Arguments for: Foreign aid is needed for the preservation of peace, to combat communism, and must continue while communism is a threat. Foreign aid promotes our own security by giving other peoples the capacity to defend themselves. If other nations defend their own freedom they are at the same time protecting our freedom. Therefore, foreign aid is in our own enlightened self-interest. We need our allies more than they need us; the United States total cost will be greater for our defense if foreign aid is curtailed. Our past program obviously has been success-

ful since Russia has undertaken extending foreign aid. Also, criticism of United States aid could even be Communist inspired. Yugoslavia should receive our continued aid in order to provoke other satellites to break with Russia. India's economy should be bolstered by the United States to compete with Russia's development of China, India's neighbor. Otherwise India will turn to Russia.

Arguments against: The foreign aid program has become too complex. So there is no accurate accounting and bookkeeping. It is too big for thorough understanding. Most dangerous of all, some information is classified as secret, which prevents Congress even knowing the facts and in effect results in Congress being asked to sign a blank check. In United States policy, or lack of policy, in dispensing lavish material aid in the past, there is a failure to sell American ideals and beliefs abroad or to prevent a spread of communism. Our policy is negative, based on fear of communism. Also, in support of the free world we failed to stipulate what recipient nations are expected to do in order to keep the world free. We are bolstering certain governments we should not: Yugoslavia is not our friend and here we are supporting communism; India is not neutral but favors Russia and here we are supporting socialism. Are we arming future enemies under the guise of neutrality? The weakening of United States economy by huge financial expenditures is dangerous; our bankruptcy is the Communist' goal. Our program has failed to develop an adequate defense posture against Soviet military power and has failed to reach the people themselves in underdeveloped nations. Study of our past efforts uncover unwise programing, unsound fiscal practices and lack of understanding in our execution in foreign nations. For these reasons the Hoover Commission advised of the urgent need for a complete study of the program. At least 2 years of military aid money is still on hand unspent, "in the pipeline," without any further appropriation.

NOW, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Here's what I think—again, necessarily stated too briefly in this space: The many conflicting statements and bookkeeping errors involving hundreds of millions prove the program now needs overhauling. It is high time to revalue this program. In addition to the $38.9 billion for defense here and abroad already voted this year, there is still enough money on hand for 2½ years expenditures in foreign aid at the current rate. I believe the time has come for the American people to make it plain to the world that we cannot support the world, nor help those who will not, or reluctantly, help themselves. I criticized Congress for debating for too long over how much aid rather than any aid, and the loss of congressional control now over our foreign aid expenditures. A highlight of debate was Chairman RICHARD'S denunciation of the joint stand by Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Minority Leader JOE MARTIN when they championed the full amount for foreign aid. Mr. RICHARDS said that they are repudiating the action of a House committee and surrendering to the executive department without facts and figures in a matter about which they do not know. India and Yugoslavia should not be given any aid it seems to me. Most important, it is impossible to cast a vote conscientiously for this program when for reasons of secrecy I, as your Congressman, have not even been given the facts. This reason alone would preclude my voting for this bill. Who could do otherwise?

All Men Are Not Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, much drivel and nonsense has been peddled around in recent years by pseudoscientists and radical anthropologists that there is no difference between whites and blacks, and that all men are equal.

Hon. R. Carter Pittman, a lawyer of recognized ability, has recently written a thought-provoking article under the title "All Men Are Not Equal." Pursuant to unanimous consent previously granted, I insert his article herewith:

ALL MEN ARE NOT EQUAL

(By R. Carter Pittman)

Vehicles for the dissemination of news and information are now heavily laden with the thesis that America was founded on the proposition that "all men are equal." That statement may be found stated and restated a thousand times in the textbooks that our children study in school, in the newspapers, and throughout the writings of Marxists, sociologists, Communists, and of many unthinking people including hundreds of assorted doctors of this and that who often wear ceremonial gowns to enhance their sense of self-importance. No one questions the right of all men to equal justice under the law, but propagandists have carried the doctrine beyond equality of right to equality of things and men are heard to proclaim human equality who would revolt at the suggestion that all cattle, all dogs, or all racehorses are equal.

A specious falsehood, oft repeated, finally becomes a belief and at last a creed. The statement that "all men are equal" is not only the spurious basis and foundation of the racial integration decisions of the Supreme Court, but it has even been written into canned speeches read by late Presidents. Speech writers for Cabinet Members and Vice Presidents have done the same thing. A studied campaign originating in Moscow in 1928 and now directed from northern Europe is fruitful for those who sponsor it.

The civil rights program of President Eisenhower embraces a bill introduced by Mr. CELLER, of Brooklyn, N. Y., being "House Resolution 627," which proclaims that the whole civil-rights program is based upon "the American principle of * * * equality." Wherever we go and whatever we read we encounter repeatedly the same statement that America was founded upon the proposition that "all men are equal."

Many claim that the doctrine of human equality is in the Declaration of Independence. Some say the doctrine of human equality is to be found in the Constitution. Some say it is in the Bill of Rights. Others say it is in the Bible. Those who propagate falsehood are ashamed to admit where it came from, so they lie as to its source.

The doctrine of human equality is to be found neither in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, nor the Bible. That doctrine is to be found in Das Kapital, which is the Bible of communism. All Communist-front organizations in America propagate the doctrine that all men are equal. It has been written into sociology textbooks and is being taught in practically all the schools and colleges of America. The doctrine that all men are equal is the scrubbrush that is used to brainwash the unstable intelligensia of America. The Supreme Court of the United States has been thoroughly brainwashed with that brush. It may be found in decisions of the Court and in magazine articles written by several individual judges.

In its decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court struck down the law of this land as set forth in the Constitution and as affirmed by numerous decisions of the Supreme Court and attempted to make new law for this land based upon sociology. The principal work cited as "modern authority" in the decision was the American Dilemma, written by a Swedish Marxist, Gunnar Myrdal. In its decision the court held in effect that it could find no basis for integration in the Constitution or the law and therefore it turned to psychology and sociology. It cited Myrdal's American Dilemma as the "modern authority" for its decision. On page 4 of that book Myrdal obligingly defined what he called the "American creed." He said that the "American creed" is "the fundamental equality of all men." In the same sentence he said that the tenets of that creed "were written into the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and into the constitutions of the several States. The ideals of the American creed have thus become the highest law of the land."

Other sociological authorities cited by the Court maintain the same thesis that all men are equal.

Recently Thurgood Marshall explained it all. The current issue of the Phi Delta Phi Brief carries, on page 244, the report of a speech made by Thurgood Marshall to a group at Columbia University, one of my alma maters, on January 9 of this year. Here is a part of that report:

"The initial blueprint was to force equality on the separate but equal doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. Realizing the ineffectiveness of this approach, NAACP then decided on the concept of social science, of finding a basis on which it could meet the law in order to satisfy the court. Running concurrently was the need to reflect court changes in changes of tactics. Anthropologically, both races are of the same physical makeup, and of the same capabilities. The harming influence is the segregation acting on the young child's mind which impedes his education and throws him behind his white contemporaries. With acceptance of mental damage in a lower court, the issue was raised for the Supreme Court, with even stipulations of equality that did not exist in order to get the issue clearly before the court, since the lower court had no authority to overrule Plessy. The result, re education, was *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, this by a unanimous court that was by no means expected."

There you see that the "blueprint" of the NAACP was to brainwash the Court with "the concept of social science" as "a basis on which it could meet the law in order to satisfy the Court." The "concept of social science" to which Marshall referred was the bogus concept that "all men are equal."

There is not one word in the Declaration of Independence, or in the United States Consttitution, or Bill of Rights that says directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that "all men are equal." By a Marxist trick, Thurgood Marshall used Myrdal and others to seduce the inexperience Judges of the Supreme Court into believing that human equality is somehow imposed by our fundamental law and some of the weaker of the Judges of that court actually believe that their integration decision of May 17, 1594, vindicated an American doctrine.

The proposition that "all men are equal" is nowhere to be found in our history except as a perversion, repudiated in the Constitution itself. The Declaration of Independence is not a part of our fundamental laws. It never became living law in America. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that "all men are created equal." We now address ourselves to the meaning and intent of those who used that phrase in July 1776. The Supreme Court goes strong for "the intent of the framers" of the Constitution which it now finds in the half-demented mind of an alien from Sweden. We go to the minds that made the words.

In late May 1776 the Colony of Virginia authorized its delegates to the Continental Congress to introduce a resolution calling for a Declaration of Independence. At the time it declared its own independence of the British Government. Since Virginia declared its independence of British government it became necessary for her to substitute a government made by its own people for that imposed by England. A few Virginians had already foreseen the necessity of having a plan of government immediately available to take the place of the British plan. As a matter of fact, the Continental Congress a few weeks before had recommended the adoption of temporary plans of government by the several colonies. Of the several plans offered in Virginia, Edmund Randolph, said that there was one plan that "swallowed up all the rest."

The plan to which Edmund Randolph was referring was written by a Virginia farmer—not a lawyer. He was a student of history and the greatest constitutionalist the world has ever known. He had prepared a declaration of rights for Virginia in 18 paragraphs. The preamble to that declaration stated it to be "the basis and foundation of government" in Virginia.

The first paragraph of it was as follows:

"Then all men are born equally free and independent and have certain inherent natural rights, of which they cannot, by any compact, deprive, or divest their posterity; among which are the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

That original draft in 18 paragraphs was published in the Philadelphia newspapers of June 6, June 8, and June 12 and was published in nearly every other newspaper in America. A few days later Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Livingston, and Robert Sherman were named as a committee to write the Declaration of Independence. They found no difficulty in preparing the charges against George III, detailed in the Declaration of Independence, but it was late in June before they were able to put together a suitable preamble. Thomas Jefferson, to whom was assigned the task of writing a preamble, took the first three paragraphs of the Virginia Declaration of Rights and rearranged them to make a preamble for the Declaration of Independence. Before that time the Virginia convention had officially adopted the Virginia Declaration of Rights and had changed the first paragraph to read as follows:

"That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights, or which when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Jefferson rearranged and rephrased the first paragraph so as to make it say, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Thus we see that the "basis and foundation" of the first government in America was equality of freedom and independence. The Jeffersion perversion was equality at creation. The Declaration of Independence does not say that all men are equal. It says that they were created equal. There equality ended. Creation is over when life begins. The rich man makes no more dust than the poor man, and he makes no more noise. The same analogy applies as between the doctor of pseudo-socio-science and a Chinese laundryman, but no doctor will concede the Chinaman to be his equal in life. All leave equal residue in their graves as all were equal before life began. Racers are equally stanced before the start but it is inequality that makes the race. Equality at creation or in death does not mean equality in life. Nevertheless, the Declaration of Independence is constantly cited as authority for the proposition that human equality is the "American Creed."

Why did Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams adopt language for the Declaration that might be susceptible of misconstruction by Marxists, doctors, eggheads, screwballs, crackpots, fools, and others? The answer is not difficult. It is explained in the writings of John Adams. Prior to 1776 two half-demented philosophers of France, named Helvetius and Rousseau, had maintained that "all men are equal". That philosophy had caught on with the simple-minded peasants and pseudo-philosophers of France. Nothing appealed so powerfully to the ignorant French peasants as the doctrine that "all men are equal". To the peasant that meant that all men are kings. The slogan was echoed all over France: "Every man a king." The thought didn't occur to them that if all men are kings, then all might be peasants or slaves. The Declaration of Independence was written for the purpose of bringing France into the Revolution on the side of America. The war had been going on for a full year. America was in an unequal struggle for life over death. Washington had been at the head of America's armies a year before July 4, 1776. Washington's task looked hopeless. Jefferson's task was to win the case for America by writing a powerful preamble that would appeal to the hearts—not the minds—of the French people. Then, as now, the French acted on emotions—not reasons. Since the doctrine of human equality had become a popular creed in France and since Helvetius and Rousseau were the prophets of that creed, Jefferson directed the Declaration at the hearts of the French people by declaring that "all men are created equal" Jefferson won his case with the simple minds of France, but lost it with the simple minds of America's future.

In their old age Thomas Jefferson and John Adams became bosom friends. On the 13th day of July 1813, Adams' mind went back to July 4, 1776, when he and Jefferson labored together in Philadelphia. He wrote to Jefferson that day:

"Inequalities of mind and body are so established by God Almighty in his constitution of human nature, that no art or policy can ever plane them down to a level. I have never read reasoning more absurd, sophistry more gross, in proof of the Athanasian creed, or transubstantiation, than the subtle labors of Helvetius and Rousseau to demonstrate the natural equality of mankind. Jus cuique, the golden rule, do as you would be done by, is all the equality that can be supported or defended by reason or common sense."

About a year later, on the 15th day of April, 1814, the same John Adams who had helped Jefferson and Franklin write the Declaration of Independence wrote to John Taylor, of Virginia, in part, as follows:

"Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man. I believe that none but Helvetius will affirm, that all children are born with equal genius. * * *

"That all men are born to equal rights is true. Every being has a right to his own, as clear, as moral, as sacred, as any other being has. This is as indubitable as a moral government in the universe. But to teach that all men are born with equal powers and faculties, to equal influence in society, to equal property and advantages through life, is as gross a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of the people as ever was practiced * * * by the self-styled philosophers of the French Revolution. For honor's sake, Mr. Taylor, for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it." All Americans thought alike on the subject in 1776. Benjamin Franklin, a few days after the Declaration was promulgated, helped to write a Declaration of Rights for the State of Pennsylvania. Franklin had been willing to deface the classic words of George Mason's Virginia Declaration of Rights to appeal to the simple-minded philosophers and peasants of France but he was unwilling to deface those lines and firmed for the ages the profound wisdom of the Cato of his country when he sat down to make a basis and foundation for government in Pennsylvania. He copied the Virginia Declaration of Rights almost verbatim. His first paragraph was as follows:

"That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, amongst which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The basis and foundation of Franklin's government was the same as that written by George Mason for Virginia. It was equality of freedom and independence. Two years later John Adams was named as chairman of a committee to prepare a declaration of rights for Massachusetts. While he too had been willing to deface the words of the Virginia declaration of rights in order to appeal to most of the 25 million people in France, only one-half million of whom could read, he was unwilling to perpetuate that defacement as living law in Massachusetts. The first paragraph of his original declaration of rights copies that of Virginia also and was:

"All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights, among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting their property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

Given a choice between equality of freedom equality at creation, or equality of men, not one of the original 13 States wrote either equality at creation or equality of men into their fundamental laws.

When the United States Constitution was under discussion at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 not one delegate from any of the 12 States represented suggested that "all men are equal" either at creation or in life.

On June 26, 1787, on the floor of that convention Alexander Hamilton said:

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself."

Every mind in the convention assented to that statement. Freedom, liberty and independence are the basis and foundation of government in America. Equality of men is the central theme of Marxism. Marxism cannot live in a land where men are free. Marxist equality is the scavenger that eats out the vitals of liberty and freedom. It is the "come-on" of communism and is the doctrinal basis for totalitarianism. Nothing in the writings of any of the fathers of freedom in America justifies the libelous assertion that one of them believed or urged the doctrine that "all men are equal". The doctrine of human equality is the reverse of the doctrines they espoused.

The Constitution proclaims in its preamble that it was established "to * * * insure domestic transquility * * * and secure the blessings of liberty". Nowhere does it hint a purpose to insure domestic strife or secure degrading equality.

The same Myrdal who defined the "American Creed" as the "fundamental equality of all men," say on page 9 of his attrocity that equality and liberty cannot co-exist—that there is an "inherent conflict" between them and "equality is slowly winning." He told the truth. For 200 years this Nation has been a land of liberty—a haven of freedom in the dismal history of man. Equality of freedom and independence became the American Creed at the Revolution. All States and the United States wrote them into their fundamental laws and rejected the specious and depraved doctrine of human equality.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, is from California. The Declaration of Rights of his home State is almost a verbatim copy of the official Virginia Declaration of Rights. It says that "all men are by nature free and independent". There is not a word in the constitution or Bill of Rights of California sustaining the doctrine of the equality of men. It repudiates that doctrine.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, is from Kansas. If he will examine the Declaration of Rights of his home State he will find that its first paragraph is as follows:

"All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety."

Not a word is to be found in the fundamental law of Kansas that says directly or indirectly that "all men are equal." It repudiates that doctrine.

On August 14, 1862, Abraham Lincoln, speaking to large groups of Negro delegates in Washington, said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races.

Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think.

Your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least, why we should be separated.

Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you. I cannot alter it if I would. * * * See our present condition—the country engaged in war, our white men cutting one another's throats, and then consider what we know to be the truth. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

On the battlefield of Gettysburg in 1864 Abraham Lincoln recited a political speech, the first sentence of which was:

"Four score and 7 years ago our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

At the hour when Lincoln made that speech the Declaration of Rights of his home State of Illinois proclaimed "that all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, and of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness."

On and on we might go demonstrating that the doctrine of human equality is unknown in American Government and that the doctrine of equality of freedom and independence, first set forth in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, has been copied throughout America. The doctrine of the equality of all men never took root in America. It is living law nowhere. The nearest approach to human equality is in Russian slave camps where all men are equally poor and degraded. Three million party members rule 180 million slaves with an iron hand.

While Russia has partially succeeded in reducing most of her people to the level of degradation approaching "equality," she has been careful not to interfere with the segregation practices and racial mores of her people. Even Russian despots have more sense than to attempt to do a thing like that. That low mark was reserved for American despots sitting on judicial benches.

In the summer of 1955 Justice Douglas and Robert F. Kennedy, an Attorney for a Senate committee, toured Russia. Douglas found something he didn't want to tell. Kennedy spilled it in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, April 8, 1956. Here is a part:

"IV. SEGREGATION

"In every city that we visited there were two different school systems. There was one set of schools for the local children—those of a different color and race from the European Russian children. State and collective farms were operated by one group or the other, rarely by a mixture of both.

"Although work is supposedly being done to minimize the differences, many of the cities we visited were still split into two sections, with the finer residential areas being reserved for the European Russians. European Russians coming into the area receive a 30 percent wage preferential over local inhabitants doing the same jobs. The whole pattern of segregation and discrimination was as pronounced in this area as virtually anywhere else in the world."

A distinguishing feature of communism is that it never practices what it preaches. It says one thing and does another.

At the Eighth Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow in 1928, methods to be used to destroy true representatives governments by free people were fully discussed. It was revealed in the March issue 1956 of the National Republic Magazine published in Washington, D. C., that advocacy of "social equality" among the races was agreed upon there as the surest method for the destruction of free government in America. Since class hatred is the sure-fire communist weapon to bring about internal strift and finally revolution, Moscow adopted the slogan of "human equality", for the contest that has already done more harm to America than can ever be repaired. A proud nation of patriots has become a nation of fools.

After the War Between the States, "civil rights" or force bills were enacted by Congress and the prostrate and helpless southern people were put under rule by bayonets, as is again threatened. Under the protection of soldiers, illiterate negroes were commissioned to rule the white people throughout much of the South. They were put in charge of the legislative assemblies of the various southern states. The carpetbaggers of the late 1860's were the proponents of the insane doctrine that "all men are equal." While the white man was disfranchised for his loyalty to his race, his home and country and the negro and sociologists ruled them, the American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was stricken from the bills of rights of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and either the carpetbag doctrine of the equality of men or the specious doctrine of equality at creation were written into all their bills of rights. As soon as the "carpetbaggers" and "scalawags" were run out of the South by the courageous white people, everyone of those states called constitutional conventions and struck from their fundamental laws every vestige of the foul doctrine that "all men are equal", with one exception. That exception was the State of North Carolina. The carpetbaggers were never run out of North Carolina. The white people ran them as far as her college campuses where they became "doctors", put on caps and gowns and began screaming "academic freedom"! There they and their descendants yet remain, crying "academic freedom"! and the grand old American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence that stood in North Carolina's Declaration of Rights from 1777 until 1868 is yet displaced by the senseless substitute.

The American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was copied into the celebrated French Declaration of Rights of 1789. In the bath of blood we know as the French Revolution, the doctrine of human equality was substituted in the French Declaration of 1793. In the same bath of blood the French Revolutionary motto became: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity."

In 1940 France struck the doctrine of human equality from the motto upon the tomb of her liberty. That cluster of inconsistencies no longer tarnishes the tricolor of France. But France is dead. The doctrine that all men are equal reduced France to a pitiable position in the family of nations. In 1946 the doctrine of human equality was stricken from the French Declaration of Rights and the doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was reinserted just as it was copied from Virginia in 1789. But too late. When the spirit of a nation dies, when proud patriots become groveling internationalists, when pride of race is gone, the nation is dead. Where once was glory and grandeur, as in Rome and Greece, goats will browse among her moldering ruins and lizards sun upon her broken statuary. Equality made France a third-class nation. It will make us a fourth-class race. I believe it was Lord Acton who said that the reason why the French Revolution became so destructive to human liberty was the doctrine of human equality. Napoleon looked back from St. Helena with the observation that France wanted equality more than it wanted liberty; and since it couldn't have both, he gave them equality.

Flowing naturally from the doctrine of human equality is the equally specious doctrine of the "brotherhood of man." The men of the gowns sometimes put it as "the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God." Some preachers throw their voices into ministerial overdrive and exclaim, "All

men are brothers." Well, if they are, no two brothers are equal. Identical twins are never identical. Some of our ministerial friends who proclaim that all men are brothers say they found it in the Bible, yet not one has ever cited the book, chapter and verse. They, too, poor things, have been brainwashed.

If all men are brothers, then all children are brothers and sisters and are equally entitled to inherit from their collective papa (the state) all that every real daddy has worked to accumulate for his brood. That is socialism—far gone on the road to communism. "Every man a king" or "all men are brothers" may appeal to doctors and their demented minds; but if true, all are slaves to the state. If all men are equal, or are brothers, why did Jesus have such a hard time picking 12 men? Why did he pick 12 Jews? If all were equal, how is it that one was a traitor? Judas may be the equal brother of some men. Indeed, we have many in America today who would disgrace Judas and put Benedict Arnold to shame.

Liberty is always destroyed in the name of liberty. Free government is always destroyed in the name of freedom. Religion is always destroyed in the name of religion. If all men are equal and all men are brothers, why don't we all go to the same church? The Methodist bishop won't consent for his brood to become Baptists. Some Presbyterians want to integrate with Negroes, but they want to fight if one suggests that they integrate with Methodists. That is different. They have been brainwashed. If all men are equal and are brothers, why do we have a heaven and a hell? Those kingdoms are monuments of God's truth eternal, that all men are not equal, and that there is some sort of segregation in the life everlasting. The pearly gates and the streets of gold are for the good. Fire and brimstone are for the bad.

It is equality of freedom and independence that gives unto man his free choice to be good or to be bad. Equality of men leaves no choice, because if all men are equal by nature or inherently there can be no differences and no distinctions.

In Harvard's better days her Charles W. Elliot taught: "inequality, not equality * * * is the inevitable result of freedom." In Columbia's better days her Nicholas Murray Butler taught that equality is a "Shibboleth." Henry James described the doctrine of equality as "slander" by "the paid scribes of old-foggyism which no man who is not an ass can believe." Lord Acton, Edmund Burke, John Morley and hundreds of others have exposed the specious thing.

It is inequality that gives enlargement to religion, to intellect, to energy, to virtue, to love and to wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes every man poor. Equality of religion destroys all creeds. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of virtue suspends all men without the gates of Heaven. Equality of love stultifies every manly passion, destroys every family altar and mongrelizes the races of men.

Equality of freedom and independence cannot exist without inequality in the rewards and earned fruits of that freedom and independence. It is inequality that makes "the pursuit of happiness" something more than a dry run or a futile chase. It is inequality that makes every game. Inequality results in heartaches for the loser, perhaps, but it is the father of every joy and every thrill.

Equality may be imposed only in a despotism. Equality beyond that range of legal rights is despotic restraint. It is nowhere sought to be imposed except in the communistic sewers of slavic slavery. As Francis Lieber pointed out in his great work on Civil Liberty (p. 334) 100 years ago: "Equality absolutely carried out leads to communism." The prophesy is now being realized in America. We are there.

Equality homogenizes so that cream no longer rises to the top. It puts the eagle in the hen house that he may no longer soar. More than 2,000 years ago Aristotle proclaimed that equality may exist only among slaves. Russia is proving the postulate.

The Ultra-High-Frequency Problem in Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following letter written by the Joint Council on Educational Television to the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commitee:

JOINT COUNCIL ON
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1596.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your committee has been studying current problems in the field of telecommnuications, including the obstacles that are being encountered in utilization of the ultra-high-frequency (UHF) channels allocated for television broadcasting. The Federal Communications Commission has likewise taken official cognizance of the UHF difficulties, and is presently engaged in a rulemaking proceeding to determine what action might be taken to improve the situation.

The Joint Council on Educational Television (JCET) is directly and deeply concerned with the UHF problem, and has participated both in the hearings conducted by your committee and in the proceedings before the Commission. Our most immediate interest, of course, lies in the channels that the Commission has reserved for noncommercial educational television, but we are fully aware that the future of educational television is dependent upon a sound allocations policy for the Nation as a whole.

Of the 258 channel assignments reserved for educational television, 86 are in the VHF and 172 in the UHF range. There are 21 noncommercial educational television stations now in operation. Sixteen of these are VHF and only five are UHF. In addition to the five communities where educational UHF stations are already on the air, UHF channels have been reserved in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, Buffalo, Atlanta, Kansas City, and many other communities in which large universities or other important educational institution are located. It is apparent, therefore, that both the VHF and the UHF channels are of vital importance to educational television, and that its future development is seriously threatened by the adverse factors that have plagued and delayed the development of UHF television generally.

Accordingly, the JCET has followed with close attention the testimony before your committee and the comments that have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceeding. We believe that both inquiries are of great value, and in their light we have come to certain conclusions about the UHF problem, which are embodied in this letter.

Above all, we are convinced that the development of a satisfactory national television service, ample for the expanding and varied requirements of the American future, cannot possibly be achieved without vigorous and extensive exploitation of the UHF channels. Several proposals have been advanced which envisage the concentration of television broadcasting in the VHF channels, but these offer only a restricted and incomplete service wholly inadequate for our foreseeable needs.

The converse suggestion that the VHF channels should be abandoned in favor of a purely UHF allocations system, is perhaps closer to the mark. Nevertheless, it does not appear feasible or desirable in the present state of the art. Certain technical problems in the UHF field, and the enormous investment by the public in VHF receivers and by broadcasters in VHF transmitters, alike dictate caution before so radical a shift is settled upon. If, in the course of scientific advance, a purely UHF service should emerge as the best solution, still there would necessarily be a considerable period of transition and conversion, to minimize capital sacrifices and avoid the loss of service to millions of viewers.

But whether the ultimate allocations basis of television broadcasting be purely UHF or both VHF and UHF, it is plain that the UHF channels must be a stable and vigorous if not the dominant component. "There is no known alternative," Dr. E. W. Engstrom, of the Radio Corporation of America pointed out in the course of your hearings, "for we need the UHF channels in addition to the VHF channels for our still-growing black-and-white service and for the color service which is the newest of the mass communications media."

From the time of its inception as a broadcasting service in the Commission's 1952 television allocations plan, UHF television has confronted two primary obstacles: The existence of millions of receivers equipped only for VHF viewing, and slower technical development of UHF. These adverse factors have badly undermined UHF's ability to compete with VHF, and have tended to "snowball," so that UHF troubles are aggravated today far beyond what they were 2 years ago. The manufacture of all-channel receivers has declined, the viewing public has been slow to spend the money for conversion of VHF receivers to all-channel reception, networks have been reluctant to affiliate with UHF stations, and many UHF broadcasters have found it necessary to suspend operations.

If the present dangerous trend is to be checked, and UHF television put back on the road to health and growth, it appears to us that three basic steps must be taken:

(1) The manufacture of all-channel receivers must increase sharply, and substantially all receivers offered for purchase must be capable of all-channel reception;

(2) The competitive position of UHF must be bolstered by the creation and preservation of substantial geographical areas in which UHF is the sole or predominant television service; and

(3) The technical problems of UHF transmission and reception must be promptly and vigorously attacked, and the frontiers of the art pushed forward so that UHF will be as familiar as VHF to television engineers and servicemen.

It will be noted that the first of these measures is primarily the responsibility of the Congress, the second of the Commission, and the third of the telecommunications industry. In our opinion, each of the three is vital to the sound development of our national television system, and only by such a broad plan, and with the joint participa-

tion of Government and private industry, can a favorable resolution of this dangerous dilemma be achieved.

All-channel receivers: At the inception of the UHF television service, it was hoped and widely expected that its growth would be sufficiently rapid so that the manufacturers of television receivers would, as a matter of enlightened self-interest, "push" the sales of all-channel receivers. For reasons which are common knowledge in the industry, these expectations have not been fulfilled. It is our understanding that fewer than 15 percent of the receivers currently being manufactured are equipped for all-channel reception, as compared with about 30 percent 3 years ago.

Of all the threats to the survival of UHF television, this is by far the most serious, for it is making a bad situation constantly worse. Nevertheless, in a highly competitive field such as the manufacture and sale of television receivers, it is unrealistic to expect that all-channel receivers will be produced in quantity under present circumstances. The only possible solution appears to be some governmental act that will make it economically advantageous for the manufacturers to abandon VHF-only models, and thus insure the distribution of all-channel receivers. We believe that this will require action by the Congress.

It has been proposed, for example, that the 10 percent Federal excise tax should be lifted from all-channel television receivers, and left applicable to VHF-only sets. Budgetary objections to this course of action may be insuperable, and suggest that alternative of raising the rate of tax on VHF-only sets, perhaps to 20 percent. Obviously, there are many possible variants of the basic proposition. One which might warrant consideration is reduction of the rate on all-channel receivers to 5 percent, the same as is applicable to most other comparable commodities.

Objection may be raised to such proposals on the ground that they would involve a tax discrimination against the inhabitants of areas served only by VHF stations. As we understand it, the purpose of the differential would be simply to insure that purchasers of new television receivers would obtain an instrument capable of receiving the UHF transmissions which, as a matter of national policy, will be a major component of television service throughout the Nation. However, the same objective might be accomplished without altering the tax situation, by an outright statutory prohibition—based upon the Federal Government's constitutional powers in such fields as interstate commerce and national defense—of the manufacture for public sale and distribution of television receivers not equipped for all-channel reception.

We have been reluctant to reach the conclusion that Federal legislation is called for. Whether by tax differential or penal provisions, the effect of the proposal will be to furnish an economic subsidy or statutory monopoly for all-channel television receivers. Fortunately, and unlike the subsidies that have been granted in certain other fields, it may be reasonably expected that the need of preferential legislation for UHF television receivers would endure for only afew years.

Deintermixture: Under the Commission's 1952 allocation plans, the VHF and UHF channels are intermingled throughout the country, and both types are often assigned side by side within the same communities. From an engineering standpoint this is an efficient basis, for any zonal or regional limitations on the use of frequencies leads to waste through their nonuse in the areas from which they are excluded. From an economic standpoint, however, the intermingling of VHF and UHF has subjected UHF television everywhere to the direct competition of VHF stations, on terms extremely favorable to VHF, and customarily disadvantageous or even fatal to UHF.

We do not believe that it is necessary or would be desirable to tear up the present allocations scheme and substitute one based on complete geographical segregation of UHF and VHF stations. We do believe, however, that UHF must be given a certain amount of protection against the competitive incursions of VHF, in particular areas where VHF service can be dispensed with or limited in quantity, without detriment to the quality or variety of program service available to the public. Such protection can be given by an allocations policy commonly referred to as "selective deintermixture."

In communities where three or more VHF stations have already been established, there is little that can be done for the protection of competing UHF stations, and their main hope will lie in the distribution of all-channel receivers and technical progress in UHF transmission and reception. But where UHF stations have acquired a foothold, and are either free from the competition of VHF or have a chance to survive the competition of 1 or even 2 existing VHF stations, surely their prospects should not now be darkened by the establishment of additional VHF stations. So, too, there may well be particular areas in which a single existing VHF station could be required to shift to a UHF channel, without unreasonable hardship to the viewing public and with considerable benefit to UHF service as a whole.

The Federal Communications Commission, to which Congress has delegated the authority and responsibility for television allocations, now has this problem under consideration in its current rulemaking proceeding. We are aware that the Commission's task is a delicate and difficult one. But it seems to us that the facts and logic of the present situation, and the serious plight of the UHF stations that are now threatened with even more extensive competition from VHF rivals, must inevitably lead the Commission to adopt a limited policy of deintermixture. Such deintermixture, to be most effective, should provide adequate separation of UHF and VHF markets.

Technical research: In his recent address at the annual convention of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission proposed an immediate "crash research development program on UHF" to the furtherance of which all sections of the telecommunications industry would contribute. Chairman McConnaughey proposed a "twofold approach * * * concentrating on both the UHF receiver and the UHF transmitter" and gave voice to the hope that better UHF receivers could be designed.

We believe that an intensive and broad-scale UHF research program is vital to both the rapid amelioration and the long-term solution of the UHF problem. Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that the telecommunications industry is aware of its responsibilities in this respect. For example, the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers' Association has informed the Commission of their availability to "organize a program of study which * * * might encompass, for example, (a) measurements to indicate the effective coverage of UHF broadcasting under various conditions of terrain and power; authoritative information of this kind has never been available; and (b) reliability and cost of receiving equipment in the UHF together with potentials for improvement."

Of course, such a research program, although the primary responsibility of the industry, should be undertaken in close consultation with the Commission and other interested Government agencies. Indeed, the entire UHF problem calls for cooperation between Congress, the executive branch, and the industry. To be sure, each of the three major steps that we have proposed is the primary concern of Congress, Commission, or the private companies as the case may be. Nevertheless each of the three likewise requires mutual support from all sides, if speedy and effective results are to be forthcoming.

We have mentioned, and wish to stress in conclusion, the need for prompt action. A critical situation has arisen, the resolution of which will inevitably be costly and, in some respects, painful. It would have been helpful if these or comparable steps had been taken earlier, but further delay will make the situation even more difficult.

A nation's capacity for growth and even for survival may be gaged by the vigor and resilience with which it treats its ailments and grasps its opportunities. How to achieve an ample and flexible system of television broadcasting is certainly not the smallest of the social challenges we face today. We strongly urge that your committee now take action on the basis of the useful inquiry that it is conducting, and we hope that our suggestions may be of assistance in the shaping of an effective program for the salvation and growth of UHF television.

On February 29, 1956, Ralph Steetle, executive director of the Joint Council on Educational Television, made an appearance before your committee in connection with the current proceedings relating to UHF. This statement is presented by the Joint Council on Educational Television as a supplement to the one presented by Mr. Steetle, and it is requested that it be incorporated as a part of the record of these proceedings.

Respectfully submitted.

JOINT COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION,
ALBERT N. JORGENSEN, *Chairman.*

Murder on the Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christopher News Notes of June–July 1956, which graphically presents the continually mounting toll of highway deaths and outlines specific steps which everyone should take in order to reduce this massacre on our Nation's roads:

YOU CAN BE A CHRISTOPHER DRIVER

Do you realize that during the past year more people were killed by traffic accidents in the United States of America than by cancer, polio, and tuberculosis combined?

Many practical steps are being taken to curb "murder on the highway." But something more positive is needed to bring about safer driving than the mere fear of being killed one's self or of killing others. And you, personally and individually, can help bring about this change for the better.

I—A CHALLENGING OPPORTUNITY

Almight God expects each of us to act as responsible human beings—to do more than live for ourselves.

He has entrusted to you, whoever you are, a bit of His power. He expects you to use it not only for yourself, but also to apply it to the market place.

Certainly in our motorized society, the city street, country road, or superhighway is in the very heart of the market place. So as you drive along, you have countless opportunities to show the consideration, generosity, and restraint toward other motorists that you yourself would expect of anyone calling himself a Christian.

A real Christopher project

Since the one big aim of the Christopher movement is to stimulate the average individual, with God's help, to apply moral principles to the market place, it is only natural that we should encourage them to act like Christians when driving.

The fairest standard

The simple divine standard set down by Jesus Christ over 1900 years ago is still the best remedy of all for sanctifying human relations. "Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." (Matthew 7: 12).

Appealing to the nobler side of the individual to make his influence for good felt has a dynamic effect. Everyone can do something, however, slight, to raise the standards of such important spheres of influence as government, education labor relations, literature and entertainment. St. Paul stressed this positive approach when he said: "Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good." (Romans 12: 21).

Merely complaining or criticizing is of little avail. To do something constructive to right what's wrong is far more practical and effective. The Christopher motto sums it up briefly: "Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

Many urgent reasons

These few facts may remind you why this higher sense of motivation upon the part of all is urgently needed:

1. In 1955, auto accidents in the United States killed 39,969 individuals, an all-time record for slaughter on the highways. One traffic expert said recently that auto deaths during the first quarter of this year were 10 percent ahead of last. He concluded: "If this rate continues, we will end 1956 with 42,130 deaths."

2. Besides this frightful loss of life, in 1955 there were 2,158,000 injuries from 9 million vehicle accidents. One hundred thousand of these resulted in permanent disabilities. Property damage ran over four billion dollars.

3. The latest official figures show 58,589,863 registered motor vehicles in this country.

4. In 1965, it is estimated that there will be 80 million motor cars and trucks on the streets, roads, and highways of the United States of America.

5. Licensed drivers now total more than 62 million. They may number as many as 90 million 10 years from now.

These significant facts should remind us all to pause, reflect, pray, and then do something constructive. Good driving is the business of one and all.

More than fear needed

Speed, traffic, and safety laws are necessary, to be sure, but mere legislation will never produce good drivers. Fear of what will happen to one's self or to others has some restraining value. But seldom does fear produce great or lasting results. Only love and consideration for the rights and well-being of others, based on a love of God, will motivate most individuals to drive in a sane, courteous fashion.

"Thou shalt not kill"

Consideration for the rights of others, as well as your own, should be the dominant motive in helping you to drive safely and courteously. But a conscientious remembrance that one of the Ten Commandments is "Thou shalt not kill" may bestir you, if you should tend to become negligent or take chances.

It is a sobering thought to keep ever mindful that you are accountable to God for the way you drive, as you are for everything else you think, say, or do.

II—PUTTING YOUR IDEALS TO WORK

You may have noticed the sign "We love our children. Drive carefully" in many residential areas. Sound and sensible as it is, more than love of self and one's family is needed to inspire an individual to be a considerate driver. What is required is that all-embracing love which Christ expects of each of us: "By this shall all men know that you are My desciples, if you have love one for another." (John 13: 35.)

Anyone who truly loves all men without exception is bound to show it in whatever he does at home, at work, at play as well as while driving.

It is easy to generalize in a vague way about good driving. But a real test of the sincerity of our love for God and others is seen in how we apply our convictions to the hundred and one details that constitute good driving.

Here are a few out of many ways in which you can translate Christian charity into practice while motoring:

1. Show a healthy respect for traffic laws. They are the result of long and often deadly experience. Their one big purpose is to protect you and everybody else. Study these traffic laws carefully and then conscientiously obey them.

2. Drive only when fit to do so. If you are over-fatigued, ill, angry, depressed, or too distracted, you cannot concentrate on the exacting job of controlling the power of an automobile. Some feel they have the right to drive any way they like. Far from it. An obligation accompanies every right.

3. Use good judgment about speed. Avoid driving so fast that you endanger others, or at such a snail's pace that you jeopardize and annoy them in another way.

4. Check your car at regular intervals. Make certain that your brakes are in good working order.

5. Be self-composed. When in heavy traffic, remain calm and patient. You will make it easier for others in the same predicament and save wear and tear on yourself.

6. Stay where you belong. Keep a safe distance behind the car ahead. Remain in your own lane until it is safe to pass. Weaving in and out of traffic is unfair to everyone.

7. Signal properly. Give other motorists a clear and correct signal in ample time before stopping or changing directions.

8. Respect pedestrians. Give them the benefit of any doubt, especially if they are children or older people.

9. Allow others to have their rights. For example, don't speed ahead just as another car is about to overtake you.

10. Reduce your speed at night. The average driver cannot see clearly over 200 feet at night * * * Incidentally, be the first to lower your headlights.

Dozens of other helpful recommendations might be added. But you will find them in abundance in manual for motorists. Our chief purpose is to encourage you to add a note of Christian charity to their application.

III—YOUNG DRIVERS COULD LEAD THE WAY

A New York City bus carrying 30 passengers was crossing a bridge connecting Manhattan and Queens when the driver fainted at the wheel. The passengers froze in fear—all except a 19-year-old-rider seated in the rear.

Bob Kozlowski raced up the aisle and grabbed the steering wheel before the bus had a chance to swerve into the railing or into another vehicle. He then braked it to a safe stop.

One alert young man saved all 30 passengers.

Time and again young people show their great power for good when motivated by a sense of responsibility.

These few considerations regarding young drivers may help deepen their responsibility to others:

1. One-fifth of all drivers are young people. One out of every five licensed drivers is under 25 years of age. Two million new teen-agers are eligible for drivers' licenses each year.

2. The family sets the standard. Martin Klein, of the Automobile Club of New York, said recently: "Teaching a young person to drive is a cinch, but teaching him to use a car skillfully and safely is a challenge. At least 85 percent of it is the youngster's attitude. Has he been brought up to know and respect the rights of others? Is he interested not only in the techniques of handling a vehicle but in the courtesies and principles of sportsmanlike behavior in a crowd? The answers go right back to the family."

3. Parents should set the example: Young people can best learn from their parents not only the techniques of good driving but especially how they can put their "love thy neighbor" convictions into practice while behind the wheel. But parents must do more than recommend self-discipline. Teen-agers show a sixth sense in detecting preaching without practicing when their father or mother speeds, fixes tickets, or acts unfairly or rudely to other motorists.

4. Teenagers and death: During the last 10 years, the teen-agers of America have caused 5 times as many traffic deaths as those in the 45 to 50 age group.

5. Lack of responsibility: Recklessness, speeding, and general disregard for traffic signs and signals on the part of teen-agers were listed as the chief causes for auto accidents in which they were involved.

6. Costly negligence: Since 1948, insurance companies have classified all drivers under 25 years of age as poor risks. As a result, parents have had to pay $125 million extra for insurance policies each year because their children drive their cars.

7. Contributions of high schools: Out of 21,621 high schools in the United States, 6,191 engage trained teachers to give regular courses in driving instruction. Records show that teen-agers who have been taught the rules and techniques of safe driving have only half as many accidents as the untrained.

8. Sense of responsibility needed: While fear of danger is a good foundation for the young driver, he becomes a more thoughtful and considerate one if he feels a special responsibility to God and his fellowman from the moment he starts to operate an automobile.

IV. AN INCENTIVE TO DO MORE

If every motorist, motivated by the love of God and respect for the rights of his fellowmen, would take it upon himself to drive as he would like to see others drive, what a refreshing change would soon take place on the highways of America.

The personal experience of making a contribution to safety may well stimulate drivers to reach out to wider horizons and do something to humanize and sanctify every facet of public and private life.

Even though too much cannot be expected overnight, we feel that after a period of time great headway can be made in encouraging individual drivers to participate in this unique apostolate. They would then be true Christophers or Christbearers in helping to restore the peace and order of Christ to the highways as well as to all other vital spheres of influence.

A Declaration of Principles of the Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 to June 1 inclusive, the Polish-American Congress, representing over 6 millions of Americans of Polish descent, met in Philadelphia, Pa., at its quadrennial national convention to discuss and consider action for the preservation and security of the United States and for the liberation of enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain, particularly Poland.

A declaration of principles was adopted, which, under consent granted, I submit herewith.

The declaration follows:

Our convocation began on Memorial Day, a holiday that we are accustomed to observe by decorating the revered graves of those who have given their lives for the United States at home and abroad. We here assembled have in our hearts made pilgrimages to the resting places of our beloved dead to express our undying gratitude to them and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which they had given their all. We are resolved that our valiant dead shall not have died in vain, nor has death stilled their voices.

We Americans are in the midst of a Presidential election campaign in the course of which several parties are presenting their respective platforms on national and foreign policy. As an integral part of the American Nation, we feel that we, too, should be heard, and that due recognition be given to our voices. America to us epitomizes a glorious past and a brilliant future. It treasures tens of thousands of graves of our departed sons and it is proud of the many thousands of our kin who are now serving in the Armed Forces. It jealously guards the welfare of their wives and children at home, whose future is our hope and also our responsibility.

Our deep concern for the United States and for Poland, the land of our forefathers, is one and inseparable. We believe that the future of Poland directly and indirectly depends upon the present and future policies of the United States of America at home and in world affairs.

Today we plead for the inalienable right of Poland to independence and self-determination on the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late lamented President Woodrow Wilson, who, in the name of the United States, demanded and achieved independence for Poland, as a condition precedent to peace and justice in the world. In paying grateful homage to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, we simultaneously appeal to America to return to the noble ideals from which her invincible strength was born.

We realize the contemporaneous time is dominated by the relentless advance of Communism and the terroristic campaign of the Soviet Union as a state whose power and influence is consistently and alarmingly growing. This cancerous growth threatens our national and Christian culture. It aims at destroying the ideals of our lives and those of humanity in general. It is undermining the moral concepts which we cherish as our common heritage by reason of centuries of evolution in human relations. Communism cannot, it must not triumph. This, we here resolve under oath as Christians and as Americans of Polish origin.

We have asked ourselves, where should the place of the United States be, in these troubled times, in a sorely anxious world. The hearts and the sentiments of the American people have always been on the side of the oppressed and the enslaved. Throughout the period of our history, the Star-Spangled Banner has ever symbolized to the world our ideals of liberty, justice, and democracy for all. Under this banner America has marched during our Civil War and in the First and Second World Wars. Wars are justified only when fought for moral ideals. Our participation in all of our wars was motivated by the self-same ideals of liberty, justice, and democracy for all.

In the current times, when the destiny of mankind is threatened by an everchanging panorama of policy between the United States and the Soviet Union, we are more than ever conscious of our duties toward our country and mankind in general. We are in the midst of an irreconcilable conflict between democracy and communism; between Christianity and barbarian godlessness; between the dignity and the rights of free men against the tyranny of totalitarian states. It is to be deplored that during the past war, and in the course of the supervening years, our country has often vaccillated from its fixed orbit by compromising with communism, always with disastrous results. Whither go we now? We are engaged in a psychological war; in economic and international competition with Soviet Union. Yes, we are in a technological race. In this course, it is regrettable that our ideals have become obscured; nay, almost forgotten! No one dares mention the principles espoused by Atlantic Charter any more than those of the Four Freedoms. We have imprisoned ourselves within the illusory walls of imaginary limitations. We seem to be locked between bombs and dollars, still faintheartedly struggling between the implacable demands of hammer and sickle, and the throbbing, unyielding voice of our own destiny. We are seeking escape from a political entrapment in which we currently find ourselves beleaguered in Europe, in Asia and in Africa.

Our country is growing stronger internally but weaker abroad. We are consistently losing prestige and leadership everywhere. We have almost forfeited the faith and trust of millions of our friends throughout the universe. Our diplomats have acted under duress engendered by Moscow for many years, from Yalta to Geneva. They have seemingly discounted our own material and moral strength. An atomic war or dollar war are not the only avenues of escape from this dilemma. Our desire to avoid war is an understandable and thoroughly commendable aim. Yet, there are limits to the price which can honorably be paid for the avoidance of war. Avoiding war does not always guarantee peace. We recall Munich and its irrestible corrolary. We lamentably remember Yalta, too. We have suffered inevitable defeat whenever we had abandoned our fixed ideals. The birth of strength in the Soviet Union was the aftermath of Yalta. Its strength was energized by our spiritual weakness. We froze into a state of fumbling political inaction and lethargy. We were hypotized by imaginary exigencies and paralyzed by fear. We commenced a course of constantly changing our policy from threats of massive retaliation, to reappraisals, and then to a defeatist strategy of containment. We veered from the promises of liberation to the compromise of coexistence with gangsters. We have run the gamut from a conception of military strength to the wishful effort of purchasing loyalty with dollars. We have pressured our allies to accept coalition with bolshevism in Asia and Europe and have compelled China and Poland to compromise with communism. Wherever we went with our dollars and our wavering policies, fashioned to suit passing exigencies, we had consistently found ourselves on the wrong side. Why must this have been done? Is there no straight, no clear political concept to which the United States should unswervingly adhere? The policy of liberation is the only American policy which does away with doubt and error. This policy we have seemingly abandoned after sincerely and stridently proclaiming it to the world. We here and now appeal to our Government to return to its original policy of advancing the liberation of enslaved peoples everywhere, to proudly carry this message of the United States to a darkened and unhappy world.

We strongly object to the intemperate statement recently attributed to our Secretary of State, to the effect that Titoism opens great prospects to Poland and other enslaved nations. This pronunciation follows the spirit of Yalta. Titoism is communism. To tolerate Titoism means direct or oblique surrender. Its results would be analogous to those which arose from our blunders in China and Poland. We emphatically condemn a compromise that will be disastrous to freedom. Poland and all other enslaved countries want democracy and liberty not Titoism!

Titoism is the beginning of a new, perhaps more dangerous advance of the international conspiracy of Communism. It will not destroy Soviet imperialism. It will strengthen it by consolidation and by evoking a spirited new ideology.

The paradoxical idea that armed German divisions may be the sole guaranty of the survival of democracy in Europe is also a dangerous fallacy. German armed divisions mean the revival of an armed spirit. Our Government forced upon Europe German armies dearly bought by American dollars—aid. After the danger of military aggression of the Soviets has apparently receded and NATO has had to undergo a change of life, is this new threat to be foisted upon an already troubled world? What will Germany do with these divisions? How have we promoted our ideals by financing and foisting upon Europe—even on Germany—these renascent armed divisions?

This development, in our opinion, should arouse thorough reappraisal of our policy regarding the area bordering on the Oder and Niesse, which our diplomats have reactivated by rearming these German divisions. They seem to be decoying a reluctant Germany, with Polish soil as a bait.

The borders of Poland along the Oder and Niesse are the historical borders of Poland and should thus remain undisturbed. Our position gave the Soviet Union a psychological and political hold on Poland and on Germany. What have we gained by this expedient? We have convincingly made the Poles feel that, in a matter so vital to their future, the Soviets are their protectors and not the United States. Chancellor Adenauer now plans to bargain with Moscow, not with Washington, and Poland may be the pawn at stake.

The territory bordering on the Oder and Niesse should remain Poland's not as a compensation for the rape of half of Poland by the Soviet Union, a crime that was lamentably and obviously legalized and affirmed by Roosevelt at Yalta. This territory should remain Polish soil not as compensation for the unspeakable cruelty and damage inflicted upon Poland by Germany, but based

upon Poland's historic right, and the right of simple justice.

We earnestly and strongly urge our Government to modify its current attitude in the matter of Poland's boundaries along the Oder and Niesse.

Moreover, we firmly believe and affirm that the cities of Wilno and Lwow and the eastern lands which were seized from Poland, having been an integral part of Poland for many centuries, and having protected Europe against the Russo-Mongolian aggressors while the Polish nation, generation after generation, sacrificed lives and blood and property, defending these cities and these lands, that they, too, should be returned as parmanent parts of a free and independent Poland when peace commitments are finally drawn up betweeen the world powers concerned.

It is our belief that the aims of the United States to promote permanent peace and security could be more speedily and effectually realized by our return to a policy of liberation in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We can do so in Europe by extending our assistance in the creation of a bulwark between a red or white Russia and a black and yellow or brown Germany with a strong, prosperous, democratic Poland between these predatory countries and their Drang nach Osten and Drang nach Westen. The twain should never again be permitted to meet. They shall not meet as long as a strong community of nations exists between them.

We are in full accord and sympathy with those who hope to see in the United Nations a potent instrument of peace and humanity. It is our belief that the United States should use its influence to effectuate basic reforms in the makeup of the United Nations by giving a voice to the peoples enslaved and not to governments which oppress them.

We heartily endorse the recent resolution of the United States Congress that the documents gathered by a special committee on the Katyn massacre be brought to the attention of the United Nations by our delegation. Let the world pass deserving judgment on those who are guilty of the blackest crime of our times.

We express our gratitude to those who strive to effect changes in the present immigration and naturalization laws which should but now do not perpetuate our past traditions and ideals.

We warmly thank the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives who paid tribute to Poland on her national holiday, May 3 last, by expressing the sentiments of our fellow Americans.

We petition our Government to champion the demand for the release of the many thousands of people now suffering in Soviet concentration camps and prisons.

We appeal to our Government to fully support the request heretofore voiced that due compensation be made to Polish victims of nazism, as they were our worthy and deserving allies.

We believe that financial and moral assistance should be offered to Poles outside of Poland, to keep their spirit of resistance alive. Their action of resistance to the wiles of communism fully falls within the scope of combating that self-same communism which we so execrably deplore.

We highly appreciate the efforts of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe in behalf of world freedom, but we recommend that the voice of Americans of Polish descent be recognized to a greater degree. The trend of action of these agencies must be constantly adjusted by solicited cooperation of Americans of Polish descent. We know Poland and the Poles. We speak their language and suffer their pain. We are admirably equipped to tell them about America in a way which they will accept and believe.

We extend our hands of fellowship and solicitude to all enslaved nations, especially the neighbors of Poland, in a spirit of comraderies, friendship and common interest against a common enemy.

We pledge our allegiance to the flag of the United States, to the ideals and traditions of our beloved country and dedicate ourselves to a relentless combat of Christianity against the godlessness of communism. We consecrate ourselves to the achievement of victory of democracy over totalitarian tyranny. We believe in the glorious destiny of the United States and in the resurrection of a free, independent, democratic Poland. We reject any bait to compromise with evil. We reject a policy based on fear. We do not fear death for the attainment of our ideals. We have blessed our sons when they went to war to make the world safe for democracy. We have sent them to fight nazism, fascism, and communism and we shall not now be terrorized, intimidated, or induced to sell our souls for evanescent and putrid gain. The attainment of ideals requires sacrifice. The followers of Christ entered the arena of Nero's circus to be torn apart by lions—yet they were serene and died without fear. We do not expect to achieve peace and security from Moscow or from Belgrade. Nor shall we sell our birthright or that of our bretheren for a mess of pottage.

We are not frightened into submission, surrender, compromise, or defeat by appeasers or alarmists. On this memorable day, at the convention of the Polish American Congress, we raise the flag of the United States of America together with the flag of Poland's white eagle, inspired, encouraged and sustained by the realization that we nurture sentiments and principles that to us are more valuable than life itself.

Resolution Committee: Karol Piatkiewicz, Chairman; Charles Rozmarek, Kazimierz Kozskiewicz, Adela Lagodzinska, Frances Dymek, Alexander J. Laffey, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Judge Walter Bayer, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Peter Yolles, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. S. Lisewski, Chicago, Ill; Helen Rozajewski Dworczak, Dickson City, Pa.; Frances Tesny, Cleveland, Ohio; Joseph Alecks, Dorchester, Mass.; Walter Urman, Washington, D. C.; Frank Kolaczewski, Shamokin, Pa.

Address of Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, at San Souis Park, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Sunday, June 10, 1956, at 20th Anniversary Catholic Slovak Sokol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on June 10, 1956, at the 20th anniversary Catholic Slovak Sokol, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

Members of the Slovak Catholic Sokols, I get a real thrill in addressing this fine gathering of members of group 7 of the Slovak Catholic Sokols, and particularly today, when you are celebrating your 20th anniversary. We are blessed with just the kind of day this splendid organization thrives on when it takes to the wide-open spaces. And the outstanding gymnastic exhibition put on today has shown the kind of mettle Slovak-American boys and girls are made of.

Fine physical condition has always been an important factor in Slovak life, whether in the United States of America or in the great historical richness of its European background. Building the body as well as the mind and spirit, comes before good, useful lives can be led. I have always admired the Sokol motto: "A healthy spirit in a healthy body." Let us not forget that he who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything.

Certainly, such an attitude of optimism toward life, cannot be overestimated, in a day when the threat of war always hangs over our heads. Each day, the newspapers tell us about military plans to provide new defensive measures. We here in America, need more of what the Sokols stand for, optimism, hope for the future. But above all, we first need health. I believe it is the obligation of every American citizen both to himself and to his fellow citizens to keep his body so physically trim, that when he comes to the necessary tasks of making decisions about government, who to vote for, what civic programs to support, he will not be burdened by a tired body. He will not be handicapped with a rundown system. His mind, correspondingly, will not be taxed with longing for unnecessary stimulant.

History is full of great programs for physical fitness. The Nazis have their Hugend (youth movement), the Fascists also stress gymnastic work, and the Soviets too, have striven to impress the importance of physical culture on their young people, and similarly the Sokols aim to cultivate the benefits of excellent physical shape by developing its program on a group basis. But here the comparison ends, for the Slovak Catholic Sokol aims much higher than the creation of firm flesh for civil reasons. True to American ideals, a good Slovak Catholic Sokol does not hold that the state is the most important item in current affairs.

The Sokol, like the Declaration of Independence, advocates the right of each American to pursue happiness as he sees fit. But because it is a fraternal organization dedicated to principles of improving human relations—as well as man's relation with his God—the Sokol goes one step further. It wants to guide young Americans of Slovak Catholic heritage into a way of life which will bring them greater happiness because of their harmony with both God and Nation.

Mindful of the good the future can bring, the Sokol also wants its members to know the good given by its great traditions which found birth in that wonderful land of the Tatras in Europe.

I believe that an important aspect of the athletic program of the Sokols, is the cooperation taught. We Americans are proud of the spirit of assistance we frequently employ, particularly when it comes to someone in definite distress. Recall the constant flood of CARE packages sent by private citizens to starving and needy people all over the world. Your organization, as one of the outstanding fraternal societies in America, has always been in the vanguard of mutual help. And that should not be surprising when it is realized that the founders of the Slovak Catholic Sokols here in the United States sought to develop a better relationship with one's fellow man.

For over 50 years your organization has been instructing its youth on how to get along with one another. Your founders built exceedingly well when they insisted that tolerance and good will among men cannot be overemphasized.

If we are to meet the challenge of totalitarianism, we shall need this faith in this basic principle. For the real strength of America lies not in her present wealth, her luxuries, but in the spirit of the people who

produced them—the kind of spirit shown by the grandparents and great-grandparents of these fine boys and girls here this afternoon. These oldtimers had the indomitable courage and the longing for liberty, which easily enabled them to become an integral part of our great country. I count it as one of the great advantages of my life, to have been privileged to grow up with them back in North Wilkes-Barre, to have attended school with their children, and to count so many of them as personal friends. Who could not be but impressed after a 5-minute conversation with the late Msgr. John Sobota, who could not be but amazed at the versatility and genius of that great wireless inventor, Father Murgas, and who would not be stirred in reading the life stories of men like Father Jankola, Father Furdek, and a host of other great Slovak pioneers in the United States.

You boys and girls who have performed so magnificently here this afternoon have a great heritage. You have the stuff of great Americans. You are a final link of a great chain of an indomitable tradition. It is a pleasure for me, as a Member of the United States Congress to speak with you and salute you. You have been brought up in the high standards of the Slovak Catholic Sokols and you are blessed with the strength, the health, the educational opportunities, and the great heritage of freedom that will fit you for leadership in this age of great crisis. It is my earnest plea to you boys and girls this afternoon, that you realize the importance of continuing to remain faithful Sokols in this wonderful effort to fit yourselves for important service to God and country.

Never in history has there been so much opportunity available. One needs faith in both God and the future. Yours can be the faith to guarantee that while the America of tomorrow may be different from the America of today, it will remain a free and democratic America.

Zdar Boh—God bless you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*..... 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*..... University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*..... 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*..... The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*..... Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, ———, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, ———, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, and Cramer.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	Circuit Judges	
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*--------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*--
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*

Quigley, James M., *Pa.*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5304 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.

Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared State-Justice-Judiciary appropriations for President.

Senate passed 85 sundry measures.

House passed mutual security bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8926–8949

Bills Introduced: 14 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4021–4034; and S. Res. 280.

Pages 8928–8929

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 11319, fiscal 1957 appropriations for public works, with amendments—reported under prior authority (S. Rept. 2169);

S. 3388, to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the U. S. to the port of Port Townsend, Wash., with amendment (S. Rept. 2170);

S. 3866, to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by GSA Administrator and Postmaster General (S. Rept. 2171);

S. J. Res. 110, directing Secretary of Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the U. S., with amendments (S. Rept. 2172);

S. 1243, 2779, 2833, 2836, 3029, 3050, 3221, 3473, H. R. 6742, 6955, H. J. Res. 591, 609, S. 2849, 3166, H. R. 1156, S. 2863, H. J. Res. 606, 611, private bills (S. Repts. 2173–2190, respectively);

S. 3195, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to town of North Kingston, R. I. (S. Rept. 2191);

S. 3768, to include the Department of HEW among the other executive departments under section 158 of the Revised Statutes, and provide for the appointment by the President of a General Counsel of the Department (S. Rept. 2192);

H. R. 7896, to convey certain land to city of Hogansville, Ga. (S. Rept. 2193);

H. R. 8404, to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner-of-war camp near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming (S. Rept. 2194);

H. R. 9377, private bill (S. Rept. 2195);

H. R. 10417, to amend the Federal Register Act regarding public proclamations in a period following an attack upon the U. S. (S. Rept. 2196);

S. 2654, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., with amendment (S. Rept. 2197);

S. 3843, to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes, with amendment (S. Rept. 2198);

H. R. 7855, extending temporary authority to GSA to dispose of surplus property by negotiation to July 31, 1958, with amendment (S. Rept. 2199);

S. 3316, authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the U. S. to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., with amendments (S. Rept. 2200);

H. R. 5382, 5453, 8867, 11205, 1963, private bills (S. Rept. 2201–2205, respectively); and

H. R. 9285, to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U. S. obligations directly from the Treasury (S. Rept. 2206).

Pages 8925, 8928

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. **Page 8949**

Veto Message—Yellowtail Dam: Message from President transmitting veto of S. J. Res. 135, providing for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir project, Montana and Wyoming, was read, ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 128, and referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. **Pages 8925–8926**

Private Bill: H. Con. Res. 247, requesting return for reenrollment by House of H. R. 1913, a private bill, was adopted. **Page 8953**

Call of Calendar: On call of calendar, 78 measures, of which 53 were private, were passed, as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

Peace stamp: H. R. 692, authorizing a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

Tobacco: H. R. 9475, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (after Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had been discharged from its further consideration);

Waterfowl depredations: H. R. 7641, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations (after Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had been discharged from its further consideration);

Missouri land: H. R. 7913, authorizing Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between U. S. and city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

Postal field clerks: H. R. 3744, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

Navy nurses: H. R. 9838, to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy;

Military construction: H. R. 8709, to extend authority for defense production or mobilization activities of Secretaries of military departments; and

Private bills: Nine private bills, H. R. 1402, 5079, 2045, 1484, 7702, H. J. Res. 565, 581, 590, and H. R. 4873.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Wisconsin land: H. R. 2452, authorizing conveyance of La Crosse National Guard target range to Wisconsin; and

Private bills: 10 private bills, H. R. 909, H. J. Res. 534, 553, 554, 535, 555, 566, 472, 533, and H. R. 5590.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

D. C. narcotic addicts: S. 3907, extending for 2 years commitment of D. C. narcotic addicts to PHS hospitals;

Mentally retarded: S. 3620, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

Walruses: S. 3778, to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

Customs publications: S. J. Res. 178, authorizing appropriations to provide certain costs for participation by the U. S. in the International Bureau for Publications of Customs Tariffs;

Maine-Canada bridge: S. 3527, authorizing State Highway Commission of Maine to construct and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada;

Dual employment: S. 3681, to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the U. S.;

Soil conservation: S. 3314, authorizing Secretary of Agriculture to pay expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

Soil conservation: S. 3120, to extend the power that Secretary of Agriculture may exercise for payments and grants-in-aid for conservation under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act;

Agricultural research: S. 2585, to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md.;

California land: S. 3723, authorizing Secretary of Navy to convey certain land in Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; and

Private bills: 22 private bills, S. 911, 1869, 2800, 2842, 1402, 1893, 1324, 1627, 2342, 2586, 3024, 40, 2959, 3000, 3009, 3100, 3208, 3402, 3579, 2864, 2827, and 3363.

With amendment and cleared for House:

Crow Indians: S. 3698, amending the act of June 4, 1920, to provide for allotment of lands of the Crow Indian Tribe;

Farm credit: S. 3559, to amend the act of August 31, 1954, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen;

Farm Mortgage Corporation: S. 2530, to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds;

Forest fire compact: S. 3032, granting consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact;

Alaska land: S. 3344, authorizing conveyance to Alaska of certain lands in Sitka known as Baranof Castle site;

CCC property: S. 3669, to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act regarding removal of Corporation property;

Farm income data: S. 3145, to require Bureau of Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm;

Livestock quarantine: S. 3046, to eliminate requirement that Secretary of Agriculture notify officials of carriers of livestock of existence of a contagion quarantine; and

Private bills: 12 private bills, S. 1104, 1921, 2229, 2999, 2069, 2793, 2805, 2943, 2294, 2954, 3212, and 3235.

Bills indefinitely postponed: S. 3261 and 2732.

Pages 8949–8950, 8953–8972

President Eisenhower: S. Res. 280, expressing Senate's hope for complete and speedy recovery of President Eisenhower from his recent surgery, was adopted.

Pages 8969–8971

Lighthouse Service Retired Pay: Senate passed, with committee amendments, S. 3581, to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

Pages 8972, 8975

Public Health Personnel: Senate passed, with a technical clarifying amendment by Senator Hill, S. 3958, to amend the Public Health Service and Vocational Education Acts by increasing number of professional public health personnel and assisting in care and treatment of mentally ill.

Pages 8977–8983, 8985–8988

State - Justice - Judiciary Appropriations: Senate adopted conference report on, and agreed to House amendment to, Senate amendment No. 19 (funds for study of sites for a maximum-custody penitentiary and a western youth guidance center). These actions cleared the bill for the White House.

Pages 8975–8977

National Library of Medicine: S. 3430, to create a National Library of Medicine located for administrative purposes in the U. S. Public Health Service of the

Department of HEW, was passed after adoption of committee amendments. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill was, prior to adoption, amended by Senator Hill to include hospital administration among the fields from which 10 appointed members shall be selected. An amendment by Senator Douglas to locate the Library in Chicago rather than the D. C. metropolitan area was rejected.

Pages 8988–8996

War Orphans' Education: Senate passed, with committee amendments, H. R. 9824, War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956. Page 8996

Texas Tin Smelter: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for White House H. J. Res. 607, to authorize the disposal of Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. Pages 8996–8999

Strategic Minerals: S. 3982, to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the U. S., its Territories and possessions, was made Senate's unfinished business.

Page 8999

Program for Wednesday: Senate recessed at 6:30 p. m. until noon Wednesday, June 13, when it will consider H. R. 11319, public works appropriations, to be followed by H. R. 7225, social security amendments.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

FARM PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee held hearings with regard to the administration of farm programs by elected farmer committeemen, hearing testimony from the following witnesses: Under Secretary True D. Morse, Robert L. Farrington, General Counsel, Ralph F. Koebel, Office of General Counsel, Earl M. Hughes, Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, and H. Laurence Manwaring, Deputy Administrator for Production Adjustment, CSS, all of the Department of Agriculture; Lynn Drane, former chairman, and E. S. Wilcoxon, former member, both of Boone County, Mo., agricultural stabilization committee, Columbia, Mo.; and William Frazier Baker, counsel, Callaway County, Mo., agricultural stabilization committee, Fulton, Mo.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued, today in executive session, its hearings on H. R. 10986, fiscal 1957 appropriations for Defense Department, hearing testimony from Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commanding general, Strategic Air Command.

On Saturday, June 9, the subcommittee, in open session, heard testimony from Representative Aspinall regarding an oil shale plant at Rifle, Colo.; Capt. A. S. Miller, USN, Director, National Petroleum Oil and Shale Reserve; Maj. Gen. W. H. Harrison, adjutant general of Massachusetts, who was accompanied by several other State adjutants general, who discussed funds for the Army National Guard and Air National Guard; and Col. B. B. Leary, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics. Testimony was also heard from several public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—LEGISLATIVE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee began hearings today in executive session, on H. R. 11473, fiscal 1957 appropriations for legislative appropriations, with testimony from J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, Quincy L. Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Raymond Blattenberger, the Public Printer. Hearings continue tomorrow.

SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

Committee on Finance: Committee met in executive session for the consideration of H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, but made no announcements and will continue its consideration tomorrow.

TELEVISION

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Committee continued its television investigation hearings, with testimony from Everett C. Parker, director, office of communications, the Congregational Christian Churches, who discussed network programing, and Leonard Marks, representing the FM Broadcasters, who testified with regard to TV allocations.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

NOMINATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following:

The nomination of Frederick O. Mercer to be U. S. district judge for the southern district of Illinois, and Frederick Van Pelt Bryan to be U. S. district judge for the southern district of New York; and

Eighteen private immigration bills (S. 1243, 2779, 2833, 2836, 2849, 2863, 3029, 3050, 3166, 3221, 3473, H. R. 1156, 6742, 6955, H. J. Res. 591, 606, 609, 611), and nine private claims bills (H. R. 1963, 3373, 5453, 5382, 6029, 7373, 8041, 8867, and 11205).

Committee indefinitely postponed further action on 13 private immigration bills (S. 579, 700, 830, 840, 2040, 2598, 2661, 2915, 3019, 3049, 3078, 3127, and 3160), and 7 private claims bills (S. 2653, 3244, 3070, H. R. 2524, 2746, 5591, 10191).

The committee also held open hearings on the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff, to be U. S. circuit judge for

the fourth circuit, with testimony given by Senator Johnston (of South Carolina).

SOVIET ACTIVITIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Internal Security Subcommittee continued its hearings on the scope of Soviet activities in the U. S., with further testimony from Seweryn Bialer, who defected from Communist Poland in January of this year. The witness told the subcommittee that a Polish "neutral" inspection team in Korea was provided with money for payoffs and loans to members of other inspection teams for purposes of obtaining their collaboration. Mr. Bialer also stated that the defectors who have been induced to return to Poland have been used for propaganda purposes, and that the redefection of several Polish sailors last October was of high propaganda value.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 9 public bills, H. R. 11695–11703; 4 private bills, H. R. 11704–11707; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 248–250, and H. Res. 534 and 535, were introduced. Page 9064

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

Report of Select Committee on Small Business entitled "Urban Renewal Projects and Slum Clearance" (H. Rept. 2303);

H. R. 6940, relating to additional contract with Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona (H. Rept. 2304);

H. R. 7726, authorizing construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, amended (H. Rept. 2305);

H. R. 10535, including the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park in State of Utah (H. Rept. 2306);

H. R. 11558, to relinquish U. S. right, title, or interest to certain land in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear title to such land (H. Rept. 2307);

H. R. 11683, to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States (H. Rept. 2308); and

H. Con. Res. 246, a private resolution (H. Rept. 2309). Pages 9063–9064

Mutual Security: By a record vote of 275 yeas to 122 nays the House passed H. R. 11356, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. A recommittal motion was rejected by a division vote of 52 yeas to 147 nays. This bill provides a 1-year extension and would authorize an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 for the mutual security program, a figure $1,109 million below the President's request. Pages 9012–9013

Antitrust: By a record vote of 393 yeas to 3 nays the House passed H. R. 1804, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. Subsequent to its passage the bill's title was amended to contain a statement of policy. This amendment made the provisions of H. R. 1840 and H. R. 11 identical. H. Res. 521, the rule under which the legislation was considered, had been adopted earlier. Pages 9013–9041

Resolution Re-referred: The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from further consideration of H. J. Res. 643, to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii, and the resolution was re-referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Page 9041

Private Calendar: Passed the following bills on the call of the Private Calendar:

Cleared for the President: S. 872, 910, 1067, and 1221.

Sent to the Senate without amendment: H. J. Res. 621, 626, H. R. 4993, 5041, 5868, 7888, 7890, and 11489.

Sent to the Senate, amended: S. 2984, H. J. Res. 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 627, H. R. 4037, 7400, 7515, 8005, 8452, 10010, 10011, and 10199.

Objected to and recommitted: H. R. 5691. Pages 9041–9048

Private Bill: Disagreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 3957, a private bill; requested a conference with the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Forrester, Donohue, and Miller of New York. Page 9048

D. C. Legislation: The consideration of bills pertaining to the District of Columbia was in order and the following bills were passed:

Judiciary: H. R. 8149, relating to transfer of actions from the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the municipal court for the District of Columbia;

Unemployment coverage: H. R. 10670, to extend coverage of D. C. Unemployment Act to employees of District municipal government employed in D. C. institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

Drug control: H. R. 11320, to amend certain laws effecting the control of narcotics in the District of Columbia;

Board members' compensation: S. 1739, to authorize D. C. Commissioners to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions;

Motor-vehicle excise tax: H. R. 11488, to amend the D. C. Traffic Act of 1925 relative to motor-vehicle excise tax; and

Trailer license: H. R. 11487, to amend D. C. Revenue Act of 1937 relative to licensing of trailers.

H. R. 4993 and 11489 were passed on the call of the Private Calendar while the following bills were held over for the next District day:

S. 1275, authorizing D. C. Commissioners to designate employees to protect D. C. property;

H. R. 4697, to amend the D. C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act relative to sale of beer in chain stores; and

H. R. 11062, to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia. Pages 9048–9059

State, Justice, and Judiciary Appropriations: Adopted the conference report on H. R. 10721, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1957, and sent the bill to the Senate. Amendments Nos. 8, 11, 19, and 26 were in disagreement. The House receded and concurred in amendments 8, 11, and 26. On amendment No. 19 the House receded and concurred with an amendment to reduce to $250,000 the funds for preparation of plans for construction of a maximum custody penitentiary and a western youth guidance center, also provides that no site shall be selected until there is further action by Congress: Pages 9059–9060

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 4:42 p. m. until Tuesday, June 12, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will consider the conference report on H. R. 5881, to supplement Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federad projects; H. R. 4090, to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on U. S. cargo ships carrying less than two radio operators; and H. R. 9952, providing readjustment pay for members of the Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE

Committee on Agriculture: Met in executive session and considered but took no final action on H. R. 11403 and H. R. 11443, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act.

MILITARY—INSURANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Special Investigations Subcommittee concluded public hearings on the sale of commercial life insurance to military inductees. Lt. Col. R. B. Hall, Jr., chief, manpower, Texas State Headquarters for Selective Service, was heard.

RESERVE MIDSHIPMEN—CAP

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee No. 1 considered but took no final action on the following bills: S. 1748, to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the U. S. Navy; S. 1135, to amend act establishing Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the U. S. Air Force; H. R. 7290, to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate. Witnesses heard on S. 1135 were Representatives Hardy, Bates, Stephen D. Karnes, counsel, Select Committee on Survivors' Benefits, Lt. Col. A. W. Stephens, Office, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower and Personnel, Lt. Col. Earl L. Franzen, Headquarters, CAP, Capt. Ralph R. Curry, U. S. Coast Guard; on S. 1748, Edgar Sturn, Milton G. Nottingham, Merchant Marine Alumni Association, Henry G. Doyle, Navy Reserve Association; on H. R. 7290, Col. Max Neimark, Department of the Army.

HOUSING

Committee on Banking and Currency: Continued executive markup on H. R. 11510, to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and conservation and development of urban communities.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME—D. C. TAXIS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee on Judiciary considered but took no action on S. 3295, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and H. R. 10685, to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to regulate the number of vehicles to be used as taxicabs in the District of Columbia. Witnesses heard on S. 3295 were Carlton Smith, National Broadcasting Co.; Phillip Welsh, Association of American Railroads; Ed Rodgers, Air Transport Association; William Press, Washington Board of Trade; Robert Kneipp, Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia; Charles R. Van Horn, Leo O. Drumwright, B. & O. Railroad Co. Witnesses heard on H. R. 10685 were the following independent taxi drivers, Ed L. Mooney, William A. Frye, Anvil Grillo, and John Housch.

LONGSHOREMEN

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation considered but took no final action on H. R. 11113, and related bills, amending the act so as to clarify employer liability. Witnesses heard were Albert E. Rice, American Merchant Marine Institute; Ralph Pittman, Texas Employers Insurance Association; Howard Starling, Association of Casualty & Surety Companies; Ralph B. Dewey, Pacific Steamship Association; Wallace Smith, American Mutual Alliance.

POST OFFICE

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization continued hearings on the employment of experts and consultants by Federal agencies. Testimony was received today from the following witnesses relative to the propriety of a public opinion poll conducted in behalf of the Post Office Department by a private firm regarding a proposed postal rate increase: Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General; Abe McGregor Goff, Solicitor, Post Office Department; and R. E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget.

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Government Information continued its hearings on the policies of Federal agencies in withholding information from the public. The following witnesses from the Department of Commerce discussed with members of the subcommittee certain information previously classified and the regulations affecting its declassification: Erwin Seago, Director, Office of Strategic Information; Robert Bowman, Assistant Director, OSI; and Allen Overton, Special Assistant to the General Counsel, Department of Commerce.

GOVERNMENT SHIPPING LOSSES

Committee on Government Operations: Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee considered but took no final actio non H. R. 9504, relating to transfer of funds for payment of Government losses in shipment. The witness heard was Robert Maxwell, Commissioner of Accounts, Treasury Department.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Considered but took no final action on H. R. 10371, and related bills, to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of U. S. public lands for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress. Witnesses heard were Representatives Engle, Johnson of Wisconsin, Udall; Edward Woozley, Director, Harold R. Hochmuth, Lands Staff Officer, Bureau of Land Management; F. N. Ferguson, Office of Solicitor, Department of Interior; Rod Amundson, Chief, Educational Division, Wildlife Resources Commission; Michael Nadel, assistant executive secretary, Wilderness Society; Michael Hudoba, editor, Sports Afield, and representing also the Izaak Walton League of America; C. R. Gutermuth, vice president, Wildlife Management Institute.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Science ordered favorably reported to the full committee H. R. 11524 (amended), to establish a National Library of Medicine. The following witnesses were heard: David E. Price, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical); Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress; Dr. Preston A. McLendon, American Medical Association, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Worth Daniels, representing the Society of Medical Consultants to the Armed Forces; a statement for the record was submitted by Dr. William S. Middleton, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration.

CORRECTION—JUDICIARY

Committee on the Judiciary: On Friday, June 8, on page D596, the DAILY DIGEST erroneously reported that H. R. 6405 was approved by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee. The bill actually reported in lieu thereof was H. R. 6805 (amended), to prohibit in any lawsuit or action for damages the use and admission as evidence of investigations by the military departments of aircraft accidents conducted in the interest of air safety.

MERCHANT SHIPPING

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Merchant Marine considered but took no action on H. R. 11122, to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels. Witnesses heard were M. P. McLean, chairman of the board, Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp., accompanied by Sterling Stoudenmire; Clarence Morse, Maritime Administrator; Adm. Roscoe S. Good, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics), accompanied by Adm. Francis Dennebrink, commander, MSTS; Odell Kominers, attorney, representing the Luckenbach Steamship Co.; and Albert Rice, counsel, American Merchant Marine Institute.

LEASE-PURCHASE PROJECTS

Committee on Public Works: Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds met in executive session and approved two lease-purchase projects for Federal buildings in Greenville, Miss., and Oklahoma City, Okla., respectively.

Joint Committee Meetings

COMMUNITY DISPOSAL

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittee on Communities held hearings to receive testimony from citizens of Oak Ridge, Tenn., regarding community disposals in their area.

BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Laws

(*For last listing of public laws, see* DIGEST, *p. D572*)

H. R. 9429, to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services. Signed June 7, 1956 (P. L. 569).

H. R. 4656, relating to Lumbee Indians of North Carolina. Signed June 7, 1956 (P. L. 570).

H. R. 3996, to amend further the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. Signed June 7, 1956 (P. L. 571).

S. 2822, authorizing transfer of certain land in Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to school district in Mohave County, Ariz. Signed June 7, 1956 (P. L. 572).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 12

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, subcommittee, on administration of farm programs by elected farmer committeemen, 10 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building; Soil Conservation Subcommittee, executive, on subcommittee business, 10 a. m., 411 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee executive, on H. R. 11473, legislative appropriations, 2 p. m., room F–39, Capitol; subcommittee, on H. R. 10986, Defense appropriations, 10 a. m., 412 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Banking, on S. 3911, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against bank mergers, 10:30 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Finance, executive, on H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans, 10 a. m., 412 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, on committee business, 10:30 a. m., room F–53, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, executive, on committee business, 10 a. m., 224 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on television study, 10 a. m., room G–16, Capitol; Subcommittee on Auto Marketing Practices, 10 a. m., 155 Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, to hear former Senator Harry P. Cain, member, Subversive Activities Control Board, 10:30 a. m., 318 Senate Office Building; full committee, on proposed civil-rights legislation, 2:30 p. m., 424 Senate Office Building; Subcommittee on Internal Security, on scope of Communist Party activities in U. S., 11 a. m., room P–63, Capitol.

House

Committee on Agriculture, executive session, on H. R. 11403, relating to surplus commodities sale, followed by open hearing of the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower on S. 1688, to amend the Federal Seed Act, 10 a. m., 1310 New House Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 1 on S. 1637, extending the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made; H. R. 2035, providing for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of Reserve personnel, and other bills, 10 a. m., 313–A Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 on miscellaneous bills, 10 a. m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Acquisitions and Disposals Subcommittee, executive session, on Navy project, 9 a. m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive session, to continue markup on H. R. 11510, to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and conservation and development of urban communities, 10 a. m., 1301 New House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, executive session, Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation on H. R. 11113, amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to clarify employer liability, 10 a. m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee on H. R. 11526, improving governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and related bills. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Defense Department, and other departmental witnesses will be heard, 10 a. m., 1501 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on International Operations on aid to Iran inquiry, 10 a. m., 1435 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Military Operations, to hear representatives of Civil Defense Research Associates, New York, on civil defense, 10 a. m., G–53 Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs on post-office procurement. Post Office Department witnesses will be heard, 10 a. m., 1537 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on H. R. 10371, providing that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and related bills. Department of Defense witnesses will be heard, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, executive session, on pending bills, 10 a. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, on H. R. 6141, omnibus transportation bill, and related bills, 2 p. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, executive session, regular meeting day, 10 a. m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on H. R. 11122, to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade and to encourage the construction of new vessels. Industry witnesses will be heard, 10 a. m., 219 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, executive session, Robeson subcommittee on S. 65, relating to retirement for employees in hazardous positions in Federal prisons, and related bills, 10 a. m., 213 Old House Office Building.

Alexander subcommittee, executive session, on H. R. 4938, relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations, 10 a. m., 213 (Anteroom) Old House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors to complete consideration of pending projects eligible for consideration for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill. Projects to be considered are: Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; Freeport Harbor, Tex.; Ohio River at Gallipolis, and Licking River, Ky., 10 a. m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Un-American Activities Committee, investigating the use of passports in the furtherance of the international Communist conspiracy, 10 a. m., 362 (Caucus Room) Old House Office Building.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Special Subcommittee on H. R. 10477, to prohibit the payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions for periods longer than 61 days, and H. R. 10478, to provide for the disposition of certain benefits which are unpaid at the death of the intended beneficiary, 10 a. m., 356 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive session, to consider report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation re-

lating to proposed extension for 2 years of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 as amended, 10 a. m., Committee Room, New House Office Building.

Joint Committees

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Subcommittee on Research and Development, executive, to consider what private industry is doing in development of atomic energy, to hear Arch M. Booth, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 3 p. m., room F–88, Capitol.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, on Federal Reserve-Treasury relationships, 10 a. m., room P–38, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on title I of H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956, 2 p. m., 412 Senate Office Building.

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 10899, Commerce Department appropriations, 10 a. m., room F–37, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 10003, D. C. appropriations, 2 p. m., room F–37, Capitol.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1956 No. 97

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Vernon May, First Baptist Church, Tylertown, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou who hast made us for Thyself, as we come to Thee this day, we feel a deep sense of our need. We need Thee to help us become what You would have us be. May we find our example in Him who said, "I am come not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give My life a ransom for all. Pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you. Be not afraid, little flock, for it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

Help us, our Father, to recognize our individual responsibility in hastening the day when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ and He shall reign forever and ever.

Bless, we pray, the labors of these Thy servants to the end that justice and righteousness will prevail throughout the earth. In the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of enrolled bill H. R. 1913.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Railroad Commission;

H. R. 2452. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for such other purposes;

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who die as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolutions for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 40. An act for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran;

S. 911. An act for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello;

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of George Papoulias and Iren Papolias (nee Birbilis);

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robinson;

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Ilena Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu;

S. 2229. An act for the relief of Nina Greenberg;

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margareth Leiss von Laimburg;

S. 2342. An act for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng;

S. 2530. An act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Annie Feig Hildebrand;

S. 2793. An act for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski;

S. 2800. An act for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok;

S. 2895. An act for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel;

S. 2827. An act for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott;

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino;

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm;

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski);

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christina Arutjuenjan;

S. 2959. An act for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest;

S. 2999. An act for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla;

S. 3000. An act for the relief of Francesco Zammuto;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita;

S. 3024. An act for the relief of Donald Shang-Peh Kao;

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

S. 3100. An act for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar;

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;

S. 3145. An act to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm;

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Moses Rosenberg;

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayaalakshmi Koppaka Rao.

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cloepatra Vasiliadis;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site;

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3527. An act authorizing the State highway commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

S. 3559. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen;

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure;

S. 3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3620. An act to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

S. 3681. An act to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States;

S. 3698. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3907. An act to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. McCLELLAN, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy in lieu of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Kilgore, deceased.

INCOME-TAX DEDUCTION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS

(Mr. KEOGH asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in his third semiannual report, the Small Business Administrator said among other things at page 27:

Another possible revision which is worth study concerns section 401 (formerly sec. 165) of the Internal Revenue Code. This section grants tax benefits to approved pension plans for employees, including executives, of corporations. There is no similar provision available for owners of approximately 3½ million small-business concerns which are not incorporated. Employees, including corporation executives, who participate in these plans do not have to include their employers' contribution in their individual gross income until pensions are received.

The serious problem of the owners of small businesses is not only their difficulty in providing adequately for their old age and their retirement, but also their difficulty in competing with large corporations. A young man may be more attracted by the greater security afforded by a large corporation through its pension plan than by the opportunity which he may have to become an owner or a partner in a small business.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, complete elimination of destructive screw-worm fly from a tropical island, promising new techniques for irradiating deep seated brain tumors, development of better meat and milk producing cattle resistant to high climatic temperatures, techniques for planting and harvesting fish from presently nonproductive fresh water lakes, new understanding of anemia, and extended storage life of uncooked poultry, were revealed during a progress report last week by scientists using radioisotopes. These were the highlights developed at a week-long series of hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

During last week's hearings outstanding scientists reported on their work in the fields of medicine, biology, agriculture, and food sterilization in which radioactive isotopes, the byproduct of our atomic energy program, are playing a key role.

It is a tremendously gratifying experience to listen to these men describe their work, the implication of their finding and to perceive their dedicated determination to put the atom to use in treating mankind's illnesses and to develop new means to protect his health. So accustomed have we in Congress and the public at large become to hearing about the enormity of the atom's destructive power, it is refreshing indeed to hear firsthand from these capable and devoted servants of mankind of the work going on in their little advertised laboratories.

All of this work is being carried on under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission and the benefits of the scientific discoveries being made are just beginning to come out of the laboratories at an increasing rate.

For example, it was reported that a road map has been drawn of the cycle by which plants convert sunlight and

carbon dioxide into the various constituents of green plant life such as sugar. With this clearer understanding of the process scientists have actually been able by the use of certain chemicals to almost treble the amount of sugar produced by a certain form of plant. From this, for example, it is apparent that great strides have been made in unlocking the secret of how nature produces chlorophyl.

The infestation of parts of Florida by the screw-worm fly is causing an estimated loss of $10 million worth of livestock a year. The application of the techniques used in the eradication of this pest from a badly infested island if they can be successfully applied on the mainland will offset the cost of doing it, and prevent the spread of this highly destructive insect.

The full transcript of last week's hearing will be made available to the public in the very near future and it is my hope that through the wide dissemination of this committee print people everywhere will become more aware of the great and invaluable contribution to mankind being made by the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1957, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY EXERCISES

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Flag Day ceremonies that will be held here in the well of the House on Thursday, June 14, in commemoration of Flag Day and the second anniversary of the inclusion of the words "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We promise you an excellent program.

The House will recess for the presentation of an interservice choral group, an honor guard, and the colors. It is hoped that a full membership will be in attendance on Flag Day.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, there is talk in the air that we shall adjourn in mid-July. I think it is only fair that I should inform the House that I shall not vote to adjourn until the civil rights bill, now bottled up in the Rules Committee, is brought to the floor of the House. Furthermore, I shall demand a record rollcall on adjournment so that every Member of the House is put on record. Whatever the platform planks of the two great political parties may say about civil rights, it will be all hogwash if from both sides of the aisle of this House enough signatures cannot be obtained to the discharge petition to bring the issue squarely out in the open while the 84th Congress is in session.

Who is holding back? Now is the time for square talking and above-the-board dealing. I am informed that all the Democratic Members from Illinois have signed the discharge petition. Let someone speak with authority for the Republican Members from Illinois. Let others speak with authority for the State delegations, both Democratic and Republican, of the other States. This is a moral, not a partisan, issue. It would be violative of every tradition of this body and indeed of the very spirit of legislative representation if we should fold up shop and return home before we have faced on this floor the greatest moral issue of our generation.

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dulles again exemplified his talent for improvident statements. He shocked neutral nations like India, Ireland, Sweden, and Indonesia by calling neutrality obsolete and immoral.

Now all the good President Sukarno's visit did was thus dissipated.

Nehru is due July 7 to visit with the President. I suggest Nehru's visit be postponed. The President probably could not see him then and Nehru should not be compelled to take a poor substitute and thus confront Mr. Dulles who labels Nehru's India as immoral. His visit would be abortive at its threshold.

As a friend of India, I say, "Come later, Mr. Nehru, if you cannot see the President. Postpone your visit."

The strange part of the situation is that Mr. Dulles had cleared his speech at the White House, despite its inconsistency with the President's views at his last press conference that he saw no real harm in neutrality.

Apparently the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

The President discards the unfair theory that if one is not with us he is against us.

Dulles still adheres to this unrealistic if not dangerous notion.

I include in the Appendix a statement by Walter Lippmann which appears in today's Post and Times Herald.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SAFE DRIVING

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and to include an article from the Lowell Sun.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the award of winners of Chrysler's four-star driver awards for safe taxicab driving were given a trip to Washington yesterday. The safety awards are made to the most outstanding taxicab drivers in the entire country.

The Chrysler four-star driver award was given to John L. Michael for safety, courtesy, citizenship, and service.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every school in the Nation could hear the story of a man named John L. Michael, from Lowell, Mass., in my own district, who has driven an automobile for 41 years and never has had a chargeable action against him in all that time. Mr. Michael is 57 years old, and 23 years he has spent driving a taxicab. Much of that time has been with the Diamond Yellow Cab Taxi Service at Lowell. He is known also for his extreme courtesy and efficiency. Lowell is very proud of him.

I wish that every child in every school in the country could be told this story, and that the story could be printed and placed in every school.

Only 2 days ago the son of one of our most valued employees was critically injured by a teen-age driver who was driving at 80 miles an hour. If the children could be told the story about John Michael—this outstanding taxicab driver—they might be careful and would want to live up to his record.

It is only thoughtlessness that makes them reckless drivers. They do not mean to hurt and kill.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DOING BUSINESS WITH COMMUNISTS

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WHY IS AMERICA DISLIKED?

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by M. Raymond Cartier which is, literally translated, entitled "Why Americans Are Detested in the Entire

World." I trust that the Members of this House will read the article with care, as it has many very useful suggestions. It also brings to mind the truth of that great and old adage, "Lord, leave me to my enemies but defend me from my friends." I understand on good authority that M. Cartier claims to be a great friend as well as an understanding one of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territories of the House Interior Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Machrowitz
Anfuso	Fulton	Mailliard
Ashmore	Gamble	Merrow
Barden	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Bell	George	Morrison
Boland	Gray	Nelson
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hale	O'Hara, Ill.
Brooks, Tex.	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Cannon	Healey	Powell
Carnahan	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Christopher	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Chudoff	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cooley	Hope	Richards
Coudert	Horan	Rivers
Curtis, Mass.	Hyde	Shelley
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson	Sisk
Diggs	Jensen	Thompson, La.
Donovan	Kee	Thornberry
Dorn, S. C.	Kelley, Pa.	Tumulty
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Velde
Eberharter	Lane	Wickersham
Fjare	McConnell	Williams, N. J.
Flood	McDowell	Willis
	McIntire	Wilson, Calif.
	McMillan	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 23, 1956.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the small-projects bill which passed the House on May 28, I believe, of last year.

The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal assistance to local irrigation districts, water districts, and other public agencies in the construction of small projects.

The effect of the bill would be to permit the local agencies to build the small projects themselves rather than the Bureau of Reclamation, using the same funds the Bureau could use for that purpose; but, in my opinion, less of those funds, because local agencies can build small projects more cheaply.

This legislation has twice passed the House of Representatives, having passed the House in the preceding Congress under the authorship of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the then chairman of the House Committee on Interior, Dr. MILLER, where it failed of passage in the Senate in the last few days.

It again passed the House by a substantial vote in the spring of last year. When the bill was reported from our committee it applied the provisions for the benefit of small projects to all of the 48 States and was amended in the House to provide that with reference to those States, outside of the 17 Western reclamation States—that is, the 31 Southern and Eastern States—the act should be administered by the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of the Interior.

The bill went over to the other side and the Senate struck out all of the provisions of the House bill and substituted a bill of its own containing two titles. The first title applied only to the 17 Western States and was substantially the bill which passed the House. Title II of the bill provided for operation of the law with reference to the 31 Eastern and Southern States under the Department of Agriculture, although by its terms it was applicable to the entire 48 States. In other words, in the other body the bill was rewritten. Title I applied to the 17 Western States, being in effect the measure passed by this House. The other States were then segregated and put in title II under the administration of the Department of Agriculture with substantially different terms and conditions relating to the type of projects which qualified for Federal assistance and the type of aid that would be given.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and asked for a conference during the latter part of the last session, but in the crowded situation that existed at that time we found it impossible to work out the differences between the two houses; therefore, the conference was adjourned over until this session.

In the interim, however, a request was sent to the various executive agencies to determine what their views were of the bill as written in two titles by the Senate and more particularly that portion which was included in title II and which applied to the 31 Eastern and Southern States. The various departments responded. The Department of Agriculture filed its report on January 9, 1956, as did the Department of the Interior on January 11, 1956, and the Bureau of the Budget on January 9, 1956. Each one of those agencies recommended that title II, relating to the operation of this small-project program under the Department of Agriculture, be stricken from the bill and be handled in separate legislation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted an explanation of why they disagreed.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to elaborate on that part.

The Bureau of the Budget stated:

The Bureau also recommends that the Congress defer action on title II of the bill at this time and that the legislative authority to extend Federal assistance for irrigation development in the 31 Eastern States be enacted separately from H. R. 5881. The Secretary of Agriculture will recommend to the Congress the extent to which Federal assistance is required and the terms and conditions under which it should be extended.

The Department of Agriculture said:

The Department of Agriculture believes that the purposes sought in title II of H. R. 5881—

Which is the bill before you—

can most successfully be accomplished by amendment to Public Law 566, 83d Congress—

Which, by the way, is the Watershed Protection Act—

which will, if enacted, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to perform as an integral part of the agricultural services the purposes provided for in title II of H. R. 5881.

The Department of the Interior was a little more explicit on the point, saying:

Considering the differences between the two versions and the problems involved in integrating operations under either of them with operations under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, leads us to join the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in recommending that coverage of the Eastern States in H. R. 5881 be deleted. This recommendation is made without prejudice to later consideration when the various problems inherent in the proposal have been satisfactorily resolved.

Now, subsequent to that time, as I was about to say, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] introduced a separate bill, and it was brought before this House and passed the House of Representatives

some weeks ago. That bill is presently pending in the Committee on Public Works in the Senate. During the debate on that bill, which was the direct result of these departmental recommendations that these two matters be segregated and the projects under the Department of Agriculture be handled separately from the consideration of those under the Department of the Interior, Mr. HOPE, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, said this on page 6161 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1956, when the Poage bill was under consideration. The Poage bill, for the purpose of the record, is H. R. 8750. He said:

> It has been a disturbing thing to the Department of Agriculture to find that they would be compelled to administer two programs, each authorized by a separate piece of legislation, which, in a sense, would be competing with each other.

He was referring to the Watershed Protection Act and the Water Facilities Act, both of which are administered under the Department of Agriculture.

Continuing, he said:

> This legislation will clarify that matter, and I assume in the conference between the two Houses on the small-projects bill the conflicting matter will be eliminated.

I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is the author of H. R. 8750, the bill relating to the Department of Agriculture pending in the other body now, for the purpose of implementing the reports filed by Agriculture, Interior, and the Budget, and he is in agreement, too, that it would be just as well to eliminate title II from this bill.

The Poage bill is somewhat different in its terms than Senate title II which was tacked onto the bill presently before you. The suggestion was made that it might be possible to put the Poage bill into this conference report. There were certain questions which arose in connection with that which made it impossible for us to do it; not only the parliamentary matters involved, that is, taking the House-passed bill which came out of a different committee and in effect legislating in a conference committee to put that bill into the conference report, but in addition to that, the separate bill by the gentleman from Texas is presently pending over in the Senate where it was first referred to the Committee on Agriculture and subsequently to the Committee on Public Works. The Members can understand that there is a grave question of propriety of a committee of Congress taking over somebody else's bill, putting it in a conference report, and thereby depriving the regularly established committees of the other body of the consideration of that measure.

So the conference report which we have brought back has the complete concurrence of the Members of the conference of the two bodies, except for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who does not join in this report and Senator LONG, who on the Senate side did not join—4 Members of the House and 4 Members of the Senate joined in the conference report. This conference report strikes out the title II part of the Senate bill and substitutes what is in effect the bill passed by the House in May of last year applying only to the 17 Western States. The remainder will be taken care of in the separate legislation authored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] voted through this House and now pending in the other body.

So the conference report before us today is for all practical purposes the same measure that the House passed in May of last year limited to the 17 Western States. There are no really significant changes except for 1 or 2 smaller items that were referred to in the statement read of the managers on the part of the House with reference to certain of the details in the handling of these projects when they come before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I am sorry I did not hear the complete statement made by the gentleman from California. As he probably knows, I am very much interested in the Poage bill. May I ask, did the managers on the part of the Senate, in the conference committee, give the gentleman from California any assurance that they would support the Poage bill as it was sent over to the Senate, if it were deleted from this conference report?

Mr. ENGLE. It is very difficult for me, as chairman, to refer to what happened in the conference itself; but I would say to the gentleman that it is my opinion that all members of the conference will support the Poage bill in the Senate and that every effort will be made to get the Poage bill out of the committee in the Senate, get it to the floor of the Senate and send it down to the White House simultaneously with this bill. I say, without referring to anything that went on in the conference itself, that it is my opinion that that will be done. For my own part, I will say to the gentleman that I do favor the Poage bill and any assistance that I can give in getting it enacted into law, I intend to do. That was everybody's understanding. There is no conflict between us here. I discussed this matter with Mr. POAGE and he is satisfied with this conference report and the action that we took.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that just because Mr. POAGE is satisfied is not any reason why a great many of us are satisfied because, even though the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas are satisfied, that is not any reason why we should vote $100 million to 17 States, eliminating the other 31 States in the East. It does not make sense to me. The gentleman says that the Senate may consider the bill. Surely, they may consider it. But with the heavy schedule ahead and in the rush that will develop, it may never even get anywhere in the Senate.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman must keep in mind that there are some things that one can do in a conference and other things that one cannot do. I have tried to explain to the gentleman the difficulty we had due to the fact that we had a separate House-passed bill dealing precisely with that very subject matter, introduced in and passed by this House pursuant to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not true that the 31 States about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is so much concerned, are adequately protected under the Poage bill that passed the House?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. They all want that bill. The problem which arose and on which there has been some discussion by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and I assume concurred in by his colleague from Pennsylcania [Mr. GAVIN], is that we did not hook the two of them together; and I tried to say that it just was not possible to do it.

Mr. GAVIN. It would be very satisfactory if the Poage bill were up here today. I heartily concur in the suggestion that the legislation is important. I should like to see it passed, but I do not want the other 31 States bypassed. The gentleman can give us no assurance that the Senate is going to take favorable action. I am interested in the East, as other people are interested in the Northwest. We, too, should participate in these programs that make great contributions to the conservation of our water supply in our economic and industrial life.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman withhold for just a minute for me to make this comment? His colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was a part of the conference. He knows what discussions occurred there. I am perfectly sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be glad to discuss that with his colleague, but I cannot stand here on the floor, as the gentleman well knows, and discuss matters that occurred in the conference.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the big difference between the Poage bill and this bill here is that the money involved in this bill will go to the local groups, who will repay it to the Treasury of the United States. Under the Poage bill, the hundreds of millions of dollars that go to the other States are not reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say that, knowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and knowing of his past record and stand, certainly the gentleman does not want to make it appear as though he concurred in the recommendations of the conferees, even if he was in the conference.

Mr. ENGLE. I made no such implication.

Mr. GAVIN. I doubt very much, knowing him as I do, that he would be taking such a position. I presume he was in the minority and, therefore, there was nothing he could do except to protest. If the group was in agreement, well, he might take the position, but he did not get anywhere. No doubt he will tell us of his position on the matter.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman raised a question as to what the other body was going to do with this legislation and with reference to whether or not there was a good faith intention to press the Poage bill on the other side. That is the matter to which I was referring and on which the gentleman can certainly secure adequate information.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the relationship between the small-projects bill and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act. Does the small-projects bill purport to amend or supersede in any way the rehabilitation and betterment legislation now on the books?

Mr. ENGLE. As far as I know, it does not. It is separate legislation that deals with physically small projects, permitting local agencies to build projects of that character themselves rather than have the Bureau of Reclamation do them more expensively. There is no project which is authorized by this bill which cannot be built under present reclamation law, but we think more of them will be built, and be built more cheaply, if this bill goes into effect.

Mr. YOUNG. One more question regarding the size of the project. I notice that the upper limitation is $5 million except in certain cases where projects between $5 and $10 million could qualify, providing the applying organization financed all costs in excess of what the charge would be if the project cost $5 million. To take a specific case, assume there was a $9-million project, one-third flood control, one-third reclamation, and one-third power. Would this mean a participating organization would receive one-third of $5 million, for example, for flood control, or would it be $3 million, the relationship to the overall cost of $9 million?

Mr. ENGLE. It is only contemplated that the total amount of money which can be advanced in non-interest-bearing loans total not in excess of $5 million for any one project. If there are nonreimbursables in the project, they are nonrepayable as they are presently under the law.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the overall project reduced to $5 million for the purpose of determining the participation by the Federal Government with the local agencies? I notice in the legislation it is stated that the upper limit is $5 million. There are certain projects between five and ten million that may qualify, providing the organization will finance all costs in excess of what would be required, the $5 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. In excess of $5 million. That was the provision in the first bill as it went through the House. That provision is in there. I think the chairman should explain the question of the procedure in reporting back to the Congress on projects over a certain amount. I think that would be of benefit.

Mr. ENGLE. We have been very careful in this bill to give control to the Congress itself of these small projects. That matter is referred to on page 7 of the conference report in the third paragraph, which I will read:

> Another significant change to the House-passed bill adopted by the conference committee relates to the authorization procedure. The bill, as it passed the House, would have required the Secretary to submit project proposals which he approved to both branches of the Congress and to not execute a contract covering any proposal prior to 60 days following such submission. This procedure would permit the review of the proposals by the Congress but it would not provide for approval or disapproval of such proposals. The conference committee retained this provision but extended it to provide for approval or disapproval by the appropriate House and Senate committees within the 60-day period. If either committee should disapprove a project proposal, approval by the Congress would be required before the Secretary could execute the contract.

This is important because it gives the Congress a chance to look these projects over. The Secretary of the Interior cannot sit down and parcel out these projects without any surveillance by the congressional committees. The Committee on Appropriations first passes on the amount of money and the authorizing committee has the right to review and reject the project. If the authorizing committee reviews and rejects the project by resolution thereupon the project cannot be built unless it is authorized by the Congress. That is an important provision it seems to me and it is the one to which the gentleman referred.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Lipscomb
Anfuso	Fjare	McConnell
Ashmore	Fulton	McIntire
Bell	Gamble	McMillan
Betts	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Bolton, Oliver P.	George	Mailliard
Byrne, Pa.	Gray	Mason
Cannon	Hale	Miller, Calif.
Carlyle	Halleck	Mollohan
Carnahan	Hays, Ohio	Morrison
Christopher	Healey	Nelson
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Neill
Coudert	Holtzman	Patman
Curtis, Mass.	Hope	Phillips
Dawson, Ill.	Horan	Powell
Denton	Jackson	Prouty
Diggs	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dorn, S. C.	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Riehlman
	Krueger	Rivers
	Lane	Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Fla.	Vanik	Williams, N. J.
Sisk	Velde	Wolverton
Thompson, La.	Vorys	Zelenko
Thornberry	Wainwright	
Tumulty	Wickersham	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10899, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2344)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) "making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 15, 25, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, 13, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$126,804,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 23, and 28.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN MAGNUSON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,450,000 instead of $2,425,000 as proposed by the House and $2,465,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate providing funds to be expended upon the certificate of the Secretary.

The conferees concur in the statement contained in the Senate committee report concerning the handling of personnel transfers to the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $7,475,000 instead of $7,413,000 as proposed by the House and $7,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Census of governments: Appropriates $1,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees is not intended to reduce any of the functions proposed under this program.

Amendment No. 5—National housing inventory: Appropriates $1,000,000 for a survey of housing as proposed by the House instead of $650,000 for a national intercensal survey of housing as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 6—Operation and regulation: Authorizes the replacement of 100 passenger motor vehicles instead of 90 as proposed by the House and 110 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Operation and regulation: Appropriates $126,804,000 instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House and $128,608,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to by the conferees includes the sum of $108,000 to permit continued operation of 39 intermediate landing fields scheduled for discontinuance in the coming year.

Amendment No. 8—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Appropriates $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $37,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $4,625,000 instead of $4,550,000 as proposed by the House and $4,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Payments to air carriers: Appropriates $16,200,000 instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $17,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $10,900,000 instead of $10,800,000 as proposed by the House and $11,020,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Construction of a surveying ship: Appropriates $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $6,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Business Economics

Amendment No. 14—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $960,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 15—Ship construction: Reinstates House language authorizing reconditioning and betterment of one ship in the national defense reserve fleet which was stricken by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17—Ship construction: Appropriates $82,700,000 instead of $54,800,000 as proposed by the House and $108,880,000 as proposed by the Senate, and approves $1,115,000 for transfer to salaries and expenses instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,232,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The appropriation agreed to by the conferees includes $2,300,000 for the conversion of two mariners for the American President Lines, $65,000,000 for the ship replacement program, $10,000,000 for acquisition of replaced ships, $4,000,000 for research and development, and $1,400,000 for administrative and warehouse expenses.

Amendment No. 18—Operating differential subsidies: Approves 2,040 voyages instead of 2,000 as proposed by the House and 2,075 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $15,350,000 instead of $15,187,000 as proposed by the House and $15,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes $6,500,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $6,482,000 as proposed by the House and $6,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $1,600,000 for maintenance of shipyards and reserve training facilities and operation of warehouses, instead of $1,445,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendment No. 22—Reported in disagreement.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 23—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—THE PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 24—Panama Canal Company: Authorizes $3,679,000 for general and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,562,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Panama Canal Company: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed 18 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Amendment No. 27—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes $325,000 for administrative expenses instead of $315,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31—Salaries and expenses, Small Business Administration: Appropriate $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,890,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize the transfer of $4,634,000 from the revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,610,000 as proposed by the House.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that some Members were taken from

other matters in connection with this quorum call, but I would like to use the opportunity while they are here to restate the basic proposition that is before the House, and that is that this small-projects bill comes back here limited to the 17 Western States, because the House of Represenatives a few weeks ago passed separate legislation under the authorship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which puts the administration of small projects in other areas of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; that bill is currently pending over in the Senate. It was not possible to sit and legislate as a conference committee with legislation in separate bills pending before the Senate, which had already passed the House, and to include that legislation then in this conference report.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from California has well stated the situation. Some of the friends of this program, some of those who have been deeply interested in establishing a program all over the United States that would enable people in all parts of the country to enjoy the advantages of local irrigation and other water uses, have felt that if we passed this conference report today before we passed the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought you some time ago and is now pending in the Senate, that we would be jeopardizing the opportunity to extend this program nationwide.

I think that is a mistake because I believe, if we pass this conference report and make the Engle bill applicable to the 17 Western States, that we have then given them a needed tool with which to work out their problem; that if we can then pass the small watersheds bill, as brought out by the Committee on Agriculture, we will have provided an effective tool for all of the United States; and that between the two we will have a very effective program of water utilization throughout the country.

I know that there are those who say that if you pass this bill you will get no help in passing a watersheds bill. That has not been my experience with the gentleman who now stands before you and those who have worked with him on this bill. I think that we may certainly assume that we will have all the support and all the cooperation that it is possible for them to give us.

I know that in the other body there is a considerable feeling that possibly they might even hold up action on this conference report until such time as they have had an opportunity at least to pass upon the watersheds bill in their committee and determine whether or not they were going to consider it there on the floor. They have that opportunity and I think we may rely upon them to use it intelligently. I do not think we should put ourselves in the position of forcing them to do something that they do not want to do. But I believe that we may rely upon them to do the intelligent thing, and by doing it we will have a well-rounded program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, and certainly he is correct. The problem develops from the fact that one portion of this program is administered under the Department of the Interior and the other under the Department of Agriculture. Each of those departments recommended separate legislation, concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget. When the separate legislation was passed by the House it preempted that field, so far as that legislation was concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If the conference report before us today is approved and if the Poage watersheds bill is approved and still it develops that the effort to get an adequate local irrigation program for the States that are not in the present reclamation program is not successful, is it the idea of the gentleman from California that his committee would be receptive to correcting any defects that might develop in the coming year that could not be handled by legislation from the Committee on Agriculture; that is, if it develops that it is necessary for us to bring in the Department of the Interior in the Eastern States into this program, how would the gentleman react to that?

Mr. ENGLE. We tried to do that. Our original bill included the 48 States under the Department of Agriculture. If you have trouble with the Poage bill we will amend this law to put you in.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Andersen, H. Carl	Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.
Ashmore	George	Morrison
Bell	Gray	Nelson
Betts	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Boggs	Halleck	Phillips
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	Prouty
Cannon	Hébert	Rains
Carnahan	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Richards
Coudert	Holtzman	Rivers
Curtis, Mass.	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson	Sieminski
Deane	Jensen	Sisk
Diggs	Kean	Spence
Dondero	Kee	Thompson, La.
Dorn, S. C.	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Dowdy	Krueger	Tumulty
Eberharter	Lane	Velde
Fjare	McConnell	Vorys
Fogarty	McIntire	Wainwright
Fulton	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Gamble	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
	Mason	Wolverton
	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the quorum call I was answering a question by the gentleman from Mississippi preparatory to getting around to yielding some time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] which I will do immediately after answering this question.

The gentleman from Mississippi asked whether or not our committee would cooperate in getting irrigation benefits for the Eastern and Southern States if for some reason or other difficulty is encountered with the Poage bill.

My answer to him is that the bill now before us when it came out of our committee applied to the 48 States but provided for the administration of the entire program in the whole country by the Department of the Interior. On the floor of the House, however, the Department of Agriculture was put in charge of projects outside of the 17 Western States which, of course, is the genesis of the difficulty we have had and as a result of which separate legislation has been introduced to authorize these small projects by the Department of Agriculture in other parts of the country.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is, Yes; and the precedent of the committee's action in including the 48 States is the best evidence I can cite to him of our intention and the attitude of our committee with reference to aiding the other States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1955 when the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the bill H. R. 5881 to the House, the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior extended to the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. When that bill was called up for debate on the floor of the House on May 26, 1955, there was an amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to the 17 Western Reclamation States and in the 31 Midwestern, Eastern, Southern States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska the Secretary of Agriculture would administer the provisions of the bill. That is the way the bill passed the House.

It went over to the Senate, and the Senate also passed a bill covering the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

We went to conference in June of 1955. The conferees appointed on the part of the House were our good chairman, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and myself. The managers on the part of the Senate were Senators ANDERSON, BIBLE, WATKINS, BARRETT, and LONG of Louisiana.

It is interesting, and the Members of the House should know, that 7 of the 10 conferees came from the 17 Western States. All of the conferees who signed that report with the exception of the Honorable LEO O'BRIEN came from the 17 Western States. Senator LONG and myself did not sign this conference report. I could not in good conscience sign it. I am therefore going to ask the Members of the House to recommit this to the conferees because the House and the Senate both have spoken and have explicitly stated they expected this bill to apply to the 48 States, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

What the conferees did, in my opinion, was to absolutely disregard the will of the House and to absolutely disregard the will of the Senate and write their own legislation. This bill now gives the same $100 million not to the 48 States and the two Territories. This gives the $100 million to the 17 Western States.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, as has been pointed out, that we have passed the Poage bill, and I voted for that bill and I will support it and I hope that it will be come law; but the very reasons that has been given that we should accept this conference report indicates to me that the major premise of the proponents' argument is false, because if we should pass the Poage bill it will take care of not just the other 31 States but the entire 48 States. Why therefore should we pass this bill just to take care of the 17 Western States? If the Poage bill is as good as the chairman of our committee has said it is and as Mr. POAGE says it is, and as I hope that it is, we do not need this legislation, for all the States will be provided for. Why should we give to the 17 Western States the $100 million provided for in this conference report when the House of Representatives and the United States Senate said it should extend to all 48 States? To me, the proponents and conferees who signed this report fail to answer that important question.

May I say to the Members who come from the Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States that probably each and every one of you have had the same experience I have had. Municipalities and interested groups in your home communities have written to you to ask whether or not there is anything in the law that would enable them to get a little Federal help so that they might improve their water system or that they might enlarge their water system, or control their waste water, or irrigate their lands. They do not ask for a Federal grant but they would like just a little Federal help. They have been hearing about the fact that the 17 Western States have been able to use the Bureau of Reclamation and through it secure Federal funds to get help for the towns in those 17 Western States for the very type of project that yours and my communities are seeking. But we in the Midwest, East, and the South have had absolutely no help from the Federal Government for these identical projects. One of the things I had hoped would come out of the conference was that the Midwest, the East, and the South would be able to get for our communities just the same benefits enjoyed by the 17 Western States for so many years at the expense of the Midwest, the East, and the South. During the many sessions of the conference Senator LONG and I did not try to cut down the rights enjoyed by the 17 Western States. We only ask that our people be entitled to the same benefits. But, no, no; we did not get that. We were told that this bill should be changed to take care of the 17 Western States and if any help were to be given to the Midwest, the East, and the South it would come from the Poage bill. Under the guise of the Poage bill being passed some day we were told we could have no help in this conference report; that we in the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States could not have the same benefits for our communities to help them with their municipal water supply, to help them with their industrial water supply, to help them with their saline water control problems that we have in all of the Eastern States and on the Gulf of Mexico. No; we are cut out; we will have to rely on the Poage bill.

Well, let us see what has happened to the Poage bill. The Poage bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, was referred to the Senate and was sent to the Senate Agriculture Committee. Since it came before the House Agriculture Committee, it went, I think, to the proper committee, but the great chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee asked that his committee be discharged from the consideration of that bill and had it referred to another committee. I have recently been informed that it has since been reported to a third committee and not reported out as of this time.

Now, when the House of Representatives passes a bill covering 48 States, which enables the people in every town and hamlet in the Midwest, the East, and the South to get some assistance from the Federal Government for their water-control problems—and I think it is conceded by all Members of the House and the Senate and the members of the executive department that water is one of the great problems of our country—why should we give this special consideration now to the 17 Western States? If the bill should be referred back to the conferees and told that the House passed a bill covering the 48 States and they wanted these benefits extended under this bill to the 48 States, then to me it seems it comes with poor grace from several of the bureaus downtown to report adversely on this bill.

Now, I can understand why the Department of the Interior reported adversely on the bill. To me it is very simple. Their jurisdiction was not extended. They were told that the House expected them to continue to control the water in the 17 Western States and to not come into the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States. In the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States we already have the Department of Agriculture functioning, and the Department of Agriculture should extend its groundwork and all they would have had to do was to enlarge their present program a very little bit, and they would have been able to handle it. The reason the Department of Agriculture reported adversely on this bill is this: This bill would have given them a job to do that would have required them to do a little work. The bureaus downtown do not like to work unless they are performing duties that they have asked Congress to pass.

One of the things before the House right now on this conference report, I think, is that they must determine whether or not they should pass the legislation and determine what should be done with regard to the laws of this country or whether we should leave it up to 1 or 2 of the bureaus downtown. I think this issue on this conference report points up very clearly the fact that the Members of the House must decide whether or not they are actually the legislative body of the United States or whether the legislative body lies within certain bureaus downtown.

As one who is interested in extending the provisions of this bill to all 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska for equal treatment to all, I urge you to vote to recommit this conference report to the conferees.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand there is $100 million involved in this bill. Is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. That would be then prorated among the 17 States that would participate in the program; is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. It would be allocated among the 17 Western States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GAVIN. Now, if the House bill had been agreed to and no deletion made by the conferees, then the $100 million would have given 48 States an opportunity to participate in this overall program; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There was absolutely no effort on the part of the conferees to cut down the $100 million. The only thing they cut was the number of States from 48 to 17. But they kept the $100 million for the 17 Western States.

Mr. GAVIN. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the only answer to it is this. The other 31 States that would like to participate in the program will be paying the taxes which will be used to make up the fund of $100 million to give the benefits to those 17 States.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. I think it is a great program. All I ask is that fair and equitable consideration be given to all sections of the country and no special benefits to one section against any other section of the country. If they had let the bill alone as it passed the House and the Senate I would be for it. I would support the Poage bill. I think we are entitled to just as much consideration as any other section of the country.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. That is the reason I oppose this conference report. I should like this extended to all the 48 States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman does not want to leave the impression with the Members of the House that there is going to be a prorated division of the $100 million authorized by this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; I should like to make that very clear, that the gentleman's group kept the $100 million. The only thing that was prorated was the States. The $100 million will be allocated to the States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. But the money is not to be prorated State by State, anything like that. This is a trial or a research authorization. The gentleman also will admit that the Poage bill, which is an amendment to the Small Watersheds Act and which is supposed to take care of the interests of the 31 other States, has an unended authorization; that is, there is no limit to it and moneys may be expended as the Congress of the United States sees fit.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. But the important thing is that the Poage bill includes the 17 Western States; it does not exclude the 17 Western States, and they will have the benefits of this bill and the Poage bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the contents of the conference report have been accurately stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Part of the report has been discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SAYLOR], who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here considering a conference report on a bill for small projects, a bill that we passed in the 83d Congress and then lost in the other body in the closing days of that Congress. It has the same principle exactly, which I shall explain a little later. The bill before us now passed this Congress in June of last year. It did have 2 sections, 1 the watershed section touching the 31 Eastern and Southern States and the other dealing with the 17 Western States.

In the conference, of the managers on the part of the House and Senate, 8 of the 10 conferees saw fit to delete the watershed section, dealing with the 31 States, with the understanding that they would be included in a watershed bill known as the Poage-Hope bill, which passed this House. There is some concern about why that was done. I hold in my hand letters from the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, these agencies wanted a separation of the bill because of duplication and troubles of administration—your conference committee followed the suggestion of the agencies concerned.

This is a bill to permit managers of local projects to handle their own planning, do their own work without a great deal of interference by the Federal Government. It is necessary for the local group to put up a thousand dollars to have their plans reviewed by the Federal Government. They may deposit up to 25 percent of the money and they may borrow up to $5 million if they meet all qualifications. It keeps details of planning and operation at the loval level. It cuts out controls from Washington.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is worried about the $100 million, that is the ceiling on the amount of money in the bill. Every penny of that money is to be paid back to the Federal Treasury. That is not true in the watersheds bill, which I voted for and which I think is a good bill. The only money repaid there would be the money for the municipal water supply. As to the flood-control moneys, the great State of Pennsylvania has received a quarter of a billion dollars in flood-control money, and not one penny of that has been or will be paid back to the Treasury.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The local groups do the planning. They must repay borrowed moneys.

The local groups do their own planning. The bill has a provision that lets Congress review the project plans. That is a good point.

The original bill as passed by the House would have been difficult to administer. This is not a dispute between the 17 Western States and the East or South. Not at all. The watershed bill will benefit all States. I think the watershed bill is an excellent approach to the subject, and I voted for that bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] referred to the fact that the bill that passed the House had 48 States in it and the bill as it passed the Senate had 48 States in it, with, of course, a separate title for the portion under the Department of Agriculture. But it is true, is it not, that since that happened the House passed the Poage bill, which takes care of those portions under the Department of Agriculture? That bill is presently pending in established committees of the Senate. That is the reason we had to take that provision out and that the Senate conferees would not agree to tacking the Poage bill on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct. We should remember that this conference report makes it possible for local groups to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury. They must put up some of their own money. They have certain obligations they must fulfill. After they do that they can borrow the money and it must be paid back over a period of years.

I think the conference report is a good report. We have worked hard on it, and I recommend that it be adopted.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my very good and able friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], of his very able presentation, I want to say I heartily concur in what he has said. I agree with him that this proposed legislation should be recommitted for further consideration. I feel that an injustice is being done in making it a sectional bill. Had the 48 States been considered rather than 17 States in the northwestern section of the country I would say it would be all right. However, it is quite evident that the 17 States and the Northwest got together and worked out legislation that will delete the 31 States in the East and the South and set up a $100 million program for their particular section of the Nation. If this bill is passed there will no doubt be a conference with Department of Interior as to the allocation of the $100 million authorized among the 17 States. Very nice program, I would say, for the Northwest; not so good for the East or South. All we do is pay the bill but not share the benefits.

There is something unique about the Congress. We do not seem to be organized in the northeastern part of the United States, and by that I mean the New England States and Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island and Delaware. Some day, I hope in the not too distant future, we are going to get organized in the Northeast section as you are in the Northwest and then when these various programs come up we will say, "Certainly, we will go along with various legislative proposals provided you give fair and equitable treatment to all sections of the Nation and do not give preferred consideration to one section against another." So long as you look after your area you are not concerned about the rest of the States. After legislation was enacted to include the other 31 States in the bill the conferees got together. As was pointed out by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 8 of the 10 conferees came from the Northwest. So the only two in the minority, Senator LONG, of Louisiana, and Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, objected and were overruled. Certainly, they objected. So, we feel that it is rather an injustice that 17 States would bring in legislation to the exclusion of the other 31 States. Had I been one of the conferees handling the conference report, I would have let the legislation alone just as it was agreed upon by the House and Senate and would have permitted the 48 States to participate in this program without giving preferred consideration to one section of the country over any other section.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman from Colorado to say that the $100 million which would go to the 17

States was for experimental and research purposes?

Mr. GAVIN. If it is, it is quite a costly experimental and research program. I would not mind the northeastern section of the country having some kind of experimental program. My good friend here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] can tell you about the coal industry in our State. I wish we could secure a $100 million program to carry on a research program to develop some technique and methods by which we could produce and sell more Pennsylvania coal. There are hundreds of miners who have been unemployed in the great State of Pennsylvania for the past several years in our region. A research program for coal would be most helpful. But should we offer legislation for such a program for coal in Pennsylvania, I wonder how much consideration would be given to it? Again, I say it is about time the States in the Northeast get organized. I hope we can get these Northeast States together and get organized and then maybe we can get some equitable and fair consideration when these legislative proposals are presented. I trust when this conference reported is voted upon it will be recommitted and the conferees will come up with legislation that will give fair treatment to all the States of the Nation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have this afternoon witnessed a considerable difference of honest opinion. I think it is clear that everybody here is agreed that we ought to have a water program. Everybody, regardless of where he lives recognizes the importance of providing water storage both for municipal purposes and for irrigation purposes. The people of the West realized the need of water storage first because it was a more pressing problem for them. But, now such storage is a pressing problem for all parts of the United States.

This conference report will not solve all our problems all over the United States, but it does make a start in the direction that all of us think is sound and desirable. When combined with the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought before this House recently and which we passed, and which is now pending in regular order in the other body, it will, as I see it, give us a pretty good water storage program all over the United States.

Now there are those who honestly say, "Let us beat down this conference report this afternoon and possibly that will force the advocates of the Engle bill into passing the Poage bill before we agree to this report." It seems to me that it is just a mistaken idea that you can or should force or blackmail others into seeing things your way. I think we all pretty well see the thing alike. We are all pretty well agreed that we need a water-storage program in every State in the Union. The bill, which the House recently passed, makes a water-storage program available to every State in the Union. This conference report on the one hand gives a program which I think is needed for these Western States, which are even more dependent on irrigation than your section and mine, perhaps. I live east of the 98th meridian. There are those who are trying to divide this House on a sectional basis. I do not live in that region where the Bureau of Reclamation now operates, although I do live in the great State of Texas. I come from east of that 98th meridian. Nevertheless, I want the reclamation area to have the program which they need. I also want the other States to have not only a water-storage program, but I also want the people of every State to have a sound flood-prevention program. The Poage bill provides both. Of course, I think the Poage bill should pass. Everyone seems agreed on that. The only question is whether we are more likely to secure passage by cooperation or by a kind of blackmail. I urge you to use cooperation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and wsa given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the greatest difficulty here is the question of the jurisdiction of those who must supervise any of these programs. No one can charge me with being sectional in my approach to any of the beneficial conservation programs. I have always favored and supported programs that would help the Nation generally, regardless of where the projects—reclamation, flood control, or multipurpose—are located.

The Reclamation Act, the law of 1902, gave to the Department of the Interior the authority to supervise the reclamation program and such authority does not extend east of the 17 Western States. Accordingly, when we included in the original bill the 31 Western States we got into a difficulty of administration. There is no way at the present time by which the administration, that is, the Department of the Interior, can supervise under the terms of the general reclamation law any of the benefits which the 17 Western States have.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. When I have finished my statement I will yield.

The conference committee is not composed of 8 western Members of Congress but is composed of 7 Members from the West—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is the third member of the majority of the House conferees. The members of the conference were chosen in accordance with the rules of seniority in this House. We were agreeable to going along with a separate bill—the Poage bill—for administration by the Department of Agriculture, because we wanted all of the States to have the benefits which flow from irrigation programs and projects.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that part of this $100 million that is mentioned is derived from reclamation funds? Reclamation funds are separate from the revenues that come from the land holdings in these 17 Western States?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The reason for the $100 million authorization limit in this legislation is for the purpose of determining whether or not a program like this, under the jurisdiction of a Federal department, can be operated successfully and effectively. There was no question of dividing up the monetary benefits, that might be considered, between different areas of the Nation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman realizes that the 31 States were to be operated under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, so there would not be any difficulty in that respect, even if they were all in the same bill. The 17 States under the Bureau of Reclamation and 31 States under Department of Agriculture. What assurance have we that the other body is going to take any action on this bill in this session of the Congress? None whatsoever. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said the position we have taken today may be an effort to try to compel the Senate to take action on the Poage bill. I might say to the gentleman from Texas it will be a day well spent, as far as I am concerned, if we could recommit this bill and the other body did take action and passed the Poage bill. I would feel reconciled to this situation that fair and equitable consideration will be given to all States and sections of the country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], said the present bill before us was a step in the right direction. To me it is in the wrong direction. It is going in the direction of the Northwest and I am in the direction of the Northeast. It it was directed to the Northeast it would be all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to this conference report. It does not go as far as it should in taking in all the States in the East. However, I was happy to serve on the subcommittee which wrote the watershed protection amendment, known as the Poage bill, which includes agricultural irrigation service and also municipal water supplies to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope, and I feel sure the Senate will take up that bill in the near future and pass the necessary legislation to carry out the provisions that are being demanded by people who are opposing this conference report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What we are talking about is separate but equal treatment, because we have to handle matters in separate bills, inasmuch as one is in Agriculture and one is in Interior.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Separate and equal treatment, and we propose that the Poage bill will do just that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 48, noes 66.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there was an understanding that no votes would be had today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, when I have concluded my statement, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4090 is to amend section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that cargo vessels of the United States must carry more than one radio operator unless the ship is fitted with an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, in addition to the auto-alarm required by present law.

The bill would also amend section 353 to provide that a continuous watch by means of qualified radio operators must be kept unless the ship is fitted with both the automatic radiotelegraph call selector and the auto-alarm.

It is pointed out in the report accompanying H. R. 4090 that such installation would facilitate and improve communications and thus promote safety standards at sea for the protection of life and property.

The effective date of the mandatory installation requirement is 18 months, or shorter if the Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission has found that the call selector is available and may be installed at a reasonable cost to shipowners, and that the patents necessary for the manufacture of the device are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a step in the right direction as far as safety of the sea is concerned. I recall just about a year ago—to be exact on June 27, 1955—when in Boston Harbor an excursion ship that travels around the harbor and oftentimes to Nantucket and to Providence, with 272 of a school group aboard ran aground in a dense fog in Boston Harbor. It was amazing to the public at large and to the people at large that there was no auto alarm, there was no radio alarm, there was no ship-to-shore communication available on this excursion steamer. If the 272 aboard had ever realized there was no means of communicating to another ship or back to shore, there surely would have been a panic aboard that boat. There was a headline in the paper of that day that caused great concern. At the present time we have a little over a thousand ships in our cargo fleet that must have auto alarms. Auto alarms are used only in cases of dire distress when they send out an SOS. The radio telegraph alarm which is forced to be put into these new ships or they would have to carry an added radio man does this:

No. 1. The automatic radio telegraph call selector with capability of receiving and responding to the following: A, the international distress signal, S O S, B, the international safety signal, T T T, the international urgent signal, X X X, the ship's call sign and any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, this definitely is a step in the right direction. This is an opportunity for the Congress to enact legislation for further safety of life at sea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 503 and at this time yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the membership of this House will appreciate that it is not exactly a happy situation to oppose a bill authored by the majority leader.

At least, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is only doing what he believes to be right in opposing legislation he believes to be wrong.

H. R. 4090 is not a major piece of legislation. It is not included in any political program. It should be judged free of party and personalities. So, first, I urge my colleagues to act on the merit of the bill and not on the merit of its author and his worthy motives.

In my opinion, just the opposite occured when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported the bill out. In fact, it reminded me of the old game of follow the leader. It could not have been decided, it seemed to me, on the basis of the testimony and hearings, and I feel if you read the 130 pages of the hearings you will recognize this as a gadget bill wrapped up and labeled "Safety at Sea:"

A substantial minority of the Commerce Committee, according to the minority views, voted against reporting H. R. 4090 favorably.

The witnesses favoring H. R. 4090 were the owner of the patents, his son-in-law, a representative of one group of radio operators, and of course the distinguished author of this bill. Outside the latter, the proponents had some reason to hope for the passage of the bill.

For that matter, admittedly the various shipowners' associations had similar incentives to oppose the measure.

But the departments of Government which were negative or downright opposed certainly are objective critics and in the case of the Federal Communications Commission, particularly Commissioner Webster, are experts in this field and the very sources to which we laymen should look in order to avoid pitfalls and mistakes.

When I was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 83d Congress hearings were held on a bill similar to H. R. 4090. I signed minority views. Time, service on the Merchant Marine Committee, and further testimony have only served to increase my knowledge of the facts and conviction that this is bad legislation.

Frankly, it seemed to me the argument in the Rules Committee the other day was not a matter of explanation and logic but more of emotion.

For example, there was an attack on the steamship owners and the statement was made that this industry had always

opposed safety and means of protecting lives at sea.

On the other hand, in testifying before the committee on H. R. 4090 the industry stated without challenge that the shipping industry is safety conscious. It pointed out with pride that it incorporates millions of dollars in safety features into American vessels. It stated with pride that it spends millions of dollars in operational measures and devices to increase safety of life at sea. As a matter of fact, as the hearings state, new technical specifications for the auto-alarm presently used internationally were supported by the shipping industry at the Safety of Life at Sea Conference in London in 1948.

Improved auto-alarm devices to overcome atmospheric and interfering signals have been adopted by the Federal Communications Commission as the hearings show. But such features are not incorporated in the proposed call selector device which would become mandatory under H. R. 4090. The FCC reports this new gadget will not respond efficiently with atmospheric interference. Interference will blanket the alerting signals.

As to the criticism that the industry has always opposed safety, I think the voluntary installations of direction-finding equipment 20 to 25 years in advance of compulsion contradict such a statement. Radar, depth sounders, loran, gyrocompasses and gyropilots and similar devices installed but not required by law, indicate the irresponsible nature of such undocumented arguments. Steamship interests supported a program for merchant ships to have internationally improved lifeboat radio equipment. And besides, if there were a basis of truth for the charge, the argument is hardly germane to the merits or lack of them with respect to H. R. 4090.

A Commerce Committee member before the Rules Committee referred as a similar case to airline opposition to imposition of a new air-safety system. I submit that testimony regarding safety devices in the field of aeronautical control is completely irrelevant. The charge is often made that scientific testing such as is conducted by the Federal Communications Commission is slow. If I had patents and were hopefully awaiting approval I would feel that way. But if the safety of my family and friends, and myself, were at stake I would want thorough testing under all conditions. The patented device under H. R. 4090 has never had such an operational test. What is the hurry? This is being a bit overanxious to hand a signed order in blank to the patent owner, saying if you can make this device work here is an order forcing more than 1,000 American ships to install a $2,500 or $3,000 piece of equipment, and this without finding out if the present internationally accepted system can be adapted to the same purpose.

As a matter of fact, great care has been taken by someone in drawing this bill to insure that the present system cannot be adapted to perform the proposed function of this new radio call selector.

Now, my friends, we are discovering something. Why is there to be added to section 354 a paragraph (b) with these words:

> The automatic radio call selector shall be independent of any other radio equipment on the ship.

There you have it. That little provision insures a new device must be added to the ship's equipment. It prevents adjusting the present alarm system to respond to individual ship call signals. That provision, my friends, may well be worth a million dollars to the patent owner of this new gadget.

Figuring $1,000 profit per piece of equipment and 1,000 or more ships each one of which will be forced to install a separate device—there is your million dollars—less, of course, the cost of buying the patent from the inventor and any promotional expenses.

Reference was made in the Commerce Committee hearings to an example where this call selector was supposed to have contributed to the saving of lives. This was the case of the steamship *Mormacroy* which stood by the British tanker *Adellen* for 3 days. But listen—quoting the statement of Moore-McCormack lines: "The call alarm was not used in summoning aid." As the ships lay side by side this gadget was used three times as were light and flag signals, but this selector was no factor in saving any lives.

This measure has the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau; and the House may be misled into giving its blessing to the wrong object. This is special interest legislation. It is dangerous to allow the high and highly emotional motive of safety-at-sea to be considered hastily with only 1 hour of debate.

I urge that H. R. 4090 be defeated so the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can restudy the measure in the light of the evidence.

Now I know very few Members have the time to read the complete printed committee report. However, the objections of the Coast Guard and the Federal Communications Commission should be noted—and above all the provisions of the bill itself should be thought out.

For example, in the Rules Committee one member, and this could have been true of all members, obviously was unfamiliar with the bill. He expressed support because of a case where 200 or more passengers on an excursion boat were stranded off a point of land near Boston. This bill pertains to cargo vessels. Passenger vessels must carry more than one radio operator.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. I realize that what the gentleman is saying is true, but I was talking about safety at sea and that is what this bill has reference to.

Mr. PELLY. I thought the gentleman had not understood it.

Mr. O'NEILL. I understood it thoroughly, and I understand this, also, that all the laboring people, and the working people who ride on these ships, and all people connected with the cargo-carrying industry except the owners of the ships, are for the proposed legislation.

Mr. PELLY. I will come to that in my presentation.

Let me emphasize and repeat here and now that H. R. 4090 is to require an automatic radio alarm device on United States cargo vessels of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than 2 radio operators.

In summary, the reasons for opposing the bill are as follows:

First. As stated by the Coast Guard, Federal Communications Commission, and Defense Department in testimony on a similar bill—H. R. 6004—in the 83d Congress in 1954, the present mandatory internationally accepted auto-alarm device is more than adequate from the safety standpoint to receive distress calls and cyclone warnings on off-watch hours.

Second. The expense of hiring two more radio operators on cargo vessels, which as a practical matter is what would result if this bill is enacted into law, on the average per ship will amount to $12,000 per year straight-time pay and $2,500 for welfare per year, plus $3,500 overtime pay. A radio room on a ship now costs about $8,500 per year. By the terms of this bill, the cost will be $26,500, approximately. It is his sort of featherbedding that drives shipowners to transfer their cargo ships to foreign registry, where they employ low-wage foreign crews. My interest in this subject is in preserving an American merchant marine.

Third. This automatic radio call selector device duplicates existing equipment; it bypasses international safety and communications conventions; it bypasses procedures previously followed under section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934, which specifically provided a method of approval of equipment in the field of marine radio.

GREAT LAKES STUDY

In the presentation to the Rules Committee the impression was gained that these devices had come into use since hearings on the bill in March, May, and June 1955. This misapprehension was due to 2 apparently conflicting statements; the statement that only 1 prototype device had been built, and the statement to the effect that 8 units were in use by the Moore-McCormack Steamship Co. The explanation is that a similar two-signal model was installed by Moore-McCormack in 1947 for convenience and commercial functions, not safety, but was found mechanically defective and the report of the hearings shows this company's unfavorable testimony.

A more complicated five-signal device is called for by this legislation. But the prototype model of it has never been tried out under operational conditions.

One of the most compelling arguments against the bill appeared in the Seafarers' Log, the official organ of the Seafarers' International Union. The article reads:

> The Radio Officers' Union, an affiliate of the Maritime Trades Department, is on record against the device as offering no advantages over the present automatic alarm sys-

tems. Automatic alarms, which are required by Government regulations, are keyed to respond to the international distress signal whether from ship or shore station.

An ROU spokesman explained that the automatic call selector would be of little advantage in an emergency because a shore station would have to know the specific call numbers of all vessels that happened to be in the area. Most shore stations would not be in a position to know which ships were in a given vicinity.

And speaking of unions, I imagine all Members received a telegram from George Meany supporting H. R. 4090.

Somebody, whoever asked Mr. Meany to do them a personal favor, certainly caused him to get his wires crossed, because the AFL–CIO maritime trades division, as I said, is on record as opposed. One radio union representative in the hearings did support the bill. However, when you realize that American ships are being driven off the sea you realize why other maritime union leaders oppose this legislation—why Mr. Meany's own maritime trades are opposed. We only have 69 United States tramp vessels in operation. As members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee know only too well, our American shipowners have been transferring their ships to foreign registry. This can reduce the cost of wages, by substituting a low-wage foreign crew, about $20,000 a month. This bill would add about another $20,000 a year to American vessels expense which their foreign-flag competitors would not have to pay. No wonder the secretary of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, Harry Lundeberg, wrote me saying he is in thorough accord with my statements and that he thinks my position is absolutely correct. About this gadget he commented that it is not a necessity and will only impose, as he says, a heavier burden on the industry. This burden would be about $12 million a year, of which Uncle Sam would pay $3.3 million through subsidy.

No wonder Capt. George Decker, first vice president of the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, A. F. of L., urges that the matter be taken to the International Convention for Safety at Sea and thus make all signatories either accept or reject the alarm device. He says in his letter to me:

> Do everything in your power to defeat H. R. 4090.

Obviously George Meany is supporting a friend, not legislation as it has been studied and reported by the maritime trades division of the AFL–CIO. Whoever got him to send each of us a telegram did him a disservice. He has enough interunion squabbles without pulling someone's chestnuts out of the fire against the best interest of the maritime workers.

Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of the hearings, 84th Congress, 1st session, before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 4090, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in his testimony, the second paragraph at the bottom of the page, says the automatic radio call selector "is commercially perfected." I think he has been misinformed. Compare this statement with the testimony of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., on page 122 of the same hearings. It reads:

> In addition to the call alarm's failure to operate from causes traced to interferences and mechanical weakness, it has on occasion also suffered from another annoying defect—that is false alarms.

Also I might point out that when the Federal Communications Commission tested the auto call selector specified by this bill it had 72 false responses in 646 hours of operation. This explains why the Bureau of the Budget, in replying to a request of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for its views, commented: "The reports of the Department of Commerce and Federal Communications Commission raise important and as yet unresolved questions concerning the technical reliability and operational utility of the particular device specified in H. R. 4090." The Bureau suggested, as I do, further study and experimentation before enacting legislation. Overtime pay in responding to off-hour calls and false alarms is estimated at $32.90 per day.

I should point out, too, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in his statement to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, indicated a belief that the device is essential if our safety standards are to be maintained at the highest level.

Whereas Commissioner Edward M. Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission, on this point of safety, said in his testimony: "There are a lot of things which contribute to safety. I was brought up in the Coast Guard to consider safety matters. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of devices were submitted to us for examination, and they all contributed to safety. If you legislated every one of those pieces because it contributed to safety, you would load down the ship and you would not have any place for cargo or for passengers. It is a relative matter.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Would not the gentleman say that is quite an exaggerated statement that if all of these safety devices were put on the ship that the ship would be so loaded up that there would be no room for cargo and passengers?

Mr. PELLY. I think the point is that there are hundreds and hundreds of safety devices that are asked for.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; but the point I am making is that the statement is quite exaggerated, would not the gentleman agree?

Mr. PELLY. I am quoting this testimony.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; but the gentleman will agree that it is a bit exaggerated.

Mr. PELLY. I think Mr. Webster is considered to be the outstanding authority on electronic communications at sea.

Mr. Webster's statement continues as follows:

> I cannot deny that this would contribute something to safety. My point is that it is not necessary because you already have a system, and it is not necessary to superimpose this on a system which has been provided and which has been provided now by treaty and by law. I think the weight is on the convenience side more than it is on the safety side.

As to whether H. R. 4090 would be operationally effective until the automatic radio call selector is approved by the Federal Communications Commission is not clear. However, assuming the mechanical weaknesses of the device can be corrected, I would emphasize strongly that reliability of operation should be assured likewise by the international standardization of the speed of transmission and characteristics of the signal. Under any circumstances there should be no approval by the Federal Communications Commission until the device has been endorsed by the next International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea.

I hope H. R. 4090 will be sent back to committee for further study. It is unnecessary and premature, as Commissioner Webster has pointed out.

Before I close I trust Members will understand that under H. R. 4090 a patented gadget, the patents for which are owned by a Mr. Benjamin Green who bought them from one of his employees, would have to be installed on all radio operator American cargo vessels. The gadget would have to be capable of being set manually to simultaneously receive and respond to Morse code international signals as follows: First, the ship's own code call; second, the international distress signal—S O S; third, the international safety signal; fourth, the international urgency signal; and fifth, any other emergency code.

Thus when the radio operator on a cargo vessel was off duty, he could be called by an alarm. The present signal for an automatic alarm can only be used in an emergency but not for matters that might or might no lead to a disaster.

Of course, under the present internationally accepted system messages are arranged so as to be transmitted from shore during radio operator watch. A ship can send a message any time by paying the operator overtime. No disaster at sea, as far as I can figure, would have been averted, or lives been saved from the *Titantic* sinking until now, by this legislation.

Meanwhile, I submit, international ship signals—all five under this proposed new gadget if you will—should be approved by the regular International Safety At Sea Conventions.

To sum up quickly why this rule should be defeated: The provision requiring the owner of the patents to make them available at reasonable cost to other manufacturers is no protection. According to the committee report there are 266 Government subsidized vessels and 771 nonsubsidized ships affected. When the St. Lawrence seaway is opened up, 243 more bulk carriers could also become compulsory prospects for the gadget. On a production-line basis, say at $3,000 each, it would be like several auto manufacturers building 1,000 automobiles. It is only economical and practical for one company to manufacture such a limited number. Otherwise the cost would be almost double. Any other manufacturer would have to add

the royalty costs too and could not compete. So the special interest factor of the one family which owns the patents is distasteful to me. As I have said, the bill could be worth a million dollars to the patent owner.

That the gadget duplicates to a large extent an existing device on all ships, domestic and foreign, argues against the bill.

Finally, let me suggest that without the recommendation of technical Government advisers we laymen have no business approving such a measure. And why approve it in advance of the Federal Communication Commission's finding out if it works statisfactorily? Why the rush? Let the patent owner wait for his million.

With all the negative Government department reports, and with the facts which I hope I am contributing toward bringing into focus, I feel confident an Executive veto would result if the bill is passed as it might out of respect and deference to its sponsor.

Surely it is in the best interest of all—including the owner of the patents—to return the measure for further committee investigation and study.

In conclusion, let me say I intend, as I said before, at the proper time during the reading of the bill, to offer an amendment deferring the effective date until approval by the International Convention for Safety at Sea. If the committee would agree to accept that amendment which would cure the measure's greatest weakness, I would withdraw opposition now and let the experts by international convention resolve the issue.

If, as the proponents of the bill believe, H. R. 4090 has merit, international acceptance would greatly increase the safety factor of the bill, because all cargo vessels, domestic and foreign, would have to install the equipment.

Finally, I wish to thank the Members for their kind attention.

I have given you the facts, as I see them, and have explained my opposition. I consider H. R. 4090 special-interest legislation, but in no way, shape, or manner wish to diminish, as I told the Rules Committee, from the objectives or motives of any disagreeing Member.

I follow my conscience—and I say I hope the bill will be defeated.

If not, I urge adoption of an amendment providing for international acceptance.

If that in turn fails, I shall hope to gain recognition in order to move recommittal.

My colleagues, this is not good legislation.

I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is before the House after long hearings and searching consideration in two Congresses by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] last year, the bill was reported out. I have a telegram which he sent me, which I received today. It is addressed to me:

I regret that an unexpected matter of official business requires my presence in New Jersey today. I had expected to be in the House and speak in favor of your bill H. R. 4090 to require installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships carrying less than two radio operators. This bill should have the support of the House. It would provide additional safety and security to ships and men in maritime service. It is not claimed to be the last word but the system is undoubtedly a step forward in providing care and helpfulness to those who follow the sea. These men are entitled to have the benefit of every possible means that will provide for their safety and welfare. The need for this legislation has been given extensive consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce both this session and in the previous Congress. Last session the bill was reported favorably but did not reach consideration in the House before adjournment. It should not be further delayed. It is important to our shipping interests and exceedingly important to the welfare of all seafaring men. I hope it will receive the approval of the House.

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Ranking Republican Member, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I also have a telegram from Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor-CIO, which I understand has been sent to all Members:

We will appreciate your giving favorable consideration to H. R. 4090, which is a bill to improve safety of life at sea through use of automatic radio call selector. Passage of this legislation means better protection for American seamen and ships on the high seas, and, as has been true in the past, we must look to Congress for leadership in achieving this objective. Your support of this legislation will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours.

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO.

Now the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] has referred to the testimony of Mr. Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission. I have profound respect for the views of Commissioner Webster, but his views have been met in this bill. This bill has to meet the requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.

This matter of the cost being $12 million is a new figure to me; I never heard that before, and I think that was just picked out of the air. The committee has been very careful. There is no monopoly. The language in the bill is specific, and the same protection is given in this bill as has been given in previous legislation passed by the Congress in years gone by to assure safety to men and property on the high seas.

This instrument is not something that costs $20,000; the outside cost is $1,650 to $1,800 per installation, and anyone can manufacture it by getting a license through the payment of a proper and justifiable royalty. Every instrument on a modern ship has at some time been controlled or owned by some individual or company as a result of a patent, and there is nothing unusual in relation to this bill that differentiates it from any other legislation the Congress has acted upon. We must keep in mind that every piece of legislation on the statute books for safety at sea has been brought about as a result of congressional action and against the bitter opposition of the steamship association. I am not saying that every shipowner is opposed, but the association as such has always bitterly opposed safety-at-sea legislation enacted by the Congress in the past.

It is the old battle of progress being impeded or attempted to be impeded, particularly when progress means the welfare of human beings; the big shipping interests bitterly opposed the existing laws for the protection of people in bygone years.

The bill means a saving of lives and property. Not so long ago there was a maritime catastrophe in the Pacific where a ship was sunk and about 35 seamen cast into the sea. They had their lifesaving instruments, but they floundered around in the sea for hours and hours and finally every one of them drowned, yet only a few miles away, not so far away, was another ship going in the same direction, but this other ship knew nothing of the disaster to the first or the plight of the seamen. Had there been one of these instruments on board there would have been constant communication with the shore and they would have learned of the disaster and could have come to the rescue of this stricken ship and probably saved most if not all of the men.

Talk about opposition, let me read you a list of the companies that use this device now:

	Units
Moore-McCormack Lines	35
States Marine Corp	20
Robin Lines	10
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey	15
Grace Line	14
United Fruit Co	1
Waterman Steamship Corp	3
Standard Vacuum	2
Maritime Administration vessels	108
United States Coast Guard	66

That is evidence they cannot contradict.

I will not take any more time under the rule except to make this observation about the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Washington. I respect his views and his right to oppose this legislation, but I do not respect his effort to impugn the motives of others. I do not say the gentleman did, but in a letter that was sent out very generally was that the committee reported this bill for me. Nothing was done for my personal interest; I cannot proceed that way in regard to any legislation. I have never approached any colleague of mine or any committee on the basis of my being so interested in the bill that I asked them because of friendship with me and my position to vote for the bill. I certainly would not have undertaken to do that; it could not have happened. The bill was reported out last year supported by Republicans on the committee; and it was reported out again this year. So there is the history of this bill so far as this Congress and past Congresses are concerned. The amendment that the gentleman from Washington says he is going to offer would defeat the bill. We

have never put through legislation where it had to be internationally agreed upon as a condition precedent. All past legislation applied to American ships with reference to equipment for safety at sea and lives and property, then it was extended to the vessels of other countries. The amendment is a nice way of defeating the bill and is inconsistent with the history of Congress in the passage of sea legislation in the past. When the amendment is offered I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, before I got into politics I was a seaman and I want to speak today more as a seaman than as a Member of Congress, merely utilizing my membership in this body to gain the opportunity to speak. I am going to relate some past history not for the purpose of impressing anybody but for the purpose of trying to convince you that I know what I am talking about.

I have been on ships that have sunk under emergency conditions, others that have been rammed; I have gone over the side in the midst of typhoons to lash down equipment that was endangering the ship, I have sailed through good weather and bad, on easy seas and on rough ones. I have tremendous respect for the men who sail the seas, and I also know how very important is any piece of equipment, any regulation, any code, any custom that will promote safety at sea. I also have a similar understanding of any devices, codes, customs, and practices that will endanger the lives of men at sea, because when a ship casts off her lines and leaves port and gets out into the open sea she is on her own. What she has with her, what her men know as sailors, are those things upon which the lives of the men depend. So, with that kind of an introduction I just want to say that I think I know perhaps a little more about what is needed and not needed than our good colleague [Mr. WOLVERTON] despite all the testimony he has heard, and perhaps more than George Meany, who is not a seaman.

I agree with the Radio Operators Union, the men who sail on the ships, the SUP, the Sailor's Union of the Pacific, the Seafarer's International Union, who say: "Do not make us put these devices on the ships."

They do not come down here and say they are not necessary, they are duplicating equipment or anything like that. They say they are dangerous. Why are they dangerous? Just look at the minority views in this report that quote the Federal Communications Commission and these other Government departments affected, all of which have given adverse reports on this proposed legislation. The Federal Communications tests decry this equipment as unsatisfactory. Whether you say it has to be satisfactory before it goes on a ship or not, you are trying to compel the use of a piece of equipment that today cannot pass the tests.

What does that mean? Where men's lives depend upon the functioning of such equipment that does not work, you are putting them in peril. What happens when you get a piece of equipment like this that according to the FCC tests, during 464 hours it brought in a total of 72 false responses, or 1 every 9 hours. What does that do to your radio operator? It is like the boy who cried wolf. They flip it off, they cut the wires, they get rid of it somehow or other. They would not depend on it, and if they did, they would be responding to false alarms constantly, as well as the rest of these things that the Commission found out about this piece of equipment that will not work. Someone has said it will bring in one signal but will not bring in another. You see what I mean? I would not want to go to sea and be compelled by the laws of the United States Government to sail with a piece of equipment that is going to endanger me and endanger the men under me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in command of ships. I commanded a 10,000-ton ship, and I know what the responsibility is, and based on that personal experience I plead with you to defeat this rule and defeat the bill, because you simply cannot put our seamen in the position of having to sail with equipment that is not worth while, that causes them to be in peril when they leave port, and if we execute our responsibility to this great group of people as we should, we will not force upon them a condition which will be created by this equipment which is unsafe.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I make reference to the steamer going aground in Boston Harbor last year with 272 schoolchildren on it. Now, this steamer would normally carry about 1,000 people. The interesting thing about it is that naturally it had a radio room like any ship would have, but the truth of the matter is that there was no radio operator aboard the ship, the reason being that the company wanted to cut down on expenses at the cost of the passengers who were aboard that steamer. I understand the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already reported out a bill saying that ships that carry passengers, excursion steamers, fishing boats, and ships of that trade, will have to have a radio man aboard the ship. Every law that has ever been enacted as far as safety is concerned, whether it is about running lights, whether it is to put life preservers on the boat, whether it is to put lifesaving craft on the boat, has been accomplished because of the fact that you have had to have legislation for it. The owners of the ships at all times have tried to reduce their costs to whatever extent they can, and they have opposed every type of legislation along the line.

Now, the fact remains, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has said, that the Moore-McCormack Lines have 35 units, the State Marine Corp. 20 units, and many others. He gave you a long list, naming some 8 or 10 companies that have over 300 of these units on their ships. Surely companies of this type would not have them on their ships if they did not think they were worthy.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the rule is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4090, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill would require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on certain cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators.

Ships equipped with such a device could receive radio messages from shore stations and other ships while the ship's radio operator is off duty. This would be an important contribution to safety at sea.

The Communications Act of 1934 now provides that cargo ships required to have radio must carry more than one radio operator unless the ship is fitted with an autoalarm. Unless such ship has an autoalarm, continuous watch must be maintained by qualified radio operators while the ship is being navigated outside a harbor or port.

The autoalarm responds to what is known as the international alarm signal, which is a series of 12 dashes 4 seconds long, spaced 1 second apart. The device is designed so that four dashes will actuate the circuit and ring bells in the radio officer's quarters, on the navigating bridge of the vessel and in the radio room. This will alert the radio operator to an emergency whenever he is off duty or listening to another frequency, so that he can receive the distress message, which follows the alarm signal by two minutes.

The primary usefulness of the autoalarm is in the period immediately before or after a maritime disaster occurs.

The call selector would perform a similar alerting function, but it would supplement the autoalarm by alerting the ship radio operator during situations which, although not of a distress nature, do involve maritime safety.

The autoalarm system now in use does not permit calling of ships in situations

of difficulty not of a full distress nature. A ship carrying only a single radio operator is to cut off from messages alerting the ship to potential danger when the ship's radio operator is not on duty, which is the greater part of the day. Additionally, the installation of call selectors aboard ships would supplement the autoalarm by substantially increasing the probability of alerting other ships during distress situations. This is because call selectors will be capable of responding to the international distress signal while presently approved autoalarms will respond only to the international alarm signal. Under international radio distress procedures, the distress signal is transmitted far more frequently than the alarm signal, so that the call selector would be useful in many situations where the autoalarm would not respond.

Specifically, for example, installation of an automatic call selector would facilitate and improve communications in the following manner:

First. Specific ships known to be in the vicinity of a distressed vessel may be called directly by use of that vessel's own call sign.

Second. During protracted distress traffic the single radio officer on a cargo vessel working traffic with the distressed vessel is assisted in responding to calls when in an exhausted state after continuously operating alone over a period of days.

Third. Medical assistance and transfer of sick or injured at sea may be facilitated.

Fourth. Promulgation of weather and other maritime safety information may be facilitated and ships cautioned to avoid exposure to needless danger by receipt of such information.

Fifth. Response of ships to lifeboat transmitter signals sent by survivors whose vessels may not stay afloat till rescuers reach them will increase the rescue possibilities of such survivors.

The automatic radiotelegraph call selector has been compared to the bell on a telephone. Without a bell the owner of the telephone, if away from the instrument, would not be able to receive messages since there would be no way of alerting him to the fact that another person wanted to communicate with him. Comparably, a ship which has a single radio officer on duty for 8 hours can receive messages during those 8 hours. However, for 16 hours during each day when such officer is not on duty no messages may be received.

The bill provides that the automatic radiotelegraph call selector must be capable of receiving and responding to the following:

First. The international distress signal, S O S.

Second. The international safety signal, T T T.

Third. The international urgent signal, X X X.

Fourth. The ship's call sign.

Fifth. Any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergencies.

The bill postpones the effective date of the mandatory installation requirement until 18 months—or such shorter period as the Commission may determine—after the Commission has found that, first, an automatic radiotelegraph call selector is and will continue to be available and may be installed at a reasonable cost to shipowners; and second, patents covering or necessary to the manufacture of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty. The committee feels that to avoid monopolization in the manufacture of this device it is necessary, in the public interest, to require that the patent owner make binding commitments to the Commission that the necessary patents will be available freely and that the royalty charged for the use of such patents will be reasonable before installation of a patented device becomes mandatory.

While the installation of automatic call selectors would be mandatory only for cargo ships of the United States, it was pointed out to the committee that this equipment could serve as links in a radio network of ships which are not so equipped, thus making an important contribution to safety on the high seas.

The public interest requires that safety standards at sea be maintained at the highest possible level for the protection of life and property. The proposed legislation would help in carrying out the obligation of the Congress to enact legislation to protect the public interest.

Let me reemphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee after rather extended hearings in the 83d Congress reported a similar bill; that following hearings in the present Congress H. R. 4090 was reported after being amended in order to meet some of the objections that had been raised with reference to possible monopoly and also in connection with the question of approval by the Federal Communications Commission. We made it very certain in this legislation that no equipment would be installed unless it had the approval of the Commission. If tests fail on a pilot model and if they do not measure up to the standards required, then it will be up to the manufacturer to develop another model and another set that will meet the requirements of the Commission.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of safety that the pending legislation will be approved by the House.

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DOLLIVER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

(Mr. MACK of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon in the interest of safety at sea. I have never worked aboard a ship in any capacity, but I have traveled extensively by air over the Atlantic and Pacific: I appeal to this House to vote for safety at sea. There are vast expanses of ocean where there are no rescue facilities of any kind, and there are spots 1,200 nautical miles from the nearest land in any direction. That is the reason I believe it to be worthwhile for this committee to make navigation as safe as possible. That is the kind of bill we are considering today. It will be another step to help protect individuals, ship owners, passenger vessels, and cargo vessels traveling throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that we should wait until we have perfected this device, and then enact this legislation. That was not the case when the original legislation was passed, and I have before me the testimony of Commissioner Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission, wherein he stated that they recommended the legislation before they had actually developed the autoalarm.

As a matter of fact, what we are trying to do here today is merely to require a mechanism which can contribute more to safety than the one presently required, which was invented nearly 30 years ago—this is progress.

Our mechanical engineers, our electrical engineers have made progress, and we are trying to raise the requirements so that we will be up to date. Commissioner Webster made it clear in the hearings that at the time the other legislation to which I referred was passed by Congress, the device had not been perfected. He said it was simply a question of mechanical perfection, that the idea was well-known; there was no argument about that. So we are in exactly the same position today, as we consider this legislation, as we were at the time we considered legisaltion requiring the autoalarm on cargo vessels.

I want to say also, Mr. Chairman that, when we speak of cargo vessels, we are speaking of 97 percent of all the ships at sea. It is very important, therefore, that we provide additional requirement of safety for cargo vessels and thereby improve the safety of the passenger vessels as well. In the past we have waited until after the occurrence of a major disaster. We have already had several minor disasters, but we are prone to wait, as I say, until we have a major disaster, and then seek appropriate legislative action. What we must do is pass this preventive legislation, so that we may avert any major disaster at sea. That is the reason the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported the legislation to the House at this time.

I do not think it is necessary to wait for other nations to develop this device. I believe it is appropriate that the United States, the world leader in most fields, take the initiative in this instance as well and require that automatic call selectors be installed on our cargo vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the amendment to the Federal Communications Act of 1934 requiring an autoalarm came as the result of a tragedy and terrible disaster following the 1934 FCC Act and as a result of that tragedy the Communications Act was amended in 1937 to require an autoalarm radio system on United States cargo ships; is that true?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is correct. That is contained in our testimony here as well.

Mr. HARRIS. Following the utilization of this devie, is it not true that our Government then took the lead during these years to bring about international agreements — agreements with other countries—that this system be installed on their ships?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is certainly correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The international agreements were promoted by our own Government after the FCC Act had been amended in 1937 to require this radio system or alarm system aboard ships?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that all this legislation does is require the cargo vessels to install the new device we have referred to as the automatic call selector. This device responds to various signals, the urgent signal, distress signal, safety signal, and it also responds to the ship's call signal. It will also respond to any prearranged or predetermined code that the international conference would want to agree upon. So it would be contributing to safety.

I believe in safety at sea. I am not in favor of subsidies, but I would favor subsidizing safety if it is necessary to subsidize at all. We cannot put a price on safety with any more grace than we could put a price on human life. Therefore, I do not believe we should consider the price argument at all. As has been stated, it is only a matter of $1,500 or $2,000. The opponents have argued that it will run to $10,000 or $20,000, but it does not make any difference to me what the price is. If it involves safety, I am willing to pay the price. I do not care whether the Government has to pay it or whether the shipowners have to pay it, if it is for safety and will increase the safety of passengers on vessels at sea, I am for it and I am willing to pay the price.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion I believe that this legislation is long overdue. We have been discussing it for the last 2 years. We reported out a bill last year, and naturally there were organizations which opposed it. The shipowners will always be opposed to this type of legislation, because it does not help the individual shipowners as the result of installing the device in any particular vessel, but it helps the people who are underway at sea in the event of an emergency. So, it is obvious that the Government must require this type of equipment, and it is imperative that Congress enact this legislation.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor this bill. I think it is a great stride forward. The opposition of the shipowners is to be expected but, I trust, not long endured. I want to reemphasize the fact that I have flown many, many thousands of miles over the water, and believe that if this equipment were installed in cargo vessels, it would be an aid in air emergencies as well as emergencies on the surface.

Mr. DOLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say again and reiterate that I feel for my opponents in this particular debate the very highest degree of regard, for the members of the committee in particular, for when I was a member of that committee I always enjoyed it, and I think it is a wholesome thing to bring out the facts.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say for the members of our committee and the Members of the House as well that we have the highest regard for the gentleman from Washington. We on the committee particularly recall that he was a member of this committee during the last Congress, and we regretted to see him leave. We know that his feeling in this matter and his attitude and position toward this matter is sincere. I recall that he opposed it when it was before this committee in the last Congress, as he is opposing it now. I just want to say that I, for one, know that the gentleman is sincere in his opposition, and I am sorry that I have to differ with him on this problem as I see it.

If the gentleman will permit me to say this further, the reason I feel that this is a principle that should be followed and pursued is because we are living in what we refer to and what everybody today calls the electronic age. More electronic devices are being developed for the benefit of the people, the public, to provide safety for the people of this country and of the world, and I, for one, am not going to say that by my action here I am going to take a position that would retard or otherwise prevent our scientists from developing these devices which can mean so much to the future development and for the welfare of this country. That is the reason I believe these electronic devices, when they are so designed and developed, ought to be made available for the use of the public throughout the whole world, not only the United States. For that reason I feel that we ought to promote this project as one of those electronic devices which I believe will prove to be highly beneficial.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his very kind remarks about my motives in opposing this legislation.

I would like also to say that I think the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will realize that the present device is only limited from doing exactly what this new call selector would do by international agreement. International agreement says that it be limited only to distress. Therefore, as far as the electronic device goes, to me, it would only do something by a complicated process that might well be done simply.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This is no different from the controversy that we are in today with our military. In this Congress we appropriated $550 million to the Navy to develop a system of air navigation aids, called TACAN, which is an electronic device that we all know about. We developed the common system which was promoted by this country and adopted by the ICAO Conference, the international conference, and which today has been adopted. But yet, in this Congress, through our own action, we appropriated $500 million to the Navy to develop this new navigation aid, which is another type of electronic device for the benefit and the use of our military people. If we were to adopt this one we are discussing it would not be contrary to the policy that we have pursued in promoting a new and an additional safety device for the benefit of our people.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman realizes that the development of TACAN is completely separate and different from the device which is to be used commercially and which is used all over the world. A great amount of confusion is caused merely by fiat of the Congress, which is acting without understanding the technical difficulties inherent in the problem, and creating a difficult situation commercially, not only in this country but all over the world. That is why the Congress ought to be careful, when it gets into such a field of technical devices, which we, as laymen, know little about, before it acts, or it might cause a great deal of trouble because of unthoughtful action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PELLY. In that regard I want to make it plain that I am a layman and my judgment in this matter is based largely on the recommendation of Commissioner Webster who suggested that this intercommunication at sea should be based on standardized international agreement.

I want to say also at this time that when we come into the House again I am going to ask permission to put in the RECORD a statement covering the additional operating cost attributable to the call-selector device which would be required under H. R. 4090. I realize that we used a figure such as $12 million a year as the cost. I think if you would look at the record you would find the basis on which the various statements have been made.

I have outlined my objections to this bill at some length in the debate of the rule. There is nothing to be gained, as I see it, to add to that public record.

As stated by me, then, I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time. Already the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee added a section providing an effective day of the legislation as 18 months, or a shorter period if the Federal Communications Commission determines, after it finds this new equipment is available at reasonable cost and freely available for license at a reasonable royalty. I would add one more proviso to these two, so that this law would be deferred also until after the FCC finds this equipment is in conformity with safety of life at sea convention like the automatic alarm is.

I have told the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I would withdraw my objection if that amendment is accepted.

One provision in section 3 I dislike. It is designed to prevent adjusting the present automatic alarm to perform the added duty of responding to four signals—so it would make installation of this new gadget unnecessary. In section 3 the bill reads:

> The automatic radio call selector shall be independent, except for source of power and antenna, of any other radio equipment on the ship.

There is the provision to protect the owner of the patents to this gadget. There is monopoly written right into the language of the bill. It could not be plainer. That sentence should be worth a million dollars to Mr. Benjamin Green, who bought up the patents from an employee who worked for him at one time.

I shall have an amendment to nullify the effect of that language. I would accomplish this in section 4 by a provision to defer the effective date of this bill until it is determined by the FCC that agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present automatic alarm for the purposes which would be served by this new gadget.

Let me emphasize what the testimony of Commissioner E. M. Webster called for—the desirability of a common standardized distress call system in the world. If there is going to be any aid called for, why limit it to assistance from an American vessels. Why ignore a foreign ship—it may be the only one in the vicinity. Finally, too, let me say if the FCC were asking for legislation of this nature, I would not be in the well of the House today. But no Government department recommends this measure.

As minority views state, legislation of this type is most unusual. If there is doubt to the facts, the normal procedure is to direct that a study be conducted and a factual report be compiled. There is ample precedent in the field of marine safety radio equipment—as was provided in section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The present auto alarm can be used to accomplish exactly what this new call selector would do as provided in this bill. All it would take is a broadening of the limitation on its use by International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea.

This bill would make use of the present alarm impossible by insisting on a separate piece of equipment.

Accordingly, as I said, I shall introduce an amendment, the simple effect of which will be to defer the effective date of this legislation until the Federal Communications Commission finds "agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the safety purposes which would be served by the automatic radio call selector specified in this bill and unless and until such an automatic call selector is required by the next International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention."

If that amendment is adopted, I see no objection to passage of the bill. It would cure the greatest weakness which is lack of international standardization.

I strongly urge support of such an amendment.

And I should like to say further, if my amendment is not adopted, I expect to offer a motion to recommit.

Estimated additional operating cost attributable to the call selector device which would be required under H. R. 4090

1. If device used with one radio operator: [1]

Alarms responding to T T T and other calls (from Coast Guard radio station data hearing, pp. 112–114): Average 1 alarm every 2 hours.

False alarms (from FCC laboratory tests, hearing, p. 59): Average 1 alarm every 8 hours.

Alarm in operation 16 hours per day: Average 10 alarms per day.

Overtime payable to radio operator for answering alarm ($3.29 per alarm): $32.90 per day.

Annual cost (ship at sea 50 percent [2] of time or 182.5 days): $6,004.24 per year.

2. Cost of second radio operator:

Basic wage of $501.72 per month	$6,020.64
Required wage increase to first radio operator	433.92
Automatic weekend overtime (52 weeks times 2 days equals 104 days plus 9 holidays) estimated at sea 50 percent or 56½ days at 8 hours per day times $2.19	989.88
Welfare, 365 days at $1.60 per day	584.00
Taxes (estimated)	150.00
Vacation fund, 9½ percent of basic wages ($6,454.56)	613.18
Wage classification cost, per year	8,791.62
Subsistence (average $1.75 per day), per year	638.75
	9,430.37
Overtime payable to radio operators for answering alarm, if installed (alarm in use 8 hours per day) [3]	3,002.12
Total, per year	12,432.49

3. Per annum cost to Government and industry: [4] On subsidized cargo vessels the entire cost must be borne by the Government because the added cost is 100 percent in excess of foreign wage and/or operating costs.

[1] NOTE.—It is the shipowners contention that it would be impossible to use the proposed device with a single radio operator because the radio operator could not physically stand the strain of being brought on duty an average of 10 times per night during off watch hours.

[2] Based on dry-cargo vessel. Other vessels, such as tankers, will be at sea more than 50 percent of the time.

[3] NOTE.—The dilemma presented by this bill is apparent. The call selector need not be installed if a second radio operator is carried, yet the purpose of the bill is to require the call selector.

[4] NOTE.—These cost figures are exclusive of equipment purchase, installation, and maintenance costs for which no accurate figures are available since the device itself is not in production. Estimated manufacturing costs range from $3,000–$10,000 per unit. (House committee report, p. 12.)

	To Government (266 subsidized cargo vessels)	To industry (771 nonsubsidized cargo vessels)	Total (1,037 cargo vessels)
Estimated cost if device could be used with single radio operator	$1,597,127.84	$4,629,269.04	$6,226,396.88
Estimated minimum cost of 2d radio operator	2,508,478.42	7,270,815.27	9,779,293.69
Estimated added cost if device used with 2 radio operators	798,563.92	2,314,634.52	3,113,198.44
Estimated total probable cost	3,307,042.34	9,585,449.79	12,892,492.13

4. Other costs: The following costs are not applicable to all vessels, and the number of ships which would be affected is not ascertainable:

(a) On some vessels, such as certain tankers, the ratio of crew to stewards is in such critical balance that if a second radio operator must be hired the ship must carry an additional steward. This will add an additional $4,108 per annum to the wage classification of the vessel involved.

(b) The second radio operator must be furnished with a room. In cases where new space must be provided, or when one of the 12 passenger spaces is utilized for this purpose, the cost is estimated at $6,000 to $8,000. If passenger cabin space is taken the cost becomes an annual revenue loss.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I tried to make it clear a while ago that I had a more than usual interest in safety at sea. We might have a bill before us to require every ship in the United States merchant marine to have an empty black box placed on the wheelhouse 5 feet long, 2 feet wide, and 3 feet deep. We could all get up and argue that such a device would make the sea safe for people who are passengers and people who are seamen, but we certainly could not give any reasons why.

The same situation pertains as to the device to which the bill refers. Nobody understands what there is about the wires, tubes, condensers, circuits, and dials of the device before us that would make for safety at sea. So nobody can give any reason why. So the argument made, that we are legislating for safety at sea, and you cannot be against saving lives so you should vote for this bill, sounds kind of good, but is specious when analyzed. And let me tell you, you can get yourself in trouble that way, whether

you buy a pig in a poke or buy a black box or some other kind of mysterious device to put on ships is the same thing, if they do not work properly for the purpose of safety your safety argument is no good. On that issue, what is the evidence?

This is what the Federal Communications Commission says about this thing before us, according to the minority report:

FCC took two kinds of tests. They took tests on it to see if it could be set manually to receive the five different kinds of signals it is supposed to receive. In other words, a series of dots and dashes that are supposed to actuate any one of five particular types of signals. The signal then is supposed to appear in the wheelhouse or radio shack or wherever this device is setup. The FCC found that the device could not be set manually for equally efficient and accurate reception of each of the various signals. FCC further found that accuracy varied with the speed of transmission of the same actuating signals. In other words, it receives dots and dashes that are sent out by radio operators. Radio operators vary in the speed at which they send. Some of the foreigners do it differently than we do, and vice versa. So you might have a ship of some particular nationality sending a signal back home for one purpose and it will be actuating an alarm on an American ship for an entirely different purpose, all because of the different speeds and characteristics with which radio operators may transmit.

FCC also found that even room temperature and voltage had a great effect on these devices. 'If ever any of you have sailed a ship or operated on it, you know that the voltage is quite a problem. We have automatic voltage regulators, and so forth, but 9 times out of 10 somebody will dope off in the engineroom and maybe instead of 110 volts you will be getting 90 or 120. All of these uncontrollable factors and variables lead to the device's malfunctioning. I have great respect for marine engineers and the remarks I have just made should not be interpreted as critical. But anyone who knows the sea also knows that neither the deck gang nor the black gang ever misses an opportunity to complain about the other, so let us accept my words about voltage variations in that spirit, and just concede that for causes unknown and beyond the control of competent watches in the engineroom, it goes up and down.

The second kind of test, the positive response of this device to actuating signals, is where the true test of its value lies. The percent of true response varied from 46 percent to 92.5 percent on the 500-kilocycle band, which is the international distress frequency. On the lifeboat frequency it varied from 53.7 percent up to 100 percent on one of the tests.

You must be able to rely on a piece of equipment 100 percent if it is to save lives. How many people have bought a car that turned out to be a lemon, and you could not rely on it and had to get rid of it? When safety at sea is at stake you do not want to legislate devices on ships unless they are going to bring safety instead of danger. That is plain commonsense, because their reliability will either protect or endanger the lives of your seamen and passengers.

The startling facts about this device, according to the Federal Communications Commission tests, is that there were a total of 72 false responses in 646 hours of operation, or 1 every 9 hours. What if they had a false alarm in each fire department station here in Washington every 9 hours? Visualize it. The confusion and demoralization would be endless. Visualize what it would mean at sea, where just 1 radio operator is aboard ship. You see what a terrible thing it is to have these false alarms. It not only destroys the confidence of the people in the equipment, in this case the whole ship's crew, but, more than that, think of your radio operators. These fellows have so many hours on and so many hours off. If they are jumping up all during off-duty hours to respond to these false alarms, you can see what kind of shape those operators are going to be in before the voyage is over. You can see how disruptive of morale and efficiency this type of equipment is going to be. We should not be legislating for it; we should be legislating against it, if safety at sea is our goal.

I have stood watches for a long time. All of you that sailed in the Navy or merchant marine during the war know that the general alarm was ringing all the time. After that lasted a few months, you had to get back to port to rest or go crazy. You cannot keep people keyed up with alarms, real or false. That is all this device promises.

Congress appropriates a lot of money for the Federal Communications Commission and its engineering and testing people every year. If you have enough confidence in this agency to appropriate this money, you should have an equal confidence in what it says when it comes up here on the Hill and tells you that a piece of equipment is no good and gives you the statistics on its tests and everything else to prove it. Is it not just plain common sense to believe the FCC?

We have heard the argument here that the people who stood up in the well of the House in 1934 arguing against the enactment of the auto-alarm legislation were just obstructionists. They may have been. But that does not apply to those who argue against this admittedly deficient and defective device proposed by the bill before us. For the auto alarm is today serving the purpose of alerting unmanned receivers when a May Day S O S distress call is broadcast. Legislating the additional device, called for by this bill on to American ships would not only have all the disadvantages mentioned by others, but would, in addition, serve not to alert radio operators to emergency calls, but, through the device's inherent defects, serve to deaden response to them. It would promote anger, not safety, at sea. Protection of American seamen and passengers on United States-flag vessels demands this bill be scuttled.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 153), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph: "(hh) 'Automatic radiotelegraph call selector' on a ship of the United States subject to the provisions of part II of title III of this act means a device meeting the requirements prescribed for such devices in section 355 (b) of this act and approved by the Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 353), is amended to read as follows:

"OPERATORS, WATCHES, AUTO-ALARM, AND AUTOMATIC RADIOTELEGRAPH CALL SELECTOR—RADIOTELEGRAPH-EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 353. (a) At least two qualified operators shall be carried for safety purposes on—

"(1) each cargo ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is not fitted with an auto-alarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector;

"(2) each cargo ship (other than a ship of the United States) which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is not fitted with an auto-alarm; and

"(3) each passenger ship which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation.

"(b) At least one qualified operator, who shall have had at least 6 months' previous service in the aggregate as a qualified operator in a station on board a ship or ships of the United States, shall be carried for safety purposes on—

"(1) each cargo ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is fitted with an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector in accordance with this title; and

"(e) Each cargo ship (other than a ship of the United States) which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is fitted with an autoalarm in accordance with this title.

"(c) Each ship of the United States required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation shall, while being navigated outside a harbor or port, keep a continuous watch by means of qualified operators: *Provided*, That in lieu thereof, on a cargo ship of the United States fitted with an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector in proper operating condition, a watch of at least 8 hours per day, in the aggregate, shall be maintained by means of a qualified operator.

"(d) The Commission shall, when it finds it necessary for safety purposes, have authority to prescribe the particular hours of watch on a ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation.

"(e) On any ship of the United States fitted with an autoalarm or an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, or with both an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, such apparatus shall be in operation at all times while the ship is being navigated outside of a harbor or port when the operator is not on watch, and at such other times as the Commission may prescribe."

SEC. 3. Section 355 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 355), is amended by redesignating paragraphs (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), by striking out the words "subsection (d) of this section" in each place where they appear

in the paragraphs redesignated as (5) and (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "paragraph (4) of this subsection", by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 355.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The automatic radiotelegraph call selector installed on any ship in accordance with this part shall be capable of being set manually to simultaneously receive and identify and respond to the following international Morse code signals:

"(1) The ship station call sign;

"(2) The international distress signal;

"(3) The international safety signal;

"(4) The international urgency signal; and

"(5) Any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergencies.

It shall provide a means for receiving such signals on the frequencies 500 kilocycles and 8,364 kilocycles, or such other frequency as the Commission may prescribe in lieu of 8,364 kilocycles, selectively but with respect to frequency not simultaneously, and shall sound an alarm if, but only if, any of the above 5 signals are received. Such alarm shall be sounded in the radio room, on the bridge, and at such other places on the ship as may be directed by the Commission. The automatic radiotelegraph call selectors shall be independent, except for source of power and antenna, of any other radio equipment on the ship."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the expiration of 18 months (or such shorter period as the Commission shall determine) after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—

(1) an automatic radiotelegraph call selector (as defined in section 3 (hh) of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended by this act) is and will continue to be available, and may be installed, at a reasonable cost to shipowners; and

(2) patents covering, or necessary to the manufacture of, such an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading of the bills). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD at this point, and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: On page 6, in section 4, after line 2, insert a third proviso as follows:

"(3) agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the purposes which would be served by the call selector device, and unless and until an automatic radio call selector is required by International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention."

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have no wish to delay the committee at this late hour. I think everyone understands what the amendment would accomplish. In brief, it would carry out the recommendation of Commissioner Webster of the Federal Communications Commission.

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to inquire of the author of the amendment as to the language which he proposes. He would add a new section on page 6; is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. No, that is not correct. The gentleman will see that on page 5 there are two provisos. This would add a third proviso so that the legislation would take effect after this third proviso.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill reads as follows.

On page 2 of the bill, subsection (2) of section 4, with reference to the effectuation of the act reads:

(2) patents covering, or necessary to the manufacture of, such an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

And then the gentleman by his amendment would add the number (3) after line 2, page 6.

Mr. PELLY. So then it would read, "after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—" subparagraph (1), which is followed by subparagraph (2); and I would add a third proviso, namely, that agreement cannot be effectuated internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the purposes which would be served by the call selector device.

Mr. HARRIS. I see. That is the third subparagraph of section 4?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. After the Federal Communications Commission has found that an agreement cannot be effected internationally that would permit the use of the autoalarm for a purpose which will be served by the call-selector device, and unless and until the automatic radio call selector is required by international convention for safety of life at sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention.

Mr. PELLY. I would explain that this provision would mean that the Federal Communications Commission would have to find that under international convention it was acceptable and standardized before the law would take effect.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope you will pardon me if I have to ask for more time, but I have not seen the gentleman's amendment before. The amendment says:

The act shall take effect on the expiration of 18 months (or such shorter time as the Commission shall determine) after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—

(3) Agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present autoalarm for the purposes which would be served by the call-selector device, and unless and until an automatic radio call selector is required by international convention for safety of life at sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention.

Mr. PELLY. That is, it would be affected by the use of five different messages.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows very well from the hearings which our committee held last year and this year that the autoalarm cannot provide other signals which this call selector is designed to receive. Is that not true?

Mr. PELLY. I might say that the present alarm, that is, 12 dashes, under the present system that alert a ship for a disaster call could be used for an urgent message or a safety message or any other kind of message, but under international convention it is limited to disaster messages.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows very well that the autoalarm system has this one signal which it will receive; is that not true?

Mr. PELLY. Twelve dashes. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. It does not receive an international distress signal?

Mr. PELLY. It does not.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it does not receive an international safety signal?

Mr. PELLY. It would alert to say that a safety message is coming through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HARRIS was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PELLY. The point of this amendment is to provide that the alert signal presently used on ships can be for messages other than disaster messages.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I understand what the gentleman means, and certainly it confirms my feeling about it, that the amendment itself—I do not say it is designed for that purpose—but the effect of it will be to kill the bill. It cannot have any other effect.

Mr. PELLY. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman admits it. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment because I am for the bill. The gentleman's admission is precisely what I thought he intended, and that was to kill the bill by this method. The gentleman has clarified precisely what I thought was in his mind, for the record.

Now, the purpose of bringing up this legislation is not because the Moore-McCormack Lines is against it; not because the labor organizations or someone else is for it. The purpose of this legislation is for safety of life at sea and safety of property. The hearings have revealed that over the years we had development in the electronic field. We developed the autoalarm system in 1934, 1935, and 1936, and it was adopted by this Congress in 1937. From that the International Radio Conference adopted it as a part of the international program. Through these years we have had, then, the development of a new system which can add to safety of life at sea. This is just in keeping with the great advances that have been made in electronics in many other fields during the last 15 years. Here is a device that not only will increase safety of life at sea but the safety of the ships owned by the very companies who are opposing it. To save my life I cannot understand why they should oppose something like this which would cost them 1 extra operator or else about $1,600 to $1,800 for this installation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The fact that it has been said that the adoption of the amendment would kill the bill to me makes the amendment very desirable, also because I am opposed to the bill. However, in all seriousness, let me say that this amendment would permit or require that this device be adopted internationally as the present signaling device is adopted internationally by the International Convention; and it seems to me in, all seriousness, that is a very desirable amendment to this legislation and that it ought to be adopted for that reason, because then all the ships at sea would be required to have this kind of device.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. My time is very limited.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not adopted until—

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point I was going to make; the International Radio Conference did not adopt the autoalarm system until after this Congress had amended the Federal Communications Commission Act to provide for it. Here we have another device. How can you promote something if it is not by law or by policy or principle adopted by the Government that is going to promote it? Who is going to promote something that has not been recognized by the man that offers it? They are going to say, of course, that if your own country does not adopt it, how can you expect us to adopt it and follow your leadership in an international conference?

I think it is well to remember that we have a system here that can add to what we already have had in these last nearly 20 years. If we will undertake to carry out our safety policies by development of a device of this kind and adopt it in our own country and then promote it in the international field, I think we will find that we will promote safety at sea, and, therefore, be in a better position to save life and property and avoid some of the disasters at sea that have occurred in the recent past.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I have not been able to be here all afternoon. I should like to address a question to the proponents of this bill. Is there anything in the majority report that gives any indication of the cost? Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell me?

Mr. PRIEST. I believe the best estimate the committee received on cost was approximately between $1,600 and $1,800 per unit, though there were some who felt that about $1,800 was the best estimate the committee received.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the total cost?

Mr. PRIEST. It would depend on the number of ships. I do not recall the total number of cargo ships, but 97 percent of the cargo ships flying the American flag have but one radio operator. What the number is I do not know at the moment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Washington. I am searching for information.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman, unfortunately, was not here when I made a statement on that subject. It was to the effect that there are approximately 1,000 such vessels.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. As soon as we get back into the House I shall ask permission to insert in my remarks a statement showing those figures, of the lumber of ships and cost.

I may say that the 4-way signal device of 1947 cost $1,650, and costs have about doubled since that time; so I would think the 5-way device, which is considerably more complicated, would be around $3,000, as a conservative estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any idea of the total cost of equipping the ships with this new device?

Mr. PELLY. I have said there are approximately 1,000 ships at $3,000 each. You can see it is an order for somebody to the extent of about $3 million. I would like to call attention to the fact also that the overtime involved in responding to the calls, either false alarms or regular calls that come to a ship on the basis of tests results in a cost to each ship of $30.90 per day. Figuring the ship is at sea approximately half of the time, you get a cost per year to a ship of $6,000. But no radio operator can stand being awakened approximately 10 times during his recreation and sleeping period, therefore you will have to put on extra radio operators.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the Government contribution by way of subsidies?

Mr. PELLY. $3 million, according to the ship operators.

Mr. GROSS. That would be the cost to the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That would be the direct cost to the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman from Washington about the total cost of the installation say of a thousand of these units at $3,000, which I believe is a rather high figure, but we will accept that estimate for discussion. It would cost the taxpayers, he says, $3 million.

Mr. PELLY. I did not say that.

Mr. PRIEST. I think the gentleman from Iowa so understood it and I wanted that clear.

Mr. GROSS. I simply understood that the cost to the taxpayers of the country for this device—at least that is the statement of a number of people here—is not necessarily reliable, but that the cost would be $3 million.

Mr. PELLY. That is the operational cost.

Mr. PRIEST. That is the cost to the shipowners, the total cost to a thousand cargo ships, but it is not the cost to the taxpayers of the country. This is not a Government subsidy and it is not a Government program.

Mr. GROSS. It would be financed in part up to the amount of our subsidies to the shipping lines by the taxpayers?

Mr. PRIEST. There will be some of these ships that will receive subsidies, I am not sure how many that would be, but I do want to emphasize this is not a Government program insofar as paying the cost of the installation is concerned.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to emphasize that the cost to the shipowners of this device is not the big expense to them. It is in operating through additional radio operators. It is anticipated that the 277 subsidized ships that would have to put this device on will in operating cost each year have to draw on their subsidies to the extent of $3,300,000.

Mr. GROSS. And as these costs went up there would be a demand from Congress for more subsidy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words simply to point out this fact. The gentleman from Washington in response to the gentleman from Iowa said that a great deal of the additional cost would be involved by putting extra radio operators on. If there are as many as two radio operators, they would not have to put the device on. They have the choice. They may either install this equipment and continue to operate with one radio operator or they may put on two operators and not install the equipment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. They would not have to buy $3 million worth of equipment but instead they would have entailed an expense per year of approximately $12,000 a ship, or a total of $12 million which would in effect be what would have to be done because no radio operator could stand these overtime difficulties on a reglar basis.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, if they are going to put on the additional operator they would not have to buy the equipment. Let us make that clear. Let us not double up on the cost and say they have to pay both.

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question. We have had the question raised as to how many of these ships would be subject to subsidy. The gentleman from Washington, I am sure, will agree with me that as a matter of fact a very few of the ships concerned here would be subject to subsidy for the reason, after all, as I understand the Merchant Marine Act, only certain classes or certain cargo vessels can be licensed to receive subsidies. Bulk cargo carriers generally and coast-

wise ships do not receive subsidy; am I correct?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. The record shows that there are 277 cargo vessels of 1,600 tons or more which would be affected by this legislation, which are under subsidy. That is in the record.

Mr. DINGELL. 277?

Mr. PELLY. Yes. But the bulk carriers on the Great Lakes, when the shipway is completed, would have to comply with this when they get ore

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from California

Mr. HOSMER. I think probably the people who are most familiar with safety at sea are the maritime insurance people, and anything, of course, that would reduce hazards at sea would reduce maritime rates. I wonder if there was any testimony at all before the committee from any maritime insurance people with respect to what the adoption of this law might do to maritime insurance rates.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman that I was not a member of the subcommittee, but I understand from the chairman of the subcommittee that there was no testimony on that particular subject.

Mr. HOSMER. It would be compelling to me that anything like this should have the opinion of the marine underwriters before such a drastic step was taken as to enact this device into law.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. On that question, would it not reduce insurance rates if the safety of the ships has been increased?

Mr. PRIEST. That was the general theory, I believe, that any increase in safety would have the effect of reducing the insurance rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 508, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PELLY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have a record vote on this bill. I wonder, if it is deferred, whether I could ask for a division and then, if there is not a quorum, get a rollcall vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot guarantee that. I can assure the gentleman from Washington that the gentleman from Massachusetts will resort to no parliamentary methods to try to stop a rollcall vote. Of course, there is going to be another vote before the vote on this bill and, if there is a quorum present, then the constitutional number must stand.

I want the gentleman to understand that, but I am making my request in accordance with our agreement and in accordance with an agreement that I made with the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that I should like to ask for a division in order to be sure that there will be an automatic rollcall.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman does that, then the House can do only one thing, and that is to adjourn. It would not be able to transact any more business today.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING READJUSTMENT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 517 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9952. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour general debate on the bill.

H. R. 9952 amends the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1952 to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components, officers, and enlisted men, who are involuntarily released from active duty after having completed, immediately prior to release, at least 5 years of continuous active duty.

The payment would be computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade in which the member is serving at the time of release for each year of active service ending with the 18th year.

Another section of the bill provides that a member of the Reserve who is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay shall not be involuntarily separated until he qualifies for retired pay.

Reserve members involuntarily released may elect to receive severance pay based on military service under any other provision of law.

Those who would not be entitled to such payments are listed in the bill—those released from active duty at their own request; those released from active duty for training; those released for moral or professional dereliction; those who would be immediately eligible for retired pay based on military service and a few other categories.

Reserve members may elect to receive readjustment pay or Veterans' Administration disability compensation to which they may be entitled, but not both.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 517.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has so well and ably described the content and purpose of the bill which House Resolution 517 makes in order that I do not believe any additional com-

ment on my part is necessary, except to say that it was the understanding of the Committee on Rules, according to my best recollection, that this bill was reported from the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and I believe the rule was granted by the Committee on Rules by a unanimous vote.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9952, with Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the Committee is to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 in order to provide a reasonable lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, after its enactment, and who shall have completed at least 5 years of continuous active duty.

As a result of the Korean hostilities and related international tensions of the last few years, a large number of Reserve officers with wartime experience have been retained on active duty.

These officers have served faithfully and efficiently, in many cases have 10 or more years, and now many are approaching the age at which their usefulness to the military forces is less than that of younger officers who are needed for current and future military service.

These older reservists have been away from civilian life for an extended period and, in some cases, have been called away from their civilian occupations on two separate occasions, during World War II and the Korean incident.

It is because of this that the legislation is before us today. We believe that these deserving individuals should be given an equitable payment upon involuntary release from active military duty to help them readjust themselves to civilian life again. We must all recognize that the Armed Forces require today, and will in the foreseeable future continue to require, large numbers of Reserve officers on extended active duty to meet the commitments of national defense.

As of the close of the last calendar year, approximately 72 percent of the active duty officer strength for the entire Defense Establishment were Reserve officers. For instance, the percentage of Reserve officers serving on active duty in each of the military departments were as follows: Army, 76 percent; Navy, 49 percent; Air Force, 83 percent; and Marine Corps, 49 percent.

Furthermore it is anticipated that the requirement for Reserve officers to serve on extended active duty in the future will continue to be high. As a matter of fact, it is estimated that to maintain the active military forces at a level approximating 2.8 million currently and for the foreeeable future, it will be necessary to keep approximately 150,000 Reserve officers on active duty to supplement the Regular officer corps. Excessive turnover of these Reserve personnel is costly and detrimental to the effectiveness of the military forces and the national security. The economic security which would be given by this legislation provides an inducement for qualified reservists to remain on active duty for prolonged periods, thereby reducing costly personnel turnover and increasing the effectiveness of our fighting forces through retention of experienced officers needed to direct our military units.

The commissioned Reserve element of the military departments consists of both volunteers and nonvolunteers. The nonvolunteers, for the most part, are any commissioned Reserve lieutenants serving the 2-year military obligation which they assumed in order to complete their college education and ROTC training.

The services must retain a considerable number of these officers on extended active duty beyond their obligated periods of service in order to maintain a balanced officer structure. On the other hand, these officers must be subject to release when their services are no longer required.

Existing law provides authority for keeping Reserve officers on active duty for long periods of time and also for releasing them when their services are no longer required. However, there is no provision for readjustment pay, or any other monetary cushion to ease their transition back to civilian occupations when their services on active duty can no longer be justified.

Personnel turnover among reservists continues to be a serious problem with all of the armed services. Much has been done, both by the Congress and the military departments, in the way of career attractiveness legislation and improved personnel management to reduce personnel turnover. These steps have had some effect as established by the fact that the personnel turnover rate of some 31 percent of the officer corps during fiscal year 1954 has been gradually reduced to a point of turnover of about 17 percent.

It is obvious, however, that anything that can be done to reduce personnel turnover will result in considerable savings to the Government and in increased effectiveness of the services.

Fluctuating military strength since World War II and lack of security in terms of tenure for Reserve component officers serving on active duty have caused undue uneasiness and anxiety among such officers, and many fine officers whose services were needed by the military departments have voluntarily returned to civilian life. This trend is particularly true in the case of officers who hold a civilian specialty for which there is great demand—for example, engineers and doctors. The armed services are doing all within their power to provide a greater sense of security to the highly capable type of active duty Reserve officers. Nevertheless, because of a continuing need to provide the degree of vitalization that is so essential in the active officer corps, it has been necessary and will continue to be necessary to release certain reservists involuntarily prior to their qualification for retirement benefits.

Those reservists who are subject to involuntary release from active duty, are usually those who have the greatest need for some type of monetary compensation to help them readjust to civilian pursuits. Most are reservists who have rendered relatively long and faithful service, and now that they are being released from their chosen career in the military service, through no fault of their own, it is only right that they be provided with a monetary cushion to ease their readjustment back into civilian pursuits.

At this time I would like to explain the provisions of the bill. The readjustment payment authorized by this bill would be computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade the reservist is serving at the time of release from active duty, for each year of active service up to and including the 18th year. A part of a year, that is 6 months or more, will be counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months would be disregarded.

Although the bill provides for readjustment payments only through the 18th year of service, a provision of the bill provides that a member of a Reserve component who is on active duty and is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay shall not be involuntarily separated from active duty before he qualifies for that pay. Consequently, this type of individual would be retained in active service until he was eligible for retirement benefits.

Under the provisions of the bill, a reservist must have served 5 years of continuous active duty before he could qualify. Inasmuch as the required terms of service, both for enlisted men and officers, do not exceed 3 years, we know that a person who has served for 5 years has either reenlisted or has remained on active duty voluntarily, presumably with the thought of making the military service his career.

Now, I want to call your attention to the provisions of the bill which set forth those persons who are not entitled to any readjustment payment. For instance:

First, a person who is released from active duty at his own request is not entitled to any of the benefits of this bill.

Second, neither is a person who is released from active duty for training, inasmuch as he has been in training on active duty, that, in itself, means that he did not intend to remain on active duty for an extended period and thus make a career of the service.

Third, furthermore, a person who is released from active duty because of per-

sonal or moral dereliction would not be entitled to benefits.

Fourth, and persons released from active duty, who would be immediately eligible for retirement pay or for disability compensation, would not receive readjustment pay.

I should also point out that a person could only receive readjustment pay once. If a person serves for an extended period of time on active duty and then is involuntarily released, he would be paid readjustment pay. If he should later return to active duty and be qualified for another readjustment payment under this bill, he could not receive it unless he refunded the earlier payment.

I want to make one point clear. This bill does not authorize the payment of a bonus. This bill is not intended to reward a person for having served in the armed services but rather to recognize that when an individual has rendered long and satisfactory service, and then is required to leave active duty before qualifying for retirement, some monetary payment is necessary to readjust him to a new way of life.

I would like to call to your attention the fact that this legislation does not set a precedent. The Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944 provided for mustering-out payments for members engaged in active duty during World War II, who were discharged or released from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941.

The Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provided for mustering-out payments to members engaged in active service or or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955.

The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 provides that an officer eliminated from the active list shall, if not eligible for retirement, be honorably discharged with severance pay. The Permanent Warrant Officer Act of 1954 provides for severance pay for warrant officers.

Consequently there is ample precedent to grant a rehabilitation payment to members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

I should also mention something about the cost of the bill. In the first place, the committee report sets out tables which show the payments that will be made under the provisions of the bill to an enlisted man in pay grade E–1 through E–7, and for officers from a warrant officer, pay grade W–1, on up.

The total estimated cost of the legislation for fiscal year 1957 is $11,842,000. This cost figure is based on the estimate that it will be necessary to involuntarily release 4,335 reservists during this period. It is not feasible to estimate a cost beyond fiscal year 1957 because there is no way of knowing at this time how many members of the Reserve components will have to be involuntarily released from active duty.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close my remarks by reminding the Members that the personnel requirements of the Armed Forces are not static. Many considerations dictate what the size of our Armed Forces shall be at any time, and our officer personnel requirements contract and expand accordingly. It is not possible to avoid fluctuations. With the stabilized end strengths and the new Reserve program the military departments are working toward, I am sure it will be the policy and effort of the entire Department to keep fluctuations to the irreducible minimum. However, we all know that fluctuations will occur and that certain reservists, when circumstances require, will be released from active duty through no fault of their own.

In this respect the problem is comparable to that of industry with its fluctuating periods of increased and decreased productivity with attendant changes in personnel requirements. It is a growing practice in industry to grant severance pay to workers who have completed a specified minimum number of years in the company's employ if the worker's employment is thereafter terminated without fault on his part. This practice promotes stability because it requires prior faithful service and it promises financial aid to the individual during the period in which he is seeking other and new employment.

We have spent many years trying to build a strong and efficient Reserve. This bill is another milestone in the progress made by the Reserve components. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very worthwhile legislation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. As I understand the legislation, the readjustment payment would not be made if the man secured a position in civil life and started receiving income before the expiration of a certain time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Suppose the man has entered the service planning to make a career of it and through no fault of his own is separated after 5 years, he is paid an amount which would help him readjust himself in civilian life.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The readjustment benefits are not contingent upon any criteria of need. In other words, the officer might be fortunate enough to get a high paying job as soon as he leaves the service but would still draw these benefits?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The officer who is involuntarily separated from the service because of fluctuating needs of the defense picture after he has served 5 years gets a readjustment payment, but once he gets out into civilian life there is no military control over what he does.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman does not understand my question: Take the case of a reservist who is separated against his will but is fortunate enough to land a good-paying job immediately, would he still draw benefits?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He would draw the benefit before he got out of the service at the time of his release.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true this will apply to the Reserve officer who has had more than 5 years' service but less than 18 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is to assist him in the reestablishment of himself as a civilian?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. We started with 5 years because we estimate that the average individual who stays 5 years in the service has in view making a career of that service. After he has gone a long way toward making a career of the service and when we take that opportunity away from him and turn him back to civilian life, we feel that there should be some sort of readjustment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The minimum, then, is 5 years; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. The reason for the 5 years, of course, is that a 3-year enlistment would require a reenlistment, or, if you put it this way, a man who is in for 4 years will have to reenlist for an extended period. After he completes the first enlistment I think he intends to stay in the service and this encourages him to stay in the service as long as the service needs him.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask another question. Referring to a graduate of West Point, for instance, is he credited with 4 years of service at the Academy?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GROSS. They are not so credited?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GROSS. This would involve $5 million plus in the fiscal year 1956?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Eleven-million-dollars-plus.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about 1956. The cost in 1956 according to the Secretary of the Army is $5 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There would not be any cost for the fiscal year 1956 because that has expired. For next year there would be a cost of $11 million.

Mr. GROSS. The letter from the Secretary of the Army so states?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That refers to the bill before we changed and amended it. This bill has been changed a great deal. This is a committee written bill. However, the Department now approves it, the Budget approves it just as though it were an original bill. It is a better bill than the Department sent us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is an important item of personnel legislation for the members of our Reserve components.

For many years I have worked to bring about an equalization of rights and benefits for members of the Reserve and Reg-

ular components of our military services. Because of my work in this field, I favor the enactment of this bill.

At the present time, all of the military departments are faced with a sizable hump in their officer corps resulting from the high personnel procurement during World War II—individuals who have remained on active duty and now have some 10 to 16 years of active military service.

Most of the armed services have more officers in this hump and now serving on active duty than can be properly utilized on a long-term basis. Many of these officers, who entered active service during World War II at relatively high ages, are now becoming overage in grade. They cannot be retained on active duty in an officer corps that must, of necessity, be composed primarily of highly qualified young officers who would be able to withstand the rigors of sustained combat.

A vitalized officer corps thus demands that many of these officers, who have relatively long periods of service but not enough to be qualified for retirement at this time, must be separated. These individuals find themselves with a major readjustment problem.

Now, I should point out that, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, a Regular officer eliminated from the active list before being eligible for retirement, may be honorably discharged from the Regular Army with severance pay.

Under the Permanent Warrant Officer Act of 1954, a permanent warrant officer who is unfit, or whose performance of duty is unsatisfactory, and who is not eligible for retirement, and who is separated after having completed more than 3 years of active service, is entitled to severance pay. Furthermore, a permanent warrant officer with less than 18 years of active service, who has twice failed of promotion is entitled to severance pay.

Consequently, I feel that it is only equity that Reserve officers be authorized a readjustment allowance, when they are involuntarily released from active duty, just as are Regular officers.

I have already mentioned that reservists, who are involuntarily released from active duty after many years of service, have a major readjustment problem. This is true because many of our business organizations are, like the Military Establishment, most reluctant to hire individuals at advanced ages. So we find that individuals released from active duty who have been away from civilian pursuits for a long period, and are now at advanced ages, are finding it extremely difficult to reestablish themselves in civilian occupations that will enable them to meet their financial needs. This is particularly true of individuals whose military training has been in fields that bear little relationship to civilian pursuits. These individuals have rendered faithful service to their country at a time when their services were vitally needed. Many have served in two or more armed conflicts. As a matter of fact, some of these officers were recalled to active duty involuntarily for the Korean emergency with considerable personal sacrifice.

The readjustment pay proposed by this bill will help these deserving individuals cushion their readjustment to civilian life and is certainly a justifiable element of the cost of national defense. In addition to the very real benefits to be provided to deserving reservists by this legislation, there are equivalent benefits that may be expected to accrue to the Government.

This bill should do much to induce stability in the officer structure of the Defense Establishment. Capable Reserve officers, knowing that they will be eligible for readjustment pay in the event of involuntary release prior to the time for retirement, will have an increased feeling of security and will be more likely to remain on active duty voluntarily for extended periods.

Never forget that under present and foreseeable circumstances, our national security is dependent on sizable augmentation of our Regular forces by members of our Reserve components. We depend heavily on them to maintain our military effectiveness.

The Congress has authorized severance pay for Regular officers whose careers are terminated prior to qualifying for retirement. But, at the present time, no such provision is available to members of the Reserve components. This is wrong. It is inequitable. It is discriminatory. But, by passing this legislation, we will be setting up a program whereby Reserves and Regulars will be placed on a similar basis and thus, we will give substantial equality for all who serve on active duty and must be released prior to qualifying for retirement.

I sincerely hope that all Members of the House, who are interested in the welfare of our reservists that serve with the active military services, will give their unqualified support to this legislation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to address the same question to the gentleman as I did to his predecessor. I have in mind the very considerable criticism which was addressed to the so-called 52–20 club following World War II, where payments were periodic and conditioned on the ex-serviceman not obtaining employment. I am just wondering if there is a possibility of similar criticism of this measure or if this program is somewhat different in nature from that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. While the answer is no, I wish to qualify it by saying this: Let us consider the situation faced by a Reserve officer who has been on active duty, away from his home for a period of anywhere from 5 to less than 18 years, and who within 90, 60, or 30 days may receive word from his superior that he will be separated from active duty as of the 1st of the month. In such an instance here is what happens? First he has to think about moving his family to a community, because he may be occupying quarters on the station. Next he has to think about establishing a home somewhere for himself and family, because he can no longer live on the military station. In addition he has to buy civilian clothes and have a period of time for the purpose of establishing himself in a position, and rehabilitating himself in civilian life. This bill will provide him with a sum of money that he will use for the purpose of reestablishing himself as a Reserve officer on inactive duty as he returns to civilian life.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the committee has inserted a number of very good provisions on page 2 of the bill. But, I should like to ask the gentleman what is meant by a person who is released from active duty for training. What kind of training?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A Reserve officer who is called up for training purposes may find himself on active duty for a period of months, weeks, or days, so we differentiate between an officer who is on active duty for a longer period of time—anywhere from 5 years to less than 18 years—and the Reserve officer who is called up only for training purposes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the 6-month trainee under the reserve program would be one of the men included, and the National Guard sometimes sends its officers to the Regular Establishment for training purposes only. In those cases the trainee would not be included under the act.

Mr. GROSS. But this is confined to a military trainee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is confined to active duty by a Reserve officer but does not include a Reserve officer called up only for training.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] have thoroughly explained this bill. We sat in hearings for a long time and discussed the various angles of it. I believe it is a bill that is needed and one that is just to take care of the situation of, as I call him, the career reservist who has spent many years on active duty.

If there are any questions about the bill, I should be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I simply urge the support and passage of this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the members of the subcommittee for long and patient work on this bill. We started out with one type of bill. The subcommittee analyzed the provisions of the bill submitted to us very carefully. We revised it and redrafted it and came out with a much-improved bill. I think everybody on the committee is entitled to a great deal of commendation for the patience they displayed in helping

us work out a good bill. I am pleased, therefore, to be able to present such a fine bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it would be well to say for the record that this bill has the endorsement of the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard, and other groups supporting the reserve of the country.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. I should like to add this—this does not pertain exactly to the bill, but I think it is a matter of great interest to the Members of Congress. Under the Reserve Act which we passed last year providing for 6 months' training and for the training of reserves in active duty, I should like to say that last week the Army recruited 1,980 reservists under this program. Of these 1,980 recruited in a 1-week period, 856, I am told by the Pentagon, were recruited under the 6-month training provisions of the act. There has been a lot of interest in it. The 6-year provision of the act refers to those cases where a reserve goes on active duty for 2 years. We recruited last week 680 persons and, surprising to all of us, we recruited last week 444 under the provisions of the act which permits a man getting out of the active service to take 1 year of active duty in the reserves in lieu of his obligation. As I say, we recruited 444 of those. Up to date we have recruited a grand total of 40,310 in the Army Reserve program under the new law.

We have until August 7 to complete this recruitment. We have a need for 90,000 in the Army Reserve. That represents a little less than 50 percent of our needs for the current year. I think that all who have been studying this program are optimistic that for the next year we will get the full needs of 90,000 persons for the Reserves under the Reserve Act of 1955. That was the requirement of the Army for that 1-year period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481), as amended, is further amended by adding the following section after section 259:

"SEC. 260. (a) A member of a reserve component who is involuntarily released from active duty after having completed immediately prior to such release at least 5 years of continuous active duty, except for breaks in service of not more than 30 days, as either an officer, warrant officer, or enlisted person, is entitled to a lump-sum readjustment payment computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade in which he is serving at the time of release from active duty for each year of active service ending at the close of the 18th year. For the purposes of this subsection, a part of a year that is 6 months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded.

"(b) The following persons are not entitled to any payments under this section:

"(1) A person who is released from active duty at his own request.

"(2) A person who is released from active duty for training.

"(3) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a person who is released from active duty because of moral or professional dereliction.

"(4) A person who upon release from active duty would be immediately eligible for retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay based entirely on his military service under any provision of law.

"(5) A person who upon release from active duty would be immediately eligible for severance pay based on his military service under any other provision of law. However, such a person may elect to receive either readjustment pay under this section or severance pay, but not both.

"(6) A person who upon release from active duty would be eligible for disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. However, such a person may elect to receive either readjustment pay under this section or disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, but not both. Election of readjustment pay shall not deprive a person of any disability compensation to which he may subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"(c) The acceptance of readjustment pay under this section shall not deprive a person of any retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or other retirement benefits from the United States to which he would otherwise become entitled.

"(d) Under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, which regulations shall be as uniform as practicable, a member of a reserve component who is on active duty and is within 2 years of qualifying for retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay under any purely military retirement system, shall not be involuntarily separated from that duty before he qualifies for that pay unless his separation is approved by the appropriate Secretary.

"(e) A member of a Reserve component who on the effective date of this section is serving on active duty under an agreement authorized by section 235 of this act, and who is involuntarily released from active duty before completing his agreed term of service, may elect, in lieu of separation payment under that section, to receive readjustment pay under this section.

"(f) Any payments accruing to a person under this section shall be reduced by the amount of any payment previously received by that person under this section, unless he has already refunded the prior payment to the United States. If he has refunded the earlier payment, the period covered by the earlier payment shall be considered as a period for which no payment has been made under this act.

"(g) A person who receives readjustment pay under this section is not entitled to mustering-out pay under the Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944 or under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

"(h) For the purpose of this section, the term 'involuntary release' shall include release under conditions wherein a member of a Reserve component, who has completed a tour of duty, volunteers for an additional tour of duty and the service concerned does not extend or accept the volunteer request of the member for the additional tour."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "section 259" and insert in lieu thereof "section 264"; and in line 6, strike out "SEC. 260." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 265."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, pursuant to House Resolution 517, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session during general debate on Thursday and Friday of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROBLEM

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. LONG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the Honorable Bernard J. Berry, mayor of Jersey City, N. J., I have today introduced a bill to amend titles I and XIV of the Social Security Act to provide that, where a State requires an individual to assign his life-insurance policies to the State agency as a condition of assistance thereunder, such requirement shall not apply to the first $1,000 of the proceeds of such policies.

I deem it a high privilege to list below the letter from Mayor Berry which develops the proposal that prompted the introduction of this bill.

In his letter, it appears to me, and I trust that it does to the membership of this House, the distinguished mayor of

Jersey City clearly justifies the need for the remedy which passage of the bill would provide:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY HALL,
Jersey City, N. J., May 17, 1956.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Congressman, 13th District, New Jersey,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: Our local public assistance and medical center officials have called my attention to a condition at the medical center which is the cause of much resentment among some old age or disability assistance recipients receiving care at the medical center.

Under the present State approved program which includes a Federal matching formula the Hudson County Welfare Board is permitted to pay up to $168 per month to the chronically ill old age receipient for his care in the approved areas at the medical center.

Because of a Federal regulation the Hudson County Welfare Board is not permitted to give this assistance unless the recipient assigns all insurance, if any, to the Hudson County Welfare Board.

This has caused much resentment among the recipient, his family, and his legally responsible relatives since no part of this insurance may be retained for the funeral and burial expenses of the recipient in case of his death.

While it is true that the Hudson County Welfare Board is permitted to pay $255 for burial expenses it is felt that this is not sufficient and would be unnecessary if the family or legally responsible relatives were permitted by the regulations to retain up to $1,000 of the insurance for funeral and burial expenses.

I believe that this proposal is humane and realistic and therefore urge that you sponsor such a change in the present public assistance regulations of the Bureau of Public Assistance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

May I offer the following proposal;

"All old age and disability assistance recipients, who are covered by life insurance, shall be permitted to retain up to $1,000 of personal life insurance to be used for funeral and burial expenses upon their death."

May I have your reactions to this proposal?

I also wish to urge your active support of title I, title II, and title IV of the public assistance amendments of H. R. 9120 introduced by Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee and now in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Title I of this bill amends the formula for determining the Federal share of assistance expenditures to become effective July 1, 1957, so as to provide separate dollar-for-dollar matching of State expenditures for medical care in behalf of assistance recipients, up to a specified maximum.

Federal share would be 50 percent of amounts spent by the States up to $6 per month times adult recipients, $3 per month times child recipients.

The Federal share for medical care would be in addition to present Federal matching of public assistance.

Cost—$65 million commencing July 1, 1957, and increasing to about $110 million annually after 10 years.

Title II extends from September 30, 1956, to June 30, 1959, the present formula for determining the Federal share of public assistance expenditures.

Failure to extend the formula would result in a reduction of about $200 million in Federal grants and may result in a reduction in payments to recipients.

Title IV amends the aid to dependent children program by extending the list of relatives with whom the child may live and receive aid, and by eliminating the school attendance requirement from children 16 to 18 years of age.

I feel that these suggestions are in the best interests of our citizens and urge their adoption.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD J. BERRY, *Mayor.*

THE 24TH NATIONAL 4–H CLUB CAMP

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to three items of interest and import.

Mr. Speaker, the 24th National 4–H Club camp will be held here in Washington, D. C. from June 13 through June 20, 1956. The purpose of the National 4–H Club camp is to assist these young people between the ages of 10 and 21 years of age to prepare for more responsible citizenship and service through:

First. Learning more about the organization, structure, and functioning of the Federal Government.

Second. Travel over this vast country and the exchanging of ideas and experiences with other delegates from different parts of the country.

More than 2,156,000 young people belong to nearly 90,000 4–H Clubs in the 48 States, and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The delegates to this the 24th National 4–H Club camp, numbering some 200 boys and girls, however, are chosen by their respective State extension service directors for outstanding project achievement, citizenship activity, leadership ability and community service.

Mr. Speaker, some 357,650 unpaid volunteer local leaders direct the activities of these 4–H'ers. They in turn are given training, and assistance by the county agricultural and home demonstration agents and the subject matter specialists of the State land-grant college or university. Some 100 of these adult 4–H leaders will accompany these 200 4–H Club delegates to Washington. They will attend special instruction classes so as to better equip themselves for their volunteer leadership activities.

The 4–H Club program, Mr. Speaker, now includes an international farm youth exchange program involving 40 countries. Over 300 outstanding 4–H Club members spend a summer in a foreign country living with farm families, assisting in the fields and participating in local community activities under this program. On the other hand, a young outstanding rural youth comes to this country living under the same type arrangements. Many civic organizations have sponsored on a State basis the exchange of 4–H Club members, as have business firms and foundations.

In particular, however, the National 4–H Club Foundation, with offices in Silver Spring, Md., has played a major role in establishing and administering, as an arm of the Federal-State Cooperative Extension Service, the international farm youth exchange program. In 1951, the Chevy Chase Junior College property was purchased by the Foundation. This property valued at $500,000 has been completely paid for and is now owned by the Nation's 2 million 4–H Club members. The center is to be renovated and ready for occupancy in 1958.

The property will be used by 4–H Club groups visiting here. They will live at the center while attending national camps. Facilities for meetings will be included.

Mr. Speaker, the National 4–H Club Foundation Journal for March 15, 1956, includes a short article on plans to renovate the property.

It is as follows:

RENOVATION PLANS PROCEED FOR NATIONAL 4–H CENTER

Plans for renovation of the National 4–H Club center are moving full speed ahead, following the decision by the board of trustees of the National 4–H Club Foundation to occupy the center by early 1958.

After its January 24–25 meeting, the board announced that the foundation would take over the center when the lease now held by the Department of Defense expires in June 1957. The Department has occupied the center property since shortly after its purchase in February 1951.

The center property consists of a beautiful 12½-acre campus in Chevy Chase, Md., a suburb of the Nation's Capital. There are three main buildings: Smith Hall, named for C. B. Smith, extension pioneer; and Turner and Warren Halls, named for Ray Turner and Miss Gertrude Warren, retired extension 4–H officials. When renovation is completed the center will be able to house and feed groups of 250 to 300 people, as well as provide conference rooms and other working facilities.

The property will be renovated to accommodate National 4–H Club Camp, the offices of the National 4–H Club Foundation, incoming and outgoing IFYE participants, and many other activities.

Among the many activities expected to take place at the center after its restoration are: Workshops and training conferences in connection with citizenship and human relations training programs; adult and junior leader training conferences; State and county 4–H citizenship training groups; meetings of 4–H Club program development committees, and county extension agent associations; subject matter specialists workshops; homemakers council sessions; and meetings of farm organization youth groups, agricultural commodity groups, etc.

The decision by the board of trustees to move ahead with putting the center in operation, brings to a final stage the work and dreams of 4–H members and leaders for more than a decade. As a working shrine the 4–H center will reflect the vision and dedication of the thousands of 4–H members and leaders who have given both of time and money to turn this idea into reality. Through the share and care program more than $100,000 has been contributed to the development of the center, now valued at half a million dollars. More than half of the States have already completed their quotas with 4–H'ers giving a dime each to establish their own National 4–H home. Business groups, too, will be given an opportunity to give special financial assistance to establishing the center.

RISE IN DAIRY INCOME

Mr. Speaker, the publication, Dairy Situation, for May 14, 1956, should be read by all Members of the Congress who have been concerned about the dairy price support program, since it indicates that:

With larger sales and higher prices, cash receipts from dairy products this year will be substantially above the 1955 level.

Although production of milk is continuing to show substantial increases over a year earlier, the consumption of fluid milk and cream has also been on the increase. In addition, consumption has been aided by a substantial increase in the amount of creamery butter being made from whole milk and the production of several whole milk products.

Mr. Speaker, this has resulted in a 5- to 10-cent per hundred pounds price increase for milk during the first 4 months of 1956 over the corresponding period in 1955. As of May 15, 1956, according to the publication, Agricultural Prices, the average price of milk—whole—was $3.86 per hundredweight. This represented 91 percent of the parity price of $4.69 per hundredweight.

Although milk prices are not as high as a few years ago, prices for feeds have declined even more. For example, the milk feed price ratio has been above the longtime average since July of 1955. In April 1956, it was 6 percent above the average for that month. The result, of course, has been higher prices for dairy farmers.

OPERATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN UTAH

Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have heard several Members complain about the operations of the Small Business Administration. Of course, in this election year one expects to hear such charges made against a Republican administration. But an accurate picture of the job the Small Business Administration has been doing in Utah makes it evident that a great many small businesses of all types have received financial assistance without which they could not have continued in business.

For example, about 37 percent of the net applications received in Utah by the Small Business Administration totaling some $857,000 were approved. What type of business firms received loans? Namely, these:

First. Canning and processing of fruits and vegetables.
Second. Grain mill products.
Third. Logging camps and sawmills.
Fourth. Household furniture.
Fifth. Stone, clay, and glass products.
Sixth. Poultry processing.
Seventh. Retailers.
Eighth. Motels.
Ninth. Contractors.

How have the borrowers fared? Mr. Wendell B. Barnes informed me by letter that two of the loans made were canceled, and that although no loans have been repaid in full or otherwise liquidated, no loss is "anticipated to result."

Mr. Speaker, the small-business firm predominates in Utah's economy. A great many of them have and are finding financial assistance forthcoming from the Small Business Administration, which otherwise would fail to keep pace with their larger competitors, if not fail altogether.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WISE COUNTY, VA.

(Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I take the opportunity here today to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a celebration that is taking place in the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia.

Wise County is observing its 100th anniversary. A countywide, year-long series of events have been planned by the directors of this centennial celebration in order to bring every person and every facet of community life into the observance.

Wise County was formed on February 16, 1856, from three neighboring counties. The General Assembly of Virginia, which approved the formation of Wise in 1856, commemorated the 100th year of the county's existence with an appropriate resolution this year. This joint resolution, which I include herewith in my remarks, was introduced in the Virginia House of Delegates by two of my very good friends, Delegates Orby L. Cantrell and James L. Camblos. The resolution follows:

Whereas the county of Wise was formed 100 years ago, on February 16, 1856, by the severance of territory from the counties of Lee, Scott, and Russell, and was named in honor of Henry Alexander Wise, Governor of Virginia from 1856 to 1860; and

Whereas Wise County ranks sixth largest among the counties of the State, according to population, with over 56,000 sons and daughters; and

Whereas the Trail of the Lonesome Pine winds serenly through Wise County, which is endowed with the scenic beauty of lofty High Knob, and the tranquillity of peaceful Powell's Valley; and

Whereas in Wise County is located the Southwest Virginia Museum and the home of the noted author John Fox, Jr., who recorded forever the romance of mountain life in his novels, The Trail of the Lonesome Pine, The Shepherd of Kingdom Come, and others; and

Whereas Wise County is in the heart of Virginia's rich coal fields decorated with quaint beehive coke ovens and towering, modern coal tipples and coal processing structures, and is gifted with a variety of industry and agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Virginia joins the county of Wise in commemorating its centennial anniversary, and acknowledges its contribution to the glorious history of this Commonwealth and the Nation; and be it

Resolved, further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to send a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to the clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Wise.

The objectives of the Wise celebration are, indeed, noteworthy. I list them here and commend the directors of the centennial for their intense interest in seeing that this observance results in much that is good for the future of the county.

The objectives are:

To pay tribute to the hardy pioneers who settled in this part of Virginia and passed on to us a heritage of which we are proud.

To give every citizen of Wise County, their friends and acquaintances abroad, an opportunity to celebrate in unity, friendship and good spirit, the 100th birthday of the county's glorious history.

To call attention to our own people as well as people beyond the borders of our county the outstanding progress our county has made in the development of schools, churches and industry.

To call attention of the tourist to the opportunities which Wise County affords them in scenic beauty and places of interest and recreation.

To contribute something to the achievement of education in the realm of local history and at the same time furnish entertainment and opportunity for having good wholesome fun.

Many outstanding events have been planned in connection with this centennial celebration. Among them are historical programs, parades, picnics, a centennial pageant, Governor's Day, and a special Labor Day celebration. In addition schools, churches and the various communities are scheduling, or have completed, special programs.

I would like to extend today to the Members an invitation to join me in attending and taking part in these many events that are a part of the Wise celebration. I know from experience that you will enjoy any visit to Wise County, which not only offers the hospitality for which southwest Virginia has become famous, but can provide many other recreational and entertainment opportunities. I quote from a recent article written by Mr. Luther F. Addington, executive director of the centennial, as an example of what you can expect to find in Wise County:

Visitors will find their way to turbulent, singing streams leaping from the mountain and cast a red ibis or a black gnat or maybe a worm into the deep, dark pools to lure a trout from his watery hiding place. Whether they go to Machine Creek or Clear Creek or the head of Old Stoney, they will know the surcease from toil and worry and find joy untold in the exhilarating air of the land in the sky.

So I urge you to come to Wise County—to the land of John Fox, Jr., who wrote such books as The Trail of the Lonesome Pine and The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Wise County among the counties and cities of my district. I am proud to have the opporunity of representing this fine group of citizens in the House. It is desirable and appropriate that we recognize Wise County and her sons and daughters on the occasion of their 100th birthday.

I am not one to make predictions, but I feel confident in stating that Wise County has a bright, prosperous future. Basing my prediction on the accomplishments of the past, I feel certain that this progressive county will go forward with continued vigor after pausing to reflect on the 100 years.

The 56,000 citizens of Wise County have a "song of celebration in their hearts" in this 100th year of their existence as a county. I pay tribute, today, to Wise County, and send by best wishes for the future years of growth and development in every field that I know are forthcoming.

IMPORTATION OF POULTRY AND EGGS FROM CANADA AND THE ARGENTINE

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the House of the plight of the poultry farmers in Massachusetts. A number of farmers in my district have gone out of business as the result of the high cost of feed, and they are protesting most bitterly now against the importation of a good deal of poultry and a good many eggs from the Argentine and also from Canada. It is a very unfair position to put my poultry farmers in, and I am extremely anxious to have this situation remedied. I am working with the Department of Agriculture, and I hope to have the support of the Members of the House in seeing that this importation of poultry and eggs from Canada and the Argentine stops. The eggs and poultry from these countries sell at a lower price than our farmers can afford to sell their products. The low price is always the market price.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 56 I am recorded as "not voting." I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS NEW NONSTOP SERVICE TO EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, significantly it has become the responsibility of Pan American World Airways to bring to an end an era of aviation history just as it was that airline's responsibility to open new transportation vistas by being the first carrier to order jet aircraft for international operations.

This week Pan American began DC–7C service across the Atlantic, nonstop to Europe. This handsome new aircraft, built by Douglas, is capable of flying 5,000 miles without refueling. Consequently, passengers who board Pan American's new DC–7C this summer for a holiday in Europe will know that they will be arriving in London in 10 hours and in Paris in 11 hours.

The super–7 clipper, adapted from the luxury DC–7 by Pan American and Douglas Aircraft for over-ocean, nonstop, tourist class service, will be put into the transatlantic schedules of the airline in time to add more than 30 percent in passenger capacity during the booming summer season.

Carrying a full load of 71 passengers and 6,300 pounds of baggage and cargo, the plane will speed along at 353 miles an hour, faster than any other passenger plane. It is 30 miles faster than any over-ocean plane.

Newly designed seats, with built-in tables, more leg room, and enlarged galleys are among the improvement that make the plane the most comfortable available for tourist service travelers.

The planes will go into daily New York-Paris service this month with four of these flights continuing to Rome. In July, daily service between New York and London will begin, continuing on to Frankfurt three times a week. Super–7's will be put into additional flight to Frankfurt via Shannon and Brussels, and also via Prestwick and Amsterdam, in August.

The plane is powered by 4 of the newest Wright turbo-compound engines that give it 13,000 horsepower at take-off. Extra gasoline tanks built into the wing enable the Super-7 to fly nonstop for 4,000 miles and still have reserve fuel to fly another 1,000 miles.

The new seats have molded backs and cushions 30 percent thicker than in present tourist-class seats, with a down-filled pillow molded into the back of the cushion. The table, built into the back of the seat, can be dropped down for the use of the passenger sitting behind. It has been built so that even if the seat is fully reclined, the table will remain level. A new, large coatroom has been added, and there is more room for storing passengers' hand baggage.

More efficient and faster food service for passengers is made possible by the Super-7's enlarged galleys. The galleys are designed to store two full meals and an in-between snack for all passengers and crew members. A newly-developed coffee machine provides fresh coffee at all times.

The plane, which enables large groups of tourists to speed across the Atlantic faster than ever before, is still another step forward in the program to make travel available to more and more people.

This program was outlined in 1949 by the President of Pan American. He said at that time: "The goal is not just to fly airplanes on schedule, across oceans, to all six continents, and around the world. The goal is to carry people, cargo, and letters in great numbers—mass air transportation, for the average man at fares he can afford to pay."

Mr. Speaker, I opened these remarks with the use of the word "significantly" and let me explain why: Pan American was the first air carrier to use the glamorous and romantic old flying boats for transoceanic passenger travel. It was Pan American which first put the DC–4's into service around South America, across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific. In 1949, the revolutionary Boeing Stratocruiser went into service on Pan American routes bringing to air passengers the most luxurious accommodations of all times.

It is virtually certain that the DC–7C's will be the last of our piston engine aircraft built.

The jet age is already upon us, and Pan American will begin operating jet flights across the Atlantic, across the Pacific, and around the world in late 1958 or early 1959. Until that time the DC–7C's will provide the ultimate in dependable, swift, and comfortable service to the four corners of the world.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that historic day in October 1927, when a comparatively tiny Pan American plane flew 80 miles from Key West to Havana carrying United States mail over water by air for the first time. Swiftly the enthusiasm for Pan American spread, and working with the complete cooperation of the United States Government the airline expanded down the east coast of South America and, in 1928, combined with the W. R. Grace Co. to form Panagra, which has been flying down the west coast of South America for 28 years.

This expansion took place at a time when bilateral air agreements were unknown. Without the help of Government agencies, Pan American negotiated for landing privileges with our Latin American neighbors. Let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that Pan American did not carry the financial burden alone. An interested and farseeing administration, which caught the importance of having a United States-flag carrier dominant in the international field, subsidized Pan American's early operation to a considerable extent. I recently learned from the Civil Aeronautics Board that Pan American is now almost completely off subsidy, that only on the national interest routes to Scandinavia, South Africa, and Australia does that airline still receive subsidy.

Pan American does not have a domestic operation as yet. All its American competitors in the international field do. Should Pan American ever obtain a high-density domestic route the Civil Aeronautics Board advises me the subsidy requirements would disappear overnight. This is a situation that can and should be corrected by quick and positive action on the part of the CAB in order that Pan American can compete sensibly and equally with other United States carriers with domestic certificates who fly on parallel routes to Europe, to the Orient, and to South America.

Pan American's record is one of remarkable and unbelievable achievements. This airline was first across the Pacific in 1935, first across the Atlantic in 1939, and first around the world in 1949. Credit for these accomplishments belongs to a great team of progressive air pioneers headed by Juan Terry Trippe, the company's president since its inception. A young Yale graduate and Marine Corps flier of World War I, Mr. Trippe was barely 28 years old when he conceived the idea of a privately owned commercial airline flying over water to every section of the world. Juan Trippe and his company have rendered a great public service. Those of us who have had the good fortune to travel extensively throughout the world get tremendous pride and comfort in seeing Pan American equipment at almost every airport of importance. We

have also been greatly impressed with the amount of foreign competition Pan American has from airlines wholly owned and heavily subsidized by the governments under whose flag they fly.

Mr. Speaker, as Pan American begins to pioneer again with its new DC–7C equipment it seems imperative to me that the Congress of the United States should take pride in its record and should do everything in its power to help Pan American grow, expand, and prosper. It is no longer the tiny little company which began operating from Key West in 1927; Pan American now has 18,000 employees all over the world and is owned and controlled by 33,000 stockholders.

Personally, I am proud to be a member of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is largely responsible for the good health of our commercial air-transport industry. I am likewise proud to salute Pan American World Airways for its initiative in placing at the disposal of American tourists such excellent equipment as the DC–7C.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to ask the gentleman to yield so that I may say a few words in behalf of Pan American, about which the gentleman is talking; and also, as a fellow committeeman with the gentleman, it has been my pleasure to observe the operations of Pan American and the fine services they have been extending to the public. I want to specifically call attention to one point about which I have some intimate knowledge, and that is the question of labor relations, the fine labor relations maintained by Pan American with the Transport Workers Union of New York City. In fact the relations have been so pleasant that Mike Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union, has written a letter to Pan American suggesting that Pan American be given a route from New York to Miami Beach.

So I want to commend the Pan American Airlines and the gentleman from Indiana for calling to the attention of the House this fine and splendid work that is being done.

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I also wish to join with the gentleman from Indiana in the remarks he has made. I think it is particularly refreshing to know at a time when other nations are taking superiority in the air away from us not only in the military but also in the civilian air travel, that this country is making such rapid strides. I am particularly interested to know that it will now be possible for people in my area to fly nonstop to the principal cities of Europe.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like this time to concur in the remarks made previously on the flight of Pan American to Detroit from Europe.

I would like to point out other significant features of the flight. To the auto and other industries that have exports and imports, this will be of great assistance to them. This emphasizes Detroit as being a international port.

Pan Americans decision to fly to Wayne Major Airport is important for it emphasizes the superiority over Willow Run as an airport for Detroit. Nearness, adequate landing field, and the practical arrangements with the Wayne County Road Commission, is certainly more desirable.

Pan American's move to Wayne-Major is a gain to Detroit not only for the additional service but also the practical approach of utilizing Wayne-Major as a civilian airport and to give back to the military Willow Run which they now so drastically need.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida has unmatched pride and feeling for Pan American World Airways, for this airline which carries the United States flag around the world with such great distinction is our own. The company was formed in my district in Florida in 1927 with Mr. Juan Terry Trippe as president. Many of the residents of south Florida can remember when Pan American made its first flight from Key West to Habana on October 28, 1927. It was an augury of the future that 90 miles of this 110-mile route were over water. Pan American was America's first overseas air service.

Today Pan American's 4-engined airliners equipped with all the most modern electronic aids to navigation span the oceans and seas in our Western Hemisphere, alone they link 34 countries and colonies. Last year this company transported 1,045,131 passengers between the Americas.

This great worldwide air transport operation had its beginning in Florida with only seven employees. Its Florida-based Latin American division today employs 7,785 persons. Its planes are among the newest and finest produced by America's aircraft industry. Pan American's vast experience and skill helped design them.

As long ago as 1930, this company flew 600 miles nonstop across the Caribbean from Kingston, Jamaica, to the Panama Canal Zone. This was the longest scheduled overwater hop in the world until PAA began its transpacific service. While expanding around the world PAA has never forgotten Florida, its birthplace. It maintains its greatest overhaul depot in international aviation at Miami. It employs 6,028 persons in Florida alone, with an annual payroll in the State of $28,606,554.

Its employees are permanent, substantial residents of my congressional district, 4,500 of them owning their own homes there. About 5,500 of them own automobiles. Real estate and automobile taxes paid by these employees to the State of Florida exceed $1 million a year. They are active in civic affairs, as indicated by the $51,000 they contributed to the most recent Community Chest drive. Entirely in addition to the great importance of its employees to the community, Pan American itself spends $5 million a year for supplies and materials in Florida alone. The company also pays important taxes and fees to the State and Dade County.

PAA Clippers flew 456,171 passengers in and out of Florida in 1955. Conservatively estimating that each spent $15 daily for at least 3 days in the State, we can see that PAA's passengers spread another $20,500,000 through the State's economy, reaching every level from bankers to bootblacks.

Pan American has made Florida a summer resort for thousands of our good neighbors from Latin America. Nearly as much Spanish as English is heard on Miami's streets in summer months. Thousands of North Americans also fly in PAA Clippers to Latin America, this interchange of visitors is a major and vital contribution to greater understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Our country's policies and international relationships are aided too. It is not difficult to remember when mistrust and even hatred was the unhappy state of affairs in our part of the world. Since 1927 there has been a noticeable and growing change until now there is a high degree of understanding, friendliness and mutual respect. The family of nations of the Western Hemisphere now assist each other in their social cultural and economic development. PAA has had an important part in this new era of cordiality by linking all these countries with swift, efficient air transportation making possible the peoples visiting and knowing one another. For not only does PAA fly in and out of the Latin American countries, it also has assisted a number of them to establish air transport systems of their own. It lent its vast knowledge and experience to help found associate companies in Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Brazil and the Dominican Republic. Thus Latin American air transportation advanced on a par with our own and a great store of good will resulted, not only for PAA but for the United States as well.

Among its many contributions in the international field, PAA has spent millions of its own advertising and public relations dollars to foster understanding and travel throughout the Western Hemisphere. It has striven for lower fares. Today bargain-rate tourist fares which PAA inaugurated are in effect on many airlines around the world.

We of Florida note with satisfaction that when Pan American has another great aerial achievement to demonstrate, it returns to its birthplace to make the demonstration. Thus its newest plane

departed May 25 from Miami for 4,806-mile nonstop flight to Paris, the first ever to link Florida and France directly and the longest nonstop flight ever scheduled by an airline. This historic trip was made in 14 hours and 2 minutes with 63 persons on board.

This magnificient flight, too, is an augury of things to come with the jet age. We of Florida would be happy to see Pan American World Airways make regular flights from Florida to Europe, and opening up a new phase of intercontinental tourism. The plane used for the Miami-Paris flight was a DC-7C, the newest, fastest, and last of piston-driven airliners. It was the first aircraft capable of demonstrating the great distances which can be covered nonstop by jet airliners.

The world will shrink one-third in size with jet-propelled air transports, and the new era will bring new glory to the United States to Florida, and to the great airline born in my State.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on the statement he has made. I have had considerable experience in air transportation and have flown as a pilot. I have followed the development of international air transportation with great interest.

I very well remember the situation at the beginning of World War II when we found that Pan American had developed a system of international airways and air transportation which greatly assisted us in the war effort in ferrying airplanes and transporting troops in the early stages of World War II.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that our international carriers have continued to expand, notwithstanding the fact that we now have competition in international air transportation from nearly every country in the world. To maintain our leadership it is necessary for us to have the very best equipment, and it is gratifying to me to know that Pan American is continuing to expand their facilities to provide additional service and extend the length of their flights, as I understand, to 5,000 miles.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has already paid many fine compliments to Pan American Airways and I wish to join with him in this most fitting tribute. Many of Pan American's employees reside in my congressional district and while I would like to acknowledge them all I have particular reference to Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American, and Samuel F. Pryor, vice president and assistant to the president of that airline.

Both of these men have given a lifetime to the development of a sound commercial aviation system. It would have been relatively simple for either or both of them to get into some field of endeavor which brought a great reward and less heartache. But aviation, to them, presented an exciting challenge which they could not deny.

No one is more aware than these two constituents of mine of the competitive aspects of international aviation. Pan American Airways is unique in that it has no domestic routes, while all its American competitors in the international field enjoy the privilege of flights within the continental United States. Several of Pan American's foreign competitors are similarly situated in regard to domestic operations but these carriers are all owned by their governments and are heavily subsidized. Pan American is an international example of private enterprise, and for that reason this body should do all in its power to further its expansion and encourage it to fly wherever it can.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Indiana in his complimentary remarks about Pan American Airways and jealously suggest that Connecticut has had a great stake in this company's conception and has an even greater stake in its future.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who are interested in the advancement of domestic or international airlines may have the opportunity and privilege of extending their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISRUPTIVE INCREASES IN IMPORTS OF FOREIGN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech I had hoped would be unnecessary. It involves a matter of great urgency to the Congress, to one of our basic defense industries, and to our country. It concerns a problem that many of us thought, and certainly hoped, we had solved. I refer to the unwarranted and disruptive increases in imports of foreign oil, in defiance of established Government policy and in violation of minimum defense standards set forth in that policy.

The issue of excessive oil imports is not new to my colleagues. It had exhaustive, and we thought conclusive, consideration in the first session of this Congress. It was one of the primary issues which led to enactment of the defense amendment to the 1955 Trade Agreements Extension Act.

It was the intent and expectation of the Congress that the defense amendment would be implemented in a manner which would solve the import problem, by establishing a proper relationship between imports and domestic oil production. Definite assurances were given that the amendment would be so employed. In fact, many leaders in Congress agreed to support the amendment only after such assurances were given.

Because of recent actions of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in effect disregarding the clear intent of Congress, as expressed in the defense amendment, it is urgent that the Congress review the oil import matter in light of what it hoped would occur, as against what has actually happened. I believe my colleagues will be shocked and disturbed, as I have been, by facts which indicate a handful of international oil companies have been given a green light to write their own ticket in importing foreign oil to the detriment of our defense-vital domestic petroleum industry.

Policies which we had hoped would end this problem have suddenly evaporated. Standards which the Congress considered and accepted as proper and necessary have been abandoned. Studies by government and industry which indicated an urgent need for less foreign oil—not more—have been ignored. Assurances given by the administration that the defense amendment would be implemented to hold oil imports to their 1954 relationship to domestic production, as recommended in February 1955 by a special Cabinet committee, have been forgotten.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, under the law, is responsible for administration of the defense amendment as to imports of oil and other critical materials. In a recent action, based on an arbitrary reevaluation, ignoring the clearly expressed intent of Congress, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has, in effect, invited the importation of more foreign oil—at a time when total petroleum imports are scheduled at a rate 42 percent higher than in 1954—and at a time when production in most of our major oil producing States is being curtailed by State conservation agencies for lack of market.

Because of these developments, I believe the Congress needs and deserves a report on the stewardship of its defense policy as to foreign oil. This involves a review of past considerations of the problem by the administration, by the Congress, and by the petroleum industry. I will try to make this review as brief as possible. When I have finished, I do not believe there will be room for any other conclusion than that the Office of Defense Mobilization has broken faith with domestic oil producers and with the Congress, and has diluted Government policy so as to make it ineffective and meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall no problem which has had the benefit of more study, analysis, and discussion. Not within my memory do I recall when more sincere men dedicated so much time and thought to a single problem and accomplished so little. After more than a year of encouraging signs which indicated an equitable solution could be achieved, we find ourselves right back where we started. Rather than a reduction in oil imports, there have been huge increases. Where we had hoped for and expected an effective limitation on imports, we

find in effect a policy of encouragement for more imports.

More than a year ago, we received the first signs of a hope that the oil import problem could be resolved. In October 1954, President Eisenhower appointed a special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy to study, among other things, the oil import problem.

In February 1955, the Cabinet Committee reported. Essentially, its findings supported many previous studies which concluded that imports were taking an increasingly disproportionate share of the domestic market, and were threatening the national security. Unlike many other studies, the Cabinet report reached definite conclusions. It stated that:

If imports of crude and residual oil should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense.

Based on this conclusion, the Cabinet Committee recommended that:

If in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

These findings were disappointing to many, including myself. They proposed to restrain future imports on the basis of 1954 imports which had already been proved to be excessive. However, the recommendation recognized the important principle that future imports should be limited in relationship to domestic production. That was a principle for which domestic producers, and many in the Congress, had sought recognition since shortly after World War II. The Committee's recommendations were therefore accepted, in good faith, by the industry and by the Congress.

Here, at long last, we had found a basis for agreement and a basis for settlement of a longstanding and grievous problem. It was especially encouraging since neither side in the oil import controversy voiced any serious objections. Here was a basis, we hoped, for an equitable solution, acceptable to all concerned.

As my colleagues know, the Congress was considering the oil import problem when the Cabinet report was released. Many in the Congress thought legislation should be immediately adopted which would give meaning and effect to the Cabinet's recommendations. Legislation to effectuate a reasonable relationship between imports and domestic production was introduced, and strongly supported in both Houses. During discussions and hearings on this legislation, which would have given imported oil a permanent 10 percent of the expanding domestic market, a more than liberal formula, some leaders of Congress conferred with the administration on the oil import problem.

The sponsors of the proposed 10-percent limitation were persuaded that the matter could be resolved without writing into the law a specific limitation. The Cabinet Committee's formula was offered as a yardstick. In effect, the Congress was told, "We have a good formula. All we need is general legislative authority to effectuate this formula, if and when the need exists."

The result, as we all know, was compromise legislation, known as the defense amendment. I should like to here quote the provisions of that amendment:

In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such relief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection herewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

In adopting this amendment what yardstick did the Congress expect would be employed in dealing with the oil import problem? It was made imminently clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress expected—and in fact had assurances—that the Cabinet Committee formula, holding imports to their 1954 relationship to domestic production, would be the criterion for effectuating this amendment.

The record is abundantly clear that this was the intent of the Congress. The defense amendment originated in the Senate Finance Committee. Members of that committee made searching inquiry of the administration to determine whether the amendment would accomplish the intent of restricting oil imports. They were satisfied that it would.

So the defense amendment was written into the Trade Agreements Extension Act and the bill went to a Senate-House conference. The President called the amendment very fine, and said he would sign it into law. Subsequently, on June 21, the President signed the bill embodying the amendment in which the Congress, for the first time in a quarter century, had provided a means to restrict excessive oil imports.

Now, let us examine the interpretation of the Congress as to how it felt this amendment would be effectuated.

On July 30, 27 Members of the Senate addressed a letter to the Director of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who had served as chairman of the Cabinet Fuels Committee, and who was responsible under the law for administering oil import policy. This letter unmistakably spelled out the intent of Congress in writing the defense amendment. It read in part:

As you know, the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act contains a new provision commonly referred to as the "national defense amendment," authorizing the President to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust imports of any commodity when such imports threaten to impair the national security. Responsibility for initiating such action under that provision of the law rests with your office.

In adopting the national defense amendment one of the principal factors considered by the Congress was the problem created by the large and increasing importation of foreign oil into the United States. In this connection the Congress gave particular attention to the findings of the Cabinet Committee, that in the interest of national defense oil imports should not exceed significantly the ratio that these imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954.

The legislative record of the Trade Agreements Extension Act in the Senate Finance Committee and in the Senate itself shows that the new provision of the act was adopted in the light of assurances that the executive branch of the Government would take action under this new authority to assure that oil imports would not exceed the levels recommended by the special Cabinet Committee. In the case of oil imports, therefore, the executive and legislative branches of Government are in agreement, without the need for further study, as to specific standards to be applied in implementing the policy contained in the national defense amendment.

These 27 Senators advised Dr. Flemming that they "would greatly appreciate your informing us as to what actions are now being contemplated by you under the authority contained in the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act."

Further, at the time of Senate discussion of the "defense amendment" several Members of the Senate made significant statements in that body which further clarified the intent of the Congress.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Finance Committee, stated in the Senate on May 2:

The committee believes that this amendment will provide a means for assistance to the various national defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented.

Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable, should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken.

On the same day, Senator MILLIKIN, in discussing this amendment said:

I am convinced that the proposal can and will work. It grants to the President authority to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports if they should threaten to impair the national security. He may use tariffs, quotas, import taxes, or other methods of import restriction. He is not limited as far as commodities are concerned except that they must be involved in our national security.

On May 3, Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, addressed the following question to Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, a member of the Finance Committee:

Was there any reason why the committee included the (defense) amendment at all, if the committee did not feel that the national security would suffer if oil imports were in excess of the 1954 ratio?

Senator CARLSON answered:

We have assurances that those administering the act will act in accordance with the proposals submitted by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy and the evidence submitted to our committee. I have no doubt about it.

One reason why I say that is very definitely the opinion of the committee, or at least the intent of the committee, is the fact that the chairman of the Finance Com-

mittee included in the report of the committee a part of the Advisory Committee's report, which, after all, in my opinion, gives the intent of the Finance Committee.

Senator CARLSON further stated on May 4:

I supported the proposal adopted by the committee because I was assured by those in the administration, responsible for the administration of the Trade Agreements program, that if such amendment were adopted by the committee and by Congress, action would immediately follow, and that imports of petroleum and its products would be definitely restricted.

I was further assured that such restriction would be based upon the study previously made, to which reference was made by the committee; that the basis of the limitation would be in accordance with the recommendation of that study. This study indicated the necessity of limiting imports of petroleum and its products to an amount and in the relative position of the imports of petroleum in 1954 as related to domestic production of crude oil in 1954.

I was further assured that the Director of Defense Mobilization would take the action indicated as necessary to adjust imports of petroleum and its products to the level and relationship of 1954.

I can assure the Senate that I would not have agreed to the amendment in H. R. 1, dealing with imports of commodities which are of national defense interest, had I not been assured that it would be the policy of those who administer the act to follow the intent of those who participated in preparing the report of the Advisory committee.

If it develops, and we find that the program is not to be so administered, then it will become the duty of the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, or individual Senators and Members of Congress to demand full compliance with this intent.

On the same date, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, inquired of Senator CARLSON:

Does he (Senator CARLSON) feel that the oil producers of my State would be justified in taking the assurances given as guaranties that the oil industry is not going to be disrupted by unusual and devastating amounts of oil imports?

Senator CARLSON replied:

Had I not believed the amendment we approved in committee, which was recommended by a very substantial vote, would protect the industry from ever-increasing imports, I certainly would not have voted to report the bill to the Senate, and I certainly would not be on the floor today stating I favored it and would vote for it.

I have given here only a partial recapitulation of the intent of the Congress, reflected in the expressions of Senators who worked earnestly for a solution of the problem and who, in good faith, accepted assurances of administration action, based on the Cabinet committee study, and supported the defense amendment, on the basis of these assurances.

What was the industry's position concerning the effect of excessive imports at this time? On May 3, while Senators were discussing these assurances on the floor of the Senate, the National Petroleum Council issued a report of a special council Committee on Petroleum Imports. This committee had been organized to study the import problem at the specific request of the Department of the Interior.

I would remind my colleagues that the membership of the National Petroleum Council is composed of representatives of both oil importing companies and domestic producers. The report of the council's special committee, at this juncture, was therefore timely and of great significance. So were the conclusions of that committee, which read as follows:

1. The continued increase in imports of crude oil, coupled with a decline in exports of crude oil and its products, has damaged, in varying degrees, segments of the domestic oil industry.

2. Further increase of imports without regard to the principle of only supplementing the domestic production of crude oil and its products will seriously damage the domestic oil industry and thus affect the domestic economy and the national security.

3. Fair and equitable relationship have not prevailed between total imports of crude oil and total demands for oil in the United States during periods of excess availability of domestic oil for United States consumption. Fair and equitable relationships should obtain at all times between total imports of crude oil and its products and total demand for oil in the United States.

This, again, Mr. Speaker, is only one of many instances wherein we found general industry agreement that imports were not only too high and had harmed the domestic industry, but that action to curtail imports was due, if not overdue.

This, then, is a partial picture of the support from both industry and government for a limitation on imports. All these statements supported the principles laid down by the Special Cabinet Fuels Committee. I have to this day to hear one statement, from any quarter, that the conclusions of that Committee were in any way impractical, unworkable, or unfair.

With this background of support from all concerned, and in an atmosphere of agreement, in which we all trusted a solution was forthcoming, we were encouraged on August 8, 1955, when Defense Mobilizer Flemming took his first step in action which we expected would result in implementation of accepted policy. In a letter to 18 oil-importing companies on that day, Director Flemming recited the provisions of the defense amendment. In a press release, the Office of Defense Mobilization said Dr. Flemming was requesting information from the importing companies with respect to their importing programs, "after he received figures which indicated that the crude oil and residual oil imports of some companies have exceeded, and apparently will continue to exceed, the formula recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy."

This observation by Dr. Flemming's office, that imports "apparently will continue to exceed the formula," was indeed prophetic. A little later I will explore with you how seriously imports have since then exceeded the formula.

Dr. Flemming also quoted portions of the Cabinet Committee's report, concluding with its findings that "if, in the future, the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

The domestic oil industry, and the Congress, confident that action would be forthcoming, continued to wait for the appropriate action.

On September 12, Dr. Flemming again addressed a letter to the importing companies. Based on his studies of their programs, he advised them that:

First. Imports of crude oil and residual oils had increased more rapidly than domestic production of crude oil.

Second. Half of the companies reporting imports of crude oil had exceeded the ratio recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

Third. Unless company policy changes were made, the imports would continue to be substantially in excess of the standard recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

Dr. Flemming further advised the companies in that letter, that in the absence of individual voluntary action over and above that already taken, "it would be necessary to seek other means of implementing the recommendations of the advisory committee."

Despite these repeated explicit requests for voluntary curtailment, no overall action occurred which resulted in any downward adjustment in imports. We continued to await the appropriate action or other means which Dr. Flemming implied would be used.

Yet no positive action was forthcoming. Dr. Flemming, who had repeatedly called for voluntary compliance by the importing companies, for some reason did not exercise the specific authority he has under the law to obtain mandatory compliance.

Instead, on October 29, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization again called for voluntary action by the importers. Despite the fact that he had had convincing experience, indicating no likelihood of voluntary action by the importers, Dr. Flemming pleaded with them again.

What effect did this action have? Did it result in substantial compliance with the Cabinet committee's formula? The record tells the story. For the year 1955, total oil imports exceeded the standards set by the Cabinet committee by 116,000 barrels a day. While the Cabinet committee recommended that imports be held to the 1954 relationship to domestic production, which was 16.6 percent, total imports in 1955 increased to 18.3 percent of domestic production.

We are now concerned, Mr. Speaker, with 1956 and the future. How much higher can imports go without disastrous effects? Scheduled imports this year give a hint of what can be expected. In recent reports to the Texas Railroad Commission, importing oil companies filed schedules which indicate total imports of 1,463,000 barrels daily in 1956, and more than 1,500,000 barrels a day in the last 6 months of this year.

In other words, total imports will amount to almost 21 percent of expected domestic production, and in the last 6 months, will be even more. I, again, point out that the original Cabinet report recommended restriction of imports to 16.6 percent of domestic production.

The domestic producer has thus lost more than 5 percent of his market while awaiting positive action by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

So, the vicious spiral has never ceased. Voluntary action repeatedly has proved a farce. I would remind my colleagues that "industrial statesmanship," or "voluntary action," was first argued as the wisest solution to the import problem in 1948. Since that time, total imports have almost tripled, rising from an average of about 500,000 barrels daily to a scheduled amount of more than 1,500,000 barrels a day, in the latter part of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the domestic petroleum industry, on which we must depend for our security, can stand much more of that type of "voluntary action."

I would now call to the attention of the House some of the things that are happening to the domestic petroleum industry, in the face of this record and rising imports. I have requested some information on what is happening in some of the oil producing States. Here are the facts which stand as an indictment of the actions of the importing companies, and the condonement, and in fact encouragement, of these actions by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

I will begin with Texas because it is our largest producing oil State. For the month of May, the Texas Railroad Commission ordered the third consecutive reduction in crude-oil production. The reduction, ordered this month, amounted to 80,000 barrels a day. Total reductions, since March, amount to almost 200,000 barrels a day. The Fort Worth Star-Telegram reported a fourth consecutive reduction in Texas oil producing allowables "is expected" to be ordered for the month of June.

In Oklahoma, the State corporation commission, in May, ordered an across-the-board reduction of 15 percent in oil producing allowables amounting to about 35,000 barrels a day below the previous month's average.

In Louisiana, John B. Hussey, conservation commissioner, set that State's daily oil production allowable for May at a rate of 38,900 barrels below the April level. Kansas and North Dakota both reduced production 5,000 barrels daily in May.

More reductions are on the way. It is a foregone conclusion that further reductions must be made if we are to prevent waste of a vital natural resource, denied access to a market glutted with foreign oil.

These conditions in the oil-producing States make it imperative that Congress evaluate the problem of oil imports. Is the defense amendment being implemented as intended by Congress and can we expect that it will be? The answer, I fear, is obvious. It has just recently, on May 11, been made obvious by Dr. Flemming in another letter to the importers of oil.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming completely abandons the defense amendment and the policy of maintaining a stable relationship between imports and domestic production.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming continues to recognize the necessity of maintaining the 1954 relationship—but now only after excepting certain areas of the domestic market, certain types of imports and certain countries of origin.

For example, imports no longer to be considered as affecting the defense are the following:

First. All crude oil imports to the United States west coast of California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and Arizona whether from the Middle East, Far East, or Western Hemisphere countries.

Second. All crude-oil imports from Venezuela and Canada.

Third. All residual fuel oil imported for fueling ships at United States ports.

Fourth. All fuel oil imported for military use.

As amazing as it may seem, these exceptions account for over 75 percent of all imports scheduled for the year 1956. In other words, any limitation to be applied to imports would affect only about 375,000 barrels daily—while total imports are approaching 1,500,000 barrels a day.

In this latest proposal, outlined in Dr. Flemming's letter of May 11, to the importing companies, the following conclusions are reached:

First. Crude oil imports to the United States west coast should not be considered from a defense standpoint. This entirely ignores the large and increasing shipments into this area from the Middle East and the question of dependency on such sources.

Second. Crude oil imports from Canada and Venezuela should not be considered although these countries account for about 70 percent of total imports.

Third. Imports for fueling ships at United States ports and for military use, have no relationship to our national defense.

After making these amazing exceptions, which strip all possible effectiveness from existing policy, it was concluded that a reexamination of the oil import problem should be undertaken and completed by September 1, 1956. If this reexamination shows that imports were threatening the Nation's security, public hearings should then be held by October 1, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to reconcile this latest action with existing and long-accepted national defense considerations as to oil imports. Importing oil companies, by these exceptions, have been afforded an escape hatch through which they can bring in more and more, not less, foreign oil. These few big importers of oil seem, conclusively now, to lead a charmed existence outside of any control by Government or without responsibility to the Nation.

These companies are powerfully persuasive. Despite their outrageous record of ignoring all policy, they have apparently convinced the Office of Defense Mobilization that they really intend to employ "voluntary restraint." Even worse, they evidently have persuaded the Office of Defense Mobilization to ignore the law and leave this vital problem in the hands of the international oil companies. Following through with their favorite tactic of "delay and postpone," they have even convinced those in authority that another investigation is in order. This will give them the most part of a year to increase imports, without restraint, at the expense of the domestic industry and the Nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, I for one do not propose to stand tonguetied while these companies lullaby the Office of Defense Mobilization into actions which violate every intent of the Congress, every accepted statement of industrial policy, and, even worse, the assurances given by the administration that oil import reductions would be effectuated.

We can no longer afford to leave the solution of the oil import problem in the hands of the importers themselves. We have trusted to this course, without result, so long as to make the Congress and the administration appear ridiculous, and, worse than that—our Government is beginning to look subservient to the international oil companies.

As my colleagues know, the Office of Defense Mobilization is concerned with maintaining a sound mobilization base for the defense of our country in these troubled times. We know, all too well, from recent events, that the entire Middle East area is embroiled in powder keg tensions. To invite, at this critical time, further dependence on Middle East oil—for the west coast or any part of our country—is utter folly which deserves the opposition and intervention of every Member of this Congress.

In maintaining our mobilization base, the Office of Defense Mobilization is concerned with the stockpiling of certain critical materials. In fact, Director Flemming reported last October that 65 strategic materials, 55 of them metal and minerals, are being stockpiled against any future emergency, under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

What would my colleagues think if we suddenly found that these strategic materials were being stockpiled, under canvas, on the sand dunes of the Middle East Arabian countries? That question, I will admit, sounds so unthinkable as to not even merit discussion. Yet, through inviting increased imports of Middle East oil, we are placing increasing dependence for our most vital munition of war—petroleum—on an area which is not only afflicted with political and economic strife, but stands under the very shadow of Russia.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that oil is one of the materials we need not worry about stockpiling. Indeed, oil cannot be stockpiled beyond a few weeks supply, so we are doubly blessed in having within this country an abundance of developed reserves—and a vast hunting ground for more reserves—adequate to assure the defense of our country.

I emphasize that today we are the only major free world country with adequate oil to fuel world war III, if and when it should come. We must be wary if we are to preserve this position tomorrow, and next year, and 5 years from now. If we are to do this, I submit that we must preserve wise policies conducive to the continuous exploration and develop-

ment which must be ceaseless if we are to maintain adequate future oil supplies. Above all, we must not trade away our oil security through a policy of subservience to the international oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am not talking against all imports. A favorite line of the importing companies every time this subject is broached is that, "we cannot shut off foreign oil." No one has proposed, ever, that this be done. What we are insisting upon, and have insisted upon, for nearly 10 years now, is that imports should be in reasonable relationship to domestic production. In the past year, we thought and hoped we had developed a basis for achieving this, and now we find this faint vestige of hope is being discarded; is being simply tossed out of the window, arbitrarily.

I would remind the House that strife for the goal of sometime, someway, relating imports to domestic production, so that foreign oil would share in any increase in the domestic market, now has a 10-year history. Since shortly after World War II, we have discussed, studied, committed, commissioned, and worried over the problem. What has happened in that time?

Here, briefly, is the record. From the years 1941 to 1945, this country imported a total of 220,000 barrels of oil a day. In that period, we exported 420,000 barrels a day. This year, in 1956, imports are scheduled at 1,463,000 barrels a day. Exports are expected to be about 333,000 barrels daily. In slightly more than a decade, then, we have gone from a net exporter of 200,000 barrels daily to a net importer of more than 1,100,000 barrels daily.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that while we have vacillated on implementing sound policy on this matter, oil imports have increased more than 600 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we obviously have dickered with this vital question until 2 minutes of midnight, and in the face of these facts, the Office of Defense Mobilization now proposes an attempt to turn the clock back to a fruitless and nonexistent daylight; to turn the problem back to the importers for solution, and to hide the head of authority and responsibility in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House, and many Members of the Senate, are understandably distressed over this situation. Like myself, they are primarily concerned with maintaining our domestic oil producing industry in a sound condition, recognizing that an adequate supply of oil within our own backyard is our first line of defense.

However, there are other important considerations. One of these is the effect of increasing imports on our domestic economy. My own State of Oklahoma has more than a theoretical or academic interest in this problem. Oklahoma has a very real stake in achieving a solution now, and many Oklahomans are deeply disturbed that we are now faced with a further unnecessary postponement of that solution.

Oklahoma grew up as an oil State, and now ranks fourth in production. Our first oil production came just 2 years after the run of 1889. Out of 77 counties in Oklahoma, 66 now produce oil or gas, and petroleum accounts for more than 92 percent of the total value of our mineral production. More than 50,000 Oklahomans are employed in the production of oil alone, not to mention the additional thousands employed in petroleum exploration, research, transportation, refining, and other phases of industry operations. Every county in my district produces oil, and anything which affects oil production is of real concern to the people of my district.

Oklahoma, for the past few years, has been a victim of this unsolved import problem. Since 1949 we have experienced recurring curtailments in the market. In each of these instances, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission has necessarily been forced to restrict Oklahoma production in accordance with its conservation standards. Throughout this period we have watched imported oil take an ever-increasing share of the domestic market. In addition to recent production curtailments ordered by the corporation commission, 4 major crude oil purchasers have instituted "pipeline proration" affecting almost 30,000 barrels of crude oil daily. This at a time when imports of oil are at a historic high, and still climbing.

Mr. Speaker, unless this new policy of inviting increased imports is immediately corrected, the Congress will have a clear call to act. We must do something if the vast reserves of the Middle East are to be stopped from taking an increasing share of our market. Imported oil has doubled its share of the domestic market in the past 7 years. Without effective control, imports can and will continue to take over more and more of the domestic market.

Unless more meaningful action comes from the administration, and soon, this Congress will be compelled to effectuate, with specific standards, the policy it has already so clearly spelled out. Unless we do, we risk becoming prostrate, without oil, before whatever enemy might choose to attack.

A reasonable limitation on oil imports, in relation to domestic production, seems indeed a small price to pay for our security as to oil. As representatives of the American people in the Congress, we are challenged to see that this small price is paid.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I wish to commend the gentleman for bringing these facts before the House of Representatives. We all realize, of course, how seriously these oil imports have affected the economy, not only of Oklahoma but of every oil-producing State in the Nation. I have always contended that there could be no final cure for this except legislation by the Congress of the United States. I had hoped, however, that under the legislation that did exist it would be possible to get some relief. I had also hoped that Dr. Flemming's request for a voluntary reduction by the major companies would bring some results. I understand that in some instances it has brought certain results, but certainly not the results that are going to have to be obained if the oil industry of this country is not seriously injured. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement and join with him in his remarks.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his statement in regard to the seriousness of the threat which is confronting the oil industry of this country. This is not something that has just arisen today. As the gentleman knows, he and many other Members of the House and many people of the Nation have been concerned for years over this problem of oil imports. Insofar as I know, none of us has ever advocated that all imports be banned. I have gone along with the theory it would be best to avoid further legislation if adequate results can be achieved otherwise. I think the administration has all the power it needs to cope with the situation, and I am sure the gentleman agrees. The percentage of oil of foreign origin which we are using has sharply increased. It has reached the danger point for the United States. It is causing trouble in my congressional district and in many other areas, as we all know, and something ought to be done about it. If something is not done about it we have got to pass legislation bringing about a reduction in these imports of foreign oil. I believe our people are on the right track in their effort to try to get relief and I hope our action here today will be noted by officials in authority and I hope that some effective results will be accomplished.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I would like to state that I have carefully studied the gentleman's statement. It should be called a study because it is very effective. It is commended to all of those interested in the oil industry, it is commended especially to the members of the Department and the Office of Defense Mobilization for careful study. It depicts a serious situation. In the event of a crisis, we have not only got to protect our production and our reserves but we must protect the industry of exploration. That exploratory industry can be jeopardized and is now being jeopardized by the unlimited importation of oil. May I suggest to the Office of Defense Mobilization that unless something is done, this Congress is in a mood to take action and make it necessary. Neither the oil industry nor the administration would regard that as desirable. But something is going to have to be done.

I thank the gentleman for his very able statement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to

compliment my colleague on his fine statement. Oil production in this country is one of our really basic industries. It is an industry that is indispensable to the economy of the great State which my colleague and I are privileged to serve in this House. I agree with my friend that this is a matter which should be dealt with by the Congress. Experience has shown that we can get nowhere by delegating our responsibilities on this problem to administrative agencies. Increasing imports are hurting the oil industry in this country, and the time has come when specific legislative restrictions on imports or quotas should be imposed by law. Again I want to commend my friend for his statement.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I am sure the gentleman will cover certain areas on this question which seem to me to be of utmost importance, namely, the clear intent of the Congress expressed in the Trade Agreements Act. I am sure the gentleman agrees that in the Trade Agreements Act passed in 1955, it was the clear intent of the Congress that all imports should be held to the 1954 level. Now, I would like to inquire of the gentleman, if I understand the conclusion of the President's committee, recently reported, if it is not a fact that they have made certain exceptions of imports from the Western Hemisphere, from Canada, and from Venezuela, and that bunker fuel for ships and even crude oil to the west coast of the United States, as well as military fuels, are not excepted by the committee; in other words, that is not to be taken into consideration in determining the 1954 level. I hope the gentleman will cover these points in his discussion of this question. Further, may I inquire if that is the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. JARMAN. I will say to the gentleman that certainly is my understanding. As a matter of fact, the exceptions that Dr. Flemming has set out in his letter of May 11 amount to over 75 percent of all imports scheduled for the year 1956, and he removes from the import field under consideration all but 20 to 25 percent of what we have heretofore classified as imports.

Mr. BURLESON. And as our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority whip [Mr. ALBERT], has just said about the administration of this clear intent of the Congress, allow me to say that unless something is done, the administration of the congressional requirement is about to administer the independent oil operator out of business.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks that have been made by my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] for bringing this very important problem before us.

I was very happy to see the gentleman so clearly point out in his remarks what was, without question, the intent of this Congress last year when we passed H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade Act, the so-called national defense amendments, which were designed to take care of this situation and without any shadow of doubt, according to the record before the committees and on the floor of the Congress, the intention of Congress was clearly expressed. While it may be necessary to have additional legislation in the future, if the situation is not corrected, it should be pointed out—and I think the gentleman did it very well in his remarks—that there is now in existence legislation that could take care of this situation and that was intended to take care of the situation and by all means should take care of it; in other words, it is administrative failure, in my judgment, and complete surrender on the part of the Office of ODM and others in the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act, failure to carry out what was clearly the intent of Congress, that has brought about this situation.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. As the gentleman knows, the State of Texas has proration. I should like the RECORD to show that starting in March—for March, April, May, and June—production cuts occurred during each of those months. Today we are on a 15-day-out-of-a-month production basis, and the prospects are just about certain that there will be another cut in July, which poses a very serious situation for the small independent oil producer in the State of Texas.

Mr. JARMAN. Analogous to the last comment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], I would add that in Oklahoma, State corporation commission in May ordered an across-the-board production cut of 15 percent in oil-producing allowables amoumting to about 35,000 barrels a day below the previous month's average. The figures the gentleman has given and that I have cited are indicative of exactly what is happening to the domestic oil industry.

Mr. IKARD. If the gentleman will yield further, we have all heard that imports for the first quarter of this year are moderate and in line with what the 1954 imports were. I should like to point out, and I am sure the gentleman has later information than I do, that it is my understanding that while the imports for the first quarter are not too much out of line, beginning with the second quarter and projected on through the rest of this calendar year they will continue to zoom upward to where they get completely out of any relationship of the 1954 figure in the second quarter and become worse in the third and fourth quarters, as near as we can project them at this time.

Mr. JARMAN. I would say to the gentleman that it is my understanding that during the first quarter of 1956 imports have averaged 110,000 barrels per day above the relationship in 1954, and it is anticipated that for the entire year of 1956 it will be an average of about 300,000 barrels per day, which is a sizeable increase, having a great impact upon the industry as a whole.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield again, may I say that there is no question but that it is having an impact, as has been stated by the last speaker, and I think it is due to increase. It has had sufficient impact upon the producers in my State and in my district that the Ohio Oil Co., I understand, in the last day or two has reduced the price of oil by 10 cents a barrel. To me it would seem that with our industry growing at the greatest pace ever in the history of this country in peacetime, there ought to be a reasonable market and a reasonable production of oil allowed in this country to the American taxpayers.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this subject be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that any Members who may be interested in doing so be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time given me here to discuss an issue of critical and growing concern to our domestic economy and the Nation's security—the long-standing and increasing problem of excessive petroleum imports.

The oil-imports issue, as my colleagues know, is one which has perplexed the petroleum industry and the Congress since shortly after World War II. In the absence of any sound policy as to oil imports, we have seen foreign oil take an ever-increasing and unjustified share of the domestic market. For years a solution of the problem seemed elusive and difficult of achievement.

Since 1949 we have had recurring studies. We have had repeated enunciations from the petroleum industry that oil imports should only supplement domestic production, always with agreement from the importing companies that this was a wise policy. We had study after study by Government indicating a need to restrict imports to a supplementary level. Despite these almost endless efforts, a solution, somehow, failed to materialize.

Finally, last year action by both the Congress and the administration gave encouragement that a solution at last was forthcoming. The administration again conducted a study which indicated a need to curtail oil imports and, following through on that, the Congress amended the Trade Agreements Act so as to provide the administration the au-

thority to achieve the necessary limitation.

In the defense amendment in the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act the Congress placed in the Office of Defense Mobilization the authority and the responsibility for reducing oil imports when they threaten to impair the national security.

Previous to this action by the Congress, a Special Cabinet Committee on Fuels Policy, headed by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, conducted an exhaustive study of the oil-import problem and concluded:

First. The oil imports in excess of their 1954 relationship to domestic production "could endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense"; and

Second. If future oil imports should exceed their 1954 relationship to domestic production, "appropriate action should be taken."

Mr. Speaker, here were developments which, to the Congress, made an effective solution to the oil import problem seem inescapable. The administration set a standard, advised that oil imports exceeding that standard could impair the national security, and recommended appropriate action should the standard be violated. The Congress, in adopting the defense amendment, provided the authority and defined the responsibility for implementing this appropriate action.

The defense amendment said imports should be curtailed when they "threatened to impair the national security." The Cabinet Committee had already determined that imports above their 1954 relationship to domestic production could impair the national security.

Is it any wonder that the Congress was encouraged, and indeed was satisfied that it had solved the oil import problem, when assurances were given by the administration that the defense amendment would be so administered as to accomplish the import limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

In fact, never in my experience have I seen a clearer mandate to implement authority provided by law. The legislative history of the defense amendment established beyond doubt that Congress intended that administration of the amendment must result immediately in import limitations.

Here was a problem which threatened our Nation's security. To solve it, we provided a law. We had an accepted standard for enforcement of the law. We delegated authority to enforce the law in compliance with this accepted standard. Notice was served on the violators, and potential violators, that they must comply, or face more stringent consequences.

Immediately after adoption of the defense amendment, it became obvious that enforcement was immediately necessary. Oil imports were substantially above their 1954 relationship to domestic production, and rising. Many in the Congress, concerned that the law be given effect, transmitted inquiries to the Office of Defense Mobilization. In one instance, 27 Senators wrote the ODM Director urging that enforcement of the law be implemented, and reciting the assurances from the administration that such enforcement would follow under authority of the defense amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the actions which have followed since that time are almost unbelievable. In a series of communications to the oil importers, the Director of ODM has urged compliance with the Cabinet Committee standard. In his succeeding communications, however, the rules of compliance have been so relaxed as to defeat any chance of ever achieving a limitation of imports on a basis recommended by the Cabinet Committee or, in fact, on any realistic basis.

The first of these letters from ODM to the importing companies was last August 8. Since that time oil imports have continued upward. When the year 1955 was over, and the figures added up, we found that total oil imports exceeded the Cabinet Committee standard by 116,000 barrels a day. In the meantime, other letters were dispatched to the importers by ODM. Dr. Flemming threatened the importers. He said if import limitations were not achieved voluntarily, other means would have to be employed.

Finally, Dr. Flemming apparently dispaired of ever achieving voluntary compliance, and for some unexplained reason did not choose to employ the authority given him by Congress to obtain compliance. So, on the 11th of May, he dispatched an extraordinary letter to the importers. In this letter, he again cited the Cabinet Committee standard, and then proceeded to completely abandon all rules which might remotely have given him a chance to attain that standard.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming advised the importers that they could just forget certain oil imports. He omitted from any control at all imports of oil to the west coast of the United States, imports from Canada and Venezuela, and imports for fueling ships at United States ports and for military use.

Mr. Speaker, by these exceptions, Dr. Flemming has actually excused from any control at all more than 75 percent of the total imports now coming into the United States. On what basis this action can be justified is difficult for me to comprehend. It amounts to nothing more than complete surrender to the importing companies.

The implications of this surrender are disturbing and dangerous. At a time when we are confident of a policy of strength, we find a policy of vacillation, weakness and surrender. The potential disaster of such a policy is made clear when we recognize how much of the domestic oil market has already been surrendered to the international oil crowd in only recent years.

In 1936 to 1941, total oil imports averaged 171,000 barrels daily, or less than 5 percent of domestic production.

In 1946 to 1951, total imports averaged 611,000 barrels a day, or more than 11 percent of domestic production.

In 1954, imports totalled 1,052,000 barrels a day, or 16.6 percent of domestic production. This was the danger point enunciated by the Cabinet Committee. This was the point beyond which the committee said excess imports should be subjected to appropriate action by Government.

In 1955, total imports averaged 1,248,000 barrels a day, exceeding the Cabinet Committee formula by 116,000 barrels a day, and amounting to 18.3 percent of domestic production.

In 1956, total oil imports are scheduled at an unprecedented 1,463,000 barrels a day, according to schedules filed by the importing oil companies with the Railroad Commission of Texas. This schedule, Mr. Speaker, exceeds the Cabinet Committee formula by 301,000 barrels a day, and amounts to almost 21 percent of expected United States oil production as forecast this year by the Bureau of Mines.

In the face of this record and these facts, the director of Defense Mobilization now removes all semblance of any barriers to increased imports, and invites increased imports and increased dependency on oil producing areas on which this country would be helpless to depend in time of emergency.

Like many of my colleagues, I find it impossible to reconcile the actions of ODM with either existing policy, or the obvious increasing need to curtail, rather than invite more, oil imports.

What result are these tremendously increased imports now having?

To begin with, imports are denying more and more of the domestic market to domestic producers. Our crude oil producing capacity in the United States is about 9,100,000 barrels a day. The Bureau of Mines says domestic production this year will average 7 million barrels a day. This means, Mr. Speaker, that in face of these record and rising oil imports, the domestic petroleum industry now has more than 2,000,000 barrels of oil a day shut in the ground, lying idle for want of a market.

It does not take much of a mathematician to compute what this will mean in terms of oil unfound, and thus unavilable, in any future emergency.

As previously stated, imports will exceed the Cabinet Committee formula by 301,000 barrels a day in 1956. If imports were made to comply with the formula, this would mean added income to domestic producers of more than $850,000 a day, or $310,250,000 in the year 1956, based on current crude oil prices.

Since World War I, Mr. Speaker, there have been an average of seven wells completed by the domestic petroleum industry for every million dollars of total income from oil and gas. A loss of total income amounting to $310,250,000, simply on the basis of nonconformity with the Cabinet Committee's import formula, will deny the domestic drilling of 2,170 wells in 1956.

Deducting dry holes, this means more than 1,000 new producing oil wells and almost 175 producing gas wells will not

be drilled because of a failure to effectuate existing policy as to oil imports.

Mr. Speaker, if we project this result into an uncertain future without any limitation on imporation of foreign oil, the implications to the defense of our country become fearsome.

It is clear that if imports are left unrestrained in the next 10 years, as they have been in the past 10 years, income to domestic producers, to plow back in the ground to prove and develop new oil reserves, can be severely curtailed as to mean the difference between victory and defeat in any future war.

President Eisenhower has called our oil-producing ability a deterrent to Communist aggression. No greater truth was ever spoken. Without a strong domestic petroleum industry, we would be helpless before any enemy. It is obvious, therefore, if ODM shares the President's views as to the defense importance of our home oil industry, it should be concerned with building our domestic defense as to oil, rather than reverting to policies which experience has proven will undermine and defeat that objective.

In my home State of Texas, we are today reliving an all-too-familiar experience. With imports at a historic high, the Texas Railroad Commission has for the past 4 months been forced to reduce the flow of Texas oil. Our producing allowable for June was reduced 74,000 barrels daily from the May average. Together with previous curtailments in March, April, and May allowables have been reduced more than 200,000 barrels a day. In addition to this enforced curtailment for conservation purposes, we have experienced for the past year in west Texas the institution of pipeline proration, affecting at times up to 40,000 barrels daily of crude oil. This means that oil-purchasing companies, with their lines and tanks full, simply could not take the oil and many wells in a vast area of west Texas simply stood idle.

Mr. Speaker, the west Texas sour crude oil affected by this situation is of the same quality and type as much of the middle east oil which Mr. Flemming has told the importers they can bring into the United States west coast area in unlimited quantities.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too strongly condemn this recently announced policy which, unless challenged by the Congress and corrected by the administration, can result in the trading away of our security as to oil.

In these troubled times, I can think of no greater folly. This is no time to change the rules to suit the whims of the importing oil companies. It is clearly a time for positive action. If the administration refuses to take such action, then I submit that the Congress must.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment the importation of foreign crude oil into the United States is seriously threatening the economy of the Southwest. Particularly I can testify it affects the area which I represent in the Congress. It has already had a serious effect and the prospects are that the situation will become extremely acute in the future if there is not a curb put upon imports of foreign oil. I speak from the standpoint of the independent oil operator, whom I think can be properly referred to as the small-business man of the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I contend that I represent more independent oil operators than any man in the Congress. I believe this statement can be supported statistically, but I well know that several of my colleagues will contest my contention. Be this as it may, I mention it to emphasize that in my area the independent oil operator supplies one of the most important needs of the great Southwest area, and because of the number in the business and the number of people involved, it becomes tremendously important not only to the immediate area but the Nation that he be treated fairly by his Government.

The oil industry, and particularly the independent operator whose very identity of being an independent means independence, very much desires that he not be regulated by the Government and wishes to have as little Government interference in the industry as possible. He has not wanted to see quotas on oil imports established, but rather it has been his hope that the major companies discipline themselves and limit their imports to a reasonable amount so as to supplement, rather than to supplant, the supply of oil in the United States. He has become desperate in view of the continued increase of foreign oil imports. In the last trade agreements bill the provision was made that oil imports should be held at the level of 1954. Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, heads the agency that is to carry out the intent of the Congress.

We are aware of the situation since that time. Oil imports have continued to increase.

On May 11, 1956, the President's Cabinet Committee under Mr. Flemming announced its findings relative to imports for 1956, as related to the 1954 level.

The Cabinet committee should reconsider its findings because of the following:

First. Under the committee's recommendations oil imports for this year would exceed the 1954 domestic crude-oil production by an average 234,000 barrels per day.

Second. The findings of the committee would permit increases in crude-oil importation in 1956 over 1954 of 1,300 percent from Canada; 36 percent from the Middle and Far East; and 26 percent from Venezuela; as compared with an increase of 10 percent in United States crude-oil production.

Third. The conclusions would permit the United States western coast to become increasingly dependent on Eastern Hemisphere crude oil.

Fourth. The conclusions of the committee would permit total imports of crude-oil and refined products to take over 20 percent of the United States market in 1956 as compared with 18.3 percent in 1955 and 16.6 percent in 1954. This is the largest increase in ratio since 1950.

If this trend is to continue and the policy of our Government supports these increases, I say unequivocally it will lead to an inadequate domestic supply of oil and an increasing dependency on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Texas has a system of proration of production. Contrary to the contention of some who are not familiar with it, proration is conservation. It is a sensible practice to conserve our natural resources. While we are conserving these God-given natural resources, and while the independent oil operator is the one who discovers between 85 and 90 percent of all the oil reserves in this country, he is being sabotaged by his own Government, which permits unprorated and cheaply produced crude oil to come into both his front and back door.

On many occasions it has been pointed out to the committees of the Congress, and on the floor of both the House and the Senate, that this country cannot afford to depend on foreign oil supplies. Those supplies could be cut off any day. In the meantime, if the domestic supply and the domestic oil economy has been dropped by this policy, it cannot be revived overnight. It would take years for the domestic oil economy to become healthy again once it had been supplanted by oil from sources outside of the United States.

As far back as 1950 I introduced legislation to establish quotas on foreign oil imports. As I have previously stated, the independent oil operator does not favor quotas if it can be avoided. The purpose of my bill at that time, and legislation introduced since, was to point up the need for a sensible policy and in order to bring it to the attention of Congress.

The day is rapidly approaching when drastic action must be taken unless the major oil-importing companies can be prevailed upon to act most sensibly and to recognize that the goose which lays the golden egg is not feeling well at all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President's Cabinet Committee and Mr. Flemming will reconsider their earlier conclusions and act in the most forceful manner to place restraints upon the importing companies. In my opinion, they must now take positive action because every appeal has been made to the importing companies, but they have failed to respond. The time is rapidly drawing near, if it does not already exist, which will make the situation extremely critical. Definite and positive action is absolutely necessary in order to place some reasonable control on ever-increasing oil imports.

SURVEYS OF FOREIGN TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 or 3 years a number of surveys have been made by various groups, both

private and public, purporting to show the true interest of congressional districts or even States in foreign trade. Usually the results are given out under some title such as "The Stake of the *n*th Congressional District of the State of Blank in Foreign Trade."

Such surveys have been made by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, by the League of Women Voters, by world trade groups, universities, and so forth.

One thing most characteristic of such surveys is that they always demonstrate that further tariff reductions would be helpful; that is to say, the exporting interests of the district or area are shown to employ more people than would be hurt by a greater volume of imports.

Recently a proposal has been made that several million dollars be appropriated by Congress to be used by the United States Department of Commerce to make surveys of this character throughout the United States.

The time is therefore here when we should take a critical look at these surveys. From what I know of them they appear to be launched by those who are interested in export markets and unfailingly prove what the propagators set out to prove in the first place.

Of course, there is nothing to stop the League of Women Voters from making all the surveys they want. The same goes for any other privately financed organization. When, however it is proposed to expend public funds, all of us have a right to insist that any proposed survey must include both sides of the equation.

If the number of people employed in the export industries is to be determined, the number of people that would be needed to produce the goods imported should also be ascertained. Only in this way could a proper balance be struck. If this were not done the result of any such surveys would only be one-sided distortions of the true state of affairs, and therefore misleading.

I shall certainly oppose most strenuously any proposal to appropriate public funds for foreign-trade surveys in this country that would draw false pictures.

As for private surveys, some of them may need public exposure for their biased approach and lack of objective purpose.

Recently a survey of the kind I have referred to came to my attention. It was made by University of Minnesota economists in combination with private industries of that State. In response to an article that appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune giving the results of the survey a letter was printed in the same newspaper. This letter points out some of the serious defects of a survey of this kind.

I ask that this letter be included at this point in the RECORD. I am sure that more criticisms of this kind will be evoked as more of these private surveys are made:

(The writer of this letter is director of public relations, Cooperative Wool Growers, of Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa.)

To the EDITOR: The Sunday Tribune of April 8, carried an article entitled "Research Shows Tariff Cut Would Aid State Industry."

The article states that the report of a combined group of businessmen and University of Minnesota economists found that reduced tariffs would help more industries of the State than they would injure. It says also that in 1947 no less than 13,488 Minnesotans in 27 industries held their jobs because of export trade.

Among the industries that would be helped by further tariff cuts are listed farm machinery and equipment, plastic products, construction and mining machinery, electric motors and generators, internal combustion engines and general industrial machinery and equipment.

Among the industrial products that would be injured are listed leather products (except footwear), pottery and sugar refining. Notably missing is the dairy industry. Among the agricultural groups that the report lists as likely casualties of lower tariffs are wheat, sugar beets and wool. Smaller injury, it says, would be inflicted on oats, malting barley, rye, and flax producers. On the other hand, growers of corn, soybeans, peas, and canning corn would stand to be helped moderately.

This gives the report the appearance of a product of honest effort; and that much may be granted. Nevertheless it is something of a shock to find the dairy industry, in which Minnesota stands third or fourth from the top in the Nation, missing from the list of industries that would be severely crippled by removal or a great reduction of trade barriers. This is one of the State's key industries. It could not be injured substantially without grievous injury to the State as a whole. But for the restrictive import quotas on cheese and the virtual embargo on butter the dairy industry of Minnesota would have been on the skids long ago.

The same would be true of wheat and wheat flour, both important sources of income for Minnesotans. The import quotas on these products are very much more restrictive than the tariffs on other products.

Ruin the dairying, the wheatgrowing, and flour-milling industries of Minnesota, and your exporters of different classes of machinery and motors would also soon feel the plight. It happens that the principal products of Minnesota are the beneficiaries of the most highly protective devices employed by the United States. That includes sugar, not yet mentioned here. Sugar is also protected by a special import quota law. The fact is that if products of the rest of the county were as highly protected as those of Minnesota we would have a low volume of imports, except of products on the free list.

It should not be forgotten that dairying, wheatgrowing, flour milling, and sugar-beet growing and sugar refining are also important to other States. If the import quotas on these products were removed the exporters of farm implements would find their sales falling off not only in Minnesota, but in Wisconsin, New York, and Pennsylvania (dairy States), in Utah, Colorado, Michigan, and California (sugar beet States), Louisiana and Florida (sugarcane States), and in Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, and other wheatgrowing States.

While cotton is not grown in Minnesota, it also is highly protected by an import quota. Remove it and many Southern States would also decline drastically as a domestic market. Could the exporters of Minnesota live on their export markets? No.

There are the freer traders who wink at import quotas on agricultural products and explain them by pointing to price supports. They overlook the fact that price supports were instituted to bring about parity between farm products and industrial products. If support prices on agricultural products make them vulnerable to imports does it not follow that industrial products, to the price level of which it is sought to lift farm products, must be equally vulnerable?

The business groups and University of Minnesota economists are to be congratulated for initiating a serious study on foreign trade. A beginning has been made. It would be useful if this were followed by a more comprehensive inquiry, taking into account all the factors. (Leonard J. Nadasdy, Minneapolis.)

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, on Wednesday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, June 13, 1956.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEOGH, and include an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily News.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and includs a letter.

Mr. REUSS in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT and include an address made by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] at the University of Alaska on May 14, when she was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $200.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY and include a statement on the fluoridation of water, by Arthur C. Ford, commissioner of the department of water supply, gas, and electricity of New York.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in eight instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KILBURN and to include a speech by Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. MORANO to extend his remarks following the special order of Mr. BEAMER today.

Mr. PILLION and to include an article.

Mr. HOLLAND in two instances and to include articles.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and to include an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. BURNSIDE in two instances, in one to include an address notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $200.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include an article.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1960. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State Committees on Education Beyond the High School"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1961. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists of schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9974. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10412. A bill to amend the act for the protection of walruses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11499. A bill to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 10899. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2344). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Sellaz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 2311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish; without amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Onie Hack; with amendment (Rept. No. 2321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7738. A bill for the relief of Scott Berry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9106. A bill for the relief of Saul Lehman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10281. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10818. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10587. A bill for the relief of Charlie Gardener Ford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11530. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 520. Resolution to refer H. R. 4507 to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung; with amendment (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli; with amendment (Rept. No. 2337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9020. A bill for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; with amendments (Rept. No. 2338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 2339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immi-

gration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiancées of United States citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2341). Referred to the Committee of the White House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6765. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Peder Strand; with amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11708. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 11709. A bill to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 11710. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain persons who serve in the active military or naval service of the United States after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11711. A bill to extend for an additional year the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 11712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuitants may elect to have their annuities taxed in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 11713. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11714. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 11715. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11716. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11717. A bill to provide for the inclusion within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, of United States commissioners and the crediting for retirement purposes of certain past service of their secretarial and clerical assistants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 11718. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 11719. A bill to amend titles I and XIV of the Social Security Act to provide that, where a State requires an individual to assign his life-insurance policies to the State agency as a condition of assistance thereunder, such requirement shall not apply to the first $1,000 of the proceeds of such policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 11720. A bill creating the City of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11721. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment, and dismissal, of civilian officers and employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 647. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 11722. A bill for the relief of Maria Sebbio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 11723. A bill for the relief of Christos Petropoolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 11724. A bill for the relief of Albert Charles Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 11725. A bill for the relief of M. E. Boales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11726. A bill for the relief of Leon Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 11727. A bill for the relief of Rachel Abouganem vda de Violin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 11728. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Hassan Dardari, alias Hassan Choukat Dardari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 11729. A bill for the relief of Daniel Wilging; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 11730. A bill for the relief of Miss Helene Dimitrowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 11731. A bill for the relief of Lars T. Radberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11732. A bill for the relief of Wolf Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11733. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 11734. A bill for the relief of Marie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11735. A bill for the relief of Andor Muller and Rosa Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11736. A bill for the relief of Ante Lisica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11737. A bill for the relief of Leonard Pignatello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 11738. A bill for the relief of Connie Jean Osinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11739. A bill for the relief of Vasilios A. Xerikos, his wife, Eleni, and three minor children, Nicoleta, Constantinos, and Andreas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1134. By Mr. SILER: Petition of some 4,700 residents of the counties of Greene, Montgomery, Miami, Warren, Allen, Putnam, Summit, Ashland, Athens, Meigs, Butler, Carroll, Champaign, Clark, Clinton, Columbiana, Coshocton, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Fairfield, Franklin, Gallia, Guernsey, Hamilton, Hancock, Mercer, Harrison, Highland, Jefferson, Lorain, Lucas, Mahoning, Noble, Pickway, Portage, Richland, Seneca, Trumbull, Warren, Washington, and Wood in the State of Ohio, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1135. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at a meeting of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Americans of the city of Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the local branh of the Lithuanian American Council, on June 10, 1956, to commemorate the 16th anniversary of the forcible occupation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Appendix

A Changing Navy Faces the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the Armed Forces Day ceremonies held at the city of Huntington, W. Va., on May 19, 1956. Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett, Chief of Naval Research, was the principal speaker of the occasion. His excellent dinner address admirably points up the Navy's modern research program and its contribution to our national defense.

The address follows:

A CHANGING NAVY FACES THE FUTURE

(By Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett, U. S. Navy)

Ten years ago the United States was disbanding its Armed Forces as fast as it could. The war was over. Our people wanted to turn all their energies to peaceful pursuits. Yet at the very moment of demobilization the Iron Curtain was being stretched across Eastern Europe and the tensions of cold war were beginning.

The decade that opened with our great victory in World War II soon became a period of bitter disillusion, followed by reevaluation. We realized that freedom, once won, must be continually safeguarded. During those first few years we were relatively strong in one important sense—we had the atomic bomb; the Communists did not. This fact is credited by many with preventing large-scale aggression during that period. We had an effective deterrent.

By 1949 this advantage was wiped out—the Soviet Union exploded atomic weapons of its own. This event was swiftly followed by the invasion of South Korea in 1950, and we had to fight again. Since then the United States has been building up its military strength once more, because force must be met with force. Only those who remain strong can remain free.

The postwar decade was a period of continuous change as we pondered the lessons of World War II and adjusted our thinking and actions to the future. The Nation's basic organization for defense was changed in 1947 with the unification of the Armed Forces. There has been steady adaptation and internal reorganization since, as the military has adjusted its structure and its thinking to the requirements of the atomic age.

Most astonishing of all has been the change in the weapons of war themselves. We are in a revolution based on science and technology and characterized by sharp increases in speed, complexity, and expense.

So, 10 years after demobilization we are still building a new defense structure, because we cannot afford not to. One of the bitter lessons of the 1930's and 40's is the wisdom of preventing aggression through firmness based on strength. If all deterrents to aggression fail, we must be ready to fight, immediately and effectively.

These are the reasons the United States maintains military forces: to deter aggression, large or small, and to win a war of aggression is not deterred. Another lesson the reaffirmation of the age-old military doctrine of surprise. We cannot know what form the next overt act of aggression might take, but we must expect the enemy to try to do what we least expect and are least prepared for. In 1950 we were thinking largely in terms of long-range bombing attacks, and the enemy launched an invasion by land, in Korea. For years we have thought of the Soviet Union primarily as a great land power, and suddenly we realize that it now has the world's second greatest Navy.

We cannot know what sort of action we may have to fight. We must be prepared for anything. This is why the United States maintains balanced forces. We need the long-range, large-scale nuclear weapons delivery capability of a modern strategic Air Force. We must be able to dislodge enemy troops from areas important to us and to repel any land invasion. Therefore we need powerful ground forces—an Army. To project our power across the seas, to be able to fight battles at a place and time of our own choosing, to be able to retaliate quickly from nearly any corner of the globe, to maintain command of the seas, we need naval forces.

The objective of the Department of Defense has been to maintain an Army, Navy, and Air Force equipped to perform the specific missions they have been assigned in the defense of our country. New weapons, and the possibility of newer weapons, have been unfolding at such a fast pace that all the capabilities of any force cannot be defined specifically as an inherent, unchanging thing. Guided missiles and nuclear weapons in particular have opened up new dimensions to be explored, new tactics and even new strategy to be developed. The one constant in future defense planning is change, and each of the Armed Forces is always searching for the best way to keep abreast of future developments.

Our Navy is now in the midst of dramatic sweeping changes. Weapons are changing and new tactics are being molded to take advantage of them. A new kind of military force is being created on a foundation that has remained constant throughout history—the inherent advantage that comes from being able to move freely over nearly 70 percent of the globe, and denying that freedom to the enemy.

First, let's look at the Navy's job. We have four assigned missions.

1. The security of overseas transport. We must have command of the seas so that we can join our strength with those of our friends and allies. The United States has entered treaties and commitments with 62 nations spanning 5 oceans forming an oceanic federation. These are the NATO alliances in Western Europe and the SEATO alliances with our friends in southeastern Asia. We must always have free use of the seas to supply our great industrial machine with the more than 60 critical and strategic raw materials that come only from abroad. We must be able to transport our armies across the seas and keep them supplied.

2. Seaward extension of continental defense. The Navy shares with the Air Force and the Army the responsibility for defense against attack through the sea approaches to this continent. The first threat is long-range air attack. Far out at sea, Navy radar picket ships and submarines are watching for the first sign of enemy bombers headed for the American continent. Their job is to help head off the attack before it takes place. The second threat comes from guided missiles launched from submarines and surface ships. The Navy has built up a defense network against these sneak craft that includes surface picket ships and submarines, and air-borne antisubmarine equipment.

3. Amphibious operations. This is the means by which the power of the fleet is extended to allow our forces to establish and maintain a foothold in almost any area in the world. The ability to mount a successful amphibious assault allows us to fight where we choose, on the enemy's ground.

4. Naval striking power. The heart of this power is the fast carrier task force. Highly defended with interceptor planes and missiles, the jof of the task force is to roam the seas, ready to strike at the enemy on a moment's notice. It can launch air raids, bombard installations on shore and inland with guided missiles, and support amphibious landings. Nuclear powered missile carrying submarines and large jet seaplanes will soon add new dimensions to the Navy's ability to hit the enemy on his own ground, with speed and surprise.

These are the Navy's assigned missions. As the world situation changes, one or the other may require more or less emphasis. As technology advances and new weapons appear, the methods of carrying out these missions change.

In different eras seapower has appeared in different forms—first oars, then sails, then steam. Sweeping new developments have altered navies almost beyond recognition, and now we are on the verge of changes that can make naval power more formidable than ever in the past.

"Flexibility" is a word that is closely woven into Navy thinking. We look at the operating Navy itself as a flexible weapons system, capable of carrying out a wide variety of missions in different ways to suit the time and the circumstances.

When the fortunes of war and diplomacy left thousands of anti-Communist refugees stranded in North Vietnam, the Navy was able to come in and move them southward, to freedom. This was the "Passage to Freedom" operation, a humanitarian act that must have gained us many friends in Asia.

When aggression threatened in the Formosa Strait, the United States was represented by the firm hand of the 7th Fleet, on the alert, ready for instant action, free to go or to stay, as we chose. We needed no one's permission to say, since the 7th Fleet is not based on foreign soil; its domain is the high seas.

The southern flank of NATO's defenses is protected by the 6th Fleet. This powerful force has cruised the Mediterranean for several years. It shows the flag, to our friends and to our potential enemies. At an air show in Paris 2 years ago, European newspapers reported the most impressive event. The sudden appearance of a flight of Navy jet fighters that had roared off a carrier deck in the Mediterranean, flown overland to Paris, circled over the air show and flew back to their base—at sea. The long arm of naval striking power was evident to everyone at the show. And this powerful fleet that has represented us in southern Europe and northern Africa is based not in Italy, not on Malta,

not in Algiers or Morocco—its home base is Norfolk, Va.

If cold war should turn to a brush fire or an all-out clash, the Navy is ready to switch from diplomatic missions to large-scale attacks, troop-carrying, amphibious assaults, pinpoint interdiction missions, submarine raids, or whatever the situation should require. We are a flexible force.

"Flexibility" also describes the Navy's overall attitude toward its organization, its weapons and its tactics in battle. It can adapt to changing external conditions. It constantly looks for possible internal changes that will lead to a more efficient, harder-hitting fleet.

This attitude of flexibility is stiffened and given substance by a set of firm naval principles. The first is that the Navy's overall job is to secure and maintain control of the seas, as an indispensable condition for victory in any kind of a conflict. World War II was almost lost at the outset when German submarines nearly grasped control of the North Atlantic. We were able to campaign in Korea because the Pacific was ours, to ship troops and supplies to the battle area without serious challenge.

Following from this first principle are the ideas that command of the seas stems from mobility, from superior striking power and from superior staying power. These are the things we are really after when we work for new developments for the Navy. No matter how much the weapons change, these will still be the elements of victory for naval forces.

Working from these fixed principles, the Navy has brought continuous change in the methods of sea-based warfare, and has brought new kinds of warfare into being. These changes have all contributed to a major aim of American military strategy: keeping war away from American soil.

The First World War saw the rise of the submarine, and naval efforts revolved to a large extent around efforts to combat it, and keep supplies moving.

World War II brought submarine warfare again, and the totally new concept of aircraft carrier task forces dominated naval warfare in the Pacific. Fighters and bombers flying from floating airbases that could move to nearly any corner of the globe introduced a new element in warfare. In the dark days of 1942, when we were still on the defensive, the Japanese homeland was raided by General Doolittle's bombing planes. He flew from "Shangri-la," the deck of an aircraft carrier far out at sea. This was only the first hint of the great carrier sweeps to follow. A new cycle of change had been produced by the Navy and a new dimension was added to sea power. Techniques were developed for refueling and resupplying the carrier task force while it was at sea, so naval staying power—the ability to stay on and fight indefinitely—was also increased.

The fighting in Korea proved that the principles of sea power were still sound. They demonstrated again some of the advantages that can come only to the Nation with command of the seas—the ability to move large forces overseas and keep them supplied; and to furnish air strikes where they are needed, immediately, to cover landings and harass the enemy's railroads and troop movements. Throughout the war, carriers, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers cruised the waters around the Korean peninsula, furnishing air support and shore bombardment as they were needed.

In pondering our commitments in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization we should remember that Europe, too, is a peninsula, especially if you turn your map on end and look at Europe the way it is seen from Moscow. It is a much bigger peninsula than Korea, but the naval weapons of today have a much longer reach than the ones that did so much damage in Korea.

The Korean war saw naval aviation take a major step forward with the introduction of jet aircraft to combat operations. It marked the real close of the World War II era, and the beginning of a new cycle of change that is now in full swing. It epitomizes the Navy of today. This Navy is what we call the "fleet-in-being," the force that is cruising the high seas at this very moment, ready to go into action.

What does this fleet-in-being look like? It is composed of fast carrier task forces, equipped with sturdy *Essex*-class and *Midway*-class carriers. These are ships of World War II design. Many of them are veterans of historic engagements, in that war and in the Korean war. Jet airplanes fly from their decks. Converted cruisers and destroyers with modern sonar and radar, and radar-picket submarines make up the protective screen. New and converted snorkel-equipped submarines add to the offensive power of this fleet. It is a powerful, rugged fleet, built largely around World War II ships, but with hundreds of improvements, alterations, and advanced new equipments that represent the best in postwar technology.

Now we are entering another era of change, an era that will greatly alter the appearance and the effectiveness of our Navy. It is an era with potential advances for many years to come.

The shipbuilding programs begun 5 years ago have been steadily delivering carriers, cruisers, submarines, destroyers, landing ships, and auxiliaries of advanced design, to replace the veterans of the fleet.

The *Forrestal* is operating with the fleet. She is the first of a class of new carriers that will form the heart of the jet age carrier task force. She is designed to operate with the best jet aircraft now coming off the drawing board. She can launch planes twice as fast as our present carriers, and can launch and recover them at the same time.

New naval aircraft to fly from these decks are on the way. An entire family of new, different types that represent a new era in design are moving up to join the fleet. These are the swept-wing and delta-wing fighters and interceptors that can crack the sound barrier in level flight. When the alarm sounds, an advanced interceptor like the F4D Sky Ray or the F8U Crusader can be catapulted from the deck and reach 10,000 feet in 1 minute—less time than it takes most aircraft to get off the ground. We have a fast, jet-powered medium bomber, the A3D, that can be catapulted from a carrier deck.

The swept-wing, delta-wing era of turbojets that is now coming in will eventually be superseded by a new cycle of change. Our current basic research and exploratory development programs indicate that we can continue to develop new and extremely advanced types of aircraft. Rocket-powered interceptors are in the future, and nuclear power for aircraft shows great promise. Guided missiles will play a steadily growing role in the future of the Navy.

The first guided missile ship, the *Boston*, is now at sea. She will eventually join a task force, as the herald of a new era in fleet air defense. Current shipbuilding programs, and the request now before Congress, include 9 guided-missile destroyers and 7 guided-missile frigates, plus conversion of 5 cruisers and 1 submarine to guided-missile ships.

The undersea arm of this present day fleet consists of many attack submarines, and others that function as radar pickets, undersea tankers, troop carriers and missile launchers. We have submarines designed specifically to hunt down and kill enemy submarines. This is an effective submarine force, although we wish it were larger, as we think of the potential of the 400 submarines in the hands of the Soviet Union.

The cycle of change that is just now hitting this undersea fleet of ours is nothing short of a revolution. For here we have the first application of nuclear power to propulsion. Our first nuclear submarine, *Nautilus*, is a record breaker, as I am sure you have read. Her log already shows 34,000 miles without refueling. It is hard to digest at once the implications of a ship that can travel for months, and for thousands of miles, without once showing herself above water.

Soon this potent new weapon will be joined by a sister, the *Sea Wolf*. Six more are now being built and another six are planned.

Next on the list is a nuclear-powered guided missile cruiser. The request for funds for this ship is now before the Congress, and we hope to have her operating within 5 years. We are asking for funds to complete final development of a reactor for an aircraft carrier. Our experimental program on reactors for surface ships involves five different types of reactors now under development.

The ultimate goal is to have all Navy combat ships run by nuclear power. When this goal is reached it will mark the closing of one of the greatest cycles of change in naval history, a cycle that has just begun. And by that time, I am certain that we will be embarked upon still newer programs, of a kind that we cannot even foresee today.

If nuclear power personifies fundamental change in the Navy's ships, the change in the Navy's weapons is personified by the guided missile. Both are just beginning to enter the fleet. Both open the way to new dimensions in tactics and strategy. Both are major advances, typical of the revolutionary thinking we have come to expect in this post-war decade.

Five major Navy-developed guided missiles are in production. The surface-to-air missile, Terrier, will be the armament for the *Boston*. Terrier will be followed by another antiaircraft missile, the Talos. Talos will have longer range, but, like Terrier, is designed to be launched from the deck of a ship, against incoming aircraft.

Sparrow is an air-to-air missile, designed for our fighters and interceptors to take into battle against any enemy bombers and fighters. As these missiles move in to take over the job of fleet air defense, the five-inch antiaircraft guns aboard our ships will assume the role of a close-in, last-resort weapon.

The fifth Navy missile now in production is Regulus, a bombardment missile. Regulus can be launched from a surface ship or from a submarine, to hit shore targets such as cities and submarine pens, or to support an amphibious landing.

This change from guns to guided missiles, from high-pressure steam to nuclear power, from subsonic to supersonic jet airplanes is the vanguard of far-reaching changes in this fleet-in-being that is on guard today. Now concepts in aviation, in surface ships, in undersea warfare, in amphibious operations, are unfolding as new equipment moves from the scientist's blackboard to the engineer's drawing board, to the factory, to the fleet.

Now, let's have another look at the jobs the Navy is called upon to do, and see what impact these new developments will have. We have been working to bring about these changes not just for the sake of change, but to create a Navy that can carry out its missions faster and better.

First, we are better prepared to safeguard our overseas supply lines. Destroyers and destroyer escorts of the latest design are joining the fleet.. Their job is to hunt down and destroy the enemy submarine. Advances in electronics have led to significant advances in sonar and radar detection gear, and our new destroyers will be fitted with these devices and with new antisubmarine weapons. They will work in close collabo-

ration with the new hunter-killer submarines, and will be assisted by helicopters and blimps capable of towing sonar gear. Long range patrol planes will criss-cross the sea lanes, on the lookout for submarines.

Amphibious operations—The goal of developments in this field is greater surprise and speed. We are on the verge of sweeping advances. We want to swarm over enemy positions in a matter of minutes, rather than hours. This means bringing troops and equipment in by air as well as by sea. Now amphibious tactics are being developed, using new kinds of equipment, to achieve this goal of envelopment in three dimensions.

Assault helicopters and logistic seaplanes that can land troops and material directly on the beach and inland, and new high-speed landing craft based on new design principles are entering the picture. Heavy offshore bombardment by guided missiles is another new factor in amphibious operations.

To carry out our role in continental defense, new developments have extended the range of our electronic eyes and ears. Sonar and radar equipments have longer range and can provide us with more positive identification. Aircraft like WV2, a highly modified version of the Constellation, are now operating successfully with long-range radar equipment. These aircraft carry 6 tons of electronic equipment and a crew of 31 technicians. Their high speed and altitude enables them to spread a search over a large area, to spot farway objects and pinpoint their distance, course, speed and altitude. Surface ships and submarines must also perform this sentry duty far out at sea, since they can stay on station in weather that would make air operations extremely hazardous.

If a contact is made with unidentified aircraft, naval forces on the spot would go into action immediately. Guided missile crews would man their stations. All-weather interceptors would catapult from carrier decks, guided to their targets by radar, lock on the target and release their missiles.

Now, a fourth mission—those tasks to be handled by the striking power of the Navy. This is the naval ability to hit back at the enemy, to carry the action to his doorstep. I mention it last because naval striking power is a many-sided concept. It is prepared for many different tasks and it employs a variety of means. It is a complex, but potent, system. At its heart is the fast carrier task force.

The carrier task force has always been a lethal-weapons system, capable of ranging far, hitting hard, and presenting an elusive, shifting target. The task force, as we have known it for the past several years, is a force able to steam rapidly to any portion of the earth's surface that is covered by water, then unleash its bombers to strike targets up to 600 miles inland, or harass armies in the field. The bombers and carriers can then rendezvous far out at sea, at a spot unknown to the enemy, ready for a strike again the next day, and the next, at different targets and from a different quarter.

This force is highly mobile. It can roam the seas for months, then strike with little or no warning, with hundreds of jet bombers, and swiftly disappear, to prepare for another attack.

It is self-sustaining. The carrier task force can cruise and fight indefinitely, hitting target after target, without ever returning to a land base.

It has tremendous defensive power. The carrier task force is the most heavily defended target that an enemy air, surface, or undersea craft can tackle. It is defended by its own cover of fighter planes, by the concentration of fire power of the guns and torpedoes of its cruisers and destroyers and by antiaircraft fire from the carrier itself. Now, guided missiles are being added to this firepower. Attacking a carrier from the air means running a gauntlet of 100 miles of concentrated antiaircraft and missile fire. Attacking from beneath the sea means running a gauntlet of torpedoes and depth charges from ships listening, with sensitive sonar, for the approach of any submarine.

The aircraft carrier would certainly be one of the costliest targets that an enemy could attack. Yet he cannot ignore it without risk of sudden disaster at home.

This is the striking power of the carrier task forces in existence today. Now, picture the added punch of a similar force propelled by nuclear power and armed with offensive guided missiles with nuclear warheads. Here is a new factor in warfare: the mobile nuclear retaliatory force, ready to strike the first counterblow if anyone attacks us. It is a floating platform for launching fast jet bombers or intermediate range guided missiles. Every 3 minutes its position has changed by 2 miles, so the enemy cannot zero in in advance with ballistic missiles.

Naval striking power has other dramatic new aspects. The P6M Sea Master, our new high-speed jet seaplane is a type with great potential as an offensive weapon. It could be based in remote inlets and lagoons, supplied by submarine and be as free from the possibility of detection as any major weapon yet devised. Yet it can carry a heavy load swiftly, over a long distance.

The nuclear powered submarine can be another offensive weapon. Armed with guided missiles, it could cruise indefinitely, within striking range of hostile targets. Such a submarine could surface briefly at night, launch its atomic warhead missiles, and withdraw.

This great striking power is a real deterrent to aggression. The existence of such a powerful weapons systems places enormous burdens on anyone who hopes to attack us, or invade the territory of our NATO and SEATO allies. His land commanders must scan the skies to seaward, watching for well-dispersed attackers with greater mobility than his own forces. He cannot base his plans on his ability to knock out prelocated facilities—he must include the time necessary to locate our task forces, then attack with weapons useful against moving targets. He has the burden of continual surveillance of a vast area of sea against the danger of an atomic attack from sea-based aircraft or missiles, teamed up with submarines.

This growing naval striking power forces any potential enemy to increase the complexity and quantity of weapons he needs to contend with our forces. The stress which this imposes on his economy, his industry, his military experts and manpower can do much to weaken the structure of any military plan, or blunt the will to engage in such competition. This is cold war in its essence. It forces an enemy to face the reality of what it will cost to win a military victory.

The American military program for national security is based upon this concept of developing weapons systems so effective that the enemy will be deterred from an attack, because he knows that to attack is to court disaster. Naval striking power and the advanced weapons systems developed by our sister services are part of the balanced forces being forged as a deterrent to attack on our country.

I have tried to give you a look at a changing Navy, as it faces the future. We are proud of our past, and the naval traditions it has bequeathed us. We live in the present, ready for any assignment on a moment's notice. And we believe in the future.

In the words of the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, "We are determined to do our job. We are confident that we can do it. We know that together with our wonderful Army, our Air Force, and our gallant Marine Corps, we are ready to maintain our country's honor, prestige and security against all enemies."

The American Police—Problems and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the Police Chief magazine of June 1956 a well-written and significant article by my long-time friend and former schoolmate, Royce L. Givens, now the secretary-treasurer of the National Conference of Police Associations. Policeman Givens also serves as legislative representative for the International Association of Policemen and is well known by many members of the Congress. Policeman Givens' article sets forth the high standards of ethics and practice of policemen, as well as some of the legislative objectives of the conference, indicating the emergence of policemen as a profession.

Believing that this article is worthy of wider review and consideration, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE AMERICAN POLICE—PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS

(By Royce L. Givens, secretary-treasurer, National Conference of Police Associations, Washington, D. C.)

In his excellent book, the Trouble With Cops, Albert Deutsch rightly points out the excesses that result when an apathetic community fails to secure for itself an efficient and honest police force. But Mr. Deutsch also points out that there are thousands upon thousands of honest and efficient policement in the United States, dedicated to their sworn duty to protect life and property and to preserve the public peace, and ready to lay down their lives in pursuit of that duty.

To cite instances of corruption, as was done in the London, England, press, while overlooking Deutsch's mention of the many acts of kindness, courtesy, and courage that are a daily practice in police routine, as well as the startling progress being made toward professionalizing the American police, is a distortion of Deutsch's intentions in my opinion and the product of poor reporting.

Naturally, in a field so intimately tied to a community's health and well-being, any instance of a policeman betraying his public trust is shocking and reprehensible. But such examples should not be allowed to obscure the positive efforts being made by American citizens and police officials.

A combination of causes contribute to making the performance of police work difficult in the United States. Seldom in history have so many people of varied beliefs and modes of conduct gathered in so complex a social structure. The variety of religious and political creeds, national origins, and diverse cultures is matched only by the variety of ideals, emotions, and conduct found in its individual citizens.

Police administration today is complicated also by many factors that did not exist 100 years ago. The urbanization of population, improvements in transportation and communication, and dislocations caused during World War II and the Korean conflict, have fostered a shifting population group which at present still lacks the community roots that provide a desirable control for those who lead more settled lives.

American police problems date back to our earliest governments, and have been complicated, in part, through inactivity and neglect. The original settlers were too busy subduing a continent to give much thought to the nice distinctions upon which successful police administration often hinges, and according to the late Bruce Smith, one of our foremost authorities, "probably did not even become aware of the existence of a police problem * * * until the growth of great cities was well underway."

Police systems can be said to have "grown up with the country." Since that growth was extremely rapid, police service in the United States has never really had an opportunity for orderly and consistent development. It is only during the last 20 years that a significant number of American police agencies have been able to report excellent progress.

At that time able administrators began appearing in various parts of the country whose activities served to attract a new type of recruit to police service. This informed and vigorous leadership has gradually produced not only a new standard of management, but an increasing proportion of intelligent, trained, and hopeful members of the rank and file. The best police forces have captured the imagination of millions of youths, thus providing an opportunity to raise the quality of recruitment that will assure the police future as nothing else can.

In city after city and State after State, one finds competent police administrators who have exercised control over their respective forces for a period sufficiently long to have made their influence felt. Rising sometimes from the ranks, or appointed from fields related to police work, they represent an improvement over the past when police administrators often were politically appointed without adequate preparation of either a general or technical nature.

Coupled with this movement is the brilliant record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the emergence of a dozen or more State police forces of outstanding quality, and the striking reversal of old police patterns in many cities and villages. These physical evidences of a radical change in police thought and action are the more remarkable since our country has the most decentralized police system in the world, and there is no central authority to set and exact compliance with the latest standard of police service. But as Bruce Smith remarked in a special issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, devoted to new goals in police management, "precept, example, and a widespread desire to emulate have combined to produce a result so striking that one may doubt whether it could have been achieved in any other way."

The trend toward a professional police service has been aided by the growing recognition by States, counties and municipalities that capable men must be adequately paid. Liberal pension programs, progressive pay plans, a shorter work week, fair promotions, and equal opportunities under civil-service regulations, have helped to attract men who are well adapted to the special requirements of police duty.

For the unusual opportunities and temptations presented to policemen, and the grave nature of the responsibilities imposed on them and the authority that is theirs, requires men of above average intelligence, ethics, and emotional stability. It is the growing prominent of such well-qualified men which has stimulated much of the concentrated effort, within police ranks, to raise the professional standards of law enforcement.

Recognizing that the high regard the public has for the established professions like law and medicine is the result of years of effort by its early practitioners to develop a professional ethic, professional techniques, and improved performance, police organizations such as the National Conference of Police Associations are working to define similiar standards for themselves.

In cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the NCPA is drafting a Code of Ethics which sets forth in detail those acts which will be deemed proper and improper. And realizing that a code is useless unless all policemen share a sincere desire to abide by it, the committee is preparing a training syllabus on law-enforcement ethics for use in the curriculums offered by the various police departments and universities. At the present time, 22 colleges and universities give 2- or 4-year courses which lead to certificates and degrees in police administration and police science.

In general, police training in America has greatly increased in quantity and improved in quality during the past few years. One of the most significant trends has been toward in-service training programs. These consist either of institutes of a few days to 9 monts' duration in which officers devote full time to a course of study designed to fill specific training needs, or of a series of classes offered by local undergraduate colleges during policemen's off-duty hours. The latter type usually permits the accumulation of credits toward a degree.

The Delinquency Control Institute at the University of Southern California, and the Southern Police Institute of the University of Louisville, are two relatively recent ventures which are pioneering in new concepts of police training and philosophy.

Supported by the Carnegie Corp., the Rockefeller Foundation, ond the city of Louisville, Ky., the Southern Police Institute gives advanced training to 25 ranking law-enforcement officers 3 times a year. Each officer selected to attend the 12-week semester—mainly from departments in the southern part of the United States—is given free tuition and a scholarship to cover living and travel expenses. In addition to courses on police organization, crime detection, and traffic control, the students examine psychological, psychiatric, and socio-economic studies that relate to police work. Because of community sentiment that police officers must be equipped with skills and attitudes conducive to good human relations, particularly in situations involving racial tensions, the institute has developed special techniques for calming disorders resulting from disagreements between various racial, social, and economic groups.

The Delinquency Control Institute is the result of joint planning by school and law-enforcement officials and provides courses in sociology, recreation, education, law, social work, and administration. Its tuition-free, 12-week course is available to qualified officers anywhere in the country. The courses, utilizing field trips and seminars as well as regular classroom instruction, are taught by outstanding specialists with many years of experience in working with delinquency problems.

Institutes such as these are designed to train key leaders in local police departments, who, in turn, may be assigned to pass along their knowledge to fellow officers. An example of this is the juvenile aid school operated by my own department in Washington, D. C., which recently completed its first term following the attendance by two of our officers at the Delinquency Control Institute.

In addition to the above types of training, there are the educational programs offered by the National Police Academy of the FBI, by numerous local police departments, and through traveling instructors furnished by State departments of education. No police force is too small to receive such on-the-spot training from these traveling teachers who carry with them visual aids and other equipment. Training for recruits also is given by a growing number of colleges, and includes not only the normal police subjects, but related academic subjects, such as English composition, municipal government, constitutional concepts, public relations, and sociology.

At the same time schools like New York University are developing graduate level police administration curriculums, while a number of progressive police departments—Milwaukee and Detroit, for instance—have been experimenting with the apprentice, or cadet, plan. By catching the interest of young men just graduating from high school, and giving them employment and training as police apprentices, this method enables police officials to observe and control their activities during these formative years and select only those for permanent appointment who show aptitude for police work.

Improved personnel techniques are likewise contributing to the professionalization of police work. Widespread establishment of merit systems that provide minimum entrance requirements with higher intelligence and educational standards, through recruiting campaigns, written examinations, physical agility tests, medical examinations, and character investigations, are doing much to insure that policemen are properly qualified for their jobs. Psychiatric examination—first advocated by August Vollmer, the father of scientific policing—also is receiving responsible consideration as an essential part of police recruitment. The practice of holding nationwide competitive examinations to fill the position of police chief has become commonplace, while preemployment residence requirements for police candidates has been substantially relaxed in recent years.

The many police professional organizations that exist at national, regional, and State levels, and the social and benefit organizations frequently maintained by local forces have, by their effort to improve policemen's work and pay conditions, also demonstrated their value in discovering and correcting morale-destroying influences.

These groups also are working to increase the prestige of police officers in the public's eye. They realize that only when our police obtain the public confidence and the popularity that their British counterparts now enjoy, will conditions favorable to the best performance of law enforcement be achieved. Through the efforts of the NCPA, self-regulatory groups in the publishing, motion picture, radio, and television industries have agreed to eliminate derogatory depictions of police work.

Organized public opinion is another increasingly positive force. Public indignation over the conditions exposed by the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime ran high throughout the country. This indignation was expressed at the polls in municipal elections where existing political regimes were overthrown and police officials exposed as corrupt were subsequently replaced. Civic leaders in numerous localities began forming citizens' crime commissions. During 1951 the Chicago Crime Commission received over 400 inquiries from citizens in every part of the United States requesting information regarding formation of similar groups. The Chicago commission, which had long been calling attention to the problem of organized crime, became a focal point of citizen efforts to eradicate bad conditions which had arisen in their communities. Recently its director, Virgil Peterson, was elected president of a National Association of Citizens' Crime Commissions.

In the aftermath of the Senate committee's hearings the American Bar Association recommended passage in each State of a model police council act under which police inefficiency anywhere in the State becomes the responsibility of a permanent agency con-

cerned with the improvement of police administration.

The work of these influential groups and the promotion and support of local efforts by the Department of Justice has done much to concentrate public opinion on the problem. It is because of these efforts and achievements that I think it justified to conclude with the prediction made in 1951 by O. W. Wilson, former chief of police in Wichita, Kans., and present dean of the School of Criminology at the University of California, at Berkeley. "The next 50 years," Wilson said, "will see the American police emerge as a true profession."

Can Our Potomac Flow Clean Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following news item entitled "Can Our Potomac Flow Clean Again?" which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, June 3, 1956:

CAN OUR POTOMAC FLOW CLEAN AGAIN?

The Jesuit missionary who discovered the Potomac 300 years ago called it "the greatest and sweetest river I have ever seen."

The subsequent growth of a large metropolitan area on the banks of Father Andrew White's stream has changed it, however, from a great and sweet river into a problem in pollution control.

The problem has defied solution through piecemeal methods for many years. But in a few days the House Rules Committee will hold hearings that could lead to a new approach—to a sweeping, areawide attack on Potomac pollution.

The measure due for consideration by the House rules group next week is the amended Federal Water Pollution Control Act, nationwide in scope. Sponsored by Representative BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, it provides for $25 million in Federal grants to State and interstate agencies toward covering the cost of water-pollution programs. Perhaps, more significantly, it would authorize up to $500 million in grants to both States and interjurisdictional agencies and municipalities toward actual construction of waste-treatment plants.

DISTRICT WOULD BE ELIGIBLE

The District as a State would be eligible, with Maryland and Virginia, of course. The bill is regarded as an excellent stimulus to river cleanups here as well as in pollution plagues throughout the country.

In short, the Blatnik bill seems to hold a promise that the people here may someday be able to rediscover a clean Potomac—a river that could be Washington's greatest recreational asset.

It could be an asset as valuable as Denver's mountains, Minneapolis' lakes, or Atlantic City's beach.

An enticing picture of what the Potomac could mean as a local and national playground was drawn by the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 2 years ago.

BOATING COULD DEVELOP

Boating, the equal in variety and beauty of any in the country, could be a charming recreation. The gorge above Chain Bridge is unusual in geology and lush in plant and bird life. Historic sites and loafing areas are handy to the shore. Couples in canoes and families in rowboats continue down the lazy river past old Georgetown, the fascinating industrial area near there, the botanic and wildlife retreat of Roosevelt Island, past the Lincoln Memorial and the parklands that line the river, past yachts, big and small, in the Hains Point area, and on past Alexandria, Fort Hunt, Mount Vernon, and all the woods and stately homes that overlook the stream.

Fishing could never equal that of the Columbia River because there aren't too many varieties of game fish that naturally haunt the Potomac. But shad, herring, and perch, and the rough carp and catfish could provide sport and relaxation for lazy athletes. The good fishing sites are numberless.

Picnicking, hiking, bird watching, nature study, horseback riding, camping, bicycling, and lolling on the grass could attract numbers that never would be able to crowd into Rock Creek Park.

COULD EQUAL A PARK

It all adds up to this: Persons who live in the Washington area and hundreds of thousands of persons who come here every year for visits could find in the Potomac the equivalent of a great national park.

The hard reality of today is a different story, however. The Potomac is dirty. Everyone knows it's dirty. Persons longing for a place to relax stay away.

How was Washington's great recreational asset lost?

It was lost through its use as a sewer. Pollution has ruined fishing, halted swimming, made boating dangerous and picnicking on its shores unpleasant.

One hundred billion gallons of raw and partially treated sewage flowed into the Potomac last year, according to best available estimates. To get an idea how much that is, use the Washington Monument for a measuring stick and lay out a giant cube, one Washington Monument length high, wide, and long.

The amount of sewage poured into the Potomac last year would fill that cube—77 times.

SILT VOLUME IS LARGE

To complicate the sewage problem, the river also receives an average of 2 million tons of silt every year. That's enough dirt, sand, and gravel to fill the Capitol Building to overflowing and almost bury the dome.

The effect of pollution is to kill the fish life, provide a breeding ground for harmful bacteria and drive away the public.

Communities in this area have always sent their sewage into the Potomac or its tributaries. The practice was hard to criticize when it started. A large river can purify itself if given a chance. Any other disposition of wastes would have been prohibitively expensive in those days.

Some 90 years ago, however, engineers began to give the river a little help by treating the sewage. Basically, the operation is simple. Solids are settled out of the water, chemicals are added to neutralize any impurities that are missed. The relatively clean water is sent into the river—which can handle the rest of the cleaning job itself.

GROWTH TOO FAST

That is the theory. In the Washington area however, as in many others, population has run away from sewage treatment capacity. An estimated 10 to 20 percent of the sewage is not treated at all. The rest gets only partial treatment. The river is too choked with wastes to do its own cleanup chore.

A score of treatment plants have been built in the area, and more are planned, but their capacity never catches up with the burgeoning population.

Here are a few examples of how existing facilities fall short:

The largest treatment plant in the area, Blue Plains, at the southern tip of the District of Columbia, provides at best only 30 to 35 percent treatment, but during heavy load periods, that effectiveness drops to around 15 percent.

Alexandria does not treat any of its sewage, nor do some other small communities in the area.

The Bladensburg plant, designed to settle out 30 to 35 percent of the solids, is operating about 5 million gallons daily above its capacity, while another 10 million gallons of raw sewage have to be diverted into the Anacostia River, from which it flows into the Potomac.

Only one major plant, at the Pentagon, gives consistently complete treatment. It settles out about 90 percent of the solids, about as good as engineers can manage.

WIND STOPS FLOW

The Potomac problem is further complicated by the peculiar nature of the river flow. Sometimes it doesn't flow at all. On a summer day when the river is low an upriver wind can stop the Potomac in its bed.

On a normal summer day the river carries the wastes a few feet downstream, and the tide carries them a few feet back. Sometimes it takes a drop of water 40 days to move from Three Sisters Island to Fort Washington.

Thus a once great and sweet river has been lost to the people of Washington.

And barring a new approach to the problem, the future is even bleaker. Although almost all jurisdictions are spending large amounts of money for additional sewage treatment, population is expected to outrun sewage-handling facilities even more in the future.

The Burroughs Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of setting the record straight, I want to include in my remarks the text of a letter I have received from Edward Littlejohn, director of public relations for the Burroughs Corp.

On May 23 one of my colleagues, the Honorable JAMES UTT, caused to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his views in opposition to H. R. 5550, the pending bill to allow United States membership in the Organization for Trade Corp.

My esteemed colleague included in his summation some comments about the Burroughs Corp. and its president, Mr. John Coleman, who recently was named president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The point of the attack upon Burroughs and Mr. Coleman was the allegation that because the company had opened a plant in Scotland in 1949 for the manufacture of calculating machines, the American plant doing the same work was closed, thereby destroying jobs.

The American Burroughs plant which made calculators is located in Plymouth, Mich., which is within my congressional district. Instead of being closed, this plant has twice been expanded since 1949 and its work force has increased almost six times.

These facts can be checked by anyone. The residents of Plymouth, Mich., realize the importance of the Burroughs plant in their social and economic life. My entire congressional district enjoys these benefits in some measure.

Personally, I endorse the position of Mr. Coleman with respect to the need for more trade in the free world. I am happy that he has gratutiously used his time to promote that position, and in the interests of complete fairness to Mr. Coleman, our distinguished Detroit citizen, it is a pleasure to include Mr. Littlejohn's letter in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

BURROUGHS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., June 1, 1956.

The Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: Our attention has been called to an attack on Burroughs Corp. and on its president, Mr. John S. Coleman, by Congressman JAMES B. UTT, of California, printed as an extension of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23.

The gist of Congressman UTT's attack is that Burroughs Corp. has transferred American jobs to foreign lands, and that the corporation has exported technical and managerial know-how, thus spawning foreign competition to our domestic products. In making this charge, Congressman UTT is presumably referring to the establishment of a Burroughs plant in Strathleven, Scotland, and the production there of a line of calculators. In this connection, he quotes the testimony of an unnamed person before the Senate Finance Committee hearings on H. R. 1: "The company appears to have closed down one plant in this country and moved the production jobs to Scotland."

It is true that Burroughs' line of calculators are manufactured in Scotland. It is not true, however, that the corporation has closed down a plant in this country. Indeed, exactly the opposite has happened. In 1949 when the move to Strathleven was made, the Plymouth plant where calculators were manufactured, occupied 498,379 square feet. That plant now occupies 654,877 square feet, and by early 1957 when another new building has been completed, will occupy 840,000 square feet. And far from destroying American jobs, Burroughs has at this same plant increased employment from 587 in 1946 to 3,207 in 1955.

Congressman UTT further accuses the president of Burroughs Corp. of endangering our native business machines industry. In the period from 1946 to 1955, Burroughs' sales have increased from $46.2 to $217.8 million. And let me emphasize that the number of Burroughs employees in the United States has in the same period increased from about 8,500 to 21,182.

Congressman UTT asks what do the moves made by Burroughs Corp. mean for the individual American. The answer to his question is simple. Contrary to the Congressman's implications, they have meant, as the record shows, more jobs for Americans, an increase in the equity of stockholders, and important contributions to the office-equipment industry in research and new products.

The President of the United States has said: "The United States continuously seeks to strengthen the spiritual, political, military, and economic bonds of the free nations. By cementing these ties, we help preserve our way of life, improve the living standards of free peoples, and make possible the higher levels of production required for the security of the free world."

By developing overseas manufacturing and marketing organizations parallel with its domestic expansion, Burroughs believes that in a modest way it is contributing to the implementation of the foreign policies enunciated by the President. And in continuing to do so, the corporation believes that it thus serves the mutual interests of the United States and the whole free world.

In view of the unwarranted attack on a distinguished American industrialist contained in Congressman UTT'S remarks, I respectfully ask that this letter in reply be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD LITTLEJOHN,
Director of Public Relations.

Fluoridation of the New York City Water Supply System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following excellent statement on fluoridation of water by Arthur C. Ford, commissioner of the department of water supply, gas, and electricity of the city of New York:

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY, GAS, AND ELECTRICITY, CITY OF NEW YORK, APRIL 1956

DEPARTMENT'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO FLUORIDATION OF THE NEW YORK CITY WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Under the city charter, the commissioner of the department of water supply, gas, and electricity is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the purity and wholesomeness of the city water supply. The matter of purity has a direct bearing on the people, and involves the determination and evaluation of the tolerance of suspect, hazardous or toxic substances which may, in some manner, gain access to the water supply. Fluoride is a toxic substance.

The department has extensive laboratories staffed by reputable scientists and competent sanitary engineers, with a massive library in which is contained over 5,000 references on the subject of the fluorides alone. We have continued to study and evaluate the effect of toxic substances as related to water supply. The matter of fluorides has been under our scrutiny for over 20 years.

The addition of fluorides to the water supplies is not coupled with the concern of maintaining or improving the quality of the water or making it safe. No one has suggested that dental caries is a waterborne disease or that water is a cause of dental decay. No satisfactory reason has ever been advanced to show why everyone in a community must be compelled to risk lifelong extraordinary exposure to the toxic action of fluorides, particularly when safer, more effective, and more economical ways of administering fluorides for caries reduction in children's teeth have been pointed out and are available.

Whatever the merits of fluoridation, it would not concern us as a department if the question of water supply safety were not involved. But we are concerned and our concern is primarily with the safety of the water supply for each and every individual of our entire population of 8 million people throughout the city.

We are aware that the fluorides are extremely toxic substances, and evidence exists to show that even at the recommended level of one part per million of fluoride in drinking water, people in fluoridated communities have been harmed. A very small percentage among a population of 8 million, sensitive to the chemical and adversely affected, would constitute a seriously significant number of persons harmed.

We know of reputable, independent medical authorities throughout the United States and in the local area who have found evidence of fluoride damage to persons living in fluoridated communities. These medical authorities disagree with the fluoride hypothesis, and they have raised grave questions with respect to the safety of the procedure for an entire population which includes the young, the old, the susceptible and the infirm as well as the healthy.

No one has made a claim that the ingestion of fluoride can be of benefit to the teeth beyond the formative years of childhood. Because of this, and for reasons of safety and economy, this department has proposed that the city distribute fluoride tablets through health stations, free of charge, for parents to administer to children. The cost to the city, ascertained at less than 25 cents for a thousand days for each child, would be less than one-fifth of the cost of a fluoridated water program. Tablets (a pharmaceutical grade in contrast with the commercial by-product used in water fluoridation) would provide an exact procedure, under control, to be taken only by those during the formative period of their teeth.

Fluoride, besides being a toxic substance, is not all excreted when taken into the system, a significant percentage remaining cumulatively. Fluoridation of the drinking water at any level of concentration is a very indiscriminate procedure since children drink widely varying amounts of water, each according to taste, physical activity and seasonal variations of the year. The daily intake of one child often differs greatly from that of another who may drink milk, fruit juices and soft drinks in abundance.

How then, will each child receive his appropriate share of fluoride when each drinks widely different amounts from the same source of water having a given concentration in parts per million of fluoride?

The problem of managing the control of dosage of fluoride chemical to obtain uniformity throughout a grid-work of more than 5,000 miles of pipe and tunnels involving different sources and pressure gradients, as in the New York system, is formidable. None of those who have made statements to the contrary have ever had the experience nor do they possess knowledge of what the exact result would be. Our concern and responsibility in the department is to provide the people of our city with a dependable supply of the purest and safest water possible. No one can guarantee similar safety to all the people in the city of New York under a program using the water supply as a fluoride vehicle.

Unfortunately the forum on the subject of fluoridation is not as open as it should be, even among professions. There has been too much of emotion, blind following and lack of objective thinking by too many people on both sides of the question.

The people of the city of New York are entitled to know the risks they are being asked to assume before endorsing a program involving so many questions yet unanswered.

ARTHUR C. FORD,
Commissioner.

The Road to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the eminent columnist and news analyst, David Lawrence, which appears in the June 15 issue of U. S. News & World Report. The article entitled "The Road to War" succinctly reviews some of the failures of the League of Nations and some more recent failures of the U. N., pointing a parallel of mistakes leading to war. While I do not always agree with Mr. Lawrence, I feel that his comments are most thought provoking and should challenge the thinking of our officials of the State Department and those immediately concerned with matters of policy in foreign affairs. I believe this article is worthy of the earnest consideration of all of our leaders.

The article follows:

It's the 1930's all over again.

Then, the League of Nations faltered by failing to enforce an economic embargo on Mussolini in his war of aggression against Ethiopia.

Today, the United Nations has failed to enforce an embargo on shipments of war materials to Red China, though the government at Peking was formally declared by the U. N. in 1951 to be an aggressor in Korea.

When Mussolini saw the League of Nations unable to enforce its own embargo in 1935 and 1936, he was encouraged in his aggression—and so was Hitler. As a consequence, in 1939 the world was at war.

Today we are witnessing a strange parallel. Great Britain, a member of the U. N., has broken ranks by consenting to the shipment of rubber from Malaya to Red China. Promptly the Indonesian Government, also a member of the U. N., announced last week that what Britain had done meant that the U. N. embargo was no longer in effect and hence she, too, now will ship rubber to Red China. Indonesia is the largest producer of natural rubber in the world.

In the 1930's Italy could not have waged war without oil and war materials from the Middle East and this hemisphere. The ministries of Great Britain and France floundered. They passed the buck to the United States by trying to give the impression that, because this country was not a member of the League of Nations, no embargo could be effective. But the late President Roosevelt advised them that he was willing to act separately to enforce the embargo in accordance with a then-existing law passed by Congress.

The truth is that London and Paris weakened at the critical moment in the face of economic and political pressures from within. This enabled Mussolini to win his war in Ethiopia. Taking advantage of the breakdown of allied unity, Hitler began building up his war machine and his stockpile of strategic materials with shipments from the West that were permitted up to the very eve of the outbreak of World War II.

But rubber in unlimited quantities is now to be shipped to Red China and, if the embargo imposed by the U. N. is to be wilfully disregarded by its own members, all strategic materials soon will be exported to the enemy. For Red China is still an unrepentant enemy. No peace treaty has ever been signed in Korea, and the terms of the armistice agreement there are being violated every day.

History tells us that, as the moral force of the League of Nations went to pieces in the 1930's, the statesmen of the West resorted to the direct approach in diplomacy. They fraternized with the aggressors and exchanged many trade missions and visits of high officials. The cry in Britain and France was, "You can do business with Hitler." And in September 1938, at Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier proclaimed that peace in our times had come at last.

But the dictators also turned then to the direct approach and won Stalin's help, first with a neutrality pact and then later with an agreement giving the Nazi armies a free hand in Western Europe without immediate fear of a second front.

Today, Khrushchev has won Tito, of Yugoslavia, and Nasser, of Egypt, and Nehru, of India, to the cause of neutrality. This means a free hand for Soviet Russia in the Middle East and in southeast Asia. What a feat of military strategy.

We may ask ourselves whether the dictators in Moscow and Peking now may take the risk of encouraging some of those so-called smaller wars which can bring on a world war. Hitler, too, was confident that Britain and France would not fight to save Poland in a small war. Must we again expend human lives to disprove a fatal miscalculation by dictators?

This is a dangerous time in world affairs. The Communists see a divided alliance in the West, a collapsing U. N., a faltering NATO, and now a faltering SEATO as the faith of our allies in the western Pacific is shaken by the unfortunately phrased remarks of the White House press conference last week which had the disastrous effect of encouraging the neutralists in Europe as well as in Asia.

Will the dictators in Moscow see the coming months as a time to solidify their internal situation by seeking new conquests in the international field?

It is a dark prospect for the world. Overnight the chances of involvement in a world war have been increased. For as the disarmament intrigue progresses, it is possible that both sides will agree never to use nuclear weapons. Then conventional war could be thrust upon us as Soviet Russia's master stroke.

Whatever kind of war is threatened, the American people, through wise statesmanship, can and must be protected against its outbreak. Responsibility for carrying out that objective rests as much upon London and Paris as it does upon Washington.

War materials must not be shipped to the aggressors. We have kept the faith. But last week's news of the breakdown of the U. N. embargo was, indeed, ominous.

International Trade Union Activity: A Vehicle for Greater World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following conclusion of an article entitled "International Trade Union Activity: A Vehicle for Greater World Security," by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, in the Labor Law Journal, December 1955:

To an even greater extent than before World War II, the ICFTU is free of sectarian political allegiances, including as it does trade unions allied with Socialist movements, others which are free of political entanglements, and still others which maintain strict neutrality. They are bound together by a dedication to trade unionism, determined to fight for the right of individuals to social justice, work, and choice of employment, security of that employment and their persons, and mutual protection of their interests through forming and joining trade unions which shall be free bargaining instruments and which derive their authority from their members and democratic means of changing their government.

The movement for greater world security has derived great strength from the individual national trade unions and, significantly, from the international movement. They have encouraged and supported national defense. But their primary contributions have been made in other areas. Within their individual countries, they have fought for better terms of employment, higher living standards, greater security, and full employment, as well as advancing free collective bargaining. These achievements have removed despair and have inculcated hope in the mass of workers. Immediate economic objectives rather than elusive political changes hold the attention of the trade unionist. These efforts have solidly arrayed the workers in most countries against the Communists. In nations like France and Italy, where benefits have been slow and meager and inequalities have not been substantially eradicated, the fight is still on. Progress is being made as unions exact real economic gains and governments correct the basic sources of inequality and discouragement.

Fighting communism in unions: The Communist movement in most sections of the world has been routed or is in retreat in its efforts to win over the workers and capture the trade union movement. As in this country, the task was not simple. Its agents had infiltrated many unions during the war. They had established incontestable records in the undergrounds of many free nations. They held on during the early years of the war. In 1948, they were expelled from the CIO. The British exorcised them with less formal means. The formation of the ICFTU in 1949 dates the emphatic severance of the Communist groups from the free trade union movement.

In the few areas where the Communists still dominate, they have been exploiting the issues of colonialism—as in Malaya—or poverty, unmitigated by determined efforts to relieve distress and plan for greater economic well-being—as in Italy, France, and South America. In Morocco and Singapore, they capitalize on nationalist sentiments. Successful free unionism, able to bring benefits either through direct negotiations or political reforms, has been a true bulwark against such infiltration.

The ICFTU has determined to assist workers in other lands to form and strengthen their unions. Encouragement and financial and technical assistance to weak unions have been a central responsibility. An interregional fund of $1 million has been planned for this venture.

These efforts have not been uncontested, since Communist organizers have been found everywhere, seeking to infiltrate into national unions and capture them. The preeminence assigned to this objective of building unions and ridding them of communistic influence is further illustrated by the action of the ICFTU executive board prior to the Vienna Congress, in appointing a director of organization with responsibilities

for "planning, encouraging, and assisting in the formation of unions in areas where they do not exist; strengthening affiliated organizations where they are weak; and planning for concerted, continuous activities to combat and eliminate the totalitarian menace and to promote the influence of free trade unionism as an organized movement." The American Federation of Labor has, for the first time, also agreed to merge its world efforts with those of the ICFTU, so that they will be fully coordinated and unified.

These programs will not merely build free trade unions but will also contain and eliminate Communists from trade unions and other worker activities. As they are destroyed in these sectors, their basic support is undermined, and they will have to rely on less certain elements, such as fanatics, nationalists, peasants, intellectuals, and the footloose.

Present channels of assistance: To operate effectively in this assistance program, the ICFTU maintains central activities in Brussels and also has regional organizations for Latin America, Asia, and Europe. In addition to the agencies in Calcutta and Mexico City, offices have been set up in Singapore, Chile, Brazil, Accra, Nairobi, Tokyo, and Barbados. Staffed by local men, they are aided in some cases of special difficulties or limited experience by trained trade unionists from outside the area. These help to establish educational centers for the training of new leaders recruited from the ranks of workers, provide specific assistance as needed and coordinate unions in the area. Individual, veteran trade unions have been sent on special assignments to Asian, African, and Latin American countries to assist workers to build stable unionism and effective collective bargaining.

Roving representatives cover vast areas of Asia and Africa, collecting information on industrial and economic conditions, and encouraging the struggling unions with helpful advice. Recently, special assignments have been made for Turkey, Kenya, and Indochina. In Europe, the ICFTU has assisted in unifying the trade unions in Greece and has helped to bring together the non-Communist unions in Italy. As a result of a survey of plantations in Asia and West Africa, a special committee has been appointed for organization, and a special representative operates for this group from Singapore.

Publications have appeared in the four official languages, English, French, German, and Spanish. Special weeklies or other printed literature have been developed in Japan, West Africa, South America, Arabia, and Asia in native languages. Strikers in these nations have been helped through relief and grants—for example, the contributions sent to the striking Japanese miners and silkworkers, the northern Rhodesian copper miners, and the East German rebels of 1953.

These efforts have been supplemented to date by the special activities of the AFL, CIO, and the British Trade Union Congress. The AFL has carried on worldwide activities with special representatives, particularly in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The CIO has had people in Europe and Latin America. The BTUC has been most active in the British Commonwealth, particularly in colonial regions. While the American trade unionists have been useful to unionists employed by American subsidiaries abroad in facilitating understanding and better relations between emloyers and workers at the private level, the BTUC has been most helpful in getting better relations with the British Colonial Office. Union representatives from colonial territories have been encouraged at international conferences to voice their views and positions.

Defense and attack: The ICFTU has been the zealous defender of free labor and free unions and has pushed hard for international opinion to effect liberation of trade unionism in nations where it is repressed, suppressed, or under governmental domination. It has presented before the United Nations an exposé and careful documentation on the extent of slave labor in the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Soviet satellites, with the result that slave labor has been condemned by UNESCO.

The International Labor Organization has appointed a special committee to conduct inquiries into the freedom of worker and employer organizations from government domination and control. The ICFTU led the opposition to Franco Spain's request for admission to the ILO. Its boycott of the Caracas conference of the ILO petroleum industry committee because of that country's persecution of labor leaders and unions, followed by the expulsion from the country of the worker-member of the ILO government group, led to the adjournment of this conference and the subsequent resignation of Venezuela from the ILO. This helped focus world attention on the suppression of workers' right to organize in that country. The admission of Yugoslavian unions by two trade secretaries has been widely protested as out of keeping with the concepts of free trade unionism. It protested the imprisonment of Moroccan unionists and the denial of trade union rights to African natives in the Union of South Africa.

Supplementing the efforts of the ICFTU are the activities of the individual trade secretariats, of which 19 are affiliated with the ICFTU through a liaison committee. These range in size from the International Metal Workers Federation, with 5 million members, to the International Federation of Free Teachers Unions, with about 100,000. These secretariats work closely with the ICFTU, but are concerned with the promotion of industrial interests and standards. They have been particularly useful to the individual national unions in helping organize, fight for standards, and solve difficult industrial issues. They have arranged for the free interchange of information and membership.

Presentation of labor views: If strong, free trade unions, working effectively in the workers' interests, are a primary tool for developing progressive nations and a bulwark against Communists, the ICFTU also serves to reinforce these moves by its representations to and activities with international bodies. The workers' point of view is presented vigorously in a well-documented manner and their representatives are coordinated in a united determination for improvement.

Since 1919, the international trade union movement has served to coordinate efforts and opinions of workers' delegates from all nations before the International Labor Organization. This activity has helped to assure continued worker support for the agency and pressure for more significant achievements, and to keep governments behind the agency.

The ICFTU has a consultative position before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Its representatives have presented its views. It has applied pressure for the principle of full employment and specific measures to achieve it, such as higher wages, increased social security benefits, low-cost public housing and public works. It has supported programs for technical assistance and economic development. The movement for a Covenant on Human Rights secured its wholehearted endorsement, as did the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. Its representation in UNESCO has provided active leadership in the field of workers' education.

The ICFTU has been most active in the continental agencies for Eurpoe, Asia and Latin America. Not only does it maintain contacts with them, but it is also a participant through representatives on a number of them. It has a majority of the members of the workers' consultative committees in the European coal and steel community. Its former president was a member of the high authority of the community.

Support of democracy and self-determination: The ICFTU has, of course, played an important role in promoting distinctly political causes. It has condemned the racial discrimination practiced in the Union of South Africa, supported various peoples in their efforts for national self-determination, and urged quicker liberation and self-government for other colonial peoples. No issue has commanded more interest than that of peace. The "joint harnessing of atomic energy for peaceful purposes" was foremost among its resolves in Vienna.

In its May Day manifesto the ICFTU declared: "We of the free labor movement stand for real international cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding problems by peaceful means. So long as the Communist governments refuse to release their political prisoners, grant the workers the right to strike, allow genuine trade unions to operate, restore the liberty of speech, press, and assembly, then Communist talk of 'peaceful coexistence' and 'unity of action' must be treated as show sham and hypocrisy. Let the democratic nations set their own house in order. Full employment must be secured. Wages and working conditions must be brought into line with the ever-increasing production possibilities of modern industry. Housing and social security must be improved to correspond to the real needs of the people. Nor must the special needs of the economically underdeveloped countries and the striving for self-determination of the non-self-governing territories be forgotten.

"Let the strong help the weak. The free trade unions have set a magnificent example to the nations of the world by their unstinting support of the ICFTU efforts to assist the trade-union movements of the world's economically underdeveloped areas.

"Workers in the dictatorship countries, your elementary labor and human rights have been ruthlessly trampled underfoot, but the ICFTU has not forgotten you. We are hoping and planning for the day when you will be able to rejoin the international family of free labor."

American foreign-relations policy: No discussion of international trade-union activity should omit a description of the part played by these organizations, its membership and leadership, in the promotion of a sound American international policy and practice. Both the AFL and CIO have actively fought for the major planks of recent American foreign policy, such as the U. N., the Marshall plan, the defense of Korea, NATO, economic and technical assistance, reciprocal trade, and other measures designed to advance world security and economic activity. If anything, the trade unions have tended to criticize the present administration for being too conservative in the amounts it has allotted to the economic-assistance programs and for stinting in its support of the Charter on Human Rights and the fund for the financing of the improvement of underdeveloped countries. Trade-union leaders have advocated the cause of constructive international programs before their members, Houses of Congress, and the public.

In the administration of a number of these programs individual unionists have been added to the Federal Foreign Service to perform essential duties which few other groups are as well equipped to discharge. Many are now labor attachés in our foreign embassies. Others are labor advisers in specific aid programs. Still others perform other assignments of a nonlabor character, for which their special background, experience, and

training have particularly qualified them. Many trade unionists have been sent abroad on special missions to establish contacts with peoples in other countries.

The trade unionist in our Foreign Service enjoys the advantage of having easy access to the trade union and labor movements of these countries. If his bona fide character is established, and his truthfulness and trustworthiness are confirmed through experience, he can help overcome the prejudices and suspicions among trade unionists and labor leaders in these countries. He can help open their eyes and minds so that they may objectively consider our American position. The existence of many labor or socialistic governments throughout the world makes this contact particularly important.

The benefits of our industrial system and the description of its operations are more easily understood and believed when described by these men than by political leaders. American capitalism and democracy are more frankly discussed by the foreign intelligentsia, nationalist political leaders and academic progressives with a trade unionist, because they recognize in him a spokesman of the underprivileged rather than the vested interests. Moreover, they are likely to approach one who has an innate understanding of, and is fundamentally responsive and sympathetic to, the longings and activities of the disfranchised, the dispossessed, the underpaid and the repressed. The trade unionist will not only know the facts and react to the conditions, he will also comprehend their special speech, no matter what their language may be.

Through their participation in the international trade union organizations such as the ICFTU, the Trade Secretariats and the ILO, American unionists are also performing yeoman services in presenting our American points of view and explaining them to these organizations. The result has been a gradual shift in emphasis to immediate economic improvements, greater democratic rights and individual human rights. The battle with communism is now conducted openly through an accent on deeds rather than the sophistry of political argument.

In the United States, the trade-union movement has a special responsibility for developing among its membership and the general public a better understanding of the foreign labor, democratic and nationalist progressive movements. Through intimate contacts wtih these foreign groups, trade unionists can help the American people identify the adventurous and reactionary groups who pose anti-Communists but whose real ambition it is to substitute new personal dictatorships for the current ones. American trade unionists are beginning to understand developments in the rest of the world, and they can share their findings wtih other Americans. As a nation we must all develop greater tolerance for the institutions and goals of other peoples. We desired it for ourselves in our days of growth.

The President and Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE PRESIDENT AND MR. DULLES

There is only one subject of public interest and that is the rate and the character of the President's recovery. On that his doctors alone are qualified to speak, and they have done so not only in reassuring but indeed in enthusiastic terms. Later on, however, after he is out of the hospital and has had time to try himself out, it will be the turn of the President himself to speak. Until then, the country must once again resign itself to a period of uncertainty.

Had the President not been stricken, there would be many subjects of great public interest. One of them is the sharp conflict on neutrality between what the President tried to say in his press conference on Wednesday and what Mr. Dulles said in his speech at Iowa State College on Saturday. This conflict is all the more surprising in view of the fact that at the press conference the President promised that Mr. Dulles would make it all very clear "so that we can all understand what it is we are trying to do in waging the peace." What Mr. Dulles made clear is that he and the President do not think alike, or perhaps we should say that they do not feel alike, on the subject of the nations which refuse to join our military alliances.

For the President, who remembers our own history as a neutral in respect to the alliances of Europe, it does not seem immoral, or necessarily unwise, if a nation prefers not to aline itself in a military pact. For him, such neutrality does not mean indifference "as between right and wrong, or decency and indecency."

But for Mr. Dulles, who is in one of his sternest and most righteous moods, neutrality among military alliances is "except under very exceptional circumstances * * * an immoral and shortsighted conception." This is a rather sweeping generalization in view of the fact that in Europe it covers Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland, not to speak of Austria and Finland; and in Asia it covers India, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia; that in the Middle East it covers all the Arab states except Iraq; and that if one looks into the fact it would cover a lot of Latin America.

What has brought about the Eisenhower-Dulles muddle is that apparently uncontrollable itch in high quarters to utter resounding generalizations. Why was it necessary for the President to discuss neutrality in general and abstract terms? Why was it necessary for the Secretary of State to speak on the subject as if from a mountain top? Do other heads of state and other foreign ministers anywhere feel that they must generalize and declare moral judgments about the policies of other governments? Why then must we suffer this recurrent affliction in Washington?

The essence of the problem of neutrality and alliances is that it is the problem of each sovereign state, and that there is no general rule. What is best for some states is not necessarily best for all states. The vice of the Dulles position is that it presumes to judge and condemn on general grounds the policy of many states with whom we have no quarrel, who have done us no injury, who have as much right as we have to join or to refuse to join particular alliances. Mr. Dulles should know that his sweeping moral judgments will win him no allies but can alienate many friends.

The occasion for these untimely and dangerous utterances is that certain of the new military alliance—particularly the Southeast Asia Treaty and the Baghdad Pact—are causing so much trouble that a reappraisal has become necessary. The President's friendly remarks on neutrality reflect one aspect of this reappraisal in which he has undoubtedly been participating. Mr. Dulles' harsh remarks reflect another side of the reappraisal. They reflect the fear that if any concessions, like the President's, are made to neutrality, the whole fragile structure of the alliance will crumble.

The crux of the problem is to find ways of reducing the military character of these alliances and of transforming them into agencies of economic cooperation. The administration has not yet, however, succeeded in formulating such a solution of the problem. Fearing that the existing system of alliances will dissolve before a new system of cooperation can be worked out, Mr. Dulles is for public purposes—let us hope for public purposes only—grimly standing pat on the pretense that the whole policy is firm and is in no need of serious revision.

Could Your GI Baby Born Abroad Be President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, the able Washington correspondent of the Detroit Times, Don O'Connor, acquainted the readers with a situation that I have sought to correct through a proposed amendment to the Constitution. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article: Was Your GI Baby Born Abroad?—He May Not Be Future President:

WASHINGTON, June 9.—It's no longer true that any American boy can climb to the Presidency of the United States if he obeys his parents, studies hard, and has luck in politics.

At least, there is grave doubt here about the status of the tens of thousands of young Americans who were born in the remote parts of the world after World War II—and are still being born in United States garrisons in Germany, Japan, and other nations.

It's a definite handicap to these GI mothers and fathers that they cannot definitely hold out the old White House lure to young Johnny for diligent homework, a clean face, and good table manners.

PROBLEM MUST BE RESOLVED

But the Constitution provides that only "natural born citizens" can be elected President, and no court has clarified the status of the young Americans born in foreign lands.

Because so many children have been born to United States citizens in other lands since World War II, the problem must be resolved some day soon.

It becomes increasingly likely that an American lad now playing on the streets of Tokyo, Naples, Berlin, or some other foreign city may one day be a nominee for President.

Article II, section 1 of the United States Constitution restricts the presidency to "natural born" citizens only. The same restriction applies to the vice presidency. This is the only place in the Constitution where the term is used, and nowhere did the Founding Fathers define what they meant.

The Library of Congress says that actually no case has arisen for application of the restriction, so that the courts have had no

occasion for a definitive ruling. However, the matter is not entirely academic.

In the past few years, several names have been mentioned in the public press as presidential possibilities where the fact of birth outside the country has posed the question of constitutional eligibility. The most prominent of these was Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, a Republican, who was born in Paris on March 28, 1895, of American parents.

HERTER SPONSORS MAPPED PLANS

When it appeared that President Eisenhower might not be a candidate in 1956 by reason of his health, Herter's sponsors mapped plans for securing a judicial decision on whether their potential candidate could be considered a natural-born citizen. Eisenhower's eventual decision to run again made the question moot, but the Library of Congress says:

"The fact that in that particular case the matter was not pursued does not mean that a judicial determination may not be possible, though there is some question about it, and reputable authority can be found on either side.

"Some authorities hold it unlikely that the courts would take jurisdiction, considering it a political rather than a judicial matter; while others maintain it is a legal question."

Some of the questions which constitutional lawyers believe are raised by the vague wording in our national charter are these:

Is there any difference between natural born and native?

Was natural born a familiar expression in 1787 when the document was written, or did it leave even the people of that day in doubt?

Did the writers of the Constitution recognize citizenship as determined by place of birth or by the fact of birth from citizens?

CONGRESS ACTED IN 1790

In 1790, Congress passed an act to establish "an uniform rule of naturalization." It included a statement that "the children of citizens of the United States, that may be born beyond sea, or out of the limits of the United States, shall be considered as natural born citizens; provided that the right of citizenship shall not descend to persons whose fathers have never been resident in the United States."

That act was repealed and replaced by subsequent naturalization laws, and to this day the expression "natural born citizen" has not been used again. Did this language of a Congress contemporaneous with the Constitution represent the general interpretation of "natural born," or did repeal of the law and the failure of Congress to reemploy the term indicate that the lawmakers felt they were stepping out of bounds in so interpreting the Constitution? The Justice Department answers simply:

"We don't know. The law is not clear and it has never been tested."

In 1898, the United States Supreme Court had before it the case of a person born in the United States of alien parents who had petitioned for reentry to this country. The Court held he was a citizen of the United States. But whether the proposition is equally true in reverse—that a person born abroad of American parents is not a citizen—remains a mystery.

CITIZENSHIP IS DEFINED

While the Constitution uses the term "natural born" only once, it does in the 14th amendment define citizenship in these words:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

Obviously this definition does nothing to clarify the meaning of "natural born," and it may well be that unless Congress takes steps to correct the confusion over the point, the courts will be confronted with the problem of whether an elected President has the right to occupy the office.

Stop This Fluoridation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond News Leader, Monday, May 14, 1956, entitled "Stop This Fluoridation Program."

The editorial follows:

STOP THIS FLUORIDATION PROGRAM

Within the past several months, reputable evidence against the fluoridation of public water supplies has begun to mount with astonishing speed.

In the view of this newspaper, the evidence is of so serious a nature that city council should take affirmative steps now to suspend the city's program pending a complete reappraisal of fluoridation.

The evidence we have in mind is not directed toward what might be termed the philosophical aspects of mass medication. We are not here debating the unwisdom of socialized medicine.

What is becoming daily more clear is that millions of Americans have been subjected to a scheme of water fluoridation on the flimsiest pretenses of research and statistics. On close examination by qualified scientists and physicians, the evidence supporting the effectiveness and safety of fluoridation proves to be exceedingly shaky evidence indeed.

Typical of the accumulating testimony now mounting against fluoridation is the recent paper by Benjamin C. Nesin, published in the Journal of the Maine Water Utilities Association in March. Mr. Nesin speaks from a background and a position that command a respectful hearing: He is director of laboratories for the New York City water supply. Hear what he has to say:

"It must be emphasized that the fluoridation hypothesis in its entirety rests on a very narrow base of selected experimental information. It is this very base which is vulnerable to scientific criticism. And it is upon this very narrow base that the very impressive array of endorsement rests like an inverted pyramid.

"It can be shown that long before the special committee of the National Research Council gave its endorsement, serious evidence against fluoridation was already in existence. The validity of this information has been confirmed by subsequent investigations. Had the committee applied the simple concept of factor of safety to their hypothesis, it is clear their proposal could not pass the test as a safe procedure to be used in conjunction with the public water supply."

Mr. Nesin observes that rather extensive and devastating critical reviews of the fluoridation program recently have been published by outstanding scientists. In general, these reviews make four points:

(1) The data submitted by the proponents of fluoridation to prove the safety of the measure is unreliable and contraverted by scientific and medical information on record.

(2) The data submitted to prove the claims related to dental prophylaxis is questionable.

(3) The public water supply is neither a suitable nor efficient vehicle for administering fluoride. Fluoride cannot be distributed by this means without entertaining hazard. The variable consumption of children makes individual dosing unreliable.

(4) There are safer, more economical, and more positive alternate methods available.

Mr. Nesin has made independent studies of fluoride toxicity in his own laboratories. He has studied the mounting evidence of fluoride poisoning. "It is no longer a question of fluoride being toxic when ingested continuously in small quantity," he writes. "This is established. It is possible for an individual living in an area with the water supply fluoridated at the recommended level of one part per million to acquire a chronic fluorosis due to subacute poisoning."

We would urge every reader, and especially every candidate for city council and every member of the city council to read Mr. Nesin's next two paragraphs with care:

"Regardless of the merits claimed for fluoridation in dental prophylaxis, the use of the public water supply must carry a guaranty that its contamination with fluoride could not visit even a minimal harmful contamination upon the consuming population. This does not mean average individuals, but must also apply to the weak, the sick, and the underprivileged. Since water supply is an exceedingly important economic factor in industry and commercial activity we are also confronted with special considerations in these areas. However, the prime test at the moment must rest with the projected safety of the proposal for everyone in the community.

"The addition of fluoride to the public water supply is not concerned with its purification, improvement in quality, or providing an additional factor of safety. No one has suggested that water is a cause of dental caries in children. The essentiality of fluoride as an element in nutrition has not been established, and there is a considerable amount of information which reveals that very low caries rates may obtain in nonfluoride water supply areas. There is no question about the toxic character of fluoride even when ingested in small quantities. It is evident from the proponents's data that the margin between claimed benefit and hazard is extremely narrow, poorly understood, and not compatible with safe water supply practice. No satisfactory reason has ever been advanced why everyone in a community must be compelled to risk a lifelong extraordinary intake of toxic fluoride. Unsuspected and unbridled exposure to fluoride can lead to health hazards and in any event an extraordinary intake increases the risks involved. In the light of existing derogatory evidence, it is not possible to add fluoride to the public water supply at the recommended level and maintain even a nominal factor of safety."

Mr. Nesin's paper is a long paper, thoroughly documented. The evidence he cites of disfigured teeth and possible bone damage cannot be brushed aside as "crackpot stuff," though this has been the defense the fluoridators have relied upon.

This newspaper is a belated arrival on the battlefield of fluoridation. We were thoroughly bamboozled by the impressive array of endorsements offered when Richmond began fluoridation in 1953; to our regret, we endorsed the program at the time. Now the unsubstantial foundation of these endorsement is being exposed; the questionable nature of the evidence is becoming clear; an increasing number of reputable scientists are breaking through the barriers of censorship and are pointing to the grave

dangers involved in adding this poison to public water.

City council has an affirmative duty to obtain such evidence on the other side of fluoridation. Even a few hours of study will convince council members, we believe, that criticisms of fluoridation have mounted to a point where the public interest demands that the program be suspended forthwith.

Natural-Gas Pipeline Operators Still Doing Profitable Business at Same Old Stand, Despite Veto Pipeline Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as one who voted against the so-called pipeline bill, and who also supported President Eisenhower's veto of this legislation, I find the following article in the June 1, 1956, issue of Forbes magazine very interesting and enlightening.

The article follows:

CHANGE OF TUNE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Out of the knockdown brawl to get the Harris-Fulbright bill enacted the pipelines emerged badly whipped. But where are their bruises?)

While the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill was fighting its way through a bitterly resistant United States Senate last year, interstate gas-transmission outfits were sounding strident battle cries in every precinct in the land. Unless the Senate decontrolled the price of gas at the wellhead, they warned, the United States would be in a fine fix for future supplies of the vital fuel.

Pay the piper: Independent drillers, the argument ran, just would not stand for anything that smacked so strongly of creeping socialism as controls did. Not only would they refuse to explore for more gas reserves, but they would either cap their wells and refuse to sell what they had, or sell it within the State where it was produced, thus avoiding price fixing. In any case, the interstate pipeliners would suffer. So would their customers. Instead of getting their gas cheaper, which was what opponents of the bill professed to be after, they would probably end up getting no gas at all.

The bill passed. The President vetoed it. The pipeliners furled their battle flags and retreated silently homeward, stoically resigned to their sad and dreary fate.

But, like Mark Twain's death, reports that gas transmission was a dying industry seem in retrospect to have been "greatly exaggerated." At any rate, there was certainly nothing sad or dreary about the first-quarter statements pipeliners were sending through the mail last month. The fact was, they had never had it so good. Eight of the United States biggest pipeline companies, for example, rang up almost $300 million in revenue, 23 percent more than their totals a year ago. Profits also soared, rising 33 percent to $41 million. Not one pipeliner failed to roll up rousing gains. If natural gas transmission is a dying industry, there are no figures to verify the fact.

Quite the contrary. The evidence last month, and it was impressively solid, seemed to show that the mournful tune the gasmen were piping just a year ago actually was little more than a tactical campaign song.

No sympathy: As things have turned out, almost every turn has set the stage for pipeline profits. Some systems, like Texas Eastern, can matter-of-factly attribute their first-quarter fortunes to heavier demands because of a severe winter. Others like Northern Natural, El Paso, and Panhandle Eastern are collecting higher gas rates under bond. Texas Eastern also upped its profits by merging a producing subsidiary, and is now busy with plans to convert its Little Big Inch to an oil products pipeline. El Paso banked extra cash from its ventures in uranium and mercury. It also rang up larger profits from oil refining and petrochemicals sidelines, as did Tennessee Gas and Panhandle. Across the board, the carriers were receiving benefits from increased capacities and higher load factors.

With 5 months of what almost certainly will be the best year in their history behind them, natural gas men sing a changed tune. No talk of an impending gas shortage. No word of a revolt in the gas fields. Just statistical reports that draw a profile of prosperity.

	Assets [1] (in millions)	Revenues (in millions)		Percent change	Net profits (in millions)		Percent change
		1956	1955		1956	1955	
Tennessee Gas Transmission	[1] $868.0	$65.5	$44.1	+49	$8.1	$6.8	+19
El Paso Natural Gas	757.6	55.6	42.0	+86	7.7	4.5	+71
Texas Eastern Transmission	579.6	44.6	41.1	+9	5.9	4.0	+49
Northern Natural Gas	427.7	34.4	33.0	+4	6.0	5.6	+8
Transcontinental Gas	381.5	24.2	19.1	+27	2.7	2.1	+28
Panhandle Eastern	333.6	30.0	26.2	+14	5.8	4.9	+18
Southern Natural Gas	233.4	21.2	16.5	+28	2.8	1.4	+96
Texas Gas Transmission	215.4	21.3	18.8	+13	2.0	1.5	+35

[1] As of latest report.

Mrs. Green Awarded Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Alaska was honored last month when our colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN, traveled to the Territory to receive an honorary degree from the University of Alaska. On may 14 President Elmer Rasmuson, of the board of regents of America's farthest north institution of higher learning, conferred on Mrs. GREEN the degree of honorary doctor of laws. Thus Mrs. GREEN became the first woman in the history of the university to be singled out for such an honor. Before President Rasmuson and President Ernest Patty, of the university, and all the others who had gathered at college for this memorable occasion, Representative GREEN delivered an address, Alaska and the Future: The Case for Liberalism, which makes a significant contribution to our present-day thinking. I deem it a privilege to be able to include Mrs. GREEN's speech with my remarks:

When President Patty honored me with the invitation to receive a degree with you today and to speak at your commencement, I was greatly pleased. But I was also a little hesitant. For I am not at all sure how much my generation is entitled to give advice to yours. I came today, therefore, hoping you might extend to me the charity Mark Twain once showed toward his father. "When I was a boy of 14," Mark Twain observed, "my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much the old man had learned in 7 years." So I am trusting, you see, in the tolerance of your maturity.

But I had other misgivings, too. From my own student days and from later experience as a teacher I have submitted to a number of commencement speeches in my time. So when I accepted your kind invitation, I did so with a determination to avoid, if at all possible, the pitfalls of the commencement speaker—the rolling rhetoric, the purple platitudes, the temptation to place on your shoulders, already weighed down with a black gown, the responsibility for all the future problems of the world.

Nevertheless, I accepted, because I genuinely looked forward with real pleasure to joining you on this occasion. And being here, in this role, I will inevitably talk about the future—because to young people like you, and particularly you in Alaska, the future is so appropriately the focus of importance.

Yet what led me to the decision that I must after all speak of the future was a journey into the past. Thinking back over past commencements I had taken part in, I could not help contrasting the mood of the thirties, the temper of the times young people were launched into then—and the mood of the fifties, the climate of opinion and action in which you are beginning your adult careers.

The climate of the thirties was a liberal climate—liberalism was the banner of the decade and most young people went out into the world of the thirties marching behind that banner. But the intellectual and practical temper of 1956 is dominated by what I would call the cult of middleism.

Now I want to make it clear that I am not here labeling political parties. Both of our major parties today, I think, are affected by the temper of the "middle of the road approach." But they are reflecting, not creating the larger mood of our society. The cult of middleism, I would say, reaches into every corner of our life—not only our politics but our literature, our social life and social values, our entertainment, our tastes and our fashions. My concern, therefore, is only in part political and, I believe, in no sense narrowly partisan. I am concerned rather with the mood of a nation, in all the manifestations of its life.

This contrast of the climate of the thirties and the climate of the fifties, leads me, to some convictions that have been crystalizing in my mind over several years—convictions that give me a great deal of concern. I should like to share them with you and submit them for your consideration this morning. They take the simple form of two general propositions and a third more specific one that bears on the fact that we are here today at an Alaskan university, honoring a graduating class of Alaska's young people. My first proposition is this: "Middleism" in its present cult is, I think, a snare and a de-

lusion, a social creed without a future, and if I am right, and the pursuit of the middle has brought us to an inert standstill, then we should explore alternatives. And so, as a second proposition, I want to make the case for liberalism—to argue that liberalism, presently in something of an eclipse, is not just the outdated mood of the thirties but the best guide to the sixties—to the years of your maturity—you who are graduating here today. And finally to you, as young people, I want to say that you in Alaska should weigh the case for liberalism with very special interest—for the problems and challenges of your future, it seems to me, call with particular urgency for the liberal approach.

Let me briefly examine these three propositions. I am not, let me emphasize, condemning moderation. We are all moderates; who, indeed, is willing to call himself an extremist? But just because moderation is such a beguiling word, it needs to be examined with some care. There is moderation and there is moderation that is middleism. Before we embrace a particular brand we ought to examine it with some care—approach it, shall I say, with moderation. To my mind there is a great difference between true moderation and the creeping complacency that, far too easily, characterizes the present vogue of middelism.

Middelism, as it spreads its smog over our present-day attitudes, stands immobilized at a mathematical point halfway between two gutters. Now, we would do well to remember, that most accidents happen in the middle of the road. But more important, this attitude is a debasing of the meaning of moderation. True moderation is, indeed, a mean between extremes. But it is not a mathematical middle. And before you can find the mean, you have to recognize what are the extremes.

Let me give an example: Many of you are undoubtedly aware that a hot debate is presently going on over the proposal to provide Alaska with mental facilities to care for its own mentally ill. In the last few months, an irrational, extremist opposition has grown up against this legislation. Now where should a sensible man stand on this issue? Where are the extremes? One is certainly the hate-obsessed groups that call this a plot to create a "Siberia, U. S. A."; who charge that this is a scheme to allow the Governors of Alaska and of the several States, conspiring together, to ship off their political opponents to a million-acre concentration camp in Alaska. Is the other extreme, then, the medical associations, the many Members of the Congress of the United States, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and the leading citizens, in Alaska and the States, who conceived this project, drew up the bill that embodies it, and support its passage? Are these the two extremes? The lunatic right on the one hand and the overwhelming mass of informed judgment on the other, and if so, does moderation require the citizen to stand halfway between the two to take the middle of the road? Is he to believe that the Government, the professional groups, and the citizens supporting this proposal are, say, half-treasonable? What is a compromise on a mental hospital for Alaska—a point halfway between decent medical care and inadequate care? And there are those in Washington, subjected to this barrage of propaganda, who say let's not go to extremes—let's take the middle of the road—let's study this a bit longer.

Perhaps I labor the point. But I must confess, this seems to me the dilemma we are left in by the cult of middleism. For it is a cult that wants to avoid clear-cut decision, that wants always to stand halfway between the points of controversy and try to please everyone. As often as not, this leaves us halfway between sense and nonsense.

This is, I profoundly believe, an insidious and dangerous philosophy and it is much too prevalent today. Its symptoms are everywhere. In their anxiety to avoid the charge of extremism, men rush together to huddle in an indistinguishable mediocrity. We reduce opinion and belief to the lowest common denominator. We banish uncomfortable questions from the realm of public discussion by labeling those who raise them as radicals or traitors. The deadly blight of overzealous Government security programs spreads down into the informal pressures of every community to threaten men whose greatest crime is that, in the distant past, they deviated from mass conformity in opinion or association or action.

Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge was a wealthy patron of the arts and a grand lady, who endowed a chamber music foundation at the Library of Congress. Her son is an eminent violinist and Harvard professor. Yet, after her death, when he had been invited to become a trustee of his mother's foundation, the Library of Congress hastily withdrew its invitation because some said he is a Socialist.

Last year, the Symphony of the Air, under the auspices of the State Department, made a tour abroad that was a great success in building good will for the United States. This year, its tour was suddenly canceled because an unnamed person charged that some of its members were pro-Communist. The procommunism of at least one of them consisted in having publicly criticized our atom-bomb testing program in the Pacific.

Now these are extreme examples. Yet in less dramatic forms, they are repeated daily in our society. Public libraries come under attack for having unpopular books on their shelves—books at least unpopular with certain vigilantes. In Indiana, a woman proposes to banish Robin Hood from children's literature as Communist in meaning. In Illinois, the American Legion finds subversion in a Girl Scout publication. One Southern State passed a law requiring that publishers of textbooks certify not only that the authors were not subversive—but also that the authorities cited in footnotes were non-Communist. This would presumably bar even a mention of Karl Marx from the textbooks of the State.

The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit becomes a best selling novel as the symbol of a mass-produced stereotype of the cult of middleism. The cautious man—the middle-of-the-road man—would do well to read only mass circulation magazines, watch his television set, confine controversy to the merits of big league baseball teams.

Such a trend, carried to its logical conclusion, can end only in a mass of mechanical men, repeating the safe and sterile platitudes of middleism, avoiding like a plague the outer regions where individuality, spontaneity, and originality live.

This pressure toward the mediocrity of the middle seems to me the great evil of our decade. It not only debases art and opinion, public discussion, and practical action, it does something more dangerous—it leads to a dangerous illusion of unreality. Some of its causes seem clear, and at the same time they point the danger. After a generation of struggle and hardship, of war and conflict, many men are tired of the strenuous life. They are tired of difficult decisions, of responsibility, and of sacrifice; they are tired of the unpleasant and often costly necessities the real world has forced upon us. They want, instead, a vacation from responsibility—a life without problems. They would rather take the middle of the road to avoid conflict with extremists at either end. Unfortunately the facts of life have not gone on vacation. The only way, in the middle fifties, that the comfortable illusion of a placid world can be achieved is through an exercise in unreality.

And that, I believe, is the meaning of the cult of middleism. For the cult of the middle is precisely a sedative guaranteed to banish the hard problems of reality and create instead the comfortable and drowsy illusion of unreality. But, unfortunately, the sedative is guaranteed to produce a hangover. If we succumb to the cult of middleism, we are headed for a hangover of cosmic proportions when the facts catch up with us.

Water Lippmann a few years ago wisely pointed out that this illusory moderation is, in fact, not a guide to wise and practical action, but instead only the wishful misconception of men who think "getting along" is the only important thing—more important than where we are "getting along to" or where it will bring us out. It is a product of the illusion that differences of belief and value are not important—that the real issues over which men disagree can be clouded over and dissolved into a kind of porridge of good feeling.

This is a fatal misconception. Differences do matter. What one side is maintaining may be a great deal better than its opponent's position. It does matter whether we build a mental hospital for Alaska or because of wild charges of treason by a small but very vocal minority, play it safe to avoid criticism, we refuse to build one. And building a hospital is more important than coming to some middle ground of compromise with hysteria-mongers who oppose it. It's understandable that, today, most of us are tired of conflict and danger and seek some middle ground of moderation and safety. But as a recent writer has pointed out, "when, as is now the case, the balance of power between the major conflicting groups at the extremes gain disproportionate power simply because they are in a position to upset the whole applecart."

One danger of middleism, then, is that in the "name of moderation," we compromise good sense with the absurdity of the extremes. In our anxiety to avoid discomfort and conflict and criticism we hop from midpoint to midpoint, as the issues confront us, in a path that is not consistent moderation but aimless muddling. The end of such a path is clear—a paralyzed inertia at the center of a swamp of conformity.

This, I submit, is not true moderation. Yet if I read the signs of the times rightly, it is a misconception of moderation that is only too rapidly gaining ground in our country. It leads us in our public life to substitute rhetoric for reality, to gloss over the great problems that confront us with catch slogans and to attempt, by a kind of self-salesmanship, to deal with our problems by illusion rather than solution.

For the fact is, reality does not surrender to rhetoric; problems are not solved by catch phrases. Facts remain facts, and conflict remains conflict. Differences of opinion do matter; and real moderation is not an attempt to disolve difference into indiscriminate compromise. As Charles Frankel says, "Every solution of a conflict between different groups in a society means some rearrangement of the existing balance of power. And in this rearrangement, it is inevitable that some people are going to lose more than others." And I submit—those who want to follow the middle of the road—have the most to lose. What we need today is a little more enthusiasm for differences—in opinion, in clothes, in television programs—a little more honest recognition that there are conflicts of interests and principle—and a little more willingness to face up to the necessity to make hard choices and to tackle tough problems. And that brings us back to the case for liberalism. For the true moderation, I believe is liberalism.

Now I know that liberalism has been replaced in the current vogue, by something that is called "moderation" and is offered as a contrast. I simply do not buy that piece of semantics, no matter how much of a hard sell it is given. I say that, in fact,

today's moderation is coasting on the momentum of the liberal past. And I say that, if we are not to end in a static bankruptcy, it is time we generated a new liberal program for the future.

What can liberalism offer? First, it can offer leadership. A mob is not a community; and a scramble to stay in the middle of the mob is not leadership. Leadership recognizes differences and conflict. What it provides is a direction to move, a solution to difference—and that doesn't mean simply leading us back to the mathematical middle. It means charting a course on the basis of realistic recognition of differences and choice as to the best practical direction in which to go.

Secondly, liberalism can offer leadership because it has some further guide to action than the haven of dead center. It is committed to principles and to goals that give it direction. At the same time, liberalism is truly moderate. For instance, we are dedicated to the liberal goal of giving to all Americans their equal rights and opportunities, regardless of creed or color. But as moderates, we recognize that time and patience and good will are necessary in practice to achieve that goal.

Liberalism, in fact, is a firm dedication to democratic and humane goals, tempered by a clear understanding of practical limitations. Now those who follow the cult of the middle will argue that their uncritical dependence on the patterns of the past is preferable to the bolder willingness of liberalism to open new frontiers. But I am reminded of another observation of Mark Twain's, a little sermon on the value of experience.

"We should be careful," said Mark, "to get out of an experience only the wisdom that is in it and stop there! Lest we be like the cat that sits down on the hot stove lid. She will never sit down on a hot stove lid again, and that is well, but also, she will never sit down a cold one any more either." Middleism assumes that each new stove lid is hot. The liberal approaches each stove lid with an open mind, only being a true moderate, he tests it out first.

Thirdly, liberalism offers a quality that cannot be found in the sterile wasteland of dead center, it offers imagination. The greatest weakness of middleism is that it has no purpose. It is going nowhere and it has no ideas to offer as to where to go. It is trapped in the sterility of its own formula, a prisoner of the midpoint, wherever that midpoint happens to fall. What liberalism can offer in contrast is a willingness to explore and meet the challenges of the future in their own terms. We are in a new time, with new problems, yet still coasting, I am afraid, on the ideas of the thirties. But the ideas of the thirties are not immortal. Having accepted the general principles of the liberal program of the thirties, we argue the details of social security, fair labor legislation, and so on. Yet our debate is only an echo of the thunder of the thirties.

Now these are important issues; I would not dismiss them. But the point is that they are only the residue of the great issues of our past. They are not the great issues of the future. Our future confronts us with new problems, new challenges. How are we to identify and understand the problems of our future—how to meet them? These are questions that are today too little asked, too little answered. They are questions that call, I say, for a renascence of the liberal imagination—the kind of bold imagination that met the challenge of the thirties, brought up to date to meet the challenge of the decades ahead. I think it is a unique strength of liberalism that it has in the past supplied the imagination to deal with new problems. In the tides of time we have used up the imagination of the past. We need today a new liberalism.

The shape of this new liberalism is, I think, emerging. Let me point to some evidence. In the thirties our great problems were elemental—the basic wants of housing, food and clothing, of a decent living and a reasonable security against personal catastrophe. Those problems have by no means completely disappeared for all our people. But the broad lines of solution have long since been laid down and we have made great progress along them. Today, for most of us, our future needs and wants go beyond basic and personal material necessities. As our wealth increases, we move toward new and previously undreamed of levels of income and standards of living. The pattern of our wants shifts. It is becoming plainer all the time that our great needs in the years ahead are likely to be community needs, calling for cooperative effort. While we have constantly added our new cars, television sets, household appliances, and other conveniences, some important things have been comparatively neglected. There is a growing concern today with the condition of our schools, our highways, our hospitals. With the growth of leisure and the resources for more recreation, we become more interested in the possibilities of our great national parks and forests, our community recreational facilities, our theaters, our museums.

Yet as we have grown wealthier, a smaller and smaller share of our income has gone for these things. The fact is, in the midst of plenty, we have neglected some of our most important needs. Our schools are a vivid example. We are confronted today with the consequences of years of neglect—a school system overcrowded and partly obsolete, teachers underpaid and in short supply.

Now these are only suggestive of the issues of our immediate future. But they indicate something of the nature of the problems we face. And they contain puzzling questions that we have not yet answered, for which our past experience provides only limited guidance. Many of these problems lie in what Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has called "the public sector" of our life. And, they call, in his terms, for a "rehabilitation of a sense of the public interest" as contrasted to private interests. To a certain extent, it is clear, we need to shift some of our emphasis and some of our income from our purely private, purely personal wants to our more public, our community needs. Here are problems that are not answered simply by government, or by government spending. They reach down to every level of our society, and they call for a response by all of us—through government, through our personal activity, in our groups and associations. There, in brief, is the case for liberalism, as I see it: the challenge of new problems, the need for new vigor and new ideas to meet the future ahead of us. It calls for imagination, for a realism willing to face facts, pleasant or unpleasant, to choose and discriminate among differences of interests rather than glossing them over, and for a leadership informed by liberal goals and tempered by true moderation. These qualities, I believe, liberalism has.

I would expect this Alaskan audience to be more than ordinarily receptive to the case for liberalism—both because of your own tradition and because of the special circumstances of your own future. Alaska has a great liberal tradition. One of the first acts of its first legislature, back in 1913, was to establish woman suffrage. The same legislature initiated a pattern of labor legislation, carried on in later years, that put Alaska in the liberal vanguard in its social responsibility toward its working people. Alaska, in 1949, enacted a law requiring equal pay for women for equal work—a step forward that has not yet been accepted by the Federal Congress.

A special word is in order for Alaska's new constitution. It has been widely praised, and properly, I think, as a thoroughly enlightened achievement. The thinking that produced it is as good an example as I could ask of what I mean by the liberal imagination. And the constitution is a fitting climax to Alaska's liberal tradition. And may I say that I think Ernest Gruening's keynote speech at the constitutional convention is one of the finest speeches I have ever read.

Alaska, in very special degree, needs a liberal approach to its future. The generation that is present here today in the person of this graduating class will be the generation of Alaskan statehood. For statehood is coming—must come and I hope soon, and I for one will watch with interest and concern to see if the Tennessee plan hastens that day. In spite of the disappointments and the broken promises, the facts of Alaskan progress will be irresistible and must be recognized and accepted in statehood. But Alaska as a State has before it a future that is not only big with promise, its promise is encased in some very new and very special problems.

Alaska has been a sleeping giant, just now waking to its enormous potential. Its resources of coal and oil and other minerals are only beginning to be explored. Its resources of soil and subsoil have barely been tapped. Farming, livestock raising, mining have great promise for the future. The wealth of your forests is only now being unlocked, with the first pulp mill recently constructed near Ketchikan. Furthermore, thanks to a wise liberal policy of conservation and planned foresight, your resources will have an orderly development, instead of the wasteful exploitation that has blighted so much of resource management in earlier American experience.

These are only a few of the facts that suggest the enormous potential of Alaska's future. But I would be less than candid if I did not acknowledge the problems that complicate your future. Alaska is big—one-fifth the area of the 48 present States—and its climate and terrain complicate its problems of bigness. Alaska is not 1 region but 3, and its differences, the peculiar problems of its differences, present real difficulties. Thanks to climate and to the character of some of its industries, your economy is greatly affected by seasonal employment and seasonal fluctuation of activity. Your highway communication, however promising, cannot bear all the burden of your future. Modern communications have brought Fairbanks closer to New York, today, than was Chicago a generation ago. Yet the fact remains that Alaska is remote and, to a degree, isolated from the rest of the continental United States.

I do not cite these considerations in a spirit of pessimism. I acknowledge them only as challenges. Like all problems, they contain hidden opportunities. But they are problems and they must be faced if Alaska is to grow. They call for planning, for vision, and for cooperation. They call for a leadership and imagination that can go beyond past experience into new fields. You will not get that kind of leadership and imagination from the cult of static, unimaginative mediocrity. You will get it from a moderate but dynamic liberalism.

It seems to me, indeed, that to inventory Alaska's problems and its future, however sketchily, is to make the case for liberalism. For the kind of leadership Alaska needs is liberal leadership; the kind of imagination Alaska needs is liberal imagination. Your future needs a congenial climate for individualism and the kind of encouragement to diversity of ideas and efforts that individualism breeds. But it needs, too, a climate of cooperation. Much of the basic development of Alaska will call for community effort—to develop electric power, to build communications, to encourage and promote the large-scale investment that development needs. The record demonstrates, I think, that liberalism, not timid "middleism," is the basis for such bold efforts, both individual and cooperative. Your native people, many of

them making the drastic leap from the primitive to complex modern society in one generation, need sympathy and understanding and help in making that adjustment. They will get that help, the record shows, from liberalism.

If Alaska is to progress, it needs the kind of confidence and vision that is willing to invest now for the sake of the future, and that believes that when all of us as a nation invest in a region, like yours, that we all, in the long run, benefit. It needs a strong conservationist policy, dedicated to sustained-yield treatment of renewable resources. It needs government dedicated to wise and careful development of the vast treasures of your public domain, careful to guard against its capture by shortsighted exploiters. On the record, you will get these qualities from liberalism. You will not get them from the compromisers of "middleism."

A generation ago, Alaska was an outpost of civilization. Today, in the swift movement of global development, it lies at a crossroads of the world.

So I think it particularly appropriate, today, to put the case for liberalism to the bar of your judgment. For all of us, escape from the atrophy of the cult of "middleism" is of great importance. But Alaska has a special stake in the revival of a true liberalism. I hope and trust that in your generation the challenge will be accepted and that, through you, there will grow the new liberalism in which Alaska may flourish.

Commemorative Stamp for Amelia Earhart Putnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention on a number of occasions that no official Government recognition has been bestowed upon the late Amelia Earhart Putnam for her many contributions to the development of aviation in this country.

Since Miss Earhart was a native of Atchison, in my home district of Kansas, I have urged that a commemorative stamp be issued by the Post Office Department to honor her for her pioneering role in aviation. This honor would renew in our national memory the courage and daring of Amelia Earhart and would express a nation's gratitude for her contributions to our welfare and advancement.

I believe sincerely that few women of this century deserve so completely the honor of a commemorative stamp as does Miss Earhart. Her achievements in aviation were phenomenal. She made history as the first woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean. This she accomplished in 1932 and in so doing established a new trans-Atlantic record time of 13 hours and 30 minutes.

At one time Miss Earhart held the altitude, speed, and distance records for women in aviation. She became the world's No. 1 woman flier, and has to her everlasting credit an impressive list of "firsts."

First woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean.

First woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean alone.

First person to fly the Atlantic Ocean alone twice.

First woman to pilot an autogiro.

First person to cross the United States in an autogiro.

First woman to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross.

First woman to fly nonstop across the United States.

First woman to fly from Hawaii to the United States.

In March 1937, accompanied by a navigator, Miss Earhart started on a flight around the world. She flew from California to Hawaii, where the flight was interrupted when her plane was damaged as she took off from Honolulu on the second leg of the journey. Undaunted, she returned to the United States and prepared for another attempt to fly around the world.

On June 1, 1937, again accompanied by a navigator, Miss Earhart took off from Miami, Fla. She flew south to San Juan, P. R.; to Surinam, Dutch Guiana; to Brazil; across the Atlantic Ocean to Africa; across Africa to the Red Sea; along the Arabian coast to India; across India to Calcutta; to Rangoon; to Singapore; to Java; to Port Darwin, Australia; to Lae, New Guinea. On July 2 she took off for Howland Island, a tiny speck in the vast Pacific Ocean. Between 2:45 a. m. and 8:44 a. m. the following day the Coast Guard cutter *Itasca*, on watch for the plane near Howland Island, picked up a number of garbled messages which indicated the flight was in trouble. The plane was never seen again.

Amelia Earhart had flown more than three-fourths of the distance around the world when she disappeared. She was not quite 39 years of age, having been born July 24, 1898, at Atchison, Kans. The whole world watched and listened while hope steadily diminished for the safe return of Amelia Earhart and her navigator. It was difficult for the American public to believe Amelia Earhart was forever gone.

Although her most ambitious venture ended tragically, Miss Earhart displayed, in addition to the necessary high technical aptitudes for flying, courage and resourcefulness of the first order.

Amelia Earhart's activities outside her career in aviation also was distinguished. Few are aware of her untiring devotion and hard work in a hospital during World War I. She spent a number of years working in Boston and New York settlement houses and conducted English extension courses for Boston University in industrial communities in Massachusetts. She abounded in enthusiasm for the progress of women toward economic and political independence and equality. She worked tirelessly for the abolishment of laws which discriminated against women and she was vitally interested in careers for girls.

Miss Earhart wrote of her experiences in settlement work in these words:

The biggest job of the social worker is to give boys and girls the experience that will keep them young and that will inspire a zest for life.

That phrase would seem to reflect a shining quality in Miss Earhart's own personality. Although she received the homage of the world, she remained a modest, dignified, and charming woman to the end.

In reviewing Miss Earhart's many contributions to aviation, we should not overlook her interest in the scientific aspect of flying. She became a consulting member of the faculty at Purdue University, specializing in aeronautics and careers for women. In 1931, she married publisher George Palmer Putnam, who never dissuaded her from her interests in aviation.

Amelia Earhart can be counted among America's pioneers in science, medicine, industry and exploration. It cannot be questioned that she brought merited glory to her country, not only as the world's chief woman flier but as one of the world's chief fliers. She was a stirring example of devotion to a cause larger than individual ambition or personal safety.

The spirit, the personality and the courage of Amelia Earhart should be singled out as a model by which future generations of Americans can pattern themselves. A commemorative stamp would be a highly appropriate memorial to Miss Earhart and to the traditional pioneering spirit which has been instrumental in making our Nation great.

Miss Earhart's achievements certainly merit her the honor of a special stamp. Furthermore, such a stamp would serve to further bring aviation to the public mind. I think one would not be amiss to say that such could be considered in the national interest. The interest in the stamp is not local.

The Ninety-Nines, Inc., the International Organization of Women Pilots, has adopted the Amelia Earhart commemorative stamp program as a project of the national organization.

The National Flying Farmers has expressed their keen interest in the stamp. This is of special meaning to me because I took part in the first organizational meeting of the Kansas Flying Farmers at Hutchinson.

The Honorable EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, has stated that he favors the issuance of this stamp.

Mrs. E. E. Kaufman, president of the Women's National Aeronautical Association of the United States, Inc., Raton, N. Mex., has written me to the effect that her organization is supporting the project.

Mr. Al Bennett, editor of the Atchison (Kans.) Daily Globe, says:

It was her courage that broke the barrier for women pilots everywhere. It was her contagious smile that won friends for aviation, and for America, on the airstrips of Europe and Asia.

Amelia Earhart was the Nation's Lady Lindy. A commemorative stamp issued in her honor seems a fitting and proper way to indicate her country's appreciation and gratitude.

Last year Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, introduced a joint resolution providing for the issuance of such a commemorative stamp. Both Senator CARLSON and Senator SALTONSTALL have urged the Post Office Department give early consideration to this matter.

Arthur Godfrey manifested his interest in this vital project by informing his many viewers and listeners on his daytime TV and radio show of the proposal for a special stamp on behalf of Miss Earhart.

Mr. Leo Pusch, president of the Kansas State Junior Chamber of Commerce, has indicated the interest of the Jaycees in this worthwhile project. He states that the "young men of action" feel such a stamp is important to remind our Nation of one who added much to our heritage.

Mr. J. E. Schaefer, vice president, general manager, Wichita division, Boeing Airplane Co., states:

Amelia Earhart's courage and her deeds in the dynamic field of aviation most certainly are deserving of this recognition.

We of Boeing are keenly interested in the individual roles and historic events which have contributed to the tremendous progress of aviation in the United States. Our country would indeed be remiss if the contributions of such a person were to be overlooked.

Mr. Brook L. Haines, president of the Topeka, Kans., Stamp Club:

Last year France put out a special stamp honoring their outstanding, early-day aviatrix. The United States of America has an even better reason for honoring Amelia Earhart.

Louis M. Dobbin, chairman, Kansas chapter, the Ninety-Nines, Inc., Wichita, Kans.:

Her many accomplishments very adequately establishes the need for such a commemorative stamp. We believe wholeheartedly that Miss Earhart deserves the honor for her untiring and unselfish efforts to further aviation.

The Kansas City Star in an editorial on April 7, 1956, entitled "Tomboy on a Stamp?" said in part:

In any list of attractive American heroines, Miss Earhart would surely have a place. So naturally her name comes up with a discussion of women on postage stamps.

The Topeka Daily Capital expressed its interest in this stamp by reprinting in its entirety the Kansas City Star editorial.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives and Senate have jurisdiction on legislation introduced for commemorative stamps. The Postmaster General also is empowered to issue such stamps, exercising his authority through administrative order.

In the 81st Congress, however, Members of the House and Senate Post Office Committee by joint resolution agreed not to consider bills introduced for commemorative stamps. They felt too much time was being devoted to discussion of such bills, most of which were not deserving of legislation. They justified their position by pointing out that the Postmaster General already had the authority under law to issue commemorative stamps; that only approximately a dozen such stamps can be authorized in any given year; and that since this function was already being fulfilled by the Postmaster General there was no need to take up valuable time of the committees with it. I think the committee's position is sound and constructive.

Although no such concurrent resolution is valid at this time, the position of the respective committees is the same; that is, they will not consider legislation for the issuance of commemorative stamps. The only course of action remaining, then, is to request a commemorative stamp issue of the Postmaster General.

The Post Office Department has indicated that their 1956 program for issuance of special stamps is unusually full. Nevertheless, I believe the significance of this commemorative stamp merits the special consideration of the Postmaster General, not only for 1956 but also for 1957 issuance. I am certain that all Members of Congress recognize the good which can be gained from such a stamp. This has international meaning. I urge all Members to express their interest in a special stamp to honor Amelia Earhart Putnam to the Postmaster General.

Likewise all interested citizens should write to the Postmaster General and inform him of their desire to have such a stamp issued. As Senator FRANK CARLSON has stated:

It is a stamp that should be issued.

Address of the Honorable George A. Dondero, Member of Congress, 18th Michigan District—Dedication of the Eisenhower Lock, St. Lawrence Seaway, Massena, N. Y. June 3, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a speech given by our highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, at the dedication of the Eisenhower lock at Massena, N. Y., on June 3, 1956.

Mr. DONDERO worked for many years to get the St. Lawrence seaway through and he was one of the authors of the bill that passed. People of northern New York will ever remember him with respect and gratitude:

A little more than 2 years ago, May 6, 1954, one of the great legislative battles to take place in the Congress of the United States came to an end. On that date the St. Lawrence seaway and power project was adopted by Congress, and the United States had determined it would join Canada, our friendly neighbor government to the north, in constructing and developing this master project of North America.

Today it is under construction, and the dream of two friendly nations who speak the same language and read the same Bible is about to become a reality.

After a number of visits to the St. Lawrence River with committees from Congress, this visit today on this occasion is of the greatest personal pleasure and satisfaction to me. To say that I am extremely happy is an understatement, for today it is my rare privilege to view the actual construction of the seaway. This comes after a struggle of nearly 20 years, after many discouragements, and after overcoming formidable opposition. I say it is a fitting climax to nearly a score of years of unrequiting effort to advance the cause of the seaway. To have made at least some contribution toward the adoption of the seaway by the United States will permit me, upon my retirement from Congress next January 1957, to take with me a feeling of accomplishment of a project that will be of great benefit to the people of our time and generations yet unborn.

In my final appeal to the House of Representatives 2 years ago urging passage of the Wiley-Dondero bill, authorizing participation by the United States with Canada in building the seaway and power project, I called attention to the only quotation on the walls of the House Chamber in Washington immediately above the Speaker's chair. Webster nearly a century before proclaimed it, and I give that quotation:

"Let us develop the resources of our land. Call forth its power, build its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

The spirit of Webster prevailed that day, and all who played a part in advocating and promulgating this gigantic undertaking enjoy a consciousness of performing "something worthy to be remembered."

The subject of the seaway is not a new one. It has been the dream of man for more than 200 years. The French explorer, Champlain, first visualized the possibility of a canal linking the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean in the 17th century. In the crude diary which he left we may read of his plan for a St. Lawrence seaway. His idea remained a dream for nearly 150 years. Now man's dream is coming true.

My pleasure in being present today is almost unrestrained. We are designating a lock on this occasion as a part of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and naming it for our great President, President Eisenhower, who did so much to make this day possible. We also recall today his vigorous advocacy of uniting with Canada in the construction of this project, and we will remember that on the 7th of January 1954, in his state of the Union message to the Congress he said:

"Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction."

There is no comparable area on this earth that includes so many of the requisite qualifications for a master project as the Great Lakes region of the United States and Canada. In it is found a temperate but invigorating climate; unlimited quantities of iron ore; coal in abundance or near at hand; oil and mineral salts; varied but fertile soil conditions; adequate rainfall; immense agricultural areas; numerous industrial and commercial cities; ample labor, skilled and unskilled; boundless tracts of virgin timber; unnumbered square miles of recreational expanse; and in the center of it all, an allwise and generous providence planted five deep blue, fresh-water seas—the Great

Lakes—to provide low-cost transportation for raw materials and fabricated products.

The seaway when completed will be the greatest inland waterway in the world. The same water which flows through the locks at the Soo, in Michigan, will flow unvexed to the sea through the St. Lawrence Waterway. It will be under the joint management and control of the Governments of the United States and Canada. We are nearing our goal, and I am very sure that all of us are happy to observe today the actual construction progressing at a satisfactory pace.

Through the many years that I have served in Congress while working for the development of the navigation and power project of the St. Lawrence, it has been a pleasure to work with so many distinguished citizens of the United States and Canada who contributed so much to a common end, namely, the building of the seaway. Some of them are here today: Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; Mr. Lewis G. Castle, of Duluth, Minn., Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the agency constructing the United States part of the project; the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, President of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada; and Dr. N. R. Danielian, who heads up the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. I could name many others if time permitted.

It is no exaggeration to say that the great midcontinent area of Canada and the United States may justly and properly be called the granary, the pantry, and the breadbasket of the world. Nearly half of the food products of the continent are produced in the heartland of the continent.

It is well known that on the breast of the fresh-water seas which contain one-half of the sweet water of the earth moves an enormous tonnage of commerce belonging to the United States and Canada. We all know that through the locks at the Soo even now and before the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway passes every year more tonnage than through nearly all the other great canals of the world combined.

Again I wish to voice my pleasure and happiness on this occasion and for the privilege of being present. We may all look with encouragement to the near future when the seaway and power project will be completed. It will be a day of great achievement for both nations, and it will present to the future the vision of two nations and their faith and confidence in this common undertaking.

I wish to close these brief remarks with a quotation from an address delivered by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, president of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, in Copenhagen, Denmark, last year. Said he:

"Finally, after many years of hesitation we have decided to act together on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. Here is a magnificent example to the world of international understanding and goodwill. Because of this, I believe that in the days to come the Canadian and American peoples will, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in majesty, in justice, and in peace."

As We See It: To Aid Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 31, 1956, in support of the Jenkins-Keogh bill (H. R. 9 and 10):

TO AID SELF-EMPLOYED

The prospect of a small surplus in the Federal budget has encouraged one group that is able to make a strong case for a particular tax reduction. Their proposal is to allow some tax exemption on money which self-employed persons invest in a pension fund to provide for their own future.

The equity of this idea, as embodied in the Jenkins-Keogh bills now before Congress, is that salaried persons do, in effect, already have such a tax exemption. Money paid by an employer into workers' pension funds is a cost of doing business, and is nontaxable either to employer or employee. It becomes taxable only when received as a pension.

Lawyers, physicians, and many other professional and self-employed persons pay the entire premium for their annuities, and contend with justice that they should have some of the tax consideration that an employed person receives.

Great Britain's new budget makes such a provision. President Eisenhower, in his 1952 campaign, endorsed the idea. The time would seem to be ripe.

Cedar Shaft Supply Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. Carl Peterson, of Menomonie, Wis., on the critical situation of cedar shafts for archers. The critical situation with respect to cedar shaft results from the sales policy of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Peterson's letter reads as follows:

I am enclosing a copy of an article which was in the last issue of the National Bowhunter in regard to the purchase of cedar from the Federal Government. It would be greatly appreciated if you would take the time to read this article and do what you can for us.

We have an active organization of archers here in Menomonie, with approximately 130 members, and I know that all sympathize with the views of the author of the enclosed article.

The article from the National Bowhunter, titled "Cedar Shaft Supply Critical," follows:

CEDAR SHAFT SUPPLY CRITICAL

(By M. L. McKinney, Oakland, Oreg.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—At our request M. L. McKinney, the country's foremost supplier of cedar arrow shafts, has written the following article regarding the critical shortage which has developed in the industry. The problem is urgent for bowhunters who are agreed that the cedar shaft is the proper one for hunting big game. Mr. McKinney has had long experience in working with Government agencies of the Forest Department and knows whereof he speaks. Bowhunters will not want to use substitutes for arrow shafts. Read this article carefully, then help yourself and the rest of the bowhunters to guarantee a sufficient supply of arrow wood by following this advice. Do it now.)

The situation that has developed in the sales policy of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management is threatening the very existence of the cedar arrow shaft business, and has very definitely contributed to the critical shortage of arrow shafts now developing.

As explained in my article in Archery, which I presume a great many of you have read, there was no difficulty in getting sales of Government-owned timber until about 3 years ago. Up until that time all an operator had to do was to locate the dead cedar, find the section and quarter sections it was on, go to the appropriate office and get a negotiated sale. This worked very satisfactorily as the shaft manufacturer was assured a supply of cedar as long as he was willing to look for it. The Government was being paid for an otherwise waste material; the fire hazard was being reduced, and the field offices were put to very little time and expense.

About 3 years ago this was abruptly changed by a policy of putting all sales up for public bidding. Now this would not work any hardship in itself, except that it was no longer practical for the operators to go to the expense of hunting up the timber when he had no assurance of getting it.

The sales agencies said they realized this and would themselves work up the sales. Their efforts along that line have been spectacular for their failure.

The first year this was in effect, a considerable quantity of cedar was sold, as operators had located it and given the exact locations to the field offices, expecting to get the sales as previously. Since that time there has been one sale of cedar offered. This was by the Forest Service and the sale was for 30 cords of cedar. This amount would run our plant less than 30 days. Even this small sale was put up only after being specifically requested by a small operator. If any proof of the utter failure of the present policy is needed, all one has to do is to look at the record of sales put up.

After being advised of the conditions by my previous article, a considerable number of archers have been writing to their Senators and Representatives asking them to do something to relieve the situation. I have been privileged to see some of the answers these people have received. Some sound encouraging in that the Senators and Representatives seem to be interested. However, they check back with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management and are advised that the respective agency will endeavor to put up more cedar. The hard fact remains that exactly nothing has been done to date; and the time that cutting operations should begin is fast approaching.

From my talks with forestry officials both high and low, I am firmly convinced that the present sales policy will never work. In the first place, the agencies do not have the manpower nor the money to locate sufficient amounts of cedar, even if they had the inclination to do so. If the manpower and money were available, no competent field officer would use it for this type of work when they have so many other places they could use it to far greater advantage. The cost of locating the cedar is often as great as the purchase price, so it is obviously impractical for the field officers to work up enough sales.

I can conceive of no reason for the firm insistence of the present sales policy; and the only explanation so far offered is, "'The rule says, 'If more than one person is interested it must be put up for bids.'" It would appear that any rule that threatened the very existence of an industry as large as archery, should be changed, and quickly.

There has been, and is being, considerable pressure applied to us shaft manufacturers in an effort to get us to use green cedar. We all know that green cedar is not as good as the long-seasoned, fire-killed, cedar we have been using. I feel that we should be encouraged to use the dead cedar rather than

let it go to waste and cut the very limited amount of green cedar now left. It just doesn't make sense that the Government would obstruct our efforts to purchase salvage cedar and try to encourage cutting of green cedar.

No doubt we will some day have to use green cedar for arrows; and every archer should insist that the export of Government cedar be stopped. (It seems rather odd that we should pay taxes for years to maintain a Forest Service to save our timber, only to have it sold for export when it is nearly exhausted, and so badly needed here.)

As I see it, and I have studied it from all angles, the only possible hope of the archery industry's having sufficient quantities of cedar to meet our immediate needs, is for the quick return of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to the old, and satisfactory negotiated sales policy of arrow stock material. The only hopes for sufficient future needs is the stopping of the export of Government-owned cedar. (The export of Bureau of Land Management timber is now forbidden; but Forest Service cedar is being exported in large amounts to Japan.) This can be accomplished only by concerted, and sustained, action of all archers and archery concerns. Archers should write to their Senators and Representatives, the Department of Agriculture (Secretary Benson) and the Department of the Interior (Secretary McKay), asking that these objectives be accomplished.

You who read this can help, not only by writing letters as above; but by bringing it to the attention of your friends and club members. (Clubs should send in petitions signed by their members.) Remember this is your fight as well as the shaft manufacturers fight. We cannot make the shafts you need for your arrows if we cannot get the material to make them from.

When you write to your Senators, etc., you might mention the fact that each cord of cedar used for arrow manufacturing creates from 160 to 200 man days of employment. No other use can even remotely approach this employment rate. (Export logs produce only a day or so of employment per thousand board feet.)

If you shoot wood arrows, this vitally concerns you. Don't sit back and let our source of cedar disappear.

The Communist Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Wednesday, June 6, 1956:

THE COMMUNIST INQUIRY

A subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee has been conducting hearings in St. Louis since the first of the week. It is now possible to summarize and appraise its work thus far.

The first thing to recognize is that the investigative powers of Congress are very broad and justifiedly so. Time and again Congress has used its authority to inquire into situations and conditions which urgently needed ventilation in the public interest. There can be no question about the power of a congressional committee to dig into areas of subversive activity. Communist infiltration into defense industry in St. Louis is a proper subject of governmental investigation. Indeed the Government would be grossly derelict if it did not ferret out efforts to undermine the national security.

A second fact to note is that this subcommittee has conducted itself for the most part in a generally quiet and dignified manner. The Tuesday afternoon session did produce a sharp rebuke from the chairman, Representative MOULDER, of Missouri, when Douglas MacLeod, lawyer for one of the summoned witnesses, called for an apology from the subcommittee.

But there has been little to suggest the shouting and recrimination that characterized the McCarthy subcommittee of the Senate. Most of the sessions, held in the courtroom of United States Judge Harper, have been as orderly as a Federal trial. Credit for this goes not only to the chairman, but also to his colleagues, Representatives SCHERER, of Ohio, and FRAZIER, of Tennesee, and the subcommittee counsel, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.

It might have been expected that a subcommittee so exemplary in its own conduct would enjoy the cooperation of the witnesses subpenaed and questioned. This has not been so. Very few questions have been answered. Witness after witness has refused to reply on the grounds that his answer might incriminate him. Up to now this has handicapped the subcommittee in its efforts to elicit information from those summoned to testify.

A witness is within his rights in refusing to answer if he thinks that what he would say would incriminate him. The Bill of Rights protects a person from being forced to present testimony against himself. The reason is the sound one that in trials it is up to the prosecuting officials to gather evidence on which to base their case. Were it otherwise the State would have an enormous power of coercion over the individual; and law in a free society should protect the individual from such excessive power.

Why so many St. Louisans invoked the fifth amendment has not been explained. Pamphlets distributed in advance of the hearings by a group of those subpenaed appealed to all witnesses to defy the subcommittee. This suggests a pattern of organized noncooperation. Yet even if this is the fact, there may be some instances in which the fifth amendment's protection was invoked fairly and not with intent to abuse a historic right of citizens.

It is for this reason that the Bar Association of St. Louis, greatly to its credit, took steps in advance to help any summoned person obtain legal assistance. Chairman MOULDER showed his appreciation of the need for professional legal advice for each witness when he complimented the St. Louis bar for acting voluntarily to arrange for counsel for those summoned but unable to hire counsel. As Mr. MOULDER said, the appearance of any lawyer with a witness who himself could not obtain counsel "should not in itself be taken as any disparagement against the lawyer for doing so."

But even if a pattern of refusing to answer questions impedes the work of the subcommittee, the sessions ought not to be without their gains. From the questioning it is clear that some with Communist sympathies worked their way into labor unions and that others got into defense industries while some obtained employment as teachers.

As so often stated in these columns, the Post-Dispatch sees in communism a worldwide conspiracy in which no loyal American would now have a part, and in which none should have had a part in the postwar era—certainly not since the outbreak of the Korean war. Many persons who entered the Communist Party by honest mistake withdrew long before communism's armed aggression across the 38th parallel.

Among the men who erred in judgment, particular credit goes to those who have openly confessed their mistake and have since led exemplary and patriotic lives. Society has an obligation to be fair with them and not to punish them for their honesty. Mr. MOULDER stated a fact when he said that in the depression years there were "innocent and loyal" Americans who became "frustrated with economic conditions" and "in seeking a solution to national unemployment and economic problems, were misguided into the Communist Party."

The problem of tracking down subversive activities would be greatly simplified if all those who made honest mistakes were to remove the cloud of suspicion and doubt by full and free testimony. It is to be hoped the Moulder subcommittee can still contribute to that desirable end.

Expeditious Handling of Certain FTC Cases Important To Survival of Small and Independent Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, recently wrote a letter of utmost importance. He directly raised the issue of whether the protection of the law will be available to small business by sufficiently swift enforcement on the part of executive agencies. I hope the reply of the Federal Trade Commission will be made available to the Members.

The letter follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1956.

Re Firestone-Shell, Docket No. 6487; Goodyear-Atlantic Refining, Docket No. 6486; Goodrich-Texas Co., Docket No. 6485

Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There has come to the attention of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, information to the effect that the Federal Trade Commission has been requested by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, that the above-entitled cases be heard by the Commission in the first instance instead of by a hearing examiner. The Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, has been requested to lend its support to that request.

An examination of the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act leads me to the conclusion that the Commission may hear these cases in the first instance instead of having a hearing examiner to hear them. Therefore, it being within the power of the Commission to do so, the matter appears to resolve itself into a question of what it should do.

If the Commission should decide to grant the request which has been made of it in this respect, it appears that a change in its Rules of Practice would have to be made. Therefore it appears that two questions are presented. One relates to the feasibility of the Commission presiding over hearings in the above entitled cases. The

other relates to the need for a change in the Commission's Rules of Practice to permit it to act in the public interest by hearing a case in the first instance where the public interest would so require. I cannot believe that the Commission would desire to contend to the Congress that no instance has arisen and no instance will arise in the future where the public interest would be served by the Commisison undertaking to hear a case at the beginning on the matters with respect to which it must ultimately make a decision. If I am correct in that assumption, it would seem to be a matter of prime public importance for the Commission to consider making the changes in its Rules of Practice that would permit it to serve the public interest fully in any instance.

Referring again to the above-entitled cases, I want the record to show and the Commission to know that I concur wholeheartedly in the view expressed by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, when he states that the above-entitled cases are important to the survival of small and independent business enterprises. Therefore, I concur in his view that those cases are of prime importance to the public interest. Hence, in my opinion, any procedure available to the Commission and under which it can feasibly expedite the handling of those cases to an early conclusion will serve the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

The Silent Watch: It Protects Our Most Precious Commmodity, the American Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a tribute to the silent watch, the Army's Corps of Military Police. It protects our most precious commodity, the American soldier.

The silent watch. I suppose that is a name one might well apply to one of the least talked of, one of the most respected, one of the least in mind, yet one of the most appreciated although least openly thanked of all our defense personnel—the military policeman.

The silent watch. Eternally vigilant at home and abroad, the American military policeman is a shield for law and order in posts all over the world.

He is America's sidewalk ambassador, easy to see, wise to follow, smart to obey. He represents America's form of justice. He seldom speaks but is quick to act to protect the good and to preserve the right.

The leader of our silent watch is Maj. Gen. William H. Maglin, provost marshal general of the United States Army. His men are stationed all over the world. General Maglin is devoted to his men and they to him. Both inspire confidence in the folks back home. They have a deep concern and a lively care for the security and safety of the American soldiers, be he on post or on holiday.

In a recent issue of the Social Hygiene Papers, a publication of the American Social Hygiene Association, General Maglin has contributed a wonderfully enlightening article that the folks back home, that mothers and fathers of our servicemen all over the United States might well read.

The article tells what is being done; what safeguards have been provided, and what methods are in operation "to protect the most precious commodity—as General Maglin so aptly describes—the American soldier."

There are two other things I should like to mention, Mr. Speaker, before enclosing a full text of General Maglin's article. The first is a note on the William Freeman Snow Award for Distinguished Service to Humanity. It is to be awarded to General Maglin next fall. The second thing is a brief biographical sketch on General Maglin. Both items follow the article which now appears:

PROTECTING OUR MOST PRECIOUS COMMODITY—THE AMERICAN SOLDIER

(By William H. Maglin, major general, U. S. Army, provost marshal general)

The United States Army is the largest repository of youth in America. With over 1 million officers and men in its ranks, 90 percent of them between 17 and 25, the army represents not only an investment in time and money but the certain responsibility inherited from their home communities to preserve and maintain the character of its men.

It is staggering to realize that we are now spending 65 percent of our national budget on the major national security program, including our nuclear bombs and guided missiles, our atomic and electronic ships and planes and guns. The key man to put this mass of material into action is the individual serviceman. He was important to the defense of nations when wars were fought with muskets and pikes. He is even more important today when intricate, technical machines demand legions of highly-trained, clear-minded, healthy men. Without their steady hands and know-how, we might well mothball our equipment.

Today the serviceman is an indispensable investment, and the Army is setting out, as never before, to protect its deposit of American youth so that a dividend in defense may be assured. If this is accomplished, a perpetual return of good citizens to the American community will be the Army's promise to the nation.

THE YOUNG SOLDIER'S GOOD RECORD

How does the young man from the American community get along in his new Army home? I think remarkably well. In fact, the conduct of our young Americans while in the military service leads me to conclude that we may be painting with a broad brush and condemning our youth because of the increase in so-called juvenile delinquency. I do not mean to imply that juvenile delinquency is not a serious problem. I do maintain, however, that it affects only a small segment of our youngsters and that the vast majority of our youth are fine, wholesome, warm-hearted, upright Americans. Our experience with them in the Army convinces me of that.

I am frequently asked to give the crime or delinquency rate of 100,000 soldiers compared to the rate of an American city of 100,000 population. Consistently, our rate is much lower. Yet that is not the real picture, by any means, of how favorable the Army's report is, comparatively. In a city of 100,000, there are women and children and the aged. Of that 100,000, only 7,000 are young men between 17 and 25. Yet that is the segment of the population prone to come to the attention of the police. Remember, in the Army almost 90 percent of our men are 17 to 25.

We took a look into the subject of delinquency in the Army recently, during which we compared a group of Army delinquents to a group of soldiers who had never been in trouble while in service. We came up with the surprising discovery that 13 percent of the second group had committed some type of dereliction which classed them as pre-Army delinquents. I don't know what percentage of young men get into trouble in the average American city, but I can report that the hard figures of the Army show only 1 percent of our soldiers get off the straight track. This indicates to me that our young men have a strong potential for good. Why isn't the Army rate closer to 13 percent instead of its low 1 percent? By all accounts it apparently should be.

Many factors peculiar to Army life introduce stresses not present in civilian life: required conformity (an abrupt change for the average young man conditioned to independence and personal freedom) homesickness, crowded barracks life, and new opportunities to overindulge for the first time without the restraining hand of home and family.

Now on the positive side of the ledger we find certain conditions which add up to part of the answer to my question.

PART OF A GROUP

Military life gives a young man an opportunity to belong to a group. Instead of the Black Dragons or the Ajax Club he now belongs to A Company or B Company. If you have ever experienced company or even squad competition you will agree it can get pretty lively. The realization that his buddies have common interests and gripes brings him out of the depths of loneliness and frustration which lead to trouble.

The greatest reason for the Army's fine record is what we call the "chain-of-care." The chain follows from the commander right down to the corporal in the squad. Each is concerned with the welfare and conduct of the men in his charge. Each cares enough to take an interest in the daily presence of his crew. Competition makes each corporal, sergeant, captain, and major care enough to make his command better than the next.

I think an apt description of an Army man's conception of care for his command is contained in a Portrait of a Leader, written by the widow of Capt. Reginald B. Desiderio. "He loved variety and chance-taking. He had a fling at the Air Corps and with the paratroopers. His first love was the line infantry. In his service with the 70th Division in Europe he won the Silver Star and Bronze Star with three clusters.

"It may seem strange for me to say that he was adored by his men, but then he was adored by everyone. He was courageous even about his day-to-day obligations. He enjoyed taking over a poor organization because he knew that he could more easily put his mark on it and win it to his standards.

"Yet he was a perfectionist in that he would never spare himself. He had tremendous energy, and he led by working harder than anyone who served under him. His characteristic enthusiasm for work was contagious to other men, or at least he so felt.

"His influence as a husband and father was probably much the same as that he exerted over his company. When he was busy, one felt it necessary to pitch in and work alongside of him.

"He was greatly devoted to his duty, but more devoted to his God and his family. His interest in the welfare of his men was absolute; he lived for them even as he lived for us. Even so, he was a strict disciplinarian. He

demanded much, but he demanded fairly and justly."

Yes; the character of Captain Desiderio made him a stout link in the chain of care. Other links are our chaplains, legal aid officers, and welfare officers, all of whom have a marked influence on the soldier.

Until a few years ago the services were confronted with a lack of suitable working agencies to better the conditions of communities serving the soldiers' off-duty recreational needs. Towns near Army camps developed trouble areas complete with unsanitary restaurants, houses of prostitution, B-girls, and the like. These fringe, leech-like elements were no credit to the community and were the prime contributing factors to our AWOL, venereal disease, and delinquency rates.

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION

Beginning in March of 1950, the Joint Agreement on Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Boards, provided the services with an official working link with the community. One of the original, active agencies cooperating with the boards was the American Social Hygiene Association. Its staff provides invaluable aid in ferreting out and suppressing vice conditions. Through the help of the American Social Hygiene Association the services are forewarned of encroaching vice elements and are able to nip trouble in the bud. Certainly this is a major contribution to the crime-prevention program of the Military Police Corps.

Aid from the American Social Hygiene Association does not end with pinpointing trouble spots. The Army's educational program in suppressing venereal disease has received valuable counsel from ASHA.

Officially recognizing the chain-of-care theory, the Army strives constantly to strengthen it, with good results. To toughen the weak link of a man in transition we are now moving whole outfits, rather than individuals. Thus the entire "care" machinery of the unit moves with him.

For example, Fort Riley's 10th Division was halfway through Operation Gyroscope. Three months previously the 10th Division had begun changing assignments with the famous 1st Infantry Division in Germany, with the assurance that each would have a permanent base for the next 3 years. The 10th Division was moved to Germany in three shiploads, complete with wives and children, and families were settled before husband soldiers went off on maneuvers. At the same time, the 1st Division returned to its new base in Kansas and settled its own families.

In the same direction, the Chaplain Corps plays a far greater role in the Army today than it ever did before, performing innumerable types of personal "care" services. It's incalculable how many youngsters have been diverted from trouble by a few quiet moments with a chaplain.

Also in our Army today, stationed wherever we have American troops, are members of the Military Police Corps. This corps, numbering over 30,000 officers and men, is a permanent part of our Military Establishment and is composed of carefully selected, highly trained soldiers, whose motto is "service to the troops." The objective of the corps is to keep the maximum number of men available for duty.

Those who are veterans of World War I may find it hard to accept the psychology, practices, and procedures of the modern military police. I recall so well the derisive chant of the twenties that the "MP's won the war." Compare that feeling with the expression contained in an article in the Reader's Digest concerning one of our military police functions, the highway patrol in Germany:

"In German eyes, the American MP is United States of America. To the German Haupstrasse he brings the common sense, common courtesy, and common touch of Main Street, America. He's Mr. Democracy, in person." And, I might add, he's another link in the chain extended to the foreign lands in which we perform our duty.

Our modern military police have many functions. They have a major role in the control of military traffic and evacuation of refugees, in the custody, care, and documentation of prisoners of war, in rear area security against guerrillas, partisans, and air drops, in the control of military prisons, and of course in law enforcement and the control of conduct.

The MP's chain of care doesn't even end after a man has been arrested, found guilty, and placed in confinement. Our rehabilitation program offers a convicted man a chance to volunteer for a rigid retraining program which, if he completes it successfully, gives him a clean bill of health in the Army and an honorable discharge if the rest of his service is satisfactory. I recently received the following letter from a soldier who had taken advantage of this opportunity:

"The chance I got at rehabilitation finally opened my eyes to how dumb I'd been. I thought my parents were against me. I thought the Army was against me. I fought anyone who tried to boss me. When I finally got my sentence I figured it was the end of the line for me.

"Then for no reason at all I got this chance. I thought it was a trick at first. I decided I had nothing to lose. Now I am out and with an outfit which is swell. Thank you for caring enough about me to give me this chance."

I said earlier that our objective is to keep the greatest number of men available for duty. That too is the objective of the Medical Corps. A soldier in trouble or in the guardhouse is just as ineffective to the service as a man sick or in the hospital. Our methods parallel those of the Medical Corps to a marked degree. In the way of prevention, the medics give physical examinations and inoculations, and they maintain sanitary regulations. The MP's survey towns and cities for trouble spots, place them off limits, warn soldiers, correct their dress and passes. The doctors hold sick call to prevent minor ailments from becoming major illnesses. Similarly, the MP's issue informal reports for minor infractions so that commanders may take corrective action. In spite of prevention and sick call, major ailments and injuries occur. Then the medics put the man in the hospital. Similarly, in spite of our preventive actions, some soldiers commit serious offenses. Then we issue a formal report and gather the evidence to guide the commander in his action.

But while the medics alone order the soldier into the hospital, in our case we step out of the picture. MP's do not sentence a soldier to confinement. That is done by the courts. But as soon as he is convicted and sentenced, he again comes into our hands, since we, the military police, control the guardhouses, stockades, and disciplinary barracks.

In the hospital the medics exert all efforts to return the soldier to duty in a healthy physical condition. Likewise, through our rehabilitation program we MP's exhaust all our efforts to return the soldier to duty in an honorable status.

CIVILIAN COUNTERPART

If you think of it for a moment, the links comprising the Army's chain-of-care exist in civilian life. The captain has his counterpart in the father and mother team, and the big brother or sister can be likened to the squad leaders. Every community has its chaplain, welfare officers, and the good arm of the law. The links are there and they are forged stronger than some suspect. We have a spirited, fine Army to prove it.

Yes, from the streets of our towns to the barracks of our Army, let's give our youth the understanding and care they deserve. They are, after all, our most precious commodity.

As previously noted, I am also happy to learn that the American Social Hygiene Association's Committee on Awards has voted unanimously to present Maj. Gen. William H. Maglin with the William Freeman Snow Award for Distinguished Service to Humanity.

Dr. Snow, in whose name the award is presented, was the first executive director of the American Social Hygiene Association. The award was established in 1937 on the occasion of his 40th year of distinguished service to education, public health, and social hygiene.

The William Freeman Snow Award is the highest honor of the American Social Hygiene Association and is presented annually to an outstanding person of distinguished career, in recognition of superior service in the field of social hygiene.

As the provost marshal general of the Army, with staff responsibility for the control of conduct and the maintenance of law and order, General Maglin is well known throughout the military and by civil enforcement agencies for his accomplishments in protecting the welfare of the American serviceman.

The award will be presented in New York City in the early fall.

Mr. Speaker, General Maglin, one of our great public servants, has had a distinguished and illustrious career in the Army. He is a fighting soldier. I want to list below a short biographical sketch of General Maglin's career. Through it all, General Maglin has remained a kindly, patient man with a talent that knows how to explain to a mother and father the responsibility of the Department of the Army toward their son:

General Maglin assumed Office of the Provost Marshal General of the Army February 5, 1953.

General Maglin is the first provost marshal general to be appointed from the Military Police Corps. During 30 years of commissioned service, he has spent over 20 in military police assignments.

Born May 4, 1898, in Richmond Hill, Long Island, he went to high school in Richmond Hill; attended Alfred University in New York State; enlisted in the Army April 7, 1917.

First enlisted assignment: Troop L, 5th Cavalry Regiment, Fort Bliss, Tex., and duty in the military police detachment at El Paso.

Appointed cadet, United States Military Academy, West Point, November 12, 1918. While at West Point he captained the boxing team in 1924 and was light heavyweight and heavyweight boxing champ of the cadet corps from 1920 to 1924. Commissioned in Infantry; he is a graduate of the Infantry School and the Command and General Staff College.

In November 1945 he was sent to Korea to organize the Korean National Police of 23,000 uniformed police, 5,000 detectives, and 500 policewomen, who were among the first to bear the brunt of the North Korean attack in June 1950. In 1953 was awarded the Military Order of Taekuk by President Syngman Rhee for his contribution to the new republic.

MILITARY POLICE AND PROVOST MARSHAL ASSIGNMENTS

1924: Provost marshal, Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y.

1929: Hawaiian Military Police Company.

1934–35: Provost marshal, Governors Island, N. Y.

1935–37: Hawaiian Military Police commanding officer.

1939: Commanding officer, 2d Infantry Division, Military Police Company.

1939: Provost marshal, United States Military Academy, West Point.

1941: Provost marshal, General Headquarters, United States Army, Washington.

1942: Commanding officer, Military Police Replacement Training Center, Fort Riley, Kans.

1942: Deputy provost marshal, European theater of operations, England.

1942: Provost marshal, Allied Forces Headquarters, North Africa.

1943–45: Commandant, Provost Marshal General School, Fort Custer, Mich.

1945: Chief, Military Police Division, Office of the Provost Marshal General.

1947–50: Commandant, Provost Marshal General School, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and Camp Gordon, Ga.

1950: Deputy provost marshal general, Washington, D. C.

1951–53: Provost marshal, European Command.

It is good to be able to report to my people of the 13th Congressional District that General Maglin is doing the best possible job in protecting our most precious commodity, the American soldier.

Comprehensive Manpower Bill Seeks Aid for Teachers—Colleges and Students Included in Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Milton F. Lunch from the June 1956 issue of the American Engineer entitled "Comprehensive Manpower Bill Seeks Aid for Teachers—Colleges and Students Included in Provisions." This has reference to H. R. 11200, a bill designed to regain our world leadership in developing engineers and scientists.

The article follows:

COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER BILL SEEKS AID FOR TEACHERS—COLLEGES AND STUDENTS INCLUDED IN PROVISIONS

(By Milton F. Lunch)

The most far-reaching and comprehensive legislative proposal to institute some form of Federal program to meet the Nation's needs for engineers and scientists has been offered by Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Almost all of the bills on the subject introduced heretofore, running into the dozens, have dealt primarily with scholarships as a means of getting more students into the colleges and universities. The Holland bill also calls for a scholarship program, but in addition it contains the following unique features:

1. Supplement salary grants to raise the incomes of engineering teachers to the level paid engineers in industry with comparable qualifications.

2. Financial aid to engineering educational institutions by paying the full cost of educating the students holding the Federal scholarships, as distinguished from payment only of the normal tuition, fees, and textbook charges.

3. A two-pronged program under which engineering graduates would teach mathematics and science subjects in the high schools for 3 years, with supplemental salary grants to equalize their pay with that of the young engineers in industry. At the end of the 3-year stint, the engineer-teacher would be eligible for a 3-year graduate fellowship to study for a doctor of philosophy degree, also with an economic grant to keep the grantee's income up to that of engineers working in industry.

Representative HOLLAND told the House at the time he introduced his bill: "We have had enough warnings. We have had enough speeches. But we have had little action. Today I propose action. I propose a concrete Government program that will lick the problem." He said that before preparing his bill he sought to get the best answers to the many questions involved and the best guidance in the kind of legislation which is needed by contacting the deans of all the Nation's engineering schools. At the latest count, 126 deans of the 150 contacted had replied to the Congressman's questionnaire and offered suggestions. He told the House that the deans generally agreed on two main reasons for the present engineering manpower situation: (1) Precious manpower potential is being wasted by the failure of many bright high-school students to continue to college; (2) the shortage of qualified teachers of engineering at the college level, and of qualified mathematics and science teachers at the high-school level.

The scholarship portion of the Holland bill would provide 30 engineering scholarships each year to outstanding high-school graduates from each of the 435 congressional districts, based on competitive examinations. In lieu of tuition, the school would receive "an amount equal to the actual cost to such school * * * without regard to the school's other income and resources * * * of educating such student and providing facilities (other than meals and lodging) in connection therewith." The student would receive $100 a month for living expenses while in attendance at the school. The proposal to pay the institution the full cost of educating the student instead of only tuition is based on the fact that tuition represents only a part of the university's costs per student. Statistics as of 1950 show that in tax-supported institutions tuition accounted for only 29.8 percent of total institutional income, and in private institutions it accounted for 67.8 percent. HOLLAND said that this provision would give the schools some financial help they need and should encourage the schools to enlarge their facilities.

The supplemental salary grants to university engineering teachers are stated in the bill to be for the purpose of encouraging them "to continue in the teaching profession, and to prevent such teachers from leaving the teaching profession to seek higher-paying positions elsewhere." Holland said that the reports from the deans state that many of the best engineering teachers are being lured into industry every year through higher salary offers which the schools cannot match. The criteria for the amount of supplemental pay would be "such amounts as, when added to such teacher's regular salary as a member of the faculty of such school, will make his income substantially equal to the average income of industrial and other nonacademic engineers of comparable qualifications." Periodic checks would be conducted to determine changes in the amount of supplemental pay based on changes in nonacademic compensation levels or changes in the regular salary or qualifications of the teacher. The supplemental pay grants would be paid to the university, to be turned over to the teachers without any reduction in regular salary because of the supplemental grants.

Under the high school teacher-fellowship arrangement for graduate engineers, Holland said the purpose is to hit at the two extremes of the manpower supply situation—both of which were said to be crucial by many of the deans—by providing qualified math and science teachers in the high schools to prepare students for engineering study, and, conversely, to provide the incentives to turn out more highly trained engineers and scientists in the graduate fields. An additional factor in the plan is the hope that many engineering graduates after having been exposed to an educational atmosphere for 10 years (4 to secure B. S. degree, 3 teaching in high schools and 3 in graduate work) would choose to stay in engineering teaching work, thus further alleviating the engineering teacher shortage. The economic side of the dual high school teacher-fellowship arrangement would work as follows: While teaching in the high school the engineer would receive, in addition to his regular high school salary, supplemental grants to bring his income substantially into line with the average income of industrial and other nonacademic engineers of comparable qualifications. When the engineer completed his 3-year high school teaching assignment and moved into his graduate study, the institution would be paid the full cost of providing the advanced education in lieu of tuition. At the same time, the engineer-student would be paid an amount per month (as living expenses) equal to the total amount per month which he had received while a high school teacher, including the regular teacher's salary and the supplementary salary grant.

The Pittsburgh legislator's bill provides a specific prohibition against any agency of the Federal Government exercising any direction, supervision or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution or over its administration or personnel. The actual administration of the program would be in the hands of the National Science Foundation and the Foundation would handle the economic studies necessary to determine the amounts to be paid under the several supplemental salary grant provision, as well as the determination of the full cost of educating students at the institutions. The Foundation would be required to consult with the Engineers' Council for Professional Development in the administration of the program, and would file a report with Congress at the beginning of each regular session with respect to the administration of each program, including recommendations for revisions.

In offering his bill, Representative HOLLAND said that the cost should be regarded as an essential expenditure for national defense. He estimated the cost of the undergraduate phase at $183 million for the fourth and succeeding years. The cost of the advanced fellowship program cannot be computed, he said, until it is known how many graduate students will enter the program, but he estimated that it should not cost much more than the undergraduate program. He told his colleagues that in a discussion of costs, "it is essential to recognize that money appropriated for this bill will go to develop our most precious resource, manpower. It will be money spent to meet an imperative need. Nothing is too costly if it is essential."

The Holland bill (H. R. 11200) has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As the boldest and most all-embracing legislative proposal to cope with the engineering manpower situation it is certain to receive detailed attention and study by congressional groups and Federal agencies concerned with the engineering manpower subject, as well as from professional engineers and professional associations studying the many suggestions advanced in the critical manpower field.

Address Delivered by Mr. Walter V. Chopyk Before the 10th Anniversary Banquet of the John Onufryk American Legion Post, No. 1590, Rochester, N. Y., on May 27, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following address delivered by Mr. Walter V. Chopyk before the 10th anniversary banquet of the John Onufryk American Legion Post, No. 1590, Rochester, N. Y., on May 27, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, members of the John Onufryk American Legion post, and ladies and gentlemen, my address this evening is entitled "Action Now, Later Too Late."

In the past months many fine articles dealing with the cause of liberation have been appearing in newspapers and magazines. Recently one such article, in the form of an editorial by David Lawrence entitled "The Power of the Peoples," appeared in the magazine U. S. News & World Report. The highlight of this editorial can be best stated by the following quotation from it:

"Too often our minds are focused on the power of governments and not on the power of the peoples. Too often we accept the doctrine that peaceful coexistence with gangster governments is a prerequisite to our own survival."

Evidence of the truth of these words was quite evident at the Geneva Summit Conference last year. Mr. James Hagerty, Presidential Press Secretary, hearing of a press conference that had been planned by the many representatives of the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain, among which I was one, who were covering the Geneva Conference which was planned to take place during the Geneva talks, requested me personally to refrain from holding this conference in Geneva and asked instead to hold it in the United States.

In spite of the fact that the feeling of peaceful coexistence dominated the talks in Geneva, we were determined to have the power and the voice of the subjugated people heard and felt, and we held our press conference and made it possible for the feelings of 200 million oppressed peoples of the Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Slovakia, and Cossakia to be heard at this conference.

While our own representatives from the United States were hobnobbing with the Kremlin's glamour boys who came with their smiles and good manners hiding their sinister and deceptive motives, it was not protocol to disturb the fun by bringing up the murders and oppression going on. Our representatives gave the appearance of condoning Soviet brutality in this way. Were we our brothers' keeper in Geneva? Did we do anything to help those in the Soviet political prisons? Did these actions spell any hope for them?

How long are we to maintain this goodwill with the terrorists of the U. S. S. R.? When are we going to give the underdogs something to hope for?

Mr. Lawrence continues to say, "It is true a gangster government can in its desperation, try to start a war, and fellow Americans, let us avoid complacency regarding this matter of Red Russia decreasing its manpower and armed might and releasing so many doves of peace in Kremlin Square. They can start a war and if it will keep their people united against the "capitalist enemy," as Radio Moscow puts it, they will overnight mass such enormous forces that would make Hitler's armies look like a troop of Boy Scouts in comparison.

Mr. Lawrence continues and I agree 100 percent with him, but at heart, Moscow's rulers are probably more afraid of the very people they might drag into war. What are we doing to stir up the resentment of the Soviet slaves and thus weaken the Soviet regime? Basically, very little. We are giving them a wilting Voice of America which is on the wrong track. People behind the Iron Curtain will not be impressed by two cars in every garage. This is disgusting to their ears. The Voice of Canada and Radio Roma are doing a much better job. We know this from first hand information leaking out. We spoke over the Voice of Canada and Radio Roma of the Ukrainian underground army. The Voice of America has never mentioned the power of the Ukrainian underground army. How long will the Voice of America continue its policy of do-not-disturb while every night, Radio Moscow blasts out at America with shooting words. We must fight fire with fire or not get into the propaganda war at all.

Just the other day, Adm. William Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, declared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "It is in the political and diplomatic fields that we have to worry. The West's situation in long terms is more dangerous than a year ago, because Soviet propaganda has become more severe. We have to improve our performance in the information and diplomatic fields. We should not be complacent. We have a great deal of work to do."

Tell me, Isn't this exactly what Americans of Ukrainian extraction and others have been preaching for a long time? Why hasn't the State Department taken heed of our warnings or are some persons in the Department still wearing blindfolds and are afraid to admit failure in counteracting Soviet propaganda? Are they still blinded to the brutalities committed by the Reds, why have our leaders in Washington ignored these facts? Instead, they have chosen to break bread and sip cocktails with the same men who are responsible for the inhuman treatment of our own brothers and sisters.

Not only is our State Department lax in carrying out an effective counterpropaganda campaign. Even President Eisenhower, at the summit conference, agreed not to discuss the position of the satellites. Later again, in a Miami speech, he returned to the subject, however, he passed over the question of the enslaved peoples of the U. S. S. R. In 1955 Secretary Dulles casually mentioned the existence of 16 national republics of the Soviet Union. However, these remarks and even the speeches of the leaders for the liberation of enslaved peoples are not much help. This state of mind in Washington is not only weak and dangerous, but is directly contrary to the principles of our Nation as expressed by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Fellow Americans, let us face it. We are not winning the cold war and we are making less progress in winning the hearts and minds of millions to our side in the struggle against the colonial and imperialistic forces of Russian communism. Unless action is taken, we face the miserable prospect of failure. Joint congressional action is desperately needed to bolster and expand our informational mediums, in order to combat and expose the lies of the well-oiled propaganda machine of Moscow.

A joint resolution now before Congress, which is referred to as Joint Resolution 433, takes a step in the right direction. It calls for the formation of a committee to investigate the propaganda program now in effect in the United States with a view to finding better and more effective ways of combating Russian propaganda and of discovering its most vulnerable points. Some of our leaders, at least, have now realized the importance of having a fighting Voice of America to broadcast, instead of the soft-soap opera approach that has been the case.

For the past several years, I have been speaking before audiences very frequently and in most cases these audiences have been composed of persons of eastern European descent or sympathies. Tonight, however, I have the rare opportunity of addressing a group that is dedicated by its own principles to keeping America strong and free. Every Legionnaire knows from his own experience what it means to fight for freedom and is therefore even more qualified to understand and sympathize with the aspirations and hopes of the enslaved peoples of the world. The Legion has a voice in America that cannot be ignored. It carries the torch of patriotism for all Americans. Through my speech, therefore, the cries of help of the enslaved peoples are brought to your ears. The American Legion is strong and brave enough to do more to help these people now than any other group of citizens in the United States. The cause of enslaved peoples should become a major project of Legion activities. You can help by adopting resolutions in your chapter meetings and in your State and National convention, urging Congress to pass Joint Resolution 433. You should notify your own Representatives of how much this means to you. By thus espousing the cause of enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain, you will also be working for the cause of strengthening our own beloved America. You will be giving hope to those who are the natural enemies of communism, a force which seeks to destroy our own democracy.

The hope of freedom is not dead in these people, for they have always maintained an underground organization waiting for the opportunity of liberation. How long can this flame be kept alive if they do not get our moral support, if they do not think we care about them?

Help the enemies of communism and we help ourselves. Remember, action is needed now; tomorrow may be too late.

Why Does the World Hate America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, recently I read an article by M. Raymond Cartier in the French magazine Match. I would like to point out that this magazine has a very large circulation in France. In fact, it has, in proportion to the population, a larger circulation than Life has in our own country.

We have been discussing foreign aid on the floor of this House, and certainly nothing new or thought-provoking was brought out of our deliberations.

I am, therefore, delighted to find that my friend, Basil Brewer, the publisher of that great paper the New Bedford Standard-Times, has had a translation of the article from the National Review of May 2 printed "as a public service,"

and that it appears in the Washington Post of today:

WHY DOES THE WORLD HATE AMERICA?—A BLUNT STATEMENT OF THE FRENCH VIEWPOINT BY RAYMOND CARTIER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE MAGAZINE PARIS-MATCH, PARIS, FRANCE

If his arrival was not clandestine the word has no meaning. The only crowd was the police, closely guarding the Palam Airport.

Pandit Nehru had disdained to come, on the pretext that he was not only foreign minister but head of state.

And in the absence of an Indian foreign minister, Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the great Republic of the United States, was received at New Delhi by a functionary so minor that the American press agencies were ashamed to mention him.

They preferred to dwell on the fact that the Secretary of State has been gratified by a special and unusual favor—the authorization to fly over the Taj Mahal, in spite of the risk from vibrating motors to its fragile architecture.

A few weeks earlier Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev had arrived at this same Palam Airport amid the mobilized enthusiasm of the capital and the whole nation.

Delhi had been as red as a cock's comb—red with pleasure—under a grand array of waving flags which the police themselves had distributed to the people. A million persons, cheering the jovial Khrushchev and the debonair Bulganin, had lined the route along which the closed limousine of Mr. Dulles sped as swiftly as an American hearse.

"The warmth of our reception of the Soviet leaders simply conforms to our national tradition," a slightly embarrassed Indian official had explained. "The Queen of England, or Mr. Dulles, arriving tomorrow, would be received with the same cordiality." Mr. Dulles arrived. He saw.

DULLES ROAMS THE GLOBE IN QUEST OF FRIENDS

It is not always easy to understand the case of Mr. Dulles.

Why, for example, did he choose to expose himself, and his country with him, to inevitable comparison in a Jakarta still vibrating with last year's acclamation of the Chinese President of Council, Chou En-lai? Nothing essential, said official Washington, nothing very important, motivated his conversations in Indonesia.

Mr. Dulles is already, by a wide margin, the recordholder in mileage for his category. If he added to that mileage; if he visited capitals which no longer have any touristic attraction for him; if he incurred a supplementary and superfluous fatigue; he no doubt hoped to improve his contacts, to reduce misunderstandings, to rewarm atmospheres.

In a word, to make himself liked—the very symbol of the aim which America has been pursuing desperately and disastrously for 10 years.

The case of India, alongside that of Mr. Dulles, is edifying.

America powerfully helped India to gain its independence. In the very midst of the war, President Roosevelt pressured Winston Churchill to grant complete political liberty to a country whose sympathies were almost entirely with Japan.

Liberated India became one of America's darlings—the great spiritually enlightened democracy which would follow arm in arm with America the bright road of progress. Material aid was not omitted, even though the Delhi government always refused to undertake the slightest political obligation.

The United States subscribed $20 million to the last 5-year plan of the Indian Republic, and the total of its gifts is some $454 million. When the chronic Indian famine threatened to become tragic 3 years ago, America threw into the bottomless pit 2 million tons of wheat, part of which was lost through inefficiency.

Private aid—the phenomenal American private aid—has been added to this Government effort, representing for the year 1955 alone nearly 25 million pounds of foodstuffs with a value of $18,326,000.

American point-4 teams, and those of several large charitable organizations are at work in every part of the peninsula, helping the Indians to try not to die—while Russia has never offered to Indian distress the alms of a single sunflower seed.

VAST AMERICAN AID FUNDS BRING ONLY DISTRUST AND HATE

The dividends of these two policies are illustrated by the contrast between the reception of Mr. Dulles and that of Bulganin-Khrushchev.

There is certainly not a country in the world where America is more suspect as a nation, and the American more despised as an individual, than in India.

Nehru has never ceased to obstruct every American effort to organize the defense of Asia, but Nehru in this case merely interprets the distrust and animosity of his people.

When the Communists circulated the fable of American bacteriological war in Korea, probably not one Indian in a hundred thousand refused to believe it—just as not one in a hundred thousand doubted that the Americans were the aggressors.

The same quasi-unanimity admits as an absolute fact that the Americans dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, instead of a German city, because the Japanese are Asiatic and colored.

America could spend billions—and never succeed in effacing from the Indian mind the conviction that, more than any other nation, it represents the white man's privilege of aggressiveness and imperialism, while Russia, whose colonal conquests cover half of Asia and reach to India's very gates, is synonymous with racial equality and emancipation.

Take even England. Theoretically she oppressed India for 2 centuries, fattened on its substance, built on its misery the insolent fortunes of Belgravia and Mayfair, shed Indian blood in cruel represessions.

Nevertheless, today the Englishman—the hard, indifferent Englishman—compared with the American is to Indians a friend and brother.

No lesser person than Gamal Abdel Nasser told me recently that he had learned in conversation with Nehru this enormous difference in the degree of unpopularity of the two nations.

But when I asked Nasser what he himself thought of the Americans he thrust out his chin and answered only: "I like their films."

What applies to India applies to all Asia. America in 1948 literally tore Indonesia from the Dutch—and in his Jakarta press conference John Foster Dulles was reduced to pleading the cause of his country before accusers.

Japan, guilty and beaten, was coddled by America like a newborn babe, reeducated with immense care in democracy and the cult of baseball, presented with $2.5 billion in accordance with the American system of reverse payment of war damages.

All of which resulted in the neutralist Hatoyama Government, Tokyo crowds burning American vehicles, Japanese horror films on the atomization of Hiroshima—as if the Japanese were tender—and the immense bitter resentment of defeat slowly fermenting in this profound people.

ASIAN NATIONS' ONLY COMMON INTEREST IS DISLIKE FOR UNITED STATES

South Vietnam, Korea, and Formosa are border cases; they owe their every breath to America, yet even this does not always suffice to restrain the violence and impatience of their anti-American sentiment.

One could continue this world tour. It is the same everywhere.

Anti-Americanism is often the sole common interest of violently antagonistic nations or groups, as in South Africa where the whites curse America for its anticolonialism and the blacks blame it for its segregation.

Or in the Near East where the Arabs abominate it while the Jews accuse it of egoism and meaness. Latin America has not a single country where the anti-Yankee spirit does not preponderate.

The single fact that United States citizens have practically usurped the name of Americans causes a gnashing of teeth all the way to Canada, where, a foreign minister has said, "The time of automatically easy relations with our southern neighbor is ended, I believe, forever."

In Washington the accounts are kept. They are enormous. Since the war America has distributed to the world $52,287,000,000, of which $45,107,000,000 were gifts pure and simple. With this sum it could have rebuilt every road in the country, or created a superaviation far beyond Russia's ability to compete.

Moreover, what was given away was not merely money but wealth, particularly raw materials of which America, with its intense activity, does not have unlimited reserves.

Strictly speaking, say the economists, foreign aid is national impoverishment. It is acceptable if it buys political advantages.

Otherwise it is lunacy.

Western Europe always heads the list. It has received two-thirds of the 52 billion distributed since the war by the United States Government. England leads with 6 billion in economic aid, followed by France with 5½ billion, Germany with a little under 4 billion, and Italy with two billion eight hundred million.

Countries small in size but deeply shaken by the war, such as Holland, Austria, Greece, have cost the United States more than a billion each.

What is more extraordinary is that 11 years after the end of hostilities, when Europe is completely restored, private American generosity continues to feed a large number of Europeans.

France, an agricultural paradise, still receives from 14 philanthropic organizations almost 4,400 tons of foodstuffs, which is nothing compared with 66,000 to Italy and 33,000 to a Germany bathed in prosperity. The dollars which paid for these gifts, estimated at $160 million in 1955 for the whole world, are collected from individuals, of whom many are mere wage earners.

PROSPEROUS FRANCE, JEALOUS BRITAIN VIE IN ANTIPATHY FOR UNITED STATES

These public billions and private millions have not made Western Europe a much more favorable milieu (environment) for the United States than South America or Asia.

It is hard to say whether anti-American sentiment is stronger in England or in France. In France it is aggravated by Communist influence and at present overexcited by the events in North Africa; but in England it is fed by the intense frustration of a nation recently supplanted in its world role.

In any case it crosses social barriers in the two Western countries nearest to America.

The United States logically should have the sympathy of the working classes because of the condition of its own workers, and of the property-owning classes which it is protecting from annihilation by communism.

Yet more often it meets on the one side only principled opposition and on the other only misunderstanding, flippancy, often disdain.

Germany is not, for Washington, the consolation many Frenchmen imagine it to be.

There were those early days when the GI's felt less foreign in the conquered nation than anywhere else in Europe. But like Japan, Germany restored does not have the unctuous humility of Germany in collapse.

The "go home" campaign began there, and the movement which is alienating the Bonn government from American policy expresses the dominant attitude of the German people.

The idea of an exclusive alliance with an ideologically conquered Germany is no longer one of the variants in American planning.

It is curious to interview American officials on the universal anti-Americanism. In general they act as if the matter were not very important. "We hold," they say, "too much of a place in the world, and we are too rich, for American unpopularity not to be inevitable. No matter what we do we shall be criticized. We are making the best of it—it is for others to change."

But this defensive attitude masks a great perplexity and a serious disillusion. The State Department files are full of studies of the phenomenon and reports on remedial means. In the center of a powerful continental system, surrounded by armies all ready to march, Napoleon could allow himself the illusion of despising with impunity the opinion of foreign peoples. America, in spite of its wealth and power, is not in the same situation.

In Europe, the response to American wealth is an attitude of intellectual hauteur. Outside Europe, it is more simply a burning reaction of antipathy and envy.

America's desperate efforts to disassociate itself from colonial or ex-colonial Europeans, masters of yesterday's world, are in vain.

1. Americans are white.
2. They are rich.
3. They are the richest of the white peoples.

Three indelible facts which insure them, no matter what they do, the unfavorable prejudice of a majority of the world's inhabitants.

Americans do not share the resentment left by white imperialism; they take it more and more exclusively on their own shoulders. Their disinterestedness, even if sincere, does not exempt them from it.

Besides, a people fighting on a world field of battle cannot be disinterested. The Americans make themselves think they are, by considering the purity of their intentions and the quantity of good money which they throw after bad. But on this point the Arabs and Hindus are more perspicacious.

FOREIGN AID CALAMITOUS FOR HELPED AS WELL AS HELPER

Unfortunately there is little chance that America wil change its attitude in the foreseeable future. Urgent voices are heard demanding that it stiffen its anticolonial attitude and increase a foreign aid which, it is becoming clear, is calamitous for the helped as well as the helper.

"Whether we are criticized or not," said one Washington official, "we cannot let Iranian children die of hunger." A boundless idealism; a do-good conception of foreign policy; a conviction that all peoples should be free and all men electors; these ideas still reign firmly in Washington.

In the burning affair of North Africa, the State Department energetically eschews the slightest anti-French intervention, but official as well as public sentiment is categorically declared in favor of total independence for Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco.

The precedents of the past 10 years; the decline of every liberated country into communism or neutralism; the dizzy growth of anti-Americanism in decolonialized Asia; the fact that liberated North Africa will join an Arab League which is practically Moscow-oriented; the further fact that the loss of North Africa will push France itself—humiliated and desperate—into the Soviet system:

These realistic arguments, these indisputable truths, are unavailing against a sentimental enthusiasm that comes from a misinterpretation of history: the United States was born of a colonial rebellion (which is a false notion), and consequently all colonial rebellions deserve its sympathy.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE DICTATED BY REALISTIC SELF-INTEREST

It is terribly difficult to be the dominant power of an epoch. The Washington officials are not wrong in saying that anti-Americanism will exist, no matter what America does, so long as the United States holds its present rank. But anti-Americanism is also maintained by faults in judgment and by grave and avoidable errors. One of the most frequent is America's incapacity for taking sides. Its most general mistake is obedience to ideology, or more exactly to an intellectual confusion in which ideology and egoism blend and obscure one another.

There would be less anti-Americanism in the world if America abandoned its philanthropic aspirations, its vocation of Santa Claus, its transcendental morality, all its missionary trappings, all its Boy Scout gear, and if, at last, it followed openly and intelligently the policy of its own interest.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in debate last week one of my colleagues said that when a man goes into the Army he quickly loses some constitutional rights that he normally has as a civilian. This is true to a minor degree. The Constitution itself makes an exception of cases arising in the land or naval forces. Is this to be considered as justification for stripping him completely of all constitutional rights when he is serving in the Armed Forces abroad? His brothers in arms who are fortunate enough to remain in this country still have the rights given them by the Constitution, and enumerated explicitly in the Uniform Manual of Courts-Martial.

There are some who still insist that a trial in a foreign court does not deprive an accused American of any of his rights. This is because the enumerated safeguards in article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement are deeeptive. It is unnecessary to belabor this point because the Judge Advocate General of the Army has already determined what rights may be lost. I quote from the study made by him of the laws of France:

Certain guaranties are absent in general or specific terms from French law, and the provisions of the code, with experience derived from practice, reveal that there is some likelihood that they may be denied the accused in certain cases in France. They are:

1. Prompt and speedy trial.
2. Privilege of suspect or accused to be silent, burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt on government, presumption of innocence.
3. Guaranty of confrontation by witnesses.
4. Involuntary confessions prohibited.

The proponents of the status agreements have been quick to say that an accused does not have a trial by jury in our military courts. They overlook the similarity in procedure, though by another name. Trial is before a board which can be composed of both officers and enlisted men. The accused has the right to challenge any member of the panel for cause. He has one peremptory challenge. There is no such right in a foreign court.

Critics of our court-martial system also ignore the elaborate system of review and appeal, even to the President. The rights of appeal abroad are only apparent. Servicemen hesitate to appeal because their sentence may be increased. Right now, in France, an appeal is pending in an airman's case, brought by the prosecution for the sole purpose of increasing the penalty imposed.

Repatriation of Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the question of forced repatriation is not a dead one and something that is not a matter of the past.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the June 7, 1956, edition of the Ledger, Montrose, Calif., entitled "Offers Congress Ample Proof on Delivery of Refugees to Reds" written by Mr. Ed Delaney.

As an example of the problem that is with us today, I include an article from the June 9, 1956, Tablet entitled "Is U. N. Commissioner for Refugees Pro-Red?" written by Mr. Julius Epstein. Mr. Epstein's article points out that this repatriation of anti-Communists is still very much with us.

The articles follow:

[From the Montrose (Calif.) Ledger of June 7, 1956]

OFFERS CONGRESS AMPLE PROOF ON DELIVERY OF REFUGEES TO REDS

(By Ed Delaney)

News headlines of the past week informed us that neutral truce teams in Korea have been ousted because the Communists were flagrantly violating the terms of the so-called armistice in Korea that was dictated by the Communists and signed by the United States.

Some of the most infamous crimes and violations of agreements made with the Reds in Europe, at the end of hostilities there in 1945, have not as yet been blazoned in the metropolitan press. Although those crimes were committed 10 or 11 years ago, great effort is being made to suppress the facts and to shield those who perpetrated the crimes.

The forced repatriation to Soviet controlled countries of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians, by American military and civilian authorities in Western Europe in the years 1945–47, has resulted in a bill being introduced in Congress for an investigation and citation of those responsible for it. The measure, House Resolution 137, was introduced by Representative ALBERT BOSCH, of New York.

Many people of the Republic of Slovakia, who fled the Communists and sought sanctuary in the American occupied parts of Germany were forcibly rounded up and delivered

to the Reds for execution, torture, and enslavement.

Because I had the opportunity to personally witness some of these forcible repatriations and had put certain of the incidents in a book which was published 18 months ago, I was invited by refugee organizations to address their meetings in several eastern cities. The additional documented data and information I was able to obtain in connection with those crimes against humanity, will be given to Congressman BOSCH and others who are determined that the truth shall be presented to the American people, regardless of efforts to suppress it.

HANDED TO REDS

My own documentation relates how the American military authorities, in violation of all rules of international warfare and agreements made with other powers, handed prominent political prisoners and religious leaders to the Communists in 1945.

Additional proof of such crimes is contained in statements furnished me by certain refugees now in this country and Canada. For instance: between June 25 and 28, 1945, political refugees, men, women, and children, numbering approximately 300, were rounded up in the American military zone of Kremsmuster, Austria. Their belongings were taken from them. The whole group, with small chilren, some not a year old, were held in an open field for a week, guarded day and night by United States military police. After 1 week they were loaded into freight cars and shipped to the Czech Communists. Many of the group were jailed, tortured and some hanged.

WAR CRIMINALS

On June 27 and 28, at Aurolzmunster, Austria, in the United States zone, about 500 men, women, and children were herded into freight cars and shipped to the Communists, against their protests. Among them were prominent political leaders, priests, members of parliament, professors, teachers and small children—who were listed as "war criminals." The utter inconsistency of listing children as "war criminals" did not seem to deter the United States officials from handing them to the Reds for extermination.

From documents obtained and interviews with persons I had known in Europe and those who knew of my efforts to get facts to the public, much material will be added to the files being accumulated for the congressional committee, if they desire it. It has been indicated the committee will be glad to get the data.

House Resolution 137, notes that the "forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians, represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles."

FIX THE BLAME

The resolution also asks that a committee be authorized and directed to conduct a "full and complete investigation" of the forced repatriation program "carried out by our military and civilian authorities in Germany and other countries." It further stipulates that the committee shall "fix the responsibility for such program."

It is somewhat a shock to many Americans to learn that such inhuman and brutal treatment was meted out to anti-Communists, under direction and at the order of American officials. But among other documentation that is being put in hands of the committee is the official order in their manual of instruction for those handling the displaced persons.

Regardless of the political claptrap being put out by some in the Washington bureaus, tending to show that United States prestige has not suffered abroad, the reports gleaned from visits to some 8 or 9 cities in the past 2 weeks, point the opposite. The damage done can be repaired, but it is doubtful that those who were in any manner associated with the forced repatriation, will now be accepted as liberators of the ones they indirectly, handed over to the benign graces of the Communists.

[From the Tablet of June 9, 1956]

IS U. N. COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES PRO-RED?

(By Julius Epstein)

Should the American people support the office of the present U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart, who—were he an American citizen—would not be eligible for a mail carrier's job because he could not meet our Government's security standards?

That's the question Congress will have to answer when the appropriations for UNREF (United Nations Refugee Fund) for the next fiscal year will come up within a few weeks. The administration is asking for $2,300,000 for the next 18-month period.

The reason why this question must be answered with a clear "No" lies in Dr. van Heuven Goedhart's past record as one of the most outspoken supporters and one of the most stanchest defenders of Stalin's internal and external crimes as well as of the whole Soviet concept in world politics.

QUOTES FROM PRO-SOVIET BOOKS

To prove this very serious accusation which may well lead to the resignation of Mr. van Heuven Goedhart, we have just to look at the introduction he wrote to the book by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn, The Great Conspiracy Against Soviet Russia. The book, which was required reading for American prisoners to be brainwashed in Communist prisoners of war camps in North Korea and China, is probably the most formidable pro-Stalinist propaganda job ever done by American authors.

A few quotations will show the true character of this book. About the famous Moscow framed-up trial against Pyatakov, Radek, Sokolnikov, Shestov, Muralov, and 12 other defendants, page 301:

"The American Ambassador to Moscow, Joseph E. Davies, was profoundly impressed by the trial. He attended it daily, and, assisted by an interpreter, carefully followed the proceedings. A former corporation lawyer, Ambassador Davies stated that the Soviet prosecutor Vyshinsky, who was being currently described by anti-Soviet propagandists as a brutal inquisitor, impressed him as being 'much like Homer Cummings, calm, dispassionate, intellectual, and able and wise. He conducted the treason trial in a manner that won my respect and admiration as a lawyer.'"

On one of the most clear sighted and accurate predictions about the future course of Soviet foreign policy, made in 1944, by our former Ambassador to Moscow, William C. Bullitt, Sayers and Kahn write on page 375 as follows:

"Four years later (1944) as the Second World War was drawing to its close, Bullitt reappeared on the European continent as a correspondent for Life magazine. From Rome he sent a sensational article to Life which was published in that periodical on September 4, 1944. Purporting to give the opinions of certain anonymous Romans, Bullitt repeated the anti-Soviet propaganda which for 20 years had been utilized by international fascism in its drive for world conquest. Bullitt wrote:

"'The Romans expect the Soviet Union to dominate Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. * * * They expect that, besides eastern Poland, the Russians will also annex East Prussia, including Koenigsberg.'

"Bullitt asserted that the menace against which western civilization must unite was Moscow and its Communist agents."

From page 390:

"But the greatest of all surprises of the Second World War was Soviet Russia. Overnight, it seemed, a thick false fog was torn apart, and through it emerged the true stature and meaning of the Soviet nation, its leaders, its economy, its army, its people and, in Cordell Hull's words, 'the epic quality of their patriotic fervor.'

"LAUDS ARMY UNDER STALIN

"The first great realization which came out of the Second World War was that the Red Army, under Marshal Stalin, was the most competent and powerful force on the side of world progress and democracy."

The book concludes with the following statement by Colonel Robins on page 396:

"Soviet Russia exploits no colonies, seeks to exploit none. Soviet Russia operates no foreign trade cartels, seeks none to exploit. Stalin's policies have wiped out racial, religious, national and class antagonism within the Soviet territories. This unity and harmony of the Soviet peoples point the path to international peace."

Quite rightly, the book the Great Conspiracy Against Soviet Russia by Sayers and Kahn was enthusiastically welcomed by the American Communist Party as well as by the Soviet press. One July 1, 1946, the New York Daily Worker wrote:

"William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party, warmly endorsed the new $1 edition of the Great Conspiracy Against Russia by Albert E. Kahn and Michael Sayers, just off the press, declaring that the new popular edition 'opens up the possibility of reaching hundreds of thousands of workers with the true facts regarding the anti-Soviet intrigues of American and British imperialism from the time of the Russian revolution until the present.'"

This is the book whose Dutch edition carries an introduction by our present U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees (from Communist countries), Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart, a highly praising introduction as we shall see, an introduction from which he has never retracted a single word and which is still distributed in the Netherlands as well as in all other Dutch-speaking areas throughout the world.

COUNTESS TOLSTOY PROTESTS

Only with this introduction in mind are we now able to understand why he so fiercely criticized our Government's program for aiding refugees newly escaped from Communist countries.

Only with this introduction in mind can we fathom the hidden reasons for his continuing participation in Soviet-approved repatriation of refugees from non-Communist countries.

It was this outspoken participation in the Soviet-endorsed repatriation program which caused Countess Alexandra Tolstoy, president of the Tolstoy Foundation, to address a letter on July 5, 1955, to Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, in which she strongly and courageously protested against the High Commissioner's activities. In this memorable letter, she wrote as follows:

"I am taking the liberty of bringing to the immediate attention of the Senate Appropriations Committee considering amendments to S. 2090, information confirmed to the Tolstoy Foundation and other American voluntary agencies working with refugees in Austria that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is actively participating in repatriation of refugees from Austria to Iron Curtain countries.

"We have been informed that a Russian-speaking representative of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has been accompanying a Soviet Repatriation Mission in the British Zone of Austria with the knowledge and approval of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

"It is my understanding that the Congress had never before appropriated funds to an agency which operates in a manner which is directly opposed to the interests of the U. S. A.

"My organization as well as other American voluntary agencies is most interested in this question, and we are bending every effort at the present moment toward minimizing and preventing redefection of refugees.

"Although the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees claims legal grounds under his statute for participating in repatriation, we still consider that the fact remains that the United States Congress would be defeating its own objectives by authorizing and appropriating special funds for the United Nations High Commissioner whose policies, objectives, and interests are in direct conflict with the United States Government and the policies that are followed by the voluntary agencies working in the field."

SUPPORTS SOVIET PROGRAM

Since then the High Commissioner has not ceased participating in repatriation activities. He is the only official who ever invited repatriation of political refugees to Communist countries and who ever described such repatriation as a solution of the refugee problem.

Under his eyes, these horrible scenes at the Italian-Yugoslav border are daily occurring as documented in the memorandum by the former Yugloslav Ambassador to the United States, Constantin A. Fotitch and Michael Krek, presented to the State Department on March 20, 1956. (The text of this memorandum appeared in the Tablet of April 28, 1956, and was also fully inserted in the record of this writer's testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security of May 18, 1956.)

This writer wants to make it abundantly clear that he does not want to deprive the U. N. High Commissioner's office, as an institution, of a single penny, provided that a more suitable man can be found to direct its activities. It is to be hoped that both Appropriations Committees of our Congress will take the same stand.

Should it turn out to be impossible—for some reason unknown to this writer—to remove Dr. van Heuven Goedhart, the man who so praisingly introduced one of the most vicious Stalinist books ever written, then and only then should Congress consider the possibility of giving the funds, originally intended for the U. N. High Commissioner's office, to American Government, as well as voluntary, agencies, such as USEP (United States escapee program), the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Tolstoy Foundation, Church World Service, and the American Friends of Russian Freedom. All these agencies—and many others, of course—do extremely valuable work in the field, especially in Europe, and all of them are strongly against extending any, however cleverly disguised, invitation to political refugees to be repatriated to the countries of Communist horrors from which they fled.

To Strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and Amend the Antitrust Law Prohibiting Price Discrimination

SPEECH
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. As a cosponsor of H. R. 11 I have been very much interested in it. I feel it will help small business men who are having a most difficult time in this era of big business. We need badly to take steps to curb unfair and discriminatory monopoly and to preserve the competitive, free enterprise system. This legislation is aimed to prohibit unfair price discrimination and give the small dealer a chance to compete with the larger retailer. Recent large increases in bankruptcy of smaller business enterprises are alarming. They clearly show the need for this legislation. This bill has won the interest and approval of small business people in my district and I join in their urgent request that you act favorably on it.

Breathing New Life Into NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the article by Mr. James P. Warburg, of New York, in the current issue of the Reporter should be read by all those who are concerned that our foreign policy meet the realities of today. The article follows:

BREATHING NEW LIFE INTO NATO
(By James P. Warburg)

Although President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State have, until very recently, spoken with pride and satisfaction of NATO's growing strength and its successful role in forcing a change of Soviet tactics, it is now admitted that NATO is in serious trouble.

The obvious immediate cause of declining morale in the Atlantic Community is that since the Russians have stopped making threatening gestures a certain apathy if not a sense of greater security has permeated the people of Europe, dissolving the temporary solidarity created by common fear.

That, however, is by no means the whole story. The Soviet New Look has undermined the alliance's solidarity. The belated comprehension of what happens when both sides fight with atomic weapons has had an even worse effect. The more people think about it, the more irrelevant appears the effort to create a conventional shield against invasion. European nations have been asking themselves more and more frequently:

"If the threat of massive retaliation by the United States can prevent war, of what use are our puny divisions? And if the United States fails to deter aggression, or provokes it, then Europe will be finished, no matter which side ultimately achieves victory." In addition, an increasing number of Europeans are beginning to suspect that a defensive alliance involving the rearmament of a partitioned Germany is more likely to provoke than to prevent eventual conflict.

These, too, are only partial causes of European apathy. In order to consider what remedial action might be taken, it is necessary to recognize that the major weaknesses of NATO go back to its origins. The alliance, concluded in 1949, was the result of two assumptions: that Western Europe was the primary target of Soviet expansionism, and that military means would be the chosen instrument of Soviet aggression.

REARMING WEST GERMANY

It is not necessary to discuss here whether these two hypotheses were ever correct. I for one have consistently questioned their validity. Whatever may have been the original Soviet intentions, it is now clear that the primary Russian targets are southeast Asia and the Middle East—that the Soviet aim is to outflank and undermine NATO by other than military means rather than to attack it frontally.

The European have been quick to grasp the fallacy of the original premises. Yet the European themselves, especially the French, are largely responsible for the misshapen nature of NATO. Originally, the North Atlantic Treaty was designed as a declaration of political and economic as well as military solidarity. Its nonmilitary aspect was, however, overshadowed by the historic decision of Canada and the United States to consider an attack upon Western Europe as an attack upon themselves. Unfortunately, this military overemphasis was increased by French insistence that the United States promise not only to fight an aggressor but to start fighting him at the eastern fronties of Western Europe.

The United States agreed to this far-reaching extension of its commitment without facing its obvious implications. One of these was that an agreement to fight an invader in central Germany would inevitably lead to West German rearmament. The Korean war did not cause the United States to reverse its policy with respect to Germany; it merely provided the occasion for a reversal that had already become inevitable. The American demand for West German rearmament, in September 1950, caused the first wide-open cleavage in European opinion, one segment of which then and there became permanently alienated from NATO. This was true not only in the continental countries that Nazi Germany had overrun but in Britain and in Germany itself. The decision also strengthened Russian fear of NATO as a potentially offensive alliance.

At the Lisbon Conference of 1952, the United States finally persuaded the European governments to accept some form of German rearmament as well as a schedule of forced-draft buildup of their own military establishments. At the same time, the alliance was extended to include Greece and Turkey, two nations traditionally hostile to each other.

The Lisbon schedule turned out to be beyond the capacity of the nations participating. As a matter of fact, the goals set for 1954 have yet to be fulfilled. A cutback in promised American aid and a stretchout in American rearmament were followed by a general slowdown in European efforts. When the incoming Eisenhower administration ordered further reductions, adopted the New Look, and apparently placed its reliance upon massive retaliation, the NATO wheels ground to a halt.

THE CRISIS OF 1954

An equally important reason for the slowdown was French reluctance to ratify the treaty that would authorize German rearmament. When this European Defense Community Treaty was finally rejected in August 1954, NATO faced a crisis of the first magnitude. Rapid British footwork resulted in the development of a substitute plan. Whereas the EDC Treaty would have brought about a considerable degree of political and economic integration in addition to a common defense force, the Western

European Union substitute provided merely for adding West Germany to a strictly military alliance. Since then, however, opposition within Germany to NATO membership at the cost of continued partition has mounted steadily. At best, it will be 3 years before the 12 German divisions will be added to NATO. There is considerable doubt whether they will ever materialize as NATO reinforcements.

Meanwhile, France has now withdrawn the large majority of its NATO forces for duty in north Africa. The building and modernization of airfields is behind schedule. If war were to come tomorrow, there seems little doubt that Russia would enjoy not only immense superiority in ground forces but initial tactical air superiority as well. Small wonder that General Gruenther, NATO's retiring supreme commander, recently told a British audience that his organization was not yet capable of repelling an invasion.

In addition to a glaring weakness on the central front, which would invite invasion if the Russians had any intention to risk that adventure, NATO's Mediterranean flank has disintegrated, largely as a result of the Anglo-Greek quarrel over Cyprus. In the north, NATO's Icelandic base is in jeopardy because of local political opposition. These are the military facts.

The political and economic dangers facing the North Atlantic Community are even more serious. Britain, France, and Germany are its European mainstays. Britain faces bankruptcy and impotence if it loses its now seriously endangered hold on the oil fields of the Persian Gulf area. France faces decline to the rank of a third-rate power through the loss of North Africa. Germany is slowly drifting toward direct negotiation with Russia, which may well mean abandonment of military alliance with the West.

Relations between Germany and France are getting worse rather than better. The French are unhappy over losing the Saar and have angered the Germans by suggesting that disarmament take precedence over German reunification. American influence in Germaney is waning because of the obvious bankruptcy of a policy that seeks to force from Russia what amounts to unconditional surrender in an all-German settlement. Britain, the traditional moderator, is too beset with its own troubles in the Middle East to devise a way out of the German impasse.

All three of our major Allies are openly critical of Washington's overemphasis upon the purely military aspects of the European problem. Italy, too, does not hesitate to voice its dissatisfaction. President Gronchi recently told our Congress that NATO is out of date and "the reorganization of the western world" should be the first order of business. Our good friend and neighbor, Canada, has repeatedly warned that NATO will not survive unless its political, social, and economic clauses are implemented.

BASIC ORGANIZATION

This is the background against which one must consider what remedial action should be taken. If NATO cannot survive as a purely military alliance, what else can it become? This, in turn, raises the question: Is NATO itself necessarily the instrument through which Atlantic solidarity can be revitalized?

The obvious answer is that something must be done not just about NATO but about the basic organization of the Atlantic Community.

If the organized life of the Atlantic Community is to exist only in NATO, then Atlantic solidarity is already moribund.

NATO is obsolete in every respect except that it embodies the undertaking of Canada and the United States to consider an attack upon Western Europe as an attack upon themselves. In all other respects, it bears the marks of the time when it was believed that the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons. It is doubtful whether even later the significance of Russia's penetration of the atomic secret sank fully into the minds of the NATO planners.

If the Atlantic community is to regain its inner solidarity and recapture the moral leadership of the world, it must present itself to the world in a garb other than that of NATO. We rightly think of the Atlantic community as the breeding ground of freedom. We tend to forget that, in the eyes of many of the world's peoples, the Atlantic community is also the cradle of colonialism and that it has been the breeding ground of many wars. In the view of this observer, it is neither fitting nor expedient that the vital center of western civilization should stand embodied before the world in a military organization—especially a military organization dominated by 3 nations of which 2 have been and still are the world's greatest colonial powers. If it is to revitalize itself and its influence, the Atlantic community must organize and be represented by an entity recognized by all the world's peoples as an instrument of progress toward greater freedom, human betterment, and lasting peace.

NONMILITARY COUNCIL

What needs to be done cannot be accomplished merely by giving NATO new jobs to do or creating a Cabinet charged with the consideration of political and economic problems. It can be accomplished only if the Atlantic community breaks out of its military shell and brings into being a wholly new, nonmilitary Atlantic Council.

This new embodiment of the western heritage would concern itself first of all with developing the political, social, and economic solidarity of the community. Secondly, the new council would seek to develop common policy with respect to other parts of the world. Third, the council would speak for the West in dealing with the Sino-Soviet orbit, instead of leaving such negotiations to be conducted by the American, British, and French Foreign Ministers.

One of the council's chief aims in such negotiations would be to achieve peace settlements and an overall security agreement, effectively enforced by the United Nations. Should it succeed in this endeavor, the need for alliances and counter-alliances would eventually be eliminated. This is the ultimate goal toward which Sir Winston Churchill recently directed attention.

Meanwhile, what of NATO? The alliance would continue to exist as long as necessary but, even as such, it requires drastic reorganization. It needs a moderization of its strategic concepts and, above all, a long-overdue revision of the bankrupt western policy with respect to Germany. Such a revision would aim at the military neutralization of a reunified Germany and the creation of the widest possible neutralized belt across central Europe.

A militarily neutralized Germany, excluded from NATO would not be prevented from joining the new Atlantic Council any more than a neutralized Soviet satellite would be prevented from maintaining its close political and economic ties with the Soviet Union. Germany would not become a vacuum, cut loose from its western moorings. It would, in every sense except that of a military alliance, be a member of the Atlantic Community. Should Russia reject this proposal, the West could still proceed to admit West Germany to the new Atlantic Council, releasing it from NATO and thus placing the onus for continued partition squarely upon the Kremlin.

Finally, since membership in the new organization would require no military commitment whatever, it is quite conceivable that even such determined European neutrals as Switzerland and Sweden might be willing to join and thus to round out the Atlantic Community.

The Atlantic Community needs more than a long-overdue reorganization of NATO. It needs a wholly new instrument to express and pursue its affirmative purposes, until the day when peace is firmly established and even this new instrument can safely be dissolved into a fully functioning world organization. It is encouraging that the study committee recently appointed by the NATO council consists of the foreign ministers of Canada, Italy, and Norway.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything need or can be added to what has been just said so well by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], who is the chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee set up by Chairman RICHARDS, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to study this problem. All I can do is to underline the fact which is so generally unrealized, or misunderstood, that when the Status of Forces Treaty was entered into by the United States, we did not surrender any sovereignty or any rights our boys had in other countries. Rather, under those agreements, the countries to which these boys are sent, have voluntarily relinquished certain aspects of their own national sovereignty to give us rights which we did not have.

Of course our men abroad do not find it as good as it would be at home, in this as well as many other respects; but, actually, they are a great deal better off under the Status of Forces Treaty than they would be without it.

Since no independent, self-respecting government is going to relinquish all of its sovereignty within its own borders, for us to insist on full sovereignty over every American soldier off duty wherever he is would require us to withdraw United States troops from all foreign bases. It would mean abandoning the world to the Kremlin. That has been its No. 1 objective all these years—to get the United States isolated and its allies pulled away so that we stand alone. The adoption of the Bow amendment would force us to give up the whole program of world security and withdraw from all our foreign bases. At one stroke the Kremlin would have won.

If we will think coolly about the perilous situation we are in today and the only reason for this bill at all, we will see that to pass the Bow amendment would simply wreck the program and leave the United States in a position where no Americans, whether military or civilian, and whether abroad or at home would

have the security that it is our purpose in this bill to try to build up.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I think I inadvertently said I urge the committee to vote against the treaty. I urge the committee to vote against the Bow amendment, because, in my judgment, we have greater protection of our men under the Status of Forces Treaty than otherwise.

Federalist Papers a Best Seller in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to learn of the enthusiastic reception among the people of Italy that attended the publication of the Federalist Papers translated in Italian. Strange as it may seem, this classic of American democracy never before had been translated into the Italian language and made available in the language that they could understand to the people of Italy.

Most heartening it is to know that no sooner was this work off the presses than the sales were so large that within a matter of a few weeks the Federalist Papers translated into the Italian language was second on the list of best sellers in Italy. I say this is heartening because we in the House only a few weeks ago provided for a program carrying the classics of American democracy to all parts of the world. These classics that inspired our forefathers are now to be translated into 25 or 30 different languages and made available to peoples everywhere in inexpensive editions selling for 10 or 15 cents a volume.

If in Italy a translated edition of the Federalist Papers in a relatively expensive edition could meet with such a tremendous public response what, Mr. Speaker, can we expect from the program that will carry translated editions of our American classics to people everywhere in editions selling for 10 or 15 cents a copy?

Knowing of the interest of my colleagues, I have thought it worthwhile to compile some of the book reviews in the leading publications of Italy that attended the publication of this translated edition of the Federalist Papers.

STRESS NEED FOR TRANSLATIONS

But before proceeding with the presentment of these Italian book reviews, I wish to bring to attention a letter from Dr. Max Rheinstein, professor of law of the University of Chicago, to whom I had sent a copy of the Italian edition of the Federalist Papers. Dr. Rheinstein is a professor of comparative law and a scholar whose reputation is international. Dr. Rheinstein's letter follows:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is to express to you my best thanks for the copy of the Italian edition of the Federalist Papers, which you were kind enough to send me.

May I congratulate you on the achievement of having this work published in Italy and thus having started an enterprise which I very much hope will be continued. From my knowledge of Europe, where I have traveled extensively during the last few years and where I have a great many friends in academic life, I know how little known the classics of American democracy are there. There is a real need for making these works available to European readers, especially students and among them quite particularly the students of law, who are likely to occupy future positions of leadership in their nations.

The Italian edition of the Federalist is a beautiful achievement. The author of the introduction, Professor Ambrosini, is one of the most highly respected men of Italian public life. In his introduction, he combines high scholarship with a fine gift of presentation.

The format of the volume is beautiful and dignified. It will have a great appeal on the Italian book market. Acquaintance with the work could be greatly increased, however, if it would be possible also to bring out a cheap paper-back edition which would be available at a small price to students. The idea of publishing such a series is likely to bear rich fruits.

Sincerely yours,

MAX RHEINSTEIN,
Professor of Law.

ITALIAN EDITION OF FEDERALIST

The following is from the October 26, 1955, edition of Il Messaggero of Rome:

Yesterday, on the premises of the Association for International Organization, in the presence of the Prime Minister, of Minister of Public Education Rossi, of Mr. J. D. Zellerbach, former Marshall plan director for Italy, of Dr. Remsen Bird, of Minister-Counselor Jernegan, of the American Embassy, and of represenatives from other official agencies, the announced presentation of the first Italian edition of the Federalist was made. Hon. Gaspare Ambrosini, professor of constitutional law at the University of Rome and scientific editor of the work, presented a summary of American constitutional development from the Revolution to the Philadelphia Convention, analyzing the admirable contribution of the authors of the Federalist, three great American statesmen: Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. The fundamental problems of society and state, the position of the citizen confronted by a political power, the organization and operation of the public authorities, the tasks of the legislative, the efficiency of the executive, and the independence of the judiciary [branches of government], Professor Ambrosini said, has been thoroughly discussed in the American classic, not only with reference to the positive institutions of the American Constitution but also on the plane of the general principles governing society.

The first edition of the Federalist contains an introduction by Prof. Gaspare Ambrosini, with appendixes edited by Guglielmo Negri and Mario d'Addio. The work was translated by Bianca Maria Tedeschini Bosco, and the volume, in elegant print, was published by the publishing house of Nistri-Lischi of Pisa.

FIRST ITALIAN TRANSLATION

The following is from the Libri e Riviste—Notiziario Bibliografico Mensile—of November 1955:

Hamilton, Alexander; Jay, John; Madison, James. Il Federalista. (Comment on the Constitution of the United States.) Introduction by Gaspare Ambrosini; appendixes by G. Negri and M. D'Addio; translation by B. M. Tedeschini Lalli. Pisa, Nistri Lischi, 1955, 8°; pp. CXXXXVI-662, with 16 tables. f.t., 1,600 lire.

This is the first Italian translation of the original comment on the Constitution of the United States of America, The Federalist, a collection of 85 essays written by the authors between 1787 and 1788 addressed to the people of the State of New York in defense of the Philadephia Convention of September 17, 1787, and requesting ratification by the convention of the State of New York. G. Ambrosini remarks in the introduction that the work, which is still considered the most authoritative comment on the American Constitution and one of the alltime classics of political literature, points up, through what may be called authentic interpretation of the institutional concept, the obvious difference between the American Constitution and that of Great Britain which is unwritten and flexible. He then outlines the genesis of the Declaration of Independence of 1776, and subsequent political and constitutional developments up to the Philadelphia Convention and beyond, leading up to the Federal Constitution. The middle portion comprises analysis. A large portion of the work is devoted to illustrating the position of the Federalist in the struggle for ratification of the Constitution. The middle portion comprises the essays devoted to the fundamental problems of society and state, to the position of the citizen confronted with political power, the operation and organization of the public authorities, the tasks of the legislative, the efficiency of the executive, the independence of the judiciary (branches of government). The two appendixes examine the influence (exerted) on politico-juridical literature and the excellence of the jus naturae which it came to represent.

AFTER 170 YEARS

The following is from the October 31, 1955, edition of the Giornale della Libreria:

After 170 years, Italy has issued the first [Italian] edition of Il Federalista (The Federalist).

The Federalist is a collection of 85 essays written between 1787 and 1788, by A. Hamilton, J. Madison, and J. Jay, to defend the Federal Constitution approved by the Philadelphia Convention on September 17, 1787, and submitted for ratification to the New York State convention.

It is a survivor of the political upheavals out of which it was born and is considered even now as the most authoritative comment on the American Constitution and an all-time classic of political literature.

The Federalist treats of the problems relating to that peculiar State figure [phenomenon] created by the Philadelphia Convention, the Federal State, which not even the Europe of the "age of enlightenment" had succeeded in conceiving in concrete form, and which the Europe of today may bear in mind to good advantage if it wants to solve the crisis, into which its internal strife has led it, and to speed up its unification process.

The fundamental problems of society and State, the position of the citizen confronted with political power, the organization and operation of the public authorities, tasks of the legislative, the efficiency of the Executive, and the independence of the judiciary [branches of Government], are thoroughly discussed not only with reference to the positive institutions of the American Constitution but also on the plane of the general principles governing society.

In Italy, at the end of her period of recovery, The Federalist has been published in Italian for the first time, with an introduction by Prof. Gaspare Ambrosini, professor

of constitutional law of the University of Rome, with appendices edited by Guglielmo Negri, and Mario d'Addio, and translated by Bianca Maria Tedeschini Lalli.

A classic of all-time political literature—Nistri Lischi (cxxxvi—682 p. with 16 tables; [price] 1,600 lire).

PRIME MINISTER PRESENT

The following is a translation of an article appearing in Il Popolo di Roma on October 26, 1955:

Yesterday, on the premises of the Italian Association for International Organization, in the presense of the Prime Minister, Honorable Segni; administrative secretary of DC, Senator Magri, Senator Ceschi, Honorable Pella, Honorable Piccioni, Ministers Gonella, Mattarella, Rossi, Cassianai, United States Minister-Councelor Jernegan, and Honorables Ruini and Scoca, other deputies, professors, and judges, Prof. Gaspare Ambrosini spoke on the subject of The Federalist in the History of Modern Constitutionalism.

The speaker began by tracing the historical pattern of events leading to the formation of the United States of America and the Federal Constitution of 1787, which is still in effect, in support of what A. Hamilton, J. Jay, and J. Madison had written in their essays which had been collected and published in one volume, under the title The Federalist. This work should be considered one of the most typical expressions of American mentality and temperament, and the most authoritative comment on the Constitution of the United States, and, at the same time, an admirable treatment of [a] political science [subject].

In illustrating the institutions of the Constitution, the authors of The Federalist discussed, in a general way, philosophical and legal problems so as to bring out the reasons for the profound innovations contributed by the Constitutional Convention of Philadelphia to the previous state order, with particular regard to the politico-territorial structure of the State, to the three-power [executive, legislative, judiciary] system, and to their reciprocal [mutual] relations. As to the separation of power, the speaker illuminated the peculiar characteristics of the legislative and the executive pointing up the reciprocal [mutual] [instances of] interference [* * * overlapping of functions, etc.].

Professor Ambrosini then passed on to the most radical inovation: the adoption of the Federal system. The innovation consisted in the liberation ["divorce"] from the principle of indivisible sovereignty which in those days was regarded as a dogma of absolutist [totalitarian] as well as democratic currents. The fathers of the American Constitution created, in fact, a new order of two coexisting sovereign systems—Federal State and member States—both equally endowed with sovereignty in the power orbit and [equally] limited by the precepts of the Constitution. "Who would not appreciate," the speaker remarked, "the importance of this system and its potential advantage, especially with respect to the maintenance of peace, to strengthening the powers of the U. N., and to the unification of Europe?"

Professor Ambrosini concluded by summarizing the characteristic traits of the American Constitution, pointing out that it still answers in every way the purposes for which it had been created by the constituents of Philadelphia.

At the end of his discourse, Professor Ambrosini received warm and repeated applause and congratulations.

Professor Preassi opened the conference by speaking for the Italian Association for International Cooperation; United States Minister-Counselor Jernegan and Honorable Rossi, Minister of Public Education, offering the closing remarks.

For the Facts on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate indeed to have in Virginia two newspapers each of which has an outstanding editor. These two men have rendered a real service to Virginia. They are continuing to keep our people informed on matters of importance. There appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Saturday, June 9, 1956, an editorial entitled "For the Facts on Foreign Aid." There appeared in the Richmond News Leader of Monday, June 11, 1956, an editorial entitled "Parsimonious, the Man Says." Each of these editorials is brief, to the point, and points out very cogently the weaknesses in the foreign-aid program being espoused by the present administration.

I also would like to point out at this time the contribution that the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia, has made in clearing up some of the facts about foreign aid. Congressman HARRISON is one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives. He has rendered, and is rendering, a real service, not only to his constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia but to all of the people of this great country of ours. I hope that the Congress will follow through on Congressman HARRISON's suggestion and have a comprehensive study made by a joint congressional committee to evaluate this country's foreign-aid programs and thereby let our people know just what is going on and the true facts about the program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the two editorials mentioned heretofore and, under leave to extend my remarks, include them herewith:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of June 9, 1956]

FOR THE FACTS ON FOREIGN AID

A great many Members of Congress are out of sympathy with the Eisenhower administration's plans for continued large-scale foreign aid, as evidenced by the onesided vote by which the House rejected the President's plea for restoration of $600 million of the $1,109 million cut from the administration's bill.

We ourselves are out of sympathy with the program to a considerable degree. This thing of dishing out billions indefinitely to foreign countries impresses us as something which has got to stop sometime. We have been at this for many years now, and we have fewer friends in the world than at almost any time in the past.

Take the case of Comrade Tito. We have provided this gentleman with about $1 billion in the past decade. For a time he seemed to be fairly firm in his commitment to the West, but that was only while the late Josef Stalin lived. As soon as Stalin died, or was murdered, his successors began determined efforts to woo Tito back. They seem to be making considerable headway at the moment.

Should we, then, continue to aid Tito? It is certainly debatable.

The whole case of the neutral nations of Asia needs to be reexamined. Are they likely to be won to our side by further handouts of money? When we indulge in such handouts, we seem to get less good will in return than the Soviet Union gets with a much smaller outlay. Why is this? Somebody in Washington ought to find out.

Representative BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia, has come up with a constructive suggestion in this connection. He has joined with Representative MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, of Illinois, in proposing a joint congressional committee to evaluate the country's foreign-aid programs.

Mr. HARRISON is an able and knowledgeable critic in this field. He is no isolationist, but a realist. He went on a trip to Europe a couple of years ago to study these foreign-aid programs, and he studied them intensively. He came back with some hard-headed conclusions which were by no means altogether favorable to what the United States was doing in this field.

He and Representative CHURCH now point out that the Hoover Commission and task force have directed attention to broad areas of bad planning, extravagant programing, and wasteful operations which have cost the American taxpayers appalling sums of money over an 8-year period."

Mr. HARRISON and Mrs. CHURCH say that the Hoover Commission was unable to complete its inquiry for lack of time, and that Congress ought to complete it. Their plan makes sense. It should be adopted.

[From the Richmond News Leader of June 11, 1956]

PARSIMONIOUS, THE MAN SAYS

"We must continue to wage peace," said Mr. Eisenhower at his press conference last Wednesday. "We must not be parsimonious. We must support such programs as the Mutual Security Act."

Parsomonious, the man says.

Since July 1, 1945, the United States has paid out $51,752,000,000 in grants to foreign countries. The figure means nothing; no one can comphehend 51 billion of anything. But that is the fantastic total, and two points should be made clear about it: The figure does not include wartime aid; it includes only grants since 1945. Secondly, it does not include loans; our loans to foreign government have amounted, net, to $13,420,000,000 more.

Mr. Eisenhower's statement came as a part of his administration's effort to win congressional approval of an additional $4,900,000,000 in foreign aid for the fiscal year that begins July 1. The House Foreign Affairs Committee recommended only—only!—$3,563,000,000.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the House of Representatives will hold fast against every effort to restore the cuts made by the committee. Better yet, of course, would be House action to impose still further reductions.

Three considerations prompt us to this view: (1) An enormous sum in "carryover" appropriations, remaining unspent from previous years, is available for foreign aid in the coming fiscal year; (2) recipients of this aid are in a far better position than they have been since the war's end to carry a larger share of the load themselves; (3) foreign aid is getting to be a habit, and a bad habit, and the sooner this Nation breaks the habit, the better.

The first consideration alone should be compelling: As of June 30, the administration will have available to it—in funds already appropriated and ready for expenditure—no less than $6,800,000,000, of which $5 billion is for military purposes and $1,800,000,000 is for nonmilitary, or economic aid. In addition, almost $200 million already has been appropriated in earlier bills for foreign aid spending in the coming fisal year. Isn't $7 billion enough?

On the second point, a study by the International Cooperation Administration offers such clear evidence of European recovery since the war's end that many of the former arguments in support of foreign aid no longer seem valid. An analysis of the gross national product in European nations reflects this picture: Italy's economy has gained from an index of 70 in 1948 to an index of 108 today; Greece has gained from 64 to 106; West Germany from 47 to a lusty 110; France from 73 to 106, and Spain from 67 to 103. On the same basis, the United States' economy has gained from 81 to 107. It is apparent that a fresh appraisal needs to be taken of our allies' ability and willingness to support their own defense programs.

But in a broad sense, it is the third point that concerns us most. While "aid" from one government to another is historic—it dates at least from the time of the Hellenic wars—it is only in the past decade that such aid has come to be regarded, in the case of the United States Budget, as an automatic, recurring item. Foreign aid no longer is regarded as something special or temporary; it is viewed now as a normal part of the Federal Government's spending program, as routine as the pay of postmasters or the salary of Senators. There is no disposition to decrease the annual requests year by year, until they vanish entirely. On the contrary, Mr. Eisenhower's request for the coming fiscal year is more than $2 billion greater than Congress approved in 1955 and 1956.

This seems to us a bad thing from several standpoints. It serves to impose upon American taxpayers a vast additional burden at a time when the total tax load is dismayingly heavy. Secondly, it serves to foster in our allies a sense of continued dependence. But in actual practice, what this means is a sense of continued resentment. The United States should have learned by this time that we cannot buy allies and we cannot gain firm friends by handouts.

This newspaper does not want to be put in a position of opposing all foreign aid, of every description, in season and out, now and forever. Commonsense suggests that a particular foreign air base, in some hour of crisis, could mean life or death for the United States. What we do urge, however, is that such military aid be kept to a frugal—to a parsimonious—minimum, and that all authorizations be annually reappraised by Congress. In the field of economic aid, it seems to us that greater emphasis should be laid upon help from private capital and voluntary charity, and that government's activity should be confined merely to creating a climate in which private resources may work effectively.

On the basis of Virginia's share in Federal tax payments, it may be computed that the President's request for foreign aid next year would cost the people of this State $72 million. That is a figure more reasonably within comprehension. And put in short and simple words, we don't believe Virginians will get $72 million worth of value received if this immense sum is taken from us and sent abroad.

Hon. Sherman Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the good fortune of beginning our congressional service with the 79th Congress take particular pleasure and pride in the tremendously important contribution to the success of the Eisenhower administration which has been made by one of our former colleagues in that Congress, Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire.

All of us know of the great confidence in him President Eisenhower has expressed frequently and publicly, but those of us who served with him here in Congress, quite irrespective of party affiliation, are especially conscious of the fine work he has done as the chief assistant to the President.

Consequently, I am more than glad to place in the RECORD the following brief editorial which appears in this evening's edition of the Washington Daily News:

SPARKPLUG ON THE TEAM

Almost all executives, no matter the size of the organizations they head, have understudies, aids, and deputies who can run the show when the boss is on vacation—or, say, recovering in a hospital from an operation.

It is not so easy with the President of the United States.

But he, too, couldn't do his job unless he were surrounded by a competent staff. And one way to measure an executive is by the caliber of his staff.

Ike's top staffer is an ex-Governor of New Hampshire—Sherman Adams. He is exceptionally fitted for the job, occasional bleats from disappointed politicians notwithstanding.

Mr. Adams is the detail man. He keeps all the wheels turning at the right times. He does the spadework. He is the No. 1 channel to the President. He is buffer and go-between and alter ego. He is one of the ablest men in government.

The operation is not keeping the President out of the picture. He was back on the job, to a quite limited degree, of course, within a short time. He will take on more work as his convalescence progresses.

And his recovery will be infinitely eased and encouraged—and the Government's business adroitly directed—because the guiding hand of Sherman Adams is fulfilling its role.

On the Understanding of Aging, by Hon. Edith Green, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 our colleague the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] presented an important and timely address on one of the major problems of this generation—that of our aging.

She spoke at a community meeting sponsored by the Arlington Soroptomist International Club and the Silver Age Club.

As Mrs. GREEN points out, we are undergoing a "quiet revolution." There are four times as many Americans over 65 today as there were 50 years ago, and the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. There are 14 million people over 65 in America today. There will be 21 million by 1975.

Until recently, far too little attention was paid to their special problems, which include inadequate average incomes, job discrimination, housing and medical care.

But there is a growing awareness of the needs of our older people and of our responsibility to them. Mrs. GREEN's bill to set up a special agency devoted to comprehensive study of and action on the problems of aging is evidence of this.

Because we all share Mrs. GREEN's concern for what is rapidly becoming our neglected generation, I call my colleagues' attention to her address, which follows:

ON THE UNDERSTANDING OF AGING

Members of the Soroptimist and Silver Age Club, when your chairman invited me to join you tonight I was very glad indeed to have the opportunity, even though it commits me to stand before you for a few minutes and talk on a subject of which, very honestly, I know far too little. I'd be more embarrassed to admit this if knowledge of the real facts and problems of aging were widespread. But my ignorance is, I'm afraid, shared by young and old across the country. We just don't know much—not nearly enough—about one of the biggest things that is happening to us; as former speakers have said, we, as a nation, are growing older. But because we have so much to learn and since this is an occasion for learning together, I was very pleased to come and willing to display my scanty understanding of the subject. I am told, too, that there is to be a question and answer period after I finish. That is what I came for—I have a lot of questions to ask.

I understand I'm to talk, for a few moments, though, before the questions start. Let me say frankly, that my experience in the short time I have been in Congress has made me much more aware of the problems of the elderly citizens. The most vivid single lesson I have learned came this past fall and winter after the end of the session, when I was in Portland and working in my office there. Day after day, there in Portland, the reality of this subject unfolded itself to me in the real, living people who came through my door—a steady stream of older people, coming to talk to me about their specific problems and, sometimes (more generally), about the challenges facing older people. In those months, as I talked with these friends and neighbors, I think I learned a great deal. First of all, I learned how little I knew, and how much needs to be done and how little I or any of us have so far been able to do. Many of these people had problems on which, I am sorry to say, I could offer little help. With some, I was gratified to be able to do something. But when I came back to Washington, I came back with a new awareness of how much there is to do, and how urgent it is that we begin to do some of these things—to start now.

It seems to me that a gathering like this one, a few years ago, would have been a rarity. Today, thoughtful people are increasingly thinking about, discussing the puzzling questions raised by the facts of growing older. In a few more years, I hope, such conversation will become commonplace; and by then, we will understand a great deal more than we do now.

Of course, we have made progress. We've even got some shiny new words—like gerontology. And, because words are the coin of discourse, new ones are a sign of educational prosperity—not, I hope, of educational inflation. They mean, I trust, that we are learning something. It's high time. Twenty-five hundred years ago, in the brilliant culture of classical Greece old age was given comfort and honor—Plato entrusted the leadership of his ideal society, for instance, to a council of elders (to whom a 40-year-old vice president would have been unthinkable, if you will pardon a little cam-

paigning). In some primitive societies, whatever the time and place, special reverence and privilege for old age has been a frequent characteristic. So, as our 20th century high civilization begins a belated concern with old age, we are only catching up with 400 B. C. and with the civilization of darkest Africa.

What I would like to do, however, is not to survey our progress in dealing with this tremendous upsurge of longevity in our Nation, encouraging as progress is. Instead, I would like to dwell for a moment on the basic condition on which progress, now and in the future, depends. Beyond that I want only to examine briefly some of the major fields in which local and nongovernmental groups are at work—like the Soroptimists here and across the Nation, and many groups of older people like your Silver Age Club who have joined together in many cities for mutual pleasure and usefulness—projects like the recreation centers that are in successful operation in New York, for instance, and in my own city of Portland, Oreg., or the retired businessmen's group in St. Louis that has done such fine work in counseling and advising young businessmen out of their own experience and wisdom. And I want to say a word about the role and responsibility of government, as I conceive it, in this great human and social adventure that is overtaking us.

THE DIMENSIONS OF UNDERSTANDING

I say "great human and social adventure." I think that's what it is. We live in an age when life expectancy has increased explosively. We live in an age in which more and more of us are living longer and longer. Children being born today can expect to live a third again as long as their grandparents born in 1900. Those new years—this gift of added life—are the stuff of a great adventure. Along with them we are gaining new knowledge of the meaning of growing older. We are learning, for instance, that getting old and old age are purely relative notions; that modern gerontology bears out the old proverb that "you are only as old as you feel," for the facts are that aging is a process that begins in youth; that psychologically and physically we begin to slow down in the late twenties and early thirties. So in a sense most of our life is spent aging; and the added years we are being given in our contemporary society are simply a prolongation of the best years of our lives, our maturity. And these are not simply rose-colored views. They are what the experts say aging can and should mean if we understand it and if we age wisely and gracefully.

But if growing old is to be a rewarding adventure—if we are to use well these added years we are gaining—a great deal of change needs to be made in our social and individual outlooks. More than that, of course, there have to be some drastic changes in some of our habits and institutions—in some of the facts of life. We have to begin to live and plan our lives around the change in life span.

But the facts of life are usually a product of our understanding of life—in the field of aging as in other fields. It seems to me that, in confronting the challenges of growing older what we need now, above all, is new and greater understanding. That is what I meant a little earlier by referring to the basic condition on which progress depends. We are all going to school (in a sense) and the name of our course is on the understanding of aging. Sometimes I think that as a society we are dangerously near flunking the course. But I'm an optimist—I think we'll learn. People like you here tonight who are actually doing something—learning at first hand—are at the head of the class. We all have much to learn from you.

I say that our progress depends on understanding. Well, what is it we have to grasp, to comprehend? It is, I think, what I have sometimes called the quiet revolution. That's part of the trouble, of course—it's the noisy revolutions that get attention—and this is a quiet one. I don't want to repeat to you a lot of statistics—I am sure you know them as well or better than I do. Yet, I think we all have to learn them, relearn them—repeat them over and over until we genuinely understand them in the fullest sense. Until they have become for us facts with the urgency they warrant and the kind of urgency only facts felt and understood really have for us.

THE FACTS OF UNDERSTANDING

So at the risk of repeating the familiar, let us go over together a few of the familiar facts that mark this quiet revolution—for quiet though it is, it is truly a revolution. There are four times as many Americans over 65 today as there were 50 years ago. In fact, the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. If over 65 is old people (and that phrase itself needs some reunderstanding) then there are 14 million old people in America today—by 1975 there will be 21 million. Those figures and the millions of older Americans they stand for are the ultimate reality of the situation we are dealing with.

Yet ours is a society too much geared to youth in its values, its habits, its prejudices and fashions, its allocation of resources. It is a society that has delayed too long its adjustment to the quiet revolution. Old age is becoming more and more important to more and more of us—yet we have neglected, to a truly shocking extent, to adjust our society to that change.

Let us simply review some of the inventory of facts that bear out that statement. Our older people have far too little money income. Their average family income is only about two-thirds that of younger families. In recent studies, the figure for an emergency budget—not even a minimum, decent standard, mind you, but an emergency standard of living—the figure for an emergency budget for a city couple to exist on has been estimated at $1,200 a year. Yet among older people, over a fourth of all couples, a third of all single men, and a half of all single women, live on incomes below even this emergency figure.

There are other facts to be learned and learned again. We know that the homes of older people are, consistently, inferior to those of their younger neighbors. We know that for older people with no homes of their own, living circumstances are often difficult or even desperate, spiritually as well as physically. Yet even the inferior homes that so many of our older people must live in are beyond their means. The cold, hard figures indicate that the cost of housing, for most of them, consumes a third or more of their income. Contrast this with the familiar rule of thumb that no one should spend more than a fourth of his income on housing. The obvious conclusion is that older people are spending far too large a share of their scanty incomes just to obtain a home, however inferior it may be.

We know that too often the position of older people in the community reflects our out-of-date understanding and our outmoded values and prejudices. Too often, older people do not get the respect and social recognition they deserve—too often, they are ignored and shunted aside. Their needs for recreation and social life are sometimes neglected, their willingness and ability to contribute to the community wasted. Medical care and group medical insurance are limited and expensive. Although older people are only one-twelfth of the population, they occupy one-fifth of the hospital beds. Yet 2 of every 5 older people cannot meet their medical bills even for present inadequate levels of care. Voluntary medical insurance plans include hardly a third of our older citizens. Yet, in the face of these sad statistics, it is precisely our older people who most need adequate medical care and have the least financial resources for obtaining it. With the problems they face and their inability to meet their needs, is it any wonder that mental illness among older people is increasing more than three times as fast as the national average?

JOB DISCRIMINATION: AN OBJECT LESSON

And to this audience of all groups, I need not spell out the shortcomings of job opportunity, the sad facts of job discrimination. We all know that the number of older people in jobs is declining drastically; and that the obstacles of discrimination are geting higher and harsher at ever earlier ages. In 1890 more than two-thirds of all men over 65 were gainfully employed. Today, only 4 in 10 hold jobs. Able and experienced workers find too often that they are automatically barred from a new job at 45, even at 35 or younger. These prejudices are far too widespread. Many school systems, in spite of the shortage of qualified teachers, will not hire a teacher over 40 or 45. In Government, which should lead the way in elimination of discrimination, I am sorry to say such policies are far too common. Some of us in Congress have been trying for several years successfully to write into law prohibitions against discrimination on account of age in civil service. For when the schools, the armed services, the civil service, in their hiring, discriminate against the older worker, we can hardly expect private employers to lead the way.

It is precisely here, though, in an area we are most familiar with and whose facts we know most about, that my point about the importance of understanding can be brought home most clearly. For the job problem of the older worker is, to a very great extent, a product of poor understanding and poor education. Here is one of the crucial sectors in which the breakthrough of the quiet revolution must come. Not only is job opportunity an ideal point for understanding and education to strike—it is a very important barricade, morally and psychologically as well as economically, that must be stormed and captured if the quiet revolution is to be won.

Job discrimination is for the most part a product of poor education. Why do employers discriminate against older workers? You have had some experience with this and I will be interested to know if your experience bears me out. It is said that older workers lack physical steadiness and dexterity. But there are ample facts to show that workers as old as 70 can be as steady physically as the young. It is said that older workers are more prone to injury. The facts show just the opposite. It is said that they have poorer absentee records. The facts show just the opposite. Their efficiency and their reliability, contrary to misunderstanding and prejudice are equal or even superior to those of younger workers. In an economy in which skill, reliability and maturity grow constantly more important than sheer physical energy, the older worker should be more and more sought after.

If he is not, why not? The answer is simple. There is a job of education to be done, understanding to be communicated. This is, I think the most important single job presently to be done in our education for aging, as a society. And you are doing it. If I can presume to advise you as to what you can do—and I think it is presumptuous, in light of your interest and achievements—I would tell you to go on just as you are. What you are doing is the great job of education of yourselves and your community—and crucially, of employers who must themselves learn the facts about the value of older workers. As they learn those facts, they will learn others. They, and you, and others like you across the country, as you continue to interest yourselves in these is-

sues, will bring about that "understanding of aging" which is the basic condition of progress. In the best sense you are propagandists—persuaders propagating important and much needed facts, promoting understanding of our quiet but enormously significant revolution.

And that is what we need—to make these important and pressing facts familiar facts of our existence; to develop a sense of shock at the facts of neglect and underprivilege; to become so aware of and impressed by these facts that, grasping them, we are immediately impelled to act vigorously to do something about them. That is what I mean by "understanding of aging."

I do not want to dwell further on this subject of understanding. But I do want to take a few moments to apply it. Where does understanding as we acquire it, lead us?

In the field in which you have done the most, it is leading us, I think, toward some substantial progress. We know, of course, that educating employers is not the whole of our problem. Often, older people have real problems of adjustment or retraining to prepare for new jobs. In a pilot study in New York State for instance, a special section was set up in the employment service, to give better and more intensive job counseling and retraining to older people than was ordinarily done in the employment service. The results were impressive: Of the older people who went through this special placement service more than twice as many found jobs as among those who went through only the regular placement service. Plainly, this indicates a need for improved job placement service.

Also, we know that industrial pension plans, for instance, sometimes discourage an employer from taking on older workers. So studies are being made to learn how, without damaging pension systems, older workers can be brought in to the job and into the pension system. These are details, of course. There are many others. But I believe we are on our way to reversing the trend—the doors of job opportunity, which for decades have been closing, are going to swing open again. People like yourselves, doing the work and gaining the knowledge, all over the country, are going to bring this about.

I would like briefly, too, to mention an activity in which the Soroptimists of my own city of Portland have been doing some fine work. Working with the city's bureau of parks and public recreation they have for some time been maintaining and operating a recreation center for Portland's older women. A variety of special social events and a regular program of craftwork are among their activities. Every month, the center has become a more important part of the social life of its members. Every month the center serves nearly a thousand women and monthly attendance in craft classes runs to several hundred with activities that range from making lampshades to aluminum artwork. The Soroptimists recreation center fills a real place in the social life of our older women. And again, let me point out it is doing more than filling a present social need—it is serving as a center for building understanding, for educating, for propagandizing. And so, it is contributing to the massive social adjustment that we must make. It is significant that the center, in Portland, has drawn visitors, who come to observe and learn, not only State officials working in related fields, but observers from Germany, the head of a working girl's program in Greece, an adult education director from Singapore.

THE PLACE OF GOVERNMENT

The programs and experiments we have talked about are primarily local—the people of the community, young and old together, working to adapt to the new society. And this is as it must be. We live locally, after all, our needs and our problems are local. Adjustment and acceptance of this revolution must be molecular—a change in every community, and every neighborhood—and must depend on genuine local understanding and effort. But there is a role for government, too. And before I end I would like briefly to touch on that, because, as a Member of Congress, it particularly concerns me.

Of course, anything that government does is, in the last analysis, only possible and only worthwhile if it promotes and cooperates with local activity. But there are many ways in which government has a very special and important role to play. In the field of housing, for instance, there is an obvious need for government. The size and scale of our housing needs and the problems of financing them have long been admitted to require government participation. But only this year, for the first time, it looks as though we will get what has long been overdue—a Government housing program that clearly and specifically recognizes the housing needs of older people. Housing bills in both the Senate and the House deal with this. The housing programs of the past have simply not been designed for the needs of older people; the conditions for FHA-guaranteed mortgages, for instance, have not been suitable for older people to buy homes; the limitations on single people in public housing projects have kept the many older people who live alone from taking advantage of this low-cost housing they should be eligible for. Now, however, the proposals call for mortgage terms adapted to the circumstances of older people; for special Government loan programs for building nonprofit housing especially designed for older people, with few or no stairs, nonskid floors, handrails, and the other conveniences that can make so much difference. Provision is to be made for older people, single or couples, in low-cost public housing. And increasingly, the designers and the builders are giving thought to the special needs and problems of older people and some real advances are being made.

Now here is one good example of a responsibility Government can and should accept. It is an example, too, of the interdependence of Government and local action. For in housing, success depends on cooperation between local housing authorities and local builders and the Government. But this is only one example. We should think of the role of Government in broader terms. I think we are beginning to do so. In a social change as great and complex as this one we need thinking and planning, and coordination on a large scale. Government should have a major responsibility here. We need, too, a kind of nationwide conversation—a national classroom—in which this understanding of aging can be stimulated and promoted. When problems get national attention focused on them—when they begin to occupy the attention of Government and, so, the news of politics and Government—that kind of national education is greatly stimulated. We are beginning to get this now, and the housing debate is only one example. Of course, there are differences of opinion and arguments in Government on how to proceed. That is understandable and all to the good. Argument is the road to education. For example, the administration is opposed to this expanded housing program for older people; it wants a much more limited concession to the housing needs of the aged. The majority in Congress, however, seems inclined to move more boldly, recognizing, I think, the real size and importance of the problem. And, of course, being part of the majority in Congress, I take that view.

THE NEGLECTED GENERATION

This present concern with the housing problems of older people is encouraging—but it is late in coming. All our concern with the aging is on a badly delayed schedule. The fact is, we are in a painful transitional stage in our social policies and we have not yet cought up with the realities that make transition necessary. My mail bears this out—and I am sure every Member of Congress has the same experience. Letter after letter brings me the problems of the older people whose circumstances have left them unprovided for in our current programs—often very bitter problems indeed. These are people whose primary earning years are behind them—whose middle years came while our social policies were only beginning and were even more inadequate than now. For most of them, health insurance and other such benefits now becoming available were simply not to be had when they might have established eligibility.

Even now, less than half of all men, a third of all women over 65, are covered by social security. And the benefits many of them draw are based on the low schedules of past years, completely out of tune with present high living costs. My mail tells me over and over of the difficulties of getting by with scanty benefit payments—or even worse, of people who, through technicalities or their special circumstances, simply do not qualify. It is all very well to say that these probems will be eased after a few more years of operation of the social-security program and of expanded private-pension programs. This is cold comfort to the many people who are trapped in the shortcomings and the failures of our present benefit programs, here and now. And even for the long run, there must be substantial improvements in the social-security system to make it live up to its name and provide real security for our older citizens. The current effort in Congress to lower retirement age for women to 62 and to authorize disability payments beginning at age 50 is an example of what we must do—and more—if we are to have real social security.

Meanwhile, the present generation of older people, the first wave of the quiet revolution, suffers from our delay and neglect. They are in danger of being a lost generation. One of the most pressing burdens on our conscience should be the special problems of these people, now, quite apart from long term plans. Here is a special responsibility of government—for it will take wise and vigorous government action if we are to help them in time. They cannot wait; the policies of 20 years from now will do them little good.

A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

My own thinking about all these problems has led me, at least at this stage of my understanding, to a more comprehensive approach, which reflects the things I have said here tonight and which is embodied in a bill I, along with several others, have sponsored in this session of Congress. What we propose to do is set up, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a special agency devoted to comprehensive study and action in the total field of the problems of aging. We feel that such an agency, staffed by professional people who can combine study with practical experience and experiment is the best and quickest way to make progress. It is, we think, a way to promote that basic education and understanding and at the same time to set in motion some of the practical programs that understanding must produce. Because the field is new and complex, we are willing to make a modest start—but above all, we want to make a start. Here again, we disagree with the administration. It has appointed a "Federal Council on Aging" to study the field. We feel that, too often, these study groups are only a way to postpone serious action and tend to have the effect only of discouraging the kind of specific, concrete action we are urging. This Federal Council, for instance, is simply an

additional duty for men who have regular jobs in the different Federal agencies concerned. They expect to hold a conference of Federal and State officials this June. Now we don't object to conferences—we think the more discussion and publicity and exchange of ideas there is the better. In fact, our bill calls for a major conference, after several years, to evaluate our experience from the actual working program we propose. For instance, we want to provide some limited funds—a few million dollars for the first 5 years—for grants to the States, working with the Bureau of Older Persons—to get some expanded action and programs stimulated, so that we will have more experience on which to confer—real knowledge as the basis for a conference. But we disagree with the administration in its position that part-time councils, and conferences are a substitute for action and experience. We don't feel that they have given sufficient serious consideration to the need for such an agency and program, any more than we feel they are sufficiently bold in moving to meet the housing problem for older people.

But the important and encouraging thing here is, in spite of disagreement and what we feel is the administration's lack of vigor and imagination—the important thing is that interest in this quiet revolution is growing. We are all learning more and more, talking and experimenting more and more—we are moving toward that "understanding of aging" which—I come back to it again—is the first great step. I think the signs are abundant. And so I am hopeful that we are slowly but surely moving to that great—and overdue—social adjustment to these new facts of life. Your presence and interest here tonight—and your activities, are a further and a very important and heartwarming evidence of that same fact.

I have talked far too long for a person who admits that she knows little about this big and difficult topic. But I hope you will forgive this as simply an indication of my real interest—and because, I hope, I have talked with the purpose of promoting, as far as I can, that understanding of aging that I call the basic condition of progress.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to find myself in disagreement with my friend from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who has done so much work on this whole question. He has told me about his experiences and his observations in the Far East since his return last fall, but while many of the circumstances regarding these White Russian refugees from Communist China are as he describes them, I do not think some of the conclusions he has drawn regarding them are accurate.

First, let us look at this group of refugees. These are the first real anti-Communists in the world. These are people who fled Russia in 1917 when the Communists took over. A lot of them were members of the Czarist nobility, the Russian intelligentsia and aristocracy, and officers of the Czarist armies. They fled into Manchuria, down into Tientsin, Peking, and Shanghai. They lived in unspeakable circumstances. I have never seen refugees, even in IRO days in Europe, who suffered more than these people. Yet, they were so opposed to communism by religion and by tradition that almost none of them wavered. They had no legal status. They had no passports. Later they obtained so-called Nansen certificates of identification issued by the League of Nations to stateless persons. Many of the women lived in indescribable ways in order to support themselves and their families until they could get on their feet and reestablish good homes.

When the Chinese Communists in 1949 and 1950 took over the big cities in China, one of the first things the Russians who came with them tried to do was to get these persons to redefect to Red Russia. They offered them Soviet passports. They offered to transport them back to the Soviet Union. All sorts of promises were made, of immunity, of jobs, of reunion with their families. Some, especially among those born in China, decided to accept the promises and went back to the Soviet Union. Most of them disappeared, in the sense that the relatives heard nothing from them. To my knowledge none of them ever got back to China. They were just lost in the Soviet Union.

The great majority of the refugees refused to go back to Russia. Since they had no hopes for the future in Red China, they tried their best to get out of the country. The Soviet Union had given them passports as part of the inducements to go back to the Soviet Union, but they were foreign passports. They permitted the refugees to return to Russia but would not allow them to travel in the Soviet Union. The passports did, however, give identity to the refugees and allowed them to go from Communist China into Hong Kong, where the British would accept them for transit to other countries.

Second, what about security investigations and tests? Well, the real security clearance for these people is the one given by their fellow White Russians. This little group of anti-Communist exiles has survived only by being most closely knit together. They know each other. They know the enemy and his agents. They know who is anti-Communist, and who is a saboteur or a spy. I would much rather have the testimony regarding one of their number, of that group of individuals who have proved their dependability by almost 40 years of unwaivering anticommunism, than the findings of an American investigator who could not get any real evidence from inside China on which to base his testimony anyway.

Third, look at the record. Several thousand have been resettled and only 1 or 2 have ever caused any trouble. One was in Brazil on his way to Brazil. They have gone to a score of countries, including our own, all over the world, but no group of refugees has been taken care of by IRO or any of its successor refugee agencies has had a smaller percentage of its number go bad or prove unworthy than this tragic group of people, who are, I repeat, the original anti-Communists.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only decent for us to go ahead and help resettle them, realizing that an occasional impostor or agent will get through. That happens under any refugee operation today. I fear that the gentleman in his commendable concern to prevent Communist infiltration is taking a position like that of the surgeon who is so anxious to save the patient's blood that he does not do the things necessary to save the patient's life. Our big concern is to save lives. I recognize we take a certain hazard, but the occasional mistake need not do too serious harm. These persons will remain under scrutiny wherever they are. It is a small risk, considering the gains. Their record of proved anti-Communism is so extraordinary that it seems to me that we should vote down the gentleman's amendment which would close the door of all hope to these unfortunate victims of almost four decade of Communist tyranny. It would sentence them to the guillotine or whatever is its modern equivalent. The fact that they have again declared their strong anti-Communist stand by their efforts to escape, means they are condemned unless they do escape.

Important City of South Gate, Los Angeles County, Calif., Resolves That Air-Pollution Control Is National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a resolution just received by me from the city council of the very important city of South Gate, Los Angeles County, Calif. This is my city of residence and has a population of well over 50,000, as related by its chamber of commerce. Its municipal boundaries on the northwest are contiguous to Los Angeles.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been vitally concerned with the very subject of this resolution for a considerable time, and I ask the effective and active cooperation of all my colleagues in the premises:

A communication transmitting for councilmanic action a resolution of the Southern California Planning Congress which urges Federal participation in the smog-control program. Councilman Peckenpaugh stated that this resolution has not been brought to his attention but that it is his opinion that it would be perfectly all right to adopt such a resolution, following which it was moved by Councilman Dellmann and seconded by Mayor Hardy that the following resolution be adopted:

"Whereas the Southern California Planning Congress is interested in the promotion of constructive planning principles in harmony with the orderly growth and physical improvements of communities; and

"Whereas the smog problem is by no means limited to the Los Angeles area but constitutes a matter of nationwide concern so that a greater knowledge of the contributing factors and the ability to develop means for remedying it is of growing interest to many communities; and

"Whereas technical knowledge depends upon able research and experimentation such as that which is being excellently done locally by the Air Pollution Control District in the Los Angeles County area, as well as by a program sponsored by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the efficacy of these efforts could undoubtedly be increased by a cooperative program by both agencies in this area where the intensity of the problem provides a more effective environment for conducting such research; and

"Whereas the local circumstances constitute an emergency that portends disaster of a degree normally recognized by the Federal Government when it is known to exist, thus making possible a program of both prevention and cure both locally and nationwide: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Southern California Planning Congress urge its Representatives in the United States Congress to take appropriate steps to have the Federal Government supplement and broaden the work already accomplished by the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District by establishing a smog-control agency in this area to attack the problem in a cooperative, comprehensive, and realistic manner by building upon the foundation already laid by the local expenditure of $14 million on a program of research which represents a local contribution by the citizens of Los Angeles County for the purpose of solving the serious and urgent problem of preserving the health, safety, and welfare of the public, not only locally but nationwide; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be mailed to each of the following: Congressman CLYDE DOYLE and Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and THOMAS H. KUCHEL."

On rollcall the motion to adopt the foregoing resolution carried by the following vote: Ayes, Councilmen Weaver, Dellmann, Hutchinson, and Peckenpaugh; and Mayor Hardy.

I, Dorothy McGaffey, city clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the city council at its regular meeting of May 14, 1956.

[SEAL] DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,
City Clerk of the City of South Gate, Calif.

What Will the St. Lawrence Seaway Mean to Seafarers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Seafarers Log interprets rather graphically the many sidelights of the ultimate development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

It also points out vividly the lack of incentive for people to build the ships that will be necessary for transportation on the Great Lakes when this project is completed. The same thinking prevails in Detroit where no action but a lot of talk is going on about the development of port facilities in the area which would mean tremendous savings for the industry because the area is just a little over 500 miles closer to Europe than are the cities on the eastern seacoast.

The article follows:

WHAT WILL THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY MEAN TO SEAFARERS?

Two years from now, according to present schedules, the St. Lawrence seaway is supposed to be open to navigation by deep-sea ships drawing 25 to 26 feet. The seaway, which was bitterly opposed by United States Atlantic ports and shipping interests, is bound to take some business away from current east and gulf operations—just how much remains to be seen.

The Maritime Administration seems anxious to get United States shipowners interested in the seaway run, now serviced exclusively by shallow-draft foreign ships capable of drawing 12 feet or less. United States shipowners are at present reluctant to embark on the service for a variety of reasons. However, chances are in the long run they will get into the trade after a period of "wait and see" on how the trade turns out.

There is no question but that foreign-flag operators will completely dominate the seaway trade at its inception and perhaps for years to come. They have the ships of proper size, and they are well established in the lakes-to-Europe service.

United States operators will start from scratch on both scores.

In view of the potential effect of the seaway on United States shipping and on the jobs of seafarers, the Seafarers Log has surveyed current information on the subject. The following is a summary of its findings:

1. STATUS OF JOB

Work now going on to dig the seaway and build locks. United States Congress has also authorized deepening of Detroit, St. Clair, and St. Marys Rivers. Many major ports on lakes still have to be deepened to 27 feet or more. Welland Canal must be improved to carry more traffic, could be major bottleneck. Chicago, Milwaukee deepening harbors, other ports not so active.

Thousand Islands section: United States removing scattered shoals to get 27-foot depth, width 450 to 700 feet. Rapids section near Massena: United States and Canada building canals and locks 27-foot minimum, 440 feet wide. Canada will dredge 27-foot minimum through Lake St. Francis and will build new canal from Lake St. Francis to Lake St. Louis. Another part of the job is a new channel outside Montreal. There will be seven locks in all on river plus additional locks on canals and rivers between the lakes.

Other dredging jobs on rivers between Great Lakes will provide 25½ feet during navigation season. Welland Canal can handle 30-foot depth at sills but its traffic capacity is believed to be limited to about 27 million tons a year. The Seaway Authority is far more optimistic about Welland's capacity.

For practical purposes, ships with a 25-foot draft are desirable. No present American flag ships are suited to this trade.

2. WHAT KIND OF CARGO AN HOW MUCH?

Estimates of traffic potential range from 10 million to 83 million tons a year.

Consultant professor, John L. Hazard, University of Texas estimates 36.5 million tons in 1959, 52 million tons by 1965. Low figure is more than Panama Canal's best. Package cargo estimates are: Under 2 million tons, 1959; 6 million tons by 1965.

Maritime Administration estimates are pretty close to these figures.

Cargo will consist in main of bulk items with iron ore and grain accounting for two-thirds of tonnage; oil, lumber, coal most of remainder. Also a brisk traffic is expected in automobiles, finished steel products, farm machinery.

A good deal of bulk trade will be internal rather than trans-Atlantic; for instance, ore from Seven Isles, Quebec, which now goes exclusively to steel mills on United States east coast ports, will be shipped inland to Middle West steel mills when Minnesota ores are exhausted. This will be a good portion of overall traffic.

3. WHAT EFFECT ON PRESENT DEEP SEA PORTS?

Most effects will be on bulk cargo ports like Albany, Norfolk, Baltimore in the grain trade; also New York, New Orleans.

Port Authority, New York, originally estimated loss would be 6 to 7 million tons of grain and general cargo yearly, about 3½ million from New York alone. Big grain ports are in order of importance: Baltimore, New Orleans, Galveston, Houston, Albany, Philadelphia, Norfolk. New Orleans estimated its loss as 6 million tons when Calumet River is deepened, providing direct Mississippi-to-Chicago-to-Europe trade via the seaway.

Later estimates have been watered down considerably, but there will be some loss of bulk cargo. Baltimore estimates that maximum loss will be 10 percent on bulk cargo during shipping season.

Indiana University School of Business survey concluded cargo would be in following order: Iron ore, grain and petroleum; coal, wood pulp, ores, general cargo. Already in 1953 4.2 million tons of grain moved via St. Lawrence, more than the grain tonnage of Baltimore and New Orleans together. "Inroads upon export grain traffic now enjoyed by Baltimore, Albany, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New York are likely to be especially severe."

Port reactions: Norfolk and Albany building new elevators; New York making massive pier development program; New Orleans working on tidewater channel; New York digging out tanker channels.

4. WHAT EFFECT ON DEEP SEA SHIPPING?

United States-flag tramps may suffer as they depend on bulk cargoes. Liner operations also concerned, although less affected.

5. WHAT REACTION OF SIU SHIPPING COMPANIES?

Universally uninterested in seaway at present. Example, Alcoa has run into Halifax and parent company operates aluminum plant in Massena, N. Y., on St. Lawrence, but Alcoa has "no plans at present" to participate in Seaway trade. Other companies consider it entirely too remote to consider right now.

6. REACTION OF OTHER COMPANIES (NON-SIU)?

Maritime Administration offered subsidy on seaway route. Only one company, Isbrandtsen, applied. Other subsidized companies being prodded by MA to apply but appear most reluctant. United States shipping companies reluctant for several reasons:

(a) Shallow draft foreign ships have monopolized and developed Lakes to Europe route. United States company would have to enter trade as newcomer and build from scratch.

(b) Seaway can only operate eight months a year. Ships would have to lay up four months. Can only accept ships of 25-foot draft. New, smaller ships would have to be built by United States companies. Would not care to make heavy investment in smaller ships when trend for ocean service is to larger

vessels. Smaller ships mean same operating overhead, and are uneconomical. Foreigners have many such ships and are equipped to go in with fast-modern carriers.

(c) Smallest of MA prototype ships are too big and with too much powerplant for narrow-channel operation. For example, MA wants companies subsidized on this route to use 18-knot freighters on run. Ship operators consider this ridiculous speed for this kind of run where they are operating in narrow channels.

(d) Shipowners have good deal of inertia about seaway. If someone else goes in and makes a go of it, then they will clamor for help from Government. But they are unwilling to be the pioneers.

(e) Tramp ship operators would probably go for seaway trade if they can get tramp subsidies. Their first concern is subsidies to keep alive. Their present Libertys useless on seaway.

7. MARITIME ADMINISTRATION OUTLOOK

Essential route: United States must participate. MA will give company entering trade charters on N3 ships so they can enter trade immediately before seaway is completed. Will give 8 or 9 N3 ships to meet minimum sailing requirements of 4 or 5 sailings a month. After opening of seaway, 11 to 16 sailings with 18-knot freighters, 18 to 26 ships. Sailings would be to United Kingdom and north Europe, as well as Baltic-Scandinavia area.

N3 ships are 2,700 tons deadweight, 11-knot speed, and draw 18 feet, but will have to go light and carry only 1,000 tons of cargo to make present 14-foot locks (run with 12-foot draft).

MA claims that United States operators can utilize seaway ships in winter months by (a) annual inspections, (b) final voyages outside lakes to overesas areas, (c) loading at ocean ports for voyage into lakes at start of new season, (d) lay up remainder of time except for trip charters.

MA says its protoype ships and some C-type ships could be used in seaway; claims 80 percent of ships entering United States Atlantic ports draw less than 25 feet "indicating that high percentage of ships that operate on lakes will be able to transit seaway." MA did not indicate what percentage of ships drawing less than 25 feet are foreign-flag vessels.

And that's the picture of the St. Lawrence seaway at present. A mighty industrial waterway is aborning, but a look into the crystal ball shows little need for seafarers to be concerned over any wholesale loss of ships and jobs. The deep-sea ports are a long way from becoming ghost cities.

Resolution by the Missouri Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks of Hon. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relating to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, I would like to refer to 1 or 2 other notable incidents in which he has rendered exceptional service to the country.

Promptly at the first news of the cessation of hostilities at the close of the Second World War, which came during the recess of Congress, he flew back to Washington and notified the Bureau of the Budget to submit at once a statement of all agencies holding uncommitted funds. The result was to freeze all such funds and by the time the House convened in the next regular session the committee had completed hearings and brought in a bill rescinding $64 billion of appropriations, the largest amount ever reclaimed in the history of the Congress.

During the consideration of the farm bill in the 70th Congress, when a surprise motion was carried in the Committee of the Whole completely vitiating the bill, his point of order compelled the adjournment of the House and saved the bill.

In the last session of the present Congress a bill reported by him from the Committee on Appropriations saved the REA cooperatives from bankruptcy.

Many other instances could be cited of invaluable aid to agriculture, economy of appropriations, veterans, school-lunch programs, roads, and so forth.

It may also be noted that Mr. CANNON'S service as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is the longest since the establishment of the committee in 1865, and that his service in Congress is longer than that of any other Missourian in either the House or Senate since the admission of the State to the Union.

Recently in appreciation of Mr. CANNON'S service the Missouri Senate unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Senate Resolution 28

"Whereas today, April 11, marks the 77th birthday anniversary of the dean of the Missouri delegation in the National House of Representatives, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Congressman from the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri; and

"Whereas Congressman CANNON has ably served the citizens of his congressional district and the State of Missouri for many years; and

"Whereas Congressman CANNON is now chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and is recognized as one of the leaders of that body; and

"Whereas Congressman CANNON is also recognized as one of the world's authorities on parliamentary law and has served as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives under both Democratic and Republican administrations, and has published many works on such subject; and

"Whereas one of his publications, entitled 'CANNON'S Procedure in the House of Representatives,' is one of the handbooks of the Members of this body who are interested in parliamentary law and procedure; and

"Whereas through Congressman CANNON'S many years of attention to the duties of his office he has won for himself the respect, admiration, and affection of the citizens of Missouri, and he can be truly regarded as one of Missouri's distinguished sons: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the senate of the 68th general assembly, special session, express to Congressman CANNON their felicitations on the occasion of his birthday anniversary and wish for him many happy returns of the day, and many more years of public service, filled with health, happiness, and prosperity; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby instructed to send a suitable floral bouquet to Congressman CANNON at his office in Washington, D. C., together with a copy of this resolution."

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of Jefferson,
Senate Chamber, ss:

I, Joseph A. Bauer, secretary of the senate, do hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a full, true, and complete copy of Senate Resolution No. 28, offered into and adopted by the senate on April 11, 1956, as fully as the same appears of record in my office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Missouri this 11th day of April A. D. 1956.

JOSEPH A. BAUER,
Secretary of the Senate, 68th General Assembly.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Future Is Our Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there are many people who feel that the long-range economic welfare of agriculture depends upon the finding of new uses for products of the farm not needed for human or animal consumption. We think we are plagued with a great surplus at the present time. It is a surplus of about 5 percent. The best authorities indicate that in a few years, notwithstanding our population growth, we shall have a surplus of 10 percent.

The answer seems to lie in greater uses of farm products. The Congress has already taken important steps to give due consideration to this subject.

My attention has been called to an address delivered by Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, vice president and director of the research staff of the General Motors Corp., at the dedication of the General Motors Technical Center, at Warren, Mich., on May 16 last. Dr. Hafstad said, among other things:

We are concerned about our dwindling natural resources—iron, petroleum, coal, and so on. We wonder what succeeding generations will do.

* * * * *

Already we have, as an example of what succeeding generations may well do to solve their problems, the free-piston engine, on display here today.

In this engine we have a particularly happy marriage of the best features of both the conventional piston engine and the gas-turbine engine. Its torque characteristics and efficiency are ideal for large automotive units, but its outstanding characteristic is no doubt its complete indifference as to the kind of hydrocarbon fuel on which it is asked to run.

Looking to the future, this engine can be expected to become increasingly popular as our fossil fuel reserves diminish. Ultimately, direct energy from the sun stored up in last year's corn or cotton crop may, in the form of alcohol or cottonseed oil, fuel this year's automobiles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very fine address delivered by Dr. Hafstad be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE IS OUR ASSIGNMENT

(Remarks of Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, vice president, General Motors, director, research staff, at dedication of General Motors Technical Center, Warren, Mich., May 16, 1956)

Here at the Technical Center of General Motors the future is our assignment.

This wonderful institution which we are dedicating today is much more than a place to work. It is truly a symbol of the faith of General Motors management in the future.

There can be little doubt that such a magnificent facility as this will substantially contribute to our industrial progress. In these laboratories, as in others, scientists are at work extending the frontiers of our knowledge of the physical universe. Their procedure is first to observe and record, then to contemplate and understand and, finally, to utilize the forces of nature. Thus, the abstruse basic research of one generation has successively become the commonplace technology of the next.

Scientists describing their work are invariably asked, "Of what use is it to me?" This is the inevitable question. Here is where applied science and engineering, or for short "technology," comes in. From basic research we learn what nature will and will not permit us to do.

Nature cannot be coerced, but with cooperation she has proven lavish with her gifts. The invention of agriculture, the invention of tools, the first use of fire, the age of copper, the age of iron, the invention of the wheel, the invention of printing, the steam engine, electricity, internal combustion engines, radio, aeroplanes, television, atomic energy, guided missiles, and now looking toward the future even earth satellites, and space ships—the very listing of these achievements of technology indicates both the generosity of nature and the breathless acceleration of the pace of invention. Where will it all end? Why should it end at all? Nature is infinite—infinite beyond the comprehension of man.

But just where is all this technology and industrial progress taking us? Does anyone know enough about the long-range operation of an industrialized society to forecast precisely the future of this very recent innovation? As of the persent moment the honest answer must be "No," and this is the basis of the fears of the pessimists.

On the brighter side, however, is the fact that our industrialized society will almost unavoidably increase leisure and with it the opportunity for study and contemplation. It may, therefore, be hoped, that with proper distribution of this new leisure there may come understanding of our admtitedly difficult social problems. We need, in other words, the development of an entirely new discipline, one which has been called technological humanism. This, then, is the reason for optimism; technology based on research is the sine qua non of a continuing industrial expansion, but this industrial expansion itself provides the leisure for more research and more technology, and, above all, more contemplation, more understanding and more wisdom.

To me, our continuing technological revolution is in many respects surprisingly like the atomic chain reactions with which I have been concerned in recent years. In both cases there is now reason for optimism, because we begin to feel that we have these seemingly limitless forces under control and, therefore, disposable in our service.

In modern technology mankind has at its disposal a tool so powerful and so infinitely variable and responsive, that as engineers we can face with equanimity the fantastic task of upgrading the living standards of the entire world.

For the United States and for the immediate future the prospects are bright indeed. We have over the years accumulated the capital represented by our physical plant and equipment which has enabled us to reach criticality, the point where a reaction is self-sustaining. We have further had a century of experience with large-scale industry and its problems.

But most important of all, we in the United States have a new feature, a strictly American invention, the provision of continually increasing purchasing power for the consumer. Our potential market is large enough to permit manufacturing operations on such a large scale that costs can be reduced by a really significant amount. This cost saving, which we can call the technological gain, is of such magnitude that under our system it has proved to be sufficient to provide both additional purchasing power to the consumer and additional incentive for more production.

It is important to note that this technological gain is just as basic to a socialistic economic chain reaction as to a capitalistic one. Under neither system can the distribution of benefits exceed the increment or dividend without stopping the chain reaction. This is important to emphasize for the benefit of those who have been misled to believe that a socialistic society can, contrary to all the laws of nature, miraculously produce "something for nothing."

The remarkable and long-continued economic well-being of the United States, reflected in the prosperity of the whole Western World, seems in large measure due to the presence in the American formula of proper relative amounts of incentive and consumer purchasing power. Thus the chain reaction of progress remains sustained.

These facts have not been lost on students in the U. S. S. R. As early as 1948 Vargas, the Russian economist, pointed out that the United States economy had developed into a modified capitalism which avoided the extreme business cycle oscillations predicted by Marx. This was considered heresy and under Stalin he was forced to recant. But Vargas and his students survived. Today we know that there are many in the U. S. S. R. who accepted the Stalin dogma with tongue in cheek.

The increasingly wide spread in salaries between worker and technical expert in the the U. S. S. R. indicates that the Russians themselves now are beginning to recognize the extreme importance of the incentive factor. Much of their recent remarkable industrial progress is no doubt due to this fact.

We find ourselves in a race with the U. S. S. R. for continuing technological supremacy. In this race, how do we stand in regard to the education of the large numbers of engineers, scientists, economists, and managers our society will need? Here are some unpalatable facts. In Russia all elementary students take mathematics and basic science courses. Those with special aptitudes are given every encouragement to proceed to advanced study. Laggards are promptly eliminated and attention is focused on the leaders. In this country basic science and mathematics are merely elective courses—and unpopular ones at that.

We are in a merciless struggle for survival, freedom against regimentation, self-

discipline against coercion. We are being challenged from an ideological and technological point of view as well as from a military one. Our choice is brutally clear. As a society, we can either learn mathematics and science—or Russian.

Personally I am convinced that as a people we shall make the right choice. The reason for my confidence lies in the very nature of our society and our political system, as opposed to the Communist system.

The American political system has been particularly designed to preserve individuality. The perils of conformity and regimentation on the other hand have been amply demonstrated by recent revelations of the devastating effect of Lysenkoism and Stalinism on the U. S. S. R.

Despite the obvious superiority of our system, many continue to worry about the conditions that we and the generations coming after us will face. We worry about where the food is to come from to feed another 50 or 100 million Americans. We are concerned about our dwindling natural resources—iron, petroleum, coal, and so on. We wonder what succeeding generations will do.

I am quite convinced that such concern is in the main misplaced. It will prove to have been as academic as was any concern that farmers of 50 years ago might have felt about where to get the oats to feed 50 million more horses.

Already we have, as an example of what succeeding generations may well do to solve their problems, the free-piston engine, on display here today.

In this engine we have a particularly happy marriage of the best features of both the conventional piston engine and the gas-turbine engine. Its torque characteristics and efficiency are ideal for large automotive units, but its outstanding characteristic is no doubt its complete indifference as to the kind of hydrocarbon fuel on which it is asked to run.

Looking to the future, this engine can be expected to become increasingly popular as our fossil fuel reserves diminish. Ultimately, direct energy from the sun stored up in last year's corn or cotton crop may, in the form of alcohol or cottonseed oil, fuel this year's automobiles.

And now let's look beyond the next generation. The paramount question is, how to assure ourselves adequate energy and material resources.

Assuming adequate technology, limitations on the attainments of an industrialized society are set ultimately only by these two factors. Even today, with our present standard of living here in the United States, our requirements for both energy and materials have become enormous. The average United States citizen has at his disposal roughly 13 horsepower or 100 mechanical slaves. Still more significant, this figure is currently doubling every 10 years and can be expected to increase faster still. Every American, a generation or two hence, may well rival the pharaohs of ancient Egypt in the power at his command.

The current consumption of materials by our society has reached staggering proportions. To support 1 individual for 1 year requires, for example, 1,260 pounds of iron, 18,000 pounds of fuels of all kinds, and 400,000 gallons of fresh water. These requirements will continue to expand.

How does research and technology help meet these mounting needs? A dramatic example is given by the sudden change in our situation with respect to energy reserves. Our present assured fossil fuel reserves as represented by all deposits of coal, petroleum, oil-bearing shale and natural gas amount to a combined fuel supply equivalent to more than 360 billion tons of coal. At predictable rates of consumption, however, these fuel supplies would meet our requirements for only a matter of decades.

Fortunately, these energy resources, vast as they are, are dwarfed by the energy now becoming available from a source that has come into the picture only within the last few years. Our presently known resources of uranium and thorium—from which we shall derive atomic energy—add up to more than 25 times the energy reserves presently represented by our assured reserves of conventional fuels. In other words, at expected rates of consumption the energy available from fissionable materials alone would take care of our needs for several centuries. This at least would allow future scientists ample time to learn to tap the inexhaustible energy reserves from the sun.

To get a measure of the amazing new economies available to us in atomic energy, it is well to remember this: that from 1 pound of fissionable uranium one can get as much energy as from 2,600,000 pounds of coal. Because of this large factor, and especially with a breeder-type reactor, which can be made to produce more fuel than it consumes, the fuel cost per se can be made vanishingly small, and hitherto undreamed-of energy supplies become available.

With low cost energy in prospect, the materials supply problem is also more or less automatically solved. The most critical material for the future will probably be water. As technology advances, more and more fresh water is required for industrial purposes alone. Our Great Lakes area has this priceless asset in essentially inexhaustible quantities. But other areas, even in the United States, are not so uniquely blessed.

Fortunately, in these areas, with low cost power available, it becomes conceivable to extract mineral salts from sea water, say by evaporation. The resultant fresh water supply can be used, first, for industrial cooling operations and then ultimately for irrigation. Vast areas of the earth now arid deserts can be made to bloom again.

With ample energy the sea can be mined for other substantial resources. Magnesium is even now being produced from sea water with the expenditure of 10 kilowatt-hours of energy per pound. There are 5.7 million tons of magnesium in each cubic mile of sea water. Thus, several cubic miles of sea water could provide the entire metal requirements of the automobile industry.

Similarly, in the case of many other materials, it will become possible to process progressively lower grade reserves or develop satisfactory substitutes.

Such developments are not now economic, but economics is a relative thing. With increasing population pressure it must be expected that more and more borderline processes and new materials will come into use.

With such possibilities in long-range prospect, the reasons behind the current wave of interest in the peaceful uses of atomic energy are obvious. Here at the Technical Center, through an access agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission, and through participation in the Detroit Edison breeder reactor project, developments in this field are followed with great interest.

It is the business of the Technical Center to be aware of and prepared for the results of major new basic trends of this kind. Thus, we provide insurance against the unexpected and unknown.

The field of materials, however, is the one which touches General Motors in the most places and most intimately. In the never ending quest for lower cost and better performance in all of our divisions, the physical properties of available materials are utilized to their very limits. Even for our regular automotive activities we need steel that is stronger, copper that is a better conductor, and insulators that pass even less current. For the newer fields of aeronautics, guided missiles, and atomic energy, such demands are increased many fold. In these areas we will need a whole new category of materials which will operate continuously at really high temperatures.

At speeds now being contemplated for aircraft, the wing surfaces themselves, due to skin friction, attain bake-oven temperatures which neither the pilot nor the complex electronic control gear can stand. Accordingly, in future planes the power that will have to be provided for refrigeration may well exceed that provided for propulsion.

Similarly with respect to the structural elements of engines of all types, it is the physical properties of available materials which set the limit on performance. For chemically powered engines, materials to operate continuously in the range of 2,500° to 5,000° F. are urgently needed. For really efficient use of nuclear reactors we need even now materials which can operate in the range from 5,000° to 10,000° F. The highest temperatures attained in current operating practice, specifically for turbine blades, is in the neighborhood of 1,650° F. With the current scale of materials research effort this figure has been rising steadily at about 100° F. per year for the last decade. There is every reason, therefore, to expect that it will continue to rise in proportion to the research effort expended. Any abrupt advance in materials technology, providing increased operating temperatures of even 100° or 200°, can mean the complete obsolescence of an engine type and therefore of an entire air fleet. Herein lies the true significance of the importance of materials research. The stakes are high indeed, between nations as well as between companies.

This field of materials and their uses is thus one of several in which we are particularly interested here at the Technical Center. New alloys, perhaps even entirely new metals from among the rare earths, will be needed for uses which now can be foreseen. Metals such as hafnium, zirconium, lithium, and niobium now are hardly known outside the laboratories. They may soon become as familiar as aluminum, magnesium, and zinc are now.

To be prepared for developments in new fields such as these, we at the Technical Center are continually broadening and expanding our programs in physics, chemistry, metallurgy, electronics, mathematics, and engineering. Thus today we are dedicating more than these marvelous facilities. We are dedicating ourselves to the never-ending task of advancing technology.

The technological chain reaction can provide for all our material wants. Wisely used, the byproduct, leisure, can provide time for the study and solution of our social problems. Training for leadership in both technical and nontechnical fields must be much improved. The foundation of scientific knowledge, both in the physical and biological fields on which the entire physical structure of our current civilization rests, must be further strengthened, and deepened by patient basic research.

These are exciting times in which to live. We are in the middle, or more likely in the beginning of a second industrial revolution. Insofar as technology is concerned, the road ahead is clear. With wisdom brought to bear upon all the problems of our society, this second industrial revolution will not stop until the standard of living of the entire world has been raised to undreamed of heights.

This, then, is the meaning of this great technical center: A symbol of faith in the future and of confidence in our social system; an instrument and a tool for increased production and an even higher standard of living—an insurance policy against ignorance and fear of the unknown and unexpected—a center of knowledge—a home for the inquiring mind—this is the General Motors Technical Center. May we live up to our opportunities.

Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a most excellent speech entitled "Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations," which was delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], before the Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., on June 12, 1956.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate the thinking of the junior Senator from Arizona with respect to the problems of the Air Force in its public relations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF AIR FORCE PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By United States Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, delivered before Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., June 12, 1956)

Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of common sense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time.

I would add one more dimension to this operation: a recognition of the faith and confidence of the American people in the truth. The greatest lie-detector ever devised is the American mind in its constant search for the truth and the facts that are involved in the truth. Be phony about solving your problem and 165 million Americans will point a finger at you, and your public relations explodes like a tatooed bubble. Be factual and honest and these people will buy your product.

Our product is our Air Force. Our problem is how better to sell it to our citizens. With your permission, I should like to apply the public relations approach I have outlined to this problem. We can break it down into its several parts; look at each one separately; and, then, reassemble them into a whole to find conclusions that will strengthen our position.

This effort, in my opinion, encompasses an understanding of, one, the proper role of the military in shaping national policy; two, the development of airpower as the dominant force in our national military strategy; three, the effectiveness of the Air Force in interpreting the potentialities of airpower; and four, the public relations measures which could and should be taken to develop better understanding and support of airpower as the dominant factor in modern war.

Proceeding then, to a discussion of the next part of our problem for today, the obstacles to the development of airpower as that dominant force, it is necessary to recall certain fundamentals. These are, of course, familiar to you, but to the American people they are news; for we have been too busy publicizing the speed of our planes to tell the people why that speed is needed. We have been too busy selling the glamour of flying to explain the hard, strenuous, and back-breaking work that goes into creating an air force of which glamour is only an incidental byproduct. Having great faith in the fable of the tortoise and the hare, I shall now assume the role of the tortoise in attempting to develop this broader viewpoint for our people and, at the same time, to offer some thoughts as to how we can overcome the existing obstacles to our goal.

The role of the military in the conduct of our national and international affairs has, in the past, been confined to the actual conduct of the wars in which we have been involved. During periods of peace, when a nation should be building up and maintaining its military strength, and reviewing carefully the role of the military in the formation of any national policy, our military, until recently, has been subservient to the needs of peace. That relationship is a historic one in this country, and I do not argue at this time that it is wrong, or that it should be changed. Rather, my discussion today will be along the lines of reconsidering the historic role of the military in the United States, and its relationship to our national and international policies, to the end of determining how we can best approach the problems that confront the military today as it accepts its responsibilities in the formation of these policies.

Prior to World War I, the United States was not particularly concerned with the impact of wars that raged in other parts of the world. In fact, those wars had only an economic impact on the United States and we grew up in our history as an island, separated from the troubles of Europe and Asia. With the exception of the war with Mexico, our relationship with our neighbors in North America has been on an exceedingly friendly basis, so we have not had to be concerned over the possibility of conflict with either Mexico or Canada.

Because of our isolated position, we never considered the necessity of alliances with other nations far removed from our shores. In contrast to this situation, we know that in Europe it has been a long-established practice for the various countries to give assurances of mutual assistance to each other or to give direct aid by the signing of offensive and defensive alliances.

After World War I we began to be concerned about the international aspect of war and its impact upon our own country; and by the conclusion of World War II it was obvious to our leaders that alliances of the kind long practiced in Europe should be entered into by this country with friendly nations in order to combat the growing threat of communism.

Alliances involve international politics and hence strongly affect national politics. Consequently, there are signs of a growing awareness in this country of the true nature of war itself and of war's position in our planning and strategy. Despite alliances with countries far removed from our immediate proximity, however, the understanding of military force as an instrument of national policy has as yet been too slowly and too narrowly developed.

War enters the field of politics again when we realize the need for unity among our allies. This unity is achieved in a large measure by the machinations of politics; therefore, war is only a part of political intercourse and is by no means an independent and isolated thing in itself. It is important that we realize this truth at this point in our discussion, because we are concerned with what you, as Air Force officers, and I, as a politician, can do to bring home to the American people the place of the military in forming and promulgating our national policy. To my mind, it is of the utmost importance to tell the American people—and the sooner the better—that military force is not an isolated thing, as we have in the past considered it to be, but that it is an integral and intimate part of our national policy—in fact, an instrument of national policy.

Now I do not propose that we create a hysteria among our people in connection with this program of education. Quite to the contrary, I suggest that we follow sane and sensible methods to bring home to our citizenry the realization of war's position today and the fact that we must be constantly alerted to its dangers as well as to its potentials for peace.

Having recognized that military force is an instrument of national policy and, because of the need for unity, that war is only a part of political intercourse and, therefore, is not an isolated thing, we must recognize, too, that the business of war has become the business of everyone. We must also admit that the conduct of war has become the business of everyone. This does not mean, of course, the actual direction of the military in the field, on the sea, or in the air, but the conduct of war insofar as the citizenry works in unity with the military to create the continuing sinews of war and to provide the giant manpower pools needed by the military, and the understanding needed for unity. Since war is everybody's business, the military joins the team and assumes an active part in the formation of national policy in times of peace as well as in times of war. In fact, we can say today that the recognition of the proper role of the military in the shaping of our national and international policies might well be the instrument by which we can maintain peace.

We have been discussing the broad role of the military in the formation of national policy. We have touched briefly upon the definition of war which I feel is the chief part of the problem under discussion today. If there can be accomplished through education a broad acceptance of these definitions and the logical conclusions they give to the military's role in forming national policy, then we in this Nation will be fully receptive to the place of the Air Force as the dominant force in our national military strategy.

In order more fully to develop the role of air power in this regard, it is necessary to revert to history—to that portion of the history of transportation and the development of weapons systems that brought about sea power. Great Britain, you will recall, mastered ocean navigation and likewise mastered the weapons system of the sea when, in 1588, she defeated Spain in the first modern naval battle. Great Britain continued to be dominant in this new field of transportation and to be dominant, also, in the utilization of this new weapons system. By the judicious use of both, she was able to maintain a peaceful situation for many years.

In the air age, however, Great Britain no longer dominates the world as she did when seapower was her strength. The thesis of Admiral Mahan is now only valid as it applies to a new element—the air. Great Britain was quick to recognize this change, and accepted the fact that, with this new dimension in the element of power, surface forces and surface strategies were vulnerable and obsolete. The Royal Air Force replaced the Royal Navy as the key to her military doctrine. History having overtaken the British Navy, that country's air force has assumed the dominant role. The reasoning of Billy Mitchell now applies. Just as it once was necessary to bring matters to an issue upon the broad sea, it is now possible to resolve conflict only in the medium of the limitless skies.

We should now examine our military policies to see how we can best bring matters to an issue in the vast expanse of the sky and, by so doing, maintain peace throughout the world, as England so successfully did when following that concept by the proper use of seapower. On January 12, 1954, Secretary of State Dulles made a speech which I feel was not too thoroughly understood by the American people. It was entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," and it became controversial because it stated that the President had made a decision to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, in-

stantly, by means and at places of our choosing. What people failed to notice was the continuing statement which said, "Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our Military Establishment to fit what is our policy instead of having to try to meet the enemy's many choices." In the past, the enemy's many choices were reflected in such areas as Greece and Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Indochina. In the past our actions have been emergency actions which, while effective, were inadequate because, as Mr. Dulles said, "What we did was, in the main, emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies."

One of the basic concepts of warfare as expressed by Clausewitz is that a defensive position is strongest particularly when the defense has strong means of retaliation. Following this concept, what Mr. Dulles' statement implied was that the United States had decided to place more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power. Mr. Dulles went on to explain this by saying, "What the Eisenhower administration wants is an * * * international security system."

I see in that January 12, 1954, speech of Mr. Dulles the first official recognition by any person in a position such as he occupies that airpower has replaced seapower and landpower as the dominant force for peace in the world. What Mr. Dulles said, in effect, replaces a Mahan theory for the seas with a Mitchell theory for air, in that air, having developed as the strongest means of transportation, and the United States being dominant in this field, we can well accept airpower as our national strategy and build around it the organizations of the land and sea forces.

Just as England, when she had control of the seas, maintained a highly mobile and effective sea force, so must we today maintain a highly mobile and increasingly effective Air Force. The truth of this doctrine cannot be doubted with the results of World War II and Korea freshly in our minds. We have seen that military operations on land and sea cannot proceed without air superiority. We know, too, that transportation can be denied on the surface of the seas and underneath the sea by airpower. We know that land transportation can be completely destroyed by airpower. Knowing these things, we can generalize as follows: "Airpower is the national strategy which relies for force on a weapons system in which the land and sea forces are organized around the air forces."

At this point, let us inject the thinking of Douhet so that we might see what one of the pioneer thinkers in aerial warfare had to say on the subject: "Viewed in its true light, aerial warfare admits of no defense, only offense. We must therefore resign ourselves to the offensive the enemy afflicts upon us, while striving to put all our resources to work to inflict even heavier ones upon him. This is the basic principle which must govern the development of aerial warfare."

His thesis was based on the argument that command of the air would be won very quickly in any war and that the side that obtained this mastery would then have little to fear from enemy airpower. We know from experiences in war that there never has been, nor is there any hope in the foreseeable future for a one hundred percent defense against enemy air attack. Therefore, we must aak ourselves what it is we resign ourselves to when we talk of the offensives of the enemy. What damage could 50, or 25, or even 10 Russian planes inflict upon the American economy and the American people were they the only ones of fleets of thousands to penetrate our aerial defenses and drop their hydrogen bombs upon strategic targets in this country? We would then be resigning ourselves to possible complete destruction, or at least a destruction that could seriously disrupt the lives and the economy of our people.

Even Douhet admitted that control of the air could never be complete; but the introduction of nuclear bombs into modern warfare, particularly those launched by aircraft, must cause us to wonder just how resigned we can become. It seems plausible to me, therefore, to argue that, in the absence of any complete defense against aerial attack, and with the admission of nuclear weapons into our weapons system, the only deterrent to war will rest in an Air Force kept at a level of proficiency, both from the standpoint of equipment and of men, that will forever deter an enemy from making an offensive move against this country.

That is true, I believe, because if a handful of Russian planes could inflict major damage on our country, certainly the Russians would realize that, their defensive abilities being no greater or no less than ours, a similar handful of our planes could wreak comparable damage upon their homeland. It seems to me, then that massive retaliation is the deterrent power we must rely upon, at least for the forseeable future; and I do not think that, in this discussion, we should get into the probabilities of what might be developed tomorrow weaponswise.

Thus, airpower becomes the primary manifestation of national power in war and in peace because of its direct influence upon the social structure and warmaking potential of an enemy nation. If we, as a people, are willing to accept this new doctrine that peace can be maintained through airpower, then we will not be like the professional soldier of old who was most reluctant to give up his particular weapon or his particular pet strategy. We will become, instead, a people fully aware of the problems of war and a people determined to support this kind of an approach to peace—psychologically, industrially, and in every other way that is incumbent upon us. Such an attitude will better enable us to understand the necessity of evaluating existing and contemplated weapons systems.

This is not a question of subjugating one service at the expense of another. Rather, it is a matter of obtaining the greatest possible return from our dollar investment in the military forces as a whole. Once this is done, the force requirements can be determined accordingly and phased to meet the time requirements of our strategy.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems have become the cornerstone of modern military power. We all recognize them to be the key to American security. Military tasks, therefore, primarily consist of maintaining armaments in such a state of readiness and in such quantities that the Communists will find it disadvantageous to solve their problems by the use of nuclear weapons. They must no only be faced with the impossible task of neutralizing our retaliatory effort, but also must be made to realize that should retaliation on our part be necessary, such an action will be instant and complete.

Unfortunately, many in this country, both military and civilian, do not realize the full scope of these military responsibilities. These are the people whose thinking is clouded by historical prejudice. These are the proponents of balanced forces, supercarriers, duplications in military effort, conflicting service roles and missions. These are the wearers of the old-school tie in a day and age when a new school has been founded.

It is not suggested that we do away completely with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is difficult to understand, however, why many still do not see the need to tailor service needs and requirements to conform with modern patterns of political and military reality. This is not simply a question of money—although I believe that billions of dollars could be saved if forces were designed around service missions—but, more important, it is a recognition that nations control war, and therefore peace, by their dominance in modern weapons and the expeditious means of delivering them. We must accept the influence of powerful air forces upon international behavior. An understanding of the implications of this new weapon is not a matter of choice—it is the very condition of national survival.

Now, having determined that the military has a definite role in the shaping of our national policy, and having traced briefly the development of air power as the dominant force in our national military strategy, we have proceeeded through two of the four points in our discussion prior to setting forth a final conclusion.

At this point, we can peek under the tent to see how effective the Air Force has been in getting these two and related points across to our people. I am a salesman and in this profession we have always had a good axiom, "To sell the steak, sell the sizzle." If we apply this to the efforts of public relations in the Air Force, then I would say that the Air Force has done a better than average job of selling the sizzle. However, I don't think that the Air Force has done the job that needs to be done to sell the steak, which is the more important item in this particular instance.

We might liken the sizzle to the glamour of the Air Force, the speed of its planes, the drama of rescues, the excitement of air combat, and the other things which have always been readily associated with flying. The steak, in this instance, is airpower and what airpower means, as well as the two points that we have already developed in this discussion.

There certainly is a definite need for selling the sizzle of the Air Force steak and we must continue to do that, but the important thing in public relations at this time is to sell the meat, or the steak, of our whole problem, so that people will not so much associate airpower with beautiful formation flying or high-speed jets or rescues, as with its true nature and its place in our national strategy.

I am not critical of Air Force public relations when I recognize a failure in its past performances, because I don't believe that we can ascribe this failure to the Air Force alone. Rather, I think, it should be placed upon the entire military establishment, upon the Congress of the United States, and upon others in high position who can and should interpret for the American people the role of the military in shaping national policy and explain to them what war really is.

Much of the current misunderstanding stems from an historic general disinterest on the part of the American people in the subject of war itself. You and I know that war in this country has always been looked upon as an isolated thing. We have gone into them unprepared materially because in periods of peace between the wars there has been a general disinterest in the Military Establishment and its upkeeping. We have gone into them unprepared mentally because the people of the United States, having a natural and understandable abhorrence of war, have never concerned themselves with the true relationship of war to our national policy. It is well to recognize at this point, also, that we have gone into these wars weak in manpower because of a general apathy on the part of the youth of this country to participate in military training during the times of peace. Washington said something about this when he remarked: "The American people never sense danger till the bayonet is at their chest."

Generally, I think we can sum up this portion of the problem by recognizing that the American people, at all levels, do not under-

stand war and do not yet understand the basic reasons for airpower being the force around which we must construct all of our military strategies.

While these obstacles have been discouraging, and at times frustrating, there are indications abroad in our country today that are encouraging both to the military and to those of us who are not in the military, but who are concerned with national defense and the maintenance of peace. Most important of the encouraging signs was the statement by Secretary Dulles earlier this year which inferred that we had the ability to go to the brink of war and return. In that statement, we see the first general recognition by a man in high position that military force is an instrument of policy and a weapon that can be used for the maintenance of peace even without its application in the accepted form of the word.

At the outset of this discussion I said: "Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of commonsense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time."

We have developed the problems as I see them, so it is now necessary to approach their solution in the most logical way possible. This I would like to do by presenting to you gentlemen a list of suggestions which I think will help to solve the problems we are discussing today.

The first of these should certainly be an intensive campaign of education starting immediately. This campaign should embrace the schools of our country from the high school level, or even lower, on through, so that the students might have a complete opportunity to study the relationship of military force to our national policy, thereby enabling them to better understand the problems of the military when they become voting citizens.

This same program of education should be directed at the personnel of the Air Force. It should likewise be spread to include citizens of adult ages who can be reached through the media of luncheons, club meetings, and visits to air bases. In other words, let's take the public in on what we are doing. Trained and intelligent officers and enlisted men should be sent to talk before these various organizations about the very problems we are discussing today.

One of the finest means of accomplishing this, in my opinion, would be to downgrade the classification of briefings of the various major commands in the Air Force and send them around to the organizations just mentioned. A person could learn more about the problems involved in global air power by listening to one of General LeMay's briefings than by reading many books on the subject. These briefings would necessarily have to be changed to eliminate some of the necessarily secret material that is passed on to officers; but, nevertheless, if we started with the mere assumption that people today do not realize that the globe no longer is measured from east to west and west to east, but rather from north to south and over the poles, we would lay a basis for a better understanding of air power.

Air Force personnel, from the privates to the generals, should be imbued with the idea that air power is our dominant power and they should speak of it on every occasion; but they should speak of it intelligently and speak of it not in terms of the speed of our aircraft, or the accuracy of our weapons, but, instead, in terms of the true concept of air power and how it has reached its rightful place as the dominant force in our military strategy. I understand that a dozen officers out of this class are scheduled to travel throughout the country after graduation and speak on air power. This is a good idea. It is a healthy thing. I know you are qualified to do this great public service.

The second suggestion that I wish to make depends entirely upon the success of the first, in that I will suggest that public relations should "trickle down." I mean by this that the top brass of our Air Force must be thoroughly cognizant of the problems which we discuss and must be able to transmit this understanding to their junior officers, and on down to the lowest grade of enlisted man. You have a very valuable program in the Air Force called Commanders' Call, I understand that once every month each commander talks to his people about air power. He shows them films of top Air Force leaders who cover the subject. Keep this program going. Use it to best advantage. It is necessary that, in the Air War College, we teach the officers the extreme importance of public relations. We take away, by so doing, the stigma that has always been attached in one way or another to the Public Information Office. That office should become one of great importance; it should be occupied by men thoroughly trained in all aspects of public relations.

A vital point to remember in discussing public relations, and particularly in discussing the people engaged in public relations, is that if a job is done properly, by properly trained men, many of the attendant problems are taken care of before they start. For instance, if the citizenry were fully cognizant of all of the issues that we are discussing here, and understood them, there is a strong possibility that the difficulties that have developed over sound around jet air bases would long ago have been overcome. Objections raised by some of our citizens to the high expenditures necessary to maintain an Air Force would likewise be eliminated if the people were told how this money is spent, not just in a general way, but in a detailed way, having explained to them the needs as they relate to air power and as air power relates to peace.

We long ago discovered that the glamor of flying has pretty much worn off—that it is looked upon today as a job, as a hard and arduous job to which dedicated men are attracted. If this is true, and we know it to be true, then public relations directed at the young, with the objective of educating them along the lines we have been discussing, will develop in them a patriotic fervor for the Air Force and for military service in general, and cause them to come into the Air Force in increasing numbers. It is not a healthy thing for the Air Force, or any of the military, to have to rely on draftees to build up its manpower. It would be a much better thing for this country if our youth were so imbued with patriotism that they looked forward to their period of service with the Armed Forces, and, of course, we would hope, particularly service in the Air Force. That, I feel, would be one of the results of a public-relations program following the course that I have outlined.

The third suggestion that I would like to make will primarily aid public relations people, and the public only indirectly. This suggestion has to do with the classification of material. When a national aviation magazine, or any magazine, for that matter, publishes a detailed account or report of a modern airplane or a modern piece of equipment, it is to be assumed by the public that the material is not classified. How many times, though, have you public relations men been asked by local newspapers for information based on these magazine articles only to have to say that you cannot release it because it is still classified. The newspaperman goes away with a peculiar feeling that the Air Force's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. This, of course, can only be accomplished from the Washington level; but a thorough check on releases before they are made to see that there will be no conflict with existing classifications would certainly be appreciated by your public relations men, by the press, and, I know, by the public, as well.

The fourth suggestion that I make is one which I direct to all officer personnel, whether they be in public relations or not. It is this: Have an open-door policy toward the press, and particularly toward the public. Do not build a fence around your office through which citizens, or their representatives, cannot pass. Being in public life, and having been in the military, I realize that this is easier to say than to do; but remember that one unhappy customer can undo the good of hundreds of men working to better your position and the position of the Air Force. Particularly is this important as far as the press goes, because I can assure you that nothing makes a press man madder than to be continually denied access to an executive's office, whether that executive be a Senator, a general, or the president of a corporation.

The fifth suggestion that I make is a rather basic one, but I make it because I feel that it is not being followed too wisely at the present time. The public information officer must be in the know. He must sit in on policymaking meetings; he must be kept informed of the latest developments in air doctrine, air plans, aircraft, and everything about the Air Force. As a commander, include your information services officer on your personal staff. You write his efficiency report. Get a sharp, intelligent man who has some commonsense for the job. Give him free access to your office and your confidence.

Sixth in the list of suggestions that I make to you gentlemen this morning concerns a failing that many of our public relations people seem to have which does not show up in the corresponding efforts of our sister forces. This is the tendency of a public relations officer to seek to be a public relations person for his own particular outfit—that outfit alone—and not for the Air Force in its entirety. I know that many times this is the fault of the commander; so if any of you gentlemen here, going out to assume command posts, have the tendency to seek publicity for your outfit above the Air Force as a whole, you would do well to bury those feelings immediately and allow your public relations man full rein in his development of a better understanding of air power for the total Air Force. I might say that this is a rather common disease among all new institutions, whether they be in the fields of economics, in the professions, or in the fields of the military, as we have witnessed in the last 10 years during the swaddling days of the Air Force. It is a weakness and a tendency, as I say, but it is one that must be overcome before the organization as a whole, regardless of what field it is operating in, can go ahead and assume its rightful place of leadership in that area. Remember you are selling air power, you are not selling the glamour of any particular outfit.

The seventh suggestion which I offer today is that the Public Information Officer work closely with the aircraft industry. The aircraft industry has probably done more to promote the Air Force than the Air Force has done itself; and these people continue to do so, and their efforts can be coordinated with the efforts of the Air Force to a degree that the public relations of both the industry and the Air Force will greatly improve. The Air Force can very well tap the vast reservoir of experienced public relations men who are connected with the aviation industry and they can also enjoy the fruits of the large amounts of money spent by this industry to promote their aircraft, and, at the same time, airpower.

The eighth and last suggestion that I want to leave with you gentlemen today is that the Air Force should make a more concerted effort to educate the Members of Congress

concerning the true meaning of airpower and airpower's natural position as a pivotal force in forming our military strategies. How can this be done? Of course, you will say that Senators and Representatives are busy people. Well, I would suggest that you bring the briefings of the various commands of the Air Force into Washington, into the Senate and House Office Buildings, and stay there 2 weeks if necessary so that each and every Member of Congress could have the opportunity of being briefed, not on the glamour of flying, but on the basic essentials of airpower. Remember, gentlemen, that Congress is the legislative body of this Government which decides upon your appropriations—the body that can be openly critical of you—harmful to you, or helpful to you, depending on the attitude that it holds.

I can tell you from experience that Congressmen are interested in airpower and the problems of airpower; but not too many of them have had the opportunities that I have had to become intimately associated with the subject, and I feel that if more of them have that opportunity one of the great obstacles in your path today will be overcome. The Navy and the Army have sold their concepts in a wonderful way, chiefly because they've been at it longer; and then, too, because they have been associated in the peoples' minds with power, and with power in war. Now, however, we are locked in an argument as to whether the pivotal force will remain on the surface or go to the air, and we are not going to win that argument by continuing public relations efforts that merely "sell the sizzle." We must, as I have said before, "sell the steak."

Lastly, I want to remind you again that public relations takes a great deal of energy all of the time. The job of selling is not one that is done periodically, or spasmodically, or with a half-hearted effort. Selling is something that you gentlemen will be engaged in for the rest of your careers; in fact, you've been engaged in selling all of your lives, whether you know it or not. Your very first cries as babies were selling arguments to your mothers that you wanted to be fed. Your attempts to improve your dress and your appearances as you reached the age when you began to look at girls were only an effort to sell yourselves to some particular girls. The things you do through your careers as airmen and officers are attempts to sell yourselves to those people who are above you or to those people with whom you associate.

Apply exactly this same technique, then, to the issues we have discussed today, and the problem of public relations in the Air Force will improve rapidly and the people of the United States will develop a better understanding of airpower and will give it the proper support which it deserves as the dominant force in modern war.

The Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the interchange of people among nations is one way to wipe out hostility and misunderstanding. If we know one another, we usually are friends with one another. The American Field Service program has helped to bring into homes in the United States hundreds of outstanding young people from other lands, who have become bosom companions of American boys and girls, and who thus have helped to promote international understanding and friendship.

One such young person is Jan Stoltz, of Sweden, who was an exchange student, under the American Field Service, in the city of Pendleton, in Umatilla County, in my home State of Oregon.

Jan Axel Stoltz lived with the family of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Forrester, of Pendleton. He shared classroom experiences with the Forresters' older son, Michael, whom many Senators will remember as a Senate page during the year 1955.

In order that some of the beneficial results of this student exchange program may be known to Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a fine editorial from the Pendleton East Oregonian of June 7, 1956, which includes a portion of another editorial from the Albany, Oreg., Democrat-Herald, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD. Its title is "It Has Been Good for Him and Us."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT HAS BEEN GOOD FOR HIM AND US

The round of applause given Jan Axel Stoltz when he received a Pendleton high school diploma at graduation exercises last week spoke as adequately as words of the place he has earned in this community.

Jan was brought to Pendleton in August of last year by the Pendleton Rotary club through the American Field Service program. The Rotary club paid for his transportation from Sweden to the United States and return, and arranged living accomodations for him in a Pendleton home.

Jan is one of some 650 students who came to the United States last summer through the American Field Service program to study for a year in American high schools. The students were selected by AFS and were recommended to such organizations as the Rotary club throughout the country. The AFS program was started in 1948 and has grown rapidly. In another year it is possible as many as 1,000 students will be in United States high schools under AFS.

The AFS program works two ways. A high school that has had an AFS student may send one of its students to a foreign country for the summer months. Bill Clarke, a senior at Pndleton High School, will go to Germany this summer.

During the year that Jan Stoltz has been in Pendleton a great number of people have become acquainted with him. He has spoken to a countless number of organizations, has been active in youth activities at the Lutheran Church and has participated with other Pendleton High School students in many community activities. It has been good for Jan and for all who have associated with him.

Jan's presence at Pendleton High School has been as advantageous for the students as for him. It wasn't long after Jan came to Pendleton High when Principal Don Fossati told us, "I have to look twice to identify Jan in a group of students. He has become one of them. They accept him as one of the gang and he measures up in every way."

We have long been convinced that many of the problems that seem biggest in this world would dissolve if it were possible for all students in foreign lands to come to the United States for a year of high school and all our students could go abroad for a year of study.

Jan Stoltz convinces us it would be the answer when he says, "I can understand now why you do many things in this country that I used to think were entirely wrong. The greatest lesson I have learned from this year in Pendleton is to be tolerant."

Racial prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry are not born in people. But it isn't long before they are acquired. The AFS program blots them out in young people whose convictions are not yet formed to the point that they cannot be changed. The things those young people learn about the United States will benefit them, and the United States, through the rest of their years—benefit them particularly because the young people selected by AFS are future leaders of their nations.

Every community that has had an AFS student would like to have another. We're sure Pendleton will.

The Albany Democrat-Herald takes an interesting look at the student exchange program in its community:

"We've often thought that 'foreign student' is a misnomer for the thousands of young internationals who each year come to America to 'learn.'

"More correctly they should be called 'foreign teachers' because they teach us about their country and to a degree about the whole world. Then they go back home and teach their friends and relatives about us—and the whole world.

"But the misnomer must stick because we and everyone else prefer to learn by being the teacher.

"Bodil Normose illustrates our point. She is the young Danish student who has spent the school year at Albany Union High School. Those who know her have only to ask themselves whether their views of Denmark and 'foreigners' have changed at all in the past 9 months. If the answer is yes, then Bodil has been a teacher.

"She has taught those around her tolerance at least, and probably more.

"Another illustration of our point comes from an Albany man who several years ago was a foreign student in Denmark. About that important matter of ideologies of government, he says, 'I now see why they have their socialized system; I don't think it would work here, but I can see how it benefits them.'

"This is tolerance and it is a thing we need plenty of in a world split down the middle.

"The many foreign student exchanges aren't going to mend this international fracture. The principal reason they won't, we think, is that they have not been going on long enough, have not included enough students, and have not extended into the sealed-off portions of the world."

The One Hundredth Birthday Anniversary of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this year we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson who boldly committed the United States to a mission of world service and who gave his life in an heroic effort to dispense justice to a world maddened by wartime hatreds.

Viewing man as a responsible moral agent, he demanded the same high standards of integrity and impersonal dedication to service of other men and

nations which he imposed upon himself.

The moral idealism which enabled him to hold so tenaciously to what he believed were principles of international justice, even after his countrymen had listened with dull ears to his 14 points and rejected his beloved treaty, was the same moral idealism which gave him his driving zeal for public service in national and community affairs.

His character has withstood the assaults of his detractors and today Woodrow Wilson is recognized as a great statesman and a great educator.

The faith which guided and sustained Wilson throughout his years in the Nation's service was a faith acquired in childhood as he sat in the pew and heard his father bring the word to the people. Wilson was always an active participant in the affairs of his church and, even in his most trying days in the Presidency, he did not fail to attend weekly worship services.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered at Staunton, Va., on April 22, by the Reverend Graham Gordon Lacy, D. D., pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Washington the church in which Wilson served as a ruling elder during his years in the White House.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE THIS TREASURE

As we are gathered here in the house of God to remember before Him one of His servants, and to thank Him for the life of Woodrow Wilson, I am reminded of some words written by Lord Byron. The poet is remembering all the grandeur of Rome, and he imagines how one would feel when viewing its monuments by moonlight. After telling how the moonlight softens its "rugged desolation" and fills up the "gaps of centuries," he says: "The place became religion and the heart ran o'er with silent worship of the great of old—the dead but sceptred sovereigns, who still rule our spirits from their urns."

It is now a hundred years since our great World War I president was born, yet he rules our spirits now more than when he was alive. He is dead, yet he is more than ever a "sceptred sovereign," especially in the councils of United Nations, and the hearts of people who long for peace.

It is fitting that, as Ecclesiasticus says, we should "Praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us." They are a people's treasure. More than all the gold buried at Fort Knox, they are our treasure. More than in its armies and navies and strategic air command, the treasure of America lies in its memories of great men—Washington, Adams, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Lee, Woodrow Wilson. Memories of these and other constitute our hope for the greatness of sons now growing up, and of children not yet born. Truly we can say today, thinking of Wilson, "We have this treasure."

But we shall want to say it—even as Wilson himself would insist that we say it—under the control of the New Testament. Says Paul: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

I

As you pay homage to Wilson through the events of the coming week, distinguished authorities will call to mind his many sided service. They are qualified, as I am not, to assess the full value of his legacy as an educator and a statesman. My desire is, rather, to speak of his Christian faith, that we may not only mark its power in his life but claim such power for living today.

You know well the gracious influences of home and church that began to shape this faith in early childhood. Born here in Staunton a son of the manse—his maternal grandfather and two of his great grandfathers, as well as his own father being Presbyterian ministers—Thomas Woodrow Wilson was a "child of the covenant" if ever there was one. He moved away at the age of two; but other faithful churches, in Georgia and the Carolinas, nourished the faith of the growing boy, and always there was a wonderful home. Said Wilson later: "My father was a very lively companion and seemed to provoke and draw out liveliness in other people. * * * He was the best instructor, the most inspiring companion, I venture to say, that a youngster ever had."

It has been said that although most of our Presidents have been conventional churchgoers, few have been unusually religious men. Washington and Lincoln, however, as Perry Laukhuff noted, "hold a special place in our history and our hearts because of their inner faith and their reliance on a divine providence." And Wilson became the soul of a vast idealism which he himself inspired and which was first inspired in him by the Christian convictions he held. These were not assumed for political advantage; they had always been a part of his life.

The religion of Woodrow Wilson is part of the Capital of America. Let us be thankful that "we have this treasure."

Wilson became an elder of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton. When he came to Washington as President, he continued the habit of a lifetime by regular attendance at church. For 12 years he was a member of the congregation I now have the honor of serving. Some of our present members have vivid memories of his presence. Dr. James H. Taylor was Wilson's pastor during those momentous years, and he has given us a fascinating description of the President as a churchman. "He was deeply reverential in his worship," says Dr. Taylor, "desiring always that he might occupy his place in this church in a simple, unostentatious manner. He came to the services regularly and enjoyed the fact that he was permitted to worship quietly and without display. He gave the most careful attention to the reading of the Scripture and to the preaching of the sermon. In fact, it was often quite disconcerting to a visiting minister to discover suddenly that the sermon was being listened to with such concentrated attention. He always joined in the singing of the hymns and would often step out of his pew to give a hymnbook to someone who may have come in late.

"He himself was always punctual. His punctuality was an example to this entire congregation. During the period of the war, when our city was crowded and our churches taxed beyond their capacity, he insisted that his pew should be divided with the soldier boys, and often soldiers, sailors, and marines were seated next to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. * * *

"He was interested in the work and progress of the church and took time from the arduous duties that were resting upon him to come to the meetings of the congregation and of the presbytery to emphasize his interest by his presence.

"He went to church to worship, not merely to observe a custom, but to find comfort and strength for his spiritual life." [1]

Dr. Taylor will never forget that on the Sunday following the declaration of war with Germany Wilson came as usual to the morning service looking "as calm as a summer sea."

[1] Dr. Taylor's book, pp. 39, 41.

And later when the treaty of peace was under attack—and the Covenant of the League of Nations—Wilson would come on Sunday mornings and "sit in his place in the house of God, apparently oblivious to all the storm and tempest on the outside." Dr. Taylor says that he seemed to have "just one great absorbing thought—that he had come to the house of God to worship."

II

I do not mean to suggest that the religion of Woodrow Wilson was confined to his behaviour in church. Heaven forbid. This was only the most obvious expression of a faith that permeated his life.

How can we bring into focus here a faith so far-reaching as his? I believe we can do it through two of the strongest convictions Wilson held. One was his belief in the supremacy of the spiritual. The other was his confidence in the providence of God.

A suberb expression of the former conviction, the supremacy of the spiritual, may be found in a message entitled "The Minister and the Community." Here Wilson says: "It seems to me that the minister should try to remind his fellow men in everything that he does and in everything that he says, that eternity is not future, but present; that there is in every transaction of life a line that connects it with eternity, and that our lives are but the visible aspect of the experiences of our spirits upon the earth; that we are living here as spirits; that our whole conduct is to be influenced by things that are invisible, of which we must be constantly reminded least our eyes should be gluttonously filled with the things that are visible; that we should be reminded that there lurks everywhere, not ungraciously and with forbidding mien, but graciously and with salvation on its countenance, the image and the memory of Christ, going a little journey through the earth to remind men of the fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of men, of the journey that all spirits are taking to the land that is unseen and to which they are all to come." [2]

This way of looking at life is the very fountainhead of freedom; for if we are spirits responsible to God alone, we need have no anxious fears about what man can do to our bodies. Here is a faith of untold worth. It is ours—we have this treasure.

Speaking about the Bible, Wilson said that it "reveals men unto themselves, not as creatures in bondage, not as men under human authority, not as those bidden to take counsel and command of any human source. It reveals every man to himself as a distinct moral agent, responsible not to men, not even to those men whom he has put over him in authority, but responsible through his own conscience to his Lord and Maker. Whenever a man sees this vision he stands up a freeman, whatever may be the government under which he lives, if he sees beyond the circumstances of his own life." [3]

Again, Wilson asserted the supremacy of the spiritual in an address in Washington when he said: "I believe that the glory of America is that she is a great spiritual conception and that in the spirit of her institutions dwells not only her distinction but her power. The one thing that the world cannot permanently resist is the moral force of great and triumphant convictions." [4]

The force of this conviction freed Wilson from toadying to selfish men. During his second campaign for the presidency certain minority groups tried hard to get him to make concessions, but in a letter to the leader of one such group he made his position very clear. "I would feel deeply mortified," he said, "to have you or anybody like you vote

[2] The Minister and the Community, by W. W., 1909, Y. M. C. A., pp. 9, 10.

[3] The Bible and Progress, Denver, 1911, Pub Pap., vol. 11, p. 292.

[4] Address at Washington, D. C., 1915, Pub. Pap., vol. 111, p. 381.

for me. Since you have access to many disloyal Americans and I have not, I will ask you to convey this message to them."

Wilson made mistakes in judgment, and for them he paid dearly; but his loyalty to principle was never questioned. It grew out of his faith that the spiritual was supremely important. The mistakes were human, the frailty of what Paul calls "earthen vessels." But the faith was a treasure possessing the power of God.

III

Equally strong was Wilson's faith in the providence of God, whose judgment and mercy appear in history, ruling and overruling the actions of freemen.

The other day a mother was rejoicing with her son about an honor that had come to him in high school. Reminding him of some duty he had neglected, she asked him to do it now as an expression of gratitude for the honor. To her surprise, he saw no connection between gratitude for a privilege and performance of a duty. "But honors can be lost," she reminded him. "Much depends on how we receive them and use them. We live in God's world, where spirit and character have a lot to do with our destinies."

Such a faith is not obvious to young people, but there is no finer legacy we can leave them. It is never subject to proof, but neither is it subject to disproof. It's a matter of moral decision alone, but it makes for great men and great women.

We like to chuckle over an extreme expression of this faith in the life of Woodrow Wilson. As President he had no more use for the machine politician than he had shown when Governor of New Jersey. To one who had campaigned for him and who was suspected of seeking favors from him, he said: "I wish it clearly understood that I owe you nothing. * * * God ordained that I should be the next President of the United States. Neither you nor any other mortal could have prevented that."

Such a faith was no easy fatalism, however. I am indebted to John Huffaker, a member of Central Church, for pointing out that "If any one characteristic stands out in Woodrow Wilson, it is his emphasis on contributing his maximum effort to meet each challenge." Mr. Huffaker cites the time when Wilson refused to cancel an important engagement because of a painful cut on his head. Said he: "I never feel the slightest concern over the outcome of anything when I have done all that I could do. It is only when I feel that I haven't done my part that I worry about results."

It was faith in the overruling providence of God that made Wilson's patriotism so free from any selfish chauvinism.

"The way to be patriotic in America," said Wilson, "is not only to love America, but to love the duty that lies nearest to our hand and know that in performing it we are serving our country."

On Memorial Day at Arlington, 1917, he expressed the servant ideal for our Nation, even as the servant ideal had been Christ's conception of His own proper role. "In the providence of God," said Wilson, "America will once more have an opportunity to show to the world that she was born to serve mankind."

Such patriotism is always subordinate to the Kingdom of God.

Recently a distinguished Virginian expressed the same sentiment in a group that included the president of Virginia Union University. The colored man pressed him on the point. "Do you mean that your loyalty to the Kingdom of God transcends your loyalty both to the Nation and to your State?"

The answer was unequivocal: "I do."

The Library of Congress has a centennial exhibit of Wilson materials—photographs, medals, notebooks, letters.

It includes a letter written by Wilson to his pastor, Dr. Taylor, showing that his faith in Providence was strong to the end of his life. One paragraph reads: "I sometimes get discouraged at the exceedingly slow progress of my recovery, but I am ashamed of myself when I do, because Gad has been so manifestly merciful to me, I ought to feel much profound gratitude. I believe that it will turn out well, and that, whether well or ill, it will turn out right."

In the darkest hours of his life, when his strength failed and opponents mocked him, there was always the light of God to lead him on. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

The Christian faith of Woodrow Wilson was his greatest treasure, and it may be ours. We have this treasure in earthen vessels—frail vessels of clay—but this only points to the comforting truth that its power lies in God and not in us.

If this was not so, our heroes would discourage us. How could we, unaided, hope to equal their towering genius? But if the power in them is God's, there is hope for every one of us. Filled with the power of God, as the earth is filled with spring, we can rejoice that "He cometh in the spring to redeem us all."

CONCLUSION

Let us close with a poem that is strangely prophetic. Wilson was standing on the seashore at Bermuda talking to a friend on a sunny day. But he chose to express his thoughts by quoting this somber poem from the Oxford Book of English Verse:

"In the hour of death, after this life's whim,
When the heart beats low and the eyes grow dim,
And pain has exhausted every limb—
The lover of the Lord shall trust in Him.

"When the will has forgotten the lifelong aim,
And the mind can only disgrace its fame,
And a man is uncertain of his own name—
The power of the Lord shall fill this frame.

"When the last sigh is heaved, and the last tear is shed
And the coffin is waiting beside the bed,
And the widow and child forsake the dead—
The angel of the Lord shall lift this head.

"For even the purest delight may pall,
And power must fail and pride must fall,
And the love of the dearest friends grow small—
But the glory of the Lord is all in all."

Let us pray:

Our Father, even as today we hold in grateful remembrance a high-statured leader of our country and the world, turn us, we pray, toward the tasks of the future with a patriotism as pure, a virtue as sound, and a faith as serene as his.

May Thy will be done in our corner of the earth that Thy love may be known through the breadth of it, for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Tide Has Turned Against Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine statement made by that distinguished statesman, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, of New York.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIDE HAS TURNED AGAINST INTERNATIONALISM

(Statement by former Representative Hamilton Fish, New York, May 28, 1956)

This is an answer to the veiled implications that Nazi money was given in 1940 to the National Committee To Keep America Out of War. I was chairman of the committee, composed of 50 Members of the House of Representatives and a few former Members, and I welcome the opportunity to defend its actions and all of its members.

We had only one objective: to keep America out of the European conflict, representing the sentiment of 85 percent of the American people according to public opinion polls at that time. We raised approximately $4,000, sufficient for our purposes of using every legitimate means to keep us out of war, including one advertisement in the New York Times just prior to the Republican Convention in 1940. We never received, and never were offered any Nazi money. There is not an iota of evidence of any kind that a single cent was ever given to the committee.

I have been asked why the State Department released this "dead cat" 16 years afterward, and whether it was routine procedure or premeditated for political purposes. If I thought it was a political release made in desperation to head off the rising tide of Americanism, I would denounce Secretary Dulles without reservations, and the New Deal internationalist holdovers in the Department, for another attempt to smear the 1940 Republican noninterventionists who represented 85 percent of the people, and who in 1952 still constituted one-half of the Republican Party under the leadership of Senator Taft.

In the last year, the pendulum has swung back and I believe today that once again a large majority of the Republican Party is opposed to our huge foreign handouts, to making the NATO a world government, and are in favor of the Bricker amendment. If Secretary Dulles wants to debate our foreign handouts and one-worldism, without dead cats, I accept the challenge. The overwhelming rejection of Senator WILEY by the Republican convention in Wisconsin, where the Republican Party was born; and the withdrawal of Senator GEORGE because of opposition to his intense internationalism and support of foreign handouts, are significant political-opinion straws indicating distaste of our extreme internationalistic policies. Public opinion is now once again in favor of placing our own American interests first.

I was proud to be associated with such Americans in 1940 as Senators Taft, Vandenberg, Wheeler, Reynolds, Walsh, Nye, Clark of Missouri, Clark of Idaho, Johnson of Colorado, and a host of Congressmen, including Representative Joseph Martin, who realized that the lend-lease bill was a phony war measure—the money and arms to be followed by soldiers and war. Today, many of the supporters of the lend-lease bill admit it was a war measure, including Editor Sulzberger of the New York Times. It was forced through the Congress by the most outrageous use of patronage and political influence. I denounced the presidential campaign of 1940 as the grossest fraud ever perpetrated on the American people. President Roosevelt proclaimed his love of peace by promising the American fathers and mothers again and again and again that their sons would never have to fight in foreign lands. And Willkie afterwards called his own speeches mere campaign oratory. After FDR

won, he exerted his vast powers to incite us into war. I agree with Ambassador Claire Luce that President Roosevelt maneuvered and lied us into war against the wishes of the American people. I know nothing about the dead-cat release of the State Department except what I have read in the newspapers.

Senator MUNDT, then a Representative, led 20 Members of Congress to the Republican National Convention in 1940 to urge an anti-war plank and succeeded in having a very strong one written. No Member of Congress was paid his traveling expenses to Philadelphia. Our committee had ample funds if anyone had required $20 for such expenses. It is obvious to me that the Nazi telegraphic suggestion to provide $60,000 for numerous newspaper ads was rejected, as no such ads were ever published except in the New York Times, which our committee paid for. There would have been nothing legally wrong if our committee had taken money from any source, a year and a half before Pearl Harbor—but it did not. For every dollar Germany spent to keep us out of war, Britain spent millions to drag us in. I wonder why the State Department release contained no reference to the vast sums, amounting to many millions of dollars, spent for British propaganda in the United States in order to drag us into World War II? How much of these huge sums came from lend-lease money or actually from our own taxpayers to involve us in a war against the wishes of our taxpayers and of most of the American people?

I am proud of the fact that up to Pearl Harbor I did everything in my power to keep us out of war. I voted for war after Pearl Harbor, but what a tragedy it turned out to be. We had a million casualties, spent $300 billion to destroy Germany and Japan—the only powerful barriers to the spread of world communism. A mad Hitler was replaced by an even madder Stalin, and 70 million Germans by 700 million Communists. Now we are trying to placate West Germany, Japan, and Spain, and make military allies of them. We have spent over $50 billion since the war in foreign handouts and the more we spend the more we are hated because Britain, France, and Italy fear we are trying to drag them into world war III. The truth is that the result of the Second World War, which we entered to save the liberty of Poland and the smaller nations, was that we threw them to the dogs and communism, which has taken over half of the world. What a tragedy and travesty it has all been. The American people are just beginning to realize the ghastly blunders of our warmaking internationalism. We are now confronted by world communism, a frightful, evil, dangerous, and powerful force which is determined, by fair or foul means, to communize the entire world.

In my opinion, the members of the National (Congressional) Committee To Keep America Out of War should be awarded medals for meritorious service for their efforts to keep out of war instead of being subjected to snide smear attacks 16 years later. If it had not been for the activities of this entire antiwar committee, President Roosevelt would have involved us in war 6 months or a year before Pearl Harbor, and then Germany would never have attacked Russia on June 21, 1941. In all probability, we would have been fighting Germany and Soviet Russia, and might have lost the war, or it might have been a deadlock, with millions of American soldiers sacrificed in vain.

I am reminded of other unfair and untrue smear attacks made on me. I was accused of renting my house in New York to Otto Von Keip, the German consul general, and raising the rent twice. The fact is that it was my father's house, and the rent was reduced twice, and some years later Otto Von Keip led the conspiracy on Hitler's life and was tortured to death. He was never a Nazi.

Again in 1938, when I was chairman of the military affairs committee of the New York State Constitutional Convention I introduced a bill to outlaw the Bundists and Communists from arming, parading, and marching in uniform. Fritz Kuhn, the Bundist leader, came up to Albany to oppose the bill. I never had met him before or seen him since, but someone took a picture of him asking me at the hearing for an opportunity to oppose my bill, and thereupon circulated 100,000 copies, stating that I was affiliated with him.

There are other smears that I remember, but time will not permit discussing them. But one thing is positive: There is not one word of truth in any of them. No one has ever questioned my integrity or Americanism, except possibly some fanatical Communists. However, I am not interested in making any defense of myself except to keep the record clear that I and my noninterventionist colleagues fought a valiant fight to keep America out of war in 1940 and 1941, and only lost when we were maneuvered into war through the back door by President Roosevelt issuing a secret war ultimatum to Japan 10 days before Pearl Harbor to get out of China and Manchuria. Secretary of War Stimson called it a war ultimatum in his memoirs.

The repudiation of Senator WILEY and the withdrawal of Senator GEORGE will have a discouraging and terrifying effect on the internationalists and one-worlders. The time has come for a complete revision of our foreign policies, no matter how agonizing it may be to some misguided internationalists and one-worlders.

The Magic Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial, which appeared recently in the Record-Searchlight, of Redding, Calif., deals most interestingly with the magic factor in the nonprofit utility system. This illuminating editorial points out that a rate cut in a nonprofit utility system actually results in a profit that brings another rate cut—which brings another profit and another rate cut.

Obviously a practical limit would ultimately be reached in the reducing of costs—but the editorial touches upon important facts which defy contradiction.

The editorial follows:

THE MAGIC FACTOR

There's a magic growth factor in a nonprofit, publicly owned electric system that seems to work like yeast in a dough. The annual report of the Sacramento municipal utility district, which we've just received, shows that the magic factor is at work there.

Here's how it works: The publicly owned utility lowers its rates. The lower rates encourage people to use more electricity, so that the utility system makes more profit on the lower rates than it did on the earlier, higher ones. But in a nonprofit utility system, the profit is used to improve the system and to lower rates. So, a rate cut results in a profit that brings another rate cut—which brings another profit and another rate cut. This can go and on. Municipal electric systems that have been operated for a long time on a nonprofit basis show a history of rate reductions every few years. Tacoma, Wash.; Eugene, Oreg., and Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; are good examples.

Sacramento's municipal utility isn't so old, just 9 years, but even in that time it has managed to reduce rates twice and increase both total use of electricity and use per customer.

On October 1, 1954, SMUD cut its rate to consumers. But instead of this meaning less revenue, it meant more revenue. Use of electricity gained 11½ percent, from 732 million kilowatt-hours in 1954 to 817 million in 1955. This brought in $12,344,802 for 1955, as compared to $11,631,605 the year before.

The average cost per kilowatt-hour for residential users dropped from 1.96 cents to 1.85 cents, and the use per residence went up from 2,688 kilowatt-hours to 2,817 kilowatt-hours.

Despite the lower price to consumers, SMUD's net operating revenue (which a business would call an operating profit) went from $3,649,338 in 1954 to $4,028,952 in 1955.

This magic factor can work in Redding, too. It has, in fact, worked several times in the past, but not as often as it should. The trouble here is that there has never been a policy established to devote electric system profits to rate reductions. Instead, various amounts are withdrawn from the electric fund and spent for other city activities. The amount depends not upon some sensible formula or fixed limit, but on how badly the council needs money for something else.

So it's a poor bargain, really, when the council transfers $100,000 from the electric department to the general fund. Assuming that it buys a full $100,000 worth of services, that's all it provides. The same $100,000 put into a rate reduction would save Redding people that amount, so they'd get full value. But the reduction would result in increased use of electricity and bring about another, future rate reduction—a something for nothing that we're now passing up.

Mason's Declaration of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of June 11, 1956:

THE FEDERAL CORNER SPECTATOR

George Mason and Gunston Hall will furnish much "wire copy" tomorrow when Thomas E. Dewey, former Governor of New York, speaks at the observance of the adoption of Mason's Declaration of Rights, by the Virginia Legislature 180 years ago.

It is predicted here that the speech will touch off a reexamination of the role played by George Mason in the early shaping of the United States.

Such an appraisal, though belated, could only end in additions to the stature and prestige of the man of Gunston in the eyes of his beneficiaries—all citizens of the free world.

Strictly speaking, George Mason was not among those illustrious first Federal employees from the State of Virginia. The closest he came to being a Government worker was when he turned down the post of Senator from Virginia.

But the part he took in sifting out the essences of liberty, freedom, and the rights

of man from the taglines and emotional outbursts, and stating them in practical, workable charters for a new nation is great. The part is also unrecognized in relation to its worth. Mr. Dewey undoubtedly will have much to say about this.

The term unrecognized is used because somehow George Mason has always been on the fringe of the assemblage of well known and hallowed figures of the Revolution. Whether this is because of his personality, his stand against ratification of the Constitution, or his firm denunciations of slavery in company of those for whom it was a way of life is not known. It is to be documented by the historians and the politico-social theorists and scholars.

The fact remains that though the name Mason has not been on the lips of school children through the years as has Patrick Henry and Tom Paine, the final analysis may show Mason's contributions to be greater than either of these.

In terms of titanic milestones along the journey to a free world, there must be included Christ's Sermon on the Mount, the Mangna Carta in the days of King John, the American Bill of Rights, and the Charter of the United Nations.

There is little doubt that the American Bill of Rights has its genesis in the Fairfax Resolutions which George Mason handworte and hand-carried to George Washington in 1774. The resolutions were later adopted almost unchanged as the Virginia Declaration of Rights. The profound influence of this document upon the Bill of Rights, upon the Declaration of Independence, and upon the United States Constitution is the gist of Mason's legacy to free peoples.

Much of the worth of that legacy was in its practicality and workability. It dealt not only with the stating of inviolate rights of man, but dwelt much upon the procedures and the governmental means for preserving them—hence a "practical" piece of paper. Hence its extreme value in a time when a whole world was stirring with notions of certain sanctities deep within all individuals, but with no written requirements for action.

Since that time, these individual sanctities have become for us, constitutional dignities.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, has already pointed out the significance of George Mason's work in terms of the aims of the U. N., and in terms of being the beginning of a chain of documents that has its latest manifestation in the blueprint for united free nations.

It is hoped that Americans soon take Thomas Jefferson at his word when he said that George Mason was one of the "really great men" of the Revolution.

It is hoped that Americans do this before, like many other greats of this country, the firm reputation of Mason has to reach these shores by way of London, Paris, Rome or Copenhagen.

GTA Daily Radio Roundups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two radio reports of Mr. M. W. Thatcher.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

How big should farmers' regional marketing and supply co-ops be? Are they too big now? There you have a couple of questions discussed in the current issue of the Missouri Farmer. It's the magazine of MFA—the Missouri Farmers Association. MFA has built both marketing and supply co-ops, and it's been successful at the job. It's doing an important service for the farmers who patronize and own it. Nevertheless, as the Missouri editor says, there is occasional talk heard around the State about MFA getting too big.

To meet this argument, the editor suggests that every MFA member read an article carried recently by the Associated Press. It was entitled simply, "Biggest Businesses Still Grow." It had this information: "The biggest businesses continue to grow. Today there are two more American corporations reporting their total assets as in excess of $1 billion than a year ago. And, with only three exceptions, the lengthening list shows assets valued higher than a year ago. In all, 34 industrial, railroad, and utility companies report themselves in the bigger-than-$1-billion class. There are 17 banks in the country whose resources top the billion-dollar mark. Thirteen insurance companies and three finance companies are also in the list."

A look at the 34 industrial, transportation and utility giants—and ignoring the financial institutions whose resources are of a different kind—shows Bell Telephone System leading the list as usual with total assets of $14½ billion. Next comes Jersey Standard Oil with $7 billion, and General Motors with more than $6 billion. Three carry their assets at more than $3 billion—United States Steel, Pennsylvania Railroad, and Du Pont. And, so on down the list of corporation giants.

Now, the farm editor from Missouri wasn't complaining or deploring all of this. In fact, he praises the big corporations for having raised our standard of living to the highest in the world. What he warns about is the need to guard against monopoly control by these growing giants. Then, he turns to comparing them with Missouri Farmers Association's co-op enterprises. What a difference. All of MFA's assets amount to around $78 million. The editor says just put that figure alongside any of the figures on the list of big corporations, and this outstanding farmers' co-op enterprise is made to look almost like a pygmy. But you don't hear our critics talking about the size of the giant corporations.

And then the editor concludes with this statement: "When you consider that agriculture is the State's biggest business, the Missouri Farmers Association is certainly not nearly big enough to adequately serve the farmers of our State, who, incidentally, are its owners."

Farmers in the Midwest have built their regional grain marketing cooperative. That's GTA. It's grown—been highly successful too in working for the farmers who own it. It's the largest regional grain marketing co-op in the Nation, but it can do a lot more for farmers if more and more farmers ship their grain GTA, the co-op way, and thus make sure that their bushels are working to help win better farm prices and a better living for farm families.

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1956.

"How To Make Farmers Buy More." We just saw that title on an article in a trade magazine for lumber dealers. So, we looked into that report, to find out what's the magic answer to this question that Main Street merchants keep pondering. We came away—we must confess—with some confusing and contradictory ideas of just how farmers can be made to buy more. First of all, the article takes a completely defeatist attitude on the outlook for farm income. It says that "agricultural experts are inclined to agree the farm-income slide will probably continue, at least for the majority of farmers."

Thus the magazine hangs the black crepe on the farm market and mourns that what it chooses to call the "easy" days of selling to farmers are gone forever. So, what's the answer? The building supply publication comes up with two. First, as you'd expect, there's the old plea to get on with the "hard sell" and the magic word is "hustle." Instead of waiting for the farmer to come into the lumber yard, get out on his farm and turn on the salesmanship. Be aggressive—hustle.

But, all the powers of salesmanship aren't likely to make a farmer the customer for a new barn, or shed, or for anything else, if he hasn't got the purchasing power necessary. That's certainly one business fact of life. However, the article sees great hope for building supplies in concentrating on the big farms. It extolls the sales possibilities that it sees in the trend toward larger farms. It takes up the subject of selling to what it calls the "right farmer," noting that the "market situation for rural dealers is changing beyond any doubt" with the emphasis on bigness, on more corporation-type or commercial operators "practically industrial in scope." The magazine throws its literacy hat in the air, and cheers loudly this development. This is the simple and complete answer to the rural lumber yard operator.

The magazine puts out the answer in a single sentence. "The larger the farm, the more materials and labor-saving buildings can be sold, but in many cases these operators will demand newer materials, or economical structures." There you have it. The accelerating trend to bigness will pump up sales, provided the dealer gives better services to more discriminating buyers.

What about the market lost by farmers squeezed off the land? No word on that market. And another matter that's overlooked is this: The corporation farms may—very likely will—bypass that retail lumber yard out in the country. They'll be buying their lumber and other building supplies at wholesale, and leave the local dealer dying on the vine. We'll bet there are plenty of merchants who've seen and felt this blow to sales already.

So, it seems to us that the lumber dealers' magazine ought to take another look, and realize that the local merchant's welfare depends on maintaining family-operated farms. Help those families get enough income, and they'll be wonderful customers again. One of the first steps in doing that is for merchants to throw their support to the campaign for a big, landslide "yes" vote in the July 20, wheat referendum. That will be one way to help farmers keep a farm program on which to improve and bolster farm income. That's what GTA, the Coop Way is working for.

High Court Ties President's Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of June 12, 1956:

HIGH COURT TIES PRESIDENT'S HANDS—MAJORITY RULING IN JOB-SENSITIVITY CASE SEEN OPENING DOORS TO SUBVERSIVES

(By David Lawrence)

Three Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States say emphatically that the six other Justices have just issued a decision which has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government.

This decision must be good news to Moscow. It must be good news to the thousands of hard-core Communists in America who are trying to get inside the Government of the United States through agents, stooges, and dupes. It must be good news also to the groups of misguided individuals in certain so-called liberal circles who have been striving in recent months to break down the whole security program.

For, by a single stroke, the Supreme Court majority—Justices Harlan, Frankfurter, Douglas, Black, Burton, and Chief Justice Warren—has practically opened the doors to Communist subversives inside many agencies of Government. Unless the Congress acts immediately by legislation to erase the Supreme Court's tortured concept of what it thinks is the law, the entire security program will be endangered. For the Congress still makes the laws—even though the Supreme Court has the power to frustrate their enforcement by extraneous technicalities.

The point at issue relates to a law passed in 1950 by Congress which designated certain agencies of the Government as sensitive, but left it to the President to make, in his discretion, that designation for other agencies. The Supreme Court says that, when the President sought by Executive order to designate additional agencies as sensitive, he didn't have the power to do so because he didn't spell out the actual relationship of those agencies to the national security. Also the Court argues now that it is not only the individual but the position he occupies which must be declared sensitive and the relationship defined. The minority opinion by Justices Reed, Minton, and Clark, however, says:

"It is not realistic to say that the Government can be protected merely by applying the act to sensitive jobs. One never knows just which job is sensitive. The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot securitywise as the top employee in the building * * *.

"The President's standard is complete and unswerving loyalty, not only in sensitive places but throughout the Government. The President requires and every employee should give no less. This is all that the act and the order require. They should not be subverted by the technical interpretation the majority places on them today."

It seems incredible that six Supreme Court Justices should be living in such a vacuum that they do not know the technique of Commmunist infiltration as it has been uncovered in case after case and in the hearings of committees in Congress. An employee in a railroad retirement bureau, for example, may be said not to be working in a sensitive agency but, if he can furnish the names of key employees in transportation centers in certain sections of the country and overnight the Nation gets into war, the enemy would have a valuable list for its sabotage.

Likewise, with the right to send out letters on Government stationery, all kinds of seemingly innocent information, valuable to the enemy, can be acquired. One day a food inspector can be working in a nonsensitive agency, but overnight that same agency can be highly sensitive if it is discovered that bacteriological warfare is being conducted through the distribution of the food supply to the Armed Forces. The cases of dangerous subversion possible in so-called nonsensitive agencies are limitless, and that's why the President's Executive order covered all Government employees.

The six Supreme Court Justices, however, do not seem to take account of the clear and present danger doctrine which Judge Learned Hand espoused in his famous decision. He wrote:

"The question before us, and the only one, is how long a government, having discovered such a (Communist) conspiracy, must wait. When does the conspiracy become a 'present danger'? The jury has found that the conspirators will strike as soon as success seems possible, and, obviously, no one in his senses would strike sooner."

But the Supreme Court majority evidently argues now that the Government must wait till the conspiracy is consummated. The Government cannot take precautions in advance—at least, the six justices say that existing law doesn't permit dismissals because it doesn't require the President to spell out in advance in a special memorandum in every case the exact risk to national security involved in every potential case of sabotage in which a known and proved security risk might operate.

Plainly, the Supreme Court majority has set an impossible task for the Government, and even the writers of remedial legislation will have a hard time drafting a law that suits the judicial whim of the six Justices who insist that the President of the United States cannot be trusted to render a judgment as to which employees may be retained or dismissed or to set up proper procedures to ascertain whether their continuous employment in a Government job constitutes a risk to the safety of the Government.

Proclamation Declaring the Week of June 24-30 Food and Drug Law Anniversary Week in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Food and Drug Law Anniversary Week will be observed across the Nation June 24 to June 30, to commemorate 50 years of consumer protection from misbranded, fraudulent, adulterated, and dangerous foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

Dr. G. B. Carlyle Thompson, executive director of the Montana State Board of Health, has directed my attention to the fact that we shall also be observing the 45th anniversary of Montana's food and drug act.

Administration of the food and drug laws is an outstanding example of State-Federal cooperation and use of State and Federal powers to supplement each other.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proclamation issued March 23, 1956, by Gov. Hugo Aronson, of Montana, declaring the week of June 24–30 Food and Drug Law Anniversary Week in our State.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas June 30, 1956, will mark the 50th anniversary of the signing by President Theodore Roosevelt of the first Federal Food and Drugs Act, amended and reenacted in 1938 as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Meat Inspection Act; and

Whereas 1956 marks the 45th year of enactment by Montana's first Food and Drug Act; and

Whereas the purity, integrity, and abundance of our food, drug, and cosmetic supplies are unexcelled in the world today and stand as a tribute to the industries producing them; and

Whereas the maintenance and protection of the purity and integrity of our food, drug, and cosmetic supplies are essential elements of our national strength, safety, and economic welfare; and

Whereas for this protection we are indebted to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who, as crusader for the first Federal legislation, became known as the father of the pure food and drug law; to the distinguished and dedicated public servants at all levels of Government who have administered these laws over the years; and to the leaders in industry who have supported the enactment and improvement of these laws and have cooperated in their enforcement: Now, therefore,

I, J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of the State of Montana, do hereby proclaim the week of June 24–30, 1956, to be Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week, and I request the appropriate officials of the State of Montana and all citizens of Montana to cooperate in the observance of that week.

I also urge all industrial, business, professional, labor, agricultural, educational, and civic groups, and the people of Montana generally, to observe 1956 as an anniversary year with gatherings, discussions, exhibits, and other appropriate commemorative activities to foster public recognition of the benefits derived from Federal, State, and local food, drug, and cosmetic laws.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Montana to be affixed. Done at the city of Helena, the capital, this 23d day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

Attest:

S. C. ARNOLD,
Secretary of State.

McKay Politics Repudiated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a cogent editorial entitled "McKay Politics Repudiated," from the June 5, 1956, issue of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune.

This editorial, written by the editor of the Mail Tribune, Robert W. Ruhl, a former winner of the Pulitzer prize for journalism, emphasizes that the selection of ex-Senator Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior was a renunciation by President Eisenhower of the McKay policies in that Department.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCKAY POLITICS REPUDIATED

Word comes to us from Washington, D. C., that President Eisenhower did not accept Secretary of the Interior McKay's resignation with such alacrity solely because he believed he was so sure-fire to defeat WAYNE MORSE. The President also opposed retaining him in the administration, for he believed him and his giveaway record to be a definite political liability. In other words while the President and his advisers did believe Secretary McKay to be the logical opponent for MORSE, they would not have exerted so much pressure and so suddenly, had they not believed also the sooner they got rid of McKay as a member of the administration, the better for their 1956 campaign.

We have been given no absolute proof this is correct. But from the first we suspected it. And we firmly believe that if the administration had really wanted Mr. McKay and his giveaway doctrine retained, "Dear Doug" would still be having his picture taken with that most august body, the Cabinet.

Comparing the records of Secretary McKay and that of his successor, strengthens this assumption.

For if the President had searched his party for an anti-McKay type, he could scarcely have been more successful than his choice of ex-Senator Seaton, of Nebraska.

Here we have the GOP antipodes politically speaking—McKay the ultra conservative, Seaton the genuine liberal; McKay the big business worshipper who believes—and we think sincerely—that what is best for General Motors is best for the country; and the gentleman from Nebraska a public power State, who believes that what is best for the country should come first.

It was rather pathetic in fact when the Seaton appointment was announced to hear that still small voice from Salem claim that the appointment was a confirmation of Secretary McKay's views and record.

The only evidence presented was the Seaton endorsement of the power-partnership plan. But former Senator Seaton did not endorse it as a ruse to block public power development for he believes in public power, he only gave his O. K. when public power was impossible or impractical either for financial or engineering reasons.

Quite a difference.

A few of the important issues involved in the administration of the Interior Department show a similar fundamental difference.

Tidelands oil for example. This notorious "give away" of billions to 3 or 4 States and passed on (by lease) to half a dozen of the largest oil operators, when it should have gone to the people of the country as a whole.

Secretary McKay was for this deal 100 percent, while Senator Seaton spoke and voted against it.

Mr. Seaton also was for Alaska statehood, which Secretary of the Interior refused to favor. He likewise was in favor of Niagara Falls power development by the State of New York, McKay, of course, wasn't.

In short the administration of the Interior Department under Secretary Seaton regarding oil and timber conservation, public against private power, wildlife development, Indian lands administration, etc., practically everything of importance but the single item of partnership-power, promises to be as different from that of former Secretary McKay as black is from white.

Whether it is literally true or not, that one of the main reasons for selecting Secretary McKay to take on Senator MORSE in the fall, was to get rid of a definite political liability we don't know, but there can be no denial that the selection of the former Senator from Nebraska was—and is—a complete repudiation of the basic political philosophy of his predecessor.

Finally lend an ear to this, quote:

"The Republican Party must be a positive party. * * * We Republicans will find success in the solid middle ground between a spendthrift left and reactionary right. * * * It does us no good whatever at the polls to cry 'socialism' every time a measure is offered to combat or correct an evil. * * * Certainly it is not socialism to abolish the sweatshop, to regulate hours and put a floor under wages. Neither is it socialism to regulate the stock exchange or the dealings in agricultural commodities, to assure the farmer of parity between the prices of what he sells and the prices of what he must buy. Nor is it socialism to conserve our natural resources, to build dams for flood control, for irrigation, and for electric power, or to bring electricity to the farmer."

Shut your eyes and try to imagine that being part of a speech ever delivered by former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

Hard to do?

Exactly.

But it is an extract from a speech delivered by his successor in Topeka, Kans., when he was a Member of the United States Senate.

Tribute to Prof. Albert Lee Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this month Prof. Albert Lee Thomas is retiring after 52 years of devoted service and teaching at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, at Auburn, Ala. He was born in the town of Auburn, and joined the college faculty after his graduation from the institute; and, except for military service, his entire professional career has been spent at Auburn. In addition to his teaching duties, he is an accomplished musician, and has been an outstanding leader in Boy Scout work.

Professor Thomas organized the South's first Boy Scout troop at Auburn; he was president of the Central Alabama Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America for 5 years, and for 11 years served on the national executive board of directors of Alpha Pi Omega, the national organization of former Boy Scouts attending college.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article about Dr. Thomas, which appeared in the Birmingham News for May 24, 1956, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I take this opportunity to add my warm congratulations to Professor Thomas for his devotion to the teaching profession and his rich, outstanding, and distinguished service in the field of education and to the youth of our country. He is an American of whom we may all be proud.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR THOMAS RETIRING AFTER 52 API YEARS

AUBURN, ALA., May 24.—Albert Lee Thomas, professor of engineering drawing and design at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, will retire in June after 52 years of teaching at Auburn.

Professor Thomas, a native of Auburn, joined the college faculty as an instructor in mechanical engineering in 1904 after his graduation from Auburn with a bachelor of science degree in mechanical and electrical engineering. He also holds a master of science degree and a professional mechanical engineering degree from API.

From 1906 to 1921, Professor Thomas was director of the Auburn band and manager of the college picture show, which was operated in Langdon Hall for the benefit of the band, orchestra, and glee club. During this time, he was serving as an instructor in physics and electrical labs, and machine design and drawing. For 7 years, he was director of the orchestra and glee club as well as the band.

Professor Thomas, the entire Auburn band and Chief Musician P. R. Bidez volunteered for Army service in 1917. The band went overseas, but Professor Thomas served as bandmaster at Fort Sheridan, Ill., 3 months before returning to Auburn.

In 1920, he was appointed to a full professorship in engineering drawing and design and served as acting department head for the first 3 years.

The South's first Boy Scout troop was organized in Auburn by Professor Thomas, who served as Scoutmaster from 1911 to 1918. He also served as president of the Central Alabama Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, for 5 years.

In 1926, Professor Thomas organized the API chapter of Alpha Pi Omega, a national organization for former Boy Scouts attending college. For 11 years he served on the national executive board of directors of APO.

He is a member of the Montgomery Symphony Orchestra; organized and served at first president of the First National Bank of Auburn, is now a director of the bank; served as first president of the Auburn Chamber of Commerce; a member of the American Society of Engineering Education; American Society Motion Picture Engineers; Rotary Club; Phi Eta Sigma; Phi Kappa Phi, Eta Kappa Nu, and Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia, and is a registered engineer, No. 711.

Prayer by Rabbi Daniel Lowy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the people of Maryland are particularly fortunate in having among them a man like Rabbi Daniel Lowy, of Cumberland. Knowing the exceptional character of this man, we were greatly pleased, therefore, when the American Legion magazine paid a special tribute to him in the issue of June 1956 by including a prayer by Rabbi Lowy in the publication's Chaplain's Corner. I ask unanimous consent that the prayer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAIN'S CORNER

(By Rabbi Daniel Lowy, Congregation B'er Chayim, Chaplain, Post 13, Cumberland, Md.)

Almighty God, unto Thee we turn in prayer in these crucial times. Grant us wisdom and understanding so that we may

continue to pursue the paths toward brotherhood and peace. Help us remove all intolerance and bigotry from our midst. Fervently we invoke Thy blessing upon our country and all who are entrusted with its welfare. Inspire them to continue their valiant and noble efforts to guard this great land from every enemy, pestilence, and sorrow. Fortify us with determination, a better world in our time, and Thy kingdom of truth, justice, and peace shall prevail over all the earth. Amen.

Washington and Jefferson's Rose Bowl Iron Men Gather Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, 35 years ago, the little college of Washington and Jefferson played the mighty California team in the Rose Bowl. The result was a no-score tie game. The members of that famous Washington and Jefferson team met at a dinner on June 8, commemorating the 35th year of their having left college.

Mr. Chester L. Smith wrote an article concerning the team, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on June 7, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON'S ROSE BOWL IRON MEN GATHER AGAIN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by Sports Editor Chester L. Smith and appeared in the June 7 edition of the Pittsburgh Press. Smith went with the Washington and Jefferson 1921–22 football team when it played California to a 0–0 standstill at Pasadena, Calif. In actuality, the 35th anniversary of the team is next year, since the class graduated in, and the game was played in 1922.)

It's about time to say that there's a monumental struggle going on between the Washington and Jefferson College team that played at Pasadena on January 2, 1922, and the Rose Bowl to determine which will outlast the other.

And don't be too quick about betting against the Jeffs. They're a hardy crew.

In 1946 they held their 25th reunion, and everybody showed up. Tomorrow night, in little Washington, they'll sit down to celebrate their 35th birthday as a squad. The center, Al Crook, will be missing. He has been ill at his home in Detroit. Otherwise the team that numbed the West by playing California to a 0–0 tie remains intact.

"Mother" Murphy, the graduate manager, is long gone and Dave Morrow, who helped "Greasy" Neale and "Honest" John Kellison with the coaching, died a few years ago.

Actually, the Jeffs never played in the Rose Bowl, which did not take shape until the following year. The site of their game was old Tournament Park, the splintery forerunner of the present stately oval in the Arroyo Seco. But that is a technicality that can, and should, be overlooked.

The story of how they got there is involved. The tournament folks had their eyes on Yale, with Cornell second in the running. But the Elis lost caste when they were beaten by Harvard and the Cornelians were lukewarm. Now Pasadena began making passes at Iowa, Lafayette, Penn State, and Centre.

The Big Ten, still mortified by the 28–0 whipping Ohio State had taken from California the previous January, discouraged the Hawkeyes from even considering an invitation. Centre, for reasons never closely explained, agreed to meet Arizona at San Diego. Little enthusiasm could be stirred up for either Penn State or Lafayette.

But the tizzy that came in the wake of the announcement by Chairman Frank Creller of the tournament football committee that Washington and Jefferson was the choice could not have been surpassed, no matter what team had been chosen.

"So Willie and Jake are coming out to be murdered by the Golden Bears," a coast writer typed twittingly. California was so mortified that it delayed its decision to go through with the game for a week.

There were very few critics who had taken the trouble to analyze Wash-Jeffs record. It had won all nine of its regular season games and had defeated strong opponents in Carnegie Tech, Lehigh, Syracuse, Pitt, and West Virginia. On December 2, it had defeated the University of Detroit, 14 to 2, in a postseason match at Detroit.

Of all the teams in the East none was more eligible than the Jeffs.

Their durability was their trademark, a perfect answer to the proponents of the free substitution that was still years ahead.

When they lined up for the kickoff the ends would be Herb Kopf and Karl Konvolinka, Capt. Russ Stein would be at one tackle and Chet Wiederquist at the other, although Stein, a tremendous performer, might be found at end or over in the backfield during the course of the game.

There would be Ralph Vince and "Farmer" Neal for guards and Crook centering the ball.

The backfield? Well, there you could find Wayne Brenkert, Charley West, Hal Erickson, and Joe Basista.

West and Erickson were exceptional breakaway runners. Defense was Basista's forte. Brenkert was handy to have in any situation.

Washington, Pa., was considerably more distant from Pasadena, travelwise, then, than it is today. The Jeffs caught up with heat and sand in the desert, cold in the mountains and across the plains. They spent Christmas Day in Kansas City and worked out there. During the practice, Coach Neale welcomed a couple of visitors whom he had come to know in the National League. They were Casey Stengel and Cotton Tierney.

Along the way they lost 1 of their 179 players when Lee Spillers went down with appendicitis, but as it turned out he wasn't missed. The team that started the game also finished.

That W. and J. lost the winning touchdown on a wide run by Brenkert when Stein was called offside is well remembered. Also that California was at no time in command.

The Jeffs were expert jockeys, a knack they must have picked up from their baseball-playing coach. When Charley Erb, the Cal quarterback, who weighed 143 pounds, chided Stein because Erickson had lost a sizable gain by stepping out of bounds, the W. and J. captain snapped, "Why, you little squirt, back East we don't even allow boys your size to put on a football suit."

"Out here, brawn doesn't mean much," Erb shot back.

A moment later there was a lull. Stein looked around.

"Where's Erb?" he called out, then pointed at his victim. "Oh, there he is—over behind that blade of grass."

There is sure to be more of the same tomorrow evening when the indestructible Jeffs huddle again.

The Problem of East Prussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American Council in America has furnished me with the following facts which I feel are noteworthy.

In his speech of February 8, 1956, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] called attention "to one of the great tragedies and gross injustices in the wake of those agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, resulting in the present separation from Germany of East Prussia and the expulsion of its population of 2,519,000 people."

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the vital interests of one nation in the problem of East Prussia which the gentleman from Tennessee has omitted in his remarks; namely, those of the Lithuanian nation. East Prussia was, at Potsdam, not only separated from Germany, but also divided into two parts—the southern part being placed under the administration of the Polish state, the northern part under that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although this decision was only provisional "pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement," the Soviet Government has, one-sidedly and illegally, incorporated that part of East Prussia into the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, naming it "Kaliningradskaja oblast."

Furthermore, it has completely russified and bolshevized a territory which never belonged to Russia and was never inhabited by Russians. Having murdered, deported, and expelled that part of the original population which did not succeed in escaping the horrors of war and Russian occupation, the Soviet Government deliberately depleted the country of a population which had been living there for centuries and, as far as the population of Lithuanian origin is concerned, even since immemorial times. This population has been replaced by Russian soldiers and settlers, forcibly driven into a country to which they have no title except that of Russian inhumanity and brutality.

This is, of course, no final settlement of the problem of the northern part of East Prusia. On the contrary, a new human and political problem of particularly great dimensions has been created which one day has to be solved at the peace settlement.

Whatever the decision may be—the solution will not be found in the maintenance of the present status or in the restoration of the status prior to World War II. The conditions have already been changed—and probably will change—too radically.

Whatever the implications and elements of the decision may be—no solution will be just and definite which satisfies only one-sided revisionistic aims of one party concerned. The solution will have to take into account the interests

of all parties directly concerned with the problem. The Lithuanian nation has so definitely the most vital concern in what the final settlement of the problem is going to be.

Since immemorial times, this part of East Prussia has been inhabited by the Old Prussians—Borussians—and their kinsmen, the Lithuanians. It was conquered and subjugated by the German Knights of the Order of the Cross in the 13th and 14th centuries. It was under the vasallage of Poland and the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth for 2 centuries before it became part of the German Empire.

Through many generations the Lithuanian nation was a direct and active participant in the fight of the inhabitants for their freedom and independence. By united Lithuanian and Polish forces the knights were crushingly defeated at the battle of Grunewald in 1410, which stopped the German Drangnach Ostem for centuries. Subsequently Lithuania, under the leadership of its ruler Vytautas, settled her old border problem with the knights in 1422, drawing a kind of a demarcation line through Lithuanian territory which became the eastern boundary of East Prussia for 500 years until it, in 1919 at Versailles, was partly changed in favor of Lithuania; the territory north of the River Nemunas—Memel—was separated from Germany because of its still predominantly Lithuanian character and its close economic ties to Lithuania proper.

During centuries of their struggle for freedom and against slavery the old Prussians disappeared as a nation, leaving only their name to their conquerors. But the ethnic character of the northern part of East Prussia, now under Russian administration, remained Lithuanian until World War II. First in 1938, Hitler, under a supposedly final attempt to eradicate the most evident and significant proof of the Lithuanian character of the territory, changed the names of cities, localities, rivers, and so forth, into German ones.

The greater part of the territory surrounds the estuary of the River Nemunas flowing from Lithuania proper into the Baltic Sea. It connects Lithuania economically and geographically with the world. The economy of the country, its system of waterways and railway lines, is most closely connected with that of Lithuania and vice versa. It is the most vital part of Lithuania and its immediate vicinity as a geographic unit.

The problem of the northern part of East Prussia, therefore, directly affects the vital interests of the Lithuanian nation by reason of its history, its ethnic character, its economic relations, and its geographic vicinity. The Government of the United States, as well as any other Government responsible for the just solution of the problem of East Prussia, will be well advised to recognize these vital interests of the Lithuanian nation, and consequently her natural and undeniable right to actively participate in any consideration and decision concerning the political fate of East Prussia.

On Massive Countersubversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues an article which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, June 10.

In this article Mr. Ansel E. Talbert, military and aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune, writes on the subject of massive countersubversion.

Mr. Talbert has called to our attention the tremendous potential for countersubversion within Soviet Russia. He points out that there are already indications of uprising in the Ukraine and in Georgia. This movement toward independence and freedom by the non-Russian peoples who have been captives of the Communist dictatorship should be encouraged.

It is significant that Mr. Talbert reminds us that there are 1,500,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent in the United States and Canada and that nearly all of these people support movements for an independent, democratic Ukraine.

I particularly want to call my colleagues' attention to that part of Mr. Talbert's article which commends our colleague, Congressman THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, for having taken the lead with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in this effort to kep alive and make a matter of active interest the liberation and the independence of the Ukrainians and other non-Russian captive peoples.

In his article Mr. Talbert praises our colleague, Congressman DODD, not only for his current activities in Congress with respect to the captive peoples, but as well for his distinguished record at Nuremburg.

I think this article should be read by every Member of the House. It reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEFENSE AND AVIATION—ON MASSIVE COUNTERSUBVERSION

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The rapid, and frequently surprising, march of events in Soviet Russia is revealing to the West a potential new weapon against Communist imperialism which conceivably could become more effective than even massive atomic retaliation. This is the now well-documented and unquestionable existence, within the vast Soviet slave empire of an active prowestern underground.

It is drawn from a variety of freedom-loving peoples and nationalities, which clearly have not been terrorized or propagandized into complete submission to communism. The non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, entirely apart from the East European satellites—actually constitute a majority of the Soviet population.

OFFICIAL SLIP

The Communist Government of Poland, militarily most powerful of the satellites, has just let slip officially that more than 30,000 security police, Communist Party members and state bureaucrats, have lost their lives since World War II in actual armed conflict with the anti-Soviet underground. Seweryn Bialen, an important Polish Government official, is a new defector to the West.

A month ago this column called attention to unprecedented official references in the Soviet and Red Chinese press to armed uprisings in Tibet, central Asia—presumably Soviet Turkistan—the Baltic States, and the Ukraine, second largest "republic" in the Soviet Union, as well as to recent conflicting stories by top Soviet officials on disorders in Georgia.

Last week other reports which American intelligence experts believe to be completely authentic in substance told of new anti-Soviet guerrilla activities. These included the derailing of a Soviet troop train last month at the Ukrainian rail center of Shepetovka—on the main line between Lvov and Kiev, the old Ukrainian capital—and the plastering of Tiflis, capital of Georgia, with posters reading: "Long live the independent Georgian republic."

The 26th of May, when the posters made their appearance, is the anniversary of the proclamation of Georgia's last independent government after the fall of Czar Nicholas II—a government which the Red army later attacked and crushed.

All this information is of the highest importance to Western strategists. It acts to destroy the widespread idea of the military invulnerability of the Soviet empire of captive states, and points the way to soft spots in the superficially hard Iron Curtain. Even more heartening to such planners is the implication that an alternative Western strategy to possible nuclear holocaust, having high chances of success, may well be a psychological one based on "massive countersubversion."

There are approximately 1,500,000 Americans of Okrainian birth or descent in the United States and Canada today; nearly all support movements for the establishment of an independent, democratic Ukraine. President Eisenhower repeatedly has told them that the struggle of the Ukrainian people "has significance for every lover of freedom everywhere in the world."

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Representative THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, are among the leading Democrats in Congress who have acted to make this support of Ukrainian freedom bi-partisan. A few days ago, Representative DODD, who as associate prosecutor at Nurenberg confronted Baldur von Schirach and other Nazi war criminals with official records showing mass murders of Jews at Buchenwald, submitted to the House of Representatives a list of recent Soviet crimes, including religious persecution in the Ukraine.

AMBUSH RECALLED

Representative DODD and others familiar with the history of the Ukrainian "freedom movement" recall that in 1944 its partisan fighters ambushed and killed the Nazi SS chief Victor Lutze near Brest-Litovsk. In 1947—in much the same manner as they are reported to have acted last month at Shepetovka—they derailed the train of the Kremlin's famous agent, Gen. Karol Swierczewski, and machinegunned him to death with every member of his staff. Gen. Swierczewski—the mysterious "Gen. Walters" of the Spanish civil war—then was Poland's Vice-Minister of Defense.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, retiring commander of North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, made a significant statement recently in Munich—site of the Free Ukrainian University, and home of some 30,000 Ukrainian refugees from communism. He told a group of newspapermen that the Ukrainian people initially welcomed the German Army in World War II "as liberators—with bread and salt," but that the vicious Nazi administration turned them into "partisans." He added: "We would not have done this."

A Bill To Require the Automobile Industry To Live Up to Fair Business Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to require the automobile industry to live up to fair business standards.

The necessity for this legislation arises out of abuses which have grown up over a period of many years in the distribution of motor vehicles in interstate commerce. For some time, I have received complaints from automobile dealers in my district and in my own State about unfair business methods in the automobile industry. I also know of the way in which some automobile manufacturers have intimidated and threatened dealers with a cancellation of the dealer's franchise. In some cases dealers' contracts have been canceled in a most heartless way. In some instances many who have been faithful and loyal and competent have lost their automobile dealerships and have been without recourse under the law.

Lately automobile manufacturers are overloading the automobile dealers with new cars and if the dealer refuses to take the cars, which they know they cannot sell, some of these manufacturers and their agents threaten to cancel the dealership contracts.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the automobile industry is overproducing and overloading its dealers.

A committee of the Senate has been studying this problem for more than a year and automobile manufacturers have known about this study. If they intended to clear up this bad situation in their own industry, they have had ample time to do so. Although it is probably fair to say that in some instances some effort has been made but it has not been successful.

Unless these bad practices in the automobile industry are corrected, our whole economy will suffer. Small-business men in the automobile sales field will be destroyed and, ultimately, the American people will suffer as well.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is must legislation for this session of Congress, and I urgently ask my colleagues to join with me and with others who have introduced similar legislation to see that this problem is handled by this session of Congress well before adjournment.

The bill which I introduced today reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 18 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C., secs. 57 and 58), are renumbered as sections 18 and 19, respectively, and such Act is further amended by inserting after section 16 thereof the following section:

"SEC. 17. (a) For the purposes of section 5 it shall be deemed an unfair method of competition and an unfair act or practice in commerce:

"(1) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to induce by means of coercion, intimidation, or discrimination any of its dealers to order or accept for delivery any product of any kind.

"(2) For a dealer knowingly to sell, other than to another dealer of such manufacturer, a new motor vehicle for resale as a new motor vehicle in competition with other dealers of such manufacturer without first affording such manufacturer an opportunity to repurchase such motor vehicle at the price paid therefor, and for such manufacturer to refuse to repurchase such motor vehicle at such price under a plan adopted by such manufacturer which is equitable to all dealers and consistent with the financial resources of such manufacturer.

"(3) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to hold out or require that warranties will be fulfilled and services rendered by all of its dealers, without effectuating a reasonable system of compensating all of its dealers, for maintaining the personnel and facilities required to fulfill such warranties and render such services.

"(4) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to execute a dealer's franchise after the date of enactment of this act which shall include any provision for its cancellation or termination at the option of the manufacturer of motor vehicles without the consent of the dealer, for any cause not specifically described and provided for in the franchise unless such franchise provides for the payment by the manufacturer to the dealer, upon the cancellation or termination thereof by the manufacturers without the consent of the dealer for any cause not so specified in the franchise, of a sum equal to the reasonable value of such franchise to such dealer, as determined by 3 appraisers, of whom 1 shall be selected by the manufacturer, 1 shall be selected by the dealer, and the third shall be selected by the manufacturer and the dealer, respectively.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'manufacturer of motor vehicles' includes any corporation which acts for such a manufacturer in connection with the distribution of new motor vehicles in commerce.

"(2) The term 'dealer' means a franchised retail seller of motor vehicles."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on November 1, 1956.

An Ill-Advised Presidential Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the June 10 issue of the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, commenting on the "ill-advised Presidential veto" of the Yellowtail Dam resolution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ILL-ADVISED PRESIDENTIAL VETO

We think President Eisenhower was the victim of some hasty political counsel in his exceedingly ill-advised veto of the Yellowtail Dam site bill which came to him with approval of the Congress and the endorsement of Governor Aronson, of Montana.

Lone opponent of paying the Crow Indians a reasonable price for the site was Representative FJARE of the eastern district. Whatever his reasoning, he has succeeded only in seriously impeding the construction of a badly needed Montana development for which funds had already been recommended by the Senate Public Works Committee. He has succeeded only in throwing a distressing roadblock on a project which up to now had been free of political barnacles.

Congressman FJARE presents his own solution, to cut the heart out of the price, and says his bill will avoid political log-rolling. We think he's still on the wrong foot.

If anyone introduced politics into the question, it is the Congressman from the eastern district. He stuck his neck out, and the Republican administration has now moved trying to save it.

The Civil Rights Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Sixth District Council of the American Legion:

RESOLUTION URGING SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL-RIGHTS DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas our great American democracy was founded upon the basic concepts of equality and liberty for all, which principles are embodied in our Constitution and cherished as the supreme law of our land; and

Whereas these doctrines of equality and freedom have been fountainheads of strength to our Nation which have borne us through our times of trial, nurtured us as a free people who have matured a mighty and thriving civilization, and brought up to an ascendency among the nations of the earth; and

Whereas the American Legion is dedicated among its avowed objectives to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to maintain law and order; and

Whereas the Supreme Court has decided that the school system be integrated among all races and peoples and that segregation be abolished; and

Whereas pursuant to article 4, clause 2, the Constitution of the United States provides "This Constitution and the laws of the United States * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary not withstanding": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Harold A. Taylor Post, No. 47, the American Legion, That we concur in the logic and reasons for said Supreme Court action and pledge our support and our aid in bringing about compliance therewith within the framework of the United States Constitution; and be it further

Resolved by Harold A. Taylor Post, No. 47, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, That it petitions the executive branch and Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to support the recent deci-

sions of the Supreme Court on civil rights; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Department of Justice, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Sixth District Council, the executive committee, and the department convention of the American Legion for further action consistent herewith.

Adopted at a regular meeting of Harold A. Taylor Post, No. 47, the American Legion, at the regular meeting held this 6th day of April A. D. 1956.

JOHN E. STRONG,
Commander.

Attest:

DOMINICK P. CUPURO,
Adjutant.

The above and foregoing resolution was adopted at a meeting of the Sixth District Council of the American Legion held on the 25th day of April A. D. 1956.

ELSTON G. BRADFIELD,
Acting Commander.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SCHMITZ,
Adjutant.

Alert in the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the article, "Billion-Dollar Gamble That Failed?", which appeared in the June 15 issue of the U. S. News & World Report. I ask that particular attention be given the closing paragraphs of this article, subtitled, "Alert in the Pentagon," which follow:

ALERT IN THE PENTAGON

Tito's game, whatever it is, has shaken the United States. Senators heard Yugoslav exiles testify that Tito has helped Moscow all along. The House banned all aid to Tito unless the President orders that it be continued.

The Pentagon's experts, when United States military aid first went to Yugoslavia, had trouble finding out just how the aid was used. Now, however, several hundred United States military men are moving about in Yugoslavia checking up on United States equipment and providing the United States with valuable intelligence on the whole area.

Yugoslavia's Army, these observers report, now has so much United States equipment that it is dependent on a $50 million flow of parts and supplies from the United States to keep going. Tito, once again, would become completely dependent on Russia if United States aid ended.

Tito himself, in Moscow, coolly said: "Our relations with the United States will not suffer." And Tito's friends say he knows he will be in trouble with his own Yugoslavs if he breaks his United States ties.

In the weeks just ahead, however, American policymakers will be taking another look at Tito. They must decide whether Tito has enough independence left to warrant any United States aid, or whether he is back on Moscow's side after a billion-dollar buildup from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the foregoing statement that the United States has several hundred military men moving about in Yugoslavia were true. However, in the testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, it is brought out that we actually have 55 people assigned for this purpose in Yugoslavia. Following is a transcript of the committee testimony:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder whether the question of Yugoslavia's cooperation in compliance with the law of inspection has come up. I would guess that came up for discussion.

Chairman RICHARDS. It hasn't come up, and it is a good question to raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Last year that formed quite an important part of the legislative history.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is right. General Waters, I believe, in the first week in February went out and made a complete inspection trip, which is the first time that has happened to our MAAG in Yugoslavia.

Mrs. KELLY. How many military are in our MAAG mission in Yugoslavia? I want to know that. I want to know how many are in all the countries.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mrs. KELLY, don't hold me to this figure, I am doing it from memory. That is one of the other questions, that we could have people in there. They did raise that ceiling.

I think, if I recall correctly, we had 45 and we now have 60.

Mrs. KELLY. How many have you in Turkey?

Mr. MCGUIRE. That I can't answer you. I will say you have a little different mission in Turkey; a substantial amount more. Because in Turkey you have a training mission along with the MAAG activity.

(The following information was supplied for the record:)

"As a result of the visit by Deputy Under Secretary of State Murphy last summer, the Yugoslavs have authorized an increase in the size of the MAAG to a total of 60 United States nationals. As of November 30, the following United States personnel were assigned: 27 Army, 8 Navy, 14 Air Force, 6 civilians—total 55.

"The strength of JAMMAT Turkey as of November 30, 1955, was as follows: 97 Army, 35 Navy, 51 Air Force, 34 United States civilians—total 217. These figures do not include 368 United States personnel engaged in training activities with the Turkish armed forces."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. Do you know how many personnel we have in the United States Embassy in Yugoslavia, and how many has Russia been permitted to send in Yugoslavia?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I don't know.

Mrs. KELLY. Will you find that out?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I think the State Department will have to answer that.

Mr. ELBRICK. I will find out. I am not sure that we have information here. We can give it to you.

Chairman RICHARDS. Will you provide that information?

Mr. ELBRICK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"The total number of United States Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia at the present time is 172 persons, including Embassy and military personnel, ICA personnel, marine guards, USIA employees, etc. Of these, 55 are connected with the MAAG mission, 8 are stationed at the United States consulate in Zagreb, and the remaining 109 are connected with the Embassy in Belgrade.

"The exact number of Soviet Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia is not known. The number of Soviet personnal with diplomatic status is known to be 16, which would indicate a total complement of approximately 50 persons. We have no information indicating that there are any Soviet military personnel in Yugoslavia in a status similar to our MAAG mission."

Chairman RICHARDS. Do you want to ask a question, Mr. Byrd?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman, did you ever think—I am sure you did—of the other side of the equation, of their attitude of playing both sides against the middle. This attitude hurts the anti-Communist world to a degree where those nations we are trying to align with the West become neutral. They can say, "Well, look what you do for Yugoslavia. Twice as much. We will do the same thing, play both sides against the middle." We are coerced into being blackmailed all along the line.

Stalin's Ghost as Scapegoat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, nations which are resisting the conquest by the Communist conspiracy of the free world are on notice that we cannot trust the dictators in the Kremlin.

On last May 12, in Human Events, an outstanding authority on the Russian conspiracy, Mr. Eugene Lyons, submitted a statement regarding the trick behind the false face of those dictators. His article was entitled "Stalin's Ghost as Scapegoat."

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the article that appeared in Human Events:

STALIN'S GHOST AS SCAPEGOAT

(By Eugene Lyons)

Any attempt to understand the sensational purge of Stalin's ghost, its causes and its implications for the future, must begin with a grasp of the enormity of the action.

The new Soviet dictators have only the prestige of their regime and its ruling party to give a semblance of legitimacy to their rule. Yet their indictment of the Stalin period is the kind that a victorious opposition, rather than legal successors, normally makes. Khrushchev and his associates have deliberately blackened and disowned a quarter of a century of the history of both party and regime, the whole of their heritage.

This they have done in full awareness that every accusation against Stalin is a confession of their own complicity in error and crime. They knew that their obvious guilt by association would far outweigh the pretense of innocence by dissociation. The only alibi the chieftains of a militant revolutionary movement could muster was abject fear of their master and patron. The humiliation must rankle—this is probably the first time in history that a group of rulers pleads cowardice as its warrant for leadership of a great empire.

In branding Stalin as a depraved blunderer and mass murderer, his heirs acknowledge the truth of the worst slanders, through the years, by "enemies of the people" at home and anti-Communists abroad. They cancel out 25 years of indoctrination and planned education, along with all textbooks, encyclopedias, and official histories.

There are few families in Soviet Russia which have not suffered heavy casualties first in the purges and liquidations, then in the war. Now the survivors are being told that the terror was largely unjustified and that much of the death and destruction in the war derived from Stalin's stubborn blunders. The long decades of suffering and sacrifice are thus turned into a macabre of mockery. In stripping Stalin of glory and conceding their own corruptions, the successors have provided deadly ammunition for opponents abroad and, more important, at home. They destroy the last illusions of the Kremlin's honor, veracity, and infallibility.

Such is the magnitude of their action. To explain it in terms of clever tactics is therefore absurd. Khrushchev and company would not have besmirched the Stalin period in which they are rooted merely to placate Tito or to improve relations with neutralist countries, or to promote united fronts with leftwingers, or even to raise the productivity of Soviet economy. Such considerations seem trivial when appraised in relation to the risks and humiliations involved.

The new oligarchs are, after all, the cream of the crop of Stalinist tough boys, trained and hardened to yield only to insuperable force. Clearly the repudiation of Stalin must have been an act of desperation, forced upon them by terrific and irresistible pressures.

It was "no easy question," one of the collective leaders, Lazar Kaganovich, said at the 20th party congress. For 3 years, the inheritors blew hot and cold on Stalin. Times when he was played down or ignored were followed by sudden renewals of ritual eulogies. The coup de grace was delivered after long delay and with heavy hearts—recall Khrushchev's tears and the fainting delegates—under compulsions that ruled out half measures. Neither the downgrading of Stalin—the attempt to let his halo fade out—nor the execution of Beria, as the terror symbol, had sufficed.

Foreign analysts seem agreed that the anti-Stalin drive somehow clears the road to united fronts and facilitates the wooing of neutralist and uncommitted nations. But this assumption is a shallow fallacy. Actually the admission of frauds, frameups, anti-Semitism, and the rest, all on a horrifying scale, shears the last shreds of idealistic pretensions from the Kremlin. It makes Stalin's long-time collaborators not more but less attractive as partners and comrades.

Pious talk of excesses and promises to behave more decently hereafter would have been enough for the Nennis, Corliss Lamonts, and Bevans of the world. The Kremlin's problem is to win over Socialist parties and uncommitted liberals—but these must be embarrassed and even revolted by the striptease revealing Soviet reality in all its moral nakedness. The cool reception Khrushchev and Bulganin met in England, especially in Labor circles, very likely was influenced by official Soviet confirmation that the worst suspicions about the Kremlin are quite true.

Naturally, the Soviet leaders will try to exploit their break with Stalin to gain some advantages abroad. But those who seek clues to the smearing of Stalin in Moscow's foreign affairs are in the writer's view, on the wrong track. These will be byproducts of a decision forced upon them by deep ferments inside their own country.

Only pressures menacing the very life of the dictatorship could explain the reluctant decision to jettison Stalin. The angers and despairs, always boiling under the artificial calm of a police state, threatened to break through to the surface. Anti-Kremlin sentiment has always been rife in the Soviet land, as witnessed by the maintenance of a colossal apparatus of surveillance and repression, the endless purging, the inhuman security laws and censorships. That sentiment must have reached explosive dimensions to force the rulers to offer Stalin himself as scapegoat.

Clearly the collective leadership found itself in deep trouble. We can only speculate, though with a large measure of assurance, where the pressures came from:

1. THE ARMY

In the last war the Armed Forces and their commanders reaped the blame for terrible defeats, while Stalin hogged the credit for the ultimate victories. The ghastly slaughter of the flower of the officers' corps left wounds that would not heal. Moreover, the millions of conscripts—drawn from the general population, most of them sons of the badgered peasants—have always mirrowed the moods of the populace. In the early 1930's, for instance, it was primarily grumbling in the ranks of the army that finally forced the Kremlin to call a halt to collectivization terror.

After Stalin's demise, his successors moved swiftly to conciliate the armed forces. The elevation of Marshal Zhukov was to signalize the change. But evidently a lot more drastic measures were required. The first of the major Stalin atrocities spread on the record at the 20th Congress was the murder of 5,000 officers in the Tukhachevsky purge. (In truth, several times that number perished.) The myth of Stalin's military genius was deflated with unsparing irony; the blame for inadequate preparedness and shattering losses in the war was laid squarely at the Kremlin's door; Pravda, on March 28, underlined the harm done by the Stalin cut to "works of art and literature devoted to military topics."

2. THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Restiveness in the ruling party itself unquestionably entered into the complex of pressures. In the Stalin era, the party was reduced to awed silence and utter impotence; its supposed policymaking organs became rubberstamps for one man's arbitrary will. In ratio to their numbers, Communists had more purge victims than any other segment of the citizenry. Though despised by the masses as the instruments of their ordeal, party members and secondary leaders alike felt themselves no less oppressed than nonparty neighbors.

Moreover, at least the more self-respecting among them were distressed by hypocrisy and mass murder. They winced as the traditions and revolutionary mystique of their party were dirtied and bloodied, as its founding fathers were reduced to the status of foreign spies.

A recent Warsaw broadcast in connection with the anti-Stalin campaign exclaimed: "How monstrous and pathological must the thoughts of a person have been who could have imagined that many members of the central committee, most of them old Bolsheviks, could have been enemies or imperialist agents." Late in the day, it was voicing the despair of myriad Communists compelled to believe just such monstrous nonsense.

It is significant that the denigration of Stalin is coupled with fulsome pledges of some inner-party democracy and restoration of the original powers of the central committee and other party agencies. No less significant is the fact that the first people to take advantage of the new dispensation seem to be Communists. Already Pravda has several times threatened "rotten elements" in the party, who allegedly are exploiting the anti-Stalin campaign to launch "anti-party views." If ever there is an uprising against the regime, it will not be astonishing to find dissident Communists in its forefront. Better than most of their countrymen, they know the extent of the Kremlin's corruption and inhumanity.

3. THE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENTSIA

The Soviet industrial supertrust is increasingly dependent upon its engineers, scientists, managers, and bureaucrats. Though educated along narrow technical lines, their intellectual growth could not be wholly prevented. Education has given them access to dangerous ideas despite censorships.

Materially this new class is well rewarded, but on terms that are galling to many if not most of them. They have seen scores of thousands of their colleagues dragged off to prison camps or execution cellars, and do not know when their own turn is coming. They represent the paradox of a privileged elite which is at the same time insecure and suspected. A curb on terror—the terror so long personified by Stalin—is surely intended to assuage the fears and win the allegiance of this group.

4. YOUTH

Former inmates of Soviet concentration camps now in the West are unanimous in reporting that the average age of inmates is well below 30. The great majority of some half million Soviet citizens who, at the war's end, refused to go back to their homeland, were young people. Now, as in Russia's past, "idealistic" university students are a thorn in the flesh of the rulers; the incidence of arrests has normally been much larger on the campus than in the population at large. Even the muffled reports of the riots in Tiflis and other areas made it clear that the leading role was played by students.

Youth's immemorial hatred of injustice has reasserted itself in terrorized Russia. The spread of what we would call juvenile delinquency, about which the Soviet press is frankly alarmed, is not without political overtones. The cutting of classes (in political indoctrination courses especially), the refusal to work, drunkenness and mischief are primitive protests against the boredom and drabness and insecurity of Soviet existence.

In the early period of the Russian Revolution, its glowing promises fired the imagination of young people. This spring feeling dies hard. It flared anew, as this writer saw, under the impact of bold slogans of industrialization and a happy life to come in the early 1930's. But thereafter youthful ardor was rapidly eroded by Stalin's ruthlessness and contempt for life. Factories and electric stations are not enough to feed the hungers of the soul-searching minority that has always set the pace for Russia's youth.

Recently the head of the Komsomol (Communist youth) organization, Shepilov, held forth on the need to revive the old fervors of the young. "The spirit of revolutionary romance and the spirit of pride in the great deeds of old generations of revolutionaries," he said, "are being lost in Komsomol and pioneer youth work." He was offering a more plausible explanation of the attack on the dead despot, and the rehabilitation of some of the victims, than any of the guesses of foreign experts.

These groupings, of course, overlap and intermesh. Nearly all officers of the Armed Forces and large portions of the new managerial elite are also party members. The grumblings of youth are echoed in the Armed Forces and in the party's auxiliary, the Komsomol. Vast discontents in the mass of the Soviet humanity, especially acute in the peasantry—still half of the population—provide the background for the more focused rebelliousness in the groups listed above. There is a prevailing unease, a sullen fed-up mood, among the common people. All of this adds up to a smoldering opposition, vague and inchoate as yet, but one which the new masters could no longer ignore. They live under the fear that it may suddenly flare into flame.

The dethronement of Stalin has more to do with the slave revolts in Vorkuta and other forced-labor regions than with Geneva or Belgrade or New Delhi. The riots in Soviet Georgia and elsewhere, in which at least 100 were killed, were explosions of long pent-up indignations.

Interviewed by a New York Times correspondent, the rector of the Tiflis State University, Victor Kupradze, remarked that in the 1930 purges, Georgia had suffered more than any other Soviet republic. He blamed the disturbances on "dark elements" composed of "former students, relatives of liquidated kulaks and liberated victims of the 1937 purges." But why would such persons risk their freedom and their lives to shield the reputation of the Great Purger and Liquidator? It makes no sense. The pretext for the demonstrations was illogical, but the motivating angers were all too genuine. The demonstrators were not so much defending Stalin as attacking his cynical henchmen and successors.

The important and encouraging fact is that four decades of police terror have not destroyed the capacity of Kremlin subjects for protest, and that the lead was taken by students who could have no memory of the pre-Soviet past.

Apparently a real measure of relaxation is today being allowed in the U. S. S. R. to underline the retreat from Stalinism. The milder political climate can be expected to break up the icepacks of fear. More and more millions, who only sighed and groaned, will find the courage to articulate their griefs and despairs. Already ordinary people, one reporter has cabled, are speaking "far more freely than they used to."

How far will this process go? Even a little freedom can be intoxicating. The oligarchs will become increasingly scared by the evidences of the intensity of popular hatreds of their regime and can be expected to resort again to the only medicines they know—purge, liquidation, shootings. The old-style threats against "unstable elements" in the ruling party, so soon after the renunciation of Stalin, are straws in the wind. The supposed break with the Stalinist terror is likely to prove the prelude to a new terror.

But the pressures which compelled his successors to disown their Stalinist heritage will remain to plague them. What the present bosses need most in this, their troubled hour, is prestige and acceptance abroad to bolster their positions at home. And the free world, alas, is providing these things in heaping measure. We fraternize with the Khrushchevs, Bulganins, Mikoyans, and their pisorted delegations and missions. We confuse their military might with political strength vis-a-vis their own people.

By every test of commonsense we should act today to undermine the legitimacy of the new leaders ,to emphasize their deep complicity in Stalin's crimes, to make clear our detestation of the whole Soviet nightmare and our understanding sympathy for the Kremlin's domestic enemies.

Instead we are doing the very opposite—receiving the hierarchs as honored guests, enlarging trade with them, underrating the Soviet people whom the dictators hoped to propitiate with a supreme scapegoat. A civilization not merely willing but eager to coexist with evil openly dedicated to its destruction has lost its will to survive. Should it be saved notwithstanding, it will be despite its own apathy and blindness, through developments within the Communist empire.

The Rogue River of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article written by Mr. Kenneth A. Reid, noted conservationist and honorary president of the Izaak Walton League of America.

Mr. Reid has been an ardent conservationist for more than 30 years. For 10 years he was executive director of the Izaak Walton League. His article in the May-June 1956 issue of Outdoor America, the official publication of the Izaak Walton League, is entitled "The Rogue River of Oregon." In the article he mentions the need for screening the fish destroying turbines and pumps in the Savage Rapids Dam. Mr. Reid, as well as all conservationists in America, will be pleased to know that the Savage Rapids fish screen problem is taken care of in the Public Works appropriation bill which was passed by the House recently.

The article referred to follows:

THE ROGUE RIVER OF OREGON
(By Kenneth A. Reid)

The Rogue River is the most famous, and probably the best steelhead river in the United States. Some other rivers have larger fish, and a few may have more steelheads ascending from the Pacific to reproduce their kind, but all things considered, none holds a stronger appeal to the angler seeking the ultimate in sport than the famous Rogue.

For reasons that are imperfectly known, the steelhead in one river may be quite different in their feeding habits from those in another. No one who has ever caught a steelhead questions the outstanding game qualities of this sea-run rainbow trout. But, unfortunately, in far too many river, one must resort to salmon eggs or hardware to get this splendid fighter on the line. In the Rogue he regularly takes the fly without encumbrance of spinner or other hardware and, on occasion, I have seen good fish taking floating insects off the surface.

For well over a hundred miles from its mouth at Gold Beach winding up through the timbered valleys and rugged canyons of the Siskiyou Mountains to the more open valley above Grants Pass, the Rogue affords superb steelhead fishing for the discriminating angler in a delightful and varied environment. And while they do not compare from a sporting standpoint, the salmon runs of the river have considerable commercial importance.

Through the years both fish have suffered considerably from widespread irrigation diversions and other developments of man. Now they are threatened with virtual extinction through the big annual loss of seaward migrants at the Savage Rapids Dam because the intakes to the turbines and pumps are not properly screened.

Federal appropriation of approximately $200,000 is needed to correct this situation. Each year since 1949 Congress has shirked its responsibility and failed to appropriate the needed money while the runs of salmon and steelhead have diminished year by year. Again the House Appropriations Committee has before it an item of $208,000 for screening these intakes to save an irreplaceable capital asset worth many times that amount. Commonsense thrift demands that this deplorable situation be corrected.

Economy in congressional appropriations is very much needed today. But we don't want or need the pennywise and pound-foolish type of economy that striking out this item would signify. Pleading economy as the reason for failure to protect the fisheries of the Rogue does not make sense when we consider the traditionally lavish policy of the same body on much greater appropriations for great dams which have often destroyed the salmon and other anadromous fish runs by blocking their essential spawning migrations. A very small fraction of the colossal sums being approved for these extravaganzas will suffice for the needed protection on the Rogue. Impartial application of the same yardstick of economy to the big appropriations will recover many times the funds needed here and effect overall savings. We are in favor of that type of economy.

Disruptive Increases in Imports of Foreign Oil

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised this question this afternoon. I had a chance to read a copy of his speech that he was kind enough to mail me, and I was impressed with the factual information and logic it contained. As you know, for many years I, along with the other gentlemen here and many other Members of this Congress, have been interested in trying to see that the small independent oil producers of the great oil industry have thrown around them the proper protection so that they could continue to explore and continue to widen the development and the production of oil, and that they could have reasonable protection against excessive imports, so that they could prosper and continue to find and develop new fields which is so necessary to industry and the economy of our Nation, and so necessary to our national defense.

The gentleman from Oklahoma and others here know that we have had this problem up on the floor of this House many times and we held a number of conferences with those in the executive branch of the Government seeking to slow down the constant increase of imports at a time when only 10 percent of our market was being taken by imports.

Notwithstanding our efforts, imports have continued to increase to the point where probably 18 or 20 percent of our market for oil consumption in this country is going to foreign countries, because certain big major oil companies have somehow or other refused or at least failed to comply with the wish expressed by this Congress, and by the committee that was set up to determine what the limitations on oil imports should be. That Cabinet-level committee, after making a thorough study, decided that oil imports into the United States in the future should be held to a level not to exceed imports of the year 1954, and that any significant amount of increase above that would be looked upon as excessive.

They asked these big oil companies to comply. They have not fully complied. Dr. Flemming wrote them a second letter urging them to voluntarily comply with the order.

They still have failed to comply, and imports by these companies have increased.

Some 3 weeks ago I was in touch with Dr. Flemming over the telephone, complaining of the present situation which we are discussing this afternoon. He told me that it was his intent and that of his committee finally to reach the objective laid down in the order. I feel sure he made that statement in good faith. I hope he reaches the objective of lower imports in the very near future.

I am hoping that our discussion of this problem today will again serve notice, not only on the major oil companies which are responsible for most of the excess imports, but on the executive branch of the Government, because, unless there is compliance on the part of the powerful importing interests in oil, there is no alternative, in my judgment, except to protect the independent oil industry that is so necessary to the economy of our country and the defense of our Nation, by legislation, which we reluctantly decided not to press at that time, in the belief they would ultimately comply with the order and we could gain the objective sought in the interest of our people.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the floor of the House and to our attention this afternoon.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The gentleman from Illinois has long been active in the consideration of this great problem, and I appreciate his contribution to our discussion.

1955 Big T Irrigation Water Spelled Success to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enclose in the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from the Loveland-Reporter Herald, Loveland, Colo., on June 5, 1956, entitled "1955 Big T Irrigation Water Spelled Success to Farmers."

This is a very interesting statement and is an illustration of what can really be done with western irrigation projects when properly organized.

The article follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE BIG T IRRIGATION WATER SPELLED SUCCESS TO FARMERS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is an informative article on the Colorado-Big Thompson project that will be of especial interest to the people of the Loveland area. Colorado-Big Thompson water in 1955 accounted for $17 million in crops. The 240,000 acre-feet of diverted water was 34 percent of the total supply.)

(By Robert E. Struthers, agricultural economist, Denver, Colo., region 7)

For the third successive year, Colorado-Big Thompson project supplemental irrigation water in 1955 spelled the difference between success and failure of crops in many parts of northeastern Colorado.

Drought began in 1953, the same year when project construction, started in 1937, reached the stage of permitting delivery of large quantities of western slope water diverted through the Alva B. Adams Tunnel.

In 1954, the project was ready with water to combat what had become the most severe drought Colorado farmers ever experienced. The 301,000 acre-feet of project water used in that year meant an estimated $22 million boost in crop value.

The drought cycle continued into the 1955 season—again calling for emergency water delivery from the project storage system. The 240,000 acre-feet of transmountain water furnished in 1955 represented one-third of the total surface irrigation water in the area served by the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. And it likewise accounted for one-third of $51,210,000 in crops, or $17 million.

SUPPLY MULTIPLIED

Normal inflow to the district averages about 900,000 acre-feet annually. By the reuse of return flows this initial supply is multiplied to the extent that actual measured diversions throughout the district total 2,200,000 acre-feet. Another half million acre-feet are supplied by well irrigation, all of which arises out of the initial inflow.

The average supplement to be provided by the Colorado-Big Thompson project is estimated at 257,000 acre-feet. Approximately the same rate of recurrence is expected of this water, and the beneficial effects will thus be felt throughout the district as well as in the area of initial application.

The project is expected to furnish about 22 percent of the district's annual supply. In 1954, however, the project water was 45 percent of the supply and in 1955 it was 34 percent.

Availability was even more important in 1955 than quantity. Throughout the unusually dry spring months project water was heavily used. For the season the Colorado-Big Thompson supplied 58 percent of the stored water used.

The same drought conditions that multiplied the uses at the same time prevented replenishment of storage. At the end of the year the 804,000 acre-feet of project storage capacity contained only 239,000 acre-feet of water. As the spring of 1956 approached, however, a heavy snow pack in the mountains held forth hope that total storage may increase even while full demands are met for supplemental irrigation water.

The water content of snow on the Colorado River drainage above Granby Reservoir, the project's main storage, was 160 percent of the 20-year average at the end of January. Should the rains be scant and the suns hot again in the summer of 1956, there still is assurance that near adequate supplies will be available for the district and the seven towns served with municipal water.

Crop production within the district increased about 8 percent in 1955 over the previous year, offsetting a 6-percent price decline. Farmers were not entirely spared the expenses and frustrations of drought, seeing sugar beet and corn plantings lost and having to replant to beans and sorghums.

The Big Thompson farmers commiserated with their fellows elsewhere in Colorado who had no means of supplementing their irrigation, or had no irrigation at all. Winter and spring moisture deficiencies destroyed the plantings on thousands of acres. The production of wheat, the major dry-land crop, was only 40 percent of the past 10-year average.

Abandonment of croplands over the State amounted to 43 percent of the cropped acreage. These failures, coming on the heels of 1954 when 39 percent of the crop acreage was abandoned, had an extremely depressing effect on the Colorado farmers' economic status. Business was down in drought-stricken communities and mortgage debts increased.

SALES TAX UP

Retail sales tax collections are an indicator of general business conditions and volume of spending. In the northeastern and southeastern irrigated valleys of Colorado, widely divergent trends in retail sales tax collections are evident, although both areas have been affected similarly by drought.

In the northeast, where supplemental water has been available, a progressive growth trend has been established. In the southeast, where drought-induced water shortages remain uncorrected, retail sales have declined with serious effects on the valley towns.

Such indirect effects are well known and accepted in irrigated communities. The Northern Colorado Water Conservancy district, contracting agency with the Government for construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, is organized under a pioneering law passed in 1937; under the law, the general population of 160,000 is helping to support the project through ad valorem mill levies. This form of support recognizes that the project means added stability and new wealth, not only for farmers but also for townsmen. Many similar conservancy districts have now been formed throughout the West.

The project provides an important service to western slope irrigators. Western slope project reservoirs include storage sufficient to replace any project-induced shortages among irrigators on that side of the continental divide. In addition, 95,000 acre-feet of storage capacity was provided on the west side for future irrigation expansion.

In 1955, western slope irrigators drew 39,000 acre-feet of water from this storage to offset shortages in their own supplies. This was water that otherwise would have been lost in the surplus spring flows, and it was provided without cost to the western slope irrigators.

A Flag for Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution which would provide for a flag for Members of the House of Representatives.

All of us, particularly those who have been members of the armed services of the Nation from time to time and even more particularly those Members of the House who own small boats and pleasure craft, are conscious of the use of flags to designate the high civilian officials in a great variety of Government departments and to identify the presence of the flag officers in the military service on ships, on boats, on other conveyances, and over headquarters such flags are constantly used to indicate the presence of the persons which they respectively represent.

The conversations and suggestions of a number of Members of the House aroused my curiosity concerning the subject. I wrote to Mr. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and learned that there is no official flag for Members of Congress in existence. He suggested that if it were desirable to have one the purpose might be accomplished by a simple

resolution of the House. I will include as a part of these remarks his letter to me of August 22, 1955.

At Mr. Griffith's suggestion I got in touch with the Heraldic Branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch of the Government. Colonel Laux and Mr. DuBois of that agency furnished me with a study explaining how flags for the United States Government officials are designed and including a statement concerning the background of the suggested designs for flags for Members of Congress. I will include, as a part of these remarks, the letter, dated August 9, 1955, which was written to me by Colonel Laux and the statement which he entitled "Schematic Philosophy in Creating Flag Designs for United States Officials." The flag suggested would have a red or blue background on which would appear the shield of the coat of arms of the United States, in the usual red, white, and blue, encircled by a wreath of oak and all surrounded by 13 gold stars. The finial piece, which is the ornament on the top end of the flagstaff, might be a reproduction of the Capitol dome in gold color metal.

Either red or blue as a background would be appropriate to either House of Congress. Having in mind that the House Chamber is decorated in blue and gold while the Senate Chamber is decorated in red and gold, I concluded to use the blue background in describing the color of the flag for Members of the House of Representatives in drafting the resolution which I introduced.

With his letter Colonel Laux also furnished me with designs and sketches of the proposed flags in color and of the proposed finial piece. These I will submit to the chairman of the committee to which the resolution is referred if such is his desire.

The resolution which I have introduced is based upon a draft which was furnished to me, at my request, by the Office of the Quatermaster General.

The drafting service was very much appreciated as the subject is a technical one, and I express my thanks therefor. It was, I should note, a drafting service only and did not necessarily represent a policy position of the Department of Defense.

The letters and documents to which I have referred above read as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
August 22, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter of July 19, 1955, concerning an official flag for Members of Congress.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, there is no such flag now in existence.

Regarding the appropriateness and symbolism of the proposed design which you mention; this is a fairly technical subject upon which we would prefer to refer you to a recognized authority. We suggest that you get in touch with the heraldic branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch. (Mr. DuBois, Code 131, Extension 52901.)

The third point which you mention concerns the necessity of legislative action for adopting such a flag. We have found no instance where a flag of a Government official has been adopted by means of a public law. The President's flag and that of the Governor of the Panama Canal are based upon Executive order. Those of the other officials are based upon departmental action. It would seem that comparable authority for a congressional flag would be found in a concurrent resolution (assuming that the Senate were asked to join) or by simple resolution of either House. Such authorization, however, would apparently not carry with it any legal obligation to official recognition by other Government agencies. If it is desired to insure official recognition, it would seem that it should be accomplished by a public law.

We are forwarding a copy of Lloyd's Register of American Yachts, containing a section in which the private signals of yachtsmen are reproduced, which indicates anyone or any group may adopt a private flag.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
August 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter, 19 July 1955, and letter from the Office of the Quartermaster General, 1 August 1955, concerning a proposed flag design for Members of Congress.

Careful study has been given to your request, and suggested designs are enclosed for your consideration. (See enclosure 1.) Also enclosed is an explanatory statement concerning the concept of this Office in creating the designs for flags for United States Government officials. This statement includes the background of the suggested designs for the flags for Members of Congress.

It is hoped the proposed designs are satisfactory. If they are approved, action will be taken, at your request, to prepare manufacturing the drawings for the flags.

Respectfully yours,
RAY J. LAUX,
Colonel QMC, Executive Officer.

SCHEMATIC PHILOSOPHY IN CREATING FLAG DESIGNS FOR UNITED STATES OFFICIALS

1. DESIGN (STAR ARRANGEMENT)

(a) Circle of stars around central design of the flag is reserved for the President and Vice President of the United States.

(b) Four stars in bend direction appear on the flag for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(c) Corner stars on flags are reserved for civilian appointive Secretaries of Departments and Governors of States.

(d) Deputies, Under and Assistant Secretaries of departments use the same design as that for Secretaries, but the colors are reversed.

(e) Rank for naval flag officers is indicated on vertical center line or extremity of imaginary geometrical figures.

(f) Army and Air Force military personnel have stars on horizontal center line and extremity of a geometrical figure.

2. DESIGN (COLOR OF BACKGROUND)

(a) President's flag: Dark blue.

(b) Vice President's flag: White.

(c) Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: Red and white; diagonally divided.

(d) Secretaries of departments: Various colors, with white stars.

(e) Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary of departments: White with colored stars.

(f) Navy flag officer: Dark navy blue, white stars.

(g) General officers of the Army: Scarlet, white stars.

(h) General officers of the Air Force: Ultramarine blue, white stars.

NOTE.—Military grade is indicated on uniforms by silver stars; it is symbolically represented on flag designs by white stars.

3. FLAGS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDING OFFICERS

(a) Vice President or President of the United States Senate (already adopted): White (Executive Order No. 10016, November 10, 1948.)

(b) President pro tempore of the Senate: To be determined.

(c) Members of the House of Representatives: Blue background, honor color from the flag of the United States, representing vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

(d) Speaker of the House: To be determined.

(e) Members of the Senate: Red background, color from the flag of the United States, representing hardiness and valor.

(f) Design: Inasmuch as the military ranks are represented by silver stars on the uniform and white stars on the flags, it is suggested the flag designs for Senators and Representatives have gold (or yellow) stars which will be distinctive to the legislative branch of the Government as distinguished from the executive branch. The shield of the coat of arms of the United States as described in RS 1793 (4 U. S. C. 4) is composed of 13 palys argent (white) and gules (red) alternated, a chief azure (blue). The 13 palys represent the Original Thirteen Colonies with the chief uniting the colonies and representing Congress. Therefore, this design encircled by a wreath of oak representing strength, all surrounded by 13 gold (yellow) stars, is most appropriate for use on flags of the legislative body. This central design would appear on both the Senators' and Representatives' flags. This central design could also appropriately be reproduced as a lapel button for wear by Members or former Members of Congress.

(g) Sizes: The flags should conform in size to the normal Armed Forces systems and for private boat use they should be appropriate for the boat on which displayed.

(h) Finial piece: Inasmuch as the eagle is prescribed as a finial design for the President's flagstaffs (the gilt halberd ball, gilt star are used by the Navy, and acorn and spearhead by the Army and Air Force) it is suggested that a reproduction of the Capitol Dome in gold color metal be used by Members of Congress as their distinctive finial piece.

H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5550, the bill which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC—is currently pending in this Congress. The controversy which it is raising throughout our land is increasing in intensity and I believe all Americans have a stake in this issue.

Recently the United States Chamber of Commerce evidenced its interest in the OTC. During its 44th annual meeting held here in Washington recently, there was submitted to the assembled delegates of chamber members a policy

statement prepared by the United States Chamber's Foreign Commerce Department Committee. This statement endorsed United States participation in multilateral trade agreements. Rather than gaining the quick acceptance of the chamber delegates, the statement loosed a controversy. It soon became evident that many of the delegates did not think too highly of the statement. So strong was their attitude, in fact, that they voted to submit the policy statement on multilateral trade agreements to a membership referendum by a vote of 227 to 163.

This referendum is now being conducted. I am proud to call the attention of the House to the role which is being played in this referendum by the Gloversville Chamber of Commerce of the 32d District of the State of New York.

After receiving numerous letters urging local members of the United States Chamber of Commerce to vote in favor of the policy statement, the Gloversville chamber decided that it had to do something. The members of the Gloversville chamber just could not believe that these letters spoke for any but a small number of chamber members. They felt that if they did not seize the initiative, many local chambers of commerce and trade association members of the United States chamber would be presented with a distorted picture.

The people in Gloversville were very aware of the damage which our participation in the multilateral tariff-cutting accord, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the so-called GATT—had caused in their region. They knew of the many sectors of our economy which labored under the threat of cheap imports.

Led by their able president, Mr. Richard B. McNamara, the members of the Gloversville Chamber of Commerce felt it to be their responsibility to redress the balance. They addressed letters to local chambers of commerce and trade association members of the United States Chamber urging them to vote down the policy statement on multilateral trade agreements, and they enclosed a very persuasive 12-point argument to support the letter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the Congress to take note of the letter and the supporting argument from the Gloversville Chamber of Commerce:

GLOVERSVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Gloversville, N. Y., June 5, 1956.

To Local Chamber of Commerce Executives:

As you know, local chambers are being asked to vote by June 18 on referendum No. 95, and are receiving numerous appeals to support the declaration involved.

A favorable vote on the declaration would place the national chamber on record as supporting H. R. 5550, a bill authorizing United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC). It would also be taken as approval of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), with all its ramifications, even though it has never been submitted to Congress and many people do not realize its implications for American business.

There are many valid reasons why the chamber should not take this position and why local chambers should vote "No" on referendum No. 95. The enclosed statement sets forth a number of these reasons. Also enclosed is a copy of "Willoughby and the Lorelei," which tells the story of GATT–OTC in a light and understandable way.

We in the Gloversville Chamber of Commerce are convinced that H. R. 5550, if passed, would adversely affect our community and the business climate which we want to maintain. We think other local chambers should share our concern, and should vote "No" on referendum No. 95.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD B. MCNAMARA,
President, Gloversville Chamber of Commerce.

WHY AMERICAN BUSINESS SHOULD VOTE "NO" TO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REFERENDUM NO. 95

Appearing in the guise of a general endorsement of an international approach to trade problems, the policy statement contained in referendum No. 95 is actually an endorsement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and H. R. 5550 (a bill now before our Congress which would authorize United States membership in the OTC).

The chamber's policy statement, taken by itself, reads more like a general endorsement of an international approach to trade problems: It states:

"The chamber favors participation by the United States in international organizations which deal with international commitments for the relaxation of trade restrictions; provide mechanisms through which arrangements for trade negotiations would be facilitated, and serve as forums for the discussion of trade problems and the amicable adjustment of problems involving commercial rules and commitments mutually agreed upon by the members. Under no conditions, however, shall the United States surrender its sovereignty or submit to control or domination by any supranational organization."

But after the unsuccessful bid for adoption at the 44th annual meeting of the chamber, the real purposes behind the statement have been revealed in the background material for the referendum:

OTC-GATT CONFLICTS WITH STAND OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

American business has always sought to retain within our own shores responsible control over American trade policy. It has held to the principle established in the Constitution: that the power to regulate foreign commerce be vested in the Congress and the Congress alone.

American business has sought to establish efficient and effective foreign-trade controls within our Government and to make them responsive to the needs of the American economy. It has opposed moves which would weaken American control over our own economy. Because our foreign-trade policy has played such a great role in shaping the flourishing economy of our Nation, American business has a continued and active interest in it.

In 1950, American business joined in opposing United States participation in the International Trade Organization (ITO). Opposition was so pronounced that the ITO never came up for a vote before Congress.

But now the charter of the ITO, which has already suffered one smashing defeat, has been rewritten and served up anew under the OTC label.

Our Government has been participating in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade without any explicit authorization from our Congress. GATT supporters are so wary of opposition that they decline to make United States participation the subject of a congressional vote.

POLICY STATEMENT ENDORSES GATT-OTC—RUNS COUNTER TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

In submitting its policy statement on multilateral trade agreements at the 44th annual meeting, the chamber too tried to make the GATT-OTC combination more palatable by using vague and general terms. Nevertheless, this declaration, if passed, would have had two effects:

1. It would be taken by Congress and the State Department as a businessmen's endorsement of H. R. 5550, OTC and GATT, an effect which is acknowledged in the background information supplied by the national chamber on referendum No. 95.

2. It would be a blank check endorsement of the planned economy approach to trade toward which GATT-OTC is trending, indeed an endorsement of the discredited ITO, which the chamber earlier disapproved.

It would be difficult to reconcile such endorsement by the chamber with its attempts to reform the ILO (International Labor Organization) and prevent its drift toward socialism. If the voice of free enterprise has been limited at Geneva in the ILO, is it safe to expect that it will be any greater at the secret OTC sessions at Geneva?

WHY OPPOSE GATT AND THE OTC BY OPPOSING THE CHAMBER'S POLICY STATEMENT?

1. The objectives of GATT permit and encourage a drift to socialism, as evident from paragraph 1 of GATT article I, Objectives:

(1) The contracting parties recognize that their relations in the field of trade and economic endeavor should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, insuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods, and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties.

2. GATT and OTC, as presently created, already go beyond the description of international instrumentalities in the proposed chamber declaration.

3. GATT not only deals with "interantional commitments for the relaxation of trade restrictions" it actually contains the rules under which the United States is expected to conduct its tariff and trade policies, and the exceptions under which most other countries can continue their restrictive trade practices.

4. GATT is already more than a forum. It is a codification of trade rules and exceptions. Supporters of the OTC constantly assert that it is "entirely administrative." However, the Secretary of State has admitted under cross-examination before the House Ways and Means Committee that the OTC is quasi-judicial. It could determine facts in disputes and mete out retaliation or penalties. These actions would be by vote, with the United States having but 1 out of at least 35 votes. The United States would either have to conform or quit the OTC.

5. GATT and OTC each comprise the same membership. Each can amend itself. The fact that OTC cannot amend GATT does not prevent either from expanding its own scope and influence.

6. OTC, in its present form, can determine whether member countries, such as the United States, are violating their GATT obligations. Whenever any member country accuses another of such violation, OTC, under its article 14, "shall promptly investigate the matter and * * * make appropriate recommendations * * * or give a ruling * * *." OTC may consult with the UN, or "with any appropriate intergovernmental organization." If OTC "considers the circumstances are serious enough" it may authorize member countries "to suspend * * * such concessions or other obligations * * * as it determines to be appropriate."

7. The United States has already been accused of violating its obligations under GATT, through our agricultural import quotas. The United States obviously can be outvoted. But, under OTC rules, we might not have the opportunity of casting

even our single vote, since, according to OTC Art. 8, "the rules of procedure may require that parties to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

8. Of course, we need not submit to an adverse decision of GATT-OTC. In the case of the agricultural import quotas our State Department delegates agreed to a GATT waiver which commits us to end the violation as soon as possible, and, in the meantime, to make an annual report of progress. In some future case GATT-OTC might not be willing to grant us a waiver, or the terms might be too degrading. In those cases we would either have to knuckle under or quit the organization with the stigma of disrupting international amity.

9. While we would theoretically retain our sovereignty and legal freedom of action, the realities of the situation would effectively infringe that sovereignty and freedom.

10. Congress will have no voice in GATT-OTC. Our voting delegate to GATT will be answerable, after his appointment is confirmed, only to the State Department and the President. Congress would usually have an opportunity to act only after a GATT-OTC action were taken.

11. By approving the declaration the chamber would be telling Congress to pledge its solemn good faith to abide by GATT-OTC. The chamber cannot effectively say to Congress: "Go ahead and agree to abide by those obligations you think proper and avoid the improper."

12. In this whole setup, the ordinary citizen would be lost in the shuffle—without knowledge of what was going on behind the closed doors of Geneva; without any direct voice in the decisions affecting him.

A FINAL IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

By issuing the policy statement on "multilateral trade agreements" with little prior notice, a committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce sought overnight to reverse the position of American business on American foreign trade policy. Now the membership is given only 30 days to make the momentous decision.

A vote of "yes" will commit the chamber to this reversal of policy. A vote of "no" will not endorse a negative stand; it will merely cause the chamber to stand above the controversy.

What New Soviet Plans Mean to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, frequently in our daily reading we come across articles of such significance as to merit sharing them with fellow Members of Congress. The Chicago Daily News long noted for its foreign news coverage and excellent commentaries, has printed a personal letter of foreign news correspondent Mr. Ernie Hill, as a climax to a series of dispatches which Mr. Hill sent in from Moscow. Mr. Hill, who has been reporting foreign news for the Chicago Daily News since 1945, intended his comments as a guide to the thinking of the men who edit this paper. The editors found the letter so informative and provocative that they felt the contents should be shared with their readers.

I am heartily in agreement with the editors regarding Mr. Hill's viewpoints, and feel his remarks offer much food for thought.

The article, which appeared in the May 29 issue of the Chicago Daily News, is as follows:

WHAT NEW SOVIET PLANS MEAN TO UNITED STATES—HILL CONFIDENT WE CAN WIN GLOBAL ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

(By Ernie Hill)

DEAR BOSS: I feel somewhat better about the state of the world as a result of my visit to the Soviet Union.

The Soviets need another generation of intensive construction work on living quarters, schools, and hospitals. Today there is only a beginning.

They are so proud of what they have accomplished that I feel certain they will think a long time before having it all blown up.

The Soviets, at the same time, are not nearly so efficient as we have been led to believe. Such a vast bureaucracy is cumbersome. Decisions are hard to come by and delays are interminable. Building construction is generally mediocre to bad.

The Soviet people most certainly want peace.

I wish I could report that the liberal changes now taking place mean that the Communists have given up the idea of world domination. Or at least that the Russian people are becoming fed up with the whole business of communism. But neither is true.

RUSS ARE STILL SOLD ON COMMUNIST GOALS

The Communists of Russia have convinced themselves that they must extend the dictatorship of the proletariat to the entire world for the good of the world.

And instead of being fed up, they are becoming more confident and enthusiastic over communism because of the material progress of the last generation.

Let's not kid ourselves. This is true. But I still feel we have grounds for optimism.

The most hopeful thing that can be said now is that the Russian people and the present leadership appear convinced that they can expand communism through economic competition without resorting to war.

They believe that the United States and its allies will soon go into an economic depression of such magnitude that the working classes will turn to communism as a way out.

The cold war is being turned into an economic war. Yet we have no choice but to stay strong and unified just in case the men in the Kremlin discover that capitalism is too formidable an economic opponent to defeat peacefully. We have to stay ready for war.

UNITED STATES MUST BEAT REDS AT ECONOMIC GAME

Our best course, it would seem, is to join in their new game and beat them at that too.

The Soviets talk big. But there is every indication that they are more afraid of us than we are of them. We have the bases, the planes and the bombs surrounding them.

President Eisenhower is highly regarded in the Soviet Union. He is considered a great general, a reasonable man from his Geneva statements and one who wants peace.

Secretary of State Dulles not only irritates all of our friends in Europe but is considered by the Soviets as the spokesman for irrational elements in the United States. His statements over a period give him a reputation as a shrill voice.

Some of the more intelligent Russians believe that Dulles is forced to do this to frighten congressmen into voting appropriations and to chill our allies into line. This looks like a fundamental weakness both in our country and in our alliance.

The best-informed Americans say Russia wants a sort of peace that is something like a quiet afternoon in a boiler factory.

The Soviets expect Communist parties in every country to keep stirring trouble, to be prepared for redoubled activities when signs of economic depression show. They are expected to engage in all activities short of war to press their ideology. It is a religion with them.

HOPE TO TRIUMPH WITHOUT BIG WAR

Why do the Russian Communists insist upon giving everybody such a hard time?

Why don't they relax, quit spending so much on armaments and allow the world to enjoy the fruits of automation and atomic energy?

I asked a number of Communists this question. They contend with considerable conviction that the last thing they want is war.

All they ask is an opportunity to have Communist Parties everywhere preach the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and try to attract enough followers to win an election or a civil war.

Marx and Lenin, they say, never made any provision for a great international war to subdue capitalism.

Each party in each country takes its own action to obtain power. They were doing very well with this formula in Eastern Europe and Asia until we stepped in and stopped the rot from spreading.

There can be little question but that Italy, France, and perhaps the rest of Europe would have succumbed through coups and civil wars had it not been for American aid and leadership.

Now that the lines are drawn, they want to settle it through economic competition which would suit us a lot better than war.

There is a good chance, I believe, that the opening of the Soviet Union to tourists and ideas from the West is going to produce some changes. Russia's historic isolation and secrecy is being modified. It is bound to work for the good.

If the loosening-up process continues for another 10 years or so, some experts feel that militant communism will begin to lose force.

Failing to bring about the economic collapse of the West, there may be greater reluctance to launch the horrors of atomic warfare.

There are some indications that fervor of the Communist zealots may be at a peak; that it may soon start to wane. The white-hot temperatures of the last third of a century cannot be maintained.

Other countries have gone through such periods of fanatical idealism. The Crusaders spent two centuries trying to capture and hold Jerusalem and convert the Moslems to Christianity. Then the move lost force.

Christianity gets along just fine today with Jerusalem divided between Mohammedans and Jews, the birthplace of Christ in the hands of the former and the place where He lived held by the latter. We have learned tolerance, to respect the religions of others.

WE NEED PATIENCE FOR YEARS AHEAD

Not long ago we tried to force all Latin American countries to become democracies. Today we are less intolerant of dictators. So, too, the Communists must realize eventually that they cannot force the rest of the world to worship Marx and Lenin.

Americans and Europeans going to Russia can help to break down the myth that western capitalism is on its last legs. Russian tourists to other countries will verify this.

It is going to take patience and intelligence to steer a peaceful course during these years of peak Communist fanaticism.

Let's talk softly, carry a big stick, and remain confident that we can hold our own militarily or economically. And that like the Crusades, militant communism will blow itself out.

Heart Disease and Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the expanding field of research as applied to agricultural products is producing the happy union of added markets for these products with increasing benefits to the comforts and the needs of humanity. One pleasing example of this work is found in the added use of soybeans in the diet and the health benefits which accrue from this product of medical research.

In the June 1956 issue of the Soybean Digest appears an article written by Dr. Philip S. Chen, professor of chemistry of Atlantic Union College at South Lancaster, Mass., which shows the importance of new medical discoveries concerning use of soybeans. The article, entitled "Heart Disease and Soybeans," will be of interest to all citizens and I wish to commend it to the attention of the Members.

The recent heart attack of President Eisenhower has brought renewed alarm to most Americans regarding the seriousness of this No. 1 killer, which, with other circulatory ailments, accounted for 52 percent of the deaths in the United States last year—more than all other causes of death combined. It has been estimated that 2 out of every 3 Americans of 55 years of age will die of this disease.

What is the chief cause of coronary heart disease? An explanation of this malady appeared in an article by Blake Clark in the November issue of Reader's Digest from which we quote:

"The arteries which distribute food and energy throughout the heart muscles are called coronary arteries. Doctors have long known that the greatest danger to the heart is an accumulation in these arteries of a fatlike substance called cholesterol. * * * It may be deposited within the walls of a coronary artery, narrowing down the channel for the blood to flow through and starving the cells of the artery itself. If this process continues, the artery may be closed by a blood clot. Since the heart muscle depends upon the blood and oxygen brought to it by the arteries, the result may be a weakening of the heart. In the end the heart may simply stop for want of this vital fuel."

Cholesterol is produced in the liver. It is also contained in the fat of animal source—including meat fat, egg yolk, butter, cream and milk. It has been shown that the higher the fat consumed by people, the higher is their cholesterol content of the blood, and the higher their incidence of coronary heart disease. The following are but a few illustrations:

Forty years ago fat constituted only 30 percent of the calories in the American diet; now it provides 40 percent. There are proportionately more cases of heart disease today than 40 years ago.

The Italians consume only about half as many fat calories as Americans do. Their death rate among men from heart disease is less than a third of ours. In England and Spain, the amount of blood cholesterol and the incidence of coronary heart disease were found to have a direct relation to the proportion of fat in the diet.

Dr. A. R. P. Walker and J. Higginson, of Johannesburg, South Africa, found that the Bantu natives, who get only 15 percent of their calories from fats, had little cholesterol in their blood. Only one death from coronary heart disease was found among 224 autopsies on men 50 to 70 years old.

QUALITY MOST IMPORTANT

While the quantity of fat in the diet is a contributing factor to the coronary disease, according to most of the reports published, the quality of fat is of even greater importance, according to the author, for of food fats only animal fats contain cholesterol. Fats of vegetable origin—fruits, vegetables, cereals, nuts—do not contain cholesterol. They contain phytosterol instead of cholesterol, and phytosterol, though closely related to cholesterol, does not cause coronary disease.

That there is a correlation between the kind of diet and the cholesterol content of the blood is made clear by a recent survey made by Dr. Merwyn G. Hardinge, of the College of Medical Evangelists, and Dr. Frederick J. Stare, of Harvard University (the Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2.73, 2.83, 1954). A brief résumé of their survey is as follows:

Their study included 201 persons using the following 3 types of dietaries: (1) Lacto-ovovegetarian, a plant diet, plus milk and eggs, but no meat, fish, or fowl; (2) pure vegetarian, a diet of plant foods, excluding milk and eggs; (3) nonvegetarian, the average American diet of milk, eggs, meat, and foods of plant origin.

An analysis of the diets of the three groups was made to determine the average daily consumption of calories, protein, fat, calcium, phosphorus, iron, vitamins A, B_1, B_2, C, and niacin. All of the three dietariaes came within the limits of the daily allowances of the various nutrients as recommended by the National Research Council. Also, there were no significant differences in the height, weight, blood pressure, red-cell count, and hemoglobin concentration among the three dietary groups. It was found, however, that the blood-cholesterol levels of the three types of adults were significantly different. The nonvegetarians had the highest blood cholesterol, the pure vegetarians the lowest, the lacto-ovovegetarians fell in between.

Probably there is no other group of people in the world that is more enthusiastic about soybeans in their diets than the Seventh-Day Adventists. They are the originators of health foods and meat substitutes, many of which contain soybeans.

Among the Seventh-Day Adventists who have helped to popularize soybeans in this country and abroad are Dr. P. A. Webber, a former secretary of the American Soybean Association, now a missionary to Japan, and Dr. H. W. Miller, the originator of the soy milk powder, Soyalac. Dr. Miller has been a frequent contributor to the Soybean Digest and is now a missionary in free China.

It is true that a pure vegetarian may find it hard to get enough high quality protein to meet his body requirements. But thanks to the soybean, a plant food which contains all the essential nutrients for the human need, this is no longer a problem.

NO PROBLEM WITH SOY

What is true of coronary disease is also true of arteriosclerosis, namely, cholesterol is the chief offender. Stephan Jamyn reported in Revue Internationale du Soja of March 1946, that hardening of the arteries in rabbits can be artificially produced by including cholesterol in the diet.

The use of soybeans in the human diet not only does not contribute to coronary disease and arteriosclerosis, but the soybeans also contain a factor which aids in the cure of these diseases. This is clearly indicated in the work of Pottenger, Jr., and Krohn as published in the American Journal of Digestive Diseases of April 1952. Contrary to common medical practice of giving the patient a low-fat diet to relieve hypercholesterolemia (high content of cholesterol in the blood), these doctors gave their patients the opposite diet—one high in fat and cholesterol—plus soybean phosphatides, which are used in the food industry under the name of lecithin.

One hundred and twenty-two patients were put on a high-fat regimen that included raw liver and raw brains—foods that are rich in cholesterol. Ninety-nine of the patients took a teaspoon of soybean phosphatides with each meal. The remaining 23 served as controls.

The blood cholesterol showed a marked decrease in 79 percent of the patients who took the lecithin, but not in the patients who did not take lecithin.

This indicates that it may be possible to correct hypercholesterolemia in those individuals who are on a high-fat, high-cholesterol diet with the use of soybean lecithin. The administration of soybean lecithin may also be applied to coronary disease and arteriosclerosis with beneficial results.

At a recent meeting of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology held at Atlantic City, it was reported by University of California researchers that by using a synthetic butter made from soybean sterols, 10 grams of soy sterols in this butter each day effected a 10-percent reduction in cholesterol levels in the blood of the experimental animals.

CAUSE OF GALLSTONES

Besides causing coronary disease and arteriosclerosis, cholesterol causes yet another human malady, namely gallstones. These stones are formed either in the bile duct or in the gall bladder. They consist of cholesterol or cholesterol mixed with calcium salts of bilirubin, carbonate, or phosphate.

According to Dr. Louis F. Fieser of Harvard University who has been working in cancer research for many years, cancer-producing substances might be derived from cholesterol. The following excerpt is taken from Dr. Fieser's lecture delivered in Paris, November 13, 1953, under the auspices of the Societe Chimique de France and the Societe de Chimie Biologique: "Consideration of the correlation of chemical reactivity and biological potency points to delta 5-cholestene-3-one as the one substance derived from or related to cholesterol most likely to possess carcinogenic activity * * * but the evidence that such a substance has indeed been responsible for tumors evoked in mice by preparations from cholesterol has seemed to me more convincing than the theoretical argument to the contrary." (Science, May 21, 1954, vol. 119, No. 3099, pp. 710–716.)

Thus it is seen that the cholesterol in the animal fat is responsible for these common diseases which take a heavy toll of human lives each year and cause untold misery and suffering.

As people become cholesterol conscious as they are now calorie conscious, the author believes the following dietary changes will take place in which soybeans are bound to play a prominent role:

1. A decreased consumption of animal fat, especially lard, fatty meats, and organs, such as brain, heart, liver, and kidneys. In their place will be substituted protein-rich soybeans and soybean meat substitutes.

2. A greater consumption of margarine in place of butter.

3. Mellorine, a frozen dessert made of soybean and other vegetable oils, taking the place of ice cream.

4. Skim milk, buttermilk, nonfat milk powder and especially soy milk and soy milk powder consumed instead of whole milk containing the milk fat, cream.

When that time comes, a breakfast consisting of eggs and bacon (especially when fried in lard), heavily buttered toast, and coffee

with rich cream—now a common American breakfast—will become very unpopular, especially among those who are particularly susceptible to coronary and other diseases in which cholesterol is the chief offender. It is, therefore, to be anticipated that the consumption of soybeans in the human diet will be greatly increased in the very near future.

It's the Veterans Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the June 7, 1956, issue of the National Tribune, Washington, D. C., concerning the Bradley Commission recommendations affecting the Nation's veterans should be read by every Member of Congress.

This article reveals that the attack on veterans' benefits as contained in the Bradley Commission report is nothing more than a repetition of similar attacks launched years ago by other anti-veterans groups.

The editorial follows:

IT'S THE VETERANS' TURN

The first week in June 1956 is now history and, if present plans are followed, the Congress will have adjourned by the end of July so that Members may attend the August national conventions of our two great political parties. That means there remain only 7 more weeks to complete congressional action on all of the essential legislative proposals still pending, among them some terribly important relief bills for veterans and their dependents.

We would hesitate to believe that the apparent reluctance to approve veterans' relief is part of a plan of strategy to resist the enactment of needed measures demanded through their national conventions by the major veterans' organizations of the country, but events certainly appear to be shaping up that way. Fewer than 10 legislative measures for the veteran class have gone through the House of Representatives during the final session of this 84th Congress, far less than the usual score at this point of the year; most have been of a comparatively minor character and relate principally to the younger and newer veterans; only a couple of them have as yet received the approval of Senate committees, and this, be it remembered, is an election year.

Long ago this column pointed up the deterrents. First, there were the unscrupulous and unreasonable requests of two Hoover Commissions that would in a great measure wipe out certain rights of the veteran class. Then came the single-package Hardy committee recommendations for survivors of veterans that do violence to every nationally accepted principle of dealing with the dependents of service dead and apply a new concept of rank and length of service to legal benefits that would create added inequalities. And, finally, there was the long-delayed Bradley Commission report with proposals that rocked the country from one end to the other and which are in almost all instances unacceptable as a means of treating with the men and women who throughout our national emergencies have sacrificed most for the Nation's cause.

It is fitting, now that legislative time is running out, to look to the weeks ahead. Having been combed over thoroughly, most of those Hoover suggestions that relate to veterans and their care have been rejected by responsible Members of Congress and have been relegated to the pigeonholes where they belong. The Bradley Commission recommendations have been given a thorough airing by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and, if we are able at all to judge congressional reactions, they, too, are disagreed to by the lawmakers in almost all respects. Certainly it is obvious that even if President Eisenhower and his kitchen cabinet want any part of them and send their demands to Capitol Hill before adjournment, they will receive scant attention before a new Congress comes into session next January. During the present week the Hardy bill is receiving Senate committee attention, but even though this measure is supported by the White House and by the high brass at the Pentagon, it will be examined as though with a microscope and we would be surprised if it goes the rest of the way through the legislative mill without considerable debate and major amendment.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that if anything else is to be done for veterans and their loved ones than might conceivably be achieved through these sources, those committees of the Congress that are cloaked with the responsibility of legislating for the veteran class had better get down to business quickly. We have already declared our understanding of the desire of many Congressmen to know what these several investigations were all about and how they reacted on veterans' rights, both existing and pending. They know now, and they realize that there is nothing very helpful to be found in them. It was suggested that the information made available recently to the Congress be gotten to the people to offset their seemingly ready acceptance of new and untried philosophies of veterans' care. We think that regardless of the well timed and vicious load of anti-veteran propaganda that was so generously broadcast by the administration has served its purpose by now, that regardless of tremendous newspaper, magazine and air coverage it has failed abjectly and that the Congress itself, judging from the communications received by Members, must realize that the campaign to belittle war veterans and downgrade their services to the country has been thoroughly debunked.

Even those younger former servicemen, who were weaned on the pap that war service is only a citizen's privilege and that the real rights won by victory are "the right to say what you think, work where you please and raise your kids as you see fit," have been strangely silent since it has been made clear to them that they accepted far more intrinsic privileges than those, great as they are, and that they were not merely handed out to them on a silver platter by a grateful Congress. These extended hearings to examine into the proposals of philosophers, psychologists, socialists and impure crackpots have shown above all else that truth is the best vindication against slander. So they have served a good purpose. But now it is time to get down to business.

As we stated earlier, very little along the line of what we call veterans' legislation has gotten serious attention so far this session, and regardless of some observations by carefully calculating Congressmen, it is fair to draw comparisons when the question of expenditures is made a vital issue. Very properly there has been little serious debate on the expense required for national security. Before the legislators conclude their work for the session a billion dollars or so may be shaved from requests for continued foreign aid for which the White House wants $5 billion to add to the $51 billion given away since World War II, $37 billion of it nonmilitary in nature. And we think that a total of some $66 billion in spending for the next fiscal year will be approved, including well over a billion to go to farmers for not planting crops, a deal that will cost everybody about 10 bucks apiece to say nothing of what they, including veterans, must resultantly shell out for higher food prices. "Comparisons," we admit, "are odorous," but they do have their place, and we feel certain that no legislative demands for veterans that are reasonably legitimate will put much of a crimp in the country's Treasury.

So the organized veterans of America—that great segment which takes the time and utilizes its energy to aid the rest who are unable to help for some reason, or who are too lazy to do their part in helping their less fortunate—feel that it is time to do something about veterans' legislation. There is still time to do the job that must be done if congressional committees will act without delay. If, after bills are reported, the powerful House Rules Committee through which most veterans' bills presumably pass, fails to act, the rules of the House provide a fortunate bypass. All the chairman has to do is call them up, a system that is seldom resisted by the leadership. And if that causes too much delay, there is the little-used but effective petition route. We hesitate to offer a suggested means of actiton that reflects on the judgment of regularly constituted committees, and we do recommend it only as a last resort, but we consider some of the pending measures are vital to the needs of the Nation's veterans and their dependents, and they are the people who come first with us.

We, therefore, make this appeal to those on Capitol Hill who hold the fate of the veteran class in the palms of their hands. They can move, if they will, and we are sure that a majority of the Congress is ready to do something, even by signing petitions if that be necessary. We are not selfish. Abraham Lincoln once said, "If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another," and he added, "I go for all sharing the privileges of the Government who assisted in bearing its burden." That philosophy saved this Nation. It holds good in the existing crisis that faces our veterans. It's their turn now.

Tribute to the Honorable Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Saturday, June 2, 1956, which pays tribute to Attorney Charles Rozmarek, a native of Wilkes-Barre, who was recently reelected for the fourth time as president of the Polish American Congress:

MR. ROZMAREK CARRIES ON

It was no small compliment to attorney Charles Rozmarek of Chicago, formerly of Wilkes-Barre, when he was elected president of the Polish-American Congress at the convention in Philadelphia yesterday for the fourth time. He has been the organization's only president since it was founded in Buffalo in 1944.

Last year, for the fifth time, Mr. Rozmarek was elected president of the Polish National Alliance, the largest fraternal and beneficial organization of Americans of Polish extraction.

Thus, Mr. Rozmarek has the distinction of heading the two outstanding bodies of their kind, making him the spokesman for 6 million of his fellow countrymen. It is an unprecedented personal tribute as well as an endorsement of his vigorous leadership.

Mr. Rozmarek has gone a long way since leaving this city. He has become an outstanding figure, consulted by three successive Presidents of the United States and other world leaders like Sir Winston Churchill. On his shoulders has rested not only the cause of Poland, but much of the burden in the continuing struggle against communism. It has been a heavy load, but he has not shirked responsibility.

In view of his background and experience, it is understandable why the Polish-American Congress has retained his services. On the other hand, it has been at no small personal sacrifice that he heads this crusade for liberty year after year in the interest of humanity. Only a truly dedicated man could carry on so long and so successfully.

Report of the Resolutions Committee for the 26th Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational Christian Churches, May 8–10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following report of the resolutions committee for the 26th annual meeting of the Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational Christian Churches. I know the membership will give careful consideration to the views of the conference on these important issues.

RESOLUTION NO. I—CHRISTIAN HUMAN RELATIONS

Whereas the precepts of Jesus proclaim the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of His human creations; and

Whereas the conscience of this Nation has been awakened with regard to its failure in affirming belief by action in the area of race relations; Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the Middle Atlantic Conference of the Congregational Christian Churches, affirm our concurrence with those decisions of the United States Supreme Court dealing specifically with the relationships of Americans one to another and affirm our willingness to move "with all deliberate speed" towards the realization of the goals thus set forth; be it further

Resolved, That the individuals and churches of this conference be urged in all heartfelt sincerity and sympathy to lend their efforts to the forces now laboring for truth, justice and unity in all sections of the country; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all ministers, church clerks, and chairmen of the boards of deacons of the churches of the Middle Atlantic Conference.

RESOLUTION NO. II—FOREIGN AID

Whereas the world situation remains serious, with a continuing tension between East and West, especially with the political future of Asia, Africa and the Middle East still to be determined; and

Whereas it is to our Nation's interest to strengthen other nations to grow toward political and social health, that they may have the will and the strength to maintain and enlarge their freedom; and

Whereas these things represent our fundamental Christian convictions: Be it

Resolved, That we commend and support the President of the United States in his appeal to Congress for an expanded foreign-aid program, with greater emphasis upon economic and technical aid; and be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Honorable John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, the Senators and Congressmen who represent the areas in which the churches of the Middle Atlantic Conference are located, the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION NO. III—MIGRANT LABOR

Whereas we recognize the urgent need for coordinated educational facilities for children of migrant laborers who move from State to State; and

Whereas we recognize the urgent need for co-ordinated health inspection and clinical medical facilities for migrant labor and their families: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational Christian Churches, urge support of the President's "Committee on Migratory Labor in its efforts and proposals to coordinate State programs and activities in these fields; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to Henry K. Arneson, Executive Secretary of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, and the Honorable James P. Mitchell, United States Secretary of Labor.

Sad Suspicion Confirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing sentiment that prevails in this country that the Communists are getting smarter every day, while our American diplomats are sinking into a form of lethargy. We continue to build up our enemy with American tax dollars, while our own people keep digging into their pockets to pay the bill.

Are we trying to build Tito into the world's first air power, when it is very apparent that he is not our friend? Or are we going to let Yugoslavia remain as the fifth largest air force, already made so by American taxpayer dollars? It is apparent that we are evidently going to help Tito and his cohorts build into the world's largest air power, not knowing where he would stand in case of a struggle with the Soviet Union.

Consequently, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, an article that appeared in the Sarasota (Fla.) Herald Tribune on June 10, 1956. The writer's voice is but one voice crying out in the wilderness. He certainly is speaking for many Americans who are disturbed about where we are going and the reason for the necessity of these large outlays of money in this huge giveaway plan that has not bought us one friend and can never buy one.

The article follows:

CRACKER BARREL

(By John Henderson)

SAD SUSPICION CONFIRMED

The suspicion long entertained by many Americans that the top-level Communists are smarter than our boys of the same rank is rapidly assuming the proportions of solid fact. The latest evidence is Tito's triumphal entry into Moscow after being kicked out of the Cominform a while back. While Tito was still nursing his bruises, the giveaway do-gooders foregathered and told the country that now is the time to bind the Communist marshal to us with bands of steel, meaning dollars. And forthwith we gave him half a billion dollars of goods and services produced by American workmen.

A few editors, columnists, and Congressmen warned that Tito was a Communist and that no Communist could be trusted. But their voices were drowned out by the chorus of the idiots who have been preaching for two decades that we can buy friends with cash.

Now you hear from every direction the wail that "We been robbed" by Tito who has returned to his first love, taking along with him the half billion bucks we gave him. But have we been robbed? We have not. The five hundred million we gave Tito went far in sustaining our present glorious prosperity. But for that giving thousands of automobiles, TV sets, and washing machines now in use would be gathering dust in the dealers' warehouses.

We shouldn't be too rough with Tito. Our present fabulous standard of living requires that we give away large quantities of goods and services. And wasn't it cheaper to give Tito the tanks, planes, et cetera than to store them at, let us say, 50,000 smackers a day? The reason is not far to seek. We have 60 million workers who are as busy as bees tending Aladdin machines so marvelous as producers that some of our leaders are enthralled, some appalled. We must keep these workers busy or some of our best economists will be shamed. We are making more of everything than we need. We can't sell it abroad even at cutrate prices. And sometimes we can't even sell the stuff at bargain basement prices. An example of that is to be found in Mr. Benson's recent effort to place 5 million bales of American cotton on the world market for what it would bring. The State Department fairly screamed its objections. Said it would bring down upon us the wrath of our foreign friends who produce cotton. But he didn't say who these friends were. But we can give tanks, guns, planes, and ships to our foreign friends—many of which are in the Tito class.

We shall, no doubt, find someone to take Tito's place—maybe two or three—and everything will be hunky-dory. That is, until we reach the last pea in the dish. There won't be any last pea in the dish because money grows on trees? Brother, who do you think you are kidding? If you don't know, it's about time you were told: Nobody but yourself.

Saw a picture of some of the underground caves built for protection against the time when the Devil shall be loosed upon the earth. Reminded me of Ruben and his wife Ca'line who lived on the yon side of the hill in a little white cove while I was growing up. Both were of pure English ancestry. Hard-shell Baptist in faith and never been inside a schoolhouse. But Ca'line defected and joined the liberal Baptists, a sect which, among other things, allowed a cottage organ in its churches. Ruben said the organ was what led her into the paths of unrighteous paths.

Anyway, Ca'line demanded a "storm pit" into which she could go when a black cloud appeared above the horizon. Rube built her one, covered with discarded crossties from a railroad 9 miles away. Thereafter, every time there was a clap of thunder, Ca'line made a beeline for the pit and rolled into the far distance. Rube clung to his faith that whatever was to be would be come heck or high water and remained in the house. But according to his neighbors, he did make one concession. On the occasions when his wife was in the pit, he would fall upon his knees and pray: "Easy, Lord, my wife's afraid o' thunder."

Wonder what would be Rube's reactions were he here when the brimstone begins to shower down.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, several times in debate recently mention has been made in the House of the case in Japan in which the Fuquoka District Court ordered Capt. Lincoln MacKay, liaison officer of the Itazuke Air Base, to reemploy four Japanese who had been discharged for security reasons, and later rendered judgment against Captain MacKay for the amount of their wages had they been working.

I have been fortunate to receive a copy of the court's opinion, and I wish to call attention to one paragraph therein.

(a) An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity. Consequently, it is a well established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty, is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. Neither are members of the armed forces subject to the jurisdiction thereof for acts performed in furtherance of official duty, that is, the acts done in the performance of official duty whether such acts were done within the area of their station (barracks) or outside such area. However, stationing of a foreign armed force has considerable effects upon the sovereign rights of the receiving state, and upon the rights of the people thereof. Therefore, it is customary that the fundamental rights, duties and obligations are provided for in detail in agreements concluded at the initial stage. Such agreements are often revised.

The proponents of the status of forces agreements have been saying that without such agreements our servicemen abroad would have been subject to the criminal jurisdiction of foreign governments even for offenses when on duty. I think it is notable that even the courts of Japan have recognized the correct rule of law which would have applied to our troops when off duty, without the so-called administrative agreement with Japan.

This agreement apparently has lost us the dignity which that court thinks a fighting force should have. Instead of protecting our men, the courts are emboldened to ignore our rights under international law and to see how much they can get away with in spite of the terms of the agreement.

Racketeering and Pickles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article by Edward Ranzal which appeared in this morning's New York Times and an Associated Press story from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

This case indicates the extent to which racketeering in various forms appears to have developed. The reports state that 12 men have been indicated for using violence to extort about $150,000 annually from the pickle and condiment industry. This racketeering is said to have caused a $1 million increase in consumer prices.

As in some other racketeering cases, there appears to have been collusion between a union and an industry association.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express once again my hope that we shall soon see an all-out investigation of this type of racketeering, either by Congress or a special commission.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1956]

UNITED STATES INDICTS 12 IN PICKLE RACKET LINKING DEALER UNIT AND UNIONS—PLOT TO MONOPOLIZE $10 MILLION INDUSTRY IN REIGN OF TERROR IS CHARGED BY JURY—INQUIRY CONTINUES

(By Edward Ranzal)

Management and labor were described yesterday as associated in a reign-of-terror conspiracy to monopolize the $10-million-a-year pickle and condiment industry.

Such a conspiracy was sketched in a four-count indictment returned by a special Federal grand jury charging 12 men with violating the Federal antiracketeering laws.

By means of extortion and coercion, United States Attorney Paul W. Williams said, the conspirators mulcted the industry of $150,000 a year. He estimated the ultimate cost to consumers as $1 million annually.

Mr. Williams said the New York Pickle & Condiment Dealers Association, Inc., had attempted to monopolize the industry with the cooperation of local 1648, Condiment and Table Suppliers Union, and Local 120, Pickle and Condiment Workers Union of America.

Seven of the 12 men who were indicted have police records. The principal was said to be Morris (Moishe) Malinsky, 46 years old, of 56–20 175 Place, Flushing, Long Island. A charter member of local 1648, Malinsky was business manager of the association from 1952 to 1955. His salary was $400 a week.

Malinsky has a police record going back to 1937 for assault and robbery. In 1942 he was convicted of killing a policeman. He spent 2½ years in the Sing Sing death house. The United States Supreme Court reversed his conviction on the ground that his confession was obtained illegally.

The association controlled the industry by dividing up customers and territories, Mr. Williams said. When an independent dealer refused to join the association, he declared, the unions were used to picket and put pressure on him.

The grand jury charged that part of the conspiracy was "to use force and violence and inflict bodily injury upon those in the pickle industry who would not conform to the dictates imposed by the association."

The panel asserted that the defendants "would create throughout the pickle and pickled products industry, a feeling of fear and terror in order to prevent resistance to the operation of the conspiracy."

Myles J. Ambrose, assistant United States Attorney in charge of the investigation, said money was extorted from businessmen through dues paid to the association or to the unions.

Mr. Williams said that the indictment gave a significant picture of "what is going on in New York in the case of some small businesses." He added that the investigation was continuing.

The inquiry was instigated more than a year ago by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The grand jury questioned 157 witnesses. The books and records of 2 trade associations, 9 labor unions, and 40 companies were examined.

Mr. Williams said "Fortunately we had the cooperation of a lot of witnesses. However, if we had had even more cooperation there might have been more persons indicted."

Nineteen persons were named in the indictment as coconspirators but not as defendants. Seventeen were associated with management and two with unions.

Besides Malinsky, the other defendants were:

Louis Rapkin, 43, of 8911 Avenue B, Brooklyn, past president of the association.

Irving Greene, 38, Eastchester, N. Y., past president of the association.

Albert Pfeffer, 44, 131–06 234th Street, Laurelton, Queens, who held various positions in both the association and local 1648.

Milton Tillinger, 42, 56–36 175th Place, Flushing, Queens, vice president of local 1648.

David Lustigman, 38, 226–69 129th Avenue, Laurelton, Queens, secretary-treasurer of local 1648.

Isidore Schwartz, 175–15 North Hempstead Turnpike, Flushing, L. I., trustee of local 1648.

Robert Barbieri, 40, 184 East 32d Street, Brooklyn, association member.

Robert Felt, 35, 57–50 240th Street, Little Neck, L. I., sometime picket for local 1648.

Joseph Meglino, 40, 135 Ridge Street, former business manager of the association.

Sam Vogel, 36, 132 East Seventh Street, former president of local 120.

Sam Stolzenberg, 43, 720 East Sixth Street, former secretary-treasurer of local 120.

The defendants will be arraigned before Federal Judge John F. X. McGohey on June 20. If convicted, each could receive a maxi-

mum prison sentence of 20 years and a $10,000 fine on each count.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 13, 1956]

TWELVE ARE INDICTED AS EXTORTIONISTS IN PICKLE TRADE

NEW YORK, June 12.—Twelve men were indicted by Federal rackets grand jury today on charges that they used violence to extort about $150,000 annually from the pickle and condiment industry. This allegedly caused a $1 million boost in consumer prices.

Those indicted included industry officials, members of the New York Pickle and Condiment Dealers Association, Inc., and officers of local 1648 of the Condiment and Table Supplies Union.

United States Attorney Paul Williams said the association tried to get all manufacturers in the $10-million-a-year industry as members. Force and violence were used to bring balky businessmen into line, Williams said.

Metropolitan Amateur Athletic Union Gold Medal Award Dinner Honoring James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, April 24, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following presentation address by Hon. Robert Moses, New York City park commissioner, Mr. Farley's response, excerpts from address by Mr. Louis Nizer, and tributes by sports writers:

PRESENTATION ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT MOSES

This is no conventional tribute. It is not what Governor Smith used to call "a piece of flowers," meaning a wreath or anchor of tired blossoms propped up at a sick bed, a birthday party, a wedding or a wake.

If I were a psalm singer about public life, or a professional pleader for good works, I would raise a hymn to character and courage, a prayer for the most precious, the most indispensable and by far the rarest qualities to be found in that crowded field.

I like to quote John Drinkwater in this context, because he saw the dilemma in a flash, as poets do:

"Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,
Grant us the strength to labor as we know,
Grant us the purpose, ribbed and edged with steel,
To strike the blow."

Many a young Lochinvar has come charging into the city from points as far north and west as Rockland County to raise his white banner and burnished shield briefly, to triumph for a while in the lists and leave us finally nothing but the echo of a name and a suit of rusty armor. Now and then, however, a man comes along who gets toughened in battle, and hardened by victory and adversity. Though his banner may be frayed and his shield dented, his head is bloody, but unbowed.

We can't remain as romantic in middle age as in youth. No one can continue to be Sir Galahad. The fickle crowd may for a while cheer other heroes. Nevertheless a wedding of character and courage is so unforgettable that in the end the man is rediscovered and somehow, somewhere brought back into the field. For character and courage, like matter, are indestructible. It has been proven before. It will be proven again.

Democracy, given plenty of time, catches up with the mean, the shabby, the cheap, the shoddy, the synthetic, and looks not for leaders, not for manners but for men. Unfortunately, it often takes so long for the democratic process to be vindicated that the proud grow impatient and some become embittered. The best of the breed, however, emerge from the fire of experience tempered and unscathed.

This then is an impartial tribute to a remarkably durable and respected public figure. I offer it not because of the old-school tie which binds all of us public characters, not because of close friendship, not because I owe him anything, or because I want anything from him, or because I must sing for my supper, but because he has earned our respect for his contribution to the public welfare, his interest in youth, his devotion to clean and honest competition, and for the example of sportsmanship and character he has set the rising generation.

Here is a man who studiously avoids the cool sequestered vale of life. He likes people. He remembers them and their names, not as a stunt but because they mean something to him. He has no doubt earned leisure, but when the trumpet sounds, he takes up the broad sword rimmed and edged with steel, as he does this evening, to strike a blow for youth, for competitive athletics and for those who will finally pick up the sword when he lays it down.

I have the honor, on behalf of athletes, past, present and future, to present the gold medal of the Metropolitan Amateur Athletic Union to the Honorable James A. Farley.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

I would like to touch on the recent criticisms of the AAU. The integrity of officials on both national and local levels has been attacked.

Let me say with all emphasis that I would not be here had I not firsthand direct personal knowledge that the AAU officials—local and national—whom I have known for many years, are gentlemen with the highest moral standards. I have known many and have yet to find one who is venal—who is dishonest—who is motivated by anything but a desire to help the boys and girls of our country to develop athletically.

From my long experience in the sports world and public life I know that any large organization will have its share of bad apples. Press reports indicate that out of the tens of thousands of young athletes competing under AAU rules a minute fraction, by their own admission, have gone wrong. Have played for pay. Well, that handful is not representative, in my opinion, of the AAU.

We also have heard that AAU officials have condoned these play-for-pay athletes. This charge has not as yet been substantiated. Investigations are underway. But here again we have the integrity of gentlemen like Judge Jerry Mahoney, Eddie Eagan, Harry Henshel, and a host of others being smeared. These men have never condoned dishonesty.

I have every confidence that should the investigations verify the charges, the guilty officials will promptly be thrown out of the AAU and branded as having violated their trust—betrayed the youth of America.

There's one group of AAU officials to whom I want to pay particular tribute. These are the men and women who on the local level are in direct contact with youth. Day after day, we find them creating athletic meets—directing them—and in general making substantial contributions toward making the youth of this Nation conscious of the advantage of a sound body—a healthy mind—and sportsmanship.

There's no compensation of any description for this devoted group. A job well done is their reward. They do not receive even expenses when serving as officials at meets.

But what of the expenses allowed athletes when traveling? The AAU now authorizes actual railroad or airplane fare plus $15 per day. Until recently this sum was felt to be adequate. Then an athlete under investigation raised the point that it wasn't enough. Perhaps this issue was created as a smokescreen but it did attract considerable attention.

May I call your attention to the big league baseball player. During the season he is on the road about half the time. His travel allowance is precisely the same as that of the AAU—$15 per day.

Furthermore this figure is far above the $12 authorized by the Federal Government for a 4-star general when traveling. It would appear that $15 is adequate and that criticism is unjustified.

Yet we must be realistic about these financial problems of the amateur athlete. If he is married, and quite a few of the outstanding stars are, can he afford to take time off from his job or profession to enter the various bigtime meets around the country. In order to achieve stardom he must compete against the strongest possible rivals. This means much travel.

We are in accord that this young man will never achieve financial independence on the AAU allowance. Much as the young man or woman may love their particular athletic specialty there comes a time when the question arises, Can I afford to give so much time and energy to training and competition? Eventually the answer is "No." And with that decision arises the possibility that we have lost a possible world-record breaker.

Possibly the time has arrived when a study should be made not only of the financial phases of the AAU program but also its other rules and policies. Perhaps a special committee could be appointed to survey the situation. How do our codes compare with those of other Nations?

Amateurism in the United States is an important activity. It affects the lives of tens of thousands of boys and girls. Amateurism even has its impact on the international scene. I feel sincerely that the time has come when an exhaustive survey should be made to determine whether or not our various rules and policies are sound and practical.

Such a survey should be worldwide in scope but from my knowledge of AAU finances is beyond their means. As a suggestion a special commitee might be organized to study the advisability of interesting one of the large foundations in undertaking this responsibility.

Such a committee should bring to the attention of foundation executives the importance of amateur sport and its impact on the physical and character development of the youth of this country.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY MR. LOUIS NIZER

Jim Farley is the decathlon champion. When he was in Washington, despite the obstacles placed in his path by Republicans, he broke the hurdle records. Perhaps you will recall that he broke the Gallup pole vault record. After 30 years of achievement in the political realm, his stamina is well recognized and he is the long distance running champion. Recently, he broke the discus throwing record. As you know, he uses a red disk with the initial "C" on it.

There is a more serious reason why we honor him. It used to be the tradition that a politician was a devious man who was Machiavellian in his principles and was a little proud of his lack of scruples. Those were the days when a politician bragged that he was a self-made man, and a citizen replied that that relieved God of a terrible responsibility. And those were also the days when, I am afraid, we took political corruption with indecent composure.

Then, came a new era, ushered in by Al Smith and Jim Farley. Farley made the politician's word as good or better than a bank president's word. He established the tradition of forthrightness and honorable dealing, and lifted the word "politician" to its finest meaning—a man who practices the sicence of government. This is why we honor Jim Farley. This is why he is universally popular and appreciated. It is not because we agree with everything he has done or said, but because we admire the purity of his motives, the scrupulousness of his conduct, and the integrity of his position. Perhaps you can sum it up in one word—he stands for incorruptibility.

TRIBUTES

John Barrington, sports editor, International News Service:

"It is a great privilege to participate in a tribute to Jim Farley, who for so many years has done so much for athletics, both professional and amateur, and for the cause of good sportsmanship. We know him as a guiding spirit and an inspiration in sports, and one who always is ready with the helping hand for the youth of our country."

Tim Cohane, sports editor, Look magazine:

"Jim Farley is the best example I know of to fit the old adage, 'If you want a job done, ask the busy man.' He has devoted much of a full life to help kids and is certainly deserving of the Gold Medal award from the Metropolitan Association of the AAU."

Bob Considine, columnist, International News Service:

"Unlike old generals, old Haverstraw (N. Y.) first basemen not only never die but they don't fade away, either. Take Jim Farley, for example. There isn't a more industrious, harder working, get-up-and-go traveling man in the world than James Aloysius. He's been that way for a long time. I would give odds that he'll be that way in A. D. 2000.

"It's more than fitting that Jim's contribution to sports should be recognized. Jim Farley is the prototype of the sportsman, in the purest sense. His decency, his keen understanding and appreciation, his impeccable conduct, and his warmth lend a certain enchantment to any scene. He wrought what one day may be called a miracle; he emerged unsullied from both boxing and politics."

Arthur Daley, the New York Times:

"Long before he became Postmaster General, Jim Farley seemed to have adopted for himself the departmental motto to the effect that neither snow nor rain nor heat of day could stay that carrier from the swift completion of his appointed rounds. One of his appointed rounds was sports events and Big Jim has been a genuinely devoted follower of every form of athletics.

"I've seen him huddled in a cold rain to watch the football giants; in scorching heat to take in the baseball Giants or the Yankees; in the dark of night for boxing or other sports events. To us in the sportswriting business, Big Jim has always been "one of our guys." And our esteem and affection for him has grown throughout the years.

"It's our boys whom the metropolitan association of the AAU is honoring tonight and the press-box tenants are mighty proud of him."

Ike Gellis, sports editor, New York Post:

"To me the highest praise anyone could be paid is being paid to Big Jim Farley tonight. A pro is being honored by an amateur organization. Big Jim always has been a pro. As an athlete, as a commissioner of boxing, and as a spectator, he always has conducted himself with class. The AAU should be proud of its choice."

Whitney Martin, sports columnist, Associated Press:

"Whenever the conversation concerns true sportsmen, the name of Jim Farley will be among the first to be mentioned. An athlete in his youth, Big Jim has retained his avid interest in sports, both as a fan and as a man willing to give of his own time and energy to promote fair play and to make possible the keen, wholesome competition which is part of our way of life. A more worthy recipient of the gold medal award could not be elected."

Dan Parker, sports editor, New York Daily Mirror:

"All I claim for Jim Farley is that he could fill successfully any office in the United States from the presidency down.

"Jim can play first base on my all-American good-citizens team anytime."

Westbrook Pegler, King Features Syndicate:

"I won't presume to endorse Jim Farley, who is in no need of the approval of the likes of me. However, all of us remember times when someone off by the piano started yipping jolly good fellow and the chorus swelled and swelled with all present bawling fervently in an outburst of devotional feeling.

"So I am singing with Jim's friends on this occasion and always. His virtues remind me of Granny Rice's and vice versa."

Leo H. Petersen, sports editor, United Press:

"James A. Farley is America's elder statesman of sports. No other man can count on more genuine friends from the fields of friendly combat. And he has earned these friendships. He has been a true inspiration to many a discouraged young athlete, spurring him with the determination to carry on. All that is clean and decent in American sports is represented by Big Jim Farley."

Jimmy Powers, sports editor, New York Daily News:

"I congratulate the AAU in selecting James A. Farley to receive the 1956 gold medal award. His record of consistent service to his fellow man warrants the award.

"May a grateful America continue to recognize his talents."

Red Smith, Herald Tribune:

"On my job I have met many big wheels and a few truly big men—Grantland Rice, Connie Mack, Jack Dempsey, Jim Farley. In an overprivileged life, the privilege I have treasured most is that of having a man like Jim as a friend."

Ted Smits, sports editor, Associated Press:

"Here is a sportsman in the best sense of the word; dedicated to athletics of all kinds as a means of cleansing the mind and the body both by participation and by the simple act of watching and applauding; friend of youth and champion of fair play—Jim Farley."

Joseph P. Val, sports editor, New York World-Telegram:

"Jim Farley, the old Haverstraw first baseman, was noted for his stretch and reach. Then, as now, he was sure death on 'foul balls.'

"It was only natural that his influence should stretch and reach into many phases of sport, to the undoubted benefit of the sport concerned. Remember, in boxing, Jim said 'there shall be no fouls' * * * and he made it stick.

"It would be hard to find a man more deserving of honor from a sport group."

Very Rev. Msgr. Harold S. Engel, director, Catholic Youth Organization, Archdiocese of New York:

"From the earliest days of the Catholic Youth Organization in the Archdiocese of New York, the Honorable James A. Farley has been a distinguished member of its board of directors.

"His long experience in athletics, education, and government administration qualified him expertly as a director for youth.

"His firm belief in the axiom that a sound body make a sound man prompted him always to give a high place to supervised recreation in the character formation of youth.

"Mr. Farley's personal leadership in every field of endeavor he encountered makes him the ideal for countless youth."

Four-Billion-Dollar Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I would like to have included in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Jack W. Gore, of the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News, one of our finest Florida newspapers. Mr. Gore comments on a measure which I have introduced in the House, H. R. 11526. This measure proposes changes in executive-branch accounting and formulation of budget requests for appropriations, and it proposes changes in congressional authorization of the expenditure of money on Federal programs. This legislation, which carries out the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, would result in some $4 billion savings, and I think Mr. Gore's comments reflect the widespread acceptance of such a revision in governmental accounting and budgeting processes.

The editorial follows:

A $4 BILLION SAVING

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, a legislator who believes in something more than mere lipservice to the principle of Government economy, introduced a bill in the House of Representatives last week which, if enacted, could be the means of saving taxpayers some $4 billion annually.

Representative ROGERS' legislation carries out the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission in regard to revising the governmental and budgeting processes and is a companion bill to one already introduced in the Senate.

Representative ROGERS, like a number of other conscientious legislators and taxpayers, is quite concerned over the sloppy budget and accounting processes now being used by the Federal Government and which act to give Congress only limited control over Government spending.

For instance there is now a backlog of some 80 billions of dollars of unexpended authorizations on the Government's books. In simpler terms this means that if Congress were suddenly to shut off all further appropriations the various and sundry governmental departments and agencies would still have some 80 billions of previous appropriations to spend before they would run out of money.

Representative ROGERS thinks this is far too big a backlog of unspent authorizations. So does the Second Hoover Commission and a host of other people who know a little bit

about corporate and governmental budget procedures.

So what Representative ROGERS is seeking to accomplish is to put in a system of budgetary control which would place the entire governmental structure on an annual accrued expenditures basis as opposed to the obligations system now in operation.

The effect of this would be to permit a much closer supervision by Congress over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government, and it would also give the top management of the executive branch a more complete and more meaningful understanding of the financial operations of the Government.

The way things are handled today very few people know what's going on. Previous Congresses have approved the expenditure of vast sums of money much of which won't even be spent for several years yet. The Defense Department, for instance, already has authorization to pay for aircraft, ships, uniforms, and a host of weapons which aren't even yet in the process of being manufactured.

No well-managed corporation could operate economically under the budget and spending procedures followed by the Federal Government. The current system breeds a terrific amount of waste and confusion and while exact savings are difficult to measure it is conservatively estimated that at least 4 billions could be saved through the revisions in budgetary and accounting procedures contained in Representative ROGERS' proposed legislation.

This legislation would do away with the system of Congress providing money for expenditures more than 1 year in the future. Governmental agencies would still be given authority to incur obligations extending over a greater period than 1 year, but Congress could only provide the money for 1 year's operation at one time. Thus, in submitting their budgets to Congress the agencies would ask only for the actual funds to be expended in the budget year in contrast to the system now in operation wherein the agencies may ask for funds to be spent over several years.

This business of agencies asking for and receiving funds which won't be expended within a 1-year period is the basic reason behind the current 80 billions in unspent appropriations. Some 8 billions of this total is for foreign economic and military aid yet with 8 billions in the kitty unspent from previous appropriations, the executive branch of the Government is still asking Congress to authorize another 4½ billions in expenditures this year the major part of which won't even be needed to meet commitments coming due this year.

It's necessary, of course, for any government to plan ahead and to make contracts calling for future expenditures. But it is just plain silly for Congress to appropriate the money to pay for future commitments long in advance of the time the money will be needed. Nothing breeds more wasteful practices in Government than to give bureaucrats almost unlimited funds to spend with no easy way to check up on their spending and that's one reason Representative ROGERS would like to see his proposed bill put through in quick order.

Labor's Racketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial, from the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of June 11:

LABOR'S RACKETEERS

That ample justification exists for thoroughgoing investigation of labor racketeering is conceded. Within the space of a few days last March two labor figures were shot down in Newark streets. Subsequently, Victor Riesel, labor columnist, was blinded by an acid-throwing thug amid reports of a new gangster invasion of trucking, food, garment and like fields. Thereafter a lot was heard about prospective investigations, congressional, quasi-official and by union labor itself.

In Washington, Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, Fifth District, proposed a congressional investigation. Reportedly the Senate Investigations subcommittee, headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, is in the preliminary stages of an inquiry into waterfront criminality as it relates to installations used by the Federal Government. President Eisenhower is credited with volunteering the support of administrative agencies in a private conversation with George Meany, president of AFL–CIO. Whether he did or not, labor's executive committee suddenly voted new house-cleaning powers to its heretofore inactive committee on ethical practices.

These are signs of an increasing awareness of the criminal infiltration of the labor movement. But the frontal attack on union exploiters and what Federal Judge McLaughlin called "economic blackmailers" in the assorted trades is yet to come. Indeed, except for a few sporadic convictions here and there, it has been so long in arriving that skeptical victims of the rackets will believe the promises of official action when they see it.

Effect of Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, appeared yesterday before a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. At that time he was questioned closely on the subject of increased interest rates by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], a Member of this body.

Mr. Humphrey's testimony concerns the livelihood and welfare of every person in America. His words are of interest to business and commerce throughout the world.

So much misinformation is bandied about concerning the rise and fall of interest rates, the rise and fall of prices, the rise and fall of employment, the increase and decrease in installment buying, and the effect of these concerns on the poorer people, that I include an article from the Washington Post concerning Mr. Humphrey's testimony.

Mr. Humphrey speaks, of course, as a high official of our Government and a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States. His testimony corrects some of the canards circulated all too often by persons who should know better and should think twice at least before talking.

The article follows:

HUMPHREY SAYS ECONOMY IS IN REFRESHING PAUSE

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey yesterday depicted the economy as enjoying a refreshing pause and forecast that the unemployment-ridden auto industry would soon be out of the woods.

With wages and jobs generally at record levels and "relatively full employment" of resources, Humphrey said, "it is just as well to hesitate a little." Otherwise, he warned, increased buying would merely bid up prices.

On autos, where layoffs have reached 200,000, Humphrey declared "conditions now are proceeding in a very satisfactory way. In a relatively short time" the industry's "difficulties will be behind us."

He gave this appraisal to a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. Called to testify on his differences with the Federal Reserve System's mid-April discount rate increase, he wound up defending higher interest rates and credit curbs.

MARTIN DISAGREES

The Treasury head said he was not worried about tight money now and was glad that installment buying "has slowed somewhat." But credit shortages, he said, were one of several factors that have held back car sales. Auto makers have also blamed Reserve System credit tightening for their woes.

Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, the day's other witness, however, disagreed. "I question very much," he said whether higher interest rates have reduced car sales. He said one dealer told him the industry was losing cash, not credit, customers.

The 1-day hearing was conducted by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, to lay bare the details of the administration's advance warnings against the latest discount rate rise. But it soon wandered all over the economic map.

LIFTED RATE IN APRIL

In April, 10 Reserve banks lifted the discount rate, the price at which member banks borrowed from the Reserve, to 2¾ percent. The other 2 Reserve banks raised the rate to 3 percent. This was the fifth boost, aimed at restraining borrowing, since April 1955.

PATMAN asked Humphrey if the rising rates over the year had not cost every American $40 and slowed down the economy.

GIVES TONGUE LASHING

"You are wrong as you can be," retorted Humphrey. "Only new borrowing, not outstanding debt," he said, "has to pay the higher price."

This was one of several tongue lashings Humphrey gave the subcommittee chairman. Asked if he weren't obligated to keep interest rates down on Treasury borrowing to reduce the burden on taxpayers, Humphrey shot back, "My responsibilities extend to a much broader field than your questions indicate." Too low rates, the Treasury head said, would be disastrous for the economy because they would breed inflation and discourage the savings needed to finance investment.

PATMAN also wondered whether Humphrey would blame Federal Reserve if business slumps.

"I never passed the buck in my life" answered Humphrey. "And I'm not going to start now."

"Would you blame the Democrats?" PATMAN asked.

"If I found a way I'd be glad to," Humphrey replied to a roar of laughter.

He repeated his previous statements that he had advised Federal Reserve against raising the discount rate in April because he thought inflation and deflation forces were in balance.

He said the biggest worry now was accumulations of inventory because if they pile up faster than sales, business will stop ordering and workers will lose jobs.

Civil Service Barbering Requirements Too Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, a condition that may involve a comparatively small number of people has come to my attention. However, whenever inequities appear, it should be our duty to bring the matter to the attention of the proper agencies and authorities in order to make the necessary correction.

There is a Veterans' Administration hospital located in the district that I have the privilege to represent. As usual, its employees are under civil service, and their salaries are determined by the grade classification for their work. This particular hospital is occupied by psychoneurotic patients and special care must be given the patients.

The barbers employed in this institution have only a GS–2 classification which does not provide either a reasonable living wage or an income comparable with incomes of barbers in State institutions or in privately owned barbershops.

It is hoped that the Civil Service Commission will give early and favorable consideration to the upgrading of this group.

Under unanimous consent, I include a letter written to the Civil Service Commission in behalf of this group and which appeared in the Direct From Washington section of the Journeyman Barber of June 1956:

HYATTSVILLE, MD., *May 14, 1956.*

Hon. PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is the opinion of the Journeyman Barbers' International Union, AFL–CIO, that wages paid to and qualification requirements for barbers employed under civil service are far below salaries and standards of barbers who do not work under civil-service regulations.

In support of our opinion we submit the following data:

Wages: Under civil service, GS–2 classification, $2,960 to $3,470 annual salary.

In the State of Illinois where this international union has a contract with the State on behalf of barbers employed in State institutions, the contract calls for a minimum annual wage of $4,440 which the $970 more than the maximum paid under civil service. Recently in the State of Indiana, this international union made a survey of 15 cities and found the average annual wage to be $4,038-.32, or $568 more than the maximum paid under civil service.

CIVIL SERVICE BARBERING REQUIREMENTS TOO LOW

Requirements: Under civil service, the Civil Service Handbook (1955) on Qualifications-Standards states: "One year practical experience as a barber is required."

Forty-six States, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Hawaii require barbers to be licensed. Forty-four of these political units require, before licensing, at least (some more) 1,000 hours in a recognized barber school which must teach a prescribed course of instructions in the following subjects: Scientific fundamentals of barbering, hygiene, bacteriology, histology of the hair, skin, muscles and nerves; structure of the head, face, and neck; elementary chemistry relating to sterilization and antiseptics; diseases of the hair and glands, and cutting, shaving, arranging, dressing, coloring, bleaching, and tinting of hair. An eighth grade minimum education is required by 25 States. Most States also require an apprenticeship of 18 months in addition to the 1,000 hours in barber school.

LICENSE REQUIREMENTS PROVE ABILITY AND SKILL

After schooling is completed, an examination is required and after apprenticeship is over a second examination must be passed before a license is issued. In the State of Illinois, institutional employees must have an Illinois barber's license. The State of Illinois requires a 10th grade education, 1,872 hours in a recognized barber school and 27 months apprenticeship and examination before a license is granted.

We believe we have proved beyond doubt that conditions for barbers under civil service are far below standards elsewhere. This situation attracts unskilled and incompetent barbers which results in poor service to those who are compelled to submit to their attendance. In the Federal service we find a majority of barbers under civil service employed by the Veterans' Administration in neuropsychopathic hospitals. Patients so hospitalized are helpless to complain. This appears to make matters worse and the Government cannot justify its treatment to these unfortunate wards.

The Journeyman Barbers' International Union requests the Civil Service Commission to review the status of barbers and to bring barbers under civil service up to the standards comparable to those of barbers not in the Federal service. The data set forth in this letter could be used as a guide.

Please be assured that the Journeyman Barbers' International Union will at all times be happy to assist the Commission in any way in this matter.

Sincerely,

VICTOR HOOD,
Washington Representative,
J. B. H. C. and P. I. U. of A.

Amending Communications Act of 1934

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation. I opposed it in the committee and I oppose it here. The only qualification I claim for any information about this is what I heard in the committee. I am not a seafaring man. I come from the interior of the United States, from the State of Iowa, which while it is bounded by two great rivers has no maritime interest within the State and, certainly, there is no maritime interest within my own district I did attend, I think, all the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I must say despite the very persuasive testimony of the majority leader and others, it has completely failed to convince me that this is desirable legislation. On the contrary, I am well convinced that this legislation is not in the interest of the country. To begin with, it is not the interest of safety at sea.

Before going further, I would like to clarify one point which was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and others in the debate relating to the number of devices that have already been installed on ships. There was some testimony about that before the committee, but when the witnesses were pinned down, the device that is now under consideration turns out not to be the same device that was referred to as having been installed on this multitude of ships. Further, the other devices which may in some respects be related to the present device now under consideration was installed on the ships of the Moore-McCormack Line, but was withdrawn and the Moore-McCormack Line is opposed to this legislation. Of course, the question of safety at sea is one of great importance. The men who go down to the sea in ships certainly deserve the consideration and the help of the Congress of the United States. But, on the contrary, we should not pass legislation here which would be an impediment to safety. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion, after listening to the testimony before the committee, that this would not contribute to the safety of the people who go to sea. But, on the other hand, as has been pointed out in debate, it would destroy safety at sea or at least have a tendency to make it worse for seafaring people.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman explain a bit more fully his own opinion why he believes this would contribute not to safety but to less safety?

Mr. DOLLIVER. My reason has already been summed up by what has been said in the debate. Here is a device that has not been proven.

The Federal Communications Commission representative, Mr. Webster, who spent a long time in the Coast Guard, testified that the thing had not proven satisfactory. As was pointed out by the gentleman from California, if you have a device on board ship which has not proven satisfactory, what is going to happen? The crew will not pay any attention to it. The radio operator will say, "That equipment is no good," and he will turn it off or cut the wires. In other words, it is not a piece of equipment that would help safety at sea. It would destroy it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that this bill does not become effective until the Federal Communications Commission has found that the automatic radio-telegraph call selector is and will continue to be available, and may be installed at reasonable cost to shipowners?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes. That is in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. That is part of the bill itself.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is part of the bill itself, and I am glad that safeguard is in the bill, but this bill is putting the cart before the horse. Let them get the approval of the Federal Communications Commission and let them establish a market for their product before they come here and ask us to require that their device be put on board ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman unnecessarily, but I think if we can talk about this we will get a better understanding. Is it not a fact that Commissioner Webster is one of the most able men in this field that we have in our Government?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Unquestionably.

Mr. HARRIS. He takes the position that he is against this bill. He calls it a dignified statute, as I recall. His principal objection is that it would be contrary to the agreement reached by the International Radio Conference. Is that not true?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course that is one of the reasons he is against it, and that is one of the reasons I am against it, because these matters of safety at sea go beyond one nationality. That is one of the reasons this law should not be adopted, because it puts a handicap restriction and extra burden upon American shipping which is already under certain handicaps in relation to competition with other maritime nations.

A great deal has been said about the question of the operators being opposed to this; the operators of shipping have been attacked in a very unfavorable light. There have been times in the history of the country when that was justified. However, I do not believe in this instance it is based upon any such crass and diabolical attitude on their part. They came before the committee in a very fair and unbiased manner and told their opinions, and without exception the shipowners, ship operators, were in opposition to this bill. For example, on page 54 of the hearings, in a letter from the Association of American Shipowners, they say:

> The association opposes this bill for a number of reasons, and we would appreciate it if you would include this letter in the record of hearings.

Then they give four very cogent reasons for their opposition to it. On page 108 of the hearings, the telecommunications committee, American Merchant Marine Institute, makes this statement:

> We oppose H. R. 4090 for the following reasons:
>
> We believe it both inappropriate and premature to consider the mandatory installation of an unknown and untried piece of equipment, even if the purpose of such a device should be found to be desirable.

Again, on page 122, the Moore-McCormack Lines, which has been referred to, said this:

> We do not feel that any selective calling equipment should be mandatory inasmuch as existing autoalarm equipment fulfills the safety requirements involving distress at sea, and we feel that the telegraph call alarm is purely a device of some commercial value which cannot be relied on implicitly but which offers the chance for the saving of operational expense, when operative.

In addition, this testimony before the committee is replete with witnesses who say that the equipment is experimental; it has never been proven in actual operation. It actually is the one prototype that has ever been manufactured in this system.

Why in the world should this body go ahead and make a compulsory market for a product which has not been approved, for a product which will produce only illusory benefits to the seafaring men?

Here is another perhaps minor item: A good share of the merchant marine of the United States is provided with a subsidy by the United States Government, and many people think justifiably so. Add this additional expense which will range according to some witnesses from $12,000 to $25,000 per year per ship, add that additional expense on these American ships and who is going to pay for it? It is going to be the taxpayers through a subsidy.

I ask that the bill be defeated.

Norway Independence Day in Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Mr. Einar Bredland, chairman of the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York, 1956, which arranged a splendid and colorful parade and celebration on Sunday, May 20, in the section of Brooklyn which has become commonly known as Oslo Heights:

> THE NORWEGIAN-AMERICAN 17TH OF MAY COMMITTEE OF GREATER NEW YORK, 1956,
> *Brooklyn, N. Y., June 1, 1956.*
>
> Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
> *New House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. ROONEY: Tusen takk for sist. It was a wonderful day and a successful arrangement. The parade itself was grand and the ceremonies went off well. Our part of the city was decorated and festive and the Norwegian-American people were honored by the highest officials of the city. We shall always remember and cherish these words of Borough President John Cashmore: "If everyone were like the Norwegians, the police department wouldn't have anything to do.
>
> While the 17th of May Committee can take pride in its accomplishment this year, I am certain that all of us understand that our success was the result of many interacting forces. We are grateful to everyone who participated in the parade or made the arrangement possible. Our appreciation goes out to every man, woman, and child, to every church, lodge, club, or society, to every official or businessman who in one way or another helped to make this day a success. It was the combined effort—the cooperation of all—that made this day one we shall long remember.
>
> As your chairman, this year, I should like to express my appreciation to every one of you and thank you for your interest, for your effort and for your loyal support. These are the qualities that made this a great day long to be remembered, these are the qualities that will make next year's 17th of May a great day.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> EINAR BREDLAND,
> *Chairman, 1956 Committee.*

Statement of Henry C. Oakey, Prominent Wisconsin Attorney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I received a statement from a very prominent attorney in my district concerning the plight of the disabled veterans in our Nation.

I think that this is one of the most effective and truthful statements ever made on this subject and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HENRY C. OAKEY, PROMINENT WISCONSIN ATTORNEY

Recently I attended memorial services for those who gave their lives in our country's wars. However, being of a somewhat practical persons, I could not help but think more of what our country is doing to aid those who were handicapped by loss of time and impairment of health by such service.

In World War I the enlisted men used to think it a mark of a good officer that he tried to obtain fair treatment for his subordinates. If that is any sort of criteria, it seems we have no good officers among our generals in Washington for as far as I know none have made any effort to receive equitable treatment for those whom they ordered into battle.

As on all previous occasions it seems that if fair treatment is to be obtained for those who were handicapped by this war service we cannot rely on those who gained fame or profit from the war, but must rely on the rank and file to obtain it.

One problem before Congress at the present time is that of raising the compensation and pension rates to offset somewhat the rising cost of living. The other is to determine whether those who were handicapped by loss of time and health should because of that receive something to compensate them for this.

From the fact that General Bradley lived in Washington and knew of the great increase of the cost of living, but did not attempt to help disabled veterans to offset this, I do not think we can consider too seriously any statement by him that he has tried to deal fairly with the veteran.

The cost of living has increased considerably since the present rates were fixed. With the exception of certain agricultural segments, nearly everyone is insisting on

more than they received at that time. Should the disabled veteran because he is a small minority group without physical and financial means to help themselves politically, receive the same consideration as others?

As to the question of whether a disabled veteran should continue to receive something additional because of his service, I think there are many facts to indicate that they should.

I heard considerable evidence to indicate that when an enlisted man answered sick call he often went before a doctor who considered him a malingerer, who did not have the personal interest of a family physician and who, if he did attempt to do a thorough job, was handicapped by the fact that the Government furnished him inadequate facilities and medication. The impact of disease on them would normally be much more serious than those who had the care of a physician with a personal interest in his patients.

Those who served at the front spent many days and nights in damp dugouts or in a field covered only with a blanket in all types of weather. I believe this often resulted in serious sinus conditions showing up at a later time when weather conditions were bad.

Few were not subject to gas in their lungs to some extent although perhaps not seriously enough to leave their posts.

No medical unit put up "impotable" signs at the front so that many were weakened by dysentery.

Conditions were so that some times there was no food for several days.

As casualties mounted there was always a shortage of men so that duty times had to be lengthened and rest periods seriously shortened to take care of the duties required.

Normally 50 minutes of marching and 10 minutes of rest is considered good procedure. On one particular occasion men marched from 7 in the morning until midnight carrying about 40 pounds and with only 1 hour rest period for breakfast. I believe the exigency of circumstances in many cases required similar efforts.

The expression "If you can walk it is nearer to the front than the hospital" was not uncommon.

The nervous tension of many men while awaiting and during attacks was very great.

A statement of the effects of these conditions are perhaps not within the province of a layman, but from my observation I believe they did have considerable effect on the general health and the ability of combat diseases.

The examination at discharge was not thorough and many signed releases because they had learned as soldiers to not complain and were anxious to obtain their freedom.

From my observation a wide divergence between the number with legally service-connected disability and those of actual service connection.

One reason perhaps is that the disabled veteran is in many ways an underprivileged class.

When he files a claim he finds that the defendant makes the laws, and the attempt to build up the morale of the people at home by misinforming people of the medical attention received in the service tended to prejudice the public against him legislatively. His lack of finances and health to affect legislation made it necessary for him to depend almost entirely on voluntary disinterested help in securing suitable laws.

He could not as in accident cases pay counsel to see that his case is properly prosecuted.

He was not given an opportunity to have a trial by a "jury of his peers," but was tried by judges hired by the defendant.

A personal appearance at his hearing would require in the case of people in our area 700 miles of travel.

He must rely on the testimony of others who are scattered all over the country to remember things that happened years ago. Medical reports of the Army were often inadequate and incorrect.

If he does finally prove his claim he is awarded a small amount which generally would not compensate him for his inability to work and nothing for "pain and suffering."

Because of the uncertainties involved, there is perhaps not much more that can be done legislatively to give him more justice in individual cases, but because of the disadvantages he labors under, it seems only just that he should in general receive some additional consideration for his loss of time and health.

From the point of view of national defense it might be well to remember that the French raised many memorials to their dead, but did little for those who were disabled in World War I. Likely this had something to do with the fact that the French soldiers did little to resist the German Army in World War II and the French could muster only one division to help drive the Germans out of their homeland.

The matter of national economy seems to be one on which there is a great divergence of opinion. Some feel that to collect a great amount of taxes from individuals and use the money to furnish more Government positions and to grant huge contracts to contracting firms is the best way to better the national economy. Personally from observing such matters from the hinterland I believe the national economy would be better promoted by paying out additional sums to those who are needy and have earned it and will spend most of it to buy themselves the necessities of life.

In conclusion my observation from my services in World War I, as Post Service Officer of the American Legion for about 35 years, from assisting in the program for obtaining better treatment for the disabled, from my observation of the impact of the war upon men with whom I served and men with whom I have come in contact and the impact on the economy of the people with whom I come in daily contact with is:

1. Because of the uncertainties of causes of disabilities and the handicap that a veteran has had in proving his claim compared to the proceedings other claimants wish to take, that there are many veterans who have service-connected disabilities actually, but not legally and as to them the payment considered is far from adequate compensation for such disability and that because of the impossibilities of deciding who is service connected and who is not that the legislation offered is perhaps as nearly fair to the public and the veteran as a group as can be made at this time.

2. That if the cost of fairly compensating the veteran for his disability and loss of time because of foreign wars is too great then Congress should see that we do not get involved in any foreign wars.

3. That at the present time our Government is collecting large sums of money from the needy and average citizen to protect unwanted rulers in foreign countries contrary to the spirit of our own Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule and is taking large sums from the needy and average citizen to give war and construction contracts to those who are not in need and if this ceased many veterans would be in much more favorable positions and would perhaps not request any pension so that the cost would not be anywhere near the estimate.

4. That the payment of the pension proposed would do much more for the economic welfare of the average citizen than many of the present expenditures which the Government is making.

Rabbi Ralph Silverstein of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues this morning were very much impressed with the invocation given at the opening of today's session by Rabbi Ralph Silverstein, both as to content and the dynamic manner in which it was rendered. I urge all my colleagues to read the invocation, which contains an excellent message in these trying times.

Rabbi Silverstein is the spiritual leader of Temple Sinai in Brooklyn, N. Y., and is a very dear friend of mine for many years. He is well known for his spiritual, civic, and philanthropic leadership in our huge community. His efforts in the cause of interfaith amity are particularly noteworthy.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members may have the opportunity to learn something about Rabbi Silverstein and his background, I am inserting into the RECORD a brief article about him which appeared in a recent issue of the Jewish Examiner, a newspaper published in Brooklyn. The article reads as follows:

MAN OF THE WEEK: RABBI, EX-LAWYER

Last week while 1,000 people participated, the ground-breaking ceremonies for a new Hebrew school were held at Temple Sinai, one of Brooklyn's oldest.

It was a milestone both for the congregation and for Sinai's widely known spiritual leader, Rabbi Ralph Silverstein.

Born in Brooklyn of pious Orthodox parents Rabbi Silverstein had early manifested a strong desire to be a rabbi and with this aim in mind he attended Yeshiva Chaim Berlin of Brooklyn and then went on to the Isaac Elachanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University.

Just before he was ordained, however, he took a detour on his road to the rabbinate, diverted by a growing interest in the law and in public affairs. A husky, impressive, outgoing man with a powerful courtroom, as well as pulpit "presence," he was obviously earmarked for success as an attorney.

Graduating from St. John's Law School, he was admitted to the bar in 1933. Later, he was ordained by the Jewish Theological Seminary and Yavne Theological Academy, Brooklyn. Very soon, despite his youth, he had a highly lucrative practice, more clients than he could handle and a full schedule of speaking engagements from community organizations.

His dynamic oratorical gifts were also in constant demand by the Democratic Party and it wasn't long before he was a power in its councils. He was delegate to the Democratic State Convention in 1938 and was one of the most active members of the party's speakers' bureau. He tirelessly addressed rallies indoors and out, delivered radio talks and helped build party strategy.

Concurrently, his administrative abilities were sought by many Jewish organizations, among them the Brooklyn Division of the American Jewish Congress, which thrice elected him president by acclamation during its most dramatic period of growth.

He was a member of AJC's national executive committee and of the administrative committee of the World Jewish Congress. He was a Brooklyn delegate to the historic Cleve-

land gathering of the American Jewish Conference.

In the midst of his successful worldly career that promised ever greater financial rewards and influence, Rabbi Silverstein was haunted by the promising spiritual career he had uneasily put aside years before.

Unable to resist the call, he cut down his activities sharply to attend rabbinical school. When he was ordained in 1940, he was immediately called to the Ninth Street Temple, Brooklyn. He gave up his political activities, retaining some of his law practice.

By 1945, when he became spiritual leader of Madison Jewish Center, of Flatbush, Rabbi Silverstein had abandoned the law to devote himself exclusively to the rabbinate. In 1952, he was called to his present post, as rabbi of Temple Sinai.

Rabbi Silverstein was chaplain of a JWV post and of Cinema Lodge of B'nai B'rith, which numbered many leading directors, producers, and actors among its members. He visited Israel in 1951 and 1954, noting the remarkable course of its progress in that brief span of years. During his last trip he was guest of Ampal, the investment-development agency.

As an active Mason, he was also feted by the Israel Grand Lodge of Masons at a dinner attended by Grandmaster Shaoni and other leading officials of the organization; he brought greetings to the Israel lodge from the Grand Lodge of New York.

Rabbi Silverstein probably has one of the heaviest speaking schedules of any public speaker in the metropolitan area; his subject matter, vivid choice of words, and dramatic voice recall the golden era of oratory.

A Change To Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Town Journal of April 1956:

A CHANGE TO MAKE

The Washington reports shortly will be discussing the Bricker amendment to the Constitution. As usual many confusing and many inaccurate statements will appear. Some of these will be intentionally misleading.

The question raised by the Bricker amendment is this: Shall Americans be compelled to live under laws put in force by treaties or other international agreements even though they conflict with the Constitution?

In order to be adopted, an amendment has to win a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress and the approval of three-fourths of the States. The Bricker proposal will come up for a vote this month in the Senate and will then be presented before the House.

Two years ago 28 Democratic Senators voted for it and 16 against; 32 Republican Senators voted for and 14 against; 1 Independent voted against. This division shows clearly that the amendment is not a party question. The total lacked 1 vote of the necessary two-thirds.

Passage this year will depend upon the vigor with which informed citizens indicate their support. The division may again be close in the Senate. A hard battle may be expected in the House.

The language of the amendment, slightly changed to meet former objections, is simple and clear: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution, shall not be of any force or effect."

The Constitution itself says that a treaty "shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." That provision was written primarily to protect the treaties then in force which had been made prior to the Constitution. It was probably intended also to give the National Government full control in foreign affairs, which it should have. In those days treaties concerned boundaries, commerce, fishing rights, navigation, and such matters.

In recent years, however, wholly new circumstances have arisen. Through the United Nations and other new agencies, the United States is asked to participate in many new kinds of international agreements and treaties. The practice of "executive agreements" between nations has grown up—deals between heads of nations which are not submitted to the United States Senate, as treaties have to be, for ratification.

Ways are thus opened by which Americans could be forced to accept as domestic law rulings which have not been passed upon by Congress and which could conflict with constitutional rights. It is this danger which the Bricker amendment will prevent.

The amendment, as revised, should be adopted. Americans will protect their freedom for the future by insisting that Congress submit it to the States.

Dividends and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct our colleagues' attention to the following talk delivered on June 11, 1956, by Lewis D. Gilbert before the Advertising Men's Post of the American Legion:

DIVIDENDS AND DEMOCRACY—A TALK BY LEWIS D. GILBERT BEFORE THE ADVERTISING MEN'S POST, NO. 209, AMERICAN LEGION, NEW YORK, JUNE 11, 1956

What is the small-stockholder movement you are hearing so much about these days? Yesterday it did not exist, today it is something, tomorrow it will be much more.

Where do you find it? On the floor of the annual meeting as owners speak their piece. In corporation proxy statements as the spokesmen for the small shareholders constantly use the proxy statement of the American corporation to bring before their fellow Americans the viewpoints which long needed airing and which are increasingly being adopted by corporation management.

Those of you have read Investor magazine, my book, Dividends and Democracy, and my annual report know what our objectives are and why they are proving the first effective positive force against socialism in the United States, on the one hand, and corporation dictatorship on the other.

I will today merely sketch in brief terms what our objectives are and let our publications do the rest.

Fifty years ago the corporation in the United States was indeed the typical radical conception of a 19th century corporation. Owned by a few individuals, it was very often what its enemies portrayed it—a soulless force for evil.

Today, however, the average corporation is a miniature republic. It is owned by hundreds of thousands of owners and in the years to come, as it becomes even more democratic, it will be owned by millions of fellow Americans.

Our job therefor is to see that the corporation is kept democratic and to insure that the management brass has to answer to someone—the owners—once a year.

The machinery to do this effectively fortunately had always been there in embryo. But the annual meeting had become a dried formality and that is why the radicals rejoiced that the day of the managerial revolution had come.

The first bottleneck to crack open was obviously the right to be seen and heard at the annual meeting. Here was my job at the start of my career a generation ago. It was a simple and yet complex one because it involved the defense of the right of individual property and the managers had to be made to realize that they were to be the hired hands not the masters of this developing new people's capitalism.

Naturally, this made for battles as we clashed with the tycoons, and slowly the episodes began to be noticed by the press. When not noted, the story of what was taking place still got around by word of mouth.

This in turn brought more and more stockholders to the annual meeting and they are now here to stay. Some come to defend management—for many reasons, some sincere and some quite otherwise But others now come too to defend and to support and to applaud what we are doing. Letters too started to pour in offering me their proxies for their 10 and 20 and 100 or 500 shares.

From the start I had realized that the strength of the Communists had been that they were willing to work for what they believed in without compensation. Surely, I who had my money in our system could afford to do the same, and that is why my work is an avocation, not a profession.

From the first I saw that selling stock in a company when things were not right and needed correcting was not the answer, and that by so doing all we were achieving was merely playing the Communist game, as the errors and abuses were never corrected.

As we aired our complaints and more and more owners joined the campaigns, changes began to take place—and thus slowly we started to strengthen our capitalist system. That it also, over the years, brought its own reward—increased evaluation and increased dividends—was sufficient gain and incentive enough for me. In the same way, I still believe that too many people in this country seem to have forgotten that salary in itself, plus stock ownership, should be sufficient remuneration for top management to do its best without absurd exaggerated bonus plans, astronomical pensions, and option abuses.

Over the years the stockholders I represent and those Wilma Soss and the Federation of Women Shareholders represent—and we often pool forces in the alliance, of course—have insisted on improvement in the proxy-voting mechanism.

These SEC proxy rules, by the way, are thoroughly covered in Dividends and Democracy. We still have far to go before they give us the protection we owners want to insure corporation democracy. Tomorrow will see such changes as better facilities for independent nominations to corporate directorships, the secret ballot, long overdue, and other reforms.

But meanwhile, we now at least have hundreds of thousands of shares cast for independent viewpoints, and as the votes swell and will continue to swell as the education of the American stockholder electorate proceeds, managements become more heedful of these independent demands.

What have we achieved? If we turn to page 220 of Dividends and Democracy I will show you the many things the small-share-

holder movement has achieved for the American shareholder.

Since both sides need our votes, proxy contests such as the Montgomery Ward and New York Central episodes have also helped to remind all comers they must bid for our vote. And once in power we continue to remind them of the unfilled promises, and will until we have secured our reforms.

This is perhaps a good time to comment on two things we want in every American corporation and want enacted into the law of every State. Many corporations already allow them either by law or voluntary action. There is no excuse for any exception, however, if corporation democracy is to be strengthened and corporation oligarchy defeated.

One is mandatory cumulative voting, whereby the owners can, if they so desire, cumulate or multiply their shares for any one or more candidates of their choice. It is already mandatory by State law in more than 21 States, and North Carolina has just joined the procession. It is mandatory at all national banks, the independents having blocked an attempt in Congress to remove it.

The right to elect a watchdog, which is all that cumulative voting does, simply means that the owners can elect a director who is responsible to them and who will protect their interest on the board of directors. As a director, of course, he has rights that the ordinary stockholder does not and should not have.

Unless he commands the confidence and suffrage of roughly 10 percent of the voters he cannot be elected, so that there is no danger of abuse by a handful of shareholders. Nor can the majority board decisions be overturned. And never forget it is the majority of the board, not the minority, who elect the officers who run a corporation between annual meetings.

Does cumulative voting work? Thanks to cumulative voting—thanks only to cumulative voting—Louis E. Wolfson sat on the Montgomery Ward board last year. Look at the changes brought about as a result of that contest. Avery is gone as chairman, the stock has been split, the dividend increased, the auditors elected for the first time—as should be done in every corporation, of course—and a new policy of constructive expansion decided upon.

Personally, I believe that had Wolfson continued to sit on the board, the progress of the company would have been even more remarkable because of his prodding. But partly because we still, unfortunately, do not have the right of cumulative voting at Merritt-Chapman & Scott, as the owners of hundreds of thousands of shares have asked for, it appears likely that he will have to devote a good deal of his time to this corporation's affairs to the exclusion of Montgomery Ward.

Let us look at New York Central, too, which also does not have cumulative voting because the law of this State does not make it mandatory, as it should. Robert R. Young, who now opposes many of the things he stood for when running for office, as has been demonstrated in proxy statements of recent New York Central meetings, will not allow us the right to vote cumulatively, he says, because some of those who opposed him might want to get on the board. If they have their money in the road, why should they not have the right to minority representation?

As a matter of fact, they sold out at 20, or about half the present value of the stock, showing how absurd is the theory that if one does not like a stock one sells it.

Fortunately, we are now about to see another case where cumulative voting is proving its value to the public shareholders. This time it is out at Seiberling Rubber, where Edward Lamb will represent the sizable holdings of his group at the same time he speaks up for the views of those public shareholders who think as he does on the future of the company.

He can do this because it is an Ohio company, where cumulative voting is mandatory, thus protecting the public interest with his own. He intends to send out independent quarterly letters as a minority director, thus keeping us all properly informed on things we ought to know as well as things the management wants us to know.

The second great basic reform in our laws which will insure more, not fewer, stockholders is the ending of the stagger system at all corporate elections. All directors in all corporations should be elected annually. Those who wish it otherwise, because stagger voting allows continuity and experience, can have all the protection they need or want with mandatory cumulative voting, which accomplishes this without depriving us of the right to elect all directors each year.

The stagger or class system of electing only a few directors at a time has now been ended by law in such States as California and Illinois. All legislatures should take action to prohibit stagger systems at corporate elections.

Meanwhile, fortunately, other corporations have been moving of their own volition in the same direction, as substantial blocks of independent stockholders, large and small, have been making themselves heard on the subject.

An example is National Dairy, which has now taken the steps to terminate it and thus elect all the directors each year. Gen. Lucius Clay, an example of a military figure who is also a great business leader, has taken a similar step at Continental Can, and Gen. David Sarnoff has now indicated that the RCA board will restudy the whole question there.

I have now outlined in a sketchy way why the interests of democratic capitalism demand not that people sell shares when they do not like management policies or some management policies, but that, be they large or small investors, they must rather be interested in the protection of all. This involves a fight for shareholder rights in proxy contests, at all annual meetings, irrespective of whether or not there is a contest, in the directors' sessions, in the legislatures, and in Congress.

On all fronts the battle for the defense of the public shareholder interest, and your interest is involved just as much as in our political elections, must be carried on unremittingly.

Here and here alone we have the real bulwark against socialism and communism, which no other defenders of our system can hope to match.

Tribute to Mortimer O'Connell, Clerk of the Dail of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise to ask permission of the House of Representatives to insert in the RECORD some account of the life of the late Mortimer O'Connell, clerk of the Dail of Ireland, and one of the leading figures in both Irish politics and in the resistance movement.

Ireland, who owed him so much, and all who honor the fighters for freedom, mourned May 22, the day Mr. O'Connell died. A veteran of the rising of 1916, O'Connell joined the Irish volunteers while in his teens, and took part in some of the heaviest fighting. He was imprisoned by the British, and finally released in the general amnesty of 1917.

When guerrilla struggle was renewed in 1919, he joined the armed republican movement, was captured and interned in the iron-clad Spike Island Prison. He escaped, swimming in darkness through treacherous currents, a feat regarded as impossible.

With the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 which established the Irish Free State, he played an important part in development of the new Irish Parliament in 1922. He served in the Dail Eireann for the past 34 years, and was named chief clerk in January 1948.

O'Connell was also an enthusiastic member of the International Parliamentary Union. He was a member of that group when it met in the fall of 1953 in the house of representatives.

O'Connell was a great admirer of the United States, its people, and our own struggle for independence because he knew from his own experience what risks those of the American rising had taken, and what prices they had paid for freedom. He was well known in the United States and had many friends here.

O'Connell is also remembered as a prominent scholar (he spoke Gaelic fluently). He was once a prominent national athlete.

At his funeral were veterans of the rising and the struggle of the early twenties. It was also attended by Irish Cabinet members, Eamon de Valera, and Prime Minister Costello.

Obituaries taken from the Irish press are included here as a part of my remarks:

DAIL TRIBUTES TO LATE MR. O'CONNELL

(Tributes to the late Mr. Mortimer O'Connell, clerk of the Dail, were paid in the House yesterday by An Taoiseah, Mr. Costello, and Mr. de Valera.)

Mr. Costello, at the end of question time, said that by his passing the Dail had lost one of its most active and loyal officers and the last serving one of that band of young men who were gathered together as an administrative staff to help in the development of the new Irish Parliament in 1922.

In the pre-treaty years, Mr. O'Connell played a noteworthy part in the struggle for national independence and when the call to arms came in 1916 he did not hesitate to answer it.

During the 34 years which Mr. O'Connell served in Leinster House, he proved himself a most efficient and conscientious officer. Up to 1940 he was the principal clerk in the public bill office and in that year was appointed clerk-assistant of the Dail. In 1948, he was appointed clerk of the Dail and in that office, which was one requiring wide knowledge and experience of the precedents of the House and their equitable application, he functioned with a high degree of success. He was honorable secretary of the Irish Parliamentary Association. He organized the Inter-Parliamentary Union conference in Dublin in 1950, and he attended conferences of the union at Stockholm, Istanbul, Berne, Washington, and Vienna, where his valuable work was highly appreciated. For some years he acted on the executive committee of the Autonomous Section of Secretaries General of Parliament. His

death would deeply be regretted by everyone who had made his acquaintance.

Mr. de Valera, speaking in Irish said that on behalf of the opposition he wished to agree with everything that the Taoiseach had said with regard to Mr. O'Connell, who showed when he was a young man that he loved this country and its people and had suffered for his ideal. Afterward, as the Taoiseach had said, he was assistant to his predecessor and became thoroughly acquainted with the work and procedure of the House.

CLERK OF THE DAIL IS DEAD

Mr. Mortimer O'Connell, Clerk of the Dail, died in Dublin last night. He had been ill for some time. He was an 1916 veteran.

A Kerryman, he had been on the Dail staff since it was established, and had been clerk of the House for about 15 years. He was aged 62.

Born at Ballinskellig, County Kerry, he was educated at St. Colman's College, Fermoy, and Blackrock College, Dublin. He was a past president of Blackrock College Union.

An Irish speaker, he joined the British civil service in 1914, and in 1916 was dismissed for his participation in the rising in which he was a member of F Company, Dublin Brigade.

He was interned in Stafford and Frongoch, being released at the general amnesty in 1917. He was imprisoned again in 1920 to 1921 in Cork City Jail, Spike Island and Bere Island.

He was reinstated into the civil service in 1922, and was placed in charge of the Public Bills Office of the Oireachtas.

He was appointed assistant clerk of the Dail in 1940 and became clerk on the retirement of Mr. G. McGann on January 1, 1948.

CONFERENCES

He took a keen interest in the Irish Parliamentary Union of which he was honorary secretary and as secretary of the Irish group he attended a number of interparliamentary conferences in various capitals.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. J. O'Connell and four daughters, Mrs. Con Burns, Caherciveen, County Kerry, and the Misses Marie, Anne, and Josephine O'Connell, and also by 2 sisters, Miss O'Connell, Caherciveen and Miss M. O'Connell, New York.

The remains will arrive at the Church of Our Lady of Refuge, Rathmines, today at 6:30 p. m. The funeral will take place after requiem mass at 10 a. m. to Dean's Grange tomorrow.

Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted hereinbelow Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, by Mr. Rappelet, of the regular session of the Legislature of Louisiana of 1956, which sets forth the official position of the Legislature of Louisiana in support of a reduction of the retirement age under social security to 60 years of age. This resolution reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

Whereas there are many workers between the ages of 60 and 65 who would like to retire, but are unable to do so because of the amount of benefits they are eligible to receive from their employers is insufficient; and

Whereas the above-mentioned persons would be able to retire if social security benefits were available to them to add to their other sources of income; and

Whereas if the above-mentioned persons could retire at the age of 60, younger men and women would then be able to advance more rapidly and could replace many persons who, because of age and perhaps ill health, are no longer properly qualified for the jobs they are holding; and

Whereas one of the results of the social security program has been that the older workers have been favored; and

Whereas now that social security coverage has become largely stabilized there is no reason to continue to weight its benefits heavily in favor of the older workers; and

Whereas the present age for retirement under social security is out of line with existing practices in most State, local, and private retirement systems; and

Whereas it is important that the retirement age under social security be brought into line with the prevailing practice among the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That Louisiana's Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress are requested and urged to use their influence to obtain a reduction of the retirement age under social security to 60 years of age; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of Louisiana's Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress.

———, ———

Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

———, ———

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Measure of Greatness—Address by Senator Symington at Rally Honoring the Dean of Missouri's Congressional Delegation, the Honorable Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at the proceedings in Mexico, Mo., June 8, honoring the dean of the Missouri delegation in Congress, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, our junior Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, made an address entitled "The Measure of Greatness," which referred to the outstanding contributions of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. We all know Congressman CANNON as a kind, gentle, wonderful friend and person, whose experience and skill in parliamentary matters help all of us in innumerable ways in our efforts to serve our constituents.

Therefore, I know there will be widespread interest among Members of the House in Senator SYMINGTON'S remarks as they refer to our esteemed friend, Congressman CANNON, and I submit the text of the Senator's speech for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE MEASURE OF GREATNESS

The wisest of all teachers once said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The lasting value of a civilization, a nation, a political party, or an individual is best determined by the simple test embodied in those immortal words.

By his fruits we know CLARENCE CANNON, of Elsberry, Mo.

CLARENCE CANNON'S entire life has been devoted to the service of people, and that is the most important service of all.

Today he serves as chairman of probably the most important commtitee in the Congress.

Highlight of that effort includes Mr. CANNON spearheading the 1945 postwar drive which returned to the Treasury $130 billion of unexpended wartime appropriations.

It was he who about that time also proposed that Congress require a minimum payment of $5 billion per year toward reducing the national debt.

It was he also who stated: "No agency should be allowed to have any funds for which it does not account to Congress annually and which it does not justify in hearings before congressional committees."

Mr. CANNON believes that Government money is public money; and therefore should be spent only in the public interest.

Would that we could say this basic policy of sound government was the policy of the present administration.

Many current top appointees in the executive branch came to Washington from private business.

Some of these appointees are mighty fine people. Some, however, apparently believe the Federal Government is just another big business corporation, to be run for their own interest, and that of their friends at the top, instead of the interests of all the stockholders.

Quite a few of the latter have been removed from the job; but only after a Democratic Congress disclosed their activities. The welfare of the stockholders in question, in this case the American people, appeared incidental to their selfish decisions.

Yes, there have been some surprisingly unbusinesslike operations on the part of this so-called business administration. As a result, all of us have been forced to foot the tax bill for such financial fiascoes as Dixon-Yates, the incredible deal in cheese, and the heavy and unnecessary increased interest cost on our national debt.

With respect to that last cost, the largest single component item of the $4 billion increase in the first 3 years of this administration outside of national defense, is the increased price for money this administration decided to give the bankers.

In contrast, CLARENCE CANNON'S policy of government for all the people is made completely clear by the record.

Since first elected to Congress in 1922, Mr. CANNON has been instrumental in the passage of legislation beneficial to every American.

Let's take a few examples.

For the benefit of the farmer, Mr. CANNON has supported legislation for parity prices, farm loans at low rates of interest, reclamation and soil conservation projects, REA, protection of crops from pests and livestock disease, construction of better farm-to-market roads, flood control, and improved scientific agricultural research.

In supporting the 1941 farm-loan bill, which provided for Government loans to farmers to 85 percent of the parity value of 5 basic commodities, Mr. Cannon said the bill "places a floor under farm prices similar to the floor already under wages. For the first time in history the farmer is guaranteed a parity price."

On this and many other agricultural bills Mr. CANNON fought long and hard for the farmer, against an opposition both you and I know is entrenched and powerful.

Nor has that fight ended.

As you also know, only last April, President Eisenhower vetoed a Democratic farm bill which would have been a start toward a fair share for the Nation's farmers.

In 1952, the average farmer had an income of 52 cents for every $1 taken in by his city neighbor.

By 1955 that 52 cents had dropped to 42 cents.

As a result, the 13 percent of our population which remains on the farm, and which today produces the abundance of food and fiber that makes America the best fed and best clothed Nation in the history of the world, nevertheless receives less than 5 percent of our national income.

And according to Department of Agriculture income forecasts for 1956, under the present policies of this administration, that already unfortunate situation is going to get worse instead of better.

Already this situation is being reflected in the small towns. As a lead editorial entitled "The Rural Towns Problem" in the Kansas City Star pointed out last May 20: "Rural towns or cities are the first to feel the effect of reduced purchasing power among farmers."

For that damaging effect to reach the large cities is certain, and only a matter of time.

This administration's answer to the plight of the American farmer has been, and is, lower price supports, less farm credit at higher inerest rates, and less funds for REA.

Based on some of the statements made by those in charge, why should we be surprised?

As example, only last year an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in this Republican administration said: "Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else."

Well, 500,000 farm families have left the farm in the last 3 years.

But where have they gone and what will they do?

Is it good for America that these people and their children leave the field and pastures and woodlands of our countryside, to roam the concrete of the big cities looking for work?

What irony that in most countries of the world today 90 percent of the people work in the production of food—and their problem is famine, whereas only 13 percent of our people produce food—and our problem is surplus.

Shortly after Mr. CANNON was first elected to Congress, another Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, made this statement: "Farmers have never made money. I don't believe we can do much about it."

Apparently today, 30 years later, that is still the philosophy of the Republican Party.

But for many years the Democratic Party, under the leadership of such men as CLARENCE CANNON, has believed that something can and should be done to help farmers get a fair share.

Let's look at the record.

In the 20 years of Democratic administrations, farm income rose from $2 billion a year to $13½ billion; and the parity index rose from 58 percent in 1932 to 100 percent in 1952.

Since 1952 annual farm income has dropped nearly $4 billion. Parity during the last 6 months averaged 82, with a low point of 80. That is the lowest point and the lowest 6-month average in 15 years.

The reason is clear. It was Secretary of the Interior McKay who said, "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

If he was talking about big business, that is true; and the backs of little-business men and farmers this administration is riding are getting plenty sore.

Mr. CANNON's legislative record, however, has much in it besides sympathetic understanding and support of the farmers. He has consistently supported measures for help to our veterans; and to our small-business men, and to our average citizen.

In 1932 Mr. CANNON was one of those who worked hard to preserve $400 million of veteran benefits.

In recent years he has been one of the leaders behind legislation to provide maternity care for servicemen's wives, and also better hospitalization for veterans.

For the average citizen, Mr. CANNON has supported such welfare measures as aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, day nurseries, nurses training, pensions, and unemployment compensation.

For the small-business man, Mr. CANNON has fought against monopolistic practices. He has worked steadily for a fair deal for small business.

When and if they make any money, these farmers and businessmen are also taxpayers.

Let's review for a moment the tax policies of this administration.

In 1954, President Eisenhower proposed tax reductions.

Out of every dollar of tax relief obtained, the corporations received 73 cents.

Families earning over $5,000 received 18 cents.

Families earning less than $5,000 received 9 cents.

The Republicans said they couldn't afford to give tax cuts to everybody—so they gave a $1 billion tax cut to corporations, plus an $850 million tax cut to corporation shareholders.

This administration's record on small business is equally in conflict with the country's welfare.

Since 1952 the profits of companies worth $100 million or more have gone up 27 percent; but the profits of companies worth $250,000 or less have gone down 39 percent.

Business failures since 1952 have risen 36 percent—in fact, during the past 3 years, there have been more than twice as many business failures as there were during the previous 10 years.

Unless we put an end to the current program of helping the big get bigger while the small get squeezed out, capitalism, as we know it, will disappear.

As you know, over 80 cents of the tax dollar you pay today goes for past, present and possible future war—and 65 cents of your tax dollar goes to the Defense Department in the Pentagon to pay for the current programs.

Now a story is being spread around that because some of us believe in better organization of our military defenses—an organization based on progress instead of tradition—we are asking for more money for national defense.

This is not correct.

If the Pentagon was truly unified, the American people could obtain more security for far less money than is being spent today.

In this field also CLARENCE CANNON is a recognized authority. His voting record proves that he is dedicated to adequate national defense; but only on the basis of maximum return to the taxpayer for every dollar spent.

Anothr prominent American once agreed with that position.

On November 16, 1945, over 10 years ago, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Appropriations the then General Eisenhower stated:

"You could develop a more efficient fighting force with unification, with 75 percent of the men that you would have if you had separate forces. * * * I am certain that almost any professional officer that has studied this thing would agree."

A 25-percent reduction in the current personnel of our military establishment would save the American taxpayer many billions of dollars each year.

In this later published book, Crusade in Europe, General Eisenhower developed his point further when he said:

"The accomplishments in Europe of the three United States services operating under unified command strongly influenced my determined advocacy of a similar type of organization in postwar Washington."

And on February 7, 1948, in his farewell report as Chief of Staff of the Army, the general carried on his thought as follows:

"But our position of 5, 10, 15 years hence is being determined now. * * *

"We must do everything possible now to assure ourselves that we will fight another war with weapons more advanced than those of the enemy. * * *

"The constant aim of those concerned with integration of the Armed Forces must be the goal implicit in the act—a security program in which all fields of responsibility will be covered but from which all unnecessary duplication will be eliminated and in which each arm will be a member of an integrated team. * * *

"Study should be given to the proposition that each year a number of officers of proved experience, knowledge and judgment be withdrawn from their respective services and given commissions in the Armed Forces. The existence of a body of specially chosen officers representing all three services would act as a spur to junior officers to qualify for such selection, indirectly decreasing traditional barriers between the services. Free transfer among the services, without loss of rank, would, in appropriate cases, be a valuable measure for promotion of the national rather than the service viewpoint. Developments of this sort will come with time and I am confident that each succeeding year of unification will bring closer the goal of a fully integrated establishment."

It was not until he actually became a candidate for the Presidency, however, that General Eisenhower really "poured it on" with respect to his concept of deficiencies in the Department of Defense.

In a talk in Baltimore on September 25, 1952, the general said that we must obtain "the most defense at less cost with the least dollar."

And he continued:

"Our defense program has suffered from lack of farsighted direction.

"Real unification of our Armed Forces is yet to be achieved.

"The running warfare between Congress and the White House has made such blundering even more costly to us Americans. Both must share mutual confidence and common purpose. The cooperation must be sparked by executive leadership.

"We have had little of such leadership. Special interests in the armed services have repeatedly been carrying their appeals to Congress—sometimes without knowledge of any of their civilian superiors."

Then General Eisenhower said:

"Supplemental appropriations by Congress have been vetoed, passed over a veto, and sometimes held back by the President."

But only last year, the Congress appropriated $42 million to prevent any further reduction in the personnel strength of the Marine Corps, this action being taken on the theory that it was wrong to discharge many thousand Marine volunteers at the same time tens of thousands of men were being drafted off of the farms and out of the cities.

The Administration impounded the money Congress appropriated for this volunteer force. The Marine strength was permitted to decline. Actually, the Secretary of Defense used much of the impounded money for his own Department.

Also in Baltimore in 1952 General Eisenhower stated:

"Service disagreements have become public brawls."

Compare any disagreement between the services in 1952 with those flooding the press, television, and radio today.

General Eisenhower continued:

"Stranger than this is the almost inevitable demand of each service to do the research, development, and production work on new weapons. Each believes that it can do the work better. In this matter prompt adjudication among the services is mandatory—otherwise you will find all three engaged in spending public money for a single need."

* * * * *

"This brings us to the supremely important matter of unification of the Armed Forces.

"When I became Chief of Staff upon my return from Europe in November of 1945, I felt that all our war experience had rendered obsolete the defense organization then existing. I was convinced then, as I am today, that effective coordination of the services in war requires central planning in time of peace. This is the essence of unity in the Armed Forces. That unity must also extend to the procurement and administration of all the costly materiel and paraphernalia of modern warfare. It was the hope and expectation of all of us who worked to achieve the passage of the National Defense Act of 1947 that this kind of unity was in the making.

"This has not proved to be the case. Such unity as we have achieved is too much form and too little substance. We have continued with a loose way of operating that wastes time, money, and talent with equal generosity. With three services, in place of the former two, still going their separate ways, and with an overall defense staff frequently unable to enforce corrective action, the end result has been not to remove duplication, but to replace it with triplication.

"All this must be brought to as swift an end as possible. Neither our security nor our solvency can permit such a way of conducting the crucial business of national defense."

That was over 3½ years ago.

Not a single change in the law has been suggested by this administration to correct the situation described by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952.

Instead of any proposals to bring "all this to as swift an end as possible," the President's own people volunteer that triplication and waste has increased heavily since he took office in January 1953.

The former Assistant Secretary of Air Force Research and Development, Mr. Trevor Gardner, resigned early this year in bitter protest at the current disorganization in the Pentagon.

Only last month Mr. Gardner wrote in Look magazine as follows:

"We must junk the creaking, decentralized reviewing and re-reviewing machinery we now so foolishly look to for decisions. In place of this bureaucratic Noah's Ark, we urgently need a streamlined mechanism capable of responding to new dangers as quickly as they become known."

As an illustration of what Mr. Gardner is talking about, this country fought and won the greatest war in history—and at that time its military departments contained a total of eight Secretaries.

Today, despite all this talk about the importance of further service unification in order to increase security and, at the same time, cut expenses, there are 31 Secretaries.

And the President has just asked the Congress to approve 3 more, for a total of 34.

Because of the rising criticism resulting from the bitter interservice rows which have recently broken out in the open, it is reported that something will be done about the deteriorating situation in the Pentagon.

Last week Time magazine stated:

"It is the duty of Commander in Chief Dwight Eisenhower to insure that the machine—in all its countless parts—adds up to a single unit meshed for a sole purpose: to keep war away by its total retaliatory power.

"That aim no longer permits the luxury of the three services and their many subservices wrangling for power and heading in different directions. For this reason President Eisenhower has come to one of the most important decisions of his administration: to move for a truly unified armed service that will work in practice as well as on paper, as a single machine. Last week he ordered his White House staff planners to start work immediately on mapping out a unification plan for completion this fall. If he is reelected he hopes to present his unification proposals to Congress next year."

But we heard all that in Baltimore, back in September 1952.

Why should be believe it now, any more than we should have believed it then?

For many years some of us have stated and restated that if President Eisenhower would only carry out what he said should be done in 1945, 1946, and 1948—and what he in effect promised would be done in 1952, many billions of dollars annually could be saved in our national defense cost, at no sacrifice whatever to our military strength.

The saving could mean a balanced Federal budget; and should mean a heavy reduction in income taxes.

Apparently some people believe that emphasis on the importance of national defense indicates a certain narrowness of viewpoint; a failure to recognize that military power is only a part of that much broader struggle which is rapidly shaping up for the political and economic control of the world.

Quite obviously the Communists, dedicated to world conquest, don't want to gain control of a devastated country. There is no profit in acquiring a lot of smoldering, radioactive real estate. They want to take over a going concern, at the peak of its productivity. Therefore their approach now is political and economic as well as military.

But their political warfare rests upon a military standoff. Note they did not even begin their successful recent developments on the political front until they felt they were at least within reaching distance of military equality.

It goes without saying that the political-economic struggle is an even larger, more difficult, and more challenging problem than the problem of maintaining military superiority.

To put it another way, the problem of military superiority is in itself a challenge to our resources. But it is small compared to the vast challenge of the overall struggle, including the struggle for the minds of men.

If the present leaders of this administration have been unable to cope with the current world-wide political struggle from a position of military strength, how will they manage from a position of military weakness?

If, during the Korean War our choices of action were limited by fear the enemy would "enlarge the war" (don't dare bomb beyond the Yalu, don't dare use atomic weapons), how will our policy and program be restricted if and when the Russians have a superiority in arms?

This is an intensely practical problem, one which must be faced if we are to continue in a free world.

Some future administration may have the genius to deal successfully in foreign affairs from a position of relative weakness; but this administration does not seem to be able to exploit its asserted position of relative strength.

We have a right to expect our Government to deal effectively with the broader problem, handling the military problem in stride. But this administration seems unable to handle either without a succession of obvious failure.

We might forgive the mistakes in foreign policy; but management—with a capital M—was to have been the great talent of the crowd now in office. (If you once ran General Motors, you are equipped to run the country.)

Yet in the very place where we were led to expect the pinnacle of competence, we have seen bungling and shortsightedness.

Again, preoccupation on my part with the military-defense problem does not mean any lack of awareness of the broader political struggle now taking place all over the world.

But the military problem is elementary. If we cannot handle that, how can we handle something far more complex?

If we—the United States—cannot maintain a superiority of arms, apparently cannot even maintain a military standoff, how can we expect to win the larger diplomatic and economic struggle?

The argument is made that America cannot spend for arms at the expense of its economy.

Who says we should? This is to avoid and evade the real problem. The real problem—the real measure of the problem—is to obtain the necessary capability without injuring the economy.

It can be done; and it will have to be done.

If we don't enlarge our vision, broaden our concepts, and achieve a better comprehension of the total problem, our failures in this field are just a foretaste of the much larger failures in store for us on the international political front.

We have come here today to honor a great Missourian, to honor him for what he has stood for over the years.

To him we express the gratitude of his party, his community, his district, his State, and his Nation.

Several weeks ago in the bright morning sun, I journeyed through the farms of western Kentucky. On the train was Alben Barkley, being carried to his eternal rest.

As we went by, farmers were kneeling among their crops in the fields, paying respect to one they loved, because they knew this great Democrat had devoted his life to attaining a better life for them.

Fortunately for us, another great Democrat is with us today, with many years of public service ahead of him.

We know, CLARENCE CANNON, that at the same time you participate in our most important national problem—the insurance of a more prosperous and a more secure America—the problems of your friends and neighbors are always in your heart and mind.

It is for that reason you have our respect, our affection, and our eternal gratitude.

More About Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 10, 1956, is "must" reading for every Member of Congress:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

PARTRIDGE AND LE MAY

WASHINGTON.—The recently released testimony of Gen. Curtis LeMay and Gen. Earle Partridge ought to be required reading for every policymaking official of the Eisenhower administration, conspicuously including President Eisenhower himself.

The transcripts ought to be read in full for their real impact. But briefly, the main points made by General Partridge, Chief of the Air Defense Command, in testimony re-

leased last Wednesday, were as follows: First, the Soviet fighters are superior to anything we have. Second, "we now have a good system to fight the TU–4," which is the obsolete Soviet bomber no longer being produced. But, the Soviets "introduced the jet bombers and the Bear more rapidly than was forecast." As a result, "we find ourselves in the years 1957, 1958, and early 1959 in not too good shape."

The Partridge testimony was heavily bowdlerized by the Defense Department. But the transcript makes it abundantly obvious what "not too good shape" means. It means that under present programs, our fighters will not even be able to reach the altitude of the new Soviet bombers until the new "hundred series" of fighters begin to be delivered in quantity some 3 years from now. As General Partridge sadly remarked, "We are weak at high altitude. We are weak at low altitude." If there is any cause for complacency in such testimony, it is hard to detect it.

As for General LeMay, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, it is even more important to read the whole transcript of his testimony to gather the full meaning of what he said. But his main points were as follows:

First, by about 1958 or 1959, according to present programs, the Soviet "long-rnage bombers * * * will be a little over twice what we have, so the advantage will be with the Russians." Of 1960, LeMay said, "We may not be able to carry out our mission at that time."

The mission of the Strategic Air Command is to provide a retaliatory force sufficient to deter the Soviets from attacking. Other testimony brought out just what General LeMay had in mind. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee investigating air power, asked the key question: "In what year, at what time, if the present programs go along * * * do you think they will be in a position, if they hit us, to destroy us? We will accept it as a guess from the man who has the most right to guess."

General LeMay. "I don't like to guess on those things, but if you insist, I will come up with a guess * * * 1960, he can do it with a complete surprise attack."

In short, by 1960, the Strategic Air Command "may not be able to carry out our mission" because all the SAC bases could be knocked out by surprise attack. LeMay's "guess," it should be emphasized, is based not on his own estimate of Soviet air power, but on the "national estimates." These are intelligence estimates prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency and approved by the National Security Council, of which the President is chairman.

The Partridge-LeMay testimony suggests certain questions. If Partridge and LeMay, in a fit of hysterical parochialism, are simply misinterpreting the meaning of the national estimates, why are they kept on in their immensely responsible positions? If, on the other hand, their interpretations are correct, and their testimony substantially accurate, what becomes of the twin doctrines of massive retaliation and mutual deterrence which supposedly form the basis of American defense policy?

Maybe it doesn't matter. Maybe the Soviet rulers have not the slightest intention of using the new weapons which they have made such enormous and brilliantly successful efforts to achieve. Even so, it is worth pondering one further question: What will happen to the Western alliance, and to our own firmness of purpose as leader of the West, when the Soviets know, and we know, and the world knows, that they can destroy both our cities and our ability to retaliate, at any time, by surprise attack?

Unordered Merchandise Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement taken from Business Week which I think will be of interest to those who have been the victims of the racket to which the article refers:

PERSONAL BUSINESS

The mails these days are full of merchandise you didn't order and don't want—neckties, key-ring tags, phonograph records, books, and so on. In fact, the mailing of unordered merchandise is now a multimillion dollar business.

A part of this business is legitimate enough. About 50 of the Nation's 200 large mailers of unordered merchandise are religious, charitable, or patriotic nonprofit organizations that use this method for raising all or part of their annual budgets.

Another 150 or so large mailers are commercial companies, who swamp the mails with literally millions of articles of unordered merchandise each year.

The real culprits are among this group—a few high-pressure operators who even resort to threats in order to collect money for their unordered merchandise. One example will illustrate how unpleasant a situation of this kind can become:

An elderly man in Florida was nearly blind, and had been unable to read for years. Through the mail he received an unordered book, which he returned a his own expense (although he didn't have to).

Then he began to get a series of brazen and threatening letters, demanding that he remit $1.65 for the book. He ignored them. So a new series began—this time purportedly from a Delaware lawyer who said he was handling the claim for collection. He still refused to pay the bill.

Fortunately, not much more than threats could be leveled against him, even though no postal regulations govern unordered merchandise except when fraud is involved.

But the Federal Trade Commission has ruled that it is a violation of the Federal Trade Act for a sender of unordered merchandise to claim that "the receiver is under obligation * * * to pay for or return the merchandise."

Likewise, the Better Business Bureau says: "Recipients of unordered merchandise are not obligated (1) to acknowledge its receipt; (2) return it; (3) pay for it unless used; (4) give it particular care; (5) keep it beyond a reasonable length of time."

However, BBB points out that you are obliged to surrender the merchandise to the shipper or his agent, if called for in person, within a reasonable length of time. But before relinquishing it, you can demand storage charges.

There is a simpler way to do away with this nuisance and still stay within the United States postal statutes—just write the single word "Refused" across the face of any parcel or piece of mail you don't want. Hand it back—unopened, of course—to the mailman or postmaster—and that's the end of it for you.

The point is this: You don't have to accept any piece of mail, no matter what the reason. You don't have to state why you won't accept it, nor do you have to sign anything. So refusing the mail to begin with is the simplest way to dispose of unordered merchandise.

This also takes care of objectionable publications that you may get through the mail without having subscribed to them, or having given specific permission to anyone to send them. It's much more effective than writing to publishers and asking to be removed from their mailing lists—often they want to foist undesirable material on unwilling recipients.

When you mark such publications "Refused," the postman must fill out a form and send it to the mailer notifying him that in the future the publication is unmailable to that particular addressee.

There may soon be laws that prohibit such mailings in the first place, so you won't even have to go to the trouble of refusing it. The Post Office Department is trying to draft legislation right now that will screen out the worst offenders, and still not hurt the religious and nonprofit organizations trying to raise money for worthy causes.

The Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a most intelligent and enlightened letter from a member of the Marine Corps. This young man is from my congressional district and is now an officer of field grade status in the Marine Corps. So much has been said in the past in reference to the Parris Island episode that I think in fairness to the Marine Corps that this letter should be reprinted in full. I have deleted portions of the letter which would indicate the name or address of the individual writing me the letter and this deletion is, of course, for obvious reasons.

The letter follows:

Before I joined the Marine Corps, I was told by a well-decorated Marine officer that there were only two places where Marines were made: San Diego and Parris Island. He said that in boot camp you either make a man or you break him. I found that he spoke accurately. In my capacity both as observer and participant, I found that the Marine system of recruit training one of the most remarkably effective and singularly successful programs I had ever encountered.

The scope and purpose of boot camp is to take a fuzzy-cheeked lad of 17 or 18 years age and—in the short course of 12 weeks—develop in him the qualities of courage, discipline, individual pride, and esprit de corps that combine to prepare him morally for the gruelling hardships of infantry combat. These 12 weeks are essentially weeks of character building—training in the varied techniques of modern warfare is incidental to this primary mission. Such an undertaking is breathtaking in magnitude. To watch the transformation of "mama's boy" (away from home for the first time) into a fundamentally matured man in the period of these 3 months is most impressive. The methods that achieve this invaluable objective, I believe, should be preserved in the public interest and not lightly tossed aside as anachronistic.

The percentage of men who are "broken" or sustain any lasting physical or emotional

injury from boot camp training is infinitesimal. The notion that human dignity should be deferred to and boot training restrained out of respect for this basic dignity in a 17 or 18 year old youth is sheer poppycock. In point of fact, boot training relies quite heavily upon the existence of human dignity—but not after the notions of the egalitarian and the do-gooder. The net result of boot training is to verbally (and physically whenever necessary) hammer an individual into a respectable and self-respecting man, evincing for the first time—feeling and understanding for the first time—the attributes distinctive of human dignity and manhood.

In general terms, the method of boot training is to take a young man from civilian life, crush and redirect his adolescent rebelliousness, imbue him with pride in and allegiance to the Marine Corps and to his country, convince him of his moral responsibilities as an individual and as a member of the organization, and rigorously-exact absolute conformity to the discipline of a system whose terms are apparent to all.

The "boys" who come to the Marine Corps to be made into men generally are neither delicate nor cultivated. They do not understand the concept of discipline, but they do comprehend physically enforced authority. The techniques used, mothers might consider brutish; but that is frequently because the Marine Corps is sometimes giving her son the "spanking" she should have given him 10 years before. The code the boot lives by is harassing and it is strict. The drill instructor might just as well be God—his word is law, his authority absolute. Drill instructors, of course, are restricted but a recruit is only dimly aware of that. A boot stands at attention, addresses as "Sir," and requests "permission to speak" to everyone not a boot—from Pfc's up. Discipline starts on this basis and builds up. Anyone who decides that he wishes to deviate from the prescribed rules is dealt with in no uncertain terms and in a fashion he is not likely soon to forget.

The supreme responsibility shouldered by the Marine Corps in taking the youth of America into its organization, is that they be made into men before they must face the enemy in mortal combat. War taxes, sometimes beyond endurance, the timbre and manhood of all: how pitiful and unfortunate it would be to have to send soft and unprepared children into our Nation's battles. It is to avoid this eventuality that Marine recruits go through boot camp, and, thereby, are made ready for the demands of warfare.

So long as the old Navy Regs were in force, I am told, this system of boot training functioned well and to no one's embarrassment. The adoption of the Uniform Code of Military Justice made things somewhat difficult for the strict disciplinarian, but Marines were universally aware that certain things must be exacted from a boy in order to make him a Marine, and the law was hedged about. Drill instructors generally were protected from public opinion. They were backed up by superiors. Sudden transfers to other duty stations were instituted when punishments or activities initiated by drill instructors—in good faith—had unfortunate consequences. Public opinion was placated by being kept uninformed—mothers would never understand some of the things that were going on. No drill instructors would ever charge a boot for violation of an article under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and have him tried under a courts-martial proceeding, except in the instance of a serious offense. The purpose of the drill instructor is to make the young man a Marine, to teach him discipline, self-control, and utter responsibility. It is not his business circuitously and abstractly to exact a pound of flesh by judicial means. Breaches of conduct were (are) handled by the DI, in his own way and with no questions asked.

The public opinion of a society which had become increasingly pampered and obsessed with sugar coating has made the mission of the drill instructor an extremely difficult thing. The Marine Corps solution has been to leave the staff noncommissioned officers virtually free from direct supervision in the conduct of boot training. I believe this is as it should be. The heart of the Marine Corps is the staff NCO's. They are hardened professionals, knowing better than anyone else what it takes to make a man a Marine; giving restraint and guidance from above (but not down at the individual boot level) for decades they have done a terrific job.

For an officer to oversee the training given recruits would adversely affect that training. In the first place, it would serve to cheapen the rank of the enlisted men directly in charge of the recruit. The Marine Corps has never been known as a "rank-happy" organization; every rate carries with it legitimate and acknowledged prestige. It is important that the boot fully appreciate these distinctions. A present and supervising officer would, in effect, undermine the discipline and destroy the value of rate differences within the chain of command. Secondly, an officer is necessarily obliged to take action to rectify any instances or "maltreatment" or "injustice" which he sees. This is expected of him by the men. An officer is thought of as a gentleman, and between "men" and "gentlemen" there is expected to be a difference of kind. There is a class distinction and a recognized heirarchy here, and the initial indoctrination of boot camp serves to establish this as a serious and factual matter.

No system of training is without flaw, of course. Some individuals escape the full effectiveness of Marine indoctrination, generally because they are grossly unsuited to the tasks marines must perform. But these are very few indeed. The overage marine, graduating from boot camp, is conscientious and aggressive; he is vigorously self-reliant and enthusiastically devoted to the Marine Corps and everything for which it stands. All the hardships and discomforts of the previous months are disregarded, and he is proud of the long list of military achievements that at last have demonstrated his worth as a marine. Feeling that he has become a Marine, he probably has reached his life's proudest attainment.

It is this fundamental frame of mind that prepares him for the technical and tactical training that lies just ahead for him; that makes him respect his fellow marine as being worthy; that causes him to fight and survive and remain effective in the direst circumstances.

The Marine Corps shoots for esprit de corps in units and "gung ho" individual marines. Boot camp achieves this. The evolution of the system has taken a long time and its principles are sound.

Eisenhower Leadership Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives have recently completed consideration of the Mutual Security Act. The Senate now has that bill before it and all reports seem to indicate that that body may cut the aid proposed by the administration by an even more substantial amount than did the House.

I hope that these reports are mistaken, for it is my opinion that even those cuts approved by the House were dangerous in the extreme. If this undesirable action is taken, the President will have no one but himself to blame. Time and time again leading Democrats in the Congress have warned that only strong support of this administration measure by the administration would suffice to secure its passage uncut. This support was lacking during the House debate until the very last minute when it was too late. It now appears that the same situation may prevail in the Senate.

The import of this lack of action is not lost on the Congress, nor, I am happy to say, is it lost on the folks at home. Many people throughout the United States are distressed by the lack of leadership on the part of the President in a matter which is so vital to the future security of the Nation. That this sentiment exists is indicated quite clearly by an editorial which appeared in the Trenton Times, one of the leading newspapers in my district in New Jersey. For the information of my colleagues I would like to include the full text of that editorial. Other evidence of leadership failure may be found today in the Washington Daily News and the New York Times. I include two articles which clearly show that the feeling of uneasiness over this failure of leadership at this critical period is very widespread.

[From the Trenton Evening Times of June 12, 1956]

LEADERSHIP FAILURE

Rejection by the House of Representatives of the administration's $4,900 million foreign aid bill is one of the most severe and significant rebuffs President Eisenhower has received since assuming office. And it is one that he might have averted if he had been able or willing to fight.

Several weeks ago Democrats made it plain that if the President expected to get the foreign aid bill through Congress without substantial cuts he would have to intervene personally, promptly and vigorously. Until the last moment, however, the President listened to the counsels of timidity and proceeded on the complacent assumption that the magic of his name would dispel all opposition.

The old magic failed to function, and with good reason. There are many misgivings about American aid and there is a sincere belief in some quarters that loans and removal of trade restrictions would be more effective than outright grants. Logical questions were raised and the President did not feel under compulsion to answer them. Then, when he saw that his program was on the rocks, he made a last moment appeal which was ignored. The result was a reduction of the program by a billion dollars.

This was a failure of leadership. And there is the prospect of another failure of leadership, also of political courage, in the plight of Senator WILEY of Wisconsin, who has been cast adrift by the organization in his own State because he has gone down the line for the Eisenhower foreign policies. A word of support might have turned the tide for Senator WILEY in the Wisconsin convention. Yet, it was not forthcoming and a loyal supporter of the President is left to the tender mercies of Senator MCCARTHY.

The President's personal popularity remains high. His political leadership on foreign aid leaves much to be desired.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1956]

FOREIGN POLICY DILEMMA

(By Wellington Long)

The United States Government faces an almost insoluble foreign policy dilemma, and recent official attempts to think out loud about it have proved embarrassing.

The question is, How shall the United States, with a historic record of neutrality except in two wars, treat the new, neutral nations who wish to remain aloof from the cold war?

The administration got some burned fingers a year ago on this subject. But apparently the National Security Council has not even discussed a position paper which would lay down a policy toward neutralism. The flurry last year was created just before our stanchest European ally and a vigorous opponent of neutralism, West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, visited here in Washington.

This year, the excitement again started just before Herr Adenauer came here. But now, there's an added element—next month a foremost exponent of neutralism, India's Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, visits here.

The latest confusion stems largely from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' tour of the neutralist nations of southeast Asia last March. On March 20, he said in Djakarta, Indonesia, that when the United States was a young country just emerged from colonialism, we were very eager to devote our efforts and attention primarily to our own affairs, trying to make stable and sound our newly won independence.

"It is quite understandable to the United States, therefore," Mr. Dulles continued, "that that should be the point of view of the Indonesian Government." He declared "there is no connection between our giving of economic aid * * * and the entry of any country into a collective security pact with the United States."

That appeared to be a sharp break with the former either "you are with us or against us policy." And seemingly was confirmed by President Eisenhower a month later when he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

"The new nations have many of the sensitivities that marked our own early years as a free nation. Some of them are concerned to avoid involvements with other nations, as we were for many years. Certainly, we Americans should understand and respect these points of view."

Last Thursday, the President touched on the subject again. He told his press conference that neutralism did not necessarily mean to be neutral between right and wrong. But only in respect to military alliances.

It seemed obvious the President had in mind the Asian neutrals. But Germany's Adenauer, trying to rearm his country over the objections of a growing neutralist political bloc within his own nation, was stunned.

So the following day, the White House clarified the President's remarks. In sum, it said that neutralism was all right in some parts of the world, but not in others.

Then, last Saturday Secretary Dulles, departing completely from his Djakarta text, declared that the principle of neutrality "has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, is an immoral and shortsighted conception."

By now, our allies are as discomfited as are the neutrals. The West Germans visited the State Dupartment last week to protest the President's statements. Today, an Indian representative calls to protest the Dulles remarks.

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1956]

"SERENDIPITY" IN CAPITAL—A CRITIQUE ON NEW ADMINISTRATION MOOD OF FINDING EVERYTHING BUT SOVIET GOOD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—The administration has found a cureall. It is a rare tonic called serendipity, originally discovered by the English writer, Horace Walpole.

The word was coined by Mr. Walpole in allusion to a fairy tale, the Three Princes of Serendip, who were never dismayed by misfortune, but always managed to discover, by chance or sagacity, wonderful things they had not sought.

This is what is happening here now. Others may be gloomy about the illness of the President, the state of the Atlantic alliance or the future of Germany, but the administration, like the Three Princes of Serendip, always finds something valuable or agreeable to say about everything, except, of course, the Soviet leaders.

Secretary of State Dulles was in a particularly serendipic mood today. He downgraded the President's illness to an indisposition. He saw no reason why this indisposition should hamper the efforts of the administration to restore the $1,100,000,000 cut in the foreign-aid appropriation. And he was full of bounce and optimism about many other things.

REMARKS ON NEUTRALS CITED

He was questioned closely, for example, about the President's recent sympathetic remarks about the reasons why some States preferred to remain neutral in the world struggle, and about his own references last Saturday to the immorality of neutrality.

But he saw no difference between them on this subject. "I had a long discussion with him—the President—in the course of other matters on Thursday afternoon, and I can assure you that there is no difference whatever in our points of view," he said.

Similarly, the Secretary of State was asked about the criticisms in Asia about the weakness of the southeast Asian alliance, but he said he was not aware of any general rising criticism in Asia.

Also, he was pleased with the progress that was being made in strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty alliance; and he denied that the disarmament talks with the Soviet Union were in a state of stalemate.

This was Mr. Dulles in his most optimistic mood. When he was asked about the forthcoming visit of Dmitri T. Shepilov, Soviet Foreign Minister, to Egypt, his only comment was that Mr. Shepilov seemed to be following the Dulles habit of relying on personal diplomacy rather than on written communications through the Embassies.

DULLES RECALLS OWN WRITINGS

And his main point about the recent speech of Nikita S. Khrushchev on the wickedness of Stalin was that he, Mr. Dulles, had known about this all along and had written about it in his book, War or Peace.

Like Mark Tapley in the Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit ("my constitution is to be jolly and my weakness is to wish to find a credit in it."), Mr. Dulles is always full of hopeful visions, especially when things are going badly. And the habit seems to be spreading.

A conscious effort is now being made to give the impression that the President already is back in command of the administration, 5 days after an emergency operation.

Though the administration originally had the Pentagon deal with the Soviet invitation to Gen. Nathan Twining—so as not to give that invitation too much importance—the White House made a special point yesterday of having the President personally take charge of the decision to reject the additional Soviet suggestion that the rest of the Joint Chiefs of Staff accompany the Air Force Chief of Staff to Moscow.

ASSURANCES ON PRESIDENT

Similarly, though nobody, so far as can be learned, has talked with the President since his illness about his campaign plans, his Cabinet members are asserting to all comers that the President will certainly run and that his convalescence will be brief and successful.

Coming on top of the President's recent statement that United States prestige in the world was greater today than at any time since World War II, and his other statement that "European union * * * seems nearer today than at any time in centuries," all this suggests to observers here a calculated effort to encourage the popular belief that everything is going well.

It is only fair to say, however, that this theme, while useful politically, is widely regarded as highly fanciful. The President's illness has occurred at a critical time in the legislative program. It has occurred, too, during a period when the whole policy of the western world toward the Communists is in transition.

This is why Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, was here yesterday, why Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is here today, and why Christian Pineau, French Foreign Minister, and Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, have planned visits to the capital in the forthcoming few weeks.

For the time being, however, "Serendipity" is the word, and since this coincides with the mood of the country, it seems to be a valuable addition to the administration's political arsenal.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Speech by Vice President Nixon on Meeting Soviet Union's Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is not often that I have been prompted to compliment the Vice President of the United States in broad and unqualified terms. That I do so today reflects my enthusiastic admiration and complete agreement with the substance of Vice President NIXON'S remarkable address delivered at the commencement exercises at Lafayette College last Friday night, June 8. I consider this speech a major contribution to our national evaluation of world affairs. The Vice President has given us both a comprehensive and constructive summary of the world situation. It is a statement which should be read and reread, and its message should be reflected in what we say and what we do.

I congratulate the Vice President on making this speech and commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress, asking unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF NIXON'S SPEECH ON MEETING SOVIET UNION'S TACTICS

I was tempted in preparing my remarks for this occasion to discuss at length the economic prospects for the years ahead.

We are fortunate to be living in a period when, for the first time in a quarter of a century, we have had 3 consecutive years of unparalleled prosperity.

The college graduates of 1956 will find available to them the most jobs at the highest wages in the Nation's history.

And it would be fascinating indeed to explore the almost limitless possibilities for expansion of the American economy during the years ahead as we begin to harness the new sources of energy which our scientists have untapped.

Tonight, however, I believe there is a subject of greater importance to this graduating class and to the Nation.

I refer to the titanic struggle between two opposing concepts of life in which we are engaged. The next few years will determine whether we can live in peace and at the same time avoid surrender.

And that question will be answered by how well we are able to meet and defeat the changing tactics of the dictatorial forces which threaten the free world.

From the end of World War II to the death of Stalin in 1953, our problem was a relatively simple one.

Communist leaders all over the world used open threats of force coupled with thinly veiled support of revolutionary and subversive movements in countries designed for conquest. These actions of bluster and abuse inevitably drove the free world together in self-defense.

Then came the death of Stalin and the New Look in Communist foreign relations.

The leaders of the Soviet Union invited the rest of the world to a period of peaceful coexistence. In doing so they seemed to abandon their previous tough line and they have even repudiated some of the excesses of past regimes.

NOT THE WHOLE ANSWER

This change of tactics has understandably created considerable confusion in the non-Communist world.

I think there will be little dissent from the conclusion that in view of the record of the men in the Kremlin the lines of military and diplomatic policy that we have hammered out over the past 10 years must continue to govern our conduct at this time.

But, is this the whole answer?

Do we stand pat and leave all the initiative to the other camp?

Do we act as if nothing has happened in the 3 years since Stalin died?

I answer these questions by saying that we could make no greater mistake than to rest on our oars and to ignore the "new look" in Soviet diplomacy.

If it is made to appear that our primary concern is military hardware, we may find ourselves isolated in a world that has been convinced by the traveling salesmen of the Soviet Union selling other products.

What we face today is a new line which could be far more dangerous in the long run than the Stalin line of bluster and brute force.

It is basically a war for men's minds, a struggle for their allegiance, an effort to win them peacefully to the Soviet camp.

In this struggle, ideas—not guns or aircraft—are weapons.

In this war, our armies wear the university cap and gown, not the uniform of the soldier. Books and pamphlets, rather than tanks and battleships, will be decisive in this contest.

One of the major reasons for the change in Soviet policy becomes apparent.

It was abvious to the successors of Stalin that they could not sell their new line so long as people remembered slave-labor camps, mass purges, and the ever-present terror of the secret police.

Yet, to the outside world, there would appear to be a break with the past and a writing off of the handicaps derived from more than 30 years of terror.

WHAT THE NEUTRALS WANT

And the "new look" was sufficiently appealing in contrast to the old that there was every chance of selling this policy to uncommitted nations, and of breaking off one by one those who had allied together in a common policy of defense.

In the cold light of history it seems fantastic that a nation with the Soviet record of terror and aggression could hope to make widespread gains by announcing a simple change of policy.

At the least, one would expect that all non-Communist countries would adopt a policy of watchful waiting and not make any shift of program until the "new look" had been tried for 5 to 10 years.

Unfortunately, this is not the case.

We must recognize that there are powerful assets which work to the benefit of the Soviet in this contest. Unless we examine them and face them realistically, we may well lose out in the battle for men's minds.

First, let us see what is at stake. Approximately 600,000,000 people live in the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations. It is easy to see that the world struggle will be determined by what happens to these people.

On the basis of my travels through most of this part of the world, may I tell you what I believe the people in the uncommitted nations want and contrast the Communist appeal with our own.

First, there is the desire for peace throughout the world, a desire which is particularly strong in the nations newly freed from colonial ties. This is not merely negative in the sense of war-weariness or fear. It is often something much more positive.

They wish the time and freedom to build their countries economically, politically, and culturally.

To such nations the Communist world talks and promises peace. It appears to respect their desire for neutrality.

By contrast we often seem to be talking war and military alliances.

I do not say that these impressions are correct, but they are more widespread and sincerely held than we often realize.

Second, there is the understandable desire for economic progress in nations less developed than those in the West.

To these nations, the Soviet Union holds up the example of its own dramatic industrial progress under communism.

On the other hand, the almost unbelievable prosperity of the United States appears to many of these nations as a goal impossible of attainment.

Third, there is the desire for recognition, prestige and independence.

In much of Asia and Africa, strong resentments have been built up against Western nations because of past or present colonial and imperialistic policies.

Often there is the deep hurt that springs from real or imagined racial discrimination.

SOVIET ADROITNESS CITED

Here we find that there is a fear of what they term cultural imperialism, an effort by the West to dominate the thinking of other nations rather than to respect their cultures and religions on an equal basis with ours.

And here again the Soviet has been adroit in recognizing this desire. Compare, for example, the tactics of (Premier Nikolai A.) Bulganin and (Nikita S.) Khrushchev (Soviet Communist Party leader) in dealing with the peoples of the Far East and their tactics in Great Britain.

A fourth point to note is the attitude of many peoples toward material things in contrast to the intellectual and the spiritual. This is difficult to express accurately.

In one sense, all peoples are concerned with economic and material problems. They must produce to live.

Yet, at the same time, there are often profound differences in the relative place assigned to these activities.

In many areas of the world a place of honor is given to leaders in the arts and intellectual fields and in religious activities.

The intellectual is not dismissed as an egghead. The artist is not called a longhair. The minister of religion is not considered an impractical idealist.

Here again we find that many peoples think that we in America are too materialistic to have such ideals. We are considered anti-intellectual, deficient in culture, superficial in religion. Again, I am not passing judgment on the truth or falsity of these charges. The important point is that they are widely believed.

And what is truly amazing is this: That the apostles of communism can parade as exponents of the very ideals that they accuse us of neglecting when their own philosophy is the ultimate in materialism and the antithesis of religion.

THE BASIC QUESTION

But we find again how cleverly they present their case.

They point out that the scientist and the intellectual is held in high esteem in the Soviet Union.

Artists and writers are among the highest paid and most honored citizens in their regime.

Even the persecution of religon is played down by the claim that worship is free, and that only political activities of the churches are suppressed.

We now come to the basic question: What should our policy be in the light of the new Soviet tactics?

We must, of course, continue to maintain adequate military strength at home and we must try to keep alive our vital alliances abroad.

We must continue our programs of economic assistance and avoid, if we can, the possibility that less-developed nations will be forced to become economic satellites of the Soviet Union.

But our military and economic programs, essential as they are, may not prove to be the most important elements in this battle.

Of this we can be sure: The uncommitted nations are not going to be frightened into alliances with the West by military power, nor can their allegiance be purchased by dollars.

What will probably be decisive in this struggle is not how much each side does, but how it is done.

That is why we must, at whatever cost, place additional emphasis on developing the kind of ideological program which is designed to win the minds and hearts of men.

Before I discuss details of such a program, may I suggest one fundamental condition that can make the difference between success and failure?

Whatever we do, we must deal with other people as our moral and spiritual equals.

Nothing is more infuriating or more likely to make our program fail than a boastful or condescending attitude on our part.

It is dangerous to parade our material wealth or economic achievement.

IN A MISSIONARY SPIRIT

This may merely create envy, rather than admiration, on the part of other peoples.

In a sense, we must deal with other nations with the tact, humility, and friendliness of missionaries.

Indeed, we could learn a great deal in our foreign relations by studying the attitudes and methods of the Christian missionaries who have won friends throughout the world.

They came to help the nations to which they were sent.

They learned their languages and customs.

By taking literally the truth that all men are brothers under God, they were accepted into families and homes of distant peoples.

Once we have this attitude, our task is to convince others that democracy and freedom and all the rights and privileges we hold sacred are better for them than is the Soviet way of life.

It is not enough to denounce or expose communism. We must show that we have a better alternative.

We do not do this by parading our superior material standard of living.

It is the total pattern of life that must prevail—not merely one phase of it.

May I make one point clear at this time?

There is no question but that we have the better case to sell.

Because basically we are on the right side. The side of freedom and justice, of belief in God—against the forces of slavery, injustice and atheistic materialism.

Ours is the truly revolutionary dynamic idea. It is the Communist idea which is repressive and reactionary.

How do we get our message across?

I believe that often too much reliance is placed upon the effectiveness of bombarding the uncommitted countries with radio broadcasts, motion pictures and press releases which present the American viewpoint.

These programs are important and necessary, but, in the long run, I believe there are others which are more effective.

FOR THE COST OF A BOMBER

May I emphasize first the overwhelming importance of expanding our program for exchange of persons. This includes high-school youngsters who spend a year living with American families and going to our schools, colleges and university students who get their degrees in American schools, and the leaders program under which each week 50 or more foreign visitors—leaders in business, government, labor, and education—come to the United States as guests of our Government to talk with Americans who are in the same field as theirs.

In this way our guests learn about us firsthand, correcting false impressions they may have had about us.

It is particularly important that we expand this program in countries newly released from colonial status.

Here the need for trained leaders is often the greatest. Many times students will graduate from a university and almost immediately take a high political position in their native lands.

From a long-range point of view, we can gain immensely by programs of this nature.

For the cost of one large bomber we can make friendships that will benefit the free world for generations to come.

President Eisenhower's brilliant proposals to American educational institutions and foundations aid in expanding educational opportunities throughout the world is in line with this approach.

If the free world can teach the leaders of tomorrow in areas that may well dominate tomorrow's world, we need not fear the contest between communism and freedom.

There are those, of course, who may point out the fact that many of those who today oppose western policies were trained in western universities.

But they oppose us because we taught them ideals of freedom while we were keeping their lands in colonial bondage.

Now that great areas of the world are free from colonialism, we have a good chance to win back the friendship and loyalty of leaders of these lands.

In addition to Government-sponsored activities, it is important that every American who goes abroad or who deals with foreign guests in our own land realizes that he is an ambassador representing our Nation.

All of us must try to be sensitive, understanding, and helpful.

Arrogance and boastfulness make enemies—not friends.

And particularly we must appreciate the high place given to intellectual and spiritual values in many areas of the world. This places a tremendous responsibility upon our tourists and business visitors, upon the exporters of motion pictures and books; indeed, upon anyone who is likely to be taken as a representative of our way of life.

I was reading an article the other day that showed the importance of these attitudes. It concerned the great atomic scientist, Bruno Pontecorvo, who left Great Britain to devote his genius to Soviet atomic research. One of the important reasons for his defection, according to his colleagues, was the fact that he thought he would have more honor, prestige, and even greater freedom of research in the Soviet Union. Likewise, many of the scientists who got caught in the Soviet espionage network in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were partially influenced at least by the feeling that they were not sufficiently appreciated in the free world. The world of tomorrow belongs to the nations that lead in scientific research and technical skill. We shall pay a great price if we fall behind in this contest.

In discussing our need to win the war for men's minds, I have said little about direct contacts with the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Today we can have such contacts almost for the asking.

If the present trend continues in the Soviet Union and in many satellite countries, it will be possible to meet broadly with these peoples, to exchange ideas, to compare our respective ways of life.

Many of my fellow Americans are rather skeptical about this new move. They suspect, with some justification, a hidden trick; possibly a device to make communism respectable and to discourage the peoples held in submission by Red armies.

I do not fully share this point of view. I think that the explosive power of freedom is greater than the combined effect of all the atomic and hydrogen weapons in the world today.

Whatever be the motives behind these new moves, I think that in the long run the cause of freedom will be served by breaking through the Iron Curtain wherever an opportunity is presented.

The task ahead of us is a task for all the American people, and not Government alone.

In time of war we are prepared to risk our lives serving with the Armed Forces of our country. But the war for men's minds is a real war and just as important as the struggle of armies, navies, and air forces.

You in the academic world are particularly fitted to serve in this contest. May I suggest that you graduates and you of the faculty give thought to the part that you can play.

On an even broader sphere, I hope that the learned societies of the United States with their counterparts in other free nations will devote time and energy to extend their study to this great struggle for allegiance.

Jointly, you should embark upon a peaceful crusade for freedom.

Some should volunteer for service abroad, just as soldiers volunteer for special missions.

The best thought of our best minds should be given to this burning problem.

It was once said that "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

This challenge has echoed through the ages. It is as valid today as it was when it was uttered more than 19 centuries ago.

We believe in truth and in the power of truth.

We believe in such basic truths as man's equality under God, the dignity of man, the rights of each individual to live his life in peace, the sacredness of law, the benefits of political freedom including the freedoms guaranteed in our Bill of Rights.

These truths are the great heritage of mankind.

We are confident that they will prevail.

And it is the task of this generation to make sure that our confidence is not misplaced and that all Americans will rise to the challenge that faces us.

Written on Human Parchment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Dr. Richard F. Staar, professor of political science and departmental chairman, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.:

WRITTEN ON HUMAN PARCHMENT

(By Richard F. Starr)

Historical events are usually a mere backdrop to individual lives. They are like the rhythm of a distant drum that punctuates the melody which is seldom, if ever, the melody itself. Not with Europeans, however; with them history and social problems are so closely interwoven with the most intimate events of their lives that they make an inextricable pattern. And so it is with Stefan Bandos. When I look at his life, I see as if in a mirror a fragment of his country's past. His personal motif runs like a thread through the tapestry of history. All that he ever did and all that ever happened to him was directly caused and conditioned by Cleo's hand.

Born in a small town, then under Russian occupation, Stefan learned in the cradle, rocked by patriotic songs, to love his country and freedom above all. When did such terms as oppression, resistance, political struggle become real to him? As soon as bitter experience proved that to speak his mother tongue or to sing national songs in public was a ruthlessly punished political crime. When did he learn loyalty to a common cause? As soon as he was old enough to understand the meaning of long convoys of chained men on their way to Siberian mines. When did democracy cease to be an empty sound and become blood and tear reality? The day a pogrom of Jews was carried out by the Czar's "Black Hundreds."

By the time Stefan was 10, he had become an experienced conspirator. He thought in terms of secret meetings and of political propaganda; he dreamed of heroic deeds, of martyrdom for the country, of victory and freedom. At an age when children of other countries play with popguns, marbles, and waterwings, he spent his free time standing guard at the entrance to a hideout where a secret course in the history of his country was held, or distributing pamphlets of a subversive nature. His was a tense and exciting childhood filled with childish fears and adult hopes, with childish thrills and adult enterprise.

The death of his father left a widow and three boys in reduced circumstances. Stefan, who at the ripe age of 12 found himself, so to speak, the head of the family (being the oldest of the sons), had to go to work after school hours. He obtained a tutoring job. Among the boys in his class was the son of a local Russian police commissioner, a stupid lout, who was the despair of teachers and parents alike. Teaching him was a difficult and repugnant task, but the commissioner was appreciative of Stefan's efforts and paid well. He also praised the young tutor to his friends, and soon there were more students for Stefan to coach. This meant an increased income for the family but kept Stefan running all day long from his classes to one tutoring assignment after another. In his rare leisure hours he attended political meetings and lectures. Such a schedule left no time at all for any of the activities that are considered as normal for boys of his age in other countries.

By the time Stefan (or "Stefek," as he was known to his family and friends) was 17, he fell in love. The girl's name was Ada, and she was pretty. Her main charm, nevertheless, was her strong patriotism and great idealism. Had Stefek been less absorbed in his work, he might have married her and thus found the happiness that most men consider the goal of their life. But, obsessed with his dream of freedom and national rebirth, he relegated Ada to the fringe of his attention. The girl soon realized that she was merely an appendage to more weighty matters. In her hurt she withdraw, threw herself into a whirl of political activities, and finally married a man who had more time for pretty speeches and lovemaking. Stefan's other friends, both girls and boys, were strictly connected with the underground movement. It is worth noting that they belonged to various nationalities and religions. There were Roman Catholics, Jews, and Greek Orthodox among them who were united in a struggle against tyranny and in a fight for the rights of man.

Stefek was almost 18 and in the last year of his junior college (Gimnasyum, as it was called), when the Russian political police arrested some university students in the town. The papers that were found on them were incriminating, and one of the trails led to Stefan Bandos. The same evening his mother's house was searched, and two agents remained to arrest Stefek when he came home. But he did not return that night. The grateful police commissioner, whose moronic son Stefan had tutored with good success, warned him of what was in store for him unless he managed to escape. The following days Stefek spent in hiding. Then, after a hurried and fearful goodbye with his mother, he left and made his way through the "green border" (i. e., illegally) to Prussia. His mother had given him all the money she had been able to raise, and on this he traveled to Hamburg, where he took a boat—steerage, of course—to the United States.

Stefan does not like to recall his first years in America. But it is not hard to guess that they must have been heart-breaking and very difficult for a young boy who had neither friends nor relatives in the new country, and, worst of all, who did not know a word of English. Stefan had never done any physical work back home, but until he had mastered the language, manual labor was all that he could undertake. His first job was in a quarry. It consisted of carrying and throwing heavy rocks into a stone breaking machine. When he realized that even his powerful constitution could not stand this work, he took a job in a dress factory. From there, having acquired a rudimentary English vocabulary, he went to a metal plant where for the first time he saw machine tools, and where became interested in mechanics. Hunger, want, back-breaking toil. At last he knew enough English to resume his studies. What he experienced during that period of initiation he never forgot: a deep understanding and sympathy for the underprivileged remained with him through the years.

He enrolled at Cooper Union. Working for a living by day, he attended classes at night. I do not think this schedule left many free hours, but whatever time he had he gave to meetings and lectures organized for European immigrants. Later, after he had "found his feet" in the new country and when his material needs became less pressing, he established a technical magazine for European workmen who found it hard to understand English terms, and he wrote for his mother and brothers to join him. When they arrived, they took a small apartment in New York City, where Stefan could attend Columbia University and where his brothers were enrolled in a high school.

Stefek was still deeply involved with his studies, his magazine, and various educational and cultural enterprises which he was furthering for the benefit of immigrants when he met Julia. At that time she was barely 17, but already deeply interested in the same things that he was—social questions and work among the Europeans. Stefan, whose various activities were never of a profit-making nature, had no money in the bank and no time for a long courtship. In spite of that, he and Julia were married, to the great joy of Stefan's mother, who had always feared her eldest would marry a "foreigner" (i. e., an American).

It would be interesting to find out the details of those first years of married life. Two young people, completely poor, but full of social dreams. Unfortunately, Stefan and Julia seldom talk about these times. Thus, I can only guess at what they were like and at how Stefek, from an impecunious dreamer and apostle, became the prosperous professor that I remember from my student days. Julia, though sharing his ideals, was a woman and, therefore, a realist. After a daughter and a son were born, she probably prevailed on Stefek to give up some of his dreams and to settle down to a teaching job. And so he taught mechanical engineering at Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland and at the University of Toledo and Michigan. Somewhere in between there was a venture into business, but it was extremely short, business being altogether too mercenary for Stefan's tastes. Of those years he reminisces about a pleasant, well-run, comfortable home, a shady street, and a car in front of the lawn. It must have been a good life, but it did not satisfy Stefan. Still under the spell of his old country, in spite of Julia's protests, he decided to return to the small town of his birth, partly to be with his mother (who had gone back some years before and who was becoming very feeble), but mainly because he wanted to see his beloved country, at last free, and to take some part in her development.

The Bandos family sold their home and migrated back to Europe. Here, history was to catch up with Stefan again. When in the course of World War II the Germans overran his country, Stefan as a matter of course, threw himself into the resistance movement. Just as in his childhood days, it was pamphlets, underground newspapers, secret gatherings. Radios were taken away from all of the conquered peoples, but Stefek, as an American citizen, was permitted to keep his, with the warning that he was to listen only to German stations, and he was to repeat none of the news he heard. This did not daunt him, and he became the chief source of information for the local underground press. It was one of his jobs to listen to Allied communiques, to jot them down, and to forward them to the right persons. He also helped financially innumerable people in the community and aided Jews and persons politically suspect to the Germans to escape over the "green border" into adjacent countries still unoccupied by the Reich.

German terror increased methodically month by month, and by 1941 Stefan realized that he could do little to help his native country, while his wife and children were exposed to great danger. Urged by Julia, he finally decided to return with his family to America. Accompanied by his young son, Stefan made the trip to Berlin, where he went to obtain new passports and visas from the American Consulate-General. It was the end of April, and passage was booked on a boat which was to leave Lisbon, Portugal in July. Back from Berlin, the Bandoses got busy disposing of their furniture and household belongings, packing personal things, and saying goodby to friends.

The catastrophe came unexpectedly. The middle of May, Stefan's son was arrested by the Gestapo, and 5 days later the same thing happened to the father. At first they were kept in the local political prison, already jammed with the best of the community's citizens. After many months of confine-

ment and abuse, after innumerable questionings by the Gestapo and confrontations with other members of the underground, they were taken to Koenigsberg and put on trial with the other resistance fighters. Many of them were sentenced to death and guillotined. Stefan, who undertook his own defense, spoke with so much power and such dynamic force, argued so vehemently, and mocked the enemy so fearlessly in the German language that he made an impression upon his captors. They convicted him for high treason against the Reich, but, instead of capital punishment, gave him 9 years at hard labor.

At the Allenstein Penitentiary in East Prussia, where he was sent to serve his term, he soon won even the Germans' respect by his great courage and intelligence. Recognizing his outstanding ability, they made him inspector of the torpedo parts department of a war plant which the prisoners operated for the German Army. Right under the noses of the jailers, Stefan devised means of carrying out sabotage. It was so effective that thousands of cases of precision parts were made useless. He would have paid dearly for his audacity, had the Germans time to punish him. Fortunately, when the sabotage was detected, the Red army was on its march west, and soon the Germans had to withdraw. All the political inmates of the penitentiary fully expected to be put to death by the retreating Wehrmacht, as that was what happened in most cases. This time, however, they were formed into columns and marched out of the prison under escort. They were probably to be taken somewhere to dig trenches for the Germans. One day, the Russians evidently made an unexpected advance, for the sounds of battle grew very near. Stefek and some other men escaped from the prison convoy, then scattered and struck out for themselves, trying to get away as far as possible from the others, knowing they would be harder to find in smaller groups. Stefan was so weak after 4 years of imprisonment, semistarvation, and suffering that he could not go far. So, when he saw a farmhouse, he persuaded his companion to enter and ask the farmer for food and shelter. Three days later, he was still at the farm when the Red army occupied that sector. Besides Stefak, his companion and the farmer, there were also in the house two Russian women slave laborers. The "liberators" promptly raped both of them and then made ready to shoot all of the men, including Stefan. His fluent Russian and courage saved them, nevertheless, and he even persuaded the Red army officer, who was to have been his executioner, to arrange for a lift on an army truck, as he was trying to get to Odessa, from where he hoped to obtain a boat to France or England.

His trip to Odessa was an Odyssey, bristling with hardships and perils. It took 45 days of travel and then several weeks of waiting in the port of Odessa before he finally reached the questionable paradise of a refugee camp near Naples, Italy. There he spent 6 months awaiting passage to the United States, where Julia and their children had already arrived after many and various experiences of their own.

In 1946, at the age of 65, Stefan started life all over again. Like that first time when he came to America, he was penniless. But he had his family and many friends. On the other hand, he lacked the hope and energy that had carried him through his younger days. He saw his beloved old country still bleeding after years of German terror, suffering again under Russian tyranny. Once, long before, he had thought the future would bring freedom, a better life.

Today, he sees nothing but more tragedy, new and bloodier wars. He sees not only his native land, but the whole of the Old World, lost and submerged by a wave of barbarism. This time he knows that his old country, his own and his children's future, the world's tomorrow, live here in the United States.

Every time I think of Stefan Bandos as he is now, the lines on the Statue of Liberty come to my mind:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Were not they expressly written for such as he?

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner on June 4, 1956, 1,500 members of the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party listened to a stimulating address entitled, "Our Special Interest Is the People." Our guest speaker was Chester Bowles, the former Ambassador to India and the former Governor of Connecticut.

Mr. Bowles' provocative address deserves the widest possible audience. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no dissent, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWLES ADDRESS STIRS AND ENLIGHTENS AUDIENCE ON INTERNATIONAL THREAT

I don't want to put too much weight in a name, but what a good name you have—the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota.

Your party is, as our party must always be, a party of farmers and those who labor, a party which believes in democracy. Since most of us work on farms or in cities, in one way or another, this means we are a people's party. And that, I think, is our mark, the thing that identifies us as Democrats, a concern for the people, for all the people. We believe that what is good for the people is even good for General Motors.

Of course, some giant corporations would like special status and privileges as artificial legal persons without accepting special duties or responsibilities under the law. And there are some people who find a party based on farmers and laborers quite distasteful, and who every now and then in a thoughtless moment even catch themselves saying so.

But how tragically these privileged individuals are out of tune with the America of New England Puritans and western pioneers, the America of sweat and tears and brotherhood of which Walt Whitman sang, the America that builds and labors and creates. From Thomas Jefferson to Franklin Roosevelt, our party is rich with the story of men who were born into privilege but who left the shelter of the great houses their fathers built in order to serve and work with the people, in order to participate in the materialization of the American dream.

WHO ARE THESE MINORITIES?

The Republicans' Madison Avenue public-relations men have tried to put over the idea that the Democratic Party represents special interests. They even accuse us of representing minorities. Let's see who are these minorities, these special interests? Farmers, factory workers, Negroes, immigrants, and second-generation Americans, small-business men, cooperatives, unions, housewife consumers, the old, the sick, the needy, the ones who need social security, health insurance, or aid for education.

It doesn't take much arithmetic to see that these minorities amount to the biggest majority there is. The party which has their interests at heart is not a special-interest party but a party dedicated to the greatest general interest there is—the general interest to which our Constitution is dedicated, to promote the general welfare. It is the party of we, the people.

Whatever may be our personal preferences among the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination this year, and whatever may be the outcome of the California primary tomorrow, I think we can all agree that the common denominator among them is this concern for the people, and the primaries have already shown that each has strong support among the people.

JEFFERSON DID NOT FEAR PEOPLE

"I am not among these who fear the people," Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our party, once wrote. "The will of the people is the only legitimate foundation of any government," he added. The truths which in the Declaration of Independence Jefferson said, were self-evident, the truths of human equality and the rights of man, are still the truths which guide our party.

They were the truths which led Andrew Jackson, a rugged man of the people, to come out of Tennessee, to bring frontier democracy to Washington, to usher the small farmers of the West and the tradesmen and workers of the cities into their long-overdue day in the sun. It was a great experiment to extend the franchise to the poor, the propertyless, and the untutored.

Jackson did not fear the people, and he had faith in democratic law as the way to promote the general welfare. When in his hour of crisis some southern extremists talked of nullification, Old Hickory looked them straight in the face and with all the fire in his soul told them, "Our Federal Union! It must be preserved." And he gave the leadership the country required in upholding the law of the land.

Now when I look at the present administration, I realize what a difference there is from this tradition of Jefferson and Jackson, what a falling off there is from the days of Roosevelt and Truman. Washington, D. C., could well stand another healthy dose of the frontier democracy of Jackson, and I might add of Harry Truman, of Independence, Mo. And it needs a revival of the tradition of the Jefferson and Roosevelt example of unselfish public service for the benefit of all the people and not for special privilege.

NOT FROM EXCLUSIVE COUNTRY CLUBS

The associates, friends, and advisers of Truman and Roosevelt were from all walks of life, and not taken largely from the roster of Wall Street firms or exclusive country clubs. In the New Deal and the Fair Deal there was no confusion between the interest of the giant corporations and of the country at large.

Nowhere is the difference clearer than when you read President Eisenhower's press conference. I do not object that, when asked about some important question, he so often says he does not know, although his batting average is bad compared with the previous two Presidents.

What I object to is the fact that so often the issue about which he confesses ignorance, and demonstrates no personal concern, is an issue relating to some human being. He has general answers to questions of grand strategy, but he seldom knows anything about the most pressing human issues in which his administration or the country is involved.

What did he know or say or do about all the shenanigans of his administration during the McCarthy-John Schine affair? Why did he consider it beneath him to take action on behalf of Ladejinsky, the land-reform expert who was fired by Secretary Benson on absurd grounds at a time when he was doing more to stop communism than any American in Asia? Do reports of such things never reach him?

What about the cases of injustice in our security-risk program which former Republican Senator Cain has tried so unsuccessfully to call to the President's attention? Why did he have nothing to say, no leadership to give, on the case of Miss Lucy, or Emmet Till, or other instances of violence which put this country on trial before the world?

PLAYING GOLF

I do not object to the President playing golf with corporation heads. I object to his inattention to the needs of people who are not corporation heads. I object to his inability or unwillingness to lead in solving some of the greatest problems before all the people—particularly, for instance, the crisis in school desegregation and the need for a vast program of aid to public education.

In foreign policy the story is the same. This administration has failed to provide adequate world leadership because it does not understand people. It looks coldly—and not even very intelligently—at diplomatic reports, military analysis, geopolitical factors; but it is not in the habit of seeing the world in terms of people.

Yet the greatest power in the world is people. People armed with ideas—with faith, with hope, with fears, with human needs. There are some 2.5 billion of us now in this human race, living in the neighborhood of this world. More than 2 billion live off the land, and the rest work in cities. If there were a world Democratic Farmer-Labor Party its majority would be pretty impressive.

It is because our Democratic Party under Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman has been concerned with people that it has been able to sense the aspirations and problems of people throughout the world, and has thus provided true world leadership, leadership that stopped the march of communism in Europe and the Middle East and kept us in tune with the world.

WILSON STIRRED HEARTS OF PEOPLE

Wilson stirred the hearts of people everywhere when he raised the sights of the First World War from a naked power struggle to a war to make the world safe for democracy. He provided the vision of a world organization strong enough to enforce peace, the vision people needed. When the country chose the bumbling normalcy of the Republicans in 1920, the League lost its chance. World War II and its terrible destruction became inevitable.

Roosevelt in World War II was able to sense the revolution rising in the world, the revolution which Wendell Willkie saw, of people on the march for freedom and equality and progress, and Roosevelt's four freedoms have not been forgotten.

Truman, too, understood the people, he saw the human needs of a devastated postwar Europe, and he saw that the challenge of communism could not be met by guns alone, but only by positive peaceful performance, and he supported a great Secretary of State, George Marshall, in proposing the Marshall plan. That plan was not negative, but in the best American spirit, designed not against anything, as Marshall said, but hunger, poverty, chaos, and misery. And because it was positive and creative the Marshall plan gave new life to Western Europe and stopped the westward flow of communism.

Then came the 1948 campaign when Truman placed his faith in the people and took his case to the people with a fighting Fair Deal for our workers, farmers, and businessmen, a vigorous civil-rights platform, and won, and with his inaugural came the great creative idea, point 4, which gave new hope for democratic change to the awakening underdeveloped world of free Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and South America.

WILSON, ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN UNDERSTOOD

Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman understood the world revolution in which we live because their view of the world saw people as human beings and not as numbers.

Theirs was the same view of the world which Jefferson demonstrated 10 days before he died, when writing of the Fourth of July and the Declaration of Independence he said: "May it be to the world, what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which * * * ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government. * * * All eyes are opened, or opening to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few, booted and spurred, ready to ride them."

There in the words of the founder of our party is the world revolution of our time in a nutshell. For it was with us that Jefferson's prophecy came true, and now finally to all' has come the bursting of the chains, the demand for an end to colonialism everywhere, and the liberating knowledge that modern science and technology make possible the ultimate ending of poverty.

UNLEASHING AND LEASHING CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Now we have had 4 years of an administration that does not have this vision, this understanding of our world's facts of life. We have had 4 years of emphasis on a narrow military approach that ignores politics, economics, and geography of a negative approach to everything, of going against the Asian revolution, of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek (and then leashing him), of opposing U. N. plans for a world economic development authority which our neighbors have been repeatedly proposing, of appearing to side with the feudal landlords, the vested interest, the colonial powers, of worrying about food surpluses, and letting farm incomes fall in a hungry world, that cries for a bold plan of distribution of surpluses to deficit areas, of, in fact, betraying the spirit of the American Revolution, which is the spirit that the world expected of us. And the result is that much of the world thinks of us as militaristic, warmongering, a threat to peace, negative.

Yet we are entering a new era in world affairs. Great changes have been taking place in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death. Forces have been released which may be difficult for any new Soviet dictator to chain. After a generation of suffocating tyranny and fear, the Russian people are showing that their desire for freedom remains, and the Russian collective dictatorship has shown that it cannot wholly ignore the demands of the people, at least during this period of uncertainty after Stalin, when the new regime is unsure of its power and support. But even as many of us fear this may be only a brief respite, the denunciation of Stalin and of police state methods and the promises given of greater freedom to come are encouraging, and may produce in time the fundamental changes we have been hoping for.

How has the Republican administration reacted to this challenge? We would be wise to be cautious. But we have been totally unimaginative, we have lacked faith in ourselves, we have had no vision. The Russian moves in all probability may be no more than a change of tactics; they may not represent any genuine about face. But why should we be panicky about a relaxation of tensions, even a temporary relaxation? Why should we haggle over the exchange of persons. Why should we not encourage the lowering of the Iron Curtain in every possible way? Why should we not take the lead in proposing an exchange of farmers, of students, of people on all levels? It will be good for Russians to see the extraordinary things we have accomplished in the West which make a lie out of what they have been told about us. It will be good for Westerners to move about among Russian people, to meet them and prove we wear no horns. Why not accept this shift and try to encourage it? Who can gain but ourselves by the contrast?

SUSPECT RUSSIANS BLUFFING

If, as we suspect, the Russians are bluffing, let us call their bluff. Let us make it difficult for them to go back to the old ways. Let us ask the Russians to join us in a world development program in which we each put up a certain percentage of our national income. Let us propose that much of the development aid be given not from nation to nation, in competition, but through the U. N. where it can be administered in the name of the whole human race. If, as I believe, Russia wants to use economic aid solely for her own special political purposes, she will refuse to let it be channeled through the U. N. Then it will be clear to everyone that it is we and not Russia which really wants peace and prosperity for all people.

Let us go to work to beat the Russians at the new game that they have opened up. It is the kind of competition which is naturally designed for us: Economic construction, building, pioneering. If ability to meet them effectively at this new game turns the Russians back to the old strategy of cold war, what have we lost? We will have gained the good will and understanding of a new skeptical world.

Moreover, if we go into this new peaceful competition with the right American zest the whole world may become so involved that no nation, not even a little band of willful men in the Kremlin, will be able to divert the world's attention from the No. 1 business before mankind.

In developing positive plans for the creation of durable bonds of economic self-interest with the non-Communist world, we start with some enormous advantages. The Soviet Union under a totalitarian government can operate, of course, with somewhat greater flexibility. Her rate of economic growth is more rapid than ours, and she is turning out more trained technicians and scientists.

Yet for many years to come our economic capacity will be far ahead of Russia's. Not the least of our assets is our huge farm productivity. I believe the day soon may come when we will stop looking at our store of 1.4 billion bushels of grain and 10 billion bales of cotton as a white elephant in a world where most of the people are ill-fed and ill-clothed, and recognize it as an opportunity and a blessing.

The habits of thinking which now limit our capacity for action on such questions are deeply rooted in most of us. Yet these man-made economic roadblocks are by no means as formidable as those which kept us immobilized in the depths of the great depression. As millions of hungry, unemployed people

walked past grocery stores overflowing with unsold food products, Republicans leaders could only say: "We know it is wrong. But what can we do about it? These people have no purchasing power."

Yet by the summer of 1933, under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a substantial majority of the American people had thrown its support behind programs for economic expansion and reform which broke abruptly with the outmoded economic folklore that had so recently held us back. Millions went back to work; farm income rose; factories began to hum; and old facilities were expanded. Everyone benefited as the flow of capital and purchasing power raised living standards and set new horizons of mutual opportunity and growth.

MUST MUSTER IMAGINATION

Now, as in those days, we must muster our imagination and initiative to chart new ground. We must find ways to fit productivity to needs in international economics as we have already done so successfully within our own borders. And as we discover the economic mechanisms necessary to accomplish this objective, vast new opportunities will open up here in America and throughout the world.

So it is time for a change. It is time for the election of an administration in this country which will enable us to meet the new Russian competition in the American spirit, and most important of all, will enable us to join hands with the majority of the world's people who are not Western and not Soviet, but who are mostly farmers, who labor in the sun and have more color in their skins than most of us.

If we can join hands with this great middle world of free Asia, the new Africa, and South America, then it will not matter too much what the Kremlin does. Because we will then have frustrated the Kremlin and stopped the Russian revolution in its tracks, because we will have guided the world revolution of our time into the channels of democracy and freedom.

To do this we need an American president, someone with the vision of Jefferson and Jackson, someone who understands the world because he remembers the American Revolution and who will look at the people of the world, as Roosevelt did of this country in 1932. We need a President who will call on all nations to join with us through the U. N. in a war on want that will keep us all busy with full employment and full production and expanding opportunity for the rest of our lives.

I trust that this summer in Chicago our party will nominate such a candidate. I trust it will adopt a fighting platform that will not compromise on civil rights or a fair deal for all people at home; I trust it will not hesitate to raise this new vision for the American people and for all mankind.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Dinner of the Liberal Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered on June 13 at the annual dinner of the Liberal Party, which was held in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE 12TH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, GRAND BALLROOM OF THE COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 13, 1956

At this hour, we are all deeply perplexed by the incongruous paradox of the present world situation.

At this hour, the international Communist movement should be wasting away with sickness in its soul, as a result of the posthumous trial and conviction of Joseph Stalin by the men who knew him best.

Yet at this very hour, when the late leader of world communism has been found guilty, by his own colleagues, of tyranny, torture, murder and genocide—at this very hour, world communism appears to be making new friends and influencing great numbers of new people.

To understand this paradox requires insight. To meet the resultant challenge demands imagination.

As for the challenge, we surely have the capacity—mental, moral and physical—to win the age-old struggle for human freedom against inhuman tyranny.

But we cannot win this titanic battle with cardboard weapons of self-delusion, self-complacency and self-adulation.

We dare not delude ourselves into believing that world communism is weakening when it is actually renewing its drive, using new methods, to extend its world influence.

We dare not be complacent about our alliances and our relations with our allies while they are being assiduously and seductively wooed with large-scale, easy-term Soviet trade and aid.

Above all, we dare not give even tacit acceptance to the dangerous claim of the present administration that all is well, that the cause of peace and freedom has been advanced, and that happy progress has been made toward a better, a more just, and a safer world.

Yet this unwarranted atmosphere of smug self-satisfaction seems, in fact, to have become widely substituted for reality in America today.

I have before me page 1 of the New York Times of June 1.

In column 5 is a story in which Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Military Commander of NATO, is quoted as saying that "the Western alliance was approaching its supreme crisis in the face of dangerously powerful Soviet world propaganda." That is a grim and, I believe, a true warning.

In column 8, on the same page, is a story quoting President Eisenhower as saying that "certainly the prestige of the United States since the last World War has never been as high as it is today."

Which of these two contradictory statements reflects the truth of the present situation?

In a further comment, General Gruenther emphasized the assertion that the Communists are relying heavily on their armed strength. Their recently announced reduction in armed forces, said General Gruenther, according to the New York Times, was "a small chip from what is still a vast monolith of power." Nothing the Russians have done "in their new policy of smiles, happy talk, and receptions," added General Gruenther, "could justify the least reduction in United States assistance to NATO." General Gruenther was talking realistically, based on factual observation.

But, on the very same day, the President of the United States is reported as saying, "We have largely nullified the Soviet Union's reliance upon force and threat of force." The proof of this change, he said, lies in the fact that the Soviet Union "has gone to different kinds of influence."

Now, which of these statements corresponds more to fact and to the truth?

I fear that we are making a philosophy out of smugness. The present atmosphere that all is well in the world, generated through every possible medium of mass communications, seems to reflect little awareness of the tensions and problems which confront us in Cyprus, in Israel, in the Arab States, in Yugoslavia, in Soviet infiltration of the Middle East, in north Africa, in Formosa, and Asia; in Montgomery, Ala., in Tallahassee, Fla., and in Washington, D. C. In short, we have been and are being encouraged, no matter what we may hear or see, to believe that all problems have either been solved or on the way to solution—as a result of the brilliant leadership of the administration team.

I say that we cannot afford the delusive and narcotic effects of such smugness.

To be smug is to set ourselves apart from the millions of people who are on the move in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. Those millions are restless, trying to shake off the cold grip of poverty and oppression that has held them tightly for centuries. Those millions of people want status—and not the status quo.

In terms of the world struggle for human rights, the smug side is the losing side.

We cannot win by talking big—and acting small.

We cannot win by preaching equality and practicing discrimination.

We cannot win by wooing our foreign friends and then slamming the doors in their faces with the loud thud of our present discriminatory Immigration Act.

We cannot win the hearts of the underprivileged of vast continents while serving privilege at home.

We cannot launch a vast offensive for freedom while Congress pinches every penny for foreign aid.

The world is on the march. We cannot afford to mark time.

We can win the day if our deeds match our words. We can win if our hands do what our lips say. We can win if we apply the pioneer spirit to our newest frontier: the struggle for human rights.

In the past our great democracy has shown an infinite capacity to deal with mammoth problems: economic, political, and social.

We have made great progress in human rights, in scientific development and social justice.

The saga of America's past and recent progress as a nation, honestly told, is an inspiration to any people in the world about to embark upon the great and challenging experience of self-government.

But while giving an honest picture to the world of what we are, we must also look deeply and constantly at ourselves to see what we still have to do. In assessing and describing our own unsettled problems, we will find a closer identity with the millions of restless ones around the world; and perhaps they, too, will find in us a common soul and a common purpose.

Chief of all our domestic problems is the plight of those who are still denied equal civil rights to a major degree in some parts of our country, and to some degree in all parts of our country.

In this field, as in others, we have of course, made progress. In the last decade, we have seen the white primary ended in the South; racial covenants in real estate deeds are no longer enforceable in the courts; segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate travel have been abolished; in the District of Columbia and in many States, discrimination and segregation have been outlawed; an increasing number of States and localities have passed fair employment practices acts.

During the last 4 years the single most historic development was the Supreme Court

decision outlawing segregation in public schools.

But the single, most dramatic development, in my judgment, has been the emergence of the Negro people of the South, themselves, as active factors in the struggle. They, themselves, with strength, patience, unity, and forbearance have made the Montgomery bus strike a symbol of their new and active role, and of their deep understanding of both the will and the way to win.

The movement toward full civil rights in America has, like all progress, elicited cries of panic from its opponents. As they see the old order changing, they mobilize desperately for the counterattack, to halt further movement and to attempt to recapture ground already lost.

Recent acts of racial repression have shamed America. We have seen social ostracism, economic boycott, political disenfranchisement, and physical violence directed against white and black, who have sought to advance the democratic process.

We seem to have come to that point, in this struggle, where it is no longer possible to contain the situation with shreds of compromise. The issue must be resolved.

On this issue, the voice of the Nation is clear and resonant.

The Supreme Court decision was that voice, speaking in restrained tones, from the most august level of government. That voice has spoken the conscience and determination of millions of Americans: Black and white, North and South, Democrat and Republican.

In this struggle between law and those who would evade and defy the law, I do not see how any responsible American can be neutral. I am not neutral. I stand on the side of the law.

In this struggle between the oppressed and the oppressors, I am not neutral. I stand with the victims of oppression.

I confess I am no neutral in the conflict between the law and the Constitution, as stated by the Supreme Court, and the defiers of the law, as organized by White Citizens Councils.

I do not believe that the President of the United States can or should be neutral, as between the Government he swore to uphold and those who would paralyze and shame that Government.

Nor do I believe that the Congress of the United States can or should be neutral.

In the Congress, the Supreme Court decision must stimulate the enactment of the necessary legislation for the realization of all the goals set forth in that decision.

The first step in this direction is the repeal of that great roadblock to civil rights legislation in the United States Senate—Rule 22, that rule which permits a minority to frustrate the will of the overwhelming majority. And after the repeal of rule 22, or even without it, legislation must be pressed to assure to every American equal opportunity for political participation, equal access to public facilities, including schools, and the equal protection of all the laws, regardless of race, creed, or color.

These things must and will come to pass. Let them come now.

We must finish the job of winning full civil rights for all Americans—first, because it is morally right and legally correct; second, so that all the world may know that America, in 1956, like America in 1776, carries high the torch of human liberty. I find it not only appropriate, but important, to discuss this matter—America's role in holding up the torch of liberty—before this gathering of the Liberal Party of New York.

I consider the Liberal Party to be one of the principal forces in New York State and in the Nation, in steady support of advance and progress toward the goals of freedom and fulfillment for every man, everywhere.

Around me at the head table, and at almost every table in this gathering tonight, I recognize valiant fighters for liberty—economic, political, and social. These are not only fighters, but veterans of years of successful struggle—men and women whom I have known as fighters for these causes long before the Liberal Party came into existence.

I know of no more gallant, dedicated, and devoted leaders of the forces of liberty and progress than my old and close friends, Dave Dubinsky, Alex Rose, Adolf Berle, Dr. Counts, and Dr. Childs.

I am a lifelong member of the Democratic Party and I have never belonged—and never shall belong—to any other. But I am proud that I have had, in every political race I have ever run, the support of these men and their associates and friends. My friends too. Men like Luigi Antonini, Charlie Zimmerman, Isador Nagler, Ben Davidson, and many others too numerous to mention. May I say tonight, as I have on many other occasions, that I have considered it an honor and a great privilege to have received the endorsement of the Liberal Party each time I have run for public office since the Liberal Party has been in existence.

I have been glad to publicly acknowledge the vital support I have received from you by joining the name of the Liberal Party to my own party in my designation of affiliation in the records of the Senate.

And, above all, I have valued with pride the personal friendships and associations I have made—friendships which have been above and beyond politics or political purposes—friendships and associations I will cherish so long as I live.

And now, some brief and final thoughts on the problems which we all face.

We face the challenge of the future of America, and of the cause of democracy and freedom.

We are not meeting that challenge today. We are shrinking from it. We are hypnotizing ourselves into a trance of self-contentment and complacency.

There is so much to be done; there are so many evil forces to beat back, so many looming dangers to be confronted, and so many problems to be resolved lest they overwhelm and overcome us.

There are great new frontiers to be opened; mighty mountaintops of human progress to be climbed. Yet we hear today few clarion calls to action and achievement.

We must move forward in the field of housing, in the field of immigration and citizenship legislation, in the field of minority rights, in the field of atomic energy and its peacful uses, in the field of social security and social justice. We must learn how to share our great technical know-how with other peoples and how to learn from other peoples the great know-how of philosophic and historic experience and cultural appreciation. Above all, we must seek to achieve a just, free, and peaceful world. All these are goals, some immediate and some long range, to challenge the best and most that there is in us.

For new ideas on ways of achieving these goals, we must look to individuals and groups of individuals who dare to think in new and different terms; who dare to be nonconformists; who dare to be unorthodox—who dare to move ahead into uncharted areas of thought.

I consider the Liberal Party to be a group of such trailmakers. I hope that it will always continue, and even intensify, its explorations in these vital areas. I can think of no greater or more pressing need for our country, for the free world, and for humanity itself.

Let us set our sights on these distant goals and proceed to march forward with strong and active faith in ourselves and in the principles of freedom and democracy.

Memorial Day Address by Judge Nelson Schwab, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by Judge Nelson Schwab, Jr., at Wesleyan Cemetery, Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the REOCRD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY NELSON SCHWAB, JR., WESLEYAN CEMETERY, CINCINNATI, OHIO, MAY 30, 1956

Some of you may realize the emotions I feel standing on this platform in Wesleyan Cemetery on this Memorial Day. For you see, my grandfather, who spent his entire adult life on Blue Rock Street, and my father, also born and raised in this neighborhood, have both performed similar duties in years gone by. I mention such facts not out of boastfulness or egotism but rather in a spirit of pride in this community where we revere and respect our precious traditions and heritages.

My young sons, whom I hope may one day stand here too, asked me why we celebrate Memorial Day, and it set me thinking of the answer. So I reread Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes' great Memorial Day address in 1884. It was before the GAR post in Keene, N. H.; and Holmes told of his Civil War experiences. He spoke of his having been wounded, of different events in battle, and of his memories of Army companions living and dead. He said that Memorial Day meant to him the reaffirming from year to year of a national act of enthusiasm and faith.

And I think all of us who have fought in wars reflect back today on our experiences. We think of the men we served with, the ships we were on, and the lands we operated in. We think of those who did not come back. And I think all of us relive the glory and the honor of having served our country in uniform.

But I believe that there are reasons today which lend new and even greater significance, meaning, and importance to Memorial Day. We see too often today a feeling that references to patriotism and love of country are somewhat embarrassing or foolish flag waving. A sincere and meaningful celebration of this day with sober reflection about the duties and obligations which this day implies is one sure cure for such false thinking.

I read recently an article in the U. S. News & World Report where an Army doctor was interviewed about the brainwashing of American soldiers captured in Korea. He outlined the insidious and subtle techniques used by our enemy to confuse and weaken our young men. This Army major concluded, however, that too many of our young men had yielded to Communist brainwashing. He was asked this question:

"What do you consider the basic defect revealed by the success of this Communist program on so many Americans? What's missing? What's wrong?"

And he answered, "The basic defects lie in three areas:

"First, in the area of character development and the development within young people of an internalized system of discipline.

"Second, in the area of general education, particularly education about the American democracy, which, I think, has suffered at the hands of those who cry havoc at any hint of what they choose to label 'nationalism.'

"Third, in the area of military preparedness, which in the minds of a great many people resolves itself simply into a problem of mechanics, ballistics, push-buttons and guided missiles rather than emphasizing the moral and characterological elements in war."

The second reason given by the Army doctor is the need for more education about our American democracy interests used most on Memorial Day. Because I feel one of the purposes of this day should be to review what our American democracy means to us and to rededicate ourselves to the task of teaching our children about our country and what it stands for.

And I think we are doing a good job in this community in this regard not only on Memorial Day, but throughout the year.

Our many fine veteran organizations are doing their part and I think our churches, schools, and public officials are doing the same.

In 1954 the Cincinnati school board published a pamphlet called "Foundation Values of American Life." This was sent to all schools for use by parents, teachers, and pupils. And these are the foundation values of our American life which this pamphlet discusses. These are the values which form the framework of our heritage:

1. Recognition of the inherent worth of each individual.
2. Recognition of the spiritual and religious foundation upon which our values are dependent.
3. Importance of continuance of education throughout life.
4. Need of leadership based upon merit proven by competition.
5. Respect for truth and intellectual honesty.
6. Respect for our system of justice.
7. An understanding of the freedom of association in American life.
8. Respect for property and the right to own and dispose of property.
9. An appreciation of the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.
10. Recognition of our need for steady improvement by proper processes.

Industry is doing its share in teaching patriotism too. You may have seen the book entitled "Freedom Is Not Free." It was printed and published right here in Cincinnati and it tells of the fundamental principles and practices of our form of government and of the rights and obligations of all of us as citizens. And this book has been passed out in many industrial plants throughout the country.

The above are merely illustrations. There are countless other public and private efforts being made to make people aware of our precious heritage. But in sipte of all this, more must be done. This to me is the reason, the purpose, the spirit of Memorial Day. To pay tribute to those who have fallen—to reaffirm and restudy the foundation values of our American life, and to rededicate ourselves to the task ahead.

Housing's Winding Path

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor an editorial entitled "Housing's Winding Path." I think the editorial is a very good one, particularly in view of the very fine housing bill the Senate passed recently, and one which seems to be very good, that the House committee reported within the last day or two. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING'S WINDING PATH

The Senate's action in voting authority to build far more public-housing units than the administration had requested adds one more turn to a trail which differing viewpoints and partisan maneuvering have been tracing since 1949.

In that year a Democratic Congress, with the general backing of conservative Republican Senator Taft, passed the Federal Housing Act of 1949. This authorized Federal cooperation to built 810,000 units over the following 6 years.

In 1953 President Eisenhower toned this down to an annual figure of 35,000, and probably felt relieved when a Republican Congress cut this to no lower than 20,000. Next year he asked to subsidize 140,000 units in the next 4 years, but Congress authorized but 35,000 for the next year only.

In 1955 the President asked for the same number, 35,000 annually, but only for 2 years. Then the now Democratically controlled Senate made a move quite similar to the recent one: It called for a minimum of 200,000 and a maximum of 800,000 units in the following 4 years. The House pulled this back sharply to 45,000 for 1 year only. But the Democrats had placed a liberal effort on the record.

In its latest action the Senate has voted to restore the 1949 goal of 800,000 units. By midsummer three-eighths of these will have been built or contracted for. The remainder the President is told to build at 135,000 per year or, at his discretion, at somewhere between 50,000 and 200,000 in any 1 year. The House is expected again to cut this back. Again, and in a campaign year, the Democrats have chalked up a liberal effort.

Politics aside, whatever else the House may do it might well consider the latitude offered the President. At a moment characterized both by fear of inflation and fear of recession the authority to expand or trim a sizable chunk of public works has no little merit. Its use might help considerably to keep the economic scales in balance.

Why the Delay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Times for June 2, 1956.

This editorial states what we on Congress know well, that the American people want a complete reexamination of foreign aid, and they expect Congress, not the executive branch, to make the study.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE DELAY?

For more than 6 months suggestions have been mounting that the foreign-aid program needs a complete overhaul. They have come not only from Congressmen and Americans in private life, but from the foreign recipients of United States aid.

Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who is next on the list of Kremlin red-carpet visitors, suggested on the eve of his departure for Moscow that American aid henceforth should be in the form of long-term loans rather than outright grants.

French Foreign Minister Mollet, whose country since the war has received American aid second only to Britain, recently said the United States was detested when it gave away money.

Now the General Accounting Office, which keeps track of how the money is ultimately used, reports that the foreign-aid program suffers from poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating capabilities of recipient countries and overambitious programs.

These critical remarks could be multiplied many times to prove that the present American aid program is in dire need of reexamination and revision.

In Washington much lip service has been given to the need for a new study of foreign aid. But no one has acted.

This so obviously is a responsibility of Congress it is incredible that both the House and Senate seem reluctant to move. Of course no study started now can contribute to full appraisal of the 1957 program. But if Congress doesn't get off its cushioned complacent chair soon it will be too late for such a study to have any value for the 1958 program.

Furthermore, if pressure continues, the executive branch of the Government will start a study outside Congress' jurisdiction. And Congress should know by now what that means—a once-over-lightly whitewash of the present program.

This waiting for something to turn up is Micawberism at its worst. No wonder hardly a day passes when the Bolsheviks don't grab the initiative in some other corner of the world.

The time to start a thorough study of foreign aid is now. The agency to do this is Congress. If Congress shirks this responsibility, we hope the voters who pay the bills will remember it this November at the polls.

Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, ever since the Supreme Court decision, a little more than 2 years ago, relating to segregation in public schools, there has been much discussion of this matter—not only in the South but throughout the Nation.

The Alabama Christian Advocate is the publication of the Methodist Church in Alabama. It opened its columns for discussion of this subject, and the subject of race relations generally. Many people took advantage of this opportunity to state their views. One of those was a clergyman of many years of service in the church. He speaks forcefully out of his long experience as a Methodist preacher. I refer to Dr. James A. Chandler, of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACE RELATIONS

(By Dr. James A. Chandler)

Jesus taught the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but that doctrine does not forbid the segregation of nations, races, or social circles.

Equality before God in His atoning love does not demand social equality or the right of anyone, white or colored, to enter indiscriminately any and all circles of society. Neither does it demand or justify the indiscriminate integration of Negroes into either white school or white churches, or the white into Negro schools or Negro churches.

SEGREGATION WITHIN RACES

Both the white race and the Negro race practice segregation in their social circles, and there is no divine law against it. If Negroes practice social segregation among themselves in their various circles of culture and at the same time love God and their race, where does the Negro get the idea that he has a divine right, without mutual consent, to integration with all white people anywhere and everywhere, hotel, church, school, or what not, without any restriction whatsoever? It does not make good sense, and the Bible does not teach it.

The relations between the two races have been amicable for long years. There were no strained relations until professional agitators created them, but even now the vast majority prefer their own churches and to associate with their own color. It was Booker T. Washington, perhaps the greatest leader the Negroes have ever had, who said: "We can all be separate as the fingers socially, and as united as the hand in working to help each other and the South."

To men of good will, segregation is no indication of either race or class hatred. It is accepted philosophically. There is no sin in segregation until some agitator creates it.

SEGREGATION NOT DISCRIMINATION

Segregation does not necessarily mean the supremacy of one race over another race, nor the superiority of one class over another class. It is not a matter of to what genes one can or cannot trace his ancestry, or whether one's blood unmixed can be traced to a certain source or stock. It is not a matter of all nations springing from one blood or the opinion of some scientists that all blood is the same. Perhaps so, in a matter of blood transfusion, but the fact remains that in genetics a Negro's blood begets its kind, and a white man's blood begets its kind. There, too, was a time when there was only one language, but God changed all that (Gen. 11: 1-9).

Segregation is simply a matter of congeniality, or what and where one race or another is and prefers to remain. "Birds of a feather flock together." It is natural. God Himself made people like that. It fosters peaceful relations, with respect for all and malice toward none. Both races can be brotherly and deal justly with each other, though separate, which they did very acceptably until Russia's propaganda of desegregation and integration was sold to our country.

THE LAW OF LOVE

There is one big fact that all equalitarians seem to forget and that is that the moral law of love for one's neighbor is a "two-way street." It embraces not only one's rights for himself but his duties to others. That means if either a white man or a colored man considers it his right to enter some circle of society of a race different from his own, that circle or society has an equal right to forbid it and to prevent it, if possible to do so by lawful means.

If the law of love prevailed in society, the simple virtue of modesty, decency, and humility would prevent intrusion upon the privacy of others or any desire to seek a social preferment where one is not wanted. Both colored and white would accord to every man the right to choose, by mutual consent, his own company. There would be no inferiority complex or a personality bitterly sensitive to its own rights. There would be no display of rudeness, presumption or familiarity to provoke discord. Deference is oftentimes a Christian virtue and an indication of noble birth.

Jesus taught that the humble man will not seek the upper seats, or the higher levels, but will wait to be invited to them, with the assurance that "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Luke 14: 7-11). That Christian virtue would prevent any man, white or colored, from demanding association with some sphere of society where he knows he would be persona non grata.

JESUS OPPOSED FORCE

The law of love condemns impudence. Modesty is an indication of potential greatness. It may mean that a man is fit to be on a higher level. But men cannot happily and profitably gain a higher level by demand but by proving themselves qualified for it and worthy of it. To seek that level by force would be uncouth and reveal a lack of quality for the equality level sought.

If the law of love prevailed, there would be no fight by agitators of either race, in church or state, to obtain by force or revolution the social privileges to which one race or another may consider itself entitled. Jesus did not advocate political force. Said He, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." (Matthew 13: 33). It works silently, imperceptibly, slowly but surely. God's kingdom is not extended by force, political pressure, or court decisions. Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world" and it "cometh not with outward show," (John 18: 36; Luke 17: 20). If so, the Christian concept is opposed to carnal weapons, political pressure, or court procedures as a means to further its interests. "Let go and let God."

The time element is necessary. A mushroom may grow overnight, but the sturdy oak requires long years. Growth cannot be forced. It can grow only by a proper adjustment to the elements. If those who favor immediate radical measures to obtain what they term their social rights would bide their time in patience and rest upon the merits they claim—if they would trust the leaven of Christ's kingdom to work out the leveling process of society, all social problems would be solved in God's own time and way.

RUSSIAN HYPOCRISY

This social revolution that now confronts us was hatched in Russia. The Soviet Union demands worldwide desegregation and integration, but it is a well-authenticated fact that she does not practice it among her own people. In the central Asian region of the Soviet Union, there is a union of five Soviet republics, covering an area larger than all western Europe, populated by 20 million people mostly of strong Mongolian strain, a colored race. But Russia very hypocritically demands for all other nations social equality and integration, though she herself does not practice it but provides private schools for her own people. Russia's program is bait for the American people and they have swallowed it. Both of our political parties, our Supreme Court, and many churchmen have fallen in line with Russia's nonsegregation propaganda. It is well known that the purpose of Russia is to array class against class and to create division and frustration throughout our country and the whole world. Her success has been alarming, phenomenal, unbelievable. That program has no scriptural foundation. Russia hates our Bible and says there is no God.

Basic in Russia's often declared purpose to conquer the world is her plan to make all men equal. Equal indeed. But her leveling process is always to level down, not up. It is a plan to pull down patricians, higher-ups, even kings from their thrones, to a common level. It is not a plan to lift up the common man, white or colored, to a higher level but to reduce them to the level of puppets and slaves. That will be the result of the Communist program, if it ever gains control in this country.

RACIAL MIXTURE UNDESIRABLE

This political fight involves much more than social equality and desegregation. Mongrelization, or intermarriage, is the avowed aim of the leading equalitarians and the Negro press of this country. Mongrelization, or integration leading thereto, is contrary to the law of nature and to the plan of God, who "divided to the nations their inheritance," "separated" them, and "determined the bounds of their habitation," (Genesis 10: 5, 31, 32; Deuteronomy 32: 8; Acts 17: 26). If God had intended there should be one nation, one race, one color, one language, or one world, all mixed and living together as one people, all equal and no barriers, He would have so determined it (Genesis 11: 1-9). On the contrary, He established the nations and segregated them. He taught them and all people to love one another and to live in unity of spirit—not equality, but unity in one great diversity.

God segregated the Hebrew people and sought to keep their blood pure, or unmixed with that of a different people. What was divine for or a virtue of the Hebrew people certainly cannot be "a sin" for the white race today. The preservation of racial purity is a God-given instinct, and, being so, it cannot be inconsistent with the law of love.

By fault or favor of the white man, the Negro is far from the bounds of his divinely appointed "habitation." Africa is his home. Both Jefferson and Lincoln favored his deportation to Africa. Jefferson organized and sponsored the Colonization Society of Virginia, which deported some 10,000 Negroes to Liberia. The movement failed for lack of funds. Jefferson wrote, "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people (Negroes) are to be free nor is it less certain that the two races equally free cannot live in the same government."

The law of nature (to produce "after their kind"—Genesis 1: 21—and, naturally, to choose association with "their kind") and the law of love, which Jesus taught, must harmonize with each other, because God is the author of both laws, and therefore they cannot be opposed to each other.

Neither the law of nature nor the law of love forbids the segregation of nations, races, or social circles.

The Purpose of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the Theodore Roose-

velt Centennial Commission, as prepared by the Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION, 1858–1958—PURPOSE

To restore to American life Theodore Roosevelt's inspiration and guidance as "the greatest teacher of the essentials of popular self-government the world has ever known";

To give the widest possible circulation to his conviction that "the fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend on the type of citizenship developed on this continent"; and

To stimulate industry, labor, education, the church, and every other element of American life to use their capacities and resources to make American men and women, American boys and girls, alert and responsible citizens, who feel in their hearts the hunger that was in Theodore Roosevelt's, to make America, throughout the world, a bugle to the free, a beacon to the enslaved.

The Armistice Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Times for June 2, 1956.

This editorial points out that two of the so-called neutral members of the so-called Neutral Nations Commission were known to be Communist stooges of the Soviet Union.

It is easy to understand why the Communists insisted on putting their partisans on a neutral commission, to hide the buildup of Communist strength in North Korea, and carry on espionage and subversion in the Republic of Korea. I should like to know what strange hidden influences in our State Department, and its allies outside the Department, engineered our consent to this disgraceful political surrender of our hard-won victory, and to the humiliation of a valiant ally.

Congress should not rest until it uncovers the focal point of this deadly political infection, because that is the only way to prevent another Korean war, and another Communist victory when we sit down to talk peace.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMISTICE FARCE

The United Nations command finally has caught up—part way, at least—with the farce of "neutral" supervision of the Korean armistice.

Because it was loaded from the start with Communist pawns and spies in the name of those fine old neutrals, Red Poland and Red Czechoslovakia, the Communist side consistently has thumbed its nose at the truce terms.

The only provision they have observed is no shooting. But that is scant assurance they don't ever intend to shoot again, what with their massive buildup of artillery and jet planes in North Korea.

The United Nations has known about this all along, but has waited until now to act. And it has taken a half measure, at that. It simply bars truce teams from operating in South Korea. This won't stop the move of Red arms and jets to North Korea but it should end the espionage which has been so flagrantly conducted by the Poles and Czechs under a white flag in South Korea.

Moreover, acting in collaboration with the Communist military forces, the Red observers continually have obstructed attempts of the two real neutrals, the Swiss and Swedes, to investigate violations going on in the north.

Since the Communists obviously have no intentions of living up to the armistice terms, there is only one thing to do to end the supervision farce completely. That is, to rack up the whole commission. The United States early last month suggested this step to our allies, but nothing has come of it. Switzerland and Sweden are conscientious members who don't want to run out on a job that has been handed to them.

We should renew pressure to abolish this meaningless setup—and keep our powder dry in Korea. Being conscientious rarely pays off in dealing with communism.

Soviet Attitudes Toward Settlement of Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Richard F. Staar, professor of political science, and departmental chairman of Harding College, entitled "Soviet Attitude Toward Pacific Settlement of Disputes."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ATTITUDE TOWARD PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

(By Richard F. Staar)

Ever since the October revolution and the successful overthrow of the Kerensky government in Russia, the Communists in that country have characterized themselves as "champions of international peace." In support of this contention they have called upon the world to view the array of peace notes, appeals, and declarations, records of conferences on interwar problems and disarmament, treaties, and pacts of neutrality and nonaggression which the Soviet Government has either supported or entered into over the years. On its face this is an impressive record indeed.

In order really to understand the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the pacific settlement of international disputes, one must first determine what the Russians actually mean when they talk about "peace" or "war." The purpose of this paper, however, is merely to review the record of Soviet diplomacy, in order to determine the U. S. S. R.'s bona fide attitude toward the international settlement of disputes.

DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATION

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated and shown in practice a preference for bilateral talks rather than other means of settling disputes. This has been exemplified in many conciliation treaties. The Soviets have always claimed that their international agreements are more stable than those of any other state.

The fact of the matter is that the Russians have kept faithful to treaty obligations only when such a course was to their interest.[1] During the years that the U. S. S. R. was weak and afraid of being crushed, it sought security through negotiation (1920–21), international conferences (1922–25), political agreements (1925–31), connection with the French alliance system (1932), the League of Nations (1934–39), and Hitler (1939–41).

The situation following the Second World War was predicted 27 years ago by a Soviet international lawyer:

"The splendid isolation in the traditional policy of the United Kingdom will be reproduced historically by the Soviet Republic, with the difference that not water will separate Russia from the European Continent but borders of a different character * * * those of the Great Concept."[2]

Today the frontiers of de facto control have extended to include most of the Balkans and half of Germany.

GOOD OFFICES AND MEDIATION

Both of these methods are essentially similar. There are only a few examples of acceptance by the Russians of mediation offers by other powers. The Allied Powers invited the Bolsheviks to Prinkipo in January 1919 for a conference that would conclude the civil war then raging in Russia. The Soviets immediately accepted by radiogram.[3]

This meeting failed to bring about peace. A second attempt was made in March 1919, when William Bullitt unofficially represented the United States on a trip to Moscow for the purpose of determining the possibility of acceptable terms to both the Soviets and their enemies. The former signed a draft treaty, thus showing their willingness to conclude peace with the anti-Bolshevik forces.[4] The agreement never went into effect.

A third example under this same category was the Soviet acceptance of a 1926 French mediation offer concerning a dispute with Switzerland. The trouble arose from the assassination of a Bolshevik diplomat. The Russians agreed to remove their boycott of Switzerland, providing that the latter meet certain conditions.

It would seem on the basis of the foregoing prima facie evidence that the Communists recognize the value of mediation by third parties. Such a superficial conclusion breaks down, however, when one examines the setting in which these incidents took place. The Bolsheviks were in extremely precarious conditions.

The first two illustrations happened during the civil war, when the Soviets were battling for their very existence on all fronts. The last example took place at a time, when the political situation was extremely dangerous due to the exhaustion and disorganization resulting from this same civil war. In view of the preceding, it would seem more justifiable—especially since the U. S. S. R. to date has never accepted any other offers of mediation—to assume that the positive Soviet attitude toward good offices and mediation was not manifested ex principio but rather because of necessity.

COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY

This method of settling international disputes involves a definite procedure, established at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. The Soviets have never resorted to such factfinding commissions. The reason for this negative attitude was explained by Maxim Litvinov in a 1922 speech:[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Commander Hilton Young has asked whether it is impossible to find an impartial judge in the whole world. It must be established first that there exist not one but two worlds: the Soviet and the non-Soviet * * *. One party [to a dispute] will propose a Communist judge, like the chairman of the Third International; the other party perhaps the head of the League of Nations * * *. Maybe only an angel could solve the Russian problem."

Even U. S. S. R. satellites have been candid in their criticism regarding international commissions of inquiry.[6] Neither the Soviet Union nor its Balkan satrapies (Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria) permitted United Nations' commissions to enter territories under their control during the civil war in Greece. A similar refusal met the later attempt by U. N. representatives when they attempted to perform their legal duties in North Korea to bring about free elections.

ARBITRATION

The Russians prefer diplomatic action or even commissions of conciliation to this quasi-judicial process. They welcome arbitration only for commercial disputes on questions involving the conflict of laws, that is, private international law.[7]

Again the reason for this attitude has been made quite clear by Soviet writers:

"The necessary minimum and basic premise for any arbitration is a community of mind on legal principles. Insofar as such a community is lacking, any attempt to secure an impartial authority for two parts of humanity that speak such different languages is a priori hopeless."[8]

In other words, there are no impartial states when a question involves differing economic systems according to the Communists. The idea of compulsory arbitration by third parties, therefore, has always been opposed by the U. S. S. R. The following exceptions only tend to substantiate this rule.

In a treaty signed by the Soviets with the proletarian government of Finland on March 1, 1918, compulsory arbitration was one of the provisions. Both parties to the agreement were, however, workers' states. Also, the arbitrator was to be selected from the proletarian party of Sweden.

In December 1922, the Russians accepted the principle of international arbitration for political disputes with non-Socialist states, under the condition that a simultaneous agreement for disarmament be signed.[9] It was known a priori to the U. S. S. R. that the capitalist states would not accept the latter stipulation. In view of this, the whole proposal takes on the character of a propaganda maneuver, calculated to prove at no cost the peace-loving nature of the Socialist fatherland.

The Soviets have demonstrated that they prefer to settle disputes by means of mixed commissions. Most of the treaties of conciliation, signed by the U. S. S. R. between the two World Wars, contain provisions for such commissions.[10]

All Russian treaties of this type are restricted by the provision that if agreement is not reached through conciliation, then no further obligation rests on the parties. The conciliation commissions are paritary and do not have a neutral chairman.

Soviet conventions for conciliation procedure usually contain a provision for submitting all disputes—regardless of nature—between the two parties, which cannot be settled through regular diplomatic channels within a reasonable length of time.[11] Some of these treaties contain explicit reservations. One is found in the convention with Poland, which precludes the applicability of conciliation to disputes concerning territorial questions.

Some Soviet treaties provide that precedence be given to special procedures established by previous agreements binding upon the parties. If such special procedures are provided for in these other agreements, the disputes falling under their provisions are not approached in accordance with the treaty for pacific settlement, but, instead, are handled in conformity with the provisions of the special agreement.[12]

Many of the treaties signed by the U. S. S. R. provide for the appointment of different commissioners for each session of the commission, despite the fact that the commissions established by these treaties meet periodically. They are, in a sense, more permanent than the so-called permanent commissions constituted by other treaties, which seldom if ever convene.

Each of the countries appoints two persons from among its own nationals. The sessions are presided over by one of the nationals of the party in whose territory the commission is sitting. Meetings are held alternately in the capitals of the two states. A session usually lasts 14 or 15 days and is held toward the middle of each year.

Under the system of annual sessions, no applications are necessary, except when one of the countries demands an extraordinary session. In that case, the party requesting the meeting must inform the other party of the urgent circumstances occasioning the request. With regard to ordinary meetings, each state shall communicate to the other, through the diplomatic channel, the list of questions which it desired should be dealt with at that session (identical in all treaties).

Often, experts appointed by the parties are allowed to be with the commission as advisers. The conciliation commission usually decides the procedure of its meetings. Any person is heard, whose evidence is deemed to be useful. The countries are obligated to furnish the commission with all data and assistance that is found to be necessary.

All members must be present for the proceedings. Most treaties require a unanimous decision. The commission submits a joint report on all disputes referred to it as well as a consolidated settlement proposal on the basis of interpretations that must be sound at law.[13] It usually recommends that its proposals be accepted by the two parties through diplomatic channels. The high contracting parties are bound to inform each other within 90 days as to whether they accept the proposals.

There have been some examples of mixed commissions established for a specific purpose. One was set up to map the Soviet-Afghanistan boundary by a convention between the two states.[14] The commission had three persons from each side and was empowered to decide the ownership of islands. Its report was subject to approval by the two high contracting parties. A similar mixed border commission was provided for the following year in an agreement between the Soviet Union and Finland.[15]

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

This topic relates to disputes arising from transactions between non-Communist individuals or corporations on the one hand and Soviet state trading corporations on the other. As such, it concerns only one state directly—the U. S. S. R.

The Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission in the All-Union Chamber of Commerce was established in Moscow by decree of June 17, 1932.[16] Soviet agencies transacting business in the United States, for example, always included a clause in their contracts with American corporations which provided that arbitration would take place only before this Soviet commission in Moscow. All decisions were final and binding.

A post-war trade agreement with Poland contains a similar provision. Article XI of this agreement, which was signed on February 2, 1946, by the Minister of Navigation and Foreign Trade of Poland and the Foreign Trade Board of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany, reads as follows:[17]

"All disputes arising out of the present contract or in connection with it shall be subjected to the pronouncements of an arbitration commission attached to the All-Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Moscow whose decision is final and obligatory for both parties."

The most famous case of commercial arbitration was perhaps that between the Lena Goldfields Company, Ltd., and the U. S. S. R. The type of arbitration agreed upon here was different from the foregoing illustrations. The Soviets bound themselves in a contract to have a three-man arbitral commission, consisting of a national from each side and a neutral umpire.[18] The U. S. S. R. eventually withdrew its commissioner, Dr. Chlenov, and never paid the 13 million pounds sterling which was later adjudicated as damages.

It would seem that experiences of this type have proven to the Russians that they cannot rely on any third party to see matters from their point of view. Therefore, the Communists now keep to their own Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission, where they are certain that the verdict will always be made in accordance with their wishes.

CONCLUSION

In general, it can be said that while the U. S. S. R. acknowledges the usefulness of international law, it reserves the privilege to deny the application of those provisions that it finds inconvenient. "This desire to retain freedom of choice springs from the Soviet conception of law as an instrument of the state and the state as an instrument of a dominant economic class."[19]

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Soviet Political Treaties and Violations, S. Doc. No. 85, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955), 62 pp.

[2] E. A. Korovin, Das Voelkerrecht der Uebergangszeit (Berlin: Verlag Dr. Walther Rothschild, 1929), p. 43. Translation by R. F. and S.

[3] Desyat let vneshnei politiki SSSR, pp. 64 ff., as quoted by T. A. Taracouzio, The Soviet Union and International Law (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1935), p. 294.

[4] Sovetski Soyuz v borbe za mir, pp. 66 ff., as cited in ibid.

[5] Conference at The Hague, 26 June–20 July 1922, Minutes and Documents, as cited by Korovin, op. cit., p. 47. Translation by R. F. and S.

[6] "You observe that nowadays Commissions are perfected instruments for painting given situations in the colors desired by their masters. Our [United Nations] Commissions reflect the majority that has been formed here. They do the work which the masters of that majority give them to do, and I think that this provides a further extension of the parallel between Greece and Korea. The Commission which you dispatch will have a majority that will be a reflection of the majority in the Assembly." Speech by Bebler (Yugoslavia) in "Consideration of Dispatch of a Commission to Korea by the General Assembly," General Assembly Plenary Meetings, Verbatim Record, 113th Meeting, 14 November 1947, U. N. Doc. A/PV/113, p. 111.

[7] V. N. Durdenevsky and S. B. Krylov, Mezhdunarodnoye pravo-uchebnoye posobie (Moscow: Ministerstvo Inostrannykh Del, 1946), p. 111.

[8] Korovin, op. cit., p. 47. Translation by R. F. and S.

[9] I. V. Kliuchnikov and A. Sabanin, Mezhdunarodnaya politika noveishego vremeni v dogovorah, notah i deklaratsiah (Moscow: Gospolizdat, 1925), p. 121.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[10] An excellent summary on the subject is available in United Nations, Systematic Survey of Treaties for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes 1928–1948 (Lake Success: U. N. Publications Sales No. 1949 v. 3), 1202 pp.

[11] Compare the conventions on conciliation procedure entered into between the U. S. S. R. and Germany, January 25, 1929, League of Nations' treaty series, XC, 219, Reg. No. 2041; henceforth cited as LNTS; Finland, April 22, 1932, ibid., CLVII, 401, Reg. No. 3614; Estonia, June 16, 1932, ibid., CXXXI, 309, Reg. No. 3021; Latvia, June 18, 1932, ibid., CXLVIII, 129, Reg. No. 3409; Poland, November 23, 1932, ibid., CXXXVI, 55, Reg. No. 3125; and France, November 29, 1932, ibid., CLVII, 421, Reg. No. 316.

[12] "The procedure laid down in the Polish-Soviet Agreement of August 3, 1925, for settlement of frontier disputes shall remain in force. Should they not have been settled amicably by means laid down in the abovementioned agreement, either contracting party may refer them to the Conciliation Commission provided for in the present article." U. S. S. R.-Poland, November 23, 1932, op. cit.

[13] United Nations, Memorandum on the Soviet Doctrine and Practice with Respect to Arbitral Procedure (Lake Success; U. N. Doc. A/CN.4/36, 1950), p. 14.

[14] "Agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Afghanistan on Border Questions," signed in Moscow on June 13, 1946, Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta S. S. S. R., No. 6 (460), February 12, 1947, p. 4. Translated by RFS.

[15] Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Finnish Republic concerning the transfer to the territory of the Soviet Union of a part of the territory of Finland in the District of Yaniskoski Electric Station and the Regulatory Dam of Niskakoski, signed in Helsinki February 3, 1947, ibid., No. 19 (473), June 11, 1947. Translated by RFS.

[16] J. N. Hazard, "Soviet Commercial Arbitration," International Arbitration Journal, I (spring, 1945), p. 10.

[17] "News and Notes," ibid., I (winter, 1946), p. 391.

[18] The three men were Sir Leslie Scott, Dr. S. B. Chlenov, and umpire Prof. Otto Stutzer. For a brief discussion of this case, see Evsey S. Rashba, "Settlement of Disput in Commercial Dealings With the Soviet Union," Columbia Law Review, XLV (July 1945), pp. 539–540.

[19] J. N. Hazard, "The Soviet Union and International Law," Illinois Law Review, XLIII (November–December 1948), p. 606.

Warren, Douglas, and Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial from the Richmond, Va., News Leader, of June 6.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF WARREN, DOUGLAS, AND BLACK

The Supreme Court of the United States handed down three opinions on Monday. Each of these decisions, to some extent, tended to preserve the vanishing powers of State governments and to limit—or at least not to expand—the asserted authority of Federal agencies. From that standpoint, they surely were welcome decisions.

Yet it would be a mistake, in our view, for the States Righters of the Union merely to acknowledge the Court's opinions with a gratified glance and pass on. What the three cases accomplished, among other things, was further to confirm the rise on the Court of a tight triumvirate of federalists—men determined to weaken the States and to expand the national power. We have in mind Messrs. Warren, Douglas, and Black.

FROM CALIFORNIA

Monday's first decision dealt with the strange case of Doris Walker, who obtained a job in 1941 as a label clerk in the Cutter Laboratories. In order to get the job she concealed the fact that she was a licensed attorney; she concealed a record of prior employment with the Office of Price Administration; she concealed the fact that she had been hired and fired by a series of canneries. It was not until long after she had been on the payroll, and had become intensely active in union affairs, that the company discovered she was an active member of the Communist Party. In 1949, Mrs. Walker became president of the union. Shortly thereafter, she was dismissed. The union brought suit against the company, contending that Mrs. Walker had not been fired for "just cause," but rather for her union activities. The California supreme court upheld her dismissal.

On Monday, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the California decision, 6–3. The majority held that the key question was whether the Cutter company had waived its right to dismiss Mrs. Walker by not acting at once when the company learned of her falsehoods and her Communist activities. This question seemed to the majority to involve "only California's construction of a local contract under local law." No substantial Federal question could be found.

To Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting, the majority's action sanctioned "a flagrant violation of the first amendment." Mrs. Walker was being dismissed from a laboratory, engaged in manufacturing critical drugs and vaccines, just because she was an active Communist. This Mr. Justice Douglas could not approve. This was a dangerous innovation. This violated constitutional guaranties of industrial workers.

Suppose, Mr. Justice Douglas went on to inquire, this were a contract that allowed "any employee who is a Republican to be discharged for just cause." Surely the courts would enforce no such discriminatory contract. "It is elementary that freedom of political thought is protected by the 14th amendment against interference by the States, and against Federal regimentation by the first amendment." Why, then, permit the dismissal of a Communist? "Government may not favor one political group over another." To say that Cutter had just cause to fire a lying Communist is to approve "an unconstitutional scheme to discriminate against citizens by reason of their political ideology." "I do not think," said Mr. Justice Douglas, "we can hold consistently with our Bill of Rights that Communists can be proscribed from making a living on the assumption that * * * the danger from Communist employees is too great for critical industry to bear."

Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Black joined in this dissent.

FROM FLORIDA

The second of the cases won little attention. It involved a petition by Dan Durley, 63, who was convicted in Florida of cattle stealing and sentenced to the State penitentiary. He sought his freedom in the Florida courts on a series of petitions for writs of habeas corpus, in which he alleged, among other things, that he was convicted on perjured evidence. When the Florida Supreme Court refused to release him, he obtained a full hearing before the Supreme Court of the United States. On Monday, the high court affirmed the Florida decision, 5–4.

The opinion went to highly technical considerations of law, too complex to be summarized here. It will suffice to say that a majority of the Supreme Court held that Florida's State judicial procedures were not to be interfered with. On the record, the majority found, no Federal jurisdiction had been established.

To Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting the majority's action served only to compound "a shocking case of miscarriage of justice." In his view, the Florida courts were unwilling or unable to discern a miscarriage of justice for themselves. The Supreme Court judges, from their marbled Olympus, can see things mere State judges cannot. He was joined by Chief Justice Warren, and Mr. Justice Black, and in this case, by Tom Clark.

FROM WISCONSIN

The third case came from Wisconsin. It concerned an order entered by the Wisconsin State Employment Relations Board against the United Auto Workers, directing the union to cease violent tactics and mass picketing at the Kohler Co. plant. The UAW appealed contending that Congress had so preempted the field of labor relations that no State, through its own labor agency, could enjoin actions which would be subject to an unfair labor proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board. The Supreme Court on Monday refused to accept this argument. In a 6 to 3 opinion by Mr. Justice Reed, the majority held that the Taft-Harley Act did not take from the States their power "to prevent mass picketing, violence, and overt threats of violence." The dominant interest of the State in preventing violence and property damage, said Reed, cannot be questioned. It is a matter of genuine local concern. The States are the natural guardians of the public against violence. "We would not interpret an act of Congress to leave them powerless to avert such emergencies without compelling directions to that effect."

To Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting, the majority's action created a situation "pregnant with potentialities of clashes and conflicts." It opened a door for unseemly disputes. To be sure, the States may control violence. "They may make arrests and invoke their criminal law to the hilt." But if a State orders a union to stop bullying law-abiding citizens? That, in the eyes of Mr. Justice Douglas, a State must not do. The States transgress "when they allow their administrative agencies or their courts to enjoin the conduct that Congress has authorized the Federal agency to enjoin." Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Black joined in the dissent.

What do we learn from all this? Here are three members of the highest Court in the land, among them the Chief Justice, who equate the Communist Party with a political party; here are three justices ready to seize from State tribunals the power to enjoin violence in labor disputes. These same three Justices, in recent weeks, have joined in voiding the conviction of a notorious Communist, Steve Nelson, on the grounds that Pennsylvania's State Sedition Act was an encroachment upon an exclusively Federal prerogative. They have joined in forbidding New York City to discharge a fellow-traveling professor, Harry Slochower.

Warren and Douglas and Black: Three of nine. Two more such justices on the court, and the States are done for. The power to amend the Constitution, the ultimate control over this Union's basic law, will have passed from their hands. Was it ever in-

tended, we must ask once more, that any five men were to assume the sovereign powers of not fewer than 36 States? That is the intention, and that is the assumption, of these three. However gratified States Righters may be at Monday's majority decisions, let us not forget the fact.

Statement by George J. Burger, Prepared for Delivery Before the Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, prepared a statement to be delivered at the hearings on Senate bill 3341. Unfortunately, Mr. Burger was not able to be present at that time; but he sent the statement to the chairman of the subcommittee, to be inserted in the record. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LEGISLATION OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY, SUBJECT: S. 3341

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the Federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are committed by their majority vote. No officer or group of officers is permitted to speak or act officially for the federation until our entire membership has been polled.

Our members were polled through Mandate No. 213 (official publication of the federation) on the question: "require firms worth $1 million or more to inform Federal antitrust agencies of merger plans at least 90 days in advance of action."

It is to be noted on the mandate the instruction is given to members: "Before voting—see arguments for and against."

The argument for: "This bill strengthens safeguards against monopoly mergers. The 1914 basic law stopped such mergers completed by stock purchase; 1951 amendment closed the asset purchase route. Yet merger total today is three times the 1949 rate, almost equal to the 1946–47 high. Monopoly-threatening concentration is increasing apace. Assistant Attorney General Barnes has said bill will help in merger control, by giving antitrusters time to dig up facts and warn against mergers thought suspect. FTC Commissioner Gwynne says it will make merger law enforcement simpler."

The argument against: "After every merger wave, someone comes up with a new law to solve the problem. But the problem remains, to crop up again. Obviously there's not so much need for new laws as there is for enforcement of existing laws. There's question, too, whether Congress, having saddled antitrusters with new responsibility, will give them additional funds needed to carry out the heavier duties without shorting themselves on funds for other necessary antitrust work. Further than this, even though antitrusters get advance notice, mergers may still be completed."

The result of this poll, as it appears in Mandate No. 214, shows: 70 percent for the proposition, 23 percent against, and 7 percent no vote.

As a matter of record, I request the privilege of having made a part of the permanent record of this hearing, Mandate bulletins Nos. 213 and 214 as they refer to our action on the antimerger legislation.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, as these expressions come from what can properly be termed the "grassroots" of our Nation, we believe it should be of importance for the committee and the Congress in shaping future action on this major subject.

The bill before your committee is S. 3341. We did not poll our members on this bill introduced by Senator SPARKMAN but we did poll on S. 2075, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, which he amended in his new bill, S. 3341. The basic principles involved are the same, namely, antimerger legislation and we consider the membership poll on S. 2075 carried the same implications and instructions to favor this legislation as embodied in S. 3341.

To review our personal appearances before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions in 1948 and again in 1952, you will find our recommendations to those committees in the first instance, in fact the principal and main recommendation in behalf of small business, was for consistent and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws and that the proper steps be taken to amend these laws where actions are instituted which would result in monopoly and increased concentration. Again, our position taken at that time was upon the direct instruction of our nationwide membership, comprising independent business and professional men.

We hold to the premise that if small business is to remain an important part of our overall economy, both at the production and distribution level, the first requisite for their success in the business world, provided they are efficient and have the necessary financial resources, is that the Government must see to it that no weaknesses exist in the enforcement of the antitrust laws and they must take every safeguard to srenghen these laws to protect the small business economy.

It must also be noted for the record that small business is not looking for any subsidies nor are they looking for any special consideration over any other segment of our economy, but they must be protected against any and all merger actions in our economy that would tend to reduce their rightful position or permit a situation to be created that they would be a captive group of the big segments in our economy.

No one knows better than we in the federation, as a result of the daily correspondence from our members, either to the head office at Burlingame, Calif., or to our division office located in Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, and Washington, of the fear instilled in the minds of many small business institutions, that if they come forward and lay the facts on the line as to the situation they face through monopolistic actions, the retaliation that might accrue to them for laying the facts on the line.

Make no mistake that small business is very vitally concerned about the increased merger action in our economy and the increased concenration taking place. They put the question, "When will there be an end and how long are we to remain in our respective business or is it better, as some say, to get out now and close down and hold on to the resources we have at the moment?" I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in their behalf, this is a terrible plight to live under.

I noted with considerable interest the statement made by the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, before this committee in opposition to the above bill. It doesn't surprise us to hear of this opposition from that Department. Is it any wonder that many small-business institutions feel that the Department of Commerce speaks and acts for the best interest of the bigger industries in our economy and that they do not act for the best interest of all businesses and particularly including small business. We recall when the basing-point legislation was up for consideration before the Congress (in which the federation took a leading position opposing this legislation, because we believed the action was monopolistic and beneficial to the big and injurious to small) we found at that time that the preceding Secretary of Commerce favored such legislation. Again that was in the interest of big business.

We were told at that time that if that legislation was not approved it could result in ghost towns, and even certain segments of labor took the same position of favoring the legislation. To the credit of the President at that time, Mr. Truman, he vetoed the legislation.

In the objections by Mr. Weeks, speaking for the Department of Commerce, opposing this legislation, he is reported as saying "that the provision for a 90-day waiting period be eliminated and that mergers be permitted to go ahead as soon as the Government had been notified."

Also, Mr. Weeks was quoted as saying "that the Justice Department should be required, on request, to give a firm legal opinion on a merger, an opinion that, if favorable, would prevent any antitrust suits against the company." I am more than pleased that the Justice Department, through their able, sincere spokesman the Honorable Stanley Barnes, is reported as vigorously opposing such recommendation by the Secretary of Commerce.

Here's a good case in question, and it was an important case that happened shortly before World War II: I'm talking about the time that we officially went into the war. The Fisk Rubber Co. at Chicopee Falls, Mass., a well-known national institution, beginning in the early days of the automobile industry, was acquired or taken over by the United States Rubber Co.

At that time, the Fisk Rubber Co., as I recall, was in a reorganization period and on the way, and very definitely on the way, to remaining an important part in the rubber tire industry. They had national acceptance and furthermore were an increasing competitor in rubber tires to the United States Rubber Co. I know because I had been a member of that industry in the retail trade, at that time, for over 30 years and I knew the acceptance of their products nationwide by the independent tire trade. I repeat, they were a strong growing competitor of the United States Rubber Co. in the sale of tires and tubes.

When this acquisition by United States Rubber Co. was announced, the record will show the fear in the minds of the civic leaders in Springfield, Mass., a closeby city to Chicopee Falls, that if this merger was permitted it might result in the Fisk plant eventually being dismantled and add to unemployment in that area.

The Honorable Thurman Arnold was then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the

Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and it will be found that Mr. Arnold was in a quandry as to just what to do. It is my opinion that he remarked that the matter was of such a serious nature that before final absolution be given to the merger, it should be passed upon by the Federal courts.

There was considerable discussion on the floor of the House at the time this merger was pending and finally consummated. I think this is a good case to bring before the committee as to what could happen if the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce were followed.

A few years before that, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. acquired the Kelly-Springfield Co., of Cumberland, Md.

The irony of the situation in both of these cases is—if there had been antimerger legislation on the statute books at that time, these mergers would have been more carefully scrutinized before they were permitted to be accomplished.

Realize, Mr. Chairman, that if these companies had remained individually owned as heretofore, I mean the Fisk and the Kelly-Springfield, they would have enjoyed the prosperity of war business and probably would have been strong competitors for the four big giants remaining in the rubber-tire industry; namely, Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, and United States.

In my travels, I do run into many people in the course of conversation, and just recently, a very well informed authority in the chemical industry, who apparently is with one of the big chemical corporations, said to me that certain strong financial interests urged him to go into the independent chemical ranks. He said they were amazed when he rejected their financial assistance and he said the reason for his rejection was because of the concentration and the mergers taking place in the chemical industry, that it would be business suicide to risk that splendid financial help from people who had the faith in his ability to succeed in the chemical industry.

Whether it be so or not, I recall during the past decade, an authority in the can business remarked to me that there was not a chance for a small can company to exist with the monopoly and mergers taking place in that industry. He should know, as that was his industry I believe all of his business life.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a more serious aspect in our overall economy in which small business is vitally interested is, with the increasing population which brings about an increasing demand for all types of commodities. Look at the picture of the scarcity of newer institutions being established in the major products in our overall economy. We have requested the Small Business Committees to explore this situation and see what's really happening in our overall economy.

There are 3 or 4 dominating the automobile industry; there are 4 dominating the rubber-tire industry; there are a few bread companies dominating the bread industry; there are 3 dominating the aluminum industry and likewise the steel, copper, chemicals, shoes, etc., and a few milk companies that dominate the mill industry and still merging—why go on? Destroy small initiative and we end up with regimentation or dictatorship.

It's our hope that constructive organized labor at the same time will take cognizance of this situation as it applies to the future of small business, both at the production and distribution level; and we make a plea that they may come forward and give a helping hand to save the free enterprise system.

In conclusion, we recommend the adoption of S. 3341.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Debate Without Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of June 1, 1956.

The bipartisan policy formulated by Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles even before the end of World War II has worked out exactly as its sponsors intended. It reduces our foreign policy debates to a fruitless exchange between internationalist Democrats and internationalist Republicans, while the majority of the people in both parties are left without means to discuss their opposition to the American Government's giving our people's earnings to foreign governments which they wish to favor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBATE WITHOUT ARGUMENT

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told a television audience the other day that he would welcome a "pretty thorough airing" of United States foreign policy during the present political campaign. "I think it's a healthy thing," said Dulles, "that every 4 years foreign policy should be discussed."

It is a healthly thing. It would be healthier yet if the debate were not cut in half and the more troublesome half shoved under the table. As it stacks up now, one side takes the affirmative and the other says, "Yes, but—"

In such a debate, millions are left without a spokesman. They are the ones who say "No" to foreign spending.

The keystone of present foreign policy is to export taxpayers dollars. That is the issue which should be debated yea and nay. Yet in the realities of campaign politics, it is unlikely that any such debate will occur. Democrats are chronically committed to more foreign spending. Unhappy Republican leaders who are capable of leading a crusade against the doctrine of foreign aid are largely silenced by the fear of seeming to be critical of their own party organization during a campaign.

There is tremendous discontent in this country with the idea that America should spend thousands of dollars, for instance, spraying the homes of natives in Thailand with DDT. There is vast unrest at a bookkeeping system which uses mostly American money to support United Nation social welfare programs and gives this country not one ounce of credit. There is a very real constitutional question of the Federal Government's right to tax its citizens to buy highways for Jordan.

The discontent with continued spending abroad is something that cannot be kept down. It erupted in Wisconsin the other day when the State's Republican convention repudiated Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and gave its blessing in the coming Wisconsin primary to Representative GLENN R. DAVIS to oppose WILEY for the senatorial nomination. The issue was strictly foreign policy.

Wiley has been a consistent supporter of the administration's foreign-aid policies. If reelected to a Republican dominated Senate, he would be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. DAVIS is a violent critic of foreign spending. On that basis he won the support of the Wisconsin Republican organization. The same thing happened in Georgia, where Herman Talmadge will replace Senator GEORGE almost solely because of Talmadge's strong position against foreign aid.

In this country, where the people's representatives are supposed to carry out the people's will, the first question for debate should be, "Shall our money be spent in endless billions of foreign economic aid?"

Only when that question is resolved, and only if it is resolved in the affirmative, should the debate proceed to the matter of how and where the money should be expended. To skip the first question and debate only the second one, as it seems likely will be done, is to take the important decision out of the hands of the people and leave to them the worst of two bad alternatives.

What needs to be debated is not how our foreign policy is succeeding in Europe and Asia, but whether it is succeeding in the United States.

The Situation in the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Wall Street Journal an article dealing with the textile situation. The textile industry in this country is confronted with a most difficult problem. I believe that a reading of this article will indicate some of the causes of it. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CUTBACK—CLOTH MAKERS SLASH OUTPUT AS SALES LAG; SOME PRICES DECLINE—BATES TRIMS PRODUCTION 20 PERCENT AT TWO DIVISIONS; ERWIN CUTS HOURS AT 3 MILLS—BUT SOME STORE SALES RISE

(By Thomas E. McCarthy)

From New England to Dixie, mills that make cotton cloth are cutting back production after 3 months of sagging sales.

Mill men list a wide range of reasons for their difficulties—rising imports of cotton cloth and garments from Japan; lower auto output that has reduced use of upholstery fabrics; chilly spring weather that stalled clothing sales, and the possibility of lower cotton prices by early autumn.

While mill cutbacks have been scattered, they are being eyed apprehensively. For one thing, they are one of the few soft spots in a generally bubbling economy. And the cotton cutback comes on top of a serious slump in the synthetic fabric industry, perhaps indicating that much of the entire textile business is in for more widespread troubles.

MAINE TO NORTH CAROLINA

In the past few weeks 3 big New England concerns employing nearly 12,000 workers have curtailed operations at a dozen mills. Maine's Bates Manufacturing Co. reduced output 20 percent at 2 of its major divisions. Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., also trimmed output 20 percent at 3 Fall River, Mass., plants and at 1 in North Adams, Mass.

And in Greensboro, N. C., Erwin Mills, Inc., is operating 3 mills on a 4-day week. "We're

storing a lot of goods," says a spokesman. We'd be justified in curtailing further, but we want to keep people at work." The Erwin official blames his company's sales slump and the cutbacks on imports of Japanese textiles and the weather. "Sales are off quite a bit," he notes. "People bought for spring and spring just wasn't there."

Brookside Mills has halted all production at its 1,000-loom Knoxville, Tenn., plant and is considering closing the operation completely. "We haven't been able to book any sizable business at the break-even point since the turn of the year," says a spokesman for this matter of cotton dress goods and corruroy.

The Aragon, Ga., mill of A. D. Juilliard Co. has been on a 4-day week ever since last February and Wellington Sears Co. of New York slashed its output of auto upholstery fabrics nearly 50 percent last month as auto makers cut back their production schedules.

PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT

"Slow sales and low price levels since mid-February can only be reflected in reduced production and employment," says R. Buford Brandis, chief economist for the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute. "A major factor in this unfavorable situation is continuing heavy imports of cotton textiles from Japan," claims Mr. Brandis.

Retail merchants tell conflicting stories of cotton goods sales this spring and the reasons behind the fall-off reported in some areas. Cold spring weather throughout much of the country is blamed for some lagging demand for such normally big-selling items as cotton dresses and light blouses.

Sales of clothing made entirely from cotton are trailing the 1955 pace, says Lloyd Liebes, Sr., vice president and merchandise manager of a San Francisco store featuring women's and children's clothing. But, adds Mr. Liebes, sales of blended fabrics, combining cotton and manmade fabrics, "are a great deal better." Mr. Liebes' store is ordering fewer all-cotton goods than in 1955 for the summer selling season.

A Cleveland department store reports sales of cotton items down 10 percent to 15 percent from the year-ago level, and the store has canceled some orders to keep inventories in line with reduced demand. But in Allentown, Pa., the Hess Bros. department store reports storewide business in cotton goods "well ahead" of 1955. The manager of a San Antonio department store adds that a "May white sale right now is showing increases of about 20 over a year ago."

COTTON THE KINGPIN

According to Wall Street Journal tabulations, sales of women's wear chain stores in April plummeted 21.9 percent below the 1955 level. For the year to date, such stores' sales are down 3.5 percent. Sales of men's wear chains were off 22.4 percent in April, 3.4 percent for the year to date. Pre-Easter shopping came in March this year, while in 1955, some such buying extended into the first week of April.

Cotton is the kingpin of the United States textile industry. Cotton fabric accounts for 77.8 percent of all cloth made in this country. Synthetics total 19.5 percent, woolens and worsted materials account for 2.4 per cent, and silk has only 0.3 percent of the market.

Roughly 40 percent of the Nation's cotton cloth production goes into wearing apparel, while 35 percent goes for industrial fabrics, and 25 percent into home furnishings. The cotton textile industry once was centered in New England, but now has become largely a southern enterprise. Of the Nation's 22.2 million cotton system spindles—used to turn cotton fiber into cloth—some 19 million now are in the South.

The synthetic fabric business started to slump in 1955. Mills that weave cloth from manmade yarns cut back their production 20 percent between August and December of last year. And since late 1955, production of fabrics made from short-type synthetic fibers—the ones that compete with cotton and wool—has been reduced more than 25 percent.

But woolen and worsted mills are enjoying their best business since the scare buying that followed the start of the Korean war. In recent weeks, makers of worsted (hard finish wool fabrics) even have been increasing their prices.

Cotton mill cutbacks have been reflected in other phases of manufacture between cloth production and garment making. A sales executive of a major cotton textile printing concern estimates that the cotton printing business now is at least 25 percent below the year-ago level. Cotton printers put color and design on the gray cloth that comes from the textile mills.

MORE THAN SEASONAL DECLINE

Demand for cotton cloth normally slackens at this time of year because apparel manufacturers have filled their needs for spring and summer goods. But the cotton cloth sales dropoff came earlier this year, and it has been sharper than in recent years. Daily consumption of raw cotton mills in March generally falls 1.2 percent below the February level; this year mills consumed 3.4 percent less raw cotton in March than in February. This was the sharpest February-to-March decline since the low point of the post-Korean war recession 4 years ago. April daily consumption also fell below the March level, although not quite so sharply.

Heavy orders booked last November and December kept textile mills humming through the winter and early spring. But prices began to edge down even before output was reduced. The popular 80-square print cloth that garment makers turn into women's dresses has slipped 1½ cents to 19⅛ cents a yard since mid-February.

Among cotton textile men, the loudest complaining centers on Japanese imports. The Japanese indignantly deny low-cost goods from their country are to blame for textile troubles in the United States—and they point out that United States exports to Japan still exceed Nipponese shipments to America.

FIGURES ON IMPORTS

In 1955, some 133 million square yards of cotton cloth came into the United States from foreign nations, with 99.5 million square yards coming from Japan. Domestic output of cotton cloth totaled more than 11 billion square yards, and exports totaled 542 million square yards. But, United States cotton men argue, adding finished items such as blouses, shirts, tablecloths, and towels to the Japanese cloth volume means an import total equivalent to 250 million square yards—against a total of only 30 million square yards of cloth a few years back.

"Japanese imports are a cancer," insists Lester Martin, president of Luther Manufacturing Co. "They've hurt all the mills in this country." Luther's 1,000-loom Fall River, Mass., mill now is being liquidated. About half the 400 workers have been laid off in the past few weeks. The shutdown, states Mr. Martin, was caused directly by import competition.

While some textile executives admit—privately—that claims about their industry being pushed to the brink of disaster by imports are extravagant, they also argue that the Government has minimized their problem. "We're both talking through our hats," one textile executive admitted.

HELP FROM UNCLE SAM

The United States mills apparently are going to get some help from Uncle Sam, although probably not the rigid import quotas some would like to see imposed on Japanese textiles. A group of cotton-industry executives who met with Government leaders last week have confirmed that the administration promised to try to get other nations to buy more textile products from Japan—thus reducing the pressure on the American market—and promised to work out a plan to subsidize United States exporting mills for the difference between the cost of price-supported cotton and the world cotton price. Such a subsidy would, in effect, reduce United States mills' operating costs and help them to compete in foreign markets.

"If we don't get relief from the Government we'll have to cut back production around 20 percent within a few weeks," declares J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala. Roger Milliken, president of Deering, Milliken & Co., Inc., Spartanburg, S. C., maintains "ghost towns will replace thriving mill communities from Maine to Texas," if Japanese imports continue to climb.

The lure of Japanese textiles, of course, is low prices. Many clothing stores have offered made-in-Japan women's blouses for $1, compared to about $2.50 for a similar blouse from a United States manufacturer. For the cotton cloth eventually made into clothing, price differentials also favor the Japanese. One standard gingham-type cloth made in America sells in New York for 52½ to 60 cents a yard. The same type, imported from Japan, costs 42½ to 47½ cents. United States mills' asking price for a popular type of broadcloth used for shirts and blouses is 26¾ cents a yard. From Japan, with all import duties paid, the price is 25¾ cents a yard. Price differentials of a penny or so a yard can mean great savings to a clothing manufacturer when multiplied by hundreds of thousands of yards of material. And a penny a yard often is the difference between profit and loss to domestic mills.

While it is doubtful that the United States will impose any quota restrictions on Japanese textile imports, Japan has agreed to continue through 1957 its own restrictions on the amount of cotton goods it ships to the United States. The self-restriction would limit Japanese shipments to no more than 150 million square yards of cotton fabrics and 2,500,000 dozen blouses in 1956. Japanese exporters have promised to give the United States 3 months' notice if they decide to increase shipments to America.

Another troublesome factor in the textile business is uncertainty about the price of raw cotton next fall. Mills expect to buy cotton more cheaply after August, states Marvin Woolen, southeast manager of Anderson, Clayton & Fleming, a leading cotton merchandising concern. The cotton price decline is expected to result from Government efforts to put the fibre into the world market at competitive prices. Mills also expect domestic cotton prices to decline because of increased world production and lagging United States exports.

Nation's Drycleaners Participate in Flag Day Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, of the RECORD, I include my statement pertaining to the participation of the Nation's drycleaners in the Flag Day program:

NATION'S DRYCLEANERS PARTICIPATE IN FLAG DAY PROGRAM

The National Institute of Drycleaning in Silver Spring, Md., has gained the cooperation of the Nation's drycleaners to provide "new glory for Old Glory" by cleaning flags without charge between June 1 and June 12. This is the third consecutive year that the drycleaners of the Nation have rendered this service, and as a result more and more homes and businesses are flying clean American flags on Flag Day, June 14. The drycleaners of the Nation and the Legion posts cooperating with them deserve recognition for their patriotic services to the public in recognition of Flag Day.

Most Dangerous of all Communist Fifth Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Geneva Progress, of Geneva, Ind., March 29, 1956.

Mr. Earl Dawald, the editor, calls our attention to the most dangerous of all Communist fifth columns, that which wears the appearance of the Christian ministry. We cannot prevent the Soviet leaders from training and directing their emissaries to penetrate our churches as they have established political control of their own churchmen. We can properly ask that true Christian leaders recognize the nature of the threat to all spiritual life, and disentangle themselves from the web of illusion spun by the Communists for their destruction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEATH THE CROSS

This Easter season there is a tragic scene beneath the cross of Christ. Leaders from the National Council of Churches in America, composed of many Protestant denominations with great numbers of devoted members, have been visiting Soviet Russia for the claimed purpose of establishing better church relations between Russia and America. How can this be? Only a few short months ago Nikita Khrushchev, top Soviet leader boasted: "We remain athiest and we do everything we can to liberate a certain part of the people from the opium attraction of religion." This is no fancy or dream; it is a matter of record. Furthermore, except to the "brain washed" and to the "lovers of the left", there is evidence all over Russia that what Khrushchev said is true. Yet, here we have men who are supposed to be men of God trying to mix the red blood of Jesus Christ flowing from the cross on Cavalry with the Red atheism flowing from the Kremlin in Moscow. How impossible! Where communism prevails Jesus Christ can not; and where Jesus Christ prevails communism will not. The Church of Jesus Christ belongs to God and the Red atheism of Moscow belongs to the devil. The church of Jesus Christ seeks to save the souls of men and the Red atheism of Moscow seeks to enslave the souls of men. Never can these two dynamically opposite forces be reconciled. All Christendom this Easter season, from the crossroad church to the mightiest cathedral, should be alerted to the great danger that the church of Jesus Christ may be betrayed into the hands of its atheistic enemies in Moscow in much the manner Jesus Christ Himself was betrayed into the hands of enemies. It must not be forgotten that the betrayer of Christ had also been a follower of Christ—until he betrayed.

The Flag of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech to be delivered in St. Louis, Mo., today by Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, entitled "The Flag of the United States of America":

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, prepared for delivery before DAR luncheon at Forest Park Hotel in St. Louis, Mo., June 14, 1956)

Since the beginning of time mortal man has used emblem and banners of various kinds to express his hopes, his ideals, his struggles, and his accomplishments.

Many reverent flag authorities trace the origin of the flag to Divinity itself, holding that after the flood God unfurled in the heavens the first flag—the rainbow—as a signal of danger passed, of safety assured.

All Americans can take just pride in the reverent aspirations of our early forefathers who were the first to reach to the heavens for the symbols of the flag of the United States of America.

It was just 179 years ago, on June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress adopted our flag under the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

It is in these words that we find the real significance, the very soul and spirit of the American flag. These were the words which, like scintillating stars in the heavens, signaled to humanity the birth of the first nation on earth dedicated to the personal and religious liberty of mankind.

George Washington once described the flag by saying, "We take the star from heaven, the red from the mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

Flag authorities all agree that the essence—the divine spark—which differentiates the flag of the United States of America from those of all other nations of the world lies in those stars which so clearly spell out personal and religious liberty for all mankind.

Just as the Declaration of Independence is termed the heart of America, and the Constitution the backbone, our flag is the soul of America.

The personal and religious liberty spelled out in the 13 stars in the flag of the United States is of the utmost importance to women, who are the natural conservators of the great inheritance of freedom for our children.

Women and children are the first to suffer at the hands of tyrants and have the most to gain from liberty under law.

One way in which we as women may help to emphasize the values behind the flag of the United States is to be sure that we salute the flag properly. When the flag is passing by, women should salute it by placing the right ungloved hand over the heart.

An important exception to this rule applies to women who are members of any branch of the Armed Forces. They should salute the flag in exactly the same fashion as the male members of their branch of the services.

Generally speaking, we know when the occasion will probably arise that we will be required to salute the flag. Therefore it is only a matter of common courtesy, toward this our great symbol of liberty, that we be prepared for the salute. Let us put bundles and packages down if possible, and shift our pocketbooks and gloves to our left hands, so that the right hands may be free to render the salute.

We will not fail to do proper honor to this our flag if we always remember that these stars in the blue heaven and these rippling stripes stand for the protection of all our personal and religious liberty.

From George Washington on, every President has tried to put into words the meaning of the flag of the United States. Even that taciturn Vermonter, Calvin Coolidge, waxed eloquent when he spoke of the flag.

He said: "When the people of the Colonies were defending their liberties against the might of kings, they chose their banner from the design set in the firmament through all eternity. The flags of the great empires of that day are gone, but the Stars and Stripes remain. It pictures the vision of a people whose eyes were turned to rising dawn. It represents the hope of a father for his posterity. It was never flaunted for glory of royalty, but to be born under it is to be a child of a king, and to establish a home under it is to be the founder of a royal house. Alone of all flags it expresses the sovereignty of the people which endures when all else passes away.

"Speaking with their voice it has the sanctity of revelation. He who lives under it and is loyal to it is loyal to truth and justice everywhere. He who lives under it and is disloyal to it is a traitor to the human race everywhere. Who could be saved if the flag of the American Nation were to perish?"

As women we can render to our country and to the world a great service if we keep constantly before our youth those stalwart words, "He who lives under it—our flag—is loyal to truth and justice everywhere. He who lives under it and is disloyal to it is a traitor to the human race everywhere."

Those are true words—and considering later events—almost prophetic ones. We have only to think of the tragic results of the theft of atomic bomb secrets, for example, not only to this country but to human beings the world over to see the verity of the charge that he who lives under the American flag and is disloyal to it is a traitor not only to this country but to the human race everywhere.

Old as the ages is the knowledge in every human heart that he who is a traitor to his own nation is a traitor everywhere.

Modern education in some instances has tried to erase that idea in favor of the notion of world citizenship. Sometimes those who attempt to teach this concept are not even aware of being subversive. They are reaching for something new. They forget that the tried experience of the human race from the beginning of time gives the lie to any idea that a person can love the world or the human race if he does not first give his love and loyalty to his own.

Far from being outmoded in today's world—a globe shrunken to tiny proportions

so far as time and space is concerned—patriotism—love of country—is more vital than ever.

It has indeed become necessary for us to give great understanding and sympathy to our neighbors on this tiny globe.

But can any woman tell me how it is possible for us to respect our neighbors if we hate and are disloyal to our own family? As women, as mothers, as neighbors we know this simply cannot be.

We know that the more deeply we love our own the more sympathy, compassion, and understanding we have for others.

We can respect the ideals, aspirations, and accomplishments of others, only in proportion to our respect for the standard of our own beloved flag and the Nation for which it stands.

The very words of our Star-Spangled Banner have been a rainbow—a divine rainbow—to oppressed peoples everywhere.

"And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

With a prayer in our hearts and reverence in our minds, it is up to us to keep that Star-Spangled Banner aloft as the symbol of freedom and courage.

Solving the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union Leader of May 19, 1956.

Congress has spent a great deal of time on emergency solutions of the farm problem, without any hope that we are improving the situation as a whole. It is time for a fundamental approach which will set American farming on the road to long-term prosperity in freedom.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLVING THE FARM PROBLEM

There is sound judgment in Senator JENNER'S proposal to Congress that an advisory commission be created—made up of Members of Congress and private citizens—to make a fundamental examination of the farm problem.

That is exactly what is needed. Congress cannot go on indefinitely providing emergency legislation to relieve the farmers without doing anything to solve the farm problem.

This is what it has been doing for the past 25 years, ever since Henry Wallace, Rexford Tugwell, and Mordecai Ezekiel undertook to establish an agricultural planned economy. That was when the family farm ceased to be the basis of agriculture, and the farming industry was brought under a collectivist machine.

This is the system, as Senator JENNER pointed out to Congress, under which the farm problem has been operating since 1933. And it has got the farmer nowhere, except Government handouts to relieve his difficulties. This kind of thing can't go on forever. Even the farmer doesn't want that. He wants his problem solved correctly.

One difficulty today is that the collectivist system is so deeply rooted that changing the party in power makes no difference. For as Senator JENNER says: "With a mesh of supranational controls operating through the United Nations, GATT, and other forms of supergovernment, on the one hand; and a Government bureauacry in the saddle here at home, on the other hand—a change of party means little."

All of which means that no effective solution of the farm problem is possible except by a thorough examination of the long-term trends of American farming to create a constructive program that will restore farm stability.

There is no other road to a solution. It is hoped therefore that Senator JENNER'S proposal will be adopted by Congress to enable it to find a reasonable way out of the present farm difficulty.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Madison (Ind.) Courier of June 11, 1956:

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH

President Eisenhower's intestinal disorder, which has now been satisfactorily corrected, has given political analysts a field day—assessing and reassessing the President's chances—of running for office and winning.

These same analysts, at the same time, might turn their minds toward the Democratic presidential candidates and the Democratic leaders—and see why it is that they are so determined to paint the President as an aged and senile man instead of the vigorous man he is.

His complete recovery from a heart ailment—and there can be no question now that he has completely recovered after the way he went through surgery at Walter Reed hospital—and his amazing snapback following last week's operation can leave no doubt but that here is a man who has a strong constitution and who will not be put on the sidelines by the comments and statements of professional politicians.

Why does the Democrat Party so fear President Eisenhower that it is using every device to influence him from running?

Is it a genuine concern for what the minority firmly believes is a condition of ill health? Or is it merely a camouflage to enhance the spider-web thin chances of Stevenson, Harriman, Symington, or Kefauver?

Are the Democrats who advocate Ike's retirement concerned with the future of the country, or are they again putting party ahead of country as they did when they failed to keep the Nation informed as to the failing health of the late President Roosevelt in his declining years?

There is no one who will deny that Ike has been a great leader for peace, a leader who is widely respected the world over. Would the Democrats put this tremendous influence on the sidelines, and hurt this Nation's world prestige, just to put a hand-picked puppet in the White House to be manipulated by DeSapio and Butler and the other bosses?

Ike has been a frank President—frank about his health, frank about controversial legislation, frank about any tinge of corruption, and frank about any shortcomings. These qualities have won him the respect of his countrymen and the respect of the world.

Both the United States and the rest of the world look forward to 4 more years of peace under his leadership.

Address of Hon. Lloyd Thurston Before the St. Louis Memorial Day Observance, May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, at the Memorial Day services in St. Louis, Mo., on May 30, 1956, along with the introduction of Mr. Thurston by Walter G. Smith:

INTRODUCTION OF MR. LLOYD THURSTON BY WALTER G. SMITH, USWV, AT MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES IN ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 30, 1956

Ladies and gentlemen, on February 15, in 1898, the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor with the loss of 266 lives which caused the President of the United States to declare war on Spain. On April 25, 1898, he issued a call for volunteers. A lad of 18 on the prairies of Iowa enlisted as a private in the 51st Iowa Voluntary Infantry in this Spanish-American War and the Insurrection of the Philippines. He was a captain in World War I, a member of the Iowa Senate from 1920 to 1924, and in the Congress of the United States from 1925 to 1939. He is a member of the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the Philippine Pacific Organization, Uncle Sam's 1-2-3 Boys. He has served in the highest offices of the State and Nation of the United Spanish War Veterans. He was 1 of the 6 Members of Congress to represent our Government at the ceremonies honoring the *Maine* heroes at Havana, Cuba, February 15, 1948. He was a member of the Jefferson Memorial Territorial Association for many years. I have the great honor and the pleasure to introduce to you Past Commander in Chief of the United Spanish American War Veterans, Lloyd Thurston, of Osceola, Iowa, and his charming wife.

ADDRESS OF HON. LLOYD THURSTON BEFORE THE ST. LOUIS MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE, MAY 30, 1956

It is with humble feeling in heart and mind that I salute this huge multitude, representing the veteran, civic and official life of this historical metropolis, and well may each of your citizens be proud of the achievements you and your forebearers have brought to your city, the State of Missouri, and the Nation.

It is doubtful if any mortal could orally describe or compose sentences to portray an accurate picture of this splendid, patriotic gathering, in one of the foremost industrial and cultural centers on this continent. Not far removed from the geographical or popu-

lation centers of the Nation, nearby two great rivers commingle their waters, as men and women and children assemble to pay homage to the Founders of the Republic, and to its valiant defenders, who have made every sacrifice human beings could offer to sustain the greatest and most noble experiment of man.

May the day never come when Americans fail to honor those to whom they owe so much.

Thousands of communities in the United States of America, and many places abroad, are on this Memorial Day observing an earned tribute to the American soldier, sailor, airman. He had the courage to remain with Washington at Valley Forge; made forced marches with Jackson to reach New Orleans in time for that unprecedented victory; crossed the parched plains to Mexico City; bivouaced with our armies in the long-drawn-out War Between the States, sailed with Dewey to take part in a complete victory at Manila; several years later embarked in crowded transports to Europe for action in World War I; after a short respite, again responded to a call of the colors, by the thousands to save the day in the continents of Europe, then Africa, and later hundreds of islands in the South Pacific; lastly, the long, undecisive, bitter campaign in Korea, which they were not permitted to win.

No wonder, the American civilian is proud of the wonderful, decisive victories of those who wore the uniform of his country. All of these sacrifices based upon the premise that freedom is the most precious heritage of man.

The pages of history disclose that there has been an age-old conflict between the two dominant philosophies of life: Those who strive for freedom, and those who are willing to be slaves. The man or group who would ursurp the limitations placed upon the abuse of power, in effect, says to you: You are incapable of self-government; that your lowly mental stature justifies controls from above. A candid appraisal of such egotism brings the inescapable conclusion: A diseased, dangerous ursurper. Whether these ideas of supermen come from abroad or are fostered in our midst, intelligent minds will join to oppose these false concepts.

Out here in the heart of the Union, we are somewhat removed from the sharp, cross currents of international affairs, but, we too, are greatly concerned about the future of our country. It is known that these United States have already faced perplexing problems of both a civil and military character; yet, through calm, deliberate judgment, we righted the course of our Ship of State, so it sailed into peaceful waters. Irrespective of religious faith or political belief, we again seek such a port. Our forefathers did not flinch or fail; we must do no less.

Although we complain about excessive taxation, it would be interesting to know the total amount of funds that would be required if we did not have so many persons and charitable and benevolent organizations which annually contribute millions of dollars to assist the unfortunate, and a multiplicity of worthy causes. The list of such donors would be a long one, but included are the churches, private schools, hospitals, and colleges; service units such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Spanish War Veterans and their auxiliaries; the Farm Bureau with its 4–H and Future Farmers; the Farmers' Union and the Grange; the Federation of Women's Clubs and the Business and Professional Women; the YMCA and YWCA; the KC; the USO; the Red Cross; Salvation Army; the Rotary; Kiwanis; Lions; Boy and Girl Scouts; Parent-Teachers Association; Women's Relief Corps; Union relief funds, the Masonic and IOOF Orders and their auxiliaries. Then we have the specialized groups, such as the heart, cancer, eye, blood, blind, deaf, bone; all rendering splendid service. The Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish congregations support a multitude of institutions for the aged and impaired.

So a survey of this charitable field discloses that if all of the splendid work done by these and other like organizations were to be paid for out of public funds, there would be a tremendous increase in taxes.

Not only do many of the groups mentioned expend their funds as indicated, but their educational programs cover a broad field of public service; civic, national, international; and their welfare and patriotic teachings extend vital support to uphold American ideals and traditions.

It is no difficult task to recount the splendid victories won by our service men and women in the several major conflicts in which our Nation has been engaged, but what about the contribution of the average American citizen? Has he been adroitly lulled into focusing his attention on foreign propaganda, and thereby fail to witness the planned undermining of his Government? Is he content to listen to the lullabies of the intellectuals who are more concerned about the rights of traitors than the preservation of this freedom-loving land?

But today we are primarily gathered here to pay our homage to our servicemen who have passed to the great beyond. What a flood of thoughts come to each of us when this subject is mentioned? As a sailor, we could picture him as standing erect, alert, on the bow of a destroyer, cutting through the foam of the sea, with shell splashing the water on either side of his ship; or, a pilot, in formation with his plane, diving in an attack through a hail of missiles from hidden land batteries; then, there would be the doughboy, wading ashore, burdened with a heavy load of ammunition, trench tools, and field rations, expecting to dig in and hold a salient point.

Encountering more dangers and risks in a few hours than a civilian would experience through a lifetime. Try to think of the change brought into the life of this young American. Called to the service of his country, abandoning his way of life, his family, his business. He does not have time to ask: "What of the future? Is my present employment one that will prove of value to me in civilian life? Will those for whom I have served appreciate my sacrifice? If my services contribute to the winning of the war, will the country I am fighting to preserve retain its free institutions? Or will those who are poisoned with the plans to undermine my Nation gain control? Will the gangsters in the cities combine with the dreamers who spin but do not toil? Will those who benefit by the veterans' efforts have the courage to strike down those who would destroy my Government, your Government, the best government the world has ever known?"

Caesar, Napoleon, Cromwell, in their time, started out as the champions of the oppressed, but ended as tyrants. Later, Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and others organized a trail of bloodshed, anarchy, which brought ruin; as will all, who seek to rule through force rather than by orderly processes.

The thought expressed brings the logical corollary; men come and men go, but the principles of justice and humanity are as fixed as the north star. Stated broadly, those who put their faith in men awake in despair, as few mortal beings are strong enough to withstand the flattery of court jesters or office seekers. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, were among the limited few on this continent who survived the test. And the humility, the modesty, the nobility of these great men, might well be used as a precept for others who slightly overweigh their talents. Hero worship is a public disease.

Then a further search into the field of human motives is met with the stern, but indisputable evidence that the Almighty did not place all of the brains or intelligence of an era in one cranium; the diffusion of learning and knowledge was not confined to a race, a class, a creed, and never to an individual.

Because of our generosity to other peoples, their governments have organized subtle, clever staffs to promote propaganda to lay the basis for more funds from our Treasury. Of course, they cannot be blamed for promoting such a profitable investment, the inquiry is? How long are our people to be subjected to heavy taxation to meet the demands of our dreamers who flit from country to country, urging that gigantic sums be requested to meet their demands?

Lenin proposed that Russia should encourage her enemies to undermine their strength by excessive spending, so their collapse would require slight effort to conquer. I ask you: are we complying with the Russian philosophy?

I warn you that a solvent nation is a strong nation; the reverse need not be stated.

What America needs most today is a reappraisal of the basic concepts of our philosophy of life. We need earnest men and women to inaugurate a campaign to teach the present generation—adult as well as youth—the value of what we now possess; not what some dreamers or visionaries have to offer. Sane persons when in need of professional or technical assistance do not employ novices or roustabouts, yet, many of the intelligentsia in our land would have us abandon our practical experiences in government, industry, agriculture, and join with nations which are bankrupt, or which have failed to bring education, hospitalization, humanities and other modern conveniences and necessities to their people.

If your speaker had command of descriptive language, he would paint a word picture of the average home, school, college, church, hospital, and a long array of modern homes, which would be a panorama of current conditions in our country; then, in contrast, a picture of the average public building and home in the rest of the world, and with that wide void or gap, no sane American, no real American, would urge us to abandon what we and our forefathers have achieved. Is it improper to suggest that the "fuzzy minds" renounce their citizenship here, get a one-way ticket, and speedily join up with those they admire so much.

Well, my comrades, you have been separated from active duties in our Armed Forces, but you still have a duty to perform. You served to preserve freedom and liberty in the country you loved so well, with little thought that weakminded persons at home were proposing to submerge, eventually to destroy, your country by entering into some kind of an international organization, composed of nations which did not possess the courage to route out communistic influences, and in effect would thereby cancel or repudiate your sacrifices and results of your military efforts.

So, you with a host of true Americans must stand guard until those who support, yet fear the Communists, are safely berthed in mental institutions where they rightly belong.

As an aside, may I share with you, as one of many million citizens of the Mississippi Valley, in supporting the movement inaugurated in St. Louis to honor Thomas Jefferson for his foresight in consummating the Louisiana Purchase—one of the most important and far-reaching steps ever taken by our Government. It is fitting, indeed, that an appropriate memorial should be erected on the banks of the majestic Mississippi River to perpetually mark this important epoch in the progress of our Nation.

I was honored in being named as a member of the original Jefferson National Expan-

sion Memorial Commission, the late Luther Ely Smith being the chairman, and later in a minor way cooperated with the fine group of private citizens and public officers of your city, who through the years have guided the project to date, and who I am sure, will see that it is thoroughly completed.

God has been good to America. We have been provided with fertile soil to produce food; fuel to heat, light, and power our industries; appliances to lessen the burdens of human bodies; an abundance of all useful and requisite things; in government, the most profound concepts thought out by men. All of these benefits and many more, have been utilized for peoples everywhere, so as in part to reciprocate for the gifts of the Almighty to our land.

The untold billions of dollars, probably 200 billion, donated by the United States, exceeds the gifts of all nations for all times. In return, we only ask that those so generously treated will refrain from attempts to undermine our Government, through their own saboteurs or the misguided intelligencia in our midst. In this connection, it might be said that one does not have to be a Communist to be a traitor to our country—membership in disloyal, subversive organizations is giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

This question to the youth gathered here today:

What is the highest, most prized possession in the world? One might make a long list of physical objects: some might prefer a title from a bankrupt nation.

But the highest and most sought possession in the world is the right and privilege to be a citizen of the United States of America.

Though you might lose all of your earthly holdings—even your health—you still will possess this priceless distinction. You should always be thankful and deeply grateful to those who brought these countless blessings to you.

This America of ours is the finest heritage ever handed down to a people. America's position in the world did not just happen; it was attained through the toil and privation; the talent and genius, yes, the sweat and blood of thousands of men and women who were determined to prove that human agencies through divine guidance could create and maintain a form of government which would provide free institutions for a whole continent.

And what have been the results of the labors of the Founders of this incomparable Republic? What benefits have accrued to the descendants of the pioneers of this ocean to ocean empire? A reply could assert that if the story of the romance of human progress were to be written, the chapter devoted to America would be the most amazing chronicle of advancement the world has ever known.

All humanity in fact or in spirit shares these benefits with us. Subtract America's contribution to the world if you could visualize such a calamity: Primitive or medieval life would then replace most of the necessities—all of the luxuries we enjoy today.

America, under divine guidance, has enjoyed a glorious past; and we, its present trustees for the future, though the trail be somewhat dimmed and uneven, and in the face of difficulties which appear to be almost insurmountable, now pledge that the freedom for which generations of our forebears have toiled and sacrificed will not perish, but will blossom forth to reestablish free thought and free action among men.

In closing, we are not unmindful of the black pall of slavery which hangs over many nations; and the fear of insecurity which envelops all lands, yet, there has always been a silver lining, so in the midst of this worldwide misery.

The spirit of America with her free institutions, must be the light that never fails.

Indiana Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Looks Are Better," which was published in the Indianapolis Star of May 20.

I am proud to point out this evidence that the people of Indiana take full responsibility for meeting the school needs of Indiana's children. Our State has already built the extra classroom space needed to meet the postwar boom in the schoolchild population. We shall continue meeting the educational needs of our children by our own management, out of our own resources.

This is the only American way to provide for the education of our youth without setting up in the Federal Government a Frankenstein which, in the end, will brainwash the children of the Nation into a colorless uniformity.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO LOOKS ARE BETTER

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce has recently published a collection of facts about Indiana schools. The tables show the cycle waves of enrollment rise as the postwar boom gathered momentum. They also show that in those first years of the rising trend, construction of new school space fell far short of keeping pace.

The first Federal study of the classroom situation was authorized in 1951. In the 4 years ending with the 1951–52 school year, Indiana schools had fallen behind by more than 1,000 classrooms. That is, construction in those years lacked that much of merely taking care of the increases of enrollment in the same years.

The report of the status phase of the Federal study was made in 1953. By the 1953–54 school year, postwar addition to Indiana's classroom deficit had risen to nearly 1,400. Since 1948, enrollment increase had been enough to occupy 4,346 new rooms. Only 2,983 had been built. These figures indicated a situation which could not be allowed to continue forever.

It did not continue.

With new financing methods available, school construction came to life in Indiana in the 1954–55 school year. New schoolrooms constructed were more than half again enough to take care of the year's enrollment increase. In the current school year new rooms added will be almost twice as many as needed for the enrollment gain.

There is an even more significant figure. By the end of the current school year, the postwar deficit in Indiana schoolbuilding will be entirely wiped out. The number of new classrooms built will surpass the number required to take care of the population gain, for the wohle period.

This will not mean that space problems will have been solved in every community, of course. Some of the new space will have been built by forward-looking communities against future need. Some of the overcrowding will remain in other localities. State authorities say 1,600 rooms are still needed to overcome this. Some buildings which ought to be abandoned will not yet have been replaced. But in sum total the books will have been balanced, and orderly solution of remaining space problems will be in sight. Continuation of building at the present high level for a few more years will not only keep pace with population growth, but will enable most communities to take care of longtime needs and enable many to get ahead of the game.

There are still school needs in Indiana. But there is no longer a statewide crisis, such as could be seen developing only 2 or 3 years ago.

We wonder if something of the same sort has not been happening in other States. The lag in school construction after the war was natural. Total school enrollment had been declining for so long that most communities needed a while to adjust to the change in trend. It was during this period of adjustment that the hue and cry for Federal aid arose.

The statistics being used in the Federal-aid argument are mostly a couple of years or more old. As far as Indiana is concerned, it can be seen clearly that those statistics cover the period of lag, but not the period of recovery. How generally is this true? Before allowing ourselves to be talked into brash action, we'd better have a look at more up-to-date figures.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment striking out all assistance for India, even loans and sale of agricultural surpluses. We have just voted against cutting off military aid to a country, Yugoslavia, that is under complete control of an avowed Communist, Tito. He does not even pretend to be a neutral. A Communist government, by definition, has to be dedicated to the isolation and destruction of the United States and every other free country.

Having voted against cutting off military aid to an enemy, I cannot see any possible justification for stopping all economic aid to a country, India, which is trying to be neutral. We may not approve India's neutralism, but nobody can say that India is under a Communist dictator or is an enemy of the United States.

What is the aid proposed for India? About $10 million for technical assistance and some $60 million for development assistance. But the latter can be only in the form of loans or the local currencies obtained from sale in India of our surplus agricultural commodities to help the country maintain its independence.

We would rather have India enter into a mutual security agreement with us and other free countries. We believe that would be better for her and for the

peace of that part of the world. But India does not agree. She wants to and believes she can be neutral in this world struggle. I doubt that she can succeed indefinitely. As the Communists say, she will eventually have to lean to one side or the other. But certainly it is far better to have India a neutral and better to help her maintain her neutrality, than to have her an enemy.

Why is India so determined to remain neutral?

First, the Indians are more concerned about and more against the western imperialism they were under for so long, than they are against Communist imperialism, which they have not been under. That is not a peculiar Indian reaction; it is a human reaction.

We have seen it in France. Millions of Frenchmen would rather take a chance on a Communist conquest, which they have never known, than on a recurrence of German conquest, which they have known. We saw it in Vietnam before it gained its freedom. Millions there preferred to take a chance on Communist control, which they had not yet been under than on a continuance of the French control which they had been under.

Let us remember that India was under England for more than 200 years. Nehru himself was in jail 14 years. His lifework was to free his country from western control; and we are regarded as part of the West. If I were to have that experience, I suspect my reaction would be about the same as his. I would be against the imperialism I had fought all my life.

Many in India and other Asian countries fear that America's aid is given to enable us stealthily to take over the western imperialism, which India fought for more than 200 years. The Communists are constantly telling them that the Americans are coming in as representatives of Wall Street, first, to try to get economic control of their country, then gradually to gain control of their national policies, and finally move into England's place.

This is not a reasonable fear; in fact, it is ridiculous, but it is understandable. You find it in any country recently emerged from colonial control.

Some years ago in Korea, when a prominent leader was voicing to us his great anxiety over our rebuilding Japan's military and economic strength, one of us said, "It appears that you feel that if your choice were to be under Japan again or under the Communists, you would prefer the latter." Without hesitation be replied, "Certainly. We would at least have a different master."

The deep distrust in India following centuries of control by white men rubs off on us. It is a suspicion of us that we do not like but it is understandable and it is inescapable. Our problem is how best to allay it.

A second reason for India's neutralism is wishful thinking—the almost pathetic hope that communism in China will be different from communism in Europe, because the Chinese are Asians. It will not be. It cannot be—because when a man becomes a Communist he ceases to be a Chinese patriot—or a Japanese, or a German, or an American patriot. But I cannot blame the Indians for being intrigued with the vain hope that they can get along with communism in China. Did not plenty of Americans think that too? Some still do.

A third reason is fear. The Indians know that whoever has been master of China has generally been master of Asia. They know the growing power of Communist China and that it lies right above them. They hope they can avoid antagonizing it. Well, did not we do the same?

In a neighboring Asian country, a prominent leader said to us when we were there last fall, "We are trying to be neutral. Not because we are pro-Communist, but because we have a long border with Communist China. There are only two strong powers in the world—you and the Communist bloc. You could win—but you are not winning. We are a small country. We have only about 20 million people. We have been independent only 7 years. We cannot substantially influence the outcome of this world struggle. We have just got to accept whoever is the winner."

He said, "Your former Secretary of State said of a struggle with the Communists in China, 'Wait until the dust settles.' Well, that is just what we Burmese are trying to do; wait until the dust settles in the world struggle and try to get along with whichever side wins."

In the same country in a conversation with a brilliant scientist recently returned from study in the United States, wholly sympathetic with the free world but still defending their attempted neutralism, we asked, "How could you be neutral, or whom would you be neutral between, if we were to try to be neutral too?"

He replied quickly, "We can be neutral if you stand firm."

That, Mr. Chairman, is our task—to stand firm. We will find most of these neutral countries quickly joining our side whenever we convince them we can be depended on to stand firm and to respect fully their precious newly-won independence.

But as of today they see no certainty that the free world will prevail in this great struggle between the free world and the Communist world. They are too weak as yet to influence the outcome. They want to survive—and to try to be friends with both sides appeals to them as the safest and most realistic course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield me 2 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. The Indians and other peoples throughout Asia say to us, "Is it not strange that you insist that we not be neutral on this Communist issue, but at the same time you insist on your being neutral on many other issues?"

You will remember President Sukarno who spoke eloquently to us here a few weeks ago. We had a visit with him in his reception room in the capitol of Indonesia last fall, and he put the same question to us: Why does America want to be neutral and yet not want us to be neutral?

When the issue is between France and her north African colonies, the United States abstains from voting. She is neutral. Why?

Because America wants to be friends with both sides.

In the conflict between Greece and England and Turkey over Cyprus the United States is neutral. She wants to help resolve the dispute. She wants to be friends with all three.

In the conflict between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, America is neutral. She wants to be friends with both sides.

In the conflict between Israel and the Arab States, the United States is scrupulously neutral. Why? Because she does not want to antagonize either side.

In the dispute between the Dutch and Indonesia over west New Guinea, the United States is neutral. Why? Because she wants to be friends with both sides.

Again in the dispute between Pakistan and Afghanistan, America is neutral. She wants to be friends with both sides.

Japan wanted us to put the screws on Syngman Rhee over fishing rights, telling us he would have to do whatever we told him to do. In Korea, Syngman Rhee said we should be firmer with Japan over that same issue, that if we were, the Japanese would have to go along with our wishes. But again we are neutral, because we want to be friends with both sides.

With respect to Vietnam we were told that just as we did not want to offend France, so many in Vietnam did not want to offend Communist China, which is stronger and closer to them than France. We can make the sound argument that there is a world of difference between being neutral in a conflict over territory with some right on each side, and being neutral in a conflict between efforts to preserve freedom in the world and Communist efforts to conquer the world. But their experience with the West has been too unpleasant to allow them to see the issue that sharply.

What would be our attitude if we had had the long, hard struggle against the West that these new countries that we are trying to help through this program had had? They hope to be friends with both sides and to help settle what appears to them as only a quarrel between their friends. We must learn to be patient and more understanding while pointing out the risks they are taking.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let us ask ourselves again, what is in our American interest? What are our objectives in this program?

Are we trying to buy friends? No; it is not possible to buy friends.

Are we trying to make satellites? No. That is what the Kremlin does. That is what we are against.

We do not want satellites. We do not want puppets or stooges. Rather, we are trying to help newly-independent peoples retain their independence. We are trying to strengthen their will and increase their capacity to stay free, to keep their territory, their manpower, their resources out of the Kremlin's control. That serves their interest; and it serves ours.

Whatever else Nehru is or is not, he is an Indian nationalist, he is an Indian patriot; he has spent his whole life working for the independence of his country. India has won her independence and there can be no question as to her will to maintain it against both West and East. It is going to be a difficult task at best. I believe it is only good sense and good statesmanship to help them do so by providing some technical assistance, some loans, and selling some of our agricultural surpluses for Indian currency. That is what the Indian program is this year. I do not believe it would be wise in any respect, or would even prove to be economy, to strike out this program. I therefore urge that the amendment be defeated.

The Grassroots on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News of May 14, 1956.

The editor correctly describes the growing indignation of our people at spending such vast sums for aid to other countries, with no visible benefits either in strengtheniпg our defense or in increasing good will between nations.

We are now witnessing efforts by the House of Representatives to reduce the authorization for this global spending. I call the attention of the Members of this body, and of the press, to the parallel efforts being made by our foreign-policy propagandists to maintain or increase foreign aid by shifting it from military ends, where the needs are measurable, to so-called aid for backward areas, where the needs will be without limit as the explosive growth in population keeps increasing the number of mouths to feed. Our contributions to our loyal allies—Korea, Free China, Vietnam, and Turkey—will be decreased, while increased funds are channeled to the neutralist nations which never will stand by the side of our fighting men if trouble comes.

While Congress is trying by hard legislative work to carry out the mandate of the American people, our foreign-policy planners are working at home in their districts to fill the press, radio, television, and other channels of mass communication with human-interest stories or carefully conducted tours of visiting VIP's, designed to win support for ever-increased foreign spending for evermore elusive ends.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of May 14, 1956]

THE GRASSROOTS ON FOREIGN AID

On the subject of foreign assistance, the Washington administration needs to tune its ears more to what Americans are thinking, and less to the advice of diplomats abroad.

Up until last week, administration leaders had said they wanted $4,900,000,000 voted this year for a long-range program, to be spread over future years.

Confronted with justified congressional opposition to future commitments of that kind, President Eisenhower called key House and Senate leaders to his White House study. There they were asked, not for a future program, but a flexible $4,900,000,000 1957 program now.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had just returned from Paris, where he talked with the French, British, and others. He had been told of their needs.

On the other side of the picture is the House Foreign Affairs Committee and other Congressmen who have been hearing, not from the Prime Minister of Britain or the Khedive of Afghanistan, but from the folks back home.

These folks have been reading in their newspapers about this proposed new $4,900,000,000 (count the zeros) foreign giveaway. They are expressing their opinions in no uncertain terms.

Congress is getting an unexpectedly large volume of mail from all over the country protesting further spending programs abroad. The letters range from angry denunciations to reasoned objections.

Some of them ask why, with all the $53 billion we have sent abroad in the last 9 years, the Russians have not only been winning new followers but also the good will of some of our own allies.

Others want to know what good these financial grants do when the very countries which have been enjoying American bonanza now are leaning away from us toward neutralism and accommodation with the Soviets.

An increasing number of our own citizens are asking their Congressmen: "Do you believe we should continue to give large sums to our allies when we ought instead to be using this money to increase our own strategic bomber force and our guided-missiles program?"

How is it, Congress Members are being asked, that we propose to send over more cash for Allied military establishments when the whole lot of them now are in the midst of a disarmament binge?

Many of our average Americans have been visiting Europe. They have not been able to detect the hardships for which new billions of our economic assistance are needed. They are writing to their Congressmen.

The letters show a remarkable unanimity. They do not begrudge paying taxes for defense and security if the money is being used for that purpose. But they strongly question whether anything like $4,900,000,000—count the ciphers—in new foreign assistance is needed to protect this country.

This is grassroots reasoning, and it is right. There is a correct feeling that, since our friends are cutting down their military programs, we thereby need to increase our own. And that a lot of this proposed giveaway program should be diverted into planes and hardware for American defense.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is reported to be ready to make a deep cut this week in the administration's foreign-aid request. It should.

Foreign Policy Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, particularly in the Washington Daily News, an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy Debate." The editorial makes some very good suggestions, and is quite interesting and provocative. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE

Secretary of State Dulles welcomes a "thorough airing" of foreign policy in the election campaign so long as it is constructive debate. Any other position would be intolerable. Full discussion of all issues affecting the American people is part of the free way of life.

Mr. Dulles puts it this way: "I think it is a healthy thing that every 4 years foreign policy should be discussed."

But foreign policy in this age permeates almost every daily event. It needs to be discussed daily. Reviews and reappraisals should not await an election.

The Eisenhower administration seems unwilling to get down in the arena and debate foreign policy issues with the people. Repeatedly it squelches appeals for reexamination of foreign aid, information, defense, the cold war—usually with the answer that everything is fine as it is.

Repudiation of the Eisenhower foreign policy by the Wisconsin Republican convention—even allowing for Wisconsin's latent isolationism—should be a warning that the people are not tuned in on what the President is trying to do.

On several recent occasions the President has emphasized that "nothing is more important" than that the people understand the difficult problems of the world—what are the "basic facts," what are the alternatives, why don't we make better progress?

Yet the administration itself is doing little to promote such understanding. The President made a foreign policy speech at Waco, Tex., last Friday. But one can search it in vain for other than vague generalities, some of which are debatable.

For example, the President says "communism is, in the deepest sense, a gigantic failure." Without arguing what the President meant by "in deepest sense," most evidence adds up to the bitter fact that communism, on the surface, is a gigantic success. Not from our point of view, but certainly from the point of view of the evil men who lead the Communist movement.

Compare communism today with its status at birth in Russia 38 years ago—or even 11 years ago at the end of World War II. Why are hundreds of millions of Asians looking favorably on communism?

What of the Middle East—an area the Soviets and their Czarist predecessors have

coveted for more than 100 years? Are recent Red moves there, whatever their sinister motives, a gigantic failure?

Since Mr. Dulles concedes foreign policy is going to be an issue this year, it is time for the administration also to concede that the issue cannot be debated in generalities. The world is not at peace—in the deepest sense. The Free World is not winning the epic struggle with communism.

The American people can face those ominous facts—if they are informed. The American people will make the sacrifices needed to change those truths—if guided.

By all means let there be a great debate on foreign policy. It is many months overdue. But, in the President's own words, let us have the basic facts and not try to appraise our policies on the basis of pious platitudes.

Unhappy Coincidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star:

UNHAPPY COINCIDENCE

President Eisenhower's operation inevitably raises the question whether he will now decline to seek reelection. Only one man can answer it—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The doctors believe there is no medical reason why Mr. Eisenhower should not run. They maintain in effect that the operation to remove obstruction of the lower intestine was nothing more than an unhappy coincidence in relation to the President's earlier heart attack.

The intestinal disorder was not caused by a cardiac condition and Mr. Eisenhower's heart was not weakened by the operation. This is the testimony of the doctors.

The medical consensus is that the operation will improve Mr. Eisenhower's general health and prolong his life expectancy. There is no reason to think that more than a dozen nationally respected physicians and surgeons would be in agreement on this point if it were not true to the best of their knowledge. Their job is health, not politics.

In other words, there is better medical reason now than there was before the operation why the President should stand for reelection. There is better reason why he should be reelected if he does decide to run. The only real issue is Mr. Eisenhower's own attitude, his mental reaction. It is all important.

No one should ask him to remain in the presidency if staying there would impose worries about his health which might, in fact, make it worse. If this new trouble makes him fretful and apprehensive of the future, his real well-wishers would prefer to see him retire. The Nation does not need to and would not want to call upon Mr. Eisenhower for what he might consider a supreme sacrifice.

We hope that the President accepts the doctors' findings as the people have accepted them—as good news. If he is able to look ahead with optimistic confidence to better health sure in his own mind that the doctors are right, then he should abide by his earlier decision to accept the Republican nomination.

Mr. Eisenhower's whole record is one of optimism. He has never shown any attributes of a chronic worrier. On the basis of the President's character, it does not seem likely that he will withdraw from the political race.

If he stays in, the health issue will be used more strongly than ever by his opponents. Politics needs no logic for its arguments, and the coincidence of a heart attack and an operation within a period of a few months will be stressed. Whispering campaigns will be launched.

When they come, it would be well to bear in mind that the health issue is little changed. If there is an issue there, it is Mr. Eisenhower's heart. Public reaction has already largely rejected opposition arguments based on that issue.

A Little Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill and made a brief statement in connection with the Supreme Court's decision which tore down one of our very important defense bastions in our internal security program. In connection with it I made some statements concerning certain editorial writers in this country who consistently have supported those who favor a soft policy toward American subversives. So, Mr. President, I am happy today to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which is headed "A Little Disloyalty," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, generally accepted as one of the most constructive and most carefully edited newspapers in the United States.

It provides an eloquent argument in support of my proposed legislation.

I recognize that every editorial writer has his own point of view. But it seems that many writers on the metropolitan morning newspapers in the East write their editorials so early in the morning that they do not have both eyes wide open. I suppose that since they get up so early in the morning they open only their left eyes, because their editorials so frequently appear to be written to the left. I believe if the editorial writers would try to write their editorials in the afternoon, when both eyes are open, they could give us a better approach to and a more helpful understanding of what we should do in these days of peril to defend ourselves against subversion from within. Their editorials thereby might be better balanced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LITTLE DISLOYALTY

In 1950 Congress passed a law permitting dismissal without appeal of security risks in 11 sensitive Government offices. The law also granted the President authority to extend the provisions of the act to any other Departments or Agencies where necessary in the best interests of national security.

In 1953 President Eisenhower issued an Executive order blanketing the entire Government under the provisions of the law. A number of Government employees were subsequently fired as security risks—either because they were subversive, or associated with subversives, because their morals laid them open to blackmail, or because they couldn't keep a still tongue in their heads.

Now, the Supreme Court by a 6 to 3 decision says the President had no right to broaden the act's provisions to include all Government employees. The majority opinion said the act was designed to control those activities of the Government that are directly concerned with the protection of the Nation from internal subversion or foreign aggression. All other Government activities are nonsensitive and thus outside the law.

Stripped of its legalisms, the ruling plainly means that treasonable people have a right to work for the Government in some jobs and the Government has no right to fire them.

We think the Supreme Court is wrong for two reasons. One is that the Court makes a distinction between the risk the Government should take in one man in one job and another man in a different job.

Any person in Government who is a security risk is in a position to do disservice to the country. The three members of the Supreme Court who disagreed with the majority ruling wrote that "The janitor might prove to be as important securitywise as the top employee in the building." They added that the ruling "might leave the Government honeycombed with subversive employees."

And there is the second reason for disagreeing with the majority's ruling.

The decision can seriously shake the reliance people must have in their Government. The public is told by the Congress and the executive department that communism is a danger to our way of life and that we must spend great sums of our earnings to combat it here and abroad.

Yet the Supreme Court says that security risks have a right to work in the Government, that there is nothing wrong legally with a little disloyalty providing it is found only in some places and not in others.

We think that most Americans will agree with Mr. Eisenhower, who believes that Government employment is a privilege and not a right. And we think they will agree with him when he demands "complete and unswerving loyalty" to the Constitution of every person who is employed by the Government.

Anything less cannot only honeycomb the Government with spies, but destroy the very fabric of public confidence on which Government must rest.

Doing Business With Communists

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the American people, and I think to the free world generally, that you cannot do business with Communists unless you do it on their terms. It comes with a good deal of surprise to find out that neutralism in Europe is on the march. It is on the march in Asia and also in our own country we find that there are those in official

positions who today feel that they can do business with the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, we are on notice in that respect, however. It was in 1920 when the Secretary of State for President Wilson, Mr. Colby, put it in black and white with respect to the broken promises of Russia.

He stated:

The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

See note for further quotation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that policy has not changed even to this day.

Freeing the Satellites Is the Test of Communist Good Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum from the Alliance of Czechoslovak Exiles in Chicago, on the 11th anniversary of the Kosice Program.

This memorandum details the steps by which the Communists seized an independent nation and subjected it to alien rule.

I fully endorse the conclusion of the statement that the real test of the attack on Stalin's reputation will come when and if the Communists tear down the iron curtain about the satellite nations and permit them to have a government which the rest of the world can be permitted to see.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEING THE SATELLITES IS THE TEST OF COMMUNIST GOOD FAITH

In the case of Czechoslovakia, may we take this opportunity to utter words of warning on this, the 11th anniversary of the Kosice of April 5, 1945. The Kosice program in its entirety set the pattern for the future Czechoslovakia, under the control of the national front. Into this front, the political parties with Marxist and socialistic programs were to be included and allowed to participate. Antisocialistic and anticommunistic parties, more particularly the parties from 1919, who were the bulwarks of the nation, were denied participation in the national front. Political leaders were summarily jailed; property was confiscated and divided among the parties of the national front and private enterprise halted. In fact, the program of nationalization was begun and carried out, and the death knell of the democratic parties of the First Republic was sounded.

The Kostice program entailed the giving over of the free and independent labor organizations unto the control of the communistic-dominated organizations, and factory militia was created. Also, merging of organizations including gymnastic societies, control of the school system by communistic doctrines, control of all social and welfare agencies, regulation of religious institutions, control and censorship of the press, denial of the right of peaceful assembly and a host of other suppressions were incorporated in this program. Another bolster to the program was the creation of the socialistic bloc, which strengthened and enforced the decrees of the "National Front."

The national front, with its nationalizing decrees, its factory militia, its destruction of capital and private enterprise by the "Socialistic Bloc," all tended to prepare the way for the communistic putsch. Valerian Zorin, who came to Prague at the command of Stalin had the way well prepared for the eventual carrying out of the putsch.

In no other state overlorded by the Communists was freedom and democracy so completely killed as in Czechoslovakia. This criminal and fraudulent government, prepared after the February putsch, the Constitution of May 9, is no other than living proof of the divestation of democracy in the Czechoslovak Republic.

The Czechoslovak Exiles in Chicago, the largest organization of its kind, herewith recalls the sins and criminal acts of the Kosice program, and warns liberty-loving peoples everywhere not to believe in the Soviet leaders who would blame everything on Stalin. During his life, thousands were jailed and murdered, and today his cohorts have one responsibility, which is to return the freedom of all enslaved nations. They have the power given them by the hands of the Dictator Stalin. Let them demonstrate that they are better than Stalin, not by words, but by deed. The Czechoslovak Exiles not only wish to warn the free world against criminality, but address itself to Stalin's fellow guilty and ask them to banish the freedom-robbing decrees. Also, we ask them to return liberty, democracy and freedom to the enslaved peoples in Czechoslovakia, a freedom which they helped to destroy by the Kocise program and the subsequent putsch.

At a time when the whole world is surprised by the systematic and well-thought-out fraudulent plan of the communistic leaders in the Soviet Union, who are bending every effort to place all the guilt and responsibility upon the the late Dictator Stalin, there can be no doubt for the moment that the program for the restoration of freedom and democracy in the countries behind the Iron Curtain is entering into a new period.

For 8 years, we are in exile, forced upon us by the Soviet dictatorship. Many time we have called attention to the mass murders ordered by Stalin and to those who assisted and blindly carried out his orders. To us, who have counted the murders by this criminal system, it is hard to believe that there are people today who still, in their blind trust in socialism, can believe in coexistence with communism. All those, who today are engaged in the tearing down of the Stalin myth and trying to clear the names of those executed, guilty or not, seem to forget that there are thousands upon thousands who were eyewitnesses to concentration camps, jails and torture chambers.

The time has now arrived for the so-called representatives of the people behind the Iron Curtain to come forth and loudly herald that Messrs. Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Malenkov and others of this bloody Stalinist regime, show good faith, tear down the Iron Curtain, allow free elections, open the jails and forced labor camps, free those charged with political activity against the state, allow religious freedom and lastly, tell the Soviet people the truth.

Recreation Program for the City of Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because of the physical-fitness program now being promoted by the President of the United States and others in Government, I think an article in the June 10 issue of the Northwest Magazine of the Sunday Oregonian is unusually pertinent and appropriate. The title of the article is "Her Work Is Play," by Elizabeth Salway Ryan, noted Oregon writer.

The article describes the career and achievements of Miss Dorothea Lensch, physical education instructor and director of the park bureau recreation program of the city of Portland. Under the supervision of Miss Lensch, an outstanding program of recreation has been worked out for the children and young people of our community. This program not only serves to combat juvenile delinquency, but also improves the mental and physical well-being of our city and State as a whole.

Miss Lensch has had a notable career in the realm of community development and physical education. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mrs. Ryan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HER WORK IS PLAY

(By Elizabeth Salway Ryan)

For years Portland's park recreation was a summer project appealing mostly to youngsters. Today the year-around program is for everyone. Responsible for the tremendous growth and the continual stream of new ideas is Dorothea Lensch, director of recreation for the Portland park bureau, a woman who radiates enthusiasm.

Often she is at her desk in the city hall at 7:30 a. m. She likely is the last to leave after helping pack the props about midnight for a show at Washington park or the civic auditorium. Perhaps she held up some of the scenery during the performance. Even the youngest troupers chirp, "Hello, Miss Lensch." Mealtimes frequently see her at some service club speaking on her favorite topic—recreation.

This vivacious brown-eyed dynamo, known to hundreds as Dot or Dorothea, has been interested in activity since her first taste under Richard Gens-Genserowski at Portland's old Turnverein. She relishes every sport but one. When she was small, she once dived into the water and landed on another child. This so upset her she has disliked swimming ever since.

She won the Franklin High School girls' league cup for scholarship, character, leadership, and service. She attended Mills College a year, switched to physical education at the University of Oregon, made every honorary she was eligible for, including Mortar Board and Phi Beta Kappa, and was president of the Women's Athletic Association.

Next came a master's degree at Wellesley and teaching at Rockford College, Ill., and George Washington University. But she dreamed of Portland and at the first oppor-

tunity took the civil-service exam for recreation director.

When she began in 1938, only Montavilla, Sellwood, and Peninsula Parks had centers for winter indoors activities. Seven full-time employees comprised the staff, with thirty-three more in the summer.

She has seen her vision translated into 15 buildings with full- or part-time year-round programs. These include the junior museum, which develops talent in both gifted adults and children; the Soroptimist center, where retired women combat loneliness; the talent workshop for amateurs to acquire poise and the new craft house for those who like art.

Add 3 year-round swimming pools, the Neighborhood House pool, and the 43 parks with summer programs. Many schools contribute their facilities at times. The full-time recreation staff of 55 is joined by 130 more in the summer.

On her expanded menu are everything from checkers and ceramics to skaterball, baseball, and seven-man football. In past days, aside from high school swimming and tennis, girls had little chance to compete. She sees they get competition now in Portland's parks, with softball, volleyball, and basketball added, and they love it.

Most Portland park programs have no sex segregation. All preschool games, rhythms, storytelling, are for both boys and girls. Older boys and girls learn tennis, golf, and dance together.

Once she thought of being a doctor and was accepted at the University of Oregon medical school, several years after becoming recreation director. She had felt the need of an additional challenge. It came—with the attack on Pearl Harbor. Civilian housing units, Vanport, shipyard workers and servicemen all needed recreation.

She got the use of schools, churches, and even store buildings. Vanport had its own centers. They had big Halloween parties and posted records of no vandalism.

Her own recreation few would call relaxing, for it is the strenuous modern dance. As a college senior she acted the swaggering Goliath in a dance recital when Martha Hill was the teacher. Later she studied under Martha Graham, and spent a summer in Germany with Mary Wigman.

Since her return to Portland, she has led a modern dance group. Several of these women have been with her since the beginning and share expenses of an accompanist. Like them, she is unhappy when she can't attend Monday evenings. They have danced at the art museum and in operas at Washigton Park.

"In presenting a technique in movement, she never analyzes an individual or singles one out who may be performing the movement ineffectively," said Mrs. Ione Walker, Washington high physical education teacher and member of the group.

How does Miss Lensch add to Portland's recreation? Sometimes it begins with a call: "We need a recreation center."

"I'll see what I can do," says the friendly director.

Mayor Fred L. Peterson was in charge of the park bureau several years as commissioner, and often sees this phrase become action. He told of the St. Johns recreation hall which belonged to Oregon Shipyard:

"At the close of the war, when this building became surplus, Dorothea came to me with the idea it could be moved and re-erected at much less than its original cost ($400,000) or present value. It cost the city $1,500, plus the cost of moving and re-erecting in St. Johns.

"She helped organize a group of St. Johns citizens headed by the St. Johns businessmen and the St. Johns Optimists. They raised some $4,000 to help furnish the building with the necessary ranges, chairs, curtains, etc."

As for the junior museum, Mayor Peterson said Dorothea worked with the junior league in starting the project.

"She conceived the idea that the old Jacob Kamm home, vacant and owned by the school board, where now stands the Lincoln High School, would be suitable for a junior museum. Today the junior museum is quite a project at Southwest Second Avenue and Hood Street."

After the vacated South Portland branch library was turned over to the city, Miss Lensch saw to its transformation. It is now the craft house, used for demonstrations, exhibits, and as a workshop for arts and crafts.

Furnishings for these buildings never come from taxes. So Miss Lensch, a poised, efficient organizer, visits service clubs.

"We have a community center for you now," she says. "We will staff it, but we need your help. We need furnishings and equipment other than the bats and balls the city supplies." They respond.

The Active Club provides awards for the annual Swimathon. The American Legion sponsors the Junior Olympics. The Peninsula Kiwanis initiated the Golden Ball basketball tournament. It outgrew them, but they still serve as officials and give medical examinations.

The downtown Portland Lions bought a pony for the youngsters at the junior museum. The Optimists supported junior teams and bought uniforms. Outstanding high-school girls advise and officiate for grade-school groups and contests.

After a study, the Soroptimist women found that many older retired women were living alone and hungry for companionship. As a member, Miss Lensch shared in the decision to pay about $2,000 yearly for the Soroptimist center at SW. Third Avenue and Salmon Street. The park bureau staffs it.

Before the first world softball championship came to Portland, Mayor Peterson went to Houston. "Part of the material which helped me secure the championship," he said, "was Dorothea's fine outline as to the manner in which the team would be cared for and the type of recreation and entertainment planned for them. The fact that she is a national figure in recreation added great credit to her program. Because of the manner in which it was handled, for the first time in the history of amateur softball the tournament was split up, and the women came to Portland in 1949."

They came again in 1955.

Miss Lensch takes an active part in recreation and AAU conferences, and is a member of the national PTA board. Others often come to Portland to study her formula for successful recreation. In 1951, the State Department sent her to Germany for 4 months to help organize a recreation program.

She loves to travel, but even her vacations, such as her flying trip to South America, turn into tours to see how others handle recreation.

If she isn't speaking at some service club or on the radio, perhaps she is appearing at a high school career day or at a college.

Anyone who has watched her on the job, sometimes 7 days a week, will agree with Mayor Peterson:

"Dorothea has been, is, and will always be planning, thinking, and working for something bigger and better to improve the recreation facilities for the people of the city of Portland."

Why I Am Dedicated to Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay entitled "Why I Am Dedicated to Teaching," written by Gertrude M. Geraghty, and published in the Tennessee Teacher for May 1956. It is the prize-winning essay in the contest held by the Lion Oil scholarship fund, and I am certain it will be appreciated by teachers and by members of parent-teacher groups who may read it.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM DEDICATED TO TEACHING

(By Gertrude M. Geraghty, teacher of English, Memphis Technical High School, Memphis, Tenn.)

My early years of teaching were carefree and happy. I enjoyed my work but certainly had not the faintest idea of dedicating my life to it. A husband, home, and children were foremost in my dream of the future. When I was 30, I decided that being a wife and mother was not God's plan for me, or in some way I had muffed my chance.

I settled down, not bitterly, not hopelessly, to forget my lost romance in the training and educating of other people's children. Since I was to have no children of my own, what better lifework could I choose? As the years went by, I began to see and to feel the significance of my job. God expects everyone, I reasoned, to render an account of his talents. He will expect me to do the best job of teaching that I am capable of doing.

I must never lose sight of the fact that I am dealing with the most precious of all commodities, human beings; that subject matter, techniques of teaching are valueless if I forget the child in my teaching. With the realization of this fact, my work became important to me. It was not a new job but a different slant on a familiar one. It put life and meaning into my work. I did not feel like a crusader, however. I have never kept my eyes and mind so close to my profession that I have had no time for the interesting things on the outside.

It is remarkable how much one can enjoy his work if his heart is in it. The joyless, drab, monotonous task becomes an adventure. I am always annoyed with the well-meaning person who says: "Oh, you must have loads of patience. I don't know how you put up with so many bad children day after day. My own boys nearly drive me crazy." I try to point out to her that children are not bad—at least not every day—that there is a pattern of classroom behavior to which most children conform. I see I am throwing words away; she is "of the same opinion still."

Are we teachers not somewhat to blame for the pitying attitude some people adopt? Have we unconsciously developed a long-suffering, "down-at-the-heel" air? Do we need anyone's pity? Have we the pride in our profession that we should justly have? Most teachers today are smartly dressed, well-groomed, interesting women who are taking important places in the life of the community. We should really put a higher value on ourselves.

In what other profession would I have so much adventure, so much romance? In what other job would I have the chance to stay young with young people, for every day I live their lives, vicariously. To get the confidence of the boys and girls in the classroom, to feel that one has a part in molding the future citizens of our country—these two facts alone make a teacher's life worth while.

I can see that teaching subject matter, day after day, year after year, could become deadly monotonous. If we aren't getting joy out of our teaching, then we certainly aren't giving any. The teacher's gaiety is as necessary to her pupils as sympathy and understanding. Not every Monday is blue Monday, and there is always "Friday, thank

God." The teacher's whole soul must be bent on making her pupils come alive. She must be a master salesman, and the competition is keen. To prod the lazy, to lure the difficult, to encourage the slow, and to guide them all, she must possess the charm of a Cleopatra, the wiles of a Machiavelli, the patience of Job, the gentleness of St. Francis, and the wisdom of Solomon.

In our little world at school, every day is a fresh beginning. The discourteous boy who disrupted yesterday's class has apologized; the truant has returned repentant. The day is made new for all of us, for I have another chance also. What a challenge the new day brings; what a feeling of adventure. The boys are spick and span in uniform today, brass shining, shoes polished. They sit up straight with new dignity. The girls look fresh and pretty. All are watching me; they are giving me a chance to make good. I must not "goof." "Dear Lord," I breathe, "make me patient and gentle and wise, and help me to keep a sense of humor." My Irish sense of humor has helped me over many a difficult spot. Only a few days ago, a boy in one of my senior English classes remarked, "Miss G., I never cut your class. We get a kick out of this class. You are so human; you make us laugh. You ought to be on TV. No kidding." I must watch my witty remarks. They so easily become sarcastic, and children have no defense against sarcasm.

I hope I do not sound smug or complacent. My mistakes are legion. I do not always plant a flower where I find a weed growing. Sometimes the weeds seem to take over, but when, if ever, does a teacher really enjoy the feeling of having succeeded? I am often discouraged and disgusted, but just one word of praise from a superior or a word of appreciation from a pupil or parent will completely restore me.

"And then my state, like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth, sings songs at Heaven's gate."

Like the immortal bard, I then scorn to change my state with kings.

I feel a great pride in my profession. Like Stevenson, I could not live without my art. I believe with Jesse Stuart that "The schoolroom is the gateway to all the problems of humanity." It is the gateway to the correcting of evils; it is the gateway to happiness, to health, to brotherhood, to everything. And so I am happy to dedicate myself to the greatest profession of mankind. Even if it is the most poorly paid in dollars and cents, it is the one with the richest rewards.

And So, Mr. Butler, Let's Not Talk About Our Operations, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Boyer, editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune, in the June 13, 1956, issue, has the following editorial comment regarding the constant harping of Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in his frenzied efforts to belittle Presidential Press Secretary James C. Hagerty's efforts to keep the American people fully informed on the recent illness of President Eisenhower:

"NOW, ABOUT MY OPERATION—"

Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Tuesday accused President Eisenhower's associates of reporting on his illness "in terms of propaganda."

Mr. Butler was especially irked by what he said was the practice of Mr. James C. Hagerty, Presidential press secretary, as trying to picture Mr. Eisenhower as a better man because of his recent illnesses and operation.

We do think Mr. Butler is treading on dangerous ground. It may have escaped his notice that two current top Democratic aspirants have had recent operations. Gov. Averell Harriman of New York is recovering now from a glandular operation, and Mr. Adlai Stevenson had a gall bladder operation not long ago.

Mr. Stevenson apparently is in better health than ever, and has been campaigning vigorously, no one, so far as we've heard, even hinting that his operation was a detriment to his campaign, or made him in any way ineligible for the presidency.

And, as for Governor Harriman, his operation was hardly over until he announced formally his candidacy. Again, no one has suggested that an operation has put him out of the running.

It seems reasonable to suppose that the operations were performed on all these men because in the judgment of their doctors, such operations were necessary to continued good health and life.

The President's ileitis not only has introduced a new word to the lay public, but also, from the considerable medical explanation given variously on the subject, apparently is the culmination of a condition which could have rendered him in poor health for an indefinite period; and now, with correction of the difficulty, may place him in better health than he has been for some years.

All this at least is as reasonable to assume as it is that both Governor Harriman and Mr. Stevenson now will be in normal health because of their operations.

And so, Mr. Butler, let's not talk about our operations, please.

Farmer Carroll Gets Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 20, 1956.

The editorial tells the story of a Florida farmer who refused to sign a crop-acreage report on his own farm at the insistence of the Federal Department of Agriculture. He was promptly put into jail.

The editorial writer of the Star sees to the heart of the matter, when he says that such actions by Federal bureaucrats are, in fact, a claim to Government ownership rights in the land, transcending the rights of the individual who bought and paid for it. The so-called private owner may retain the appearance of a title to the land, but he is in fact being transformed into a serf.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star of May 20, 1956]

FARMER CARROLL GETS HELP

Walter T. Carroll, a farmer in northern Florida, was helped by the Federal Government last Saturday—right into jail. Carroll, who believes that he and nobody else is the owner of his farm, was sentenced indefinitely for contempt of court after refusing to sign a crop acreage report for the United States Department of Agriculture.

The Federal view is that when a lot of farmers in a district go along with acreage allocation agreements, you just can't let someone like Carroll upset the turnip cart by refusing to certify whether he has 10 acres of sorghum hidden on the west 40. Carroll's view is that it is none of the Government's business.

We think Carroll is right.

It may very well be that the voluntary cooperation of farmers in allocating acreage to various crops is a good thing for the agricultural economy. It may be also that the United States Department of Agriculture is the logical agency in which to center such cooperation. But when jail or the threat of jail takes the place of voluntary action, that is something else again.

Such measures as were taken in Florida represent in effect a claim to Federal ownership of farm lands transcending the ownership of the individual farmer. Under this theory, the farmer is left in possession of the land he thinks is his—except when he goes to jail—and is allowed to take the profit from it, if any. He is even allowed a certain measure of self-determination in what he will plant.

Let the serf get to feeling uppity, however, and decide that what he does on his own farm is his own business, and he soon finds out that he had a senior stockholder looking over his shoulder all the time, ready with a club to enforce that economic magic called "compliance."

The fact that Carroll went to jail for asserting one of the primary rights of ownership should surprise no one who has studied the course of Federal assistance in various fields. No matter how pure the motive in the beginning, Federal aid means creeping Federal encroachment on the rights of States and individuals alike. Bureaucratic control feeds on itself until in the end anyone who opposes it comes to be regarded as against the common interest, and therefore an enemy of society.

We suspect that something of this kind was in the mind of Midwestern farmers recently interviewed by Gallup poll representatives. The farmers were reported to be lukewarm to the proposed soil-bank plan, many of them tending to think of it as another instance of the Government "trying to tell me what to do."

They have had enough of that, and who can blame them?

The mere existence of any Federal farm program calls for a certain measure of control from Washington. In the soil-bank plan, for instance, the participating farmer cannot be given an entirely free hand in deciding which of his acres he will retire from production. The Federal Government must make sure he is not cheating.

This, in theory, protects the bulk of the taxpayers, whose money is going to help support the farmer. In bureaucratic practice, it creates an opening wedge for regulation piled upon regulation. Ultimately and inevitably, as the program becomes a fixture of agricultural life, the demand will grow among the Socialist-minded to enfore compliance upon the few rugged individualists who believe that they have a right to do as they please with what is theirs.

We hear a great deal in this election year about the so-called farm revolt, but it is mere chicken feed beside the real farm revolt that may come one of these days if the farmers discover that bureaucracy is on the way to making Walter Carrolls out of all of them.

Corporate Accounting Standards Under Federal Securities Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Corporate Accounting Standards Under Federal Securities Laws," delivered by Mr. J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., before the 18th annual institute on accounting of the Ohio State University, at Columbus, Ohio, on May 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE ACCOUNTING STANDARDS UNDER FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS

(Address of J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., before the 18th annual institute on accounting of the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, May 17, 1956)

It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to address the 18th annual accounting institute of the College of Commerce of Ohio State University on the subject of corporate accounting standards under the Federal securities laws. The 18 years during which this great university has annually sponsored this 2-day gathering of distinguished scholars, practitioners, and students in the accounting field are the years in which the great evolution of accounting standards has occurred, under guidelines and standards set by the acts of Congress administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Parenthetically, may I say, as a member and Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, I feel a close relationship with Ohio State University, in this way. As an independent agency, the Commission is by statute under the surveillance of two standing committees of the Congress. In the Senate the committee which watches over the Commission is the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which your trustee and distinguished Senator, JOHN W. BRICKER, is a member. In my talks with him from time to time he has often spoken of his great interest in the growth and accomplishments of Ohio State University, and of its College of Commerce, under whose auspices this accounting institute is held.

Before discussing accounting standards as such, I want to emphasize the great importance the accounting standards developed under guidance of the Securities and Exchange Commission, with the aid of the profession, over the past quarter century have had for the economy of America, and hence for the people of America. Good accounting is the essence of financial reporting. Good financial reporting to investors and security holders is the only way by which the public can be put in a position to make intelligent investment judgment. There are at the present time 2,238 issuers required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to file financial reports with the Commission because their securities are listed and traded on national securities exchanges and 1,104 additional issuers required by the Securities Act of 1933 to file such reports because of having made public sale of their securities in interstate commerce. The development of the enormous body of financial information, by reports prepared under the accounting standards of the Securities and Exchange Commission and in accordance with accounting principles deemed by the accounting profession to be generally acceptable, with respect to these listed and publicly financed corporations has been a vital factor in the restoration in the past few years of investor confidence in the securities markets. This confidence was badly shaken in the 1920's and early 1930's, as a result of abuses in the securities markets. On continued public confidence in the securities markets of the country depends the ability of the privately owned system of productive enterprises to raise the capital which will be needed in enormous amounts to finance the industrial expansion required for our increasing population and higher standard of living in the years immediately ahead.

The capital requirements of American industry in the next decade are expected to be very much greater than those of the years just passed, but let me tell you of them briefly to give you a glimpse of the enormous amounts of money involved.

In the year 1946 to the present, new records for industrial expansion were established and for public financing by business corporations. In this period business corporations spent $52 billion on increases in working capital and $196 billion on plant and equipment. The corporations obtained $178 billion of the funds required from internal sources, retained earnings, depreciation accruals, and the like, but raised $63 billion of new money (net of retirements) from the sale of new securities and bank and mortgage financing. Furthermore, of the securities sold, 22 percent were equities, that is capital stock. The confidence of the investing public in the securities of corporations can only be based on sound financial reporting. With that confidence continuing the enormous amounts of capital funds which must be channeled from the savings of the American people into our privately owned corporate enterprises will be raised and our free-enterprise system will advance in accordance with our expanding needs.

With this larger orientation, now let me come to the more specific area of discussion, corporate accounting standards under the Federal securities laws. These are the laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The rapid increase in the use of corporate forms of organization and the great size to which some corporations have grown, with the accompanying subdivision of ownership and the separation of immediate control of operating policies from the stockholder owners, have made reliable accounting reports a vital necessity for managerial control and investment management. While investors cannot expect to obtain from financial statements all the information necessary to the exercise of investment judgment, nevertheless financial statements come close to being the only common measure of comparison of different companies and are the basic sources of all financial information.

Accounting and financial information plays an important part in all of the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission. In the administration of the Securities Act and the Exchange Act accounting plays a most important role. These acts have had the greatest influence on the development of the present character of corporate accounting standards. The important role accounting plays in the administration of the Securities Acts is foreshadowed in the acts themselves.

The title of the Securities Act states that it is "An act to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of securities sold in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes."

It is designed to make available to investors the business and financial facts deemed by the Congress to be necessary for the investing public on which to base an informed judgment as to whether to buy new issues of securities being offered.

The title of the Exchange Act states that it is "An act to provide for the regulation of securities exchanges and of over-the-counter markets operating in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, to prevent inequitable and unfair practices on such exchanges and markets, and for other purposes."

This law provides for, among other things, the filing by listed companies of periodic financial reports. It provides for regulation by the Commission of solicitation by listed companies of proxies from their stockholders. It requires brokers and dealers to maintain certain records and file certain reports with the Commission. All of these provisions in most instances require the filing of financial statements certified by independent accountants. The aim of this legislation is broader than that of the Securities Act in that it is to provide the information to be used by the investor in determining what securities to buy, hold or sell. It also contains regulatory provisions regarding the stock exchanges and the over-the-counter markets.

The enactment of the Federal securities laws and the establishment of an administrative agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, to effect recognition of the investor's interests have created unusual demands on accounting and the accounting profession and have had a forceful impact on the trend of accounting thought and development of reporting techniques. Under these laws the fundamental basis of regulation is disclosure—disclosure of all pertinent information concerning the securities and the issuers. Neither the Securities Act nor the Exchange Act gives the Commission authority to pass on the merits of any security or to approve or disapprove any security. For this reason, these laws are called disclosure acts. They also include vital antifraud provisions.

The components of a matured investment judgment are not susceptible of exact mathematical determination. Particular facts which induce the investor to buy or sell or hold are often extraneous to the business itself or even the industry. Judgement as to the future of the industry or the competitive position of a company in its industry, or judgement as to the ability of the management may be the immediate motivating force in reaching an investment decision. Such a decision to be an informed judgment, however, could be made only after an analytical study of the available financial information.

The backbone of the information to be used in arriving at such a decision is the operating history and financial position of the corporation as reflected in its financial statements. This is basic information. This factual information is the starting point for any analytical study, whether it be to review the operating efficiency of the company, to appraise its financial position or the caliber of its management, to formulate business plans, such as for expansion, retrenchment, or direction of sales effort, or for investment analysis.

The statements required in the Commission's forms are the conventional balance sheets, income and surplus statements, and certain supporting schedules. The registra-

tion statement forms for new issues of securities usually require 3-year income and surplus statements, and in the prospectus to be delivered to the investor a summary of earnings for an appropriate period, usually not less than 5 years.

The form and content of the required financial statements are set forth in the Commission's accounting rules, known as regulation S–X. This regulation does not purport to define accounting principles. It merely defines the extent of the detailed information required in conventional terminology and present accounting practice. It was worked out with the advice and cooperation of the accounting profession, and is under constant revision in the same spirit of cooperation.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has often been importuned to write accounting principles into regulation S–X. We have even been petitioned to adopt rules requiring corporations to conform to advanced accounting theories, such as economic depreciation. But the Commission has wisely left the development of accounting principles and practices to the accounting profession and the educators. This approach has been urged upon us in the past by leaders in both the practicing and the academic sectors of the profession.

This does not mean that we have abdicated our authority or delegated it to the accounting profession. The Securities Acts give the Commission authority to require financial statements certified by independent accountants. In most instances we require that the statements be certified by independent accountants and we have taken steps to insure that the accountants will be independent.

Likewise, the Securities Acts require that a broad schedule of information be furnished and leaves the Commission a wide latitude as to the amount of detail to be required, even to defining the method to be followed in the preparation of the reports. Section 13 (b) of the Exchange Act states:

"The Commission may prescribe, in regard to reports made pursuant to this title, the form or forms in which the required information shall be set forth, the items or details to be shown in the balance sheet and the earning statement, and the methods to be followed in the preparation of reports, in the appraisal or valuation of assets and liabilities, in the determination of depreciation and depletion, in the differentiation of recurring and nonrecurring income, in the differentiation of investment and operating income."

But the Securities Acts do not attempt to define corporate accounting standards to be used in writing those rules and regulations. They do not even mention accounting principles. These matters are left to the discretion of the Commission.

Consequently, while our regulations use generally accepted accounting terminology and we expect financial statements filed with us to be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practices, as we believe that this will best indicate their significance and character, we are in no way limited to accepted accounting practice in obtaining such information as we deem necessary or appropriate for investors. Many requirements in regulation S–X were not required by generally accepted practice at the time the rules were adopted. For example, rule 3–19 of regulation S–X requires disclosure in footnotes of assets subject to lien, intercompany profits and losses, defaults, terms of preferred shares, pension and retirement plans, restrictions on the availability of surplus for dividend purposes, and contingent liabilities. Likewise, rule 3–20 requires disclosure of installment sales, intercompany profits and losses, depreciation and amortization policies, and stock options to officers and employees.

The Commission's staff has recently made a study of the stockholders reports of some 1,200 unlisted companies which have at least 750 stockholders of one class and $2 million of total assets. This study showed that while about 85 percent of the reports gave a complete set of financial statements, that is, balance sheet, income, and surplus accounts, and generally followed accepted accounting principles and practices, at least 50 percent of them failed to give the type of information I have just mentioned.

Even more important than the extent of the detail of information required or the endeavor to obtain adequate information is the accuracy and integrity of the information obtained. The Commission attempts to restrict the financial statements to pertinent factual information and to avoid the inclusion of forecasts or evaluations of securities. It is the Commission's practice to test the information furnished for substantial truth and accuracy but to leave the investor to draw his own conclusions.

Financial statements filed with us are required to be prepared on the historical cost basis as determined by conventional accounting practices. They are in most cases required to be certified by an independent public accountant. Under both the Securities Act and the Exchange Act, the corporation filing must sign the registration statement or annual report through an authorized officer. In addition, in a registration statement under the Securities Act the principal executive officer, principal financial officer, and principal accounting officer, and a majority of the board of directors must sign the registration statement. The management is therefore responsible for the preparation and reliability of the financial statements, which are required to be reviewed independently by accountants who are not connected with the business. Thus there is a dual responsibility imposed upon both management and independent accountants for the financial statements. This dual responsibility is not satisfied if the accountant is not independent as defined in our rules and regulations, or if the management has left its accounting responsibilities to be performed by outside accountants. This does not, of course, prevent the management from relying on the report and audit of an independent accountant to the extent that they may legally rely upon the report of an expert.

Although we discourage persons filing registration statements and other statements and reports from including evaluations of the security being offered and forecasts of earnings, we do not underrate the importance of current values, economic and financial analysis, and interpretations and forecasts. But we consider that these are beyond the scope of financial statements and of the basic factual information required by the Securities Acts under their disclosure standards. A sharp distinction should be drawn between the presentation of factual information and interpretations, forecasts and conclusions. As a general rule, for a person preparing and certifying accounting data to go beyond factual information detracts from the reliability, integrity and usefulness of the report.

It is because the Commission considers the integrity and accuracy of this basic financial information of first importance that it has throughout its existence resisted the pressure to accept the reflection in financial statements of departures from historical cost. By historical cost is meant the appropriate cost basis as determined by conventional accounting practices and techniques. There are many problems connected with determination of historical cost. We do not, however, object to showing in a proper manner factual evidence of increases in value of assets during the time held by the corporation, or the effect on the operating results or financial position of changes in price levels.

While, in general, we adhere to the historical cost principle, we also have to deal with all problems which come before us in the regular course of business. For example, in certain instances we have not objected to the determination of an appropriate initial carrying value in excess of cost to the last purchaser in situations in which historical cost principles were deemed not to apply. These situations are concerned with the determination of original carrying value, usually to a new corporation under circumstances approaching arm's-length bargaining, and where the value of the assets in question have been substantiated by appropriate means. We do not, however, consider these determinations as judgments of principle, but rather as interpretations of conflicting principles. We do not consider them necessarily as precedents, but as each such problem arises we consider its own merits. We have indicated in recent discussions with representatives of the accounting profession our desire to review this area of accounting thought to determine whether a satisfactory expression of the principles could be developed.

In summary, the main aim of the Securities Acts is good financial reporting. Accounting does not encompass all financial reporting, but it is the backbone of financial reporting and is of vital importance in the administration of the Federal securities laws. It is most significant for corporate accounting standards under the Federal securities laws that the accounting profession, industry, and the Securities and Exchange Commission have cooperated in the development of appropriate standards of reporting and disclosure to meet changing conditions. This progress must continue if the confidence of the American people in the corporate securities markets is to be earned in the years ahead, and this, as I stated at the beginning of these remarks, is of vital importance to the continued success of our free-enterprise system.

Shipping and the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the lead editorial appearing in today's Cleveland Plain Dealer. The legislation referred to in this editorial is S. 3108, which has passed the Senate, and H. R. 8886 and other similar or identical bills, which are under consideration in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

As the sponsor of H. R. 8886, I am delighted to see that the powerful voice of the Plain Dealer has come to the support of this much-needed legislation. I hope that, in the very near future, the House will have an opportunity to record its approval of it, in the interest of our domestic economy and our national defense.

The full text of editorial follows:

SHIPPING AND THE SEAWAY

Not in all corners is there unbridled optimism about the St. Lawrence seaway. Great Lakes shippers, operators of the famil-

iar ore and grain carriers, are apprehensive of losing trade to foreign lines in time. There appears genuine grounds for such fears, since a number of European outfits are making noises as if they were about to tackle the opportunity.

It is a chance which does not exist today. Ore movement on the lakes is a coastal proposition, strictly controlled by law. Our ships for example, can pick up ore in this country and freely deliver either in the United States or Canada. But we cannot haul Canadian ore to a Canandian port, and by the same token no Canadian vessel can engage in direct competition here.

Geographically, of course, it has been impossible for anything save Great Lakes-built vessels to engage in such service. However, as Mesabi deposits peter out, it puts much greater emphasis on the need for Labrador ore via the seaway. Movements in that direction inevitably will boom, and as things stand there is nothing on the books to bar anybody from entering this new international trade route.

The bugaboo is the same one that has perpetually plagued American shipping—low costs of shipbuilding abroad and their fractional operating expenses, brought about by low wages to seamen.

We often hear of complaints from America's merchant marine about this competition, and the Government tries to alleviate or equalize the situation by both building and operating subsidies. The policy dates back to 1936 and the Merchant Marine Act of that year. Those Government payments neither guarantee profit nor insure against loss. They can be likened to a golfer's handicap, designed to provide equal opportunity.

For lake operators, though the situation is not precisely comparable even with the opening of the seaway. Unfortunately the Merchant Marine Act specifically excludes lake ships from construction or operating differentials, because such aid is restricted to common carriers. Which the lake bulk ships definitely are not.

Compounding the predicament is the fact that America's ore fleet is perilously close to obsolescence. By 1960 better than 213 or 62 percent of the 343 lake vessels will be 50 or more years old. Since World War II only 25 new ones have been built; not one is presently on the ways. Simultaneously, the Canadians have added 223,000 tons of carrying capacity to their fleet, a move spurred by a Government tax fillip whereby 33⅓ percent of the capital cost of ship construction can be depreciated in any one year.

As a spur to building new ore ships, a bill now pending in Congress calls for trade-in allowances on old freighters. It would equalize the difference in cost of building a new ship abroad or here. The measure has passed the Senate but is facing opposition in the House.

There ought not be any objections. Ore freighters are an absolute essential in time of war and constitute a key arm of our national defense. Experience of past wars has been that European-operated ships run for home immediately, which could leave this country worse than high and dry if it lacked a fleet of ore carriers.

We grant depletion allowances for raw material producers, accelerated tax writeoffs to defense industries and assorted help to the economy as a whole. Already the Government protects a major segment of American shipping against competition abroad. While the Plain Dealer has not looked kindly upon subsidies generally, there should at least be consistency about them. The lake shippers deserve a fair share as much or more than anyone else.

Spies: France Nets Some Small Fry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the National Review for June 6, 1956, by Philippe Ragueneau.

The article reports the recent trial in France of four persons accused of involvement in the leakage of military secrets of the Indochina war to the Communists.

As usual, the meshes of the law caught some minor officials involved, but no top officials were convicted.

Mr. Ragueneau was a distinguished soldier in the ranks of the Free French Army, and rendered signal service to the allied cause by his work behind the lines in France.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIES: FRANCE NETS SOME SMALL FRY

(By Philippe Ragueneau)

ULTRASECRET DECISIONS OF THE FRENCH INDOCHINA HIGH COMMAND WERE KNOWN TO THE COMMUNISTS WITHIN HOURS—AND THE HIGHLY PLACED TRAITORS ARE STILL AT LARGE

In a warm Parisian summer dawn the roar of the presses in a printshop on the Rue Poissonnière drowned out the voices of the workmen stacking copies of l'Observateur. They little knew that they were handling dynamite.

Two hours later news trucks delivered the weekly. This particular issue carried prominently, under the signature of Roger Stéphane, an article containing the essential facts from an ultrasecret report presented 6 days earlier by General Navarre to the National Defense Committee.

The notorious affaire des fuites ("the case of the leaks") had started.

At the trial which followed, General Navarre, commander in chief of French forces engaged in the Indochina war against the Viet Minh, was to say: "My first reflex was to demand the opening of a judicial inquiry. But on further reflection it appeared to me that it was best to find out how l'Observateur got its information."

In any case, the Viet Minh knew by now what to expect. To the French Cabinet, meeting in closed session, General Navarre had said: "I cannot defend Laos if the Communists choose to attack it." And it was in the direction of Laos that the Viets surged next.

On November 24, 1953, in the rostrum of the National Assembly, Emanuel d'Astier de la Vigerie, Progressive (Communist-dominated) deputy of Ille-et-Vilaine, cited a secret telegram which dealt with the EDC and which was addressed by the French Ambassador in London to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Two days later l'Observateur drew from this material for a sensational article. (The inquiry later disclosed that the text used by d'Astier de la Vigerie did not come from the Quai d'Orsay but, once again, from the National Defense Committee.) In the trial, examining Magistrate Duval was to find the Observateur article "more precise and more complete" than the remarks of the crypto-Communist deputy. In other words, l'Observateur did not get all its information from d'Astier.

The situation in Indochina continues to deteriorate. The bell has begun to toll at Dien-Bien-Phu. On May 7, 1954, the heroic garrison is overrun.

In Paris, the leaks continue. The decisions of the Committee in its May 14 and May 15 sessions find their way, in summary form, to the Communist Party.

On May 25, 1954, Generals Ely, Salan and Pélissier report to the Committee on their mission of inspection in Indochina. May 27, l'Observateur publishes a story ("the report of the generals") which is exact in every detail.

On May 29, Express—the Mendès-France weekly—runs a story which completes the information in the Observateur article.

On June 28, General Ely reports to the Committee again. The question under discussion: the dispatch to Indochina of le contingent, the French military service draftees heretofore exempt from service in Indochina. On July 8, l'Observateur writes: "Will the contingent leave July 21?" And what follows is a faithful recounting of the Committee meeting.

President Coty is enraged. The committee room is searched with a fine-tooth comb. Police investigate the backgrounds of the typists and telephone girls. But on September 14 it is apparent to all that the committee deliberations of September 10, despite all precautions, have again passed through closed doors.

Four-way dash

This time action must be taken. Public opinion is aroused. The nation is indignant. Act? But since July 30, 1953, all of the competent police services have been in action—which is to say, too many. Since the case deals with leaks abroad of military secrets, discovered in Paris and attributed to "spies of a political organization," four police bodies are involved:

The Service of Exterior Documentation and Counterespionage (SDECE), since foreign contacts are involved;

Military security, which is run by the Ministry of National Defense, because military secrets are involved;

Department of the Surveillance of the Territory (DST), headed by M. Wybot and attached to the Sûreté Nationale (Ministry of the Interior), because the search is for a spy;

General Information Service, a unit of the Prefecture of Police, because a French political organization is on the suspect list.

Inevitably, this dispersion of authority results in interservice rivalries. Each group follows its own trail. Each hopes to wear the winner's laurels. And in the final dash each service will tread on another's heels. Which of them will furnish the papers with their first headline?

It will be M. Wybot's DST. On the morning of September 18, 1954, Police Superintendent Jean Dides leaves the Ministry of Tunisian and Moroccan Affairs. He heads toward his car, parked on the rue de Lille. Suddenly, six inspectors surround him. "Follow us," they order.

Dides is astounded. "Whom do you think you are talking to?" he barks. An unfortunate gesture of someone—and a brawl develops. Dides, a judo champion, knocks two of his assailants to the ground. But from a nearby doorway, reinforcements surge. Overpowered, Dides resigns himself to follow his "kidnapers" (colleagues) to the headquarters of the DST on the rue des Saussaies. There, his briefcase is searched. In it is found the report of the deliberations of the Central Committee of the Communist

Party, which contains a long discussion based on the National Defense Committee meeting of June 28.

The DST has triumphed, and Dides is furious. He has patiently built an anti-Communist net which operates—the DST knew this well—in liaison with the "rival" service organization, the Prefecture of Police. Dides thunders: "I was on the right track and you are trying to steal it from me." He explains: The documents in question were given to him, the night before, by one of his agents, Baranès, a journalist on Libération—a Progressive daily run by d'Astier de la Vigerie.

Baranès tries to flee, is arrested and announces he will talk. What he says has the effect of a bombshell. "Jean-François Mons, Secretary General of the Committee of National Defense," Baranès tells the police, "takes notes at committee meetings. He is the only man authorized to do so. His own chief clerk, René Turpin, then passes on the substance of the notes to another committee employee, Roger Labrusse, a bona fide Communist who has converted Turpin to pacifism. Labrusse, who believes me to be a Communist, because I write for Libération, passes on these documents to me. I give some crumbs to the Communist Party, to cover myself, and the rest to Dides."

A formal inquiry into actions "endangering the external security of the state" is opened September 18, 1954, the evening of the day on which the DST seized Dides.

The public soon discovers that Martinaud-Deplat, a former Minister of the Interior, first learned of the "leaks" when he read a Baranès report which reached his desk through the Dides-Baylot channel. (Baylot was then prefect of police.) Martinaud-Deplat alerted the Premier—at that time it was Joseph Laniel—and early in June 1954 the investigation was turned over to M. Baylot.

But a few days later (June 12) Laniel falls. Pierre Mendès-France succeeds him. At the Interior Ministry, François Mitterand replaces Martinaud-Deplat. At the trial, Mitterand will complain bitterly that no one told him of the leaks. But once he finds out his first action is to withdraw the dossier from Baylot and the Préfecture, and give it to Wybot and the DST.

Like nails in a row, one Premier follows another, one team of ministers another, one group of police another. We have seen how the DST, upon entering the game, had immediately "burned" the Dides-Préfecture network and taken over the Baranès contracts—to its own profit.

Two million words

After 18 months of investigation, "l'affaire des fuites" reaches court. The trial opens March 7, 1956, before the Military Tribunal of Paris. The dossier contains 1,854 documents, 67 sworn statements, a 2-million-word gusher—with as many contradictions.

Four defendants stand at the bar: Jean-François Mons, who will answer to charges of "grave negligence"; Turpin, Labrusse, and Baranès, indicted for "endangering the external security of the state." (L'Observateur is to be tried separately before the criminal court which deals with the misdeeds of the press.) D'Astier de la Vigerie, whose parliamentary immunity has not been withdrawn, will be summoned as a witness.

From the first day of this trial, intended to throw light on the subject, dark shadows invade the court. No person agrees with any other, nor is there agreement on any single event or fact.

Mons? Wybot will say "he is the No. 1 spy." But 10 generals and Marshal Juin himself will come forward to testify that "Mons is above all suspicion."

Baranès, the Newspaperman? For Baylot and Dides, he is a "loyal informer." For Mitterand, former Minister of the Interior, he is a Communist Party agent, who duped Dides and "intoxicated" the prefecture and the Government with false clues. According to Wybot (DST), Baranès is even a triple agent, selling his information to the highest bidder. As for Baranès himself, he says, "I gave information neither to d'Astier nor to the Communist Party. They had access to a complete dossier on the meetings of the Defense Committee without my help."

Only Labrusse and Turpin look like culprits. But they are pallid and unimportant pawns.

From March 13 on the trial turns into a political free-for-all. The witnesses see to that. Martinaud-Deplat, Baylot, and Dides uphold the theses of "Communist infiltration into the machinery of the nation." For Pierre Mendès-France and his minister, Mitterand, the case of the leaks is above all a machination against them on the part of their political enemies.

Reports vanished

But all is not said, because it is soon apparent that certain documents in the dossier are "in eclipse." In September 1954 Baranès was under surveillance. But the report about this surveillance has vanished. (It will be rediscovered—much later.) Court President Niveau de Villedary finally exclaims, "We cannot pass judgment under these conditions. Certain pieces of information have been kept from us, and every day we discover others of which we had been ignorant."

On May 3, 1956, the tribunal takes a heroic decision: "We will start again from scratch. Call back the witnesses."

That is where the case rests at this writing, with every question mark still in place. Is the Turpin-Labrusse-Baranès-X net the only one? No, certainly not. Was it the most important espionage net? No; certainly not. Had it not been established that the information l'Observateur printed was better than that furnished by three of the defendants? And hadn't Communist Deputy Jacques Duclos boasted, "We knew more about it and we knew it earlier"?

Former Prime Minister Georges Bidault put his finger on the main issue. "One thing angers me," he told the court. "That is those who are absent."

The immense majority of the French people are of his opinion. They feel that the real culprits, those who organized the Réseau des Seigneurs (the network of the Lords) have not been brought to justice—only the pitiful Labrusse, Turpin and Baranès. That the police was able to ferret out an espionage net astonished no one. Without spies, after all, there would be no movies. And what country hasn't its own spies? After all, Fuchs, Pontecorvo, Burgess and Maclean, Otto John were not French.

The real culprits

What hasn't been brought to trial are those conditions which aid and abet treason in our simple-minded democracies. We should have found:

Guilty, the administrative routine which insists on 14 copies of all secret telegrams of the National Defense Ministry;

Guilty, the organization which arrays one bureaucrat against another, and divides responsibility unwisely;

Guilty, those work methods which tie a poorly paid bureaucrat to his desk 15 hours a day and cavil at allowing him a telephone or a file cabinet;

Guilty, finally and above all, a regime in which irresponsible teams of Ministers succeed each other every 6 or 8 months.

In the best of circumstances, a secret is hard to guard. It becomes impossible to guard when the Minister of the moment (surrounded by groups of "good friends" from whom he will hide nothing because he owes them everything) takes in hand the affairs which an evicted predecessor makes no effort to explain and risks his future in the raging seas of a Parliament where 150 Communists occupy as many seats.

As M. Martinaud-Deplat cried out, pointing to the accused: "You have before you just a sample. The network of treason is complex in France, and that treason is the Communist Party and all those who group themselves around it—the bought, the idealists, and the misled intellectuals."

Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is H. R. 9065, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes. The primary objective of the measure is to provide a 15 percent increase in benefits, with certain limitations. The measure also proposes to increase contributions to the retirement fund to the extent of 1 percent each from the employer and employee. An additional feature of the bill provides that employee contributions shall be exempt from income tax. H. R. 10578, a bill pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, includes this income tax-exemption feature. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that both bills will receive favorable action by the respective committees and that the House will approve them before Congress adjourns.

During the hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, a spokesman for the Railway Labor Executives' Association and for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers presented an explanation of H. R. 9065, which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House. If that bill together with H. R. 10578 become law in their present form, several objectives will be accomplished, according to the explanation:

EXPLANATION OF BILL H. R. 9065, TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937 TO PROVIDE INCREASES IN BENEFITS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The overall purpose of the bill is to provide a 15-percent increase in benefits (with limitations hereinafter noted); to raise additional funds in the amount of 2 percent of payroll to cover the cost of the increased benefits; and to offset the burden on employees of the increased contribution by excluding the employee contribution from income for income-tax purposes. It is not proposed, however, to increase the overall social-security minimum or to increase the present maximum on spouses' annuities which is equal to the maximum spouses' annuity payable under the Social Security Act; consequently, annuities being paid under the social-security minimum and spouses' annuities may not be increased at all or may be increased less than 15 percent.

Section 1 (a) of the bill increases the several percentages of monthly compensation used in computing employee annuities by 15 percent each. The total effect is to in-

crease these annuities so computed by 15 percent.

Section 1 (b) revises two elements in the minimum employee annuity formula by increasing them 15 percent. This, too, would have the effect of increasing annuities computed under the minimum annuity formula by 15 percent, with the exception that no increase is provided with respect to those annuities which under the formula are equal to the average monthly compensation that the employee earned while in active service. It should also be noted that these changes affect only the minimums computed under the Railroad Retirement Act formula itself and do not affect the general minimum provision providing benefits at least equal to the benefits that would have been received if railroad employment had been covered by the Social Security Act.

Section 2 (a) of the bill relates to the residual lump-sum guaranty which assures to all employees that they will either draw in benefits while living or that there will be paid to surviving beneficiaries an amount at least equal to the employees' contributions, together with an allowance in lieu of interest. This amount is computed at 7 percent of the compensation on which taxes are paid at the rate of 6¼ percent. The amendment would provide for computing this amount at the rate of 8 percent of the compensation on which it is proposed that taxes will be paid at the rate of 7¼ percent.

Section 2 (b) relates to maximum and minimum survivor annuity totals and again adjusts both maxima and minima by an upward revision of 15 percent.

Survivor annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act formula are computed from a so-called basic amount which is defined in section 5 (1) (10) of the act. Section 2 (c) of the bill proposes an upward revision of 15 percent in pensions (i. e., those taken computation of the basic amount; thus the basic amount will be 15 percent higher with the consequence that survivor annuities computed therefrom will be 15 percent higher.

Section 3 of the bill provides a flat increase of 15 percent in pensions (i. e., those taken over from the railroad voluntary pension systems), in joint and survivor annuities (i. e., those under the former option provisions) awarded before the effective date of the bill, and in annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. The preceding sections of the bill do not apply to these classes of benefits.

Section 4 of the bill amends the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act provisions of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide an increase of 1 percent in both the employer and employee contributions and an increase of 2 percent in the employee representative contributions (who now pay the equivalent of both the employee and employer contributions).

Section 5 of the bill excludes employee and employee representative contributions under the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act from gross income for income-tax purposes and from wages for the puropses of the withholding of income tax at the source. The result would be that any employees who have taxable income in an amount equal to or in excess of their railroad-retirement contributions would realize an income-tax saving of at least 20 percent of such contributions; in such cases although the gross contribution under the bill would be 7¼ percent the net after income-tax savings would be 5.8 percent.

Section 6 of the bill fixes the dates on which the changes made in other sections become effective. Section 6 (a) makes the increases in annuities (whether employee, spouse or survivor) effective with respect to all accruals after June 1956 irrespective of whether the annuities have been theretofore or thereafter awarded. The increase in lump sum survivor benefits is made effective with respect to deaths occurring after June 1956. The increase in pension payments would be reflected in the August 1 payment to correspond with the date on which the first increased annuity payments would be made.

Section 6 (b) makes the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act effective July 1, 1956, and specifies that the new rates shall apply to taxes on compensation for services rendered after June 1956.

Status-of-Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the amendment I offered to the Mutual Security Act my colleague from Mississippi expressed a resentment toward military men, which is surprising when you consider his Army service and his membership in veterans' organizations. He made no distinction between the criminal inclinations of foreign soldiers and our own servicemen.

He expressed his fear of the foreign soldiers' training at the airforce base in his district with these words:

What if any one of those foreign soldiers in my district went on a rampage and committed some crime? Suppose it was a case of rape, murder, arson, or some of the other crimes we hear about.

In fact, my colleague seems to be obsessed by thoughts of these particular crimes. He had this to say about his fellow citizens:

I am getting tired of people saying that because a man is wearing an American uniform that he is perfect, that he could not commit murder, or rape, or arson, and that if he did, we should forgive him. I think that we should demand that American soldiers who do not live up to the laws of foreign countries should be subject to punishment.

I, for one, as a Member of Congress do not intend to take part in any effort to defend murders and worse by this type of indirect action.

Now the gentleman knows that the amendment I proposed to the Mutual Security Act was not a defense of murderers. He knows that no one has ever advocated that a wrongdoer in the service be granted immunity from punishment. But some of us still believe that punishment should be meted out the American way; that it should be uniform no matter where our servicemen may be; that the same offense should not be punished by a term of 90 days in one country and 4 years in another.

I was curious as to what heinous acts might have been committed in my colleague's district by foreign soldiers to develop his obsession about murder, rape, and arson. So I asked the Air Force. I am told that the Greenville Air Force base has been in operation about 2 years. During that time there has not been one single crime committed by any foreign serviceman assigned to that base for training. One man had a little trouble with a check being returned, but the commander of the base considered it minor. So there lies the bogey of crime in my colleague's district.

The gentleman from Mississippi did not claim any great success as defense attorney at courts-martial when he served in the Army. He said none of the dozens of men he represented were acquitted. This is quite understandable. He must have suffered even then from the virus that has attacked so many proponents of the status of forces agreements—the presumption that all accused servicemen are guilty. He must have represented the accused he was assigned to defend in much the same manner that some counsel act who are appointed by foreign courts to defend our accused servicemen. An observer of a serviceman's trial in Japan said: "The dedication of counsel to the defense of the accused left much to be desired."

Joint Statement by Diplomatic Representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the United States has unswervingly maintained the position that Soviet Russia occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by conquest and not in accordance with the will of the people. The right of self-determination has been denied these Baltic people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a joint statement by the Baltic diplomatic representatives in connection with the commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the beginning of mass deportations in the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. This statement is a result of a public meeting held in the city of Washington, D. C., at Pierce Hall on Sunday, June 10, 1956. The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE BALTIC DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEGINNING OF MASS DEPORTATIONS IN THE BALTIC STATES BY THE SOVIET UNION

On the eve of World War II, the Baltic States became victims of the Soviet aspiration for world domination. Soviet leaders opened the gates of aggression in Europe by the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, signed on August 23, 1939. By this pact, the Soviet Union secured a free hand in eastern Poland, Latvia, and Estonia, and later, on September 28, 1939, by means of an additional protocol, also Lithuania was included in the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union. The enslavement of the Baltic States was undertaken notwithstanding the Soviet's most solemn declarations and treaty obligations to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the Baltic countries and not to interfere with their domestic affairs. All that followed—the forced conclusion of mutual assistance pacts between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States, military occupation, formation of puppet governments,

farcical elections—is now a well-established fact.

The occupation and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union was only the prelude to the whole campaign of territorial acquisitions on the part of the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia.

"Millions of people of different blood, religious and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have in fact, although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Communist bloc. In Europe alone, some 100 million people, in what were once 10 independent nations, are compelled, against their will, to work for the glorification and aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist state.

"The Communist rulers have expressed, in numerous documents and manifestos, their purpose to extend the practice of communism, by every possible means, until it encompasses the world. To this end they have used military and political force in the past. They continue to seek the same goals, and they have now added economic inducements to their other methods of penetration.

"It would be illusory to hope that in their foreign policies, political and economic, the Soviet rulers would reflect a concern for the rights of other peoples which they do not show towards the men and women they already rule." (Joint declaration made by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in Washington on February 1, 1956.)

The same goal of world domination and expansion was recently reiterated at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union follows Lenin's thesis that 'all nations will realize socialism, this is inevitable, but not all of them in the same way.'"

To this Khrushchev added:

"These (bourgeois) politicians do not dare to declare that capitalism will perish in the new world war, if they will wage it, but they are already forced to admit publicly that the socialist camp is invincible".

"It is true," said Khrushchev in his report to the 20th Congress, "that we recognize the necessity to transform in a revolutionary way the capitalist society into the socialist society. * * * It does not at all follow from the fact that we stand for peaceful coexistence and economic competition with capitalism, that the struggle against bourgeois ideology, against the survival of capitalism in the minds of men can be relaxed."

Soviet imperialism in Europe and Asia has been imposed with greatest ruthlessness, and it has been accompanied with an appalling amount of human misery.

Today we are commemorating the mass deportations which began in our countries in June 1941, and which still continue under one form or another. In those tragic days of June more than 100,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were deported to remote areas of the Arctic and Siberia. Since then our people have been deprived of the most elementary human rights and have been exposed to torture and starvation in forced labor camps. On the testimony of hundreds of eyewitnesses, the Select Committee To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U. S. S. R. of the House of Representatives of the United States in 1954 established the following:

"The U. S. S. R. has been and is now engaged in a ruthless program of sovietization in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, employing the well known Communist tactics of arrest and detention without cause, torture chambers, mass deportations to slave labor camps, population transfer, and wide-scale political murders."

After a detailed analysis of the facts, the committee concluded:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U. S. S. R. Any claims by the U. S. S. R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940, were free and voluntary and that the resolutions adopted by the representing parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal, are false and without foundation in fact." (Third Interim Report, 1954, p. 8.)

The Baltic nations, like the other Soviet subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain are firmly convinced that as ramparts of western civilization they will not be abandoned by the free world. Therefore, we highly appreciate the joint declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom made in Washington on February 1, 1956, setting forth their attitude toward the struggle between the western and Communist worlds, wherein they expressed the hope of all the captive nations as follows:

"We [of the West] shall help ourselves and others to peace, freedom, and social progress, maintaining human rights where they are already secure, defending them when they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have temporarily been lost."

At this solemn commemoration, together with millions of other Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians throughout the world, we mourn those compatriots who have fallen victim to the Communist conspiracy and those who are still struggling for their lives in the remote reaches of the Arctic and Siberia, or in their own lands—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

We must again state that our goal has been and will always remain the reestablishment of the complete independence and full sovereignty of our nations, and we have faith that with the help of God, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania will achieve that freedom and independence.

And then further, Mr. Speaker, I am also including as part of my remarks the resolution adopted at this same meeting.

BALTIC COMMITTEE OF
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 10, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to submit the following resolution unanimously adopted by citizens and residents of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, assembled this day at Pierce Hall, Washington, D. C., to commemorate the first mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, perpetrated by the government of the Soviet Union on June 14, 1941, and to raise our voice in protest against the continuous violation of fundamental human rights, and enslavement of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union:

"Whereas the Soviet Union has arbitrarily occupied and established Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and continues to enslave the peoples of these democratic republics;

"Whereas June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to slave labor into the subarctic tundra, Siberia, and the steppes of Kazakhstan, and that such deportations still are continuing;

"Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and is steadfastly continuing recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country; and

"Whereas the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on February 1, 1956, in their Washington Declaration stated that 'Millions of people of different blood, religions and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union' and that 'we shall help ourselves and others to peace, freedom and social progress maintaining human rights where they are already secure, defending them when they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have temporarily been lost': Be it

"Resolved, That we, here assembled in prayerful mourning for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries, vigorously protest against the continuous practice of genocide and enslavement of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet Union; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respectfully request the Government of the United States to initiate action by the United Nations with the aim of achieving the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from the Baltic States and complete restoration of their soveregnties; and be it finally

"Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States for their resolute support and encouragement of the Baltic nations' struggle for regaining their liberty, and that we pledge our unequivocal support to America's leadership in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression."

Faithfully yours,

Dr. D. KAIVICKAS,
Chairman.

Withdrawal and Utilization of Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, within the last week, hearings were held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H. R. 10371, introduced by Committee Chairman CLAIR ENGLE, and other similar bills. All the bills provided that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress.

I am glad to state that I sponsored one of the bills, H. R. 11001, and appeared and testified before the committee in support of the legislation on Monday, June 11. At that time, I also presented testimony favoring the legislation received from L. P. Voigt, director of the Wisconsin State Conservation Commission, and from Werner Radke, game warden for Jackson County, my home county.

Prior to these hearings, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings beginning in January 1956 on the general subject of withdrawal and utilization of public lands in the United States. These hearings, which cover 495 pages, resulted in the proposed legislation now before the committee.

I believe it only fair to give full credit to the man who first called this matter of encroachment on our wildlife refuges to the attention of the public, Arthur H. Carhart. Mr. Carhart dealt fully with the subject in the June 1955 issue of

Sports Afield. In this informative article, Mr. Carhart discussed the encroachments by the military and also explained how a Secretary of the Interior, lacking appreciation and understanding of wildlife values, could wipe out our wildlife refuge system. At this time, I would like to include the article by Mr. Carhart:

ONE MAN CAN WIPE OUT OUR WILDLIFE REFUGES

(By Arthur H. Carhart)

By merely signing a typewritten order, one man can wipe out great national wildlife refuges. In the same way, he may open the gate to oil drillers, stockmen, rocket shooters, or others who would overrun our refuges and destroy their value to wildlife.

This appointed official can take such action without hearings, advance public notice, or discussion with outdoorsmen and conservationists. He can blot out a million-acre refuge, or open one to commercial interests, merely by putting his signature on an administrative order.

Who is the man with such life-and-death power over our Federal wildlife refuge system? He is Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

But perhaps you believe that such administrative orders would never be given. Maybe not. But let's look at the evidence.

Whiffs of what's cooking leaked out, and Sports Afield said, "Dig into this and report." Here's what was uncovered by 6,000 miles of travel, visits to threatened refuges in 6 States and weeks of probing.

At least 40 refuges appear to be in immediate jeopardy. And though abandonment proposals are more in the open for some great game refuges in the West, the pattern holds black implications of what may be ahead all across the Nation.

We have 254 Federal refuges in 40 States; and 18 in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. They contain about 17.5 million acres, less than 1 percent of the total area of the Nation.

Their sizes and critical services vary greatly. The 210-acre Great Meadows Refuge in Massachusetts is a little haven for migrating waterfowl; the 38,933-acre Noxubee in Mississippi is a winter home for ducks and geese, breeding stock flying northward to summer nesting. The Lower Souris in North Dakota, seriously threatened by both oil drillers and a Reclamation Bureau scheme, contains 58,571 acres, vital nesting grounds for waterfowl, prairie chickens, and sharptailed grouse.

The 23,648-acre National Elk Refuge in Wyoming saved, and now maintains, the biggest elk herd in the Nation. This refuge provides excellent hunting in adjacent acres by supplying indispensable wintering grounds for the elk.

In the Southwest, the Kofa, Cabeza Prieta, and Desert Refuges undoubtedly saved the magnificent desert bighorn sheep from extinction; they have built up flocks so that limited hunting has been permitted for several seasons.

Each refuge meets definite, high-priority needs of one or many types of game. They protect scarce or important species from decimation or extinction. They produce stock that can be transplanted to suitable, unpopulated areas. They are testing stations for game-management programs that, when proven out, can be applied to millions of other acres in other localities.

These refuges are so small a percentage of our Nation's area, and so vital, that any official who would reduce their acreage or allow uses that would dispossess the birds and animals on them, would deal a grevious blow to our wildlife.

This is no local issue. It's nationwide.

The issue is this: Will the Secretary of the Interior hold fast to gains in our Federal refuge system? Or by using the power he has, will he proceed to wipe out some refuges completely and allow conflicting uses in others that will degrade their wildlife values? Are we about to see a creeping disintegration of the whole Federal wildlife refuge system?

The first solid step of what appears to be a plotted course is an official memorandum signed on March 31 last year by Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis and Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor. The memo established a five-man survey team to overhaul the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interior Department agency that supervises the Federal refuge system.

On June 2, last year, after 6 weeks of intensive study and investigation, the team reported. There's no question of the integrity and good intentions of the men in that group. They probably didn't know the grief some statements about national wildlife refuges might bring.

They first recommended that all existing refuges should be subjected to critical scrutiny to determine if they fit the overall objectives and responsibilities of the service. That could be a constructive angle.

But the fuse that can blow the main demolition charge is this statement by the team: "There are certain existing refuges the continued maintenance of which under Federal control seems of doubtful value."

That gave Interior the springboard to make the next jump. Early this year, a directive went out to the regional directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to study refuges, with a plain suggestion of abandoning any of doubtful value.

That survey team may or may not have known that 3 of the 5 regional directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service already, either by act or statement, have shown positively their inclination to move out of large Federal wildlife refuges and let other interests take over. This move could do untold harm.

The threats to our refuges vary. The best way to understand what's going on is to scan some case histories.

There's a good illustration of the overall picture in the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge of southeastern Oregon and the famous, nearby Charles Sheldon National Antelope Refuge.

Both of these refuges are mountain masses bulging up out of semidesert flats. They contain high-country grasslands, spots of forest, rough canyons and most important of all, vital watering places.

The Sheldon Refuge was one of the first areas to be dedicated to protecting vanishing wildlife. More than 30 years ago, Dr. T. Gilbert Pearson, then president of the National Audubon Society, visited the area. He learned about the desperate plight of the antelope and began talking about a refuge to save the remnants.

In 1919 Martin S. Garretson, Secretary of the American Bison Society, spent days in the area appraising the situation. Garretson found antelope shot and used for wolf bait. He was told there were herds of thousands in that section. But methodical checking indicated there were less than 200 animals.

Aroused, the Audubon Society and the Boone and Crockett Club raised funds and bought 2,377 acres of key lands from private owners to make the refuge project feasible. These lands were donated to the people of the United States. Federal funds were used to purchase over 300 additional acres of private lands. And President Hoover, on January 26, 1931, issued an executive order establishing the refuge, and adding public domain so the total mounted to 31,439 acres on which wildlife welfare has first position.

This first unit, known as Little Sheldon, did not contain vital winter range. The Audubon Society bought and donated additional properties, the Government spent $153,926 to secure 23,881 key acres, and 520,525 acres of public domain were added, to set up the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, surrounding and supplementing the Little Sheldon.

Nearby Hart Mountain was made into a refuge because many of the antelope move back and forth between it and the Sheldon, finding good kidding grounds and summer range at Hart Mountain. The Government purchased 57,898 acres of private lands in the Hart Mountain area for $250,422, added enough public domain to bring the unit up to 240,644 acres.

The two areas—Hart Mountain and Sheldon—are segments of one management unit, none of which can be so well managed if any portion is cast out.

In 1919 Garretson counted 200 antelope in the vicinity; now there are 6,000 to 7,000 head using 2 refuges. In addition there are mule deer, sage grouse, and a host of other wildlife dependent on the refuge areas.

In the early 1930's, Dr. Olaus Murie studied the range on the Sheldon and found it being grazed down to nubbins. But now the range has come back. There still are 500 to 600 head of cattle grazed on the Sheldon game range because that portion of this reserve is under the joint jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management, successor to the old Grazing Service. But there is genuine local cooperation between agencies, and wildlife at least gets a decent break on the Sheldon Game Range.

The drift from these refuges has restocked surrounding areas; there is open-season hunting there. Deer hunting is allowed within the refuges in designated areas and ways; it's necessary to keep the animals in balance with the available forage resources. That's the record of Sheldon and Hart Mountain.

These two refuges are in region 1 of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Regional director is Leo J. Laythe. When asked if recommendations of the five-man survey team would lead to the Fish and Wildlife Service getting out of these refuges, he said frankly he was inclined "to turn them over to the States for management." He explained that this would be "purely a matter of economics"; that the Service's funds were too small to do a job at Hart Mountain and Sheldon.

The same Mr. Laythe later said emphatically there was no move on for the Service to dump the refuges. Apparently turning them over to the States wouldn't constitute dumping.

If you know the pattern of Western States politics you realize how stockmen dominate the scene. After 20 years of range and wildlife management, the Sheldon and Hart Mountain areas look like a cow paradise to stockmen. The forage has come back since overloading ended; your money and mine has built excellent watering places. It would be slick to have this area subject to local politics and pressures.

Men who know how State lands have been handled in the past figure that "turning the refuges over to the States for management" would just be one step in a series that even the best-intentioned department couldn't ward off surrender to grazing interests.

Regardless of Leo Laythe's declaration that there is no move to dump these refuges, one of his staff certainly did approach the Oregon State Game Commission, feeling out its attitude toward having Hart Mountain put in State hands. Oregon has its own, well-planned, and thoroughly plotted program for acquiring wildlife lands and managing them. The State apparently figures it will need all the funds it has to carry through its own program.

In Nevada it's a different story. A driving campaign is on there to get the Federals out of the Sheldon Range. The Washoe County Game and Fish Commission, an offi-

cial segment of Nevada's oddly organized department, has adopted a resolution to have Federal control of the Sheldon done away with.

Are stockmen behind this? It's a good bet. And other forces are mixed into this campaign.

The same sort of campaign is going on to wipe out the desert-game range in southeastern Nevada, near Las Vegas. On March 9 this year, Frank Groves, director of Nevada's fish and game department, was in Washington putting on the pressure to have the desert range turned over to the State, lock, stock, and buildings, plus other improvements paid for with Federal wildlife funds. Any State would be happy to have such a gift. And Nevada would have a lot to say about grazing livestock on refuge lands.

This great wildlife area was established in 1936. It contains 2,203,711 acres. Its main features are two craggy mountain ranges on opposite sides of a big desert valley. It was set up to prevent extinction of the desert bighorn sheep. And it has done the job in spite of a crazy-quilt pattern of various agencies having various jurisdictions over it.

Incidentally, if you think that refuge areas are all dedicated to wildlife, the situation on the desert-game range will set you straight. There are 61,567 acres within the refuge that are under the primary jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service. There's teamwork in this quarter; forest and wildlife men work together. Over the remainder of the desert range, the United States Bureau of Land Management has equal jurisdiction on paper with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Actually the Bureau of Land Management has more say than the wildlife officials. About 650 cattle, owned by 8 individuals, graze 61,390 acres of the refuge. On top of that, the Air Force has a gunnery range plastered on top of a third of the area.

When the desert game range was created, there were an estimated 300 head of desert bighorns in the area. They were skidding toward zero. Now there are about 1,200 head, and drift has allowed hunting for this magnificent trophy animal in areas outside the refuge. There's a chance now to trap and transplant bighorns to many other areas in Nevada where they were poached off. If the State has the money, there's a place to put it.

Regional Director Leo Laythe is the man who will study the desert range with a view, perhaps, to putting the Fish and Wildlife Service out of the area.

Southward, near Yuma, Ariz., are two other refuges, set up to save the desert bighorns and the rare Sonoran pronghorn antelope. These are the Kofa refuge, containing 660,041 acres, and the Cabeza Prieta, with 860,041 acres. Like the desert-game range, they are mountain islands surrounded by desert.

In all three bighorn ranges, water is the key to maintaining animal life. On the Desert Range, 30 waterholes have developed; 9 on the Cabeza Prieta where there was only 1 spot of water before; about a dozen installed on the Kofa. The cost of these water developments ranges from a relatively few dollars in hand labor, to blasting ingenious stub tunnels into solid rock at a cost of several thousand dollars per unit. These tunnel holes are filled by flash runoff from slashing thundershowers; wing dams prevent rubble from getting into the tunnels, but allow overflow water to fill them.

As on the Desert Range, there is a scramble of jurisdiction on these Arizona game refuges. In addition to the Cabeza Prieta being in a grazing district with the Bureau of Land Management and a local grazing board in the picture, the Air Force has a rocket range covering most of the refuge.

When air-to-air shooting goes on 5 days a week, not even wildlife officials may enter the Cabeza Prieta. Air Force "Keep out" signs are all over the place, and spent-rocket cases plummet down and bury themselves a foot or so in rock-hard soil.

Not long ago, without the knowledge of our wildlife men, ground targets were set up, and air-to-earth shooting started inside the refuge. That was stopped.

The Army also coveted this refuge. It proposed using a major portion of the Cabeza Prieta as a poison-gas training area under battleground conditions.

Recommendations to abandon these bighorn refuges would come from John C. Gatlin, regional director, Albuquerque, N. Mex. There isn't much question of what his viewpoint has been; he has already studied and recommended. In June last year, Gatlin spelled out how he would have the United States Fish and Wildlife Service move out of the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta, and turn the areas altogether into the hands of the Bureau of Land Management; Arizona then would be given permits for the wildlife to use the waterholes, and the wildlife property could be transferred to the State.

The waterholes are a sweet setup for livestock to be grazed in this area. But there isn't enough water in the Desert, the Kofa, or the Cabeza Prieta to support both game and domestic stock.

Beside the economic argument advanced for turning the refuges over to other interests, those in favor of such a move say that wildlife on the refuges is resident game and therefore should be handled by the State. The refuges saved the wildlife when it was resident game in the first place; without them there's a chance that what has been saved could be totally lost.

If the resident-game argument is valid, it should apply to all resident species.

Very well; coyotes and rodents certainly are residents. The allotment for refuges in the 1954 United States Fish and Wildlife budget was only $100,000. But for predator and rodent control it was $956,241—nearly 10 times as much. So nearly a million was set up largely to benefit individual stockmen in western States. If it's a Government principle to have States take over the management of all resident wildlife, then let's insist that they take on their coyote and rodent control as well; save a million.

I have indicated only a few of the refuges that are in jeopardy. They set the overall pattern of what appears to be a general movement to dismember our national game refuges. Only a few of the others that are threatened can be listed here.

The Little Pend Oreille, in eastern Washington, contains the indispensable, crisis winter range for a head of the largest whitetailed deer in the West. It had been skinned to bare earth by domestic stock; the Resettlement Administration bought up the land on a distress basis. The Fish and Wildlife Service took it over and rehabilitated the range; the deer have prospered. Now stockmen lick their chops as they look at the area. It's something they'd like themselves.

There are whisperings that the National Bison Range in western Montana, the National Elk Refuge in Jackson Hole, Wyo., the Sullys Hill Refuge in North Dakota are likely to be classed as of doubtful value in the Federal wildlife lands.

In Oregon and northern California there's a hell-roaring campaign on to wipe out the last of that most vital key area in the Pacific coast flyway—the Klamath and Tule Lake Refuges. The Reclamation Bureau is in there, interested in draining the last fragments of the once-great marshes so they can give lands to settlers that got bum homesteads on another reclamation unit. If this area is blotted out as a wildlife sanctuary, the center is knocked out of the whole Pacific flyway—no less.

In Oklahoma the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge is threatened again. Late in 1953 the Army unveiled plans to expand Fort Sill Military Reservation. Since the area surrounds the Wichita Refuge on three sides like a vise, Army officials eyed the refuge for a new weapons-testing area. The Oklahoma Outdoor Council, together with sportsmen across the country, raised a protest. The Army pulled in its horns.

Now, local rumors persistently point to a revival of earlier Army plans. An item in the Army's budget calls for expanding military areas, and Fort Sill is on the list for expansion. Army officials locally refuse to comment on Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge; but it is no secret that transfer of Government land from one agency to another merely involved some paperwork and no cost.

On other refuges, oil interests have tried to get in to drill. An order that would have allowed this reportedly got as far as the desk of Secretary of the Interior McKay. This move became public knowledge. Protests were made. As this is written, the order is believed to be on that desk, perhaps cooling off and ready for action later.

In Maine, another Fish and Wildlife Service regional director, David R. Gascoyne, has made moves to get rid of the Moosehorn Refuge. This is an area in which management techniques have been worked out for increasing upland birds.

The list of national wildlife refuges that are in jeopardy could go on at length. This isn't a local issue.

Remember, this scuttling and junking can be accomplished quietly and smoothly, without any knowledge by sportsmen of what's going on.

This isn't like that battle with the land-grab gang that your letters helped to beat in Congress last year. A refuge can be dumped by Secretary of the Interior McKay merely by signing an administrative order. No hearing, no discussion; the job can be done wholly within the Interior Department.

For example, Secretary McKay, by issuing a land order, could turn over all the public-domain lands of the Hart Mount Refuge to the Bureau of Land Management. They'd go into a grazing district with a local board of livestock operators having a lot to say about what happens on those ranges.

Lands bought with Federal wildlife funds could be declared surplus. They'd be offered to any other agency that might want to control them.

What legal involvements might result in dumping lands that have been purchased by conservation groups and given for refuge purposes to the United States is a question. But these lands could be turned over to the States outright under the Coordination Act. They could be tossed into a Federal-aid project, become State property, no longer Federal refuge lands.

Whatever may be the reasons for the various regional directors wanting to get the fish and wildlife out of managing our game refuges, if they study the areas and recommend their being junked as of doubtful value, that's a step toward the breakup.

These wildlife refuges have been built up through a quarter century, through labors and often heartbreak, with literally millions of dollars of sportsmen's money.

The focal point is not in the regional directors' offices, nor even in the office of their boss, John Farley, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. It's in the office of Secretary of the Interior McKay.

There's enough evidence on this issue for sportsmen and conservationists over the Nation to demand that the Secretary of the Interior define his policy on our national wildlife refuges. Is there or isn't there a sell-out shaping up for wildlife?

Soviet Record of Broken Promises—It Cannot Be Trusted To Keep Agreements—Embassies Are Espionage Centers—Sever Diplomatic Relations—Approve House Concurrent Resolution 238

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the American people, and I think to the free world generally, that you cannot do business with Communists unless you do it on their terms. It comes with a good deal of surprise to find out that neutralism in Europe is on the march. It is on the march in Asia and also in our own country we find that there are those in official positions who today feel that they can do business with the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, we are on notice in that respect, however. It was in 1920 when the Secretary of State for President Wilson, Mr. Bainbridge Colby, put it in black and white with respect to the broken promises of Russia. He stated:

The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. * * * Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

* * * * *

* * * It is within the knowledge of the Government of the United States that the Bolshevist Government is itself subject to the control of a political faction, with extensive international ramifications through the Third Internationale, and that this body, which is heavily subsidized by the Bolshevist Government from the public revenues of Russia, has for its openly avowed aim the promotion of the Bolshevist revolutions throughout the world. The leaders of the Bolsheviki have boasted that their promises of noninterference with other nations would in no wise bind the agents of this body. * * * Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the Bolshevist Government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries, with which it was at peace. * * *

* * * * *

We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them. (American Note on Polish Situation, Department of State, August 10, 1920. A Formal Reply From Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby to His Excellency Baron Camillo Romano Avezzana, Ambassador of Italy.)

In the 36 years since those historic words were uttered, there have been no substantial new facts to change or upset Bainbridge Colby's conclusion. In every year, on every continent, new facts have emerged to support it.

Communist regimes have been continuously based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, as Colby said. Communist leaders have continuously demonstrated that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing them or carrying out such agreements. Communist leaders have continuously proven that their diplomats are the agents of dangerous revolt who use diplomatic agencies to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only the conclusions and judgment of Mr. Colby but also those of Charles Evans Hughes, another great Secretary of State under a Republican President who 3 years later presented voluminous documentation to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to show that the Soviet dictators in the Kremlin had no changed one iota. Secretary Hughes summed up the situation as follows: He said:

It is believed that the evidence presented by the Department of State, at this hearing, has conclusively established three facts: First, the essential unity of the Bolshevik organization known as the Communist Party, so-called Soviet Government, and the Communist International, all of which are controlled by a small group of individuals, technically known as the political bureau of the Russian Communist Party. Second, the spiritual and organic connection between this Moscow group and its agent in this country—the American Communist Party and its legal counterpart, the Workers' Party. Not only are these organizations the creation of Moscow, but the latter has also elaborated their program and controlled and supervised their activities. While there may have existed in the United States individuals, and even groups, imbued with Marxist doctrines prior to the advent of the Communist International, the existence of a disciplined party equipped with a program aiming at the overthrow of the institutions of this country by force and violence is due to the intervention of the Bolshevik organizations into the domestic political life of the United States. The essential fact is the existence of an organization in the United States created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country. Third, the subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and the Workers' Party and their subordinate and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group. (Letter to Hon. William E. Borah, then chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 21, 1925.)

Mr. Speaker, on May 14, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 238 which if approved by the Congress would establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a full and complete study and inquiry with respect to all aspects of the question of the severance of the diplomatic, economic, cultural and all other relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics. It is in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that the prophecy made by Bainbridge Colby could be investigated to ascertain if his prophecy was true, namely, that Communist diplomacy would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt and further that diplomatic agencies would be used to promote revolutionary movements in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the blackest day in the history of the United States was the day when these United States recognized Soviet Russia. It was in November of 1933.

The first Ambassador appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt was Mr. William C. Bullitt. It did not take Mr. Bullitt long to discover the motives behind the rule of the Kremlin dictators. In less than two years he, too, confirmed the statements made by former Secretaries of State Colby and Hughes. Mr. Bullitt said:

The aim of the Soviet Government is and will remain, to produce world revolution, said Ambassador Bullitt. The leaders of the Soviet Union believe that the first step toward this revolution must be to strengthen the defensive and offensive power of the Soviet Union. They believe that within 10 years the defense position of the Soviet Union will be absolutely impregnable and that within 15 years the offensive power of the Soviet Union will be sufficient to enable it to consolidate by its assistance any Communist government which may be set up in Europe. To maintain peace for the present, to keep the nations of Europe divided, to foster enmity between Japan and the United States, and gain the blind devotion and obedience of the Communists of all countries so that they will act against their own governments at the behest of the Communist Pope in the Kremlin, is the sum of Stalin's policy. (From Foreign Relations of the United States, the Soviet Union, 1933–39, p. 227.)

* * * * *

I believe that we should employ this occasion to make clear to the American people the aims of the Soviet government which lie behind the mask labeled "united front against fascism and war."

I believed we should revoke the exequaturs of all Soviet consuls in New York and San Francisco, leaving only the consular section in the Soviet Embassy at Washington.

I believe that we should restrict to a minimum the granting of American visas to Soviet citizens (p. 246).

* * * the people of the United States must be warned of the intentions of the Soviet Government and of the American and foreign Communists who take their orders from the dictator of the Soviet Government. Steps must be taken for the protection of our lives and liberties. To permit Soviet consuls to remain in American cities after the boasts of the Communist Congress with regard to fomenting strikes in the United States is impossible. As a first protective action the Secretary of State today has directed that the exequaturs of all Soviet consuls in the United States shall be canceled. He has also directed that all Soviet citizens who desire to come to the United States must be scrutinized with greater care than heretofore. We must prepare further methods of protection. And we must be vigilant in watching for the intrusion of those American and foreign agents of the Soviet Government who, in the simile of Dimitrov, will adopt the tactics of the

Trojan horse and sneak into our midst, concealed by a covering of antifascism and peace to destroy our institutions, liberties, and lives (p. 247).

The move to sever diplomatic relations with Russia may sound and seem drastic, but the Communist conspiracy must not be approached with kid gloves. It requires drastic treatment.

There is precedent for the action that I have suggested, Mr. Speaker.

In 1921, the British Government granted de facto recognition to the Soviet Government by means of a trade agreement. The agreement provided for the prohibition of Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain. Only 2 short years later, Britain threatened to terminate that agreement because Soviet agents were spreading anti-British propaganda in Afghanistan, Persia, and India.

In 1924, regardless of what had already happened, Britain granted the U. S. S. R. de jure recognition. Three years later it terminated both the trade agreement and recognition, because the Soviet diplomatic service in Great Britain was acting as a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt precisely as our American Secretary of State had predicted 7 years before.

In 1924, China and the U. S. S. R. established normal diplomatic relations. Under the treaty "each country was to refrain from spreading propaganda against the institutions of the other." Three years later, China broke off relations because the Soviet diplomatic service, once more, was acting "as a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt."

In 1924, Mexico recognized the U. S. S. R. In 1930, Mexico withdrew that recognition. (From Trends in Russian Foreign Policy, Library of Congress, pp. 5–11.)

Mr. Speaker, again I urge that the House Rules Committee grant a hearing on my resolution and submit the matter to this House where it can work its will one way or another but the time has come for action. Assuming the adoption of my resolution, I feel certain that it would bring hope and faith to many millions of people who are today behind the iron curtain and at the mercy of the Communist dictators who think in terms only of world revolution and conquest.

Jim Hagerty's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, June 11, 1956, describing the outstanding work of Mr. James Hagerty. Mr. Hagerty has performed a great public service in keeping the American people informed of important happenings in the White House. His work last weekend particularly points up the quality of his service.

The editorial follows:

JIM HAGERTY'S JOB

This morning's bulletin from Walter Reed Hospital reflects the President's steady progress toward recovery from his operation Saturday morning. And now that the crisis atmosphere has passed, the bulletin also serves to remind one of the splendid job which has been done by Jim Hagerty, the President's press secretary.

Mr. Hagerty is getting to be an old hand at this sort of thing. During the long weeks after the September heart attack he manned the information post in Denver and kept the Nation posted on Mr. Eisenhower's condition. That ordeal is not likely to be repeated this time, for the President seems to be out of the woods and well on his way to a resumption of the quieter White House routine. Nevertheless, it was a rugged weekend for Jim Hagerty—14 press conferences on Friday and Saturday, 37 hours without sleep, etc.

This, of course, is his job. It is what he is supposed to do when the need arises. Still, this country has never seen anything quite like the handling of the news of Mr. Eisenhower's two illnesses. Never before have the people been kept so fully informed on a matter of such vital importance to them. To be sure, this was both the right thing and the smart thing to do. But it also was a job that could have been badly botched had it been entrusted to less competent hands.

National Federation of Independent Business Urges Vigorous Enforcement of Antitrust Laws as Best Way To Aid Small Business as the Administration Moves Stanley N. Barnes to Less Influential Post and Establishes Small Business Committee To Study Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many people have been interested in the large number of study groups and commissions established by the Eisenhower administration, and concerned over the fact that many of these groups were composed, in large part, of persons well known for their long record of opposition to the very programs they were appointed to study. In many cases, also, those appointed to these study groups and commissions have been in a position to benefit personally from the recommendations made.

Mr. Speaker, I tried the other day to learn the status of and count the many groups and commissions, but I lost my way, there were so many. There are those that are still studying their particular problems, those that have completed their work, and those that have been disbanded, so I do not know whether the figure today is 30, 40, or 50—and I would be completely surprised if the President himself knew just how many there are.

Now the President has established a Cabinet-level committee to deal with the problems of small business which follows the pattern of the study groups and commissions set up earlier. It is composed of people who have demonstrated their indifference to the very problem about which they are supposed to study and make recommendations. For instance, one of the members of the new committee is Charles E. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense. In a speech I made on the floor of the House on May 9 of this year I pointed out that in the 7 months ending January 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded contracts amounting to almost $1 billion. Of this huge sum only 5 percent went to firms having 500 employees or less. Surely, this kind of situation does not need any prolonged study. What is needed is a reversal of the present policy which favors big business to the almost total exclusion of small firms. Let us hope that decisive action to reverse this policy will be undertaken immediately and that we will be spared a lot of double-talk designed to pull the wool over our eyes and hide the fact that there is no intention to give worthwhile contracts to small business. The backbone of our economy has always been small business and it deserves more than it is getting from the Eisenhower administration—for what it has been getting is only the crumbs from the rich man's table.

Another important member of the new Cabinet-level committee is Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration. One of the most cogent comments on the agency he heads was made by Sylvia F. Porter in the New York Post of April 16, 1956. This keen commentator on financial affairs wrote of the recently published fifth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration in part, as follows:

The report boasts new awards to small-business firms under military contracts rose from 15.7 percent in the last 6 months of 1954 to 17.6 percent in the last 6 months of 1955, and the net value of awards to small business rose from 19.8 to 20 percent. A large part of the report and of the press release is devoted to this subject. Comment: But when you dig into other figures on defense contracts, the complexities seem baffling, and the boast seems meaningless.

For instance, for the full 1955 fiscal year, the percentage of new contracts going to small business fell from 18.3 to 18 percent, and the percentage of net procurement slumped from 25.1 to 21.8 percent. The SBA itself points out the net figure is the one which reveals the share of defense dollars going to small business over a long period.

What's more, a just-released separate report by the Defense Department discloses that since 1953 the share of defense contracts going to the giants of America has been swelling.

The report admits small businesses do complain of various problems such as the squeeze on some raw materials, higher prices, such as for steel scrap, which they are unable to absorb, tightening bank credit, inability to compete with larger firms for skilled professional help. But, remarks Barnes, shortages, bottlenecks, and price increases are characteristic of the boom economy which we are experiencing.

Comment: This tendency to minimize the problems of small business is the most startling aspect of the report. Small business is finding it brutally tough to compete against the giants for steel, aluminum, copper, newsprint, etc., and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding its borrowing costs are soaring and its ability to get new money is shrinking, and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding the pressures from every direction are fierce and mounting, and the SBA knows it.

So much for the new committee and its members. I suppose we will know before long whether it is a study committee like the others or really intends to come to grips with the preblems. In a letter to Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, General Eisenhower showed some awareness of the important role of small business in our economy. The President said:

The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our free-enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use.

Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

After listing the Government programs now in operation to help small business the President declared that, despite these programs, "the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth." He said that the programs for aiding small business should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance. The programs listed by the President included loans and defense contract assistance, antitrust enforcement, various managerial and technical aids available from the Department of Commerce, efforts by the Office of Defense Mobilization to strengthen the productive potential of small firms in our defense programs, and help for small construction companies in the housing field.

The President's recommendations seem fine, at least on paper, but it remains to be seen whether the ideas he has expressed in his letter to Mr. Burns are to be implemented or whether, like so many other programs which the President has championed with platitudes, they become lost and forgotten. Words, Mr. Speaker, are not enough. They are useful only if they result in action. George J. Burger, Washington director of the National Federation of Independent Business, pointed out that the overall actions in establishing the new committee would be largely wasted if it failed to concentrate on the basic cause of small business problems. This, he said, was the strengthening and enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. Burger has a good point. Antitrust enforcement is an action which the Federal Government can take, and take now. Such action would speak more loudly than words.

Along this same line, I should like to remind the administration of a bill I have introduced, H. R. 9514, which would establish a graduated corporation tax to help small business. The National Federation of Independent Business recently completed a nationwide poll on this legislation. The poll, reaching in excess of 100,000 small-business men throughout the country, showed that 84 percent favored my bill, while only 12 percent were opposed to it. The President has hinted of his concern for the problems of small business. Were he to support this bill, it would clearly indicate that he understood the problems faced by small business today. Establishment of additional study groups and commissions and resounding speeches are no substitute for positive action.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the New York Times reported on June 2, 1956, that the President's action in establishing the new committee was the result of a recent rise in business failures to the levels of the late 1930's.

I include here as part of my remarks a statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and a report from the Washington Evening Star on the testimonial dinner given to Judge Stanley N. Barnes, who believes, as does Mr. Burger, in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws:

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL CABINET COMMITTEE

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
June 1, 1956.

George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, hailed the action of President Eisenhower in creating the Special Cabinet Committee To Strengthen the Economic Position and Foster the Sound Development of Small Businesses.

He adds that it's a forward step by the administration to recognize this basic problem facing the future of over 4 million small business institutions in our expanding economy. He says: "We trust that this is not a partisan move."

This new Special Cabinet Committee in the opinion of Burger, should have no great difficulty in discovering the real basic causes for the destruction of small business. He holds to the premise that the destruction has been brought about by the failure of the administrations for the past 35 years or more to vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. "However," Burger adds, "one ray of light in this picture was the recent action by the head of the Antitrust Division, the Honorable Stanley Barnes. If a similar policy is instituted by the administration and following administrations, carrying out the program instituted by the present antitrust head, small business of this Nation can look for a bright future."

The federation's position on this has been stated time and again before congressional committees and also before the platform committee of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions.

He stated that the principal function of this Special Cabinet Committee should be on the No. 1 proposition, namely, antitrust law enforcement and strengthening. Burger concludes, if this is not the No. 1 subject matter to be considered by this Special Cabinet Committee, the federation would consider the overall actions wasted, to a large degree.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of June 14, 1956]

FOUR HUNDRED JOIN IN TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR JUDGE BARNES

Some 400 friends and associates of Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes gathered last night at a testimonial dinner to mark his recent appointment as judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Leading jurists here and across the Nation were among the celebrants. Heading the list was Mr. Barnes' boss of the past 3 years, Attorney General Brownell.

The dinner, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association, the District chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, was held at the Shoreham Hotel.

RETURNS TO CALIFORNIA

Judge Barnes, 55-year-old Republican, lives at 3850 Tunlaw Road NW. His new job will take him back to his native State, California. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals covers California, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii. His appointment by President Eisenhower was confirmed last March.

Congressmen, too, were present to honor the man who will soon go West to fill the post formerly held by Judge William E. Orr, who retired January 1.

Several noted guests, including Mr. Brownell, took part in the presentation of skits which hailed the guest of honor for distinguished service here. Judge Barnes has headed the Antitrust Division since 1953.

The skits began with his career as a judge of the Los Angeles County Superior Court from 1947 to his coming to the District 6 years later. He was "seen" as the bar associations see him, and by Judge Thurmond Arnold of the United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia "as a predecessor sees him." Mr. Brownell "saw" his as "any boss would see a remarkably talented and wonderful man."

ALSO PRESENT

Among those present to honor Judge Barnes were Mrs. Brownell, Mrs. Arnold, Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and Mrs. Bolitha J. Laws, Federal Trade Commission Chairman and Mrs. John W. Gwynne, Chief Judge of the Municipal Court and Mrs. Leonard Walsh, Solicitor General Simon Sobeloff, and Republican Senator and Mrs. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California.

Also, Gerald D. Morgan, assistant to the President; Judge Victor R. Hansen, of the superior court of California and recently named a candidate to the post being vacated by Judge Barnes; Senator Malone, Republican, of Nevada; Representative Celler, Democrat, of New York; and Deputy Attorney General and Mrs. William P. Rogers. Mr. Rogers was toastmaster.

Judge Barnes, who was president of the Federal Bar Association in 1954–55, also was honored by Earl W. Kintner, first vice president of the association; Mrs. John Green, president of the District Women's Bar Association; Charles Rhyne, president of the District chapter of the Federal Bar Association; and Mrs Bart Smyth.

Mrs. Barnes, Mrs. Morgan, and Mrs. Rhyne also were present.

Two Hundred Thousand Find Nothing Refreshing in Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when 200,000 workers in the automobile industry have been laid off and are un-

employed they and the members of their families find nothing refreshing in their experience. For them these are days and nights of anxiety. They derive no joy in "the right to suffer." They find in hopeless unemployment no "refreshing pause."

I deeply regret that the spokesmen for this administration are meeting the situation in the exact pattern of the spokesmen for the Hoover administration.

When unemployment had started in the last Republican administration members of the President's Cabinet assured the unemployed that they had nothing to worry about. All they had to do was wait long enough for right around the corner was a "chicken in every pot." In mid-July of 1929 a member of President Hoover's Cabinet, speaking at Jackson, Mich., said that complacency would solve all the problems of hunger. A few weeks later the great crash came and the country was plunged into the most devastating depression in history.

When people are out of work action is necessary to get things straightened out. It is no time to sit down in the rocking chair and be complacent.

The "chicken in every pot around the corner" philosophy brought on by the depression of 1929. I hope and pray we will never again have such a depression. Why cannot the spokesmen for this administration realize what they are doing by giving us in 1956 a full-size rerun of the "chicken in every pot around the corner" philosophy of 1929.

It was bad enough when a Presidential assistant told an audience in Detroit that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy." At the time there were many thousand unemployed in Detroit. Did this assistant to the President think that he was alleviating their condition by a verbal glorification of their misery? I wonder to what heights of joy he would have risen if the President had repudiated his remarks by cutting him off the payroll.

No sooner had this spokesman for the administration finished explaining that it was only a slip of the tongue than another spokesman, this time no less a personage than a member of the President's Cabinet, bobbed up with the same thought. By this time unemployment in the automobile industry had mounted. Among the workers there was real concern. But Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey said it was a "refreshing pause."

Mr. Speaker, if I went up to a man who had lost his job, could not find another job and was going sleepless worrying how he was going to support his family, and congratulated him on his good fortune in having the opportunity to enjoy a refreshing pause, what would be his reaction?

In the June 16, 1956, edition of Labor is an expression of the reaction of the 200,000 unemployed automobile workers to Secretary Humphrey's remark. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the article from Labor, as follows:

DO JOBLESS AUTO WORKERS ENJOY REFRESHING PAUSE?

Has a high administration official pulled another boo-boo? That's what some observers were wondering after a Washington newspaper this week reported Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey told Congress the Nation's economy is presently enjoying a refreshing pause.

The remark came in testimony before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas. Humphrey also predicted the auto industry's difficulties will be behind us in a relatively short time.

The Humphrey remark recalled an earlier slip by Howard Pyle, an assistant to President Eisenhower, who told a Detroit audience "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

Some 200,000 jobless auto workers, who had trouble swallowing Pyle's statement, may find Humphrey's refreshing pause equally hard to believe.

More About Republican Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the front page of the Wall Street Journal of June 14, 1956, speaks volumes:

JOBLESSNESS, LAGGING SALES HURT SOME AREAS DESPITE UNITED STATES PROSPERITY—FLINT'S RETAIL STORES SUFFER AS AUTO LAYOFFS MOUNT—CUTBACKS IN QUAD CITIES—TROUBLES IN THE MIRROR BAR

A man got up from the bar at "Ethel's" in Flint, Mich., walked over to the big Seeburg juke box and punched the selector button for guitar-banging, caterwauling Elvis Presley's Heartbreak Hotel.

"See what I mean," said Ethel's husband the bartender, "they're all singing the blues this year."

It was 6:30 p. m. and a few months ago the joint would have been jumping as the gang from the Fisher Body plant across the street relaxed a bit before heading home. But there were only four men at the bar and they all were drinking 15-cent draft beer; the harder stuff, which retails at 30 cents a shot at Ethel's, was getting no play at all. "Our sales are off more than 50 percent this month. We're not even cashing may pay checks any more," noted the bartender gloomily.

FEW INDUSTRIES FALTER

Flint, the self-styled Vehicle City where nearly everyone seems to work for the General Motors—for Buick, Chevrolet, Fisher Body, or the A. C. spark plug division—has undergone a rapid transformation. From one of the glossiest examples of the postwar boom, the city of 198,000 population suddenly became what the Bureau of Employment Security in Washington labels a distress area.

Flint is fairly typical of a small group of soft cities—communities that are suffering from the faltering of a few industries such as autos, auto parts, farm equipment, textiles and some appliances in the midst of today's generally robust economy. The tire town of Akron and some appliance cities like Newton, Iowa, and Evansville, Ind., are experiencing only a mild dose of doldrums so far. Some Midwest auto parts-making cities like Anderson and Muncie, Ind., have generally been harder hit. Other cities, in textile-making regions of New England and in the farm equipment center around Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, have had a business slump of longer duration that's now being aggravated by the current softness in those industries.

Although some cities, and even some entire industries, are showing signs of recession, the national economy is perking at record levels. For the first 4 months of the year, the Nation's personal income was running at an average annual rate of $314.6 billion a month, up from 294.9 billion in the like 1955 period. Personal income in April reached a record high of $317.1 billion, against a $298.9 billion figure for April 1955. And by mid-May employment was even higher—a record for the month of 65.2 million. Of course, these husky national figures provide little comfort for laid-off workers or sales-shy merchants in the soft cities.

On April 15, there were 5,500 people out of work and collecting unemployment compensation in Flint. This was about 3.8 percent of the total labor force, considerablly more than the 2,300 jobless a year earlier but still not considered alarming. Within the past month, however, the unemployment total has swelled to 13,000, or nearly one out of every 10 workers.

STARTED IN FEBRUARY

The effect on business in the city has been immediate and far-reaching. The big Sears store here fell 20 percent short of last year's volume in May. Although E. A. Talberg, the store's manager, thinks unseasonably cool weather may have been a contributing factor, his credit manager admits that twice as many credit customers have fallen behind on payments as a year ago.

"Business started to slip in February and has grown progressively worse, until now it is 50 percent below last year," says the owner of the Durant Laundry & Cleaners, who had to lay off two employees last month because of the downturn. "There's been no seasonal pickup at all," he adds. "Factory workers who used to come in with 3 or 4 pairs of dungarees a week now come in with 1 pair or don't come in at all."

"During April and May we had a dozen diamond rings brought back that were bought on 6 months' contracts," says the manager of Hatfield's, a large Flint jewelry store. The store's business even in this normally good month of brides and baccalaureates is down 30 percent from last year.

The auto sales slump has curbed the prosperity of a lot of places outside of Michigan. The big three auto makers maintain plants, assembly operations, and parts depots in about 100 cities. Add the independent manufacturers of parts who sell to the auto builders and as many as 200 cities and towns are affected by sluggish car sales.

LOOKING FOR WORK

Thirty-four-year-old Jim Sells joggled his two-year-old son on his hip as he waited patiently in the long line at the unemployment office in Anderson, Ind. "It's rough when you have four kids," says this former generator builder who had 1½ years' seniority at the local G. M. Delco-Remy plant. He figures there's no prospect of anything opening up in Anderson before July, and thinks he might try nearby Indianapolis for a job. "You don't worry too much about moving when you have to find work to pay the bills," he says.

But a neighbor in the line commented, "There's not too much in Indianapolis either. I ought to know. I got laid off at the Chrysler plant there a month ago."

Anderson possibly has been hurt worse than Flint by the auto-sales slump. James Armstrong, manager of the Indiana Employment Security Division's office there, estimates 14 percent of the city's labor force of 38,000 has been affected by factory layoffs. During peak auto production periods of 1955, the 10 Anderson plants of Delco-Remy employed more than 16,000 workers making ignition parts, generators, horns, starters, and

switches for G. M. cars. Employment cutbacks started in January and reached a high on May 18, when 1,726 hourly workers were laid off and 61 salaried supervisors were reduced to hourly scales. This lop-off reached men with seniority dating back to May 1952, and cut employment to 13,499.

The guide lamp division of GM, the second largest Anderson employer with more than 6,000 workers last year, is now down to 4,246. The most recent layoff occurred May 22, when 200 got their notices.

LAYOFFS IN MUNCIE

In nearby Muncie, also a big auto parts town, the principal employer is the Warner gear division of Borg-Warner Corp., which makes automatic transmissions for Ford and Studebaker. About 1,600 employees at this plant are understood to have been cut loose since the first of the year and total unemployment is estimated at 5,400, compared to 2,500 at this time last year.

Verle Hains, manager of the Modern Electric appliance store in Muncie, says, "We're making about twice as many cash sales as last year. People just hesitate to buy on credit." Also, he notes, delinquencies on time payments have about doubled. "We had to go get a washing machine and dryer this morning, but we decided just to pick up the dryer and let the washing machine go. We'll try to get all we can out of it, but this guy has five kids and he's really up against it."

Jewelry stores normally expect a brisk business in watches, pens, rings, and other graduation items at this time of year. But Anderson Jeweler Paul Adams reports his sales are off about 15 percent compared with this time last year. "I've been in this business 31 years, and I can tell you when things are good in this town, they're really good. When it's bad, it's lousy," he adds.

The auto slump has begun to take the edge off the boom in tiremaking Akron, too. In the past 2 months about 900 rubber workers have been laid off and Firestone currently is in the midst of a cutback schedule with 200 laid off last week, 200 this week, and 200 scheduled to be released next week. Another major tire producer reportedly is planning to drop 250 workers in the next 60 days.

SHORTER WORKWEEKS

Although the number of unemployed is currently only about 3 percent of an estimated rubber work force of 50,000, layoffs have been accompanied by shorter workweeks (5 days instead of 6 last year) and the Sunday overtime schedules of 1955 have just about vanished this spring.

"There's no question we have been hurt by the situation in the tire plants," says Larry Silverman, owner of the Modern Men's Shop, a small haberdashery in downtown Akron. "The worker here sees what is going on in Detroit and he starts watching his pocketbook more carefully. Our sales are down about 17 percent this spring," he says.

D. G. Burg, owner of a discount furniture store near the Goodrich plant, adds that "volume is not off too much but we're making less profit—more special sales, price cutting and the like." Mr. Burg notes a recent increase in the number of customers asking for credit, although he has no great collection problem at the moment.

"Slimmer pay checks and too many bills" is the way Pete Cipolla explains the 20 percent drop in patronage at his Silver Mirror Bar, where the Saturday night take has been off $50 to $75 from what it was a couple of months ago.

Ernest Meder, branch manager for the Capital Finance Corp., reports he's had to "refinance a few accounts because of shorter work weeks in the tire factories." But he doesn't foresee any "serious trouble" ahead and reports no increase in repossessions.

Leo Dugan, a top local official of the United Rubber Workers Union, is more pessimistic. "The summer employment outlook doesn't look too good to me," he says, adding that he's heard rumors of heavier layoffs yet to come.

"The fellows laid off today are not able to stand it economically as well as they could 2 years ago," Mr. Dugan says. "Their living standards have kept going up and they owe more bills, with less savings to fall back on."

Although demand for replacement tires is running at a record rate of 53 million a year, new-car tire shipments have been running 22 percent below last year and there is a bulging inventory of 17,800,000 tires ready to be fastened onto new cars when and if they are built, compared to a stockpile of only 12,197,000 new-car tires a year ago.

"Our main worry at the moment is the high inventory of passenger-car tires," says Robert S. Wilson, executive vice president of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Mr. Wilson concedes that production will have to be cut in the third quarter. "But the situation is by no means alarming," he insists.

Economic soft spots aren't limited to the auto industry and its adjuncts. Tomorrow, Consolidated Textile Co. will close its Lynchburg, Va., print cloth mill for a month, instead of the usual 1-week vacation shutdown, because of what President Lester Martin terms "heavy inventories and a lack of spot orders."

"THEY DON'T KNOW"

According to Iowa State unemployment compensation figures, Newton, home of the Maytag Co., big washing machine manufacturer, has seen an increase in jobless payments this year.

"I'm writing an editorial about some of those cities that are complaining about layoffs this spring. They don't know how well off they are," says the editor of the weekly East Moline Herald, in the heart of the Quad-Cities farm machinery center.

This industrial area along the Mississippi River includes Moline, East Moline and Rock Island, all in Illinois, and Davenport, Iowa, as well as nearby Bettendorf on the Iowa side. There are 12 big implement and tractor plants operated by such industry leaders as Deere & Co., International Harvester Co., J. I. Case Co., and Minneapolis-Moline Co. About a scole of foundries are located here, too, to supply castings to the implement plants.

Employment has been going downhill for years. "We haven't had it very good since 1948 or 1949," one local businessman comments. By mid-May employment in the local implement plants was down to 13,700 against 21,300 3 years ago. There were 4,100 unemployed and 3,300 on strike (against Deere & Co.), roughly five times as many without income as in 1953.

The United Auto Workers strike against Deere, which had dragged on 134 days since last January, was settled June 1, to the great joy of local business people. "We had the best Saturday since before Christmas," said Phil Rosene, proprietor of Rosene's, "the world's largest miniature department store" in East Moline.

MORE BAD NEWS

However, more bad news was not long coming. International Harvester almost simultaneously announced layoffs for 200 at its East Moline implement plant and 650 at the huge Farmall tractor works in Rock Island. Total Harvester layoffs scheduled for June in farm equipment plants will come to 2,380, the company announced last Friday. Job cutbacks at Farmall affect men whose job seniority dates back to January, 1945—11½ years—according to UAW officials.

Minneapolis-Moline Co., which manufactures farm tools at a Moline plant once employing 750, is turning the big brick building into a parts depot at the end of this month and cutting back employment from 450 to 100. J. I. Case, also in a contraction cycle, is discontinuing its foundry operations in Rock Island. Davenport Besler Corp., a locomotive maker which employed about 300, has closed for good, as has the Uchtorff Brewery in Danvenport, idling about 75. Swanson's Foundry in Moline has halved its labor force and is working a 3-day week while the French & Hecht foundry in Davenport, a division of Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., is reported working only a 4-day week.

There has been a steady decline in the total labor force as people leave for places where the job outlook is brighter. In the past 3 years, according to the Illinois State Employment Service, the labor force on both sides of the river has dropped from 112,700 to 101,700.

"Most of the fellows from Alabama, Missouri, Tennessee, and the Carolinas who came up here during the war have gone back to the hills now," says C. A. Siegfried, head of the Business Man's Association, Moline's credit bureau.

The area apparently is a fertile hunting ground for recruiters from more affluent industries in search of skilled factory hands. This week it was Boeing Airplane Co. which filed up the short help wanted columns of local papers with offers of high-paying jobs elsewhere. Recruiters for United States Steel also have been through the area recently.

BUSINESSMEN MINIMIZE EFFECTS

Businessmen in the Quad Cities minimize the effects of this year's slump, saying they've been through layoff periods before and that in January 1954, when the farm equipment industry also was in a slow period, unemployment totaled 8,700. Now there are about 5,000 out of work.

"Collections haven't been too bad this spring," a Moline banker says. "We've had to learn to be good collectors here. If a man doesn't make a payment the morning it's due, we have a letter out to him in the afternoon mail."

However, there is no gainsaying that the decline in farm equipment volume since 1950 has had its effect on business activity. Home building in Moline, for example, totaled 239 in 1951 but was down to 146 in the year ended March 31.

The sudden impact of this spring's layoffs, of course, is most dramatic in Flint, where the Michigan Employment Security Commission last month had to hire 37 more people, almost doubling its staff, to handle the sudden rush of claims.

Unemployment finds many auto workers with a full load of credit payments to handle. "I'm driving my own car now, not the finance company's," explains a former tool crib worker at the Buick plant. He eased out of his financial squeeze by giving up payments on his 1955 Ford, purchased last year, and buying instead a used 1949 Buick. Now his biggest pressure is meeting the rent every month on his house.

MOVING TO THE FARM

Another Buick worker interviewed at the unemployment office lost his $7,000 house trailer this week. Out of a job since May 7, he's moving in with his in-laws on a small 20-acre farm. His monthly payments on the trailer were $105.93 and he still owed $4,390 on it. The bank carried him for 2 months while he tried to sell it to "get some of the equity back." He still owes $300 on a 1954 Buick.

A stockroom man who came up from Mississippi with his wife 15 months ago and had worked at GM's Ternstedt division (automotive hardware) was laid off 5 weeks ago. Things had looked good and he bought a $11,246 house and a 1956 Chevrolet. Now the monthly payments total $142 for the house and car but he can't find a job.

"There were too many people who bought Buicks and Oldsmobiles in last year's flush overtime period when they should have stuck to Chevrolets and Fords," an official of

UAW local 662 in Anderson, Ind., admits.

The problem of repossessions of workers' cars is proving a ticklish one for General Motors Acceptance Corp., the credit arm of the big motor maker.

"We are making renewals and extensions of types we normally wouldn't even consider," says Martin Schneider, who manages an 11-county area, including Muncie and Anderson, in central Indiana, for GMAC. Mr. Schneider admits getting a deluge of requests for help in meeting payments and says the concern is "bending over backward to avoid repossessing an unemployed worker's car."

Despite the slump, many businessmen are optimistic that it will be over soon. "When they call back the first few workers, that will give everybody a boost and people will start buying again," hopefully predicts Roger Bloyd, standing among row after row of unsold sofas in his furniture store on Anderson's Courthouse Square.

This feeling is especially pronounced in Flint, where H. H. Curtice, GM's president and the highest-paid industrial official in the country, still maintains his home—a pleasant but not palatial structure on the western fringes of the city. Many share the belief that GM will spread a financial umbrella over Flint and that the present doldrums will be shortlived.

Brotherhood Marks Rabbi Simon's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there has been celebrated in Chicago this last week Rabbi Ralph Simon's silver anniversary in the rabbinate. Congregation Rodfei Zedek, in the district that I have the honor to represent, set aside the weekend to pay tribute to its spiritual leader. It seems to me fit and proper that we here in the Congress should take notice of such events. The strength of our Nation is in the depth of its spiritual tones.

How closely bound in brotherhood are the people of the Second Congressional District again was shown at the Friday evening services that began the weekend of festivities. Speakers who paid tribute to Rabbi Simon were prominent leaders of the Chicago community, including Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, of Congregation Anshe Emet; Dr. Samuel Hollander, president of the Jewish Federation of Chicago; and the Reverend E. Jerry Walker, pastor of St. James Methodist Church and president of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues.

Rabbi Ralph Simon, who was born in Newark, N. J., was ordained with distinction and received a master of Hebrew literature degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary, in 1931., and also holds a master's degree from Columbia University. He has served at various times as president of the Chicago Rabbinical Association, and vice president of the Zionist Organization of Chicago, and is presently treasurer of the Rabbinical Assembly of America.

The Flag Goes By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet consisting of a poem entitled "The Flag Goes By," written by Henry Holcomb Bennett, an article entitled "Its Origin," written by John Bennett; and an article entitled "Its Author," written by Martha Trimble Bennett.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FLAG GOES BY

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky:—
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

Blue and crimson and white it shines,
Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.
Hats off!
The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea-fights and land-fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the State;
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips;

Days of plenty, and years of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right, and law:
Stately honor and reverend awe;

Sign of a Nation, great and strong
To ward her people from foreign wrong:—
Pride and glory and honor, all
Live in the colors, to stand or fall.

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bungles, a ruffle of drums:
And loyal hearts are beating high:—
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

—*H. H. Bennett.*

ITS ORIGIN

(By John Bennett)

I remember well the day he wrote The Flag Goes By; and how he composed it, entire, lying on the day-bed, the old lounge in mother's room; how he rose rather quickly, went directly up to the Roost, and after quite a while came down, a bit dishevelled with intense production and singularly simple and direct creation, and handed me the first typed draft for my criticism, with 1 or 2 suggested verbal alterations already noted in pencil by himself. Those were very few, not half a dozen. The poem as finished stands almost exactly as he composed it complete, in his head, before he hastened up the stairs to set it down.

I may add that I found no suggestions to make, further than to agree with his own proposed emendations. The poem was, practically, done, perfected permanently, in that first writing.

This was a habit of Harry's; to lie down on that long lounge, apparently asleep or dozing; sometimes for an hour or two at a time, motionless, silent, giving no attention whatever to anything passing around him. During that time he would compose, complete, from beginning to end, verses, or prose articles, which his really unusual verbal memory enabled him to carry in mind as definitely as if he had already written the text down. I have known him to do this with prose stories, usually on military or soldier topics, such as he had published in Scribner and the Atlantic, incomprehensible as this was, and still is, to me. Then swing himself around on the couch, spring to his feet, and hurry through the house to his rookery and furiously engage, with typewriter or pencil, in setting down the fresh-born text, writing with great rapidity. I had the privilege of reading over with him these first drafts, and of discussing the alterations, emendations, or additions proposed by him on the manuscript.

The Flag Goes By was first published in The Youth's Companion, January 13, 1898. Its appearance in print was delayed several months by a rejection letter from St. Nicholas Magazine which its editors lived long enough to regret. It is interesting to note that the first anthology in which the verses were included was Edmund Clarence Stedman's Anthology of American Verse. I think it impossible to list the many anthologies which since have included it, as Harry was always ready and generous to permit its use and wide circulation. Rear Admiral Luce included it in his Anthology of Patriotic Verse. It was translated into French by the Reverend Samual N. Watson, former rector of St. Paul's Church, Chillicothe, and used in presentation of flags to American regiments going to the front in France during the First World War. A copy of the poem, requested, is on exhibit at the Valley Forge Museum of American History.

Harry was always militant and patriotic; he was also, though never very strong, and always rather lightly built, as pugnacious as a bull-pup, and would fight at the drop of a hat. His first "military experience" as a boy was as guide-marker for the old Campbell Light Guards, bearing the guidon on which company pivots and turns were centered. He was a member of old Company H, Ohio National Guard, and, I believe, a sergeant, at the time of the Spanish War; but illness, typhoid fever and convalescence prevented service with the company.

So long as the United States lives and honor is paid to those who lay down their lives for an ideal, just so long I think Harry's poem will be treasured as a voice from the past, perennial and forever stimulating to loyalty to all that the flag of these United States represents.

ITS AUTHOR

(By Martha Trimbell Bennett)

My brother Henry was born in our family home in Chillicothe, December 5, 1863. His education was gained in our local schools and at Kenyon College, but chiefly through life-long reading—poetry, drama, fiction, the classics, and especially history; local, national, current, ancient, modern and Biblical.

After leaving college he was employed in the Cincinnati offices of the B. & O. Railroad and later as an expert actuary in Kansas City. On his return to Chillicothe he did some illustrating, and contributed both prose and verse to leading magazines, some of his stores being based upon his experiences with Company H, Ohio National Guard, with which he saw lively service on riot duty. As a young boy he was marker for the Campbell Light Guards, a local company, and through his life he was interested in military affairs.

For 30 years he did newspaper work here, first with the Scioto Gazette and later, until his death, as editor of the News-Advertiser. For the Gazette he edited the notable Centennial edition in 1900, the research for which deepened his knowldege of local history. Many of the illustrations used in this edition were from his sketches.

In our Chillicothe Centennial (1896), and in the Ohio Centennial centered here (1903), he was active, and in the 1912 Columbus Centennial he was assistant secretary to the commission, in charge of all decoration and design. His knowledge of historical detail, of costume, and his artistic ability contrib-

uted in large measure to the floats and to the pageant put on at Ohio State University.

He was always interested in civic affairs in Chillicothe, was a charter member of the Rotary and Sunset Clubs, and for 15 years a member of the park board. He was a devout communicant of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, a founder of its men's club, member of the choir, leader of a men's Bible class, and write many plays for the young people of the church school. At his death he was secretary to the vestry.

A happy boyhood, spent with a singularly congenial group, exploring hill and stream, strengthened his love of nature. He delighted in the outdoor world—the changing seasons, clouds and shadows, color and form, trees and flowers, but above all he loved his birds, their coming, and nesting, and going. He studied them lovingly and left valuable records, accompanied by accurate water color studies of individual birds.

It was the joy he had found in such things, and his keen interest and concern for boys, that led him in 1911 to initiate Boy Scout work here. It would give wholesome interests, develop resourcefulness and responsibility, and love of country.

Unassuming, friendly, generous of time and knowledge, with a happy sense of humor and a quick and ready smile, courteous and considerate, he was a delightful companion. In every family relation he was devoted and loving beyond all measure. He died, after a brief illness, April 30, 1924, just as the world he loved so much was waking into beauty.

The cover illustration was taken from a pencil drawing of Sgt. Henry Holcomb Bennett, Ohio National Guard, by his brother John Bennett, distinguished author of historical novels (among them Master Skylark) and chronicler of South Carolina legends, who here records the origin of The Flag Goes By. Their sister, Miss Martha Trimble Bennett, founder and head of the English department at Dana Hall (Wellesley) for many year, has given her retiring years to local history, perennial object of the Bennett family's devotion. The Ross County Historical Society proudly presents this definitive study of The Flag Goes By, dedicating it with affection and esteem to the great American family which created it.

Chillicothe, Ohio, Flag Day, June 14, 1956.

Fraternalism Fights Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the American Mercury magazine carries a most important article on the subject Fraternalism Fights Communism. This article was written by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J. Here are some brief facts about Mr. Stringfellow:

He was born in Reva, Va., son of James and Elizabeth F. (Bowers) Stringfellow. Married Carrie M. Fearnow.

He is a director and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and director of Thomas A. Edison of Canada, Ltd.; was a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison for many years.

He is a director of Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; member of the board of directors of the American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C.; member of the American Iron and Steel Institute and the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, New York City; member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.; and member of the board of governors, American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry, New York City.

He is an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society; was awarded the certificate of service by the Rotary Club of Orange, N. J.; was cited as the outstanding citizen of the Oranges and Maplewood; was cited by the Brotherhood Committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects.

He received an honorary degree of doctor of fine arts from Ithaca College; honorary degree of doctor of laws from South Jersey Law School; honorary degree of doctor of laws from Upsala College; honorary degree of doctor of humanities from Indiana Technical College; a citation of merit from the New Jersey Association of Business Schools; the 1953 Gustav Lucie Brotherhood award; the citizen award for outstanding achievement in industrial statesmanship from the New Jersey Society of Professional Engineers.

He is past president of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association; founder and first president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, and the recipient of the American Cancer Society award. Served two terms as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City; served two terms as president of the chamber of commerce and civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; former chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party of New Jersey; member of the Imperial Divan of the Shrine of North America.

His clubs are the Kiwanis Club of New York City; Advertising Club of New Jersey; Union League Club of New York and Philadelphia; New York Railroad Club; Duquesne Club of Pittsburgh; Montclair Golf Club, Montclair, N. J.; and the Essex Club of Newark, N. J.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD this very worthwhile article:

FRATERNALISM FIGHTS COMMUNISM

(By George E. Stringfellow)

The voluntary cooperation of a free people is one of the invaluable spiritual resources of a free society. Personal, voluntary cooperation in the United States has become so widespread and has developed to such an extent that it can be described as an established influence in our land of the free. "When the history of our times is written," says Clarence B. Randall in his Creed for Free Enterprise, "this characteristic will stand out as our most revolutionary contribution to the advancement of human welfare by democratic processes."

Of the countless voluntary organizations in America, the 700 fraternal organizations, composed of both men and women, stand as one of our most valuable resources. Faced with the challenge of atheistic communism to our way of life, the members of these fraternal orders have not only taken their stand for God, but in opposition to communism and all its works. Moreover, many of the leaders in our fraternal orders have been on the front line in the fight to preserve our American way of life against the infiltration of communism.

Civilization rests ultimately on an act of faith. For those of us who have grown up in the Christian ethic, faith in God is the very foundation of the social order. This is God's world; He is the Creator of the universe, which is under His dominion.

In this faith and abiding conviction, Freemasonry, the oldest form of fraternalism, was founded and has developed through the centuries. Its symbolism, its ritual, and its rule of life are derived from a belief in God. No atheist can qualify for membership in the Masons, nor in other fraternal orders.

While the vows and rituals of Freemasonry are not publicized, the symbolism and philanthropic acts of the order portray its ethical foundations. The doctrines of Freemasonry parallel the traditional lessons of humanity that are one with the highest hopes of all ages. The objective of Freemasonry, briefly, is the "development of a body of 'moral instructions,'" communicated and taught.

Of the symbolism of Freemasonry, three symbols alone will suffice to illustrate the religious basis of the order: The altar, the square, and compass, and the all-seeing God.

Both the form and place of the altar proclaim its sacred importance in the lodge. Here the Bible is spread open; here, too, the square and compass are placed; here are carried on many of the rites of the craft.

The square and compass have mystic significance. By an earlier ritual, they sought "to teach members to square their actions and to keep them within bounds."

"Who wears the square upon his breast
Does in the sight of God attest
And in the face of man
That all his actions will compare
With the divine, the unerring square
That squares great virtue's plan."

The all-seeing eye, since ancient times, has been considered a symbol of divine watchfulness and care of the universe by God. David, son of Solomon, wrote: "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears are open to their cries."

This belief in God, which is the central fact and faith of Masonry, is also the central faith of all the leading fraternal orders in this country. Symbolism, ritualism, and specific objectives may differ in the different fraternities, but on one thing there is complete agreement—namely, believe in God as the Creator of the universe.

When one lists the approximate members of the major orders such as the Knights of Columbus, Odd Fellows, the Eagles, Elks, Moose, Knights of Pythias, and Masons together with their appendant orders and auxiliaries, the total is nearly 13 million. To this substantial total must be added the 700 other fraternal orders in the United States. It is this stanch phalanx of God-committed men and women who stand as a mighty bulwark against the assaults of Marxist socialism.

The role of this vast group of men and women becomes of great importance when we recognize the nature of our present world crisis. Those who have eyes to see perceive that we have reached a climax in history. That climax is characterized by the present ideological struggle for the minds and souls of men. In such an ideological struggle, it is essential that we understand not only the faith by which we live in the free world, but the faith by which the slave world lives.

The ideology of the Communist world was originally formulated by Marx and Engels in the Communist manifesto in the middle of the 19th century. By that manifesto, communism was made a mass force in the world. In that document, Karl Marx not only attacked economic beliefs of the 19th century, but its political and moral ideas as well. He denounced parliamentary government, and asserted that "force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." He based his theory on the materialistic con-

ception of history, the inevitability of the class struggle, the violent overthrow of the social order, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Communism, as it has developed, combines the most ruthless practice of power politics with a fanatical zeal for revolutionary change. Communism would abolish our fundamental concepts of freedom, democracy and law in our society. It isolates man and destroys the belief in the moral responsibility of the individual. It can exert much influence since it has the financial backing of wealthy people.

But what makes communism a most serious threat to our western civilization and to modern capitalism is the missionary zeal of its volunteers and its goal of world domination. So great an authority on Soviet strategy as Gen. Douglas MacArthur recently asserted that the Russian strategy is the double envelopment to the South as well as to the North. Soviet intent is clear; economic control of the world as a means of world conquest.

But beyond this sober warning by MacArthur, how shall be appraise the violent denunciation of Joseph Stalin by his former associate Khrushchev and the present Red leaders before the recent Communist Party Conference? And what shall be conclude from Khrushchev's statement that Moscow, in Stalin's time, was "ridden by plots, counterplots, and intrigue?" Or, what are we to conclude from the assertion that Stalin was afflicted with a terrible form of madness over the past 20 years?

If Stalin was a fanatic and a murderer, as is now charged by his former partners in crime, including all-powerful Lazar Kaganovich, his father-in-law, what about his competence to negotiate agreements in behalf of the Soviet Republic at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, with representatives of Great Britain and the United States?

Little wonder that, as a result of all these disclosures of the true nature of Stalin's dictatorship and the clique he represented, there is consternation among his followers within the Soviet Union, and utter dismay among the leaders of the Communist Party, both within and without the Iron Curtain.

Thirty years ago, before there was an awareness of the danger of Communist infiltration in the United States, the International Supreme Council of the Order of De Molay issued a warning in behalf of Masonic youth that, for the most part, went unheeded. Let me quote the words of Frank F. Land, secretary general of the order:

"The Order of De Molay took an emphatic stand against communism in 1925 when our youth movement was only 6 years old. De Molay's was the first youth movement to do this, and pioneered the way for others. Today, with its membership approaching the 3 million mark, De Molay is more firmly entrenched now than ever in the traditions of Masonic endeavor.

"De Molay immediately added a vigorous anti-Communist campaign to its list of activities in 1925, and, in the following year, more than 33,000 persons attended 473 De Molay-sponsored meetings to combat communism. Ever since, De Molay has continued this activity, always stressing reverence of God and all-out patriotism to one's country, which are two of the cardinal virtues upon which the order is founded."

Nearly a decade before the present revelations of the nature of Soviet communism, Past Imperial Potentate George H. Rowe, of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine and a distinguished member of the Supreme Court of New York for nearly a quarter century, warned of the serious inroads of communism in America.

"Fraternalism and religion will cease if communism breaks down our form of government and democracy. World leaders have commended the Shrine for its fearlessness, its foresight, and its knowledge of America's Red menace.

"The Shrine took the lead among the Nation's fraternal orders in turning the spotlight on Red communism—its identity; its aims; its purposes—and we did it in time. Certain corporations and labor organizations, and our Government itself, were then indifferent, but grew amazed at revelations. Finally, investigations were inaugurated. But the support of the Shrine must not lessen until this enemy of free living shall cease to exist in America. For that, the Shrine draws the scimitar in the Nation's defense. For only in a free country can fraternalism live."

With the same clear warning, Galloway Calhoun, past imperial potentate and chairman of the Board of Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, asserted: "Communism is a cancerous sore, eating at the very heart of the world. It is a godless philosophy, contrary to the sacred principles on which our Government was founded, our way of life, our Bill of Rights, and all for which Old Glory stands, seeking finally to overthrow our Government by force, if necessary, to accomplish its ends.

"The 800,000 Shriners of North America, each having placed his trust in God and standing foursquare for God, for country, and our flag, shall stand like a mighty phalanx, opposing this scourge from hell until their arms shall strike no longer and their tongues shall speak no more, definantly saying to the hordes of communism, 'Thou shalt not pass.'"

Harold Lloyd, a past imperial potentate of the Shrine, and member of the board of the trustees of the Shrines Hospital for Crippled Children, said: "To me, the issue is as clearly defined as white from red. One can't be both an American and a Communist."

Other prophetic voices from fearless and forthright leaders of fraternal organizations have been raised against the menace of communism, both to our country and to fraternalism. Aroused and alert, they have called upon their fellow lodge members to be vigilant and vigorous. No one can deny the pioneer work of the leaders of fraternalism in sounding the alarm long before the public was aware of the danger. Yet this patriotic service of our fraternal orders is one with that earlier and even more illustrious role of Masonry in laying the foundation of the Republic. Then, the sovereign rights of freemen were at stake—and the principle of government by consent was in the balance.

The story of the American Revolution and the early efforts to build a republic of freemen in colonial America is one of the epics of the human spirit, the achievement of which was wrought in no small measure by men whose love of freedom was nurtured in their Masonic lodges. Historians of that period assert that Masonry alone undertook to lay the foundations for national unity in America.

In 1760, there was no town, large or small, along the Atlantic seaboard where Masonry had not begun its work of preaching fraternity and unity. The fellowship thus created was invaluable, as was the ideological work carried under the shield of Freemasonry.

The Boston Tea Party is regarded as the first revolutionary act on the part of the colonists—it was, in fact, an adjourned meeting of the St. Andrew Lodge of Boston.

Paul Revere, the Right Worshipful Grand Master of Massachusetts, sounded the alarm that aroused Concord and Lexington. Tom Paine, Patrick Henry, James Otis, and John Paul Jones were all Masons.

George Washington, Master Mason of his craft, drew inspiration from his membership in the order and gained strength from his association with his brother Masons. During his entire adult life, he drew about him members of the order. Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 31 were Masons—or, three-fifths of the entire assembly.

Thirty-nine patriots signed the new Constitution that was drafted at Philadelphia; 23 of them were Masons that included Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, and Madison. But not only was Masonry a vital force in the establishment of the Republic; it was responsible, in part, for removing the hatreds caused by the War Between the States.

And so the record unfolds. It prompted one historian to describe Freemasonry as the great social force of the 18th century. It is not too much to assert that the history of Freemasonry is intertwined with the early history of our country, as today it stands with the other fraternal orders as a defender of our liberties.

The conclusion of the matter is this: The distinguished and devoted leaders of our fraternal orders and religious organizations were in the vanguard in warning our Nation about atheistic communism, and today are in the forefront of the battle to meet this mounting challenge.

As a Mason and as a Shriner, this is my belief, my creed of an American who worships God, who cherishes the beneficent services of fraternity, and who has unbounded faith in the destiny of America:

I believe in God.

I believe in this Nation, under God.

I believe in our fraternities, under God.

I believe that this Nation, under God, was destined to be the protector and defender of human liberty.

"For, where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

He Gave $11 Million Back to the Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Paul R. Leach which appeared in the Miami Herald some time ago. This article discloses a remarkable record of economy and efficiency by Mr. Raymond Blattenberger, the Public Printer, in directing the activities of the Government Printing Office.

Public attention is usually focused on waste and extravagance and all too frequently records of efficiency and economy go unnoticed. When such a record is made, I think it deserves public attention.

The article in question follows:

[From the Miami Herald of December 19, 1955]

WASHINGTON.—Thrice in the last 2½ years Raymond Blattenberger, the man who directs the mammoth Government Printing Office, has turned money back to the United States Treasury, $11 million in all.

In the same period his payroll has been reduced by 800 persons. He has wangled and absorbed $2,875,000 in 3 pay raises for members of the 15 unions working there. Prices to his "customers" have been slashed, and production volume has gone up $3 million.

He has done it by running that $77 million annual business the way he did his job as executive vice president of the Edward Stern Printing Co., of Philadelphia. That is, as a

"griper" in getting things done, but with a warm pat on the back for every man on the job who has helped do it.

Such goings on, "a gratifying achievement" to quote penny-pinching Treasury Secretary Humphrey, are termed without historic parallel in the 30 acres of floor space of that print shop. It is almost unheard of for any bureau head to turn back unused money.

Just as unusual is the story of how this slender, soft-spoken, 63-year-old man came to be Public Printer.

He never finished grade school. He grew up in the printing business, starting as a press helper at age 14 for $6 a week. He had 2 years of a night school business course, and put in 2 similar years prepping for Temple University.

You could call him a frustrated physician, for medicine was his idea in going to Temple. He disagrees with that. He remained with the trade because he loved it.

Blattenberger was drafted by President Eisenhower's "charm." He gave up close to a $30,000 income to work for Uncle Sam at half that figure.

Nearly 50 men, all with powerful political backing, wanted the job when Eisenhower came in. While the GPO does printing for all departments and Congress, it is an agency of the Congress.

Five weeks after Ike's inauguration Blattenberger picked up his phone in Philadelphia. Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas Republican, then chairman of the Rules subcommittee which had charge of printing, was talking from Washington.

"Have you any recommendations for the job of Public Printer?" CARLSON asked.

"Yes," said Blattenberger. "There's John Soandso, and Bill Whoosit, and * * *."

"Now, the man we want," CARLSON interrupted, "is vice president of one of the biggest companies in the East. He has a fine record as a production manager. He's a Republican, member of the Union League Club. He has never been in politics, lives in Haddonfield, N. J., and * * *."

"Hey," Blattenberger cut in, "are you talking about me? If you are I don't want the job. I'm perfectly happy where I am."

"We know you don't want the job. That's why we want you," the Senator said. "The responsible people of the industry say you're the man."

Still protesting Blattenberger was asked to come to Washington and see Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams. He was pleased by the offer, Blattenberger told Adams, but he did not want any part of the job. So Adams took him in to see the President.

"I am delighted that you are coming to join us," said Ike. And then the President smiled.

That did it. Blattenberger says today he'd do anything that man asked him to do. He looks over his shoulder many times a day at that same smile on his office wall. When the going is rough the smile reassures him.

It is a color print of Norman Rockwell's famous Saturday Evening Post cover portrait. There's a second portrait on Blattenberger's wall, painted by one of the Printing Office workmen. It is of another well-known Philadelphia printer, name of Ben Franklin.

It is in that setting, with a clean desk, that Raymond Blattenberger runs the Government's printing business. The GPO has its own appropriation of only about $12 million a year from Congress. That is a revolving fund.

Congress and the departments are billed monthly for printing and publishing, for which each has its own budget figure. The billing is on a cost basis, determined on the average cost per unit of operation.

Unlike other Government departments which are spenders of public money, the GPO has to maintain its own building and equipment. A balance sheet is drawn every month.

After Blattenberger had been Public Printer for a year he reduced charges to all departments by 5 percent and turned $5 million over to the Treasury. Last spring he sent Humphrey a $3 million check. Just a few days ago still another $3 million went into the coffers.

"We had the money and didn't need it," is Blattenberger's explanation. But that does not tell all the story.

At the outset he called in all division heads and told them what he wanted done. The work would be so apportioned that steady jobs were assured. There would be no firing of anybody on political grounds. Budgets were set up for the first time for all divisions.

Manpower would be reduced, he said, by not filling jobs as people retired or quit. An equipment modernization committee was set up. If a machine maintenance cost was out of line, it was replaced, not to increase output but to modernize, so as to use fewer men per machine.

Reducing the payroll, cutting out 1 of 3 round-the-clock shifts, putting higher paid men on day work when Congress is not in session, having apprentices do oiling and cleaning instead of journeymen pressmen, budgeting, and reorganizing all buying, are highlights of the economy program.

Old-fashioned letterpress printing gave way on all possible jobs to the faster and simpler offset process. That reduced manpower, because 1 offset unit replaced 2 letterpresses, and got more work done.

Labor relations are fine, according to his aids. By law, employee groups sit with management once a year for general agreements. But a grievance can come up at any time, directly to the chief if necessary.

Blattenberger has a big stack of letters from the White House, the Cabinet, Budget Director, Members of Congress, bureau heads, praising his economy and efficiency.

His way of showing appreciation to the people who work there is reproducing those letters with his note and circulating them throughout the place.

Compulsory Swimming Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Mrs. Mary Macfadden, has strongly urged that swimming training be compulsory in the armed services and in our schools. Mrs. Macfadden is the author of the best seller Dumbbells and Carrot Strips, which describes her life with the late Bernarr Macfadden.

Because of the wide interest in swimming which was aroused by the recent tragic drowning of six marines who were in training, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Macfadden, dated May 25, my reply of May 28, an editorial from the Englewood (N. J.) Press Journal of May 31, and another letter from Mrs. Macfadden, dated June 7:

URGES COMPULSORY SWIMMING LESSONS

TO THE EDITOR:

I would appreciate it if you could find space for the enclosed letter to Congressman FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., as I feel it brings up an important point:

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *May 25, 1956.*

Congressman OSMERS.

DEAR SIR: I am inspired to write you the following letter on this propitious day (Mother's Day) after attending my church. My heart was heavy for those mothers whose sons' lives had been taken in vain. I'm referring to the six marines recently drowned. Reflecting upon my memory in such a disaster, I recall some years ago that there was a bill in Washington to make swimming compulsory. Had this bill gone through, there no doubt would have been many lives saved. It is my thought on this day that such a worthwhile bill should be resuscitated by you or your colleagues in Washington. What more worthy cause could they participate in than this? To save a life is the most important thing anyone can do.

It was because of a very sad experience in my girlhood that I learned to swim. My school chum and I delighted in going across the canal locks. She slipped in one day and was drowned. This tragic situation was a nightmare to me for many years.

Although not in good health, I prevailed upon my father to let me learn to swim, although I was forbidden by my doctor. Not only did I learn to swim, I became a very healthy girl because of it. My interest in swimming knew no bounds. Competition and life saving I also took up. Of all the awards I won, I am proudest of my "Award of Merit" from the Royal Life Saving Society. Because of this knowledge I was subsequently able to save three persons that I know would have perished but for my efforts on their behalf.

I was very much interested in reading that our wonderful President took swimming in his health rehabilitation program. How can one beat a man with such wisdom. I could never have stood the great problems I've met with had it not been for what swimming did for me mentally and physically. It is my sincere desire, this day of all days, to call to your attention that mothers are the backbone of this democracy and you must help to protect the fine sons we gave you custody of.

A bill of this kind will not only save lives it will give our children better health and happiness and will help prevent much delinquency. For 30 years I have kept constant vigilance on my lake to prevent drownings which could have occurred. Some very young children, without supervision, often trespass and it is a shame not to protect them. If I had any say-so in a bill to compel children to swim, it would be when they were quite young. I taught my many children (seven) between the ages of 2 and 4. What better cause could you foster?

Cordially yours,

(Mrs.) MARY MCFADDEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1956.

Mrs. MARY MACFADDEN,
Englewood, N. J.

DEAR MRS. MACFADDEN: Thank you very much for your letter of May 25, and I want to tell you how much I appreciate having your thoughts on the subject of compulsory swimming instruction in the Armed Forces.

I have inquired at the Marine Corps with regard to swimming instruction, and I am happy to report that all recruits are required to take at least 10 hours of training which is sufficient to teach all of them except those very few who are unable to qualify due to their great fear of the water.

My own mother and father were both good swimmers and taught me to swim at an early age. I have always enjoyed swimming as a form of recreation and upon occasion I have been able to use my knowledge of swimming to be very helpful to others.

The drownings in the Marine Corps recently were tragic, but I can report that steps are being taken to prevent a recurrence.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.

From the Englewood (N. J.) Press Journal of May 31, 1956

LEARN TO SWIM

In the Letters to the Editor colums in last week's Press-Journal Mrs. Mary Macfadden of Englewood, widow of the late Bernarr Macfadden, calls upon Congress through Representative FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of this district to make it compulsory for children to learn to swim.

If there is any way in which this could be done it would mean the saving of thousands of lives and the wiping away of incalculable fears among men and women when they are in, on or over water.

Ability to swim should be as natural as ability to walk or run—unless one intends never to be near water during his life.

The newspapers are full of stories of water tragedies caused by inability to swim. Most colleges make swimming an integral part of the curriculum. Public schools do not because they lack facilities, but there again, we need more swimming pool facilities, not alone for recreational purposes but for this vital educational purpose.

And until something is done on a large public scale, it is the wise parent who insists upon his child learning to swim. This is the modern age in which you cannot stay away from the water.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *June 7, 1956.*

FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.,
Congressman, Ninth District, New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I greatly appreciate your letter to me of May 28 in answer to mine. Its contents interest me very much, and I would like to comment upon what you have written. In your first paragraph, "and I want to tell you how much I appreciate having your thoughts on the subject of compulsory swimming instruction in the Armed Forces," it is my opinion that compulsory swimming instructions should be put into effect long before a boy gets into the Armed Forces.

Your second paragraph—and I quote: "I have inquired at the Marine Corps with regard to swimming instruction, and I am happy to report that all recruits are required to take at least 10 hours of training, which is sufficient to teach all of them except those very few who are unable to qualify due to their great fear of the water." This is my answer to it: Let us assume that these boys had had compulsory swimming in their earlier years, then the 10 hours of training now given them should be used to teach them the art of lifesaving, the rescue, release, and resuscitation methods which are very necessary in some cases to save the lives of the distressed swimmer and himself. Without this knowledge, I could never have saved the life of Mr. Macfadden in the English Channel, of which I give an example in my book, Dumbbells and Carrot Strips.

Queen Elizabeth of England is the patron of the Royal Lifesaving Society, in which I got my early training in the methods to save a drowning person. Never could I forget the slogan of this wonderful society. When I saw Mr. Macfadden in difficulty in the English Channel, my subconscious mind was repeating: "Whomsoever you see in distress, recognize in him a fellowman." Without this knowledge I had acquired from this society, he would never have lived. That was in 1913, and I was a bride of only months.

The third paragraph is most interesting—and I quote: "My own mother and father were both good swimmers and taught me to swim at an early age. I have always enjoyed swimming as a form of recreation, and upon occasion I have been able to use my knowledge of swimming to be very helpful to others." In my thinking it proves my contention, and I am happy that I presented my idea of compulsory swimming to you.

Apropos of what swimming can mean to one, I was saddened this week to learn of the death of my old friend, Sir Frank Beaurepaire, of Australia. His obituary told of his great success—financial and civic attainments. Sir Frank as a poor boy swam in 1 of the 15-mile swims through London in which I participated. After the Olympics in London in 1948, he told me this story: That he owed his great success to swimming. He said to me that after the First World War he was very badly hurt and that his doctor advised him to get into swimming again to get his health back. Not only did he get his health back, but he went into competition again, and it was only at 38 he retired from racing. I am enclosing his wonderful record for your perusal.

May I say that I feel perhaps some of your success may be due to the swimming your mother and father taught you at an early age. There is no doubt about it, if you learn to swim when you are young, you get a certain confidence that enables you to feel that you can master other pursuits and life's many challenges.

I am interested in what you say in the last paragraph: "The drownings in the Marine Corps recently were tragic, but I can report that steps are being taken to prevent a recurrence."

This long letter to you is written in the hope—and please excuse the length of it—that society is not too busy to do something to make some permanent achievement along the lines I have called to your attention.

I thank you for your kind interest.

Cordially yours,

MARY MACFADDEN
(Mrs. Mary Macfadden).

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. BOWLER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOWLER. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a tribute to the American flag given by the late mayor of St. Paul, Minn., the Honorable Lawrence C. Hodgson, 39 years ago today, June 14, 1917. It was delivered following ceremonies of the naturalization of a large number of new citizens. I have read and reread his inspiring words and take this occasion to pay honor to this author whose emotions in penning the tribute must surely have come from his heart as a most patriotic American.

The tribute follows:

THE AMERICAN FLAG

(By L. C. Hodgson)

It is no fabric of silk or bunting—no mere beautiful cloth woven by human hands. It is a living thing, pulsing with the throbbing ardors of humanity, glowing with the fervor of immortal hopes, leaping out in ecstacies of love and dream. It is a song—the song of upward-looking men. It is an altar fragrant with sacrifice. It is a garden wherefrom a nation grew, watered by the pure blood of heroes. It is a heaven wherein the sanctified are gathered. It is the home where freemen dwell. It is the battlefield whereon honor strikes its blow for the cause of God. It is a flame springing up to consume injustice and wither the hosts of wrong. It is a voice that speaks with the eloquence of graves where sleep those who died to make it mean purity and righteousness. He who looks upon that flag with ransomed eyes beholds within its folds the valor and the faith of Lexington and Gettysburg—the blazing eyes of the embattled farmers at Concord Bridge—the fierce splendors of the ocean that was the cradle of Paul Jones—the clarion death cry above the ruined Alamo—the prayer of Washington at Valley Forge—the agony of Lincoln as he paced the midnight hours—and, crowning all, the wind-swept faces of boys who die today along the thunder-smitten hills of France. The flag of the United States is the glory of God shining in the faces of those who dream of a world made clean enough to be the dwelling place of God. It turns our sorrows into exultation and our sacrifices into melody of service.

For such a flag true men will always gladly die—for such a flag good men will always nobly live.

Some Homework for Our Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been directing our colleagues' attention to information from time to time appearing in the public press, which apparently had been kept away from our Secretary of State. Some more such information appears in the Wall Street Journal of June 14, 1956, as follows:

TINY KUWAIT, MID-EAST'S TOP OIL PRODUCER, POURS OUT FLOOD OF PETROLEUM FOR WEST WHILE EGYPT FROWNS—SANDY SHEIKDOM FATTENS UP ON TAKE FROM EXPANDING AMERICAN-BRITISH OPERATION

When Colonel Nasser's Egypt says Britain must give up its hold on the Arab Middle East, it has a glittering eye fixed upon one particular plum—a plum which has ripened quickly and to incredible richness: The Sheikdom of Kuwait.

Kuwait is independent, in the sense that its turbaned ruler, His Highness Sheik Sir Abdulah al-Salim al-Subah, governs his 200,000 subjects precisely as he pleases. He has never held an election; he has never so much as published a budget.

But Kuwait is a British-protected state. The United Kingdom runs its foreign relations and protects it from being swallowed by its far larger neighbors. Next door is Saudi Arabia, still just as expansionist in mood as it was in 1921, when King Ibn Saud attacked the little land.

And Kuwait is half American, when it comes to oil—which is what it does come to. Barring war or revolution, Gulf Oil Corp., of Pittsburgh should get 50 percent of all the petroleum that can be taken out of the country during the next 70 years. The concession is operated by Kuwait Oil Co., Ltd., headquarters in London, and jointly owned by Gulf and by British Petroleum Co., the old Anglo-Iranian, each of which has an undivided half interest in the concessions.

It was just 10 years ago this month that Kuwait Oil loaded its first tankship with

crude. What has happened since beggars imagination.

RESERVES TOP UNITED STATES

This tiny patch of sand, with less than 3 percent of the acreage of Texas, today boasts proved oil reserves of some 40 billion barrels, which is about one-third more than those of the entire United States. One thinks of Canada as enjoying an oil boom, but Kuwait is producing more than thrice as much and has 14 times the proved reserves underground.

A late comer to the Middle East oil sweepstakes, Kuwait's galloping production passed Iraq's in 1948, Iran's in 1951, and Saudi Arabia's in 1953. Since then none of the Persian Gulf states has been able to catch up with it; the 398.5 million barrels produced by Kuwait last year was nearly one-third of entire Middle East output.

And still the pace quickens. No official prognostication of Kuwait's 1956 crude production is available, but it is safe to say the figure is likely to pass 444 million barrels, which will be a good deal more than double the flow of just 5 years ago.

Obviously this has been very good business for Gulf. Its foreign production is now about three times its domestic output, and Kuwait is its biggest foreign source of oil. It is a very good deal for British Petroleum and for the British Government, which is part owner of the company, and for the entire British nation, which must depend on petroleum imports during this era when English coal is running short and atomic power has not yet arrived.

It is also pouring undreamed riches into Kuwait. Like all financial facts in the sheikdom, the exact size of payments by the oil company is a secret, but it is certain that the ruler is now being handed something like $300 million annually under a 50–50 profit-splitting pact which was rejuggled last year to his advantage. On top of that come the company's expenditures for local purchases and the spending of some 7,000 employees. Prosperity is evidenced in Kuwait town by a swarm of new American and European autos, making such a tumult that the muezzin must use an amplifier on his minaret to call the populace to prayer. Fluorescent lights dazzle the town at night.

TANKER COMPANY FORMED

And the Kuwaitis see still more riches in sight. Some of the local businessmen, under auspices of the ruler, have founded a tanker company with nominal capital of $10.4 million, and their representatives are expected to arrive in London any day now to begin dickering with the oil company. The intention is to cut into the lucrative business of transporting the petroleum to market; executives of the oil company hope what they have in mind is only 2 or 3 tankships, not a wholesale take-over.

The ruler is also inviting responsible oil companies to bid for offshore drilling rights in the Persian Gulf beyond the 6-mile limit of the present concession areas.

Already he has a side deal, of potential importance, with another oil company, American Independent Oil Co., which is developing the neutral zone between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia—a zone over which the two countries share sovereignty. American Independent has the concession from Kuwait, but it must share the oil with another Yankee firm, Getty Oil, which is the nominee of Saudi Arabia. The former pipes its oil from the Wafra field to a Kuwait terminal, Mina-al-Abdulla; the latter, forbidden by Saudi Arabia to use this exit, pipes its share of the crude to submarine loading lines at a neutral zone terminal, Mina Saud.

Exports began just 2 years ago and last year amounted to only about 8 million barrels for the two companies, but there are indications this may be stepped up sharply. American Independent, incidentally, is itself a combine of a number of companies and individual oil men: Phillips Petroleum, Hancock Oil, Signal Oil & Gas, Ashland Oil & Refining, Sunray Oil, Deep Rock Oil, Globe Oil & Refining, Lario Oil & Gas, Ralph K. Davies, and J. S. Abercrombie.

This wealth, present and potential, is all too apparent a temptation to zealots of the Arab movement who propagandize the anti-colonialism line. By itself it is perhaps sufficient to explain why Britain is doggedly hanging on to Cyprus, the one remaining military base dominating the area. As Prime Minister Anthony Eden has quite candidly told the House of Commons, Cyprus is "a protective guard and staging post" to safeguard Britain's vital interests—"above all, oil." Roughly half of the crude oil feeding United Kingdom refineries comes from Kuwait.

A BENEVOLENT DESPOT

While relying on the British for protection against external attack, the ruling sheik is keeping his little country far more quiet internally, at least for the present, than most Middle Eastern lands. Key government posts are kept in the family; especially important is his uncle, fierce-looking Sheik Abdulla al Mubarak, head of public security. But the ruler's formula is composed at least as much of benevolence as it is of despotism.

He has gone in for school and hospital building on a massive scale; education and medical care is free for all classes. And for a country which is entirely lacking in fresh water to drink (wells, when they strike water at all, produce a brackish liquid) he has established the world's biggest sea-water distillation plant, powered by natural gas piped from the oilfields. It is already producing 1.5 million gallons daily; a new unit will double this by next year and eventually over 20 million gallons daily will be produced.

Still a great deal of cash is left over; it is estimated that about one-quarter of Kuwait's oil revenue is being put away in an investment portifolio which must certainly be building into one of the word's largest. This would mean saving about $375 annually for every man, woman, and child in Kuwait. The securities chosen have not been made public, but reportedly a large part is composed of British Government bonds.

The course pursued by the sensible Sheik is producing short-term stability, but some oilmen are keeping their fingers crossed about the longer run. Kuwaits are within range of Radio Cairo, pouring out its message of "Oil is for the Arabs • • • Remember that the oil that flows from your land is seized by your enemy." Most of the Kuwait youth who go abroad to study are in Egypt; Egyptian teachers are plentiful in Kuwait's own schools.

Many of the workers who have immigrated to the country are Arab refugees from Palestine; others come from Syria. More than 20 suspected Communist agents have been picked up in the last few days in a series of raids which also turned up a large quantity of Communist literature in Arabic. Kuwait may yet be swept by anti-Western passions.

The dangers are quite evidently not great enough, however, to deter Gulf and British Petroleum from continued heavy investment in Kuwait. Kuwait Oil Co. is now buying the equipment for an addition to its refinery at Mina-al-Ahmadi which will increase its capacity more than sixfold, from a present 30,000 barrels daily to 190,000 by early 1958. There will be extensions, too, to the tanker loading system which is already handling far and away the largest tonnage of any oil terminal in the world; over 2,700 ships were loaded last year.

From a technical point of view, Kuwait is an oil man's dream, producing enormous volumes of oil at very low cost.

The gigantic Burgan field, located about two decades ago, is an oval of more than 135 square miles, just a few miles from the coastal tanker terminal. It can be tapped by wells plunging only about one mile deep. It seems to present few technical problems such as a dropping of gas pressure which often trouble operators elsewhere. A single well produces a flood far beyond normal United States standards; the average Kuwait hole yields about 6,200 barrels daily, compared to a 13-barrel average during 1955 in the States. Of course, the United States average is brought down by thousands of small-output wells which now have been producing for nearly half a century.

For wildcatting operations the terrain contrasts favorably with the mountains and marshes encountered in Iran and Iraq. Tall drilling rigs need not be taken down and reassembled to tackle a new site; they are merely hauled across the desert by a team of five or six huge tractors. The whole task is so simple that four drilling rigs are taking care of all Kuwait's needs; in comparison there were 2,673 rotary rigs at work in the United States at latest count.

A rig which had been pulled 99 miles northward from the Ahmadi field hit oil late last year at Raudhatain, and a second well is expected to be completed soon. The pool lies nearly twice as deep as the Burgan field, but in other ways appears remarkably similar. The oil-bearing strata are thick, but the horizontal extent of the field remains to be determined by further drilling; geologic evidence indicates it will not be so large as Burgan. By any standards, however, it rates as a major field. But so plentiful is oil in this land that Kuwait Oil is likely to spend 5 years or so drilling more wells before it will bother to build a pipeline and let them flow.

BRITON HEADS OPERATIONS

Kuwait Oil is run from its big London headquarters with a Briton, C. A. P. Southwell, a veteran of the old Anglo-Iranian company, as managing director, but Americans are plentiful in London and in the field. L. T. Jordan, of Lufkin, Tex., who used to work for Gulf in Venezuela, is general manager in Kuwait. Roy Fuquay, another Texan who worked for Gulf in South America, heads drilling operations.

Gulf Oil has thus far solved with brilliant success the problem of marketing its constantly increasing surge of Kuwait petroleum. To move the biggest chunk of its share it has resorted to contracts with other oil concerns, some of which compete with Gulf in United States markets.

By far the largest deal that Gulf has for the sale of Kuwait oil is its long-term contract with Royal Dutch-Shell. Its exact terms have been kept in a shroud of secrecy but a huge volume is marketed through the worldwide Shell group of companies.

Arrangements with other concerns include contracts with Cities Service and Sinclair.

Socony Mobil, another international oil concern, gets Kuwait crude under contract with British Petroleum. It currently is getting some 68,000 barrels daily. Part of this is used in the United States and part in Socony's foreign operations. Another taker of Kuwait crude from British Petroleum is Sun Oil. It is getting about 40,000 barrels a month.

Parts of its Kuwait production Gulf is able to swallow on its own, of course; during 1955 it imported about 59,000 barrels daily to feed its big Philadelphia refinery. But the United States Office of Defense Mobilization, prodded by domestic oil producers resentful of imports, has been trying to put the lid on. As part of this voluntary program, Gulf actually agreed to a 7-percent cutback in its imports of Middle East crude during the first quarter of this year.

Genocide Day for the People of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is genocide day for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This is the day 15 years ago that the Russian Communists deported thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians to slave labor camps.

As a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, I heard firsthand the dreadful story of these mass deportations. It is without doubt one of the blackest pages in all human history.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would have us forget what happened in these Baltic countries.

There are those who have suggested that the forced occupation of these independent nations is an accomplished fact.

There are those who denounce colonialism.

The free world can never forget what happened to the Baltic countries on June 14, 1941. Nor can the free world ever accept the forced incorporation of these countries into the Soviet Union.

In these days of soft talk from Communist tyrants, it is just and necessary that we should remind ourselves that millions of people have been forced under Communist despotism and that once free and independent countries are now captives of the Communist tyrants.

No amount of soft talk can change these facts. And the conscience of the free world can never be easy until these wrongs have been righted.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*.—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*.—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*.
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*.—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*.—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*.—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*.—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*.—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Beamer, John V., *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bell, John J., *Tex*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*.—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*.—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*.—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*.—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*.—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*.—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*.—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*.—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*.—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*.—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*.—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*.—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*.—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*.—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*.—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*.
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*.—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*.—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*.—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*.—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*.
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*.—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*.—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*.—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*.—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*.—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*.—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.—2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*.
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*.—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*.—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*.—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*.—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*.—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*.—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*.—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*.—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*.
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*.—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*.—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*.—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*.—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*.—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*.—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*.—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*.
George, Myron V., *Kans*.—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*.—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith, *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*.—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Hale, Robert, *Maine*.—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*.—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*.
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*.—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*.—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*.—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*.—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*.—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hill, William S., *Colo*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*.—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*.—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*.—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*.—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*.—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*.—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*.—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*.
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*.—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*.—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*.—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*.
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*.
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*.—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
King, Karl C., *Pa*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*.—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.